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PREFACE

THE following pages deal with a movement rather than a church or churches. The plea of the Disciples of Christ is much more comprehensive than that of any religious denomination that existed a century ago, or that has existed since that time. The religious awakening, produced by the Campbells and those associated with them, affected more or less the whole of religious society. It was a move on the strongholds of sectarianism, and a high call to liberty of thought, liberty of speech, and the right of individual interpretation. It was, first of all, a protest against the reign of priestcraft and religious despotism.

In the beginning of the movement, no one thought much about church or churches. There was no thought at all about establishing another religious denomination. The primary aim was to break down the walls of sectarianism and give freedom in Christ Jesus to all earnest souls. From this point of view it was practically a second Protestantism. It was a movement on Society, and its aim was to reform all religious denominations so as to bring them into harmony with the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures.

But it was even more than this. It was an honest, hearty plea for Christian union. It affirmed for all the children of God the right to differ but not to divide. This has always been a fundamental principle with the Disciples from the day the great “Declaration and Address” was issued by the “Christian Association” to the present time. To put the matter, with respect to religious association and fellowship, in mathematical language, the Disciples have always contended for the greatest possible numerator with the least possible denominator; or the greatest possible individual liberty with the least possible divisive element. In other words, they have made very much of Christ Himself, as the foundation of the Church and the basis of Christian union, but, at the same time, they have made very little of doctrines, opinions, and human creeds,
which divide into denominations, and thereby weaken the people of God in their effort to take the world for Christ.

During the first stages of the movement it may properly be called a “Reformation,” for at that time its advocates sought most earnestly to reform the churches which already existed, rather than to organize new churches which might result in a separate religious people.

But it soon became apparent that these earnest men could not maintain the position which they at first assumed. They were practically driven into a separate organization, and consequently they had to justify their separate position by contending for a complete restoration of Apostolic Christianity. During this special period, which extended from about the year 1830 to the year 1870, the movement may be called a “Restoration movement,” as that was emphatically the chief plea made during the time indicated.

However, about the year 1870, following closely upon the conclusion of the Civil War, there was a growing spirit among the Disciples of “Toleration” with respect to the religious denominations, and this finally showed itself distinctly in federation with these denominations, in so far as there were points of agreement between these denominations and the Disciples, these points of “agreement” furnishing a working basis, but not sufficient for complete organic union. Since then, there has been a disposition to seek for Christian union in emphasising these points of agreement rather than the points of difference.

In taking this important step, it is understood that the Disciples have not given up any distinctive matter for which they have ever contended, but that they have simply changed the emphasis with respect to some things, about which there is room for honest difference of opinion. Meantime, the denominations have been coming nearer and nearer to the main position of the Disciples. In short, there has been an approach to one another, and thereby they have illustrated what Mr. Campbell meant when he said “approaches are better than reproaches.” When he said this, he was arguing against a sectarian spirit which seemed to possess some of his own people; and this sectarian spirit, which every now and then came to the front among the Disciples themselves, was one of the things
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that Mr. Campbell used all of his power to suppress during the days of his active ministry.

It is highly probable that history will finally affirm that Alexander Campbell, more than any other man, and the Disciples, more than any other religious people, are responsible for the growing sentiment of Christian union which prevails in many of the Churches at the beginning of this Twentieth Century. For a time Mr. Campbell was compelled to deal vigorously with sectarianism, and in doing this he often gave offence to even those who in most things believed with him, but who nevertheless thought that his unmerciful attacks were ill-advised, and frequently without justification. Nor is it necessary now to defend all he said, especially in the days of the Christian Baptist. Still, his words cannot be properly weighed without taking into consideration the actual condition of things that existed at that time. Even Mr. Jeter, in his “Campbellism Examined,” half apologises for Mr. Campbell's unmerciful flagellation of the sects in the following language:

“That a Reformation was needed by the Christian sects of that time none, who possesses a tolerable acquaintance with their condition, and the claims of the Gospel, will deny. . . . Among the Baptist churches there were some sad evils. In parts of the country, the churches were infected with an antinomian spirit, and blighted by a heartless, speculative, hair-splitting orthodoxy. These churches were mostly penurious, opposed to Christian Missions, and all enlarged plans and self-denying efforts for promoting the cause of Christ. In general, the careful study of the Scriptures, the religious education of children, the proper observance of the Lord's Day, a wholesome, scriptural discipline, the reasonable support of pastors, and in fine, devotion to the Redeemer's cause, were too much neglected.”

Undoubtedly the spirit of Mr. Campbell became less belligerent as he grew older, and as there appeared less and less need for the methods which he used at the beginning of the Disciple movement.

It must be remembered that he constantly contended that the walls of spiritual Jerusalem could not be rebuilt until they were cleared of the rubbish which had accumu-
lated on them during the reign of the apostasy, and consequently, while he kept the trowel in
one hand, he held the sword in the other, as Nehemiah and his workmen did when rebuilding
the walls of temporal Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it must be conceded, by all who are
acquainted with Mr. Campbell's whole advocacy, that he was always willing to meet every
overture for Christian union, even more than half way. While he would never listen to any
compromise of truth, he was always willing to compromise within the truth, as far as this
could be done without injury to the truth itself. In short, he was the very embodiment of the
“unity of the spirit,” as it breathes everywhere in the New Testament Scriptures. But, having
pledged himself to stand by these Scriptures, it was simply impossible for him to listen to any
plea for union that could not be supported by the plain teaching of the Word of God.

Of course there are those who contend that if he had paid less attention to the rubbish on
the walls, and more attention to simply the material he was putting into the walls, his
advocacy would have produced less friction and might have reached better results. This is
doubtful. It is easy to say what might have been, but when all the facts are taken into
consideration, it is impossible to believe otherwise than that Alexander Campbell was a man
of providence, and that his whole career was under the direction of divine wisdom; and that
being so, it is well to be careful about adverse criticisms, as these might place us in the
position of fighting against God.

There are altogether too many extraordinary incidents and conjunctions in the life of Mr.
Campbell, and in the religious movement of which he was the distinguished leader, to believe
that these can be accounted for by the ordinary laws with which we are acquainted. It seems
more reasonable to admit the element of Providence in these things than to undertake an
explanation which practically eliminates God and seeks for a solution in the ordinary course
of natural laws. Nor can this apparently wise conclusion be set aside by the arrogant ipse
dixit of Rationalism. We are accustomed to the wave of its imperious hand, but we are not
always frightened into obedience by it, since we have learned that many of its explanations of
apparent difficulties do not really explain at


all, and even when they have a semblance of reason in them they are beset by many more and
greater difficulties than those which are met in the Christian solution.

Doubtless this same oracle would explain the appearance of the “Monitor” in Hampton
Roads, at precisely the crucial moment, when the “Merrimac” was beginning the destruction
of the fleet there, as simply the result of natural laws, as we understand them. Furthermore,
these same wise men would probably tell us it was purely accidental that Moses was saved
by the ark of bulrushes which his mother had prepared for him, and that there was no
providential guidance in the fact that his own mother was selected as his nurse. They would
also require us to believe that the finding of the keys to the Babylonian cuniform inscriptions
and the Egyptian hieroglyphics, at exactly the same time when the records of the past were
most needed to support the testimony of the Bible, had no connection whatever with any
providential guidance, but was simply the result of the ordinary course of things. But such an
explanation is wholly unsatisfactory to any but superficial thinkers or depraved hearts. We
must discount either our heads or our hearts before we can believe that the hand of God was
not in these transactions. Equally certain may we be of the providential guidance with respect
to the conjunction of many other events. Christ visited this earth at exactly the time it was
ready for him. Luther began his reformation at precisely the supreme moment. The age was
waiting for him.

Likewise, we see the Restoration Movement of the Disciples of Christ was the answer of
a providential call for a new religious day to begin with the ushering in of the Nineteenth
Century. America was the country where the new day had to dawn, and where the Sun of
Righteousness had to rise with healing in his beams. America is on the road to the conquest
of the nations; it is the continent where the Christian forces must be organised for the great
and final forward movement to evangelise the countries lying Westward on the other side of
the Pacific Ocean. But America, at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, was a religious
wilderness, and much rough work had to be done before the people could be made ready for
the day of “sweetness and light,” a day which finally did
come at exactly the time when it was most needed and when it could be most effective in
conquering the world for Christ.

It is only in the light of such a view as this that the Disciple movement can be intelligibly
interpreted. It was not an accidental force, moving on the confusions of Christendom, without
any intelligent direction, but as clearly a providential interposition in religious development
as was the Lutheran Reformation, or any other great movement in the history of Christianity.
At first America was a religious battlefield, and the Disciple movement was necessarily a
fighting movement, and Mr. Campbell was a great warrior.

But, however this may be, it is certain that, after Mr. Campbell's death, the spirit of
conciliation became more and more distinctly a factor with the Disciples, and finally received
marked emphasis during the stage of "Toleration," the spirit by which the present day is
classified.

Looked at from the beginning to the present time, there appear to be comprehended in
the movement, not only three well-defined chronological periods, viz., the Creative, the
Chaotic, and the Reconstruction periods; but also three distinct stages in the development
come clearly into view. These stages may be, not inappropriately, named respectively, the
Reformation stage, the Restoration stage, and the Toleration stage. Consequently, the
following generalisation, with proper sub-divisions, will help the reader to understand the
progressive development of the movement for the hundred years of its existence:

I. REFORMATION. II. RESTORATION.
(a) Idealisation. (a) Separation.
(b) Hesitation. (b) Justification.
(c) Investigation. (c) Evangelisation.
(d) Realisation. (d) Organization.

III. TOLERATION.
(a) Tribulation.
(b) Education.
(c) Cooperation.
(d) Federation.
It will be seen that the sub-divisions in this programme clearly indicate the different steps in the line of progress. The “Declaration and Address” gives us a splendid ideal. Soon it was felt that the Christian world was not prepared for this ideal, and consequently there followed a time of considerable hesitation as to what the next step should be. This led to prayerful investigation with respect to the teaching of the Scriptures, and this was followed by a realisation that some definite position had to be taken, as the Christian world did not seem willing to listen to the plea for “Reformation.” The “Restoration” movement began in a separation from the Baptists and a justification of this separation. This was followed by a remarkable success in evangelisation, and this, by the organisation of the “American Christian Missionary Society,” with other important steps in the matter of organisation. Then came the period of “Toleration.” This period began with the tribulation of the Civil War. This war settled several things, and among the things it settled was that differences must not be emphasised so as to obscure the great points of agreement. Education became a prominent feature of the Disciple movement soon after the war, while co-operation in missionary work, through the various societies which had their birth when the war closed, helped to emphasise the spirit of charity towards the denominations, which had already begun to manifest itself in a much more definite way than it had done in the past history of the Disciples. Finally, the Disciples are now engaged in the Federation movement, and this is helping them to leaven the religious world with the principles of Christian union for which they have always contended.

It is perfectly true that not a few Disciples are still hesitating about taking part in this Federation movement, for the reason that they are fearful it is more or less a surrender of the definite plea which they have always made. But this has been the cry of the extreme right wing of the Disciple movement in every step of progress that has been made. These controversialists have always protested against going forward; but all the same, the Disciple hosts have continued to march toward the great goal of ultimate triumph for their cause. Even the friction among themselves, in the long run, has been advan-
tageous to their religious movement. It has stimulated activity; it has awakened interest; more than all, it has compelled the Disciples to study the Scriptures, as these have always been the sources of final appeal.

Of course, it is no part of the writer of the pages which follow to decide definitely whether the Disciples have always been wise or unwise with respect to the steps they have taken in making their history. But it is his duty to record faithfully what he sees in that history, and this is all that is claimed for the generalisation which has just been given.

In the narration of events, the chronological order has been followed as far as this could be done conveniently; but in a few cases, the matter under consideration has been carried forward, without a break, to the present time. It was felt that the chronological order has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. But upon the whole, it was thought to be the better plan to pursue. This plan enables the reader to consider the facts of history in the order of their occurrence, and will generally be a convenient help in tracing the relation of these events to one another.

Some will, no doubt, object to the use of the term “Disciple” as an adjective. But this is done only for historical convenience. Nevertheless, I have little sympathy with this objection; and less, if possible, with those men who insist on always spelling Disciple with a little d. These men cannot be reckoned with except from the point of view of charity for their extreme narrowness. Some of these are fitly described in the following lines:

They mint, anise and cummin fondly tithe, But weighty matters make them squirm and writhe; They strain out gnats from their religious creeds, Then swallow camels as regards their deeds.

The character sketches have been mainly confined to the people who have passed to their rewards. It would have been pleasing to the writer, if possible, to comprehend in the sketches the names of those now living who deserve a prominent place in the history. But it was not possible. This has been left for other historians to do in
the coming years. In a few instances, where it seemed absolutely necessary, something has been said as to the character and life of those who are still living. But the reader will see that there is justification for this, and therefore no invidious distinction was intended to be made.

One feature, it is believed, will commend itself to every Disciple of Christ. All the histories of the movement, so far as they have come under my notice, have been confined mainly, if not exclusively, to preachers and educators, as the promoters of the movement. In this volume will be found, grouped together, the names of very many business men who have furnished the sinews of war, while others have led the army. It is believed that these generous helpers ought, at least, to have their names mentioned in the history of the Disciples. It would have been an impossible task to secure all the names worthy of mention; consequently, many will doubtless be disappointed in finding that certain noble names have been omitted. The list that is given is the result of considerable correspondence with the best informed men in different sections of the country, and if the list is not complete, it should be judged according to the facts already stated.

During the preparation of this volume I have had the assistance of so many persons that it is simply impossible to even recount their names. For all this help I am profoundly grateful. But for superintending the supply of illustrations, for proofreading and other important help, I certainly ought to acknowledge the very great assistance I have received from my son, Paul Moore, Assistant Editor of the Christian Evangelist, St. Louis, Mo.

The author of this volume has been gathering material and studying the same for more than forty years, with a view to writing a history of the Disciples. He feels profoundly grateful to his Heavenly Father that his life has been spared, and that opportunities have been afforded to produce this work, which, though onerous in some respects, has, nevertheless, been a labour of love.

He wishes to state also that in the preparation of the volume he has sought, as far as possible, to let the actors in the great movement tell the story of its progress. This will account for numerous and somewhat extended quo-
tations from the writings of the men who have been the leaders from the beginning to the present time. Some of these leaders have received more attention than others, simply because what they have said or done was regarded as of more importance in getting forth the progress of the movement.
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History providence illustrated—Several causes leading up to an effect—Most discoveries may be traced to several causes, and usually several persons make the same discovery about the same time; this shows that everything is perfecting according to a great plan—The Campbellian Reformation had its origin in several different causes—The plea of the Campbells was a plea for an intelligent understanding of the Word of God—The time was propitious for the introduction of this plea; the place where the plea was presented was suitable; the men were trained for the work they undertook to do—God's men are always trained for their work—America lies on the road to the conversion of the world—Progress is always more or less westward; never permanently eastward—Christianity started in Palestine; it has traveled westward ever since; when the countries lying west of America have been converted then the work will have been accomplished—The battle of Armageddon will be fought somewhere between America and Palestine, probably in Japan or China; it may not be a battle on the tented field, but it will be a contest where the victory will be on the side of Christ and His religion—What are known as Oriental religions make their progress eastward; they do not and never have permanently made progress westward—America has been influenced by two streams of civilisation, one from Plymouth Rock, and the other from Jamestown; the two streams coalescing make the finest civilisation the world has ever seen; this coalescence takes place in the Mississippi Valley—These conclusions strongly supported by prophecy already fulfilled—The reformations under Luther, Calvin, and Wesley were essential to the Campbellian Reformation—Antecedent facts in history must be studied to understand present conditions; we must study the development of the earth physically, in order to understand moral and religious movements—Three periods in its development, namely: the Creative, the Chaotic, and the Organic or Reconstructive periods; these three periods are marked distinctly in the Reformation inaugurated by the Campbells—It has had its Creative period, its Chaotic period, and its Reconstructive period; the last of which is still continued—Progress is never in straight lines; this looks discouraging, but it is the only way that any permanent progress can be made—The countries lying west of us are still to be conquered for Christ—America is the place where the army must be trained to do its great work—The union of the Christian forces in America will make short work of heathendom whenever that union is effected—The Disciples of Christ occupy a favorable position with respect to this great work—Some of the main features of their contention—They contend for (1) a scriptural Bibliology, (2) a scriptural Theology, (3) a scriptural Christology, (4) a scriptural Pneumatology, (5) a scriptural Anthropology, (6) a scriptural Soteriology, (7) a scriptural Ecclesiology—Some of the reasons why the plea has met with such signal success: (1) Its scripturalness, (2) its reasonableness, (3) its great simplicity, (4) its comprehensiveness, (5)
its unity, (6) its consistency, (7) its practicability, (8) its conservatism, (9) its liberalism, (10) its progressive character, (11) the infallibility which it assures, (12) the unsectarianism of the plea—it seeks for the union of all God's people; it provides a scriptural, reasonable, and workable platform for this union; it makes Love the essential atmosphere for the cultivation of the spirit which will bring about this union.

CHAPTER I
THE CREATIVE PERIOD—THE CAMPBELLS

Thomas Campbell—His birth, training, and early ministry—Evidently a providential man—Some facts of his early training—Belonged to a Presbyterian body called Seceders—Experiences with respect to Christian union—Leaves Ireland for America—Is disappointed in his new religious environment—Finds sectarianism strongly entrenched in the United States and labours earnestly to improve conditions—Has trouble with his Presbytery—Finally forms the "Christian Association"—This was not intended to be a church, nor was it intended to form another denomination; object simply to bring Christians together with a view to Christian union—The injustice of the censure of Presbytery and his appeal to the Synod—Finally separates from the Seceders—His withdrawal did not hinder his earnest efforts in preaching the Gospel—Assembles his friends and neighbours together; makes an impassioned and wonderful speech, at the conclusion of which his great dictum "Where the Scriptures speak we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent we are silent," was uttered—This sentence became the slogan of the Disciple movement—Infant Baptism not considered at this time; Thomas Campbell did not think at first of giving up infant baptism—The great "Declaration and Address" written—An analysis of this document.

CHAPTER II
THE CHAOTIC PERIOD—ITS BEGINNING

Thomas Campbell disappointed in the reception which his Address received—Sectarianism more strongly fortified than he supposed—Finally applies to the Synod of Pittsburg for membership in the Presbyterian Church—The Synod rejects his application—His son, Alexander, arrives in America and reads the proof sheets of his father's great "Declaration and Address"—How he regarded his father's movement—His religious views—The Christian Association finds itself cut off from sympathy—A church is organised at Brush Run—No purpose of the movement to form a new religious body—Reformation was the watchword at this time—The aim to unite all Christians—Alexander Campbell prepares for his great work; his training in Scotland—He immediately threw himself into his father's plans; they work heartily together, Alexander defending his father in his controversy with the Presbyterian Church—Alexander's account of this period in his own language—His great Address on the principles involved—He was influenced to some extent by the Haldanean Reformation in Scotland—His father opposed to controversy, but Alexander felt compelled to meet the opposition made to his father's great plea—The Lord's Supper observed the day the church was organised at Brush Run—Alexander becomes the hero of the hour, and is ever afterwards regarded as the chief leader of the movement.
CHAPTER III
A NEW DEPASTURE AND NEW FRIENDS

Alexander Campbell's marriage and removal to Bethany, Virginia—Description of Bethany—Alexander considers the question of Infant Baptism; reads everything he can find in favour of it; finally concludes it is unauthor
ised by the Word of God—His own account of his change of views—Finally is immersed; at the same time his father, mother, and others follow his example—This new departure caused some of his friends to go back—Finally becomes identified practically with the Baptists—A modern view of Infant Baptism; arguments pro and con—in uniting with the Baptists the church at Brush Run stipulated for religious freedom—the action alienated Pedo-Baptists—Mr. Campbell’s opinion of the Baptists—His own account of these stirring events—His union with the Baptists was advantageous in some respects, though to his disadvantage in others ......................
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NEW FRIENDS BECOME ENEMIES
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Meeting of the Mahoning Association at New Lisbon, Ohio—Walter Scott appointed evangelist—Mr. Campbell’s two arguments in opposition to Infant Baptism; these made in his debates with Mr. Walker and Mr. McCalla—The Baptists applauded him while he used these arguments against the Pedo-Baptists, but when he maintained substantially the same position in his great sermon on The Law, they sought to exclude him from their Association—Walter Scott made a practical application of Mr. Campbell’s view of the design of baptism; he showed how great a help it was in evangelistic work; it made the place and time of pardon a definite
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SCRIPTURAL MEANING OF BAPTISM
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CHAPTER X
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CHAPTER XII
RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD AND RESTORATION
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RESTORATION AS AN IDEAL AND AS A REALISATION
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A COMPREHENSIVE HISTORY
OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST
INTRODUCTORY

HISTORY is providence illustrated. If it be true that the undevout astronomer is mad, it is equally true that he who studies history without the recognition of providence in it is wholly unqualified for his task. Prophecy itself is a clear intimation that human history is the development of a definite plan. All things are working together, not only for the good of them that love God, but also for the final achievement of definite ends in the Divine government. In this view, prophecy is the eye which foresees the coming events, and these coming events are the logical consequences of certain facts which tend to bring them about. Prophecy is not, therefore, an arbitrary decree of God, which is finally fulfilled simply because it has been decreed, but is rather an anticipatory revelation of what must necessarily come to pass according to that providential scheme by which the world is governed. In other words, prophecy is in harmony with a law which links all events together in one great chain of progress.

Nor is there anything in this view that legitimately suggests the doctrine of foreordination and election, as that doctrine is commonly understood. The meteorologist does not foreordain and elect the changes in the weather; he simply foresees and announces what these changes will be from certain facts which he has in his possession. Similarly, prophecy is the announcement of what will be history when this prophecy is fulfilled, and is therefore simply history proclaimed in advance of the “coming events” which “cast their shadows before them.”

The religious movement, which took a definite form at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and which ultimately crystallised into that body of Christians known as “Disciples of Christ,” or the “Christian Churches,” was foreshadowed by many indications prior to the year 1809, when the “Declaration and Address” was issued by the Campbells. This fact is entirely in harmony with the law of development. Great religious movements are
symptomatic of causes which lie behind them. The forces which produce these movements are often numerous, and are not unfrequently operating through many years. At least two factors must always be taken into account in dealing with human history. These factors are God and man. We know nothing of the former except as He is revealed in human history; we can know little of the latter, if we entirely separate him from the former. God and man, therefore, must be regarded as co-operating in all the movements that make for human progress; and this being true, we cannot possibly understand these movements without reckoning with the two factors to which reference has been made. But when these factors are admitted, it can readily be seen how necessary it is to reckon with Providence while considering the history of any religious movement.

It is true that human instrumentality is used to inaugurate and carry on this movement, but the movement itself is really the offspring of certain forces which have been slowly culminating for ages, and which are in accordance with a providential plan, which, though often hid from view, is, nevertheless, a great factor in the case. Discoveries of all kinds are simply the formal announcements of the arrival of events which have finally worked their way to the surface of things. This fact will account for the coincidence of discoveries. Numerous illustrations of this could be given. A familiar one is that of Adams and LeVerrier, working in their respective laboratories, each without the knowledge of what the other was doing, and finally, about the same time, discovering the almost exact position which Neptune occupies in our planetary system; so that when the telescope was pointed to the place indicated in the sidereal heavens the planet, which had been disturbing the movements of Uranus, was found, to the great delight of the men who had worked out the problem in their respective laboratories.

Another instance of this coincidence in discovery may be found in the numerous claimants as regards the telephone. It is now known that very many were working at the same problem, and with the same practical results, about the same time. Lord Kelvin and Sir William Ramsay, from different points of view, working independently of each other, discovered argon at about the same
time. The beginnings of great social and religious movements often lie far back in the history of their development, and no one is fit to write history who does not recognise this fact. Indeed, it is sometimes almost impossible to determine just who started any particular movement. The great Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century had its dawn before the days of Martin Luther. Wyclif and those co-operating with him were the robins which foretold the coming Springtime of the Reformation which followed. The religious world was ready and waiting for the arrival of Luther, and his task was mainly to organise and carry forward the work which had already begun, the underlying principles of which had been bubbling over a long time above the sea of troubled religious waters with which all Europe was submerged.

The religious movement which has been called the “Restoration of the Nineteenth Century” was, in its origin, not unlike other movements of its kind. The world was waiting for it. The symptoms of its coming were seen in many directions, and the undercurrent which had, somewhat unperceived, been sweeping through the churches of Europe and America, came at last into clear vision through what was almost a volcanic eruption in this country, and was at least of sufficient force in Europe to threaten the old religious establishments with dethronement, if not with utter destruction.

It is not strange, therefore, that about the time the Campbells issued their celebrated “Declaration and Address” in 1809, there were certain indications in Europe, as well as in some parts of America, which clearly foreshadowed the beginnings of what was, in many respects, a similar movement for the restoration of primitive Christianity. In England, Ireland, and Scotland there were movements that were symptomatic of the general unrest in religious society, and these movements were practically in line with the movement of the Campbells, and really antedated the latter by several years. The same fact must be noted with respect to movements in this country. There were churches in several places which threw overboard the dominion of human creeds, even before Thomas Campbell came to the United States, while the great religious reformation, led by B. W. Stone and others, in
Kentucky, may be regarded as a distinct forerunner of the movement inaugurated by the Campbells. It set forth practically the same principles, as far as it went, as were embodied in the celebrated “Declaration and Address.” Still, from a historical point of view, it is no unworthy treatment of the facts of the case if we reckon the religious movement, named the “Reformation of the Nineteenth Century,” to have had its formal inauguration with the issuance of the “Declaration and Address,” in September, 1809.

This location of the “beginning” need not in any way undervalue the movements which antedated it. If we are to look for all the antecedent influences which led up to this period, we should go back to the Renaissance, for the Restoration movement was undoubtedly, in many respects, first of all, an intellectual movement. Prior to its inauguration the condition of religious society in the United States was truly deplorable. Numerous religious parties had usurped the place of the “One Body,” and these became the exponents of the Christianity of the times. Ignorance and superstition were more valuable to these parties than any intelligent understanding of the Word of God. No one, who will candidly consider the state of things, as it existed in religious society at the beginning of the nineteenth century, will doubt what is here stated.

The plea of the Campbells was emphatically a plea for an intelligent understanding of the Word of God, and it was, therefore, properly an offspring of that Renaissance which elevated the intellectual conceptions of Europe, and which made the Protestant Reformation, under Luther and his associates, a possibility during the sixteenth century. Indeed, the Campbellian movement was dependent upon numerous other movements which antedated it, and it coalesced with still several other movements at the time of its distinct inauguration. These independent movements, as has already been intimated, were symptomatic of the unrest in religious society at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and they were all, more or less, directed by the providence of God, so as to approach each other, and finally to coalesce in the general movement, the specific inauguration of which I have located with the issuance of the “Declaration and Address,” in 1809.

It has already been suggested that the time was pro-
pitious for the inauguration of this great movement. It is equally true that the place where all
the forces crystallised and took on definite form was exactly in line with the “ways of God to
man,” in that providential scheme which is so clearly seen in every step of Christianity in its
march around the world. All the events of the past ages had led up to the momentous hour.
All the countries, in their civilisations, in their failures and triumphs, had contributed from
their resources something to make America just the place where the new movement should
find hospitable reception and a glorious development in order that the simple, pure Gospel
might be carried across the Pacific to the regions lying between America and the countries
where the religion of Christ had its beginning.

Looking at the matter from this point of view, the idea that America has been
providentially guided through political storms and troublous seas is just as certain as that God
is ruling over the nations for the consummation of His purposes in the world. It would have
doubtless been impossible to have started, in any effective way, the Campbellian movement
in even enlightened Europe. It is true that we are indebted to Europe for the light which came
to us from the East. The Campbells were providential men. They came to this country
bearing a great message, but this message would not have been heeded in any generous way
on the other side of the Atlantic. But it found congenial soil in the new world, where the old
fetters, that bound religious thought, were broken, and where the free institutions of this great
land lent themselves to the triumphant development of the great principles which the
Campbells embodied in the “Declaration and Address.” Consequently, both the time and
place were significantly appropriate for the beginning of such a movement as was
inaugurated by the Campbells.

A little further consideration of the facts in the case will make this statement abundantly
evident.

The dawn of the nineteenth century was the ushering in of a new era. The close of the
eighteenth century was marked by several striking events. The French Revolution had come
and left its influence upon the civilisations of Europe. The Napoleonic dynasty followed
close upon this, and continued until 1815, when the Battle of Water-
loo was fought, and a new age was practically inaugurated; for this battle not only settled a number of other important things, but it also changed materially the geography of Europe.

A still more important matter was the beginning of missions and the consequent translation of the Bible into foreign languages. It is impossible to estimate the value of these missions as a religious and civilising force on the subsequent history of the nations. Christianity had become stagnant in Europe. Until the discovery of America, there had been no outlet for it in a westwardly direction; and as all progress is mainly in that direction, it is easy to see that the new world must ultimately become the centre of a religious movement, which would carry on the work of saving the people among those nations which had never felt the force of Christianity. But, in the meantime, it was well that some noble souls, even in Europe, should dream of a converted East; for while foreign missions toward the East did not accomplish very much in the way of converts, they did accomplish a great deal in their influence on the churches at home. These churches received practically a new baptism in the spirit by the reaction of foreign missions upon the home-Christianity. Not only was this Christianity imbued with a revival spirit, but it received an increment of power in other respects from its contact with Eastern civilisations. Just as the crusades were a failure, so far as subduing the East to Western ideals of government was concerned, but, nevertheless, enriched the West with many of the treasures of the East, so the reaction from foreign missions brought with it what was extremely beneficial to the Western churches.

Nevertheless, the final result would not have been satisfactory, so far as the whole world is concerned, without the intervention of America in the onward march of progress. Any good map of the world will show the reader what is meant. America lies right between Europe, Africa, and about one-half of Asia, on one side, and Australia, the Philippine Islands and the other half of Asia, on the other side. All east of us are countries which were early influenced by Christianity. All west of us are countries which were practically untouched by Christianity until the nineteenth century.
Christianity, beginning in Palestine, spread toward the South and North, and conquered all the countries lying West. But it made little or no progress east of where it had its origin. This fact is a startling illustration of the law of progress, which is always practically Westward. At any rate, it is seldom, if ever, Eastward. It is certainly remarkable that even cities make their substantial progress Westward, and if there is any real progress in any other direction it is toward the North or toward the South. This statement may be verified by examining the growth of any city, seeming to contradict this statement. It is believed that a careful estimate of all the facts will show that the statement is practically true to universal history.

This is something worth knowing. If you are about to invest in real estate, you should be careful how you buy lots on the east side of a city. It is a fact which may be demonstrated by careful observation that no city now in existence has developed eastward to any large extent where there is a free opening in some other direction, and generally, if not universally, the progress is westward, if there is a clear opening on that side. Where this is not the case, it will be found that that city makes little or no growth at all.

If you ask the reason why this is so, probably no one can tell. Neither can any one tell why the earth, in its diurnal revolution, turns from west to east instead of from east to west. There are a thousand things that happen every day, the philosophy of which we cannot understand. There are a few suggestive statements and facts recorded in the Bible which are at least interesting in connection with this matter. When man was driven out of the Garden it is said that God placed at the east of the Garden the flame of a sword which turned every way so 8s to guard man against re-entering the Garden, clearly indicating that the East was no longer the way by which he could make progress. It is a curious fact that when God used the wind, under the Old Dispensation, for the purpose of destruction or chastisement, he invariably used the east wind. An east wind is a head wind. The earth turns from west to east, and consequently an east wind is one which meets us as the earth is turning from the west. Whoever has crossed the ocean in the teeth of
a head wind will know how disagreeable this wind is. From this fact it will be seen that the very elements are opposed to progress to the Eastward.

But whether any satisfactory reason can be given for the fact stated or not, it is unmistakably true that progress, in the main, has always been Westward.

Nor is there anything strange in this if we stop for a moment's reflection. Progress is never in straight lines. Its movements are either circular or in zigzag courses. The whole universe is constructed upon the very principle underlying all progress. The world's first nursery was in the East. The tide of emigration rolled Westward, and it has continued in that direction up-to-date. For a time it was staid by the Atlantic Ocean; but, as already remarked, the discovery of America opened up a new world for progressive development; and it is worth while to notice the fact that this discovery, in 1492, was made at exactly the same time when Mohammedanism had practically its downfall in Europe. Curiously enough is the fact that Mohammedanism, the only religion that has vitally opposed the progress of Christianity, sought to establish by force its reign over the countries where Christianity had spread. Though successful in some of these countries for a time, its military progress was stopped by the Battle of Tours, fought under the leadership of Charles Martel. Meantime, the power of Mohammedanism began to recede. The countries which it had possessed gradually fell into the hands of Christian people, until, as already intimated, in 1492, their last strongholds were taken. Even Turkey, which is reckoned the Mohammedan wedge in Europe, has only a minority population following Mohammed; and while in other parts of Europe and Western Asia there are still some followers of him to be found, the unmistakable fact exists that now only east, of Palestine has Mohammedanism any decided influence. Herein is disclosed the startling fact that Christianity makes for progress, while Islam makes for stagnation. The same fact is seen in the practical working of these two systems, as to the kind of civilisation which is produced under their respective influences. Everywhere that Christianity prevails will be found essential progress; while everywhere Islam prevails will be found stagnation, with all of its unsavory accompaniments.
As an illustration of what I mean, I may state that while I was once travelling in Syria, I came to two villages in the mountains of Lebanon, one on each side of a little stream that I could almost step across. One of these villages was Mohammedan, and it showed all the characteristics of that stagnation which follows in the train of the reign of the prophet. The village was the impersonification of squalid filth and apparent misery. The other village, the name of which was Zallia, was only a few rods distant, on the other side of the little steam. This village, though dominated by a form of Christianity which is by no means the best, nevertheless exhibited signs of civilisation, prosperity, and contentment that at once brought into bold contrast the difference between the two religions, even when Christianity is shorn of its real strength by additions of error. What was here so manifest in declaring the superiority of the religion of Christ over its aggressive rival is very distinctly apparent in every country through the Orient where these religions come in contrast.

But the particular point, to which attention is now called, is that Christianity has followed the law of progress, and has itself largely contributed to that progress. Consequently its course has been Westward all the time, and if it keeps in harmony with the law already indicated, its great triumphs must continue to be Westward. The two other aggressive religions, viz., Mohammedanism and Buddhism, are both practically progressing Eastward instead of Westward, and this has been the case, so far as permanent progress is concerned, from the very beginning of these religions.

From these considerations, it must be evident that Christianity's conflict with these religions will be in those nations lying east of Arabia and Palestine, and west of America. Here is where Mohammedanism and Buddhism have their home, and when routed from these countries, Christianity's triumph will be complete. But in its march around the world, it has been constantly travelling Westward, stopping here and there for a little while, to meet the contending forces which have opposed its progress. Sometimes these forces have seemed to triumphantly prevail, and in most cases they have undoubtedly left their influence upon Christianity, even where they have failed to stay its progress. And not only so, but within Chris-
tianity itself there have been conflicts of the severest kind. On one side of these conflicts have been arrayed all those forces which may be denominated antichrist, while on the other side, even the forces of Christ have been weakened by foreign elements which have been incorporated with the religious systems which have stood for Christianity. Protestantism was a great movement in the right direction, but it carried with it many of the elements of Romanism under which the simple Gospel had so long been buried. Consequently when Christianity reached the American shores, it was in an adulterated form, and lacked the strength, which comes from unity, and the clearness of vision, which comes from purity. America received Christianity from two different geographical directions, viz., from Plymouth Rock and Jamestown. The former brought the stream of Puritanism, which was the religion of the Roundheads who fought with Cromwell for religious and political liberty in England. The latter brought in Ritualism, as illustrated in the Church of England, while the spirit of the people, who settled at Jamestown and spread themselves along our Eastward shores Southward and Westward, was that of the Cavaliers, who were arrayed on the side of Charles I. These two somewhat antagonistic streams met geographically along Mason and Dixon's line, and the conflict precipitated finally brought on our Civil War. But since that war, these two streams have been coalescing, especially throughout the great West, Southwest and Northwest, wherein may be reckoned a coming empire which will finally dominate the whole of America. The mixing of Puritan blood with that of the Cavaliers promises one of the finest civilisations the world has ever seen.

We must not lose sight of the fact that this great empire has been gained through mighty conflicts. But this is the law of progress. When man was cast out of Eden, “the ground was cursed for his sake.” He led an active life in Eden. He had to “dress and keep” the Garden, but this service was not a struggle. When, however, the ground was cursed, so that it would spread thorns and briars in his pathway, his progress could be effected only by the sweat of his brow; service became laborious, and everywhere man met obstacles in his pathway which he had to overcome. But this overcoming was the very thing
that was needed in order that real manhood should be made. All down through the ages this conflict between man and the things that hinder him, has been continued, while Christianity itself has been subject to the same law. Moving in a great circle its course has been zigzag, sometimes to the right, sometimes to the left, sometimes even retreating for a little while. But in the course of years, we see it leaping forward again, and making decided progress in its march Westward around the world.

As already intimated, we find it crossing the Atlantic Ocean and establishing itself on this new continent, but in a somewhat imperfect form, and especially weakened by divisions into sects. These sects, instead of contending against the common enemy, often became bitterly opposed to one another, and thus imperiled the success of Christianity in its movement Westward to the conquest of the nations.

Just here it would be interesting to pause for a while and consider somewhat carefully the most prominent epochs of history which, from the beginning, mark the progress of Christianity through Western Asia and Europe before it reached the American continent. In this examination it would be found that these periods were all foretold in prophecy. This fact is in itself a most remarkable confirmation of the trustworthiness of the Bible testimony, and also strikingly confirms the law of progress which has already been indicated.

“Nineteen centuries of the fulfilment of New Testament prophecies concerning the course of events during the Christian dispensation lie behind us. The fall of Jerusalem, the triumphs of the Gospel, the vicissitudes of the Roman empire, the sufferings of the Church under Pagan Rome, the victory of the martyrs, the abolition of Paganism and establishment of Christianity, the gradual development of the great apostasies in the West and in the East, the overthrow of the Western Empire by the Saracens and Turks, the depressed and hidden condition of the true Church during the Middle Ages, the great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, the slaughter and resurrection of the Christian witnesses, the retributive judgments of the French Revolution, the universal proclamation of the Gospel in modern times, the fall of the Papal temporal power at the moment of the highest act of Papal self-
exaltation, and at the date anticipated for centuries by students of the prophetic word, the wasting away of Turkish power, the issuing forth of spirits of delusion, Romish, Ritualistic and Infidel in our own days, and the visible commencement of the rise of the Jewish people from the depression of ages, of their unification, and of their restoration to the land of their fathers, all these events by their striking fulfilments of the anticipations of prophecy have confirmed our faith in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. In vain do the restless waves of scepticism dash against the base of that impregnable rock. And now astronomy is adding its testimony to that of history in confirmation of the prophetic word. The stars in their courses are fighting for Israel. The sacred “times and seasons” of the law, equally with those of the prophets, are found to possess a hidden astronomic character, binding them together as a systematic whole, linking them indissolubly with the System of Nature, proclaiming their true measures, settling their historic place, and demonstrating the divineness of their origin.”

* * 

Whoever will take the pains to study carefully the history of the periods to which reference has been made, will understand what is meant by the zigzag courses of progress, and especially the slow and tortuous movements of Christianity down the ages. Nevertheless, it will be seen that, while its progress has been sometimes retarded, at other times backward, and frequently to the right or to the left, it has slowly continued its course against all opposition from without and from within, until, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, it takes a new start on the American continent in a movement which had for its aim a complete restoration of primitive Christianity in its faith, doctrine, spirit, and life.

But this movement itself was the result of other movements which had preceded it. What Luther and his associates did, made it possible for other definite steps to be taken; and these were taken by such leaders as Calvin, Wesley, etc. But when all these movements have been carefully credited with what they achieved, there still remained much to be accomplished before Christianity could be prepared for a movement across the Pacific to attack the strongholds of Oriental religions. Luther had
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broken the fetters which Priestcraft had fastened upon the human soul; Calvin had emphasised the Divine side in the plan of salvation; while Wesley had emphasised the human side; so that progress was by a movement to the right and then to the left, but never in a straight line. At the end of these movements a great deal of truth had been developed, and many errors, that had accumulated during the Middle Ages, were shaken off; but there still remained a great task to be performed before the Church could become as bright as the sun, as fair as the moon, and as terrible as any army with banners.

Historically, this movement may be divided into three periods:

1. The Creative Period.
2. The Chaotic Period.
3. The Organic or Reconstruction Period.

This classification follows closely the steps of progress of everything in both mind and matter. The first chapter of Genesis contains the seeds of things. It is the most suggestive chapter in the Bible, and in many respects the most remarkable record that has ever been made in the history of this earth's development. It is worth while to study, especially the first three verses, so as to apprehend the divine order of progression with respect to all created things.

The first verse is very comprehensive, and has frequently been wholly misunderstood. It evidently is intended to represent a completed creation. It is a comprehensive statement of what was done in the beginning, though this “beginning” is not definitely fixed as regards time, nor is time an important factor with respect to events, so far back in the history of the universe. The one thing that needs to be emphasised is that this first verse clearly indicates a completed creation, not a partial creation, as some have supposed. The three great, comprehensive things suggested are “God,” “Creation,” and the “Heavens and the Earth,” or the Universe. Each one of these furnishes a theme for volumes, and consequently can only be mentioned in what we are now considering.

The second verse singles out the earth for separate treatment, and we are told that it “had become waste and wild.” This rendering is justified by a proper construe-
tion of the Hebrew language, and is now very generally conceded by scholars. If this rendering is admitted, then it indicates clearly that, after the Creation was completed, there was an overthrow, in which order became confusion, and darkness reigned over the great abyss. I do not stop now to discuss how this overthrow came about, though there are hints in the Bible, as well as in the physical structure of the earth, which are very suggestive with respect to the origin of this Chaotic Period. How long it lasted, we cannot tell; but finally the spirit of God, brooding upon the deep, led up to the first fiat which was uttered in these sublime words: “God said, Let there be light, and light was.” Then follow the different days in the Organic, or Reconstruction Period, each one of these days marking a definite step in the progressive development of the earth in its preparation for the great tenant—man, who was evidently in the mind of God at the very beginning.

I have already intimated that these facts, connected with the creation of the world, furnish the basis for an analogy with respect to all historic movements, whether religious or otherwise, and that we must go back to these three periods in order to reach a trustworthy basis for our reasoning with respect to religious movements. When we carefully examine these movements it will be found that they all have their Creative period, their Chaotic period, and their Organic or Reconstruction period.

The Reformation of the nineteenth century, under the Campbells, is not an exception to the general rule. It had its Creative period, which was soon followed by a Chaotic period, and this again was followed by a period of Reconstruction; and all of these periods are very important in order to give us a clear idea of the genesis, struggles, failures, and triumphs of this great movement for the restoration of Primitive Christianity in its faith, doctrine, and life.

This distinct and definite Creative period began with the issuance of the great “Declaration and Address,” written by Thomas Campbell. This historically marks the first verse in the first chapter of the book of Genesis, as it belongs to the Campbellian movement. Nor would I be far from the truth if I were to say that in this beginning God created the movement, and simply used Thomas
Campbell to put its great principles into a language that might be read by the people of the ages to come.

That the movement finally became Chaotic, and for a time seemed to lose itself in the confusion which reigned in the religious world, and especially in the regions where the movement was started, must be readily conceded by every one who studies carefully the history of what we have denominated its Chaotic Period. At first it was intended to be a union movement. The whole spirit of the “Declaration and Address” breathes the sentiment of Christian Union, and strongly invites to a cessation of everything belligerent among the people of God, or anything that hindered a coming together of all the forces of Christendom into a harmonious co-operation and fellowship. But it soon became evident that sectarianism was too strongly entrenched behind the walls which divided Christendom into numerous antagonistic parties for the new movement to make much headway in bringing about a realisation of its splendid ideals. The Campbells themselves became identified with one of the religious denominations of that period, and by doing so they, to some extent, practically stultified the great plea which they had made for an undenominational Christianity. We cannot discuss the reasons which seemed to justify this step at the time it was taken. There were undoubtedly some very weighty reasons, but all the same, it is clear to the thoughtful and impartial historian that this step practically made the Chaos which had begun to reign an assured fact; for it was not long until even the denomination with which the Campbells were identified persistently refused to recognise them as members in good standing. At this time they were without any special organic relation to the Christianity of the times. It is true that a few churches had continued to stand by the Campbellian movement and were afterwards identified with it in its separate existence. But for a considerable time the whole movement seemed to be largely without chart or compass, while moving over the sea of troubled waters which everywhere characterised the religious condition of the world at that particular time.

But about the year 1830, there was a distinct utterance in the movement which said, “Let there be light.” The issuance of the Millennial Harbinger was the beginning of the new period, or the period of Reconstruction. There
was no longer much desire to be identified with any of the religious denominations. The fight began in real earnest against all the forms of sectarianism, and from this time forward the movement became an aggressive force in carrying forward a great plea, which plea was the restoration of what was called at that time, “The Ancient Order of Things.” Mr. Campbell and his co-workers were no longer satisfied with a compromise in respect to the sects of Christendom, but they now said we must reconstruct Christendom from beginning to the end; we must restore the lost Gospel, the lost Church, and the lost unity of the spirit; and in order to do this the first thing necessary was to let the people have the light, the light of God's Word, unmixed with the dark lines of superstition which everywhere obscured Him who is the Light of the world. Mr. Campbell claimed that the Sun of Righteousness had been eclipsed by creeds and speculations, and that this eclipse must be broken and the glorious light that had come into the world should be allowed to shine into the hearts of men and thereby bring them to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Looking at it from our limited point of view, it sometimes appears that it would have been better if the movement had continued on its way as it was first started. But a closer investigation of all the facts of the case makes it evident to me, at least, that the Creative Period had to come to Chaos, and that the Reconstruction Period is at present practically the hope of the world.

It has already been indicated that America is a necessary factor on the way to the final triumphs of Christianity. Light always comes from the East, but action, movement, and progress are toward the West. The Campbellian movement has developed toward the West. It has made little progress in the Eastern states, or even in the Middle states. The two great civilising forces, namely, that which came with the Puritans and that which came with the Cavaliers, met and coalesced along the line which separates the East from the West, and has ever since been building an empire in the Western part of America which is destined to become a great power in carrying forward the religion of Christ to the nations which lie still farther West, on the other side of the Pacific Ocean. It was no accident that the Campbells, coming from the East, should
have brought the light which was needed for the Reconstruction Period; nor is it a stretch of the imagination to see in the development of our own Western land the basis from which to move upon the nations that still lie between us and Palestine, where Christianity began its triumphal march around the world.

It would be interesting and even instructive if we could tarry long enough just here to show how this goodly land of ours is precisely the best place where a new Christianity, so to speak, must find its home and grow into a great power before a successful movement can be made upon such countries as Japan, China, etc., with the Christianity of Christ. It has already been intimated that this Christianity of Christ had become adulterated, sectarianized, and made practically powerless for the great work of converting the world, while it remained in Europe. The new world offered itself to a new experiment, namely, the restoration of Christianity in its primitive simplicity, beauty, and unity, so that, having become somewhat as the Master would have it be, it can be carried to the countries lying West of us, where only such a Christianity, as has been indicated, can possibly make definite and substantial progress.

This clearly suggests the problem which the Disciples of Christ have to solve; for undoubtedly they have been called by Divine Providence to meet this emergency in the onward course of Christianity around the world; and if they are true to their own history and to the great principles for which they have contended, they must necessarily become the leaders of the missionary forces that shall take the heathen lands on the other side of the Pacific for the blood-stained banner of the cross.

Are they sufficient for these things? Are they willing to make the sacrifices which must be made in order to the achievement of this great triumph? Shall they show themselves worthy of the great mission to which they have been called? These are the great questions that must be answered in the affirmative unless they wish the candlestick removed from their hands, and the great work of conquering the world for Christ committed to the charge of some other people. This is just what will be done if the Disciples fail to meet this responsibility.

I cannot believe that the Disciples will hesitate to accept
this great and responsible position. Undoubtedly they occupy a vantage ground in the religious plea which they have to present. It is not weakened by human admixtures, nor is it perplexed by recondite theological speculations. When fairly stated, it is clear-cut, and is the only plea that is offered to-day which will unite all the forces of Christendom for the great contest which is sure to come when a pure, unadulterated, and valiant Christianity shall, travelling Westward, meet the false religions of heathendom, travelling Eastward. This meeting will take place somewhere on the other side of the Pacific Ocean and this side of Palestine. The great battle between the forces of Gog and Magog, or the battle of Armageddon, will then be fought, not perhaps with carnal weapons, but with the Gospel on one side, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and the false religions of the Orient, travelling Eastward, as has always been the case with these religions, as has already been pointed out.

Can we measure the time that is necessary to subdue sectarianism in our land and unite the people of God upon the one foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone? If we can make a correct estimate as to how long it will take to solve this great problem, we may then determine with something like definite certainty when our forces will be ready for the final contest in the heathen lands that lie on the other side of the Pacific Ocean. We have already sent some avant-couriers in our faithful missionaries to these lands to prepare the way of our coming with all the forces of Christendom in our army. But these missionaries can never conquer these nations for Christ until the churches as a united body shall go to these lands carrying one great banner, the blood-stained cross of Christ, on which there is inscribed, “One Lord, One Faith, and One Baptism.”

It is now proper to consider somewhat specifically just what the plea is which the Disciples make, and also how that plea fits in with the present conditions of the problem of converting the world. The whole plea was really comprehended in “the Declaration and Address” issued by the Campbells in 1809, but as that Address was intended to give simply a general survey of the religious
condition at that particular time, it is perhaps well to deal more specifically with the great plea as it had developed, when the Disciples had fairly launched their aggressive movement.

It has already been stated that this movement was characterised by three periods, The Creative, The Chaotic, and the Organic or Period of Reconstruction. When the Organic Period was reached and the Disciples became practically a separate people, they began to state very earnestly the special things for which they contended. In order to a clear apprehension of the whole plea which they advocated, it will be necessary to deal with some of the main features of their contention, as this will help us to understand the importance of the work as it legitimately relates to the conversion of the world. The following are among the principal things for which the Disciples have generally contended:

I.—A SCRIPTURAL BIBLIOLOGY

Some questions relating to the Bible which have occupied the attention of recent years were not considered at all during the third decade of the Disciple Movement, which decade marks the beginning of their separate existence as a religious people. Biblical criticism, as represented by modern scholarship, was scarcely considered at all in the earlier periods of the movement. With perhaps few exceptions, the Bible was accepted without any question whatever as to its literary structure. All alike accepted the statement of the Apostle that “all Scripture, given by inspiration, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to every good work.” The great dictum of Thomas Campbell—“Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent,” at once turned all eyes to the Word of God as the only-sufficient and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. At the same time it is undoubtedly true that this dictum has not always been clearly understood by those who have used it in the warfare against human creeds. Perhaps some failed to recognise that there are at least three Bibles in common use. First, the Bible as it really is, or as it would be, if we had in our possession
the original autographs. Second, the Bible, as interpreted for our neighbours; and third, the Bible, as interpreted for ourselves. Now the mistake that some made was in assuming that they followed the Bible without any interpretation of its meaning at all. But this course would leave us without any revelation whatever. Undoubtedly the Bible which every man follows, or seeks to follow, is the Bible as he understands it. In short, his interpretation of the Bible is what the Bible must be to him.

Of course this view of the matter cuts off at once the cheap way of saying that we are following the Bible, when we are only following our interpretation of it. When Thomas Campbell said, “Where the Bible speaks, we speak,” he undoubtedly meant by the Bible speaking that it uttered intelligible words, and that the Bible cannot speak to any one that does not understand it.

This view practically lifts this magnificent dictum out of the slavish service in which it has been sometimes used by those who regard “ignorance as bliss,” as well as “folly to be wise.”

But it is in the use of the scientific method of interpreting the Bible that the Disciples have become distinguished. They have always practically with great unanimity discarded the dogmatic and mystic interpretations of the Scriptures. They have sought, as far as possible, to use the inductive method, the method that brought harmony in the scientific world, and redeemed the investigation of nature from the empiricism of the Dark Ages, and to which the splendid triumphs of science at the beginning of the twentieth century are largely indebted. It was believed by the intelligent advocates of the Disciple Movement that the application of the inductive method in studying the Scriptures would finally lead up to practical unity with respect to what the Bible really teaches, so that when we say, “Where the Bible speaks, we speak,” we can know assuredly just what the Bible does speak with respect to any subject under consideration.

It is not needful here to illustrate this method as it was used by the Reformers at the time when they were forced into a separate existence as a religious people. However, it is worth while to state the fact that to this method, when honestly used, may be ascribed much of the success which has attended the Disciple Movement.
II.—A SCRIPTURAL THEOLOGY

This is perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of the Campbellian Movement. While both of the Campbells, and most of the early advocates of the movement, were Calvinists, coming as they did out of the Presbyterian Church, it is still true that they refused to accept any hyper-Calvinistic views with respect to the Divine Government. Recognising as they did that a religion will always be as its Deity is, the early pioneers were careful to give the people a true conception of God, for they recognised the fact that a religion will always take on the type of the God that is worshipped by those who hold to that religion.

At the beginning of the movement the prevailing idea of God among the religious denominations was to the Disciples an entire perversion of what the character of God really is. The conception that prevailed was doubtless inherited from the apostasy which spread such vast ruin over the Christian world during the Middle Ages. This mediaeval conception embraced at least three errors:

First. That God is a great personal governor who sits upon His throne, entirely apart from the present world, from which He rules His creatures by imperious and unchangeable laws.

Second. The administration of this government on earth is wholly committed to a specially appointed human priesthood who practically occupy the position of mediators between God and the subjects of His kingdom.

Third. The worship of this God can be acceptable only through forms and ceremonies, and in an environment which this priesthood chose to create.

This I am persuaded does not overstate the generally prevailing conceptions of the God of the Bible at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Of course there may have been some exceptions, as regards this statement, but no student of ecclesiastical history will doubt that the conception of God, which has been presented, fairly represents the general trend of religious development at the beginning of the Disciple Movement.

Now in opposition to these three predominant characteristics of the age, at the time the Campbellian movement was started, at least three distinct Biblical conceptions
of God were affirmed with all the fervour of deep conviction by the early pioneers. Perhaps they did not state the matter with exactness. Perhaps they were not always conscious of the order herein presented; but there can be little doubt that their advocacy embraced somewhat the following order:

1. God is Spirit.
2. God is Light.
3. God is Love.

With respect to the first of these, they referred to the conversation of Christ with the woman of Samaria, and earnestly contended for the truth of the statement made by Christ Himself in that remarkable interview. He declared that God is Spirit, and His contention was that if God is Spirit they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. In other words, the worship must be spiritual, not merely sensuous, and then it must be a truthful worship also, and consequently not based upon false conceptions of God or anything else.

It is well just here to notice the exact language of our Divine Lord. He does not say that God is a Spirit, nor that God is the Spirit, but that God is Spirit. The Greek is Pneuma Ho Theos. It will be easily perceived by the Greek scholar that it is not personality that is affirmed of God, but His essence; therefore being pure Spirit, He cannot dwell in particular places or temples, for the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands, as is declared in Acts vii: 45; xvii: 24-25; nor can He require earthly material offerings or special ceremonies, or any other man-made machinery, through which He may be approached. Indeed, this affirmation of Christ was intended to be a protest against all limitations of God through an objective personality, which compelled the worshipper to think of God as only manifested in material representations. Our Lord's statement is equally conclusive against image worship, and also all forms and ceremonies, such as became the ruling passion with mediaeval Christianity, some of whose evils were prominent characteristics of the churches at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

It is well to analyse somewhat carefully the statement made by Christ concerning God. As already intimated the statement does not affirm the personality of God, but
His essence. The personality is taken for granted, while the essence is distinctly declared. Look carefully at this phrase—\textit{Pneuma Ho Theos}. Notice the article before \textit{Theos}. This assumes the personality of God. Notice, furthermore, that there is no article before \textit{Pneuma}. This clearly indicates the important fact that God, viz., this Divine Personality, is, in His essence, pure Spirit. This being true, He seeks such worshippers as will meet Him in this essence. Nowhere else in the New Testament is there a stronger argument for the birth out of the Spirit, as indicated in the third chapter of John, than is found in this important statement of Christ. God's personality is for the moment absorbed in His essence, and thus supreme transcendence is made to harmonise as well as vitalise with His providential immanence. Hence, He is not only over the world and apart from the world, in the fact that He is, in His individual personality, \textit{Ho Theos}, but He is also in the world and providentially moves and helps the world, because He is essentially \textit{Pneuma}, or Spirit.

Thus we have, in this sublime statement of our Divine Lord, both the transcendence and immanence of God clearly set forth. But in order that we may render acceptable worship to Him, we must be born from above, or born out of water and out of Spirit, thus meeting God in His essence by an essence of the same kind; and as we have borne the image of the earthly we should also bear the image of the heavenly. Man was created in the image of God, but in the fall this image was lost, or at least was marred, and the restoration in Christ Jesus makes us again like God, or fixes upon us His likeness, in that we become spirit as He is Spirit. Hence, the new spiritual man, who comes out of the new birth, is the only kind of worshipper God seeks, or who can worship Him in both spirit and truth. Thus it will be seen that God, as Spirit, became flesh, that man, as flesh, might become spirit. Or to put it more in harmony with our modern style, God was manifested in the flesh that He might come down to man and touch his sympathies, awaken his dormant spiritual energies, and bring his spiritual nature into regency from which it fell when the animal man triumphed over the spiritual. Surely nothing could exalt our conception of God more than this sublime fact which is evidently the main burden of the incarnation.
The Disciples have always regarded the second conception of God, namely, that He is Light, as of great importance. It has already been stated that the first fiat of the Disciple movement, when it was driven into a separate position from the denominations, was, “Let there be light.” This has characterised the movement from that time to the present hour. Indeed, it may be safely affirmed that the plea which they have made lends itself easily to a harmony with the scientific, critical, and practical demands of the age; and, consequently, when it is affirmed that God is light we at once have a key-word with which to unlock any difficulty which lies in the pathway of a clear understanding of much that would otherwise be only darkness and confusion. In I. John i: 5 it is declared that God is Light. The Greek in this case is, \textit{Ho Theos Phoos Esti}. Here again we have the personality of God taken for granted, for the article is used before God, as in the other case, to which reference has already been made; but there is no article before \textit{Plioos}, so that it is true with respect to light as with respect to spirit. The very essence of God is light. This being true, we need not wonder that the Chaotic darkness which followed the creation was dissipated by that sublime fiat: “God said, Let there be light.” This is still the order in every re-creation, whether in individuals or in religious movements.

The Campbellian movement has always claimed that, in this respect, its plea is entirely reasonable. To use the language of the Apostle Peter, the Disciples have “always been ready to give to every man who asks them, a reason of the hope that is in them,” though they may not have always done this “with meekness and fear.” However, they have been true to the ideal as far, perhaps, as human nature can realise an ideal which is so perfect in its conception.

But the crowning revelation of God to us is the statement that He is \textit{Love}. In I. John iv: 8 we have this language, \textit{Ho Theos Agapee Estin}—God is Love. Here again the essence of God is declared without the article, while His personality is distinctly set forth by the article \textit{Ho} before \textit{Theos}.

Just here also we come in contact with the need of what has been called “dispensational truth,” in which an im-
portant distinction between the dispensations is made. The revelation of God that He is, in His essence, *Love,* was reserved for the Christian Dispensation to proclaim in its fulness, or its comprehensive import. Under former dispensations God is revealed to us as a Sovereign, as the “Lord of Hosts,” “The God of Battles,” etc.; but under the Christian dispensation He is revealed to us as a tender, loving Father, so loving the world as to give His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Under the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations God was chiefly a covenant God, Who required an exact fulfillment of all the stipulated conditions of each covenant, and offering no remission of sins except through a sacrificial institution which had no permanent value, and through a law which was only a shadow of the better things to come. The Disciple movement affirms with great earnestness that we are no longer in the shadow but in the very light which came with Christ, who is Himself the light of the world; that when Christ reached the zenith of His glory, the shadow was under His feet; that we are no longer under the “shall”s” and “shall nots” of the Mosaic institution, but under Christ, where God has been translated into the family circle, where He is known as the loving Father, and where He now reigns in the fulness of the meaning of the Apostle, when He says that “God is Love.”

This new and scriptural conception of God may not have completely eradicated Calvinism with which the pioneers of the Disciple Movement were evidently at first dominated; but it evidently subdued and held in check the wrong conceptions of God which had become so prevalent at the beginning of the Disciple Movement. Speculative theology could not become popular with the Disciples after the “Declaration and Address” had been published, for the reason that this great document, from beginning to end, severely condemns the making of speculations or opinions tests of Christian fellowship or barriers in the way of Christian Union.

But the Disciples have always believed that the Scriptural view of God, as presented in the foregoing threefold revelation of Him, is of very great importance; and without formulating this contention, as I have done, they have
undoubtedly urged it upon the attention of the world wherever their plea has been earnestly made.

III.—A SCRIPTURAL CHRISTOLOGY

From the beginning, the Disciples have made much of Christ; and as their movement progressed He soon became the centre around which everything revolved. They founded the Church on Him, not on doctrines concerning Him. Peter's confession that “He is the Christ, the Son of the Living God,” became everywhere the confession required of those who were seeking admission into the churches. They excluded everything else in the confession that was to be made by the believing penitent, contending that all extra matters only suggested the insufficiency of Christ to save, while any subtraction from this vital proposition would make it impotent to meet the case of those who are seeking salvation.

This insistence upon Christ as practically the solution of everything pertaining to Christianity has always been a cardinal feature with the Disciples. They regard the whole matter from at least three points of view:

(a.) The Incarnation.
(b.) Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ.
(c.) His offices as Prophet, Priest, and King.

In reference to the Incarnation, they held strongly that it is fundamental in the Christian system, and that it fits in exactly with the history of our race, and is in harmony with the progressive development of Divine revelation. In this history there are at least three facts brought distinctly into light.

First, that men will not to be governed by God. All experiments of this kind, beginning with the experiment in the Garden of Eden, have proved to be signal failures.

A second fact is equally prominent, viz., man, when left to himself, cannot govern himself. When the Israelites would not be governed by God, and cried out for a king, God gave them a king, but it was not long until it became evident that they could not be governed by man, and this fact has been demonstrated again and again in the history of the world.

The third fact is the union of these two facts in a compromise which meets in the Incarnation. When it
was sufficiently demonstrated that man would not be governed by God and could not govern himself, God gave him a governor who is both God and man, viz., Immanuel: “God with us “; the Theanthropos; thus uniting the interests of Heaven and earth in one great personality, who, while faithfully doing the will of the Father, is, at the same time, touched with the feeling of our infirmities, sympathising with us in our weakness, and adding Divine help in our struggles, so that we are enabled to do even all things through Him Who strengthens us.

But whatever may be the philosophy of the Incarnation, it is certainly true that the Scriptures clearly teach that Christ entered this life from another. Numerous passages could be quoted to justify this statement, but it is unnecessary to quote these passages at present.

However, the rationalistic or extreme scientific scholar of this age refuses to accept the fact of the Incarnation, because it implies belief in the super-natural. But why should any one, who believes in the existence of God, doubt the super-natural? Or how can any one on rational grounds regard the Incarnation as improbable? After all, may it not be that the difficulty at this point arises from the fact that in our conceptions of the natural and super-natural we have separated them by an impassable gulf? Is it not true that they lie very close together, and at many points actually touch each other, as light and darkness, as the different kingdoms of nature, and as even the body, soul, and spirit? We cannot fathom the depth of a question like the Incarnation, but we can see far enough to understand that there is nothing at all improbable in what is stated about it. If God be what He is represented to be in the Bible, then it is not difficult to believe that He could manifest Himself in human form without any infringement of natural law whatever. There may be a sphere above what we now know of natural law which would admit easily all that is claimed for the Incarnation. The transference of one life into another is really one of the fundamental facts of Christianity. According to the Apostle Paul the Christian’s life is not his own life, but the life of Christ in him. Christ dwells in the Christian and the latter becomes what he is through the inflow of the life from without.
This view of the Apostle is supported by all the facts recorded in the New Testament, as well as by the personal experience of every Christian; and this being true, it follows that the Incarnation of God in Jesus the Christ is no more a mystery than the Incarnation of God in a Christian. Indeed, the former was simply preparatory to the latter. God manifest in the flesh, in the person of Jesus Christ, was the first step necessary to the enshrining of God in humanity through each redeemed son and daughter of humanity. So that there is nothing at all improbable, and certainly nothing impossible, in the transference of divinity from the spiritual world into the fleshy or material world. It is easy to create difficulties with respect to almost anything, and it is not impossible to create apparently insurmountable difficulties with regard to matters entirely beyond our comprehension. Our measuring line is too short to enable us to determine what God can do. He who could create this universe, with all it contains, need not be limited with regard to the modes of His manifestation to the inhabitants of this earth, and it is the supremest nonsense, if not the most unpardonable irreverence, for any one to assume that God cannot enter human flesh if He chooses to do so.

However, it may help us, who have difficulties with this problem, to suggest that possibly we have assumed in our reasoning that God and man are more widely separated than they are. I think the Scriptures teach that there is a striking likeness between them, and that they are in many respects closely allied to each other. We must never forget that man was created in the image of God. This implies more than has generally been conceded. Just how much it implies may not be easily determined. Probably it indicates that man is like God in all that makes him a man; and if this be true, the step by which divinity was transferred to humanity may have comprehended little more than the step across sin which now separates God and man. This step was taken in the case of Jesus Christ by providing conditions which enabled Him to become flesh without assuming any taint of sin which may belong to the human race. In any case it is certain that before He could become an acceptable sin offering it was necessary for Him to possess the characteristics of an offering that would be acceptable to God. One of these characteristics
involved a life without sin, and this is precisely what was true of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now the problem of Christ's sinlessness will help us to solve the problem of the Incarnation. Is it not quite as easy to believe the New Testament account of His advent into the world as to believe that He was entirely without sin during the whole of His earthly life? The same New Testament that declares one declares the other also; and so far as human experience goes, the latter is quite as far removed from the facts of human history as the former is. Now, if we reject the testimony with respect to His birth, why not also reject the testimony with respect to His life? However, it is the habit of certain semi-sceptics to laud the latter while they utterly repudiate the former. But if the New Testament is credible with respect to one, why is it not credible with respect to the other? At any rate it is certain, when we throw suspicion upon the record concerning the peculiar conditions of the earthly advent, we must of necessity throw suspicion also upon every other fact which the New Testament records, and especially when that fact contains a suggestion of the improbable. Undoubtedly the sinlessness of Jesus, when compared with the life of men generally, is as much a miracle as the Incarnation by the Holy Spirit.

There is, however, in the whole story of the Incarnation and in its transcendent facts a special fitness to the end in view which does much to help our faith where it might hesitate without this philosophical suggestiveness. The Incarnation does not necessarily limit the activity of God in the universe to the person of Jesus Christ any more than the Christian Church limits His activity at the present time; and yet, He dwells in that Church, and is an essential part of that Church, if we are to believe the Scriptures.

Jesus was both divine and human. This compound character was essential to the mission upon which He visited the earth. A Mediator must be the friend of both parties who are to be reconciled. Jesus was therefore both God and man, entering into sympathy with both parties, uniting in Himself both divinity and humanity. Up to the time of His coming human history demonstrated at least two things: first, that every experiment in which God attempted to govern the world by His own sovereign
authority resulted in a practical failure. The experiment in Eden, and all the experiments following, as in the case of the Jewish theocracy, finally broke down for the reason, in the second place, man could never govern himself. In this extremity the Incarnation is offered as a solution of the problem. That is, when it became evident that man would not be governed by God and could not govern himself, the merciful provision was made to give him a governor who is both God and man—Immanuel, God with us. Hence Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God, the friend of both God and man, becomes the mediator of the new covenant, which covenant provides, at the same time, for the maintenance of the authority of God and the forgiveness of sins.

There is still another view of the Incarnation which may help our weak faith when it stumbles at philosophy. We must remember that the whole course of Providence, down through the ages, from Adam to Christ, was a preparation of the world for the Coming One, whose coming would fulfil all prophecies, and at the same time meet the conditions necessary to restore the image of God to fallen man. In the person of Christ the gulf which had long separated God and man was practically bridged over, and a pathway of holiness erected by which all who will accept the word of reconciliation can return to the favor and fellowship of the living God.

From this point of view the Incarnation may be regarded as the crowning glory of all the ages, and as the consummation of all the types and shadows of Jewish history, as well as the proclamation to the race of a possible glorious end to the long night of darkness which has been the result of the reign of sin in the world.

Of course, it is impossible to treat a subject so profound and so far-reaching as the Incarnation is within the space of a few paragraphs. No one can possibly fathom the depth of the Incarnation. But in this respect it is not different from many other things. We cannot fathom the mystery of ourselves. The union of body, soul, and spirit in every man is, from our point of view, quite as inexplicable and mysterious as the union of God and man in the person of Jesus Christ. Why then should we believe in one and not believe in the other? *

* Vide “Preacher Problems,” pp. 146-150, by Dr. W. T. Moore.
But we are told that the Incarnation contradicts the law of uniformity which everywhere prevails throughout the universe. But this word *universe* is a big word and comprehends much more than we can discern through our finite vision. What do we know about ten thousand things in this great universe with which we are identified as an infinitesimal atom? The rationalist stumbles at the Incarnation. He cannot accept as truthful history the story of the virgin birth. But why not? He answers: It is contrary to the law of uniformity and consequently it cannot be true. This is only another way of stating Humes' objection to miracles. He said: “A miracle is contrary to human experience, and whatever is contrary to human experience cannot be true, therefore a miracle is impossible.” Every one now knows how sophistical this reasoning is. There are many things contrary, or rather out of the range of some people's experience, while these same things are perfectly familiar to others. People who live all the time in the tropics have never seen it snow. Must we conclude, therefore, that snow is contrary to human experience?

There may be many things about the law of uniformity that no one now understands. Facts in nature are coming to light every day that compel us to change our views with respect to what nature teaches.

Not very long ago the caloric theory of heat was given in all our text books without question. It was practically universally accepted. But now that theory has been discarded in the light of the further knowledge of the co-relation of forces. This is only one of a thousand illustrations that might be given. Every day new wonders come to light in the realm of nature's laws. Indeed, even the “breaks” that seem to interfere with the law of uniformity may, when we understand all about them, be only links in the chain that binds all things together in one uniform, continuous progression. “One star differs from another star in glory,” and yet these stars all contribute to a universal harmony. The notes in a piece of music are quite different in many respects, some short, some long, some high, some low, some soft, some loud, but when occupying their right places this very difference is the source of the harmony which is produced when these notes are sounded.
The Incarnation may seem to be a discordant note, as regards the law of uniformity, but this does not, in fact, necessarily follow, even if that law is everywhere admitted. The Incarnation may simply be a higher range of that law than any thing with which we are now acquainted. We know very little of the spiritual realm. The very phrase, which somewhat materialises the Incarnation conception, is itself an extraordinary phrase. “God with us” at once sets us to thinking, and at the same time bewilders us with its stupendous, far-reaching meaning. We are awed by its awful possibilities, and yet we are calmed into reverence and silence as our faith tremulously lays hold of the great things it suggests. We are at once transferred from the material to the spiritual, from the earthly to the Heavenly, from the human to the Divine; and yet we still have one hand on the lower orders all the time. We do not let go entirely of the temporal, nor the earthly, nor the human. We simply grasp more firmly the spiritual, the Heavenly, and the Divine.

Because we do not understand all about the Incarnation, we have no right to question its possibility or even its probability. By and by we may know more than we now know. It would have been thought an incredible thing if, only a few years ago, some one had affirmed the probability or even possibility of speaking thousands of miles by what is known as wireless telegraphy. Would not every one have said such a thing would be a miracle, because at that time it was contrary to what was regarded as the law of uniformity? But we now know that this fact simply lifts us into a higher sphere of the law that we supposed would be contradicted. Similarly it may be that, when the veil is entirely removed from our eyes, we will be able to understand how even miracle itself is in harmony with all the laws of the universe.*

The Disciples have very earnestly contended for the death of Christ for our sins, His burial, and His resurrection the third day, according to the Scriptures. They have refused to formulate a theory of the atonement and then make this a test of fellowship among Christians. But they have not hesitated to emphasise the importance of Christ's death as a sacrifice for sin and uncleanness, nor have they as a whole shown any sympathy with any tendency that

seeks to make the death of Christ for our sins only an “incident” in the great work which He came to accomplish. They have contended that His death for our sins is absolutely fundamental in the Gospel, and they have quoted from the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians to prove this contention. Furthermore, they have insisted that Christ was “made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.”

Around this the Disciples have gathered their forces, and in its light have fought the battle of freedom from the entangling difficulties of both Socinianism and Calvinism. They have persistently refused to accept either one of these extremes. While not attempting to formulate a scientific statement of the Atonement, they have vigorously opposed the extreme statements which have been made by others, which statements, for the most part, either eliminate the Atonement entirely or else practically eliminate the God of the Bible, and substitute for Him an imperious personality who orders everything according to certain decrees which He made before the foundation of the world. It may be said that the whole position of the Disciple movement concerning the work of Christ in the salvation of men can be summed up in the statement of the Apostle contained in Romans v: 8-12: “But God commendeth His love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath through Him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life; and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.”

Without analysing fully this important passage of Scripture, it is well to notice the fact that the Apostle distinctly separates the death of Christ from His life, ascribing reconciliation to the former and salvation to the latter. Indeed, this is practically the style of the New Testament from beginning to end. While undoubtedly it is true that the life of Christ gives character and potency to His death, this life is never specifically confounded with the death, when the reconciliation is under consideration.
Of course, in a certain sense, everything connected with Christ enters into His great work of redemption; but this in no wise justifies us in confounding things that essentially differ. Salvation is ascribed to faith, to the life of Christ, to calling on the name of the Lord, to the grace of God, to baptism, and to still other things. Now this fact must not be construed to mean that all these are not associated in the whole work of saving men, but only each one of these has its specific place in the scheme of redemption, and, as such, this place must be kept clear of interference by other things that might be substituted for it. “If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son,” it follows conclusively that, after this reconciliation has been effected through the death of Christ for our sins, then “we shall be saved by His life,” for the Christian’s life is not his own, but Christ liveth in him, and it is also true that his “life is hid with Christ in God.” *

The Disciples have also earnestly and strongly contended for the burial and resurrection of Christ, making His resurrection the crowning conception of His work.

We must not only be reconciled to God by the death of His Son, but we must be saved by His life; and our redemption must be justified before the whole universe of God, and also Christ Himself must be justified in what He has done for us; and this is effected through His resurrection, for God has given proof to all men that He is the Christ in that He has been raised from the dead.

Just here it is important to state that the Disciples have more than any other people emphasised the fact that Christ is the foundation of the Church, and that He is our Prophet, Priest, and King. As our Prophet He is our only infallible teacher; as our Priest He is our only intercessor; as our King He is our only ruler. As our Prophet we must hear what He says; as our Priest we must trust implicitly in the efficacy of His intercession, for He ever liveth to make intercession for us; as our King we must unhesitatingly and loyally obey His commandments.

It may be that other religious bodies have, to some extent, given prominence to the same conception of Christ which the Disciples have set forth; but so far as I am informed (and I think I have gone carefully over the

whole field of investigation), no religious people have emphasised and made prominent this conception of Christ as the Disciples have done. From the very beginning of their movement they have made faith *personal*, not *doctrinal*. They have insisted that to believe in Christ with the whole heart is all that is necessary, so far as faith goes, in order to salvation. The great proposition that “Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God,” has been fundamental in their religious movement ever since it was first inaugurated.

In the presence of this proposition they have met the enemies of truth from every point of view. They have met the Romanist by insisting that *Petros* is only a little stone, and is, therefore, insignificant, while *Petra*, the foundation of the Church, is a rock of large dimensions and immovable as the eternal hills. I myself have witnessed at Caesarea Philippi both the little stone and the majestic rock which doubtless Christ had in view before His eyes at the time He made the great declaration recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew. Hence, no other foundation can any man lay than that which is laid, even Jesus the Christ the Son of the living God.

As already intimated, the Disciples have earnestly contended for the sufficiency of the Scriptures as furnishing a rule of faith and practice. But they do not build the Church on the Scriptures, or accept these as having in themselves the power to save. They make us wise unto salvation; they guide us in the way of salvation; they lead us to Him who only can save to the uttermost all who come to God by Him; but the Church is built on Christ Himself, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

Finally, there are at least three special points of view from which the Disciples have regarded the great mission of Christ to the world.

(1.) As a revealer of the Father.

(2.) As the head of the Church, reigning in and over His people.

(3.) As the sovereign over all things, guiding and controlling the affairs of this world to the spread of His kingdom, until all the earth shall be subject to His authority.

What Philip desired is, to some extent, the universal desire of mankind, wherever any knowledge of the Father
exists. We all say in some form or other, “Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.” The answer to Philip by Jesus is His answer to us. He still says, “He that has seen Me has seen the Father.”

If there is anything that distinguishes the mission of Christ to the world more than another it is this very fact that in Him is a revelation of the Father to us. We have already seen that God is Spirit, and that, therefore, it is impossible for us to see Him in His essence, for no man has seen Spirit at any time. But it is possible for us to see the Father through Jesus Christ, for He is God manifest in the flesh.

I have already intimated that a religion, in its development, follows the conception of its author which that religion embodies. Surely, then, it is of the greatest consequence that we should have a true conception of God, if it is desirable that the religion we profess should itself be a true manifestation of the truth. Jesus the Christ is the embodiment of our conception of the Father, and it is therefore through Him that we must see and understand the religion which is intended to represent the Father.

Jesus the Christ is also the head of the Church, while the Church is declared to be His body. This figure emphasises a very close relationship between Christ and His Disciples. As the members of our body receive all their instructions from the head, so the members of the Church, which is Christ's body, should receive all their instructions from Him who is the head. His will must be the final authority in everything that relates to the Christian's faith and conduct. A “thus saith the Lord” must be final as regards everything that enters into the Christian life.

In this respect, it is believed that no other religious people have given such emphasis to Christ's mission as have the Disciples of Christ. They have not only recognised Christ as the foundation of the Church, but they have also insisted that He is head over all, and that, therefore, He is the source of all authority in Heaven and in earth, as regards the principles and practice of those who are his followers.

The Disciples have also strongly accentuated the universal Lordship of Christ with respect to all the affairs of
this world. They have not dogmatically insisted upon any particular view of what is called the millennium. As a body they are neither pre-millennialists nor post-millennialists. They have always allowed the widest possible liberty with respect to questions of this kind, as well as eschatological, or questions relating to the future life. The only point with which they are especially concerned is the great fact that in some way all things are working together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to His purpose. They insist (and so strongly do they insist that this is practically an article of their faith) that some way or other the final outcome of the present struggle will be the subjection of this world's powers to the authority of Him who must reign until all enemies are finally put under His feet, and He shall everywhere be recognised as the King of kings and Lord of lords.” *

IV.—A SCRIPTURAL PNEUMATOLOGY

There can be no doubt about the fact that when the Disciple movement was first inaugurated the religious world was under some curious delusions with respect to the Holy Spirit. This was doubtless owing to a certain reaction from the purely human development of religion during the Middle Ages. The Reformation under Luther turned the tide in the opposite direction. Slowly but certainly the reaction from mediaeval superstitions and humanisms began to develop toward a more rational and worthy view of things.

However, this reaction had not reached a normal state at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and especially was this true as regards spiritual influence. The work of the Holy Spirit was more or less identified with all kinds of incantations and superstitions, until conversion, in the popular estimation, became real only when it became irrational; and the Christian life, instead of being a steady and normal growth, was supposed to grow only through jerks or sporadic and spasmodic developments.

Disciples of Christ have always recognised joyfully and earnestly the important work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and salvation of men. They have been mis-

understood and misrepresented with respect to this matter; and doubtless for the reason that
men who occupy an extreme position with regard to any subject are usually unwilling to
admit that there is any middle ground that ought to be tolerated. The Disciples have always,
in the main, contended for a conservative position with respect to the work of the Holy Spirit.
In regard to baptism in Holy Spirit they have not always spoken in the language of the
Scriptures, though their chief contention has been in the right direction, viz., to teach the
Christian world that conversion is not necessarily attended with signs and miracles; that
God's power is not in the fire, the wind, nor the earthquake, but in the still small voice that
speaks through the gospel of His love, and through all the sympathies of the suffering Christ
who woos the sinner to His outstretched arms of love and bids him rest in the great Rest-
giver and Saviour of men.

Disciples have used the phrase, “Baptism of the Holy Spirit,” as though it was a
legitimate and Scriptural phrase, and have then sought to get rid of this Baptism by declaring
that it is always accompanied by the gift of tongues, as in the case of Pentecost and the house
of Cornelius. But this view of the matter is not at all necessary, if we stick to Scriptural
phraseology. There is no such thing as the “Baptism of the Holy Spirit,” or “Baptism of the
Holy Ghost,” mentioned in the Scriptures, nor is the idea, conveyed by that phrase, anywhere
found in the New Testament. The Scriptural phraseology is “Baptised in Holy Spirit,” and the
idea conveyed by this phrase is that Holy Spirit is the element in which the agent performs
the Baptism. Christ is the Agent. John declared that he would baptise in Holy Spirit and fire.
Consequently it is Christ that performs the baptism, and Holy Spirit is the element in which
the subject is baptised.

It is also an interesting fact, and somewhat suggestive at this particular point of our
investigation, that the predominant gender of the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures is neuter. It is
not necessary to magnify this habit of the inspired writers, since it is well known that the
Greek gender does not run parallel with the gender of the English. Nevertheless, if it was the
intention of the writers of the New Testament to emphasise the personality of the Holy Spirit,
it is certainly very remarkable that they
should have selected a word which is neuter in gender rather than one that is masculine. The word “parakleetos” is masculine, but this is used only by the Apostle John.

It is also very suggestive that the exact equivalent of the New Testament phrase—“To Hagion Pneuma”—is found only three times in the Old Testament. The Hebrew style, for the most part, is “The Spirit of God,” or “My Spirit,” and not “The Holy Spirit,” while very generally the gender is feminine; and as there is no neuter gender in the Hebrew language, many of its feminines are properly rendered neuter genders in the English. In Gen. i:2, the idea of “brooding” answers well to the feminine gender of “Rooach Elohim”—The Spirit of God.

Is all this accidental? Must this predominant habit of the Hebrew language be ignored entirely in a matter of such grave importance as that under consideration? I think it is quite probable that the modern tendency to always speak of the Holy Spirit as a masculine gender is the foundation of much confusion in reference to the subject of the Holy Spirit’s office and work. If we take into account the testimony of both the Old and New Testaments it seems to me that the translation of the authorised version of the Bible is justified when it uniformly translates the Holy Spirit as a neuter rather than as a masculine gender.

With respect to spiritual operations, Disciple-teachers have very generally insisted upon limiting the Holy Spirit’s work to that sphere where co-operation with the Word of God is distinctly marked out. Possibly they have pressed this point sometimes too strongly, and for the reason that, in our present fleshly state, we can know very little about spiritual operations, and therefore it is perhaps better not to attempt to limit that which is probably limitless in its sphere of influence. Nevertheless, it is wise to avoid rushing into a boundless ocean of darkness, where only ignorance and superstition are the controlling influences. We are never safe unless we can quote for our religious position a “Thus saith the Lord,” and we are never in danger as long as we can say with distinct emphasis, “It is written.” This was the safeguard of our Divine Lord when the tempter sought to lead him.
astray. He met every assault of Satan with the terse and emphatic saying, “It is written.” This with Christ was the end of all controversy, and while we are following His example, in this regard, we need not be concerned even though ten thousand superstitions should be hurled at us.

Disciples have always believed and taught that we are now practically under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. Christ has personally ascended into the heavens, and He has sent the Holy Spirit to take His place here, to advocate His cause, to dwell in His Church, and to make intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. At the same time Disciples have clearly marked the difference between the Holy Spirit as an agent and Holy Spirit indwelling the Christian, though they have never, so far as I know, made the argument for this distinction, as I have just done, by showing that the article in the Greek is always before the Holy Spirit when reference is made to the agency of the Spirit, or to its objective relationship, and never before it, when reference is made to Spirit as an element, or when it is subjectively used. From the point of view I have considered the matter, the Disciples' contention, that we must distinguish between the Holy Spirit operating in conversion and Holy Spirit dwelling in the Christian, is not only eminently intelligible, but becomes at once overwhelmingly supported by every passage of Scripture in the Word of God where the word “Spirit” is used.*

The distinction between the act of baptism and the element in which this act takes place is a very important one, and if properly understood ought to clear up some of the confusion with which the baptismal question is environed. While the Apostle Paul distinctly asserts in his letter to the Ephesians that there is one baptism, it is highly probable that there are at least three elements connected with this one baptism. The Apostle is probably simply regarding baptism from the point of view of the action performed, that is, this one baptism is an immersion, but this does not necessarily imply the element or elements in which the baptism takes place. However, if we should say that this one baptism is connected with at least three elements, viz., water, spirit, and suffering,

* See “Plea of the Disciples.” by W. T. Moore.
it is more than probable that this view of the matter would not be far from the truth.

Nor is it necessary that these elements should all be used at the same time in order to make the “one baptism.” Perhaps the first two elements were united in the baptism at Pentecost, and also at subsequent baptisms, though not attended by the extraordinary manifestations which accompanied the Pentecostal occasion. John baptised in water, but Christ baptised in Holy Spirit. Baptism in water was therefore already in practice when the day of Pentecost had fully come, and consequently the human side of the ordinance was performed by man while the divine side, the baptism in Holy Spirit, was performed by Christ Himself; and the two elements, being united, viz., the human and the divine, the “one baptism” became a baptism in both water and spirit. The baptism in suffering or sorrow began at the same time, at least in the experience of the first Christians, for the very first word which Peter pronounces, in submitting the terms of pardon, is the word “repent,” which involves self-denial and turning away from sin, and an acceptance of the new life, with all the tribulations of that life, at the same time a complete crucifixion of the flesh. They were really baptised into a state of suffering, for Jesus had said in substance that this would be their lot. At the same time He distinctly told them that in this world they would be happy, even when persecuted, and when men should say all manner of evil against them falsely for His name's sake. The joy of the Holy Spirit more than compensated for the suffering of the baptism in fire. Indeed, this suffering of the baptism in fire was a part of the discipline. In I. Corinthians iii: 13-15, we have a clear intimation that runs very nearly parallel with the teaching in the third chapter of Matthew. This passage shows that the wood, hay, and stubble of character will be burned, while the gold, silver, and precious stones will endure; so that the man himself shall be saved, “so as by fire.” In both the tenth and twelfth verses of the third chapter of Matthew, the figure is changed from one used in the eleventh verse, but the teaching is essentially the same. It is character that is under consideration. The bad tree will be cut down and burned by the unquenchable fire. In one case the axe is used, in the other
the tribulum is used. This latter instrument was employed by the Romans in separating the wheat from the chaff, and is therefore very suggestive when we turn to such passages as the following: “Tribulation worketh patience; patience experience; experience hope; and hope maketh not ashamed.” “These are they which have come up through great tribulation, having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.”

All this is exactly in harmony with the three-fold nature of man. He has a body, a soul, and a spirit. The fleshly nature must be kept under, subdued; and as far as possible, conquered. The psychical nature must be purified, chastened, and brought in subjection to the higher Spiritual nature. We must not forget that the Spiritual Man, however consecrated he may be, will have to constantly contend against the lower elements of his nature. He is in a tabernacle of clay, he is largely influenced by the animal; and though he is a new creation in Christ Jesus, he is still more or less influenced by the flesh and the animal that is in him.

It is now easy to see that there is a fitness in the three elements belonging to the one baptism, namely, water, Holy Spirit, and suffering, and that the last is just as important, as regards the purpose for which it has been appointed, as either of the other two. Indeed, it takes the three elements to complete the one baptism, when this is considered in its full import.*

Mr. Campbell himself (and very generally those who were associated with him) held to the view that there are only two cases of the baptism in Spirit: one at Pentecost, and the other at the house of Cornelius; and that this baptism was always accompanied with the gift of tongues. Consequently in the early days of the Disciple movement the baptism in Holy Spirit was regarded as having ceased to exist, though the gift of the Holy Spirit to Christians was still a precious legacy. However, this view is no longer endorsed by many Biblical exegetes among the Disciples. Indeed, Dr. Robert Richardson, in his luminous work on the Holy Spirit, holds strongly to the position that baptism in Holy Spirit is still a part of the believer's privilege. But as different views on this subject, as well as others, depend largely upon verbal criticisms,

* Vide “Man Preparing for Other Worlds,” pp. 397-399, by Dr. Moore.
especially where there is some doubt with respect to the true meaning, these matters have never been made tests of fellowship among the Disciples.

It is a fact, however, of some importance, as has already been suggested, that the article in the Greek is not used before “Hagion Pneuma” when the baptism in Holy Spirit is spoken of. Indeed, it is rather a remarkable fact that when the Holy Spirit is spoken of subjectively, or in its operations, gifts, or manifestations, in men the article is never used; but when the Holy Spirit is spoken of as itself, or is regarded objectively, then the Greek is “To Hagion Pneuma,” the article always being supplied.

Now a habit of language so remarkable as this cannot be regarded as simply accidental. It must mean something very specific, and it is highly probable that the meaning is that, in all subjective uses of the Holy Spirit, reference is made to Spirit as an element, or as an essence, and that for the time being the personality - of Spirit is distinctly suppressed in order to make the indwelling of Holy Spirit a thinkable reality. With this idea before us it is not difficult to understand Paul's statement to the Corinthians when he says that “in one Spirit were they all baptised into one body.”

It is also probable that some theologians have overdone the personality of the Holy Spirit. Disciples have never doubted the personality of the Spirit, and yet they have been careful not to make too much of what seems to be a secondary consideration with the Divine writers. The difficulty seems to be with the words “person” and “personality.” These are never used in the Scriptures with respect to the Holy Spirit, and as Disciples have always professed to “speak where the Scriptures speak, and to be silent where they are silent,” they have been a little slow in emphasising the supreme importance of this distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. It has already been seen that where the Holy Spirit is used subjectively the article is always omitted, and doubtless for the reason that the Divine record aims at emphasis on the Holy Spirit “in esse,” and this fact itself is very suggestive with respect to the matter under consideration. It should also be remembered that the word “person” or “personality” when applied to the Holy Spirit does not necessarily mean the same thing as when it is applied to ourselves. Of
course our idea of personality is formed wholly out of our conception of what we are ourselves. But this conception may very poorly express what the Scriptures teach with regard to the Holy Spirit.

V.—A SCRIPTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

God and man are so intimately associated in history that it is impossible to separate them and at the same time treat either one or the other with satisfactory fulness. Disciples have always taught that Christianity is thoroughly adapted to man as he is, and consequently they have encouraged the understanding of a correct psychology, so as to be able to co-ordinate the religion of Christ with the needs of the soul. Speaking broadly, the Disciples have generally been trichotamists. They have accepted Paul's definition in I. Thessalonians iii: 21, where he speaks of the body, soul, and spirit. This three-fold character of man is faintly adumbrated under both the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations, but the “Pneuma.” or Spirit, as distinguished from the “Soma,” and “Psyche” is especially a revelation of the Christian Dispensation. It is true that most theologians still continue to follow Plato rather than Paul, and by doing so they have sadly perplexed the Christian Anthropology.

It is also doubtless true that a false conception of man has led to many perversions of the whole Gospel scheme of salvation. The hyper-Calvinistic view, that man is practically an automaton and can act only as he is acted upon, really destroys the free agency of man and makes him little more than a machine without volition. But the Scriptures teach that man was made a little lower than God, and this high dignity accorded to him must be accepted, if we would find a satisfactory explanation for many things in his history. When it is conceded that God created him with the power to choose between good and evil, man at once takes his proper place in the Cosmos, and the tragedy in Eden becomes a reasonable fact in his history. It also serves to explain the attributes of God, especially His omniscience. One of the staple objections of infidelity to the fall of man, as represented in the Bible, is that God foreknew exactly what man would do when he was placed in the Garden of Eden, and not-
withstanding the fore-warning he received, he would certainly eat of the forbidden fruit. Or, in other words, God placed before him the temptation and then punished him for doing what God foreknew man would certainly do as soon as he was tempted. In short, God knew perfectly well that His prohibition would not hinder man from eating the forbidden fruit when he told him he must not eat it.

Now it is readily conceded that this is fallacious reasoning, though it is generally plausible to unthinking people, and has had a widespread influence in bringing the whole story of the temptation and fall into bad repute. But there is no need for conceding so much in the argument which the Christian is in the habit of making. It is perfectly true that God's foreknowledge is different from His fore-ordination. One may know that an event will happen, and yet not be in way responsible for it. I may know that poison will kill my friend; I may even warn him against taking it, but he may act entirely contrary to my advice, and so fall a victim to his own folly. But at the same time, if I put the poison before him and allow him to be tempted to partake of it, the matter assumes a very different form.

Of course the infidel's objection may be readily met if we at once conceive the fact that God did know that man would fall under the temptation; but that the temptation was necessary in order that man might be all God had intended him to be—a free agent, as free as God Himself, in order to choose his own course of action.

In short, the temptation and fall must be regarded as part of the whole plan of God which he had in view when he created man. In this case, we must judge the tragedy in Eden from the end in view rather than from the beginning, or the process of development. There is certainly nothing improbable in the fact, that in the full development of man, in the preparation of him for what Tennyson calls, “that far-off, divine event, to which the whole creation moves,” the tragedy in Eden was a necessary factor in order to reach what the Apostle Paul calls “the glory that shall be revealed in us,” when the final struggle is over, and victory shall perch upon the blood-stained banner of the cross.

Nevertheless, there is still a more reasonable view of
the whole matter. That view is that God did not certainly foreknow just what Adam would do when He created him and placed him in the Garden of Eden under the prohibition that he was not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. There is certainly nothing impossible in this conception. Of course it limits the foreknowledge of God with respect to an important matter. But if God limited Himself in this case, surely we have no right to complain. He has undoubtedly limited Himself with respect to many things, and this was probably necessary in order that He might create the universe as He has done. We cannot conceive of God changing many of the laws which we know now exist. For instance, we would regard it absurd for any one to affirm that God could make 2 and 2 equal 5. John Stewart Mill has suggested that there may be worlds where such a thing is possible. But in this world, at least, the thing is impossible, for the reason that God has constructed this world on the principle of the unchanging fact that 2 and 2 are 4, and that “things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.”

Now let us assume that He has constructed the moral universe on the principle that He has limited Himself with regard to some things in order that He may grant a larger freedom to others. Why should it be thought an incredible thing that God's omniscience was limited the moment He created another being as free as Himself? Now this is precisely what He did when He created Adam, and it is almost certain that He did not absolutely foreknow just what Adam would do under the circumstances; and, furthermore, He could not know just what He would do, in view of the freedom which had been conferred upon Adam. In other words, when God created another being as free as Himself, He then and there distinctly limited His foreknowledge as to what that being would do under certain conditions, especially where there was no antecedent history in the case of the one created by which a probable conclusion would be predicted.

Now if this view of the matter is accepted, the last shadow of a shade of reason in the infidel objection at once vanishes into thin air. It is not here affirmed that this last view of the case has been advocated by Disciple teachers, but it is certainly involved in their Anthropology,
and ought to have been made a cardinal feature in their arguments against the hyper-Calvinism with which they had to contend, especially in the early days of their movement.

The one thing, however, which has always been emphasised with respect to their anthropology is the fact that man is capable of hearing, believing, and obeying the Gospel, and that there is no justification for a final condemnation, unless he is capable of deciding for himself what he will do when the message of heaven is clearly brought before him. They have been unable, from the very beginning of their movement, to understand why God should exhort men to cease from evil and learn to do good, if these men are utterly unable to act for themselves with respect to their soul's salvation. The insistence upon a Scriptural anthropology has done much to popularise and make workable the Disciple movement. The people have not been slow to understand that the whole contention with respect to man's dignity—though he is in ruins; and his free agency—though he uses this sometimes to his own destruction—are nevertheless absolutely essential to make his salvation worth while. Indeed, this is the only view that can make his condemnation at all co-ordinate with justice.

VI.—A SCRIPTURAL SOTERIOLOGY

A right conception of man and a right conception of the Gospel are so intimately associated that it is difficult to treat them separately. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of salvation embraces practically the whole scheme of redemption, though for the sake of convenience and clearness, Soteriology is treated as a separate division. It is probable that the Disciple advocacy has been more satisfactory at this particular point than at any other in all their contentions. They certainly have taught the way of salvation, from a Scriptural point of view, as no other religious people have done. From the beginning of their movement to the present time they have given special attention to the subject of conversion, and their clear and Scriptural views have undoubtedly wrought a great change in the evangelistic systems of the Protestant denominations generally. While they have earnestly and
persistently contended that every case of conversion recorded in the New Testament was begun and ended by the Holy Spirit, they have just as earnestly and persistently contended that the Holy Spirit, just as God does, works through means and never works so as to hinder or discount the free agency of man in his own conversion.

Doubtless the main reason why the office and work of the Holy Spirit have been confused, or else completely perverted, is owing to the fact that the whole subject of conversion has become “confusion worse confounded,” owing to both a false Anthropology and a false Soteriology.

That something called conversion is taught in the Bible no one who reads aright can for a moment question; but that the public understanding of it is correct I think may be fairly doubted. There is, perhaps, no difference of opinion, at least among those who are regarded as Evangelicals, as to the need of conversion. I believe that all are in harmony at that point. But when we come to consider what is really meant by conversion, then there is at once a wide divergence between the popular understanding and that view which a critical knowledge of the subject must necessarily yield. This difference may be clearly indicated by asking a few questions: Does the man convert himself, or is it something done for him? Is conversion an act of the creature or of the Creator? Or, in other words, is it a human or divine act? The popular view is that it is wholly a divine act; that the human is entirely passive, simply receiving what is done through divine agency. Hence, we are constantly hearing such expressions as the following: “When I was converted,” “He went to the meeting and was converted,” etc., etc.; all referring to something which the subject had done for him rather than something he did himself. And this view is at least partially justified by the Authorised Version. In that Version the original (epistrepho) is rendered six times by the phrase “Be ye converted,” which conveys a passive signification, as if the persons referred to are finally made to yield to some foreign influence which they were at the time resisting. But the idea of passivity is not in the original at all. The original occurs thirty-one times in the New Testament, in eighteen of which it expresses a mere physical act or turning or returning; nineteen times it is used to change
from evil to good, and twice from good to evil. In none of these cases does it ever express passivity of the subject. The corresponding Hebrew word (Shawb) is of very frequent use in the Old Testament, and almost invariably carries with it the force of activity upon the part of the subject. In Isaiah vi: 10, the Authorised Version gives a correct rendering as regards the very word under consideration. The passage reads: “Lest they see with their eyes, and understand with their heart, and convert,” etc. It will be seen here that the word “convert” is in the active voice, and refers to something that the people were themselves to do, and not to something that was to be done in them or for them. But where this passage is found in the New Testament, as in Matthew xiii: 15, Mark lv: 12, John xii: 40, the Authorised Version uniformly gives us a rendering which regards the subjects as entirely passive, and therefore acted upon rather than acting themselves. The Revised Version has done good service in giving a much better translation of the original; but why epistrepho should be rendered “turn again” in Matthew and Mark, and only “turn” in John, is certainly beyond the ken of any Greek scholar outside of the Revision Committee. Still, we must do that Committee justice by heartily commending their discrimination in reference to the voice of the verb in these places, as well as in Acts iii: 19. In this last passage the revisers have given us what is virtually a new revelation. As it stands in the Authorised Version it is really an entire perversion of the original, and has doubtless been largely instrumental in creating in the public mind the erroneous view to which I am calling attention. It is probable that those who made the Authorised Version were influenced in this matter by the Latin Vulgate, as it uses the passive voice where every other version known to me uses the active. It is well known that King James' translators followed very closely the Latin Vulgate, and as regards epistrepho, they followed the Vulgate slavishly. Hence it will be seen that we are indebted to the Roman Catholic Bible for one of the most blighting errors with which modern Christendom is cursed.

What, then, is the correct idea of conversion as taught in the Word of God? In answering this question it may be well to approach the final conclusion by successive
steps. Let it be observed, first of all, that the original word everywhere represents an act, and in the next place that this act is performed by the subject, and finally that the subject by this act turns from his wanderings to serve the living God. Strictly speaking, therefore, conversion denotes what the sinner does himself, and not what is done in him or for him. It is his own act, and not the act of another. True, the whole process may comprehend several acts instead of one, as the term simply indicates the fact of turning rather than the steps by which this turning is accomplished. But whether many acts or one, whatever is done, so far as any act is concerned, it must be regarded as done by the sinner himself. Hence the idea of passivity on his part is wholly unscriptural, and is dangerously misleading the people. I feel conscious that in thus speaking I am doing a service for the cause of truth. The popular mind is saturated with the notion that the sinner has nothing to do—can, indeed, do nothing—as he is wholly passive, and must, therefore, wait for some irresistibilis gratia to act for him. Thus human responsibility is practically destroyed, while the work of saving souls is turned from its legitimate course to try expedients which are as unscriptural and dangerous as the popular view of conversion is erroneous and misleading.*

Now this view of conversion has strongly appealed to the people generally. It thoroughly harmonises with the anthropology for which the Disciples have always contended; and the two, when properly co-ordinated, exactly fit each other, and what is better, they appear to fit exactly all the Scriptural teaching on the subject.

No wonder the Disciples have gained such signal triumphs in their evangelistic preaching. It is probable that sometimes, while trying to escape from Babylon, they have gone by Jerusalem in their earnest contention against the mystic theology which reigned everywhere, especially during the early days of their movement. Undoubtedly, there has been a great change of views of many eminent theologians of the present day with regard to the whole subject of salvation, and more especially with regard to the matters for which the Disciples have been such earnest advocates. Time was when both their Anthropology and

* See “Conversion of the World,” by Dr. Moore,
Soteriology were severely condemned, and even by many, regarded as the quintessence of heterodoxy. But it is perhaps true that this very heterodoxy has been one of their strongest contentions during the whole period of their religious history. But however this may be, it is certain that the religious world is rapidly coming to accept the position of the Disciples with respect to the plan of salvation, though there is still much hesitancy in adopting the views, conceded as correct, with respect to some of the conditions of the Gospel which are clearly involved in a Scriptural Soteriology.

VII.—A SCRIPTURAL ECCLESIOLOGY

While the term ecclesiology sometimes refers to a church building and its decoration, it is equally appropriate when it is used to describe the ecclesia of the New Testament, or God's building, as the Apostle calls it, or the department of religious science that treats of the organisation and development of the Church. The Disciples have been careful to build the Church according to the model prescribed by the Holy Spirit. They have studiously avoided the building of an ecclesiastic-ism, such as is represented by some of the leading denominations. They have preferred the family idea to any other, even where there is authority for the other in the New Testament. Other ideas are not rejected, where they are supported by the Scriptures, but the fatherhood and brotherhood idea, as is constantly suggested when the Church is regarded as a family, has been a favourite conception of the Disciples from the beginning of their religious movement to the present time. The Divine family is evidently the conception of Christ with respect to His Church. The members of this family are born from above, or are born of God, and hence the whole household of faith constitute a spiritual brotherhood:

“Where each can feel a brother's sigh,
And with him bear a part,
Where sorrow flows from eye to eye,
And joy from heart to heart.”

This holy brotherhood fellowship has been one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Disciples wherever
they have gathered themselves together for worship, or wherever they have come in touch with each other in the affairs of human life.

During the Middle Ages the Church practically became almost everything, while real religion amounted to very little. Even at the beginning of the nineteenth century the difference between a church and a religion was very dimly seen, if seen at all, by a great majority of Protestants; and yet the distinction between these is of the very greatest importance. A splendid ideal for a church may be a very poor ideal for a religion. The Roman Catholic Church is a magnificent ecclesiasticism which really eclipses all other religious organisations, but we are accustomed to think that its realisation of religion is far from what it ought to be. A church is only valuable so far as it fitly represents the religion of Christ. Religion must be regarded as paramount, and all our estimates with regard to a particular church must be made through that religion, rather than judging of the religion through any church, no matter what its claims may be. If we generalise the New Testament Church, for which the Disciples have always contended, at least three characteristics come prominently into view:

1. Its Spirituality.
2. Its Universality.
3. Its Oneness.

Undoubtedly the Spirituality of the Church is a cardinal feature of the teaching of the New Testament, and yet it is probable that this conception of the Church has received too scant attention in the practice of the Church. It has perhaps been recognised in theory, but not many churches have exemplified the teaching of the Apostles that the Church is “A spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.”

The Universality of the Church is as clearly revealed as the Gospel message, which is world-wide in its extent. The Gospel is to be taken into all the world and preached to every creature, and consequently the Church is intended for all the nations and cannot, therefore, be limited by any act of Parliament or any sectarian spirit which would confine the Church to any particular country.

The Oneness of Christ's Disciples is the very thing for
which He so fervently prayed in that remarkable prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John. However, it is well to distinguish between this oneness for which Christ prayed, or Christian Unity, and the Christian Union for which the Disciples have been distinguished advocates. Christian Unity is one thing, and Christian Union is quite another. Unity is a Divine gift; Union is a human expedient. We cannot create oneness or unity of spirit, but we may “endeavour to keep it.” Union is the legitimate outcome of unity. Probably the chief difficulty in effecting Christian Union is in the fact that there is too little Christian Unity out of which this union can come. Christian Union presupposes the existence of actual Christians who have been made one in Christ, as He and the Father are one; then out of this oneness union ought to follow as an effect follows cause. But if we do not “keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,” we cannot have Christian Union, no matter what the starting point may be. A bad beginning may have a good ending, but a bad beginning never did and never will make a good ending.

“Just here, if I mistake not, we touch one of the most vital questions of our Church union problem. It may be that many doctrinal differences will have to be broken down before we can realise our union ideal; but, in my opinion, the first and most important difficulties in our way lie on the practical side of Christianity rather than on the doctrinal side. When we have ceased to hinder the fullest development of spiritual oneness, by refusing any longer to recognise in our churches the distinction between Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female, we shall then begin at least to realise the New Testament ideal of the Church in which racial unity, social unity, and family unity are all practically assured. And it is not difficult to see that, when this oneness is clearly manifested in our churches, the problem of either Christian union or Church union can be easily solved. Consequently, it is my firm conviction that the real obstacles with which we have to contend are not so much doctrinal differences, the ‘historic episcopate,’ or any other kind of episcopate, as racial distinctions, national boundary lines, traditional customs, the reign of caste, and the unworthy, ungallant, and unscriptural insistence that woman
must occupy a very subordinate place in the Church. And it is furthermore my deep conviction that all efforts to realise a Christian union that would be of much permanent benefit will ultimately end in complete failure unless the practical obstacles to which I have called attention are effectually removed out of the way.

“Of course there are other things relating to the Church which might be mentioned, and which the Disciples have specially emphasised, but as I am aiming to consider their religious position from a comprehensive point of view rather than from the view of special details, I deem it unnecessary to occupy attention any further with respect to their conception of the Church. However, enough has been said to show that their conception of the Church, in many respects, is essentially different from that which is held by many other religious bodies; and it is believed that their conception is not only Scriptural, but is really the one which can be made practical for all the purposes for which the Church exists; and consequently, their conception of the Church is the only one that can possibly become efficient in bringing all the discordant elements of Christendom into practical unity.” *

With a true conception of the Bible, a true conception of God, a true conception of Christ, a true conception of the Holy Spirit, a true conception of man, a true conception of the Gospel, and a true conception of the Church, the Disciples hold an impregnable position from which they can work for the salvation of the world. In view of their earnest contention for a Scriptural presentation of all these, it is not strange that their plea must be reckoned with before we can hope for a successful movement on the nations on the other side of the Pacific Ocean that have not yet been successfully evangelised by the pure Gospel of Christ.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it may be worth while to inquire why the plea of the Disciples has been such a decided success, notwithstanding it received, for a long time at least, the almost united opposition of the forces of Christendom. That it has been a success no one will doubt who will become sufficiently acquainted with the rise, progress, and present status of the movement as to be able to form an intelligent judgment. In-

* “Plea of the Disciples.”
indeed, it is now very generally conceded that the Disciples are making more substantial progress than any other religious people in the United States; and this fact is all the more remarkable because they have very few, if any, additions from foreign countries. As we have already seen, the movement is distinctly American in its character. While the light came from the East with the men who inaugurated and propagated its principles at the beginning of the nineteenth century, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the movement has been from the beginning to the present time characteristically American, and has travelled Westward exactly in the line of the law of progress and in harmony with the movement of population. It is, therefore, interesting and instructive to briefly examine some of the reasons why the plea has met with such signal triumphs in the face of such persistent opposition. The following reasons will be sufficient for the present purpose:

(1) The Scripturalness of the Plea.

Perhaps no other religious people have emphasised more earnestly the importance of having a “Thus saith the Lord” for everything for which they contend in faith and practice. The people generally wish something assuring with respect to their religious life. In His contest with Satan, our Divine Lord met all the assaults of the adversary with the emphatic phrase, “It is written.” This seems to have been the only weapon which our Lord used, but it was eminently successful in putting Satan to flight. The Disciples have very generally relied upon the Scriptures in all their contests with their opponents. This particular fact has given their evangelistic efforts remarkable potency. Their evangelists constantly quoted the Scriptures for every step they wished the sinner to take in order that he might become a Christian. They relied exclusively upon Divine instruction with respect to the whole plan of salvation, and utterly refused to accept human testimony with reference to what the sinner must do to be saved. They quoted not only the commission of our Divine Lord, but also all the cases of conversion recorded in the New Testament, and constantly and persistently insisted that the Divine pattern should be followed in all things, in order that those who turned away from their sins and became Christians should
have the full assurance of faith which is guaranteed only by having a “Thus saith the Lord” for all the steps that are taken.

(2) The Reasonableness of the Plea,

It has already been remarked that the movement was, first of all in its development, a protest against darkness and a plea for light. While the early pioneers of the movement said very little about the scientific character of their plea, it is evident to the careful student of their history that the plea is scientific in a very high degree. It evidently fits in with all the known facts of nature, and thus co-ordinates nature and grace, making them co-operants, instead of opponents, as many did, especially in the early days of the movement. The Disciples have always contended that there is no necessary antagonism between science and religion, when both of these are well understood and occupy their respectively legitimate positions. Antagonism between them is only possible where there is ignorance with respect to one or the other, or both.

This special contention of the Disciples brought their plea into direct line with a predominant characteristic of the age, and, therefore, helped to commend the Disciple plea to many who would have otherwise rejected it. In contending for the “faith once for all delivered to the saints” the Disciples rejected speculative science, as well as speculative theology, but they have always been willing to accept any well-established facts whether in nature or in grace. This made their plea reasonable, and has done much in helping to popularise it with those who demand a reason for the hope that is in us before they will give earnest attention to what we say.

(3) The Simplicity of the Plea.

The whole complex revelation of both Testaments was reduced to the simple formula that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the living God. It was contended that this is the proposition upon which Christ built His Church, and that it is what was preached everywhere by the Apostles, though the manner of stating it is somewhat different under different circumstances. But this proposition is substantially what must be preached, and therefore, what is to be believed by those who desire to be Christians. This at once takes faith out of the category
of doctrines and makes it simple, because it is personal. It is not a belief in some theological formula, but in a glorious Person in whom the people may trust.

One of the chief difficulties with which Protestants have had to contend in their conflicts with the Roman Catholic Church has been the complexity of the machinery of Protestantism. While the Roman Catholic Church has moved steadily on, under the influence of a single inspiration, maintaining her unity in all countries and under all circumstances, the Protestant Churches have divided their influence in a warfare among themselves, as well as greatly weakened each individual effort by the complex conditions of Protestantism itself. The Protestant theory is to oppose an infallible Church with an infallible Bible, but the Protestant practice has been to weaken this plea by claiming the necessity of human creeds, and consequently the Protestant movement, as a whole, has been greatly retarded in its progress by adding to the pure, simple Word of God, the decrees of Augsburg, Westminster, and such like ecclesiastical utterances. The Disciples have always contended that these human creeds are unnecessary and divisive in their character, and ought, therefore, to be abandoned, while the Disciple creed, namely: that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God,” should be accepted everywhere as the only thing necessary to be believed in order to the salvation of the world. This contention for a simple, personal creed has been a source of great strength with the Disciples from the beginning of their movement to the present time.

The Protestant creeds have all failed to perceive that the faith of the Gospel is not belief in some particular representation of Jesus, some definite formula which expresses a philosophical conception of Him, but belief in Jesus Himself—in Him who was dead, but is alive for evermore. This the scholasticism of the Mediaeval Church would not permit, but insisted upon a scientific formula, which, whether true or false, ought now to be rejected by every intelligent Christian, not because it is true or false, but because it is a theory, and as such, is a perversion of “the faith once for all delivered to the saints.”

The modern Church has not given as much attention to the speculations concerning Christ as the Mediaeval
Church did, but it has not been by any means indifferent to philosophical questions. What the theologians at Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon regarded as the vital questions in Theology and Christology our modern divines have been disposed to consider of secondary importance, while they have given the first place to the subjects of Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. These subjects have furnished the weapons for modern theological pugilism, and, as a consequence, our symbolical literature is full of abstract statements concerning original sin; the doctrine of satisfaction; the resurrection and final state of man. The thing that the Church needs to understand is not that the Calvinistic Anthropology is superior to the Arminian, or that the Arminian Soteriology is superior to the Calvinistic, but that these are questions which belong to the schools, not to the Church, and must not, therefore, be allowed to enter into the question of any one's faith. These are matters concerning which it is all-important to have correct views; but they do not properly belong to the question of the churches' creed, and hence should not be made barriers in the way of Christian union and communion. And until theologians shall abandon their fruitless discussions about things which do not properly belong to the Christian faith, it is impossible to hope for “the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.”

But, after all, there is a point of view from which this simplicity has had its drawbacks. The theologians could not understand the Disciples. This was so much the case that many have wondered why the Disciples were so constantly and so persistently misrepresented in the early days of the movement. But the answer is not far to seek. We might ask with equal propriety, why was Christ so constantly and persistently misunderstood? No one ever spoke with greater simplicity, and yet no one perhaps was more shamefully misunderstood. The common people heard Him gladly, but the theologians could not understand Him.

The same was true as regarded the plea of the Disciples. It was so far removed from the theological zone that many of the theologians felt that it was entirely outside of the world's great need. These theologians had long been trained in the school of doctrines, philosophies, and
metaphysical speculations. Their view of religion was largely influenced by the colour of the spectacles they wore; consequently, when the Disciples insisted that these spectacles should all be remanded to the waste basket, while the clear, white light of the simple Gospel should be allowed to shine, without passing through the colored glasses of men's invention, it was all simple, and yet so revolutionary, that many honest souls actually believed that there was nothing in it, and that the religion which it professed to advocate was really nothing more than a superficial representation of what true religion ought to be.

Of course there were those who misrepresented the Disciples because they were blinded by bigotry, and others because they could not see through their ignorance, but it is charitable to conclude that most of the misrepresentations, and especially those made by the preachers of the various denominations, may be charged to the account of the simplicity of the plea which the Disciples made. Mr. Barnum was not far wrong when he said “the people love to be humbugged.” Patent medicine vendors understand this weakness of human nature, and consequently, they place upon their nostrums some mysterious label which at once covers up the simple ingredients entering into the compound. If the average man knows exactly what is in the compound he is not inclined to patronise it, but if it comes to him labelled with some mysterious name, he at once accepts this fact as an assurance that the medicine will meet his case.

No doubt there are other reasons why the Disciples were misrepresented, but it is probable that the very simplicity of their plea was the ground of nearly all the honest misunderstandings with respect to their teaching. This seems paradoxical, but it is a fact nevertheless, and the proof of it will be found in the subsequent history of their movement. In recent years they are beginning to be clearly understood, and misrepresentations are no longer the general rule. The reason for this is not that their plea has changed, but the point of view of the denominations has changed. These denominations have ceased to look at the Disciples through the spectacles that were generally used in the early days of the Disciple movement, and this makes all the difference as regards
the appearance of the Disciple position to these denominations. It may be true, and probably is true, that the Disciples have at least in some respects removed the emphasis from some of the things they once advocated, but it is an entire misrepresentation of their position when it is stated that they have given up any important contention that was in their plea when it had been fairly developed.

But, however this may be, it cannot be doubted that with the people generally the simplicity of the principles the Disciples advocated was of very great advantage in gaining converts. The average mind could understand the Disciple preachers, and it was a great relief to the masses to hear a Gospel which was really good news, and not a perplexing riddle which was no longer any account when its mystery was solved. At any rate, the common people heard the Disciples gladly, and it was among these people where the preachers made most of their converts.

(4) Comprehensiveness of the Plea.

While the creed insisted upon by the Disciples is simple, it is at the same time widely comprehensive. As regards time, it reaches over the whole area of human history. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; He, therefore, comprehends the past, present, and future. But His universality must be admitted also by all who understand His character. He not only meets the condition of all ages, but of all the people of these ages. He is the universal man, as well as the universal Saviour. The high and the low, the rich and the poor, the bond and the free, the Jew and the Greek, the male and the female, all become one in Christ Jesus, because in Him is the universal solvent of all questions, at least, the distinctions suggested by these classes do not count. They exist, no doubt, but when properly co-ordinated with Jesus Christ all distinctions are lost in a great comprehensiveness which is found nowhere except in our Divine Lord. Consequently, Disciples have contended that there is no need for anything else to be submitted to our faith, since he who believes in Jesus Christ, as the Son of the living God, has the very faith that covers the whole ground of human need and human responsibility.

It ought to be evident that when we believe in Christ,
we accept all that He has said as divine, and consequently as authoritative. His word, then, becomes law to us—an infallible rule of action. If He was what He claimed to be, then the New Testament is what it claims to be; but if He was an impostor, it is certainly a "cunningly-devised fable," and entirely unworthy of our confidence. Hence, that which is addressed to our faith is the divinity of Christ; while that which determines our action is the authority of Christ. But His authority depends on His divinity. If He is divine, His word is binding on all His followers, and every commandment in that word must be implicitly obeyed. We conclude, therefore, that it is not strictly proper to say the New Testament is our creed, but we can say it is our rule of duty. We believe in Christ because we are convinced that He is divine; we obey Him because the acknowledgment of His divinity concedes His right to command. Hence the proposition affirming the Messiahship of Jesus is the creed of the Church—the foundation upon which the Church is built—while all else in the New Testament in some way relates to this primary truth. This view of the matter turns the mind away from every other question, to consider the one which is most vital in the Christian religion, namely, “What think ye of the Christ, whose son is He?” This question is fundamental, and a proper answer to it will give us the only divinely authorised Confession of Faith that the world has ever known since the introduction of Christianity.

(5) Unity of the Plea.

We have already seen that the Disciples have always co-ordinated everything around one great personality. Protestantism has always given evidence of certain decided elements of power within it; but these elements have been manifested only in special directions. There has been no regular, harmonious development; and consequently the strength of Protestantism has been unequal to the task of successfully meeting the influence of Rome, to say nothing of the influence of Paganism, which must be overcome before the final triumphs of Christianity can be assured. The work of Wyclif, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Calvin, Wesley, and others, did much toward breaking off the shackles of religious despotism and restoring the ancient order of things with respect to the
Gospel and the Church. No intelligent, consistent historian can fail to know this fact. But it is likewise true that no candid historian can fail to admit that there was a great want of unity in the plea which they made. Some of the elements of truth, which they eliminated from the mass of error which had overwhelmed the religious condition of their age, came out clearly, distinctly, and unmistakably on the side of Primitive Christianity; but there were so many evidences of mixture with the corruptions of Rome, in other things for which they contended, that the unity of their cause was greatly disfigured and broken by these uneven developments of truth. The strength and efficiency of their plea were also impaired in the exact ratio that this want of unity was manifested. A chain may be very strong in certain parts; but on account of some weak links the strength of the whole may be greatly weakened and the chain may be rendered useless. Precisely so is it with Protestantism. In some of its parts it has always been strong, but taken as a whole it is unfortunately weak because of a lack of unity in all its parts.

The plea of the Disciples is to accept all the strong points of Protestantism, as it has gradually developed since the days of Wyclif, and to reject all that is weak in it, and thereby restore the chain of truth, with all the links unimpaired, which Protestantism has made weak by admixtures with error. This unity of their plea is a great source of strength.

(6) The Consistency of the Plea.

Much more is meant by consistency than simply the harmony of the various parts of the plea. It is meant rather that the plea is in harmony with truth and that it is practically what it professes to be. Protestants, very generally, are inconsistent in the plea which they make. While contending for the right of individual interpretation of the Scriptures, they stultify this plea by making human creeds authoritative, and thereby limiting the right of the individual to think and act for himself. Consequently, while the Protestant clergy have theoretically denied the Papal assumption of right to interpret the Word of God for the masses, they have too frequently stultified their own theory by practically sitting in judgment upon the faith of others. Had Protestantism been
consistent with itself and fully exemplified what it professes, much, very much, might have
been done, even in the sixteenth century, toward staying the tide of religious despotism
which was then sweeping over the whole of Europe. Something, indeed, was done; but
nothing in comparison with what should have been accomplished. Truth is always consistent
with itself, and it was natural, therefore, for men to suspect the purposes and doubt the
correctness of the position of their new masters when these were found little less exacting
upon the conscience than their Papal predecessors. This palpable inconsistency—this
determined opposition to Rome, on account of her assumptions of right to interpret the Bible
for the Church, while at the same time claiming the right for Protestants to do the same thing,
by forcing upon the people an almost indefinite number of theological dogmas—is, beyond
question, a very weak point of Protestantism. Try to apologise for it as we may, the
conclusion, nevertheless, forces itself upon us that just here is a plain and monstrous
inconsistency.

To remedy this unmistakable evil, and at the same time to enable us to meet successfully
the encroachments upon civil and religious liberty, the plea of the Campbellian Reformation
has been and is now, not only to theoretically allow, but also earnestly and practically to
enforce upon society the right of the individual conscience in all matters pertaining to
religion. The Disciples have held to the view that there is no middle ground between the
papacy and this position. They claim that the people must be left free to interpret the Word of
God for themselves, or else the clergy must do it for them. A domineering priesthood or a
free people is the logical and necessary consequence growing out of these conditions. The
people have not been slow to see the justness of the position of the Disciples upon this
subject, and consequently their cause has gained great strength from this source, wherever it
has been faithfully presented. Just here is the secret, to some extent, of their popularity
among the masses; and it is not to be wondered at when we take into consideration the fact
that they are the only people among Protestants who practically as well as theoretically strike
for the freedom of conscience and the right of individual interpretation; at least they are the
only people that have
The Practicality of their Plea.

This has always been a marked characteristic. Experience has proved that the plea is workable. Doubtless, in some respects, it has not always brought results commensurate with reasonable expectations. Nevertheless, a careful examination of the whole ground will show that the plea has proved itself to be eminently practical, and in many respects it is decidedly workable.

This workable characteristic of the plea has done much to commend it to the people. As a rule, the common people, at least, are not captivated by a theory, however plausible that theory may be, when, if put to the test, it is shown to be unworkable. Some dreamers have spent fortunes in trying to invent a perpetual motion. They have demonstrated to themselves, and even to others, the correctness of their theory; but after all when their theory has been put to a practical test it has proved to be unworkable. No religious plea will, in the last analysis, receive the public applause, which, when thoroughly tested, proves to be impracticable.

It is no doubt true that the plea of the Disciples was at first regarded as an impracticable dream; but the subsequent history has proved conclusively, to those who have watched the development of this remarkable religious body, that what they contend for is eminently practicable, since it is conceded that they are even now making more rapid progress than any other religious people in the United States. Nor is this progress confined simply to their evangelistic efforts. In this particular field they are undoubtedly without a rival. Whether their modern methods can be wholly justified or not, they are surely an improvement upon the methods adopted by any other religious people. Furthermore, it is certain that from the very beginning they have been without a rival in the practical way they preach the Gospel. This practicality of their preaching comes largely from its definiteness and Scripturalness. It fixes something; and settles something; it concentrates everything into one great proposition, and while this is presented from different points of view, as it is in the New Testament, at the same time it focalises the whole Gospel message, so that the un-
converted can see and understand just what the message is, and furthermore, just when they will be accepted of God after they turn from their sins and do what the Gospel requires. There can be no doubt about the fact that this simple, yet comprehensive and definite Gospel has done much to make the evangelistic work of the Disciples a conspicuous success.

At the same time it ought not to be forgotten that their success in other fields has been almost equally as great. It must be remembered that they are comparatively, from a historical point of view, a young people, with only one hundred years behind them, and a large number of these years were spent in the Creative and Chaotic Periods. Nevertheless the Disciples have grown almost wonderfully in their missionary operations, their educational development, their literature, and also in the spiritual advance of their churches. It is readily admitted that their growth in every respect is not always the same at all points and in all places. But, looking at their history, as a whole, it must be conceded by any competent and impartial judge that they have proved the truth of their contention largely by showing that their plea is eminently practical in accomplishing the things for which the Disciples contend.

(8) Their Plea is Conservative.

The Disciples have always recognised that some things must be settled, must be taken for granted, must be accepted as truth; and to these things we must hold fast if we do not wish to be moved by every wind of doctrine, etc., that may come along to disturb the “keeping of the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” They recognise the exhortation of the Apostles that there are certain things that must be “held fast,” and certain things in which we must “stand fast” in order that we may be able to make progress at all. There are some people, so fascinated with the idea of progress, that they would sweep from under us the very ground upon which progress makes its steps. But we cannot walk even physically without something permanent upon which our steps may be taken; much less can we make religious progress unless we hold fast the immutable things which are revealed to us in the Word of God, which Word itself is a permanent assurance for every step we take, for it abides forever.
Conservatism, in its right place, is just as important as liberalism; and certainly the former is more important, when in the right place, than the latter is, when in the wrong place.

The people have not been slow to see this in the Disciple movement. They have been charmed with this particular feature, because it gives the soul something definite and permanent upon which it can rely. A soul without chart or compass, while on the great sea of life, is always more or less a lost soul, sailing hither and thither without knowing whether it will ever land at port or not. Disciples have inspired the people with the Scriptural assurance that the hope for which they contend is sure and steadfast, and enters into the vail where Jesus Christ, the forerunner, has entered; a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. This assurance is worth ten thousand pleas where the name of liberty is used, as said by Madame Roland, at the Guillotine, in order to justify crime.

(9) The Plea is Eminently Liberal.

Notwithstanding all that has been said, with respect to the conservative side of the plea, it is, nevertheless, a great plea for liberty; and this is one of its most distinguishing characteristics. But what is liberty? This is not so easily defined, but for general purposes, at least for a working basis, we may affirm that it is the privilege to do right. But even this definition contains at least two somewhat ambiguous terms. What is privilege? and again what is right? There are no questions more difficult to determine than those of casuistry. In settling what is right and what is wrong we must always be influenced, somewhat at least, by certain conditions of environment and perspective, and consequently what may be right in a given case may be wrong in another; and what may be wrong in one set of circumstances may be right in another. The determining factor is nearly always a variable quantity, and this is precisely why we cannot formulate a definite rule to meet all cases. Nevertheless, the rule just given is sufficient for practical purposes; hence it is well to stick to the definition that liberty is the privilege to do right, while what “privilege” and “right” are must be left for determination in each case as it arises.

There is another difficulty in dealing with the question, and that arises from the liberty which we claim for our-
selves, and what we are willing to grant to others. We are all anxious to have the liberty to think, speak, and act for ourselves, within legitimate bounds, without any obtrusive interference from any person or persons who may seek to limit our liberty; but are we at the same time willing to grant the liberty which we claim for ourselves to all other persons? The first end of this statement will no doubt be heartily agreed to by all classes, but it may be seriously doubted whether the latter part of it will be practically accepted by very many. It is so easy to believe that our own way of thinking is best, that, even from a benevolent point of view, we are sometimes anxious to have others accept our notions of truth, *nolens volens*. Indeed, our anxiety to press our own conclusions upon others is so intense that it not infrequently happens that we persecute those who are not willing to think, speak, and act as we do; and when this persecution takes the form of fagot or sword, we cry out against it as unworthy of an enlightened civilisation, to say nothing of a Christian civilisation. But the principle is precisely the same whatever may be the form of the persecution. There are many petty persecutions at this time that are just as wrong in principle as those which characterised the period of the Dark Ages. The principle of religious liberty is perhaps violated just as often now—and that, too, by Protestants themselves—as was done in the fifteenth century by Roman Catholics. The *form* of the violation is different, that is all.

The Disciples of Christ have always recognised the true principle of religious liberty at least in *theory*, though like all other people who are liable to err, they have sometimes failed to practically illustrate the great principles for which they have contended. But their right contention has done much to leaven religious society with correct views as regards the rights of the individual conscience, with respect to all religious matters. It is perhaps true that the liberty for which they have contended has been abused, and no doubt frequently perverted, so that its true meaning has been obscured. But this only proves the weakness of human nature rather than the weakness of the principles involved in the contention of the Disciples. Liberty has its limitations and cannot be pressed beyond these limitations, without disastrous results following.
Perhaps one of the chief difficulties in the way of dealing with the question of liberty is owing to the fact that some people think they must always do the thing which they have a right to do, and that there must be no limitations. But the Apostle Paul did not so reason. He had the right, he said, to eat meat, but he would not do so while the world stands if it would cause his brother to stumble or grow weak. We certainly ought not to do what is not right in the name of Liberty, but even when we have the privilege to do right, we ought not to exercise this privilege when the result is likely to be more harm than good. In Ethics the highest reach of service is the *summum bonum*—the chief good. It is not what is right, but what is good, that stands as the highest ideal for endeavour.

But no matter how the foregoing consideration may be regarded, it is undoubtedly true that the Disciples' plea for liberty, united with their plea for conservatism, has been a most potent factor in their success as a religious people. They have stood for something that abides—even faith, hope, and love,—but they have stood also for a legitimate liberty in the exercise of the individual conscience. The people have not been slow to recognise the value of their plea in this respect, and consequently much of their success may be attributed to this union of these apparently contradictory principles.

(10) *The Plea is Progressive.*

This characteristic has been anticipated in the elements already considered. If what has been stated is true of the plea, it would be impossible for the Disciples not to be a progressive people. Progress is possible only where there is co-ordination and co-operation of the things that make for progress. The Disciples have insisted, as perhaps no other religious people have done, that revelation itself is a progressive development; hence they have divided the history of religion into three dispensations, namely, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian; or as Mr. Campbell was wont to express this fact, the Starlight Age, the Moonlight Age, and the Sunlight Age.

In the light of this division, Disciples have never had any difficulty in harmonizing the Old and New Testaments. They have constantly and earnestly insisted upon the fact that the revelation of God Himself has been progressive; that the view of God under the Patriarchal Dispen-
sation is somewhat different from what it is under the Jewish Dispensation; and it is still different under the Christian Dispensation. The recognition of this fact has enabled them to understand the character of God without affirming that the Old Testament revelation concerning Him is not to be trusted, because it was influenced by the environment in which the Old Testament records were produced. Disciples have contended that each revelation is exactly what it ought to be, in view of the characteristics of the age to which it belongs. All the light did not shine during the Starlight, or Moonlight Age. It was reserved for the time, when the Sun of Righteousness should arise with healing in His beams, for a full revelation of the character of God. At this time He is revealed as the loving Father who constantly careth for His children.

Disciples have also always distinguished between principle and method. Perhaps this statement needs some qualification. It is certainly true of the more enlightened portion of Disciples, but it cannot be doubted that some of them have not always made this distinction in their reasoning with respect to their methods of work. Nevertheless, the predominant contention of the Disciples has been that principles are eternal, and consequently do not change, but methods are transient and may change from time to time according to the special requirements of a given case. This distinction has enabled the Disciples to go forward with many things in a somewhat different method from that which characterised the work of the pioneers in the early days of the movement. In the beginning, Mr. Campbell denounced many things which he afterwards advocated. At first, this was, perhaps, necessary, for the things which he denounced were at that time great hindrances in the way of the progress of truth. The methods had run away with the principles until practically little more than the methods remained, and these were decidedly vicious. But many theologians, who did not make the proper distinction between principles and methods, came to the conclusion that Mr. Campbell was opposed to the principles involved, simply because he denounced the abuse of these principles, which abuse had become so prominent a character of the times as to completely overshadow the principles themselves.

Speaking broadly, it can safely be affirmed that the Dis-
Disciples have always been a progressive people; using all the light that is available from every source whatever. While their final appeal has always been to the Word of God, they have constantly accepted all the help from other sources that may be legitimately used in order to clearly understand what the Word of God means. When Ezra stood in the pulpit of wood and read the law of the Lord, which had been so much neglected, he helped the people to understand its meaning, and this has been a cardinal function of the Disciple teachers. They have constantly endeavoured to make the people understand the Word of God, hence they have been willing to use all the light that science, history, or learning can possibly throw upon the pages of the Bible. This has enabled them to become a virile, active, and progressive people with regard to all the great matters with which they have to deal in their day and generation.

(11) The Infallible Certainty which the Plea Assures.

The soul is constantly seeking for rest, but this rest cannot be found in anything short of infallibility. Until this is found, like Noah's weary dove, the soul wanders over a sea of doubts and difficulties. The Roman Catholic position is strong in this respect, though it is weak compared with the Protestant position, if Protestants were true to the plea they make. The Romanist believes in an infallible pope, or an infallible church, but neither of these can be trusted, and therefore, in the last analysis, they break down in supplying the need of the human heart, which requires not only personality, but a personality that is certainly infallible, and that can be perfectly trusted. The Disciple plea meets this demand in every respect, and when the plea is faithfully tested, in the experience of Christians, it has been found to be worthy of acceptation.

It has already been seen that Christ is made the centre of everything in the contention of the Disciples. He is the first and the last, the beginning and the end, the Alpha and Omega, and He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; and this being true, it is no mere experiment when we follow His gracious invitation to come to Him and He will give us rest. He is the great rest-giver; and while Disciples have very generally held to the infallibility of the Bible, as a rule of faith and practice, they have regarded this Bible as valuable chiefly
because it leads to Christ, who is the absolutely infallible authority with respect to all matters pertaining to the Christian life. To believe implicitly in Him, to unreservedly commit ourselves to His leadership, to obey without question His commandments, is life here and life everlasting in that “house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.”

In contending for Christ as the final authority in all religious matters, the Disciples have always co-ordinated with Christ the human reason and revelation. They have persistently held to the fact that there is no necessary conflict with respect to these, and that when they are all properly understood and made to occupy their rightful positions, there is not the least conflict in any respect whatever. They have uniformly contended that while Christ is the object of faith, at the same time this faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God; or in other words, the human reason, or the power to perceive and understand truth, enables the earnest inquirer to examine the Word of God, and this examination, or investigation, leads up to the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the infallible rest-giver.

All this has been intelligible to the people generally, and they have not been slow to appreciate the Disciples' position in this respect. Perhaps no one thing has contributed more to their success as a religious people than the particular point to which we are now calling attention. This infallibility of the Christ, rather than the infallibility of the pope, is a cardinal feature with the Disciples, and while doubtless other religious people have held to practically the same position, it is nevertheless true that the Disciples have emphasised the importance of this more than others simply because their rejection of human creeds necessarily magnifies the importance of the Word of God, and makes Christ not only the foundation of the Church, but the centre of the whole religious system.

(12) The Unsectarianism of the Plea.

From the very beginning of their movement the Disciples have constantly protested against sectarianism. The burden of the great “Declaration and Address,” by Thomas Campbell, was a plea against sects and for Christian union. The Campbells never intended to act as a separate body when they issued that address. They fondly
hoped to induce the Christian denominations to abandon their sectarian positions and all work together in a common effort for the conversion of the world. They taught that all that was necessary to Christian union was to abandon the things that divide Christians, and accept the common platform of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone; and be it said to the credit of the Campbells, and those who were at first associated with them, that they began this work of Reformation, or Restoration, as it has been called, in their own households, they themselves deciding in their own case to accept of nothing for which they could not find in the Scriptures a “Thus saith the Lord” in either an expressed precept or a clearly revealed example. In this matter they asked nothing of the Christian world that they themselves were not willing to practice. They really began the Reformation among themselves; and this fact goes far to relieve the movement from any selfish, personal interest. Furthermore, when it became evident that they would be compelled to occupy the position of a separate religious people, the Disciples refused to insist upon anything in their plea of a speculative character concerning which men might rightfully differ. As an illustration of this fact, it may be stated that the Campbells were both moderate Calvinists, and remained so till their death, but they utterly refused to recognise either Calvinism or Arminianism in their plea for Christian union. They and the Disciples generally held to many things that were never made tests of fellowship in their churches. Whatever was necessary to produce and sustain the Christian life was the only test that they made with respect to Christian fellowship. A very large latitude was allowed outside of what they regarded as plainly taught in the Word of God with respect to the Christian faith, state, and life. They held that their religious position must be common ground, or it would be impossible to bring the Christian world to adopt it.

Just here it is worth while to indicate the grounds on which they based their plea of unsectarianism. Undoubtedly many religious people have regarded the movement, from the very beginning, as practically a sect to some extent like all the other sects of Christendom. This the Disciples have refused to admit, and the reason for
their contention is found in the fact that their plea is not made in the interests of denominational union, but in the interest of Christian union. They have always and everywhere contended that, as a finality, nothing but Christian union is desirable, and nothing but this could possibly be permanent. This very fact has caused them to place very great emphasis upon the conditions of the Gospel, the acceptance of which is necessary to the Christian life and character. It is possible that some of their advocates have carried this contention a little too far, and have thereby partially at least justified the charge against the Disciples that they are narrow and exclusive, and that their plea for Christian union is simply a plea for all the sects in Christendom to join them. But this would be a very unworthy estimate of the plea, as it has been advocated by the more intelligent portion of their ministry. They have held to the notion that the divided state of Christendom is abnormal, and that very generally the lines of division among the sects are not necessary to the Christian life and character, and therefore, these lines should be obliterated, or at least not counted in any plea for Christian union; but in cases where there are essential differences, the Disciples have always appealed to the law and to the testimony, saying, “By the Word of God, we stand or fall.”

It is unquestionably true that the call to Christian union rather than to denominational union has much in it that is plausible, and perhaps all that is in it is really Scriptural. The difficulty in making this plea effective has been, from the very beginning, the unfriendly position of the Protestant sects, owing doubtless to the fact that sectarianism is essentially selfish, and is in most cases an inheritance; and consequently any call, asking the people to give up their household gods, is sure to be resisted. Nevertheless, the Christian world, at the time the movement took on its separate form, was undoubtedly greatly in need of just such a plea as the Disciples have made. The following extract, from Professor Max Muller’s “Chips from a German Workshop,” is from the preface of that great work, and states some facts so entirely in harmony with the plea of the Disciples that the authorship might easily be ascribed to Alexander Campbell himself.

“If there is one thing which a comparative study of
religion places in the clearest light, it is the inevitable decay to which every religion is exposed. It may seem almost like a truism that no religion can continue to be what it was during the lifetime of its founder and its first apostles. Yet it is but seldom borne in mind that without constant reformation, i.e., without a constant return to its fountainhead, every religion, even the most perfect, nay, the most perfect on account of its very perfection, more even than others, suffers from its contact with the world, as the purest air suffers from the mere fact of its being breathed.

“Whenever we can trace back a religion to its first beginnings, we find it free from many of the blemishes that offend us in its later phases. The founders of the ancient religions of the world, as far as we can judge, were men of high stamp, full of noble aspirations, yearning for truth, devoted to the welfare of their neighbours, examples of purity and unselfishness. What they desired to found upon earth was but seldom realised, and their sayings, if preserved in their original form, offer often a strange contrast to the practice of those who profess to be their Disciples. As soon as a religion is established, and more particularly when it has become the religion of a powerful state, the foreign and worldly elements encroach more and more on original foundation, and human interests mar the simplicity and purity of the plan, which the founder had conceived in his own heart and matured in his communings with his God. Even those who lived with Buddha misunderstood his words, and, at the great council which had to settle the Buddhist canon, Asoka, the Indian Constantine, had to remind the assembled priests that ‘what had been said by Buddha, and that alone, was well said,’ and that certain works ascribed to Buddha, as, for instance, the instruction given to his son, Rahula, were apocryphal, if not heretical. With every century Buddhism, when it was accepted by nations differing as widely as Mongols and Hindus, when its sacred writings were translated into languages as wide apart as Sanskrit and Chinese, assumed widely different aspects, till, at last, the Buddhism of the Shamans, in the steppes of Tartary, is as different from the teaching of the original Samana as the Christianity of the leader of the Chinese rebels is from the teaching of Christ. If missionaries could show
to the Brahmans, the Buddhists, the Zoroastrians, nay, even to the Mohammedans how much their present faith differs from the faith of their forefathers and founders, if they could place in their hands and read with them, in a kindly spirit, the original documents on which these various religions profess to be founded, and enable them to distinguish between the doctrines of their own sacred books and the editions of later ages, an important advantage would be gained, and the choice between Christ and other masters would be rendered far more easy to a truth-seeking soul. But for that purpose, it is necessary that we, too, should see the beam in our own eyes, and learn to distinguish between the Christianity of the nineteenth century and the religion of Christ. If we find that the Christianity of the nineteenth century does not win as many hearts in India and China as it ought, let us remember that it was the Christianity of the first century, in all its dogmatic simplicity, but with its overpowering love of God and man, that conquered the world, and superseded religions and philosophies more difficult to conquer than the religious and philosophical systems of Hindus and Buddhists. If we can teach something to the Brahmans in reading with them their sacred hymns, they, too, can teach us something when reading with us the Gospel of Christ. Never shall I forget the deep despondency of a Hindu convert, a real martyr to his faith, who had pictured to himself, from the pages of the New Testament, what a Christian country must be, and who, when he came to Europe, found everything so different from what he had imagined in his lonely meditations at Benares. It was the Bible only that saved him from returning to his old religion, and helped him to discern, beneath theological futilities accumulated nearly two thousand years, beneath pharisaical hypocrisy, infidelity, and want of charity, the buried but still living seed committed to the earth by Christ and His Apostles. How can a missionary, in such circumstances, meet the surprise and questions of his pupils unless he may point to that seed and tell them what Christianity was meant to be; unless he may show that, like all other religions, Christianity, too, has had its history; that the Christianity of the nineteenth century is not the Christianity of the Middle Ages; that the Christianity of the Middle Ages was not that of
the early councils; that the Christianity of the early councils was not that of the Apostles, and ‘that what has been said by Christ, that alone was well said?'

In view of the foregoing considerations the intelligent reader will not have much difficulty in recognising the validity of the claim that has been made for the providential guidance of the Disciple movement. It is no longer doubtful that the very charge of exclusiveness which was made against the movement, when the Disciples were driven into a separate people, is, after all, easily accounted for, from a sectarian point of view. Doubtless the denominations could not see the matter in any other light. The Disciple plea meant their overthrow, at least the overthrow of everything that made them denominations, or differentiated them from one another. But when this apparent exclusiveness is carefully analysed and co-ordinated with all the facts of the case, it will be seen that no other consistent ground could be taken by the Disciples, in view of the great end which they had in view. Nor is it possible to maintain the charge of sectarianism against them, for the reason that they contended for nothing in their plea that is not practically admitted as Scriptural and right by all the leading denominations of Christendom. It was the strong and persistent opposition of the Disciples to the things that are unscriptural and that, therefore, make for division rather than for union that offended the denominations. Mr. Campbell, time and again, affirmed that he was perfectly willing to meet all the denominations of Christendom and agree to unite upon a platform which all would agree is thoroughly scriptural, simply leaving out those things about which the denominations differ; and this has been the position of the Disciples throughout their entire history, since they have occupied a separate religious position. They have earnestly contended that there is enough Scriptural truth among all denominations, wherein they are all agreed, to form a substantial basis for the union of Christendom, and that such union would compel the overthrow of the differences which now divide the Christian world. The Disciples have furthermore insisted that a union is impossible simply on a doctrinal basis, for such a basis always magnifies the differences rather than the points of agreement. But if the points of agreement are accepted and Christians will
thereby ascend to the high summit of love, the differences which now divide them into antagonistic denominations will dwindle into insignificance and become so infinitesimal in the eyes of those who have learned to love one another, because they love and honor a common Lord, that union will be an accomplished fact simply because Christians will no longer see the differences, even where they may exist with respect to doctrines and opinions. They will behold only the great things, the essential things, in the expansive view which love gives.

Undoubtedly love must reign in, the council of Christians if we may hope to ever realise Christian union. Love not only covers a multitude of sins, but it also covers a multitude of our petty differences. When we are in the mountainous regions of the Alps, it is very easy to notice the fact that when we are in the valleys, or in the lowlands, it is then that the cleavage between the mountains is very distinct, and the distance which separates them appears very considerable. But when we ascend to one of the lofty peaks, such as the Wetterhorn, or the Jungfrau, the valleys practically disappear. Even a view from the Scheideck greatly reduces the size and importance of the cleavage between the mountains. It is the low view which magnifies the lines of separation. In the wide sweep of a higher view the lines of separation are practically lost. Love is our “Wetterhorn or our great Scheideck, from which we must contemplate our differences. Seen from this lofty summit, the valleys which separate us are either no longer visible at all, or else appear as insignificant fissures in the endless chain of towering mountains, which mountains fitly represent great facts and principles in which all the churches, even now, are substantially agreed.

We must, therefore, study the problem under consideration from the high summit of Love. This will at once make possible what would otherwise be a hopeless task. We must remember that there is a logic of the heart as well as the head; and while the former has its proper place, there is really no place which is not proper for the latter to occupy. The Bible tells us that the heart has eyes, and this is a most important statement as regards the question of Christian union. We must look at the question from the heart rather than from the head. In
short, we must let Love reign in all our hearts, and then the controlling vision will be “through the eyes of the heart,” and this will give us exactly the view that is necessary to see things in their right proportion. And the very moment all our hearts shall be filled with love toward one another, that moment will we see only the lofty peaks of our common Christianity while our minor differences, our insignificant cleavages, our separating valleys, will be lost in the overshadowing mountains of truth, which are seen to be everywhere united in our extended horizon.

From this point of view, the Disciples have been willing to consider the whole question of Christian union, and they have earnestly contended that when we occupy this high summit of love the differences, which have so long separated the denominations, will be lost to view in the glorious vision which will then take their place in a united Church, moving forward to take the nations for Christ. From the summit of the Wetterhorn the Bernese-overland seems to be one continuous chain of mountain tops, practically blended together with only just enough differentiation to lend a charm to the great picture which opens up to view. So it will be when we reach the high summit of love. The differences of temperament, philosophical views, and everything else which now hinders the union of the people of God, will then lend a charm to the picture by blending all the mountain tops into one great extended spiritual “Bernese-overland” of Christian union, where all the people of God, notwithstanding unimportant differences, shall be blended into one harmonious whole, and a united Church shall proclaim the “One Lord, one faith, and one baptism,” while marching Westward to the conquest of the nations.
CHAPTER I

THE CREATIVE PERIOD—THE CAMPBELLs

THOMAS CAMPBELL was undoubtedly the father of the religious movement historically known as the Reformation of the Nineteenth Century. His son, Alexander, was the chief advocate of the movement, and has, therefore, practically eclipsed his father with respect to the position legitimately occupied by the latter. Nevertheless, it is a fact, that needs to be emphasised, that to Thomas Campbell belongs the credit of inaugurating the movement, and laying down the principles by which his son was guided in his superb advocacy which followed. Let it be said also, to the credit of the son, that he himself, in his life of his father, emphasised the fact that the latter was the real founder of the movement, as well as the author of the “Declaration and Address,” in which its fundamental principles were stated and finally given to the world.

However, it must not be understood by this statement that Thomas Campbell was the first in the United States to advocate many of the principles set forth in his “Declaration and Address.” In this respect he had been antedated by Barton Warren Stone and others, associated with him in Kentucky; but the question of time is not the main question to be determined in a matter of this kind. Undoubtedly the Stone movement is entitled to much credit, and this will be duly conceded when this movement shall be considered. However, it matters very little whether the beginning of the Disciple movement is dated from 1804, when the “Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery” was issued by Robert Marshall, John Dunlavy, Richard M’Nemar, B. W. Stone, John Thompson, and David Purviance, or in 1809, when the “Declaration and Address,” written by Thomas Campbell, was issued by the Christian Association. The principles underlying both of these papers are practically the same,
though in the latter paper they are set forth much more fully, and the paper is intended as an 
earnest public protest against sectarianism, wherever it is found, and at the same time it is an 
urgent and eloquent call to Christian Union of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ more than 
party or sect.

It is not difficult to see the hand of Providence in the initial facts of both of these great 
movements. But it is no disparagement to any one else to say that Thomas Campbell, by 
special natural gifts, education, character, and experience was remarkably well fitted to take 
the lead in the movement which was inaugurated in 1809. He was born in County Down, 
Ireland, February 1, 1763. He was educated in Glasgow University and Divinity Hall. His 
father, who was at first a Roman Catholic, finally renounced Romanism for the Church of 
England, and died in its communion, in his eighty-eighth year.

Thomas was several years a Presbyterian minister of the New Market Presbytery in the 
North of Ireland; and during that time he was distinguished for his scholarly attainments, his 
amiable qualities, and his pronounced opposition to divisions in the Church. His house was a 
centre of religious instruction and prayer, and his parish is said to have been the most 
exemplary in the country. In his church relationship he had ample opportunity to feel the 
influence of the sectarian spirit. The conflict between the Burghers and the Anti-Burghers 
was very intense, and sometimes very bitter, while sectarianism in other forms very distinctly 
characterised the religious development of the times in which he lived. Out of a protest 
against the Established Churches there had grown up in England, Scotland, and Ireland 
numerous religious denominations which, when not fighting what was regarded by them as 
the common enemy, namely, the Established Churches, they set to fighting one another, and 
often they illustrated their sectarianism by engaging in the bitterest controversy,

“And proved their doctrine Orthodox, 
By Apostolic blows and knocks.”

Such was the religious environment in which Thomas Campbell was reared and began 
his public ministry. It is not surprising that a man of his amiable disposition,
catholic spirit, and deeply spiritual nature should find himself out of sympathy with the people with whom he was denominationally identified; for among these were some graceless bigots who were enough to vex the soul of any one, to say nothing of such a soul as that of Thomas Campbell.

But, after all, it was perhaps purely providential that this godly man was subjected to these early influences. In this way he became acquainted with the evils of sectarianism, and learned to abhor its spirit and to long for something better than a divided Christendom. He was settled at Rich Hill where he conducted an Academy, at the same time preaching for a church at Ahorey in the county. His first public act was in the interest of Christian Union. Doubtless because of his amiable disposition and catholic spirit he was appointed by the Anti-Burghers to make an effort for union between them and the Burghers. In this effort he failed. He was then sent to the General Associate Senate to request an increased independence for the Irish Churches. In this he was also unsuccessful. While somewhat discouraged, he did not give up his favorite thought of Christian Union.

At this time his health was very feeble, and with a view of benefiting this he decided to visit America, though with no intention of remaining there should his health be restored. Accordingly, in the year 1807, he set sail for America, bearing credentials from the Presbyterian Association, of which he was a member; and near the middle of May of that year he arrived at Philadelphia, and found the Synod of the same faith and order in session, and to this Synod he presented his credentials, and was cordially received and recommended to the Presbytery of Chartiers, located chiefly in the county of Washington, Pennsylvania, and its vicinity.

He was immediately assigned to a field of labour, and began an active ministry in behalf of the Seceder Church. But he soon found that his new associations were no better than those he had left in Ireland. The same sectarian spirit prevailed in the new world that had prevailed in the old. The religious body with which he was associated was very much circumscribed in its influence by the narrow spirit which its leaders manifested. Nevertheless, owing to his natural ability, scholarship, and literary culture,
he gained considerable influence in his new religious associations, and the preachers of the Presbytery began to look to him for guidance with respect to religious matters.

But this state of things did not last very long. The narrow spirit, illiberal rules and habits of the Seceder Church became a barrier in the way of propagating his catholic views, and he became restive under the restrictions by which he seemed to be bound. There were in his new community a number of excellent church people, who had come over from Ireland, some of whom had been his acquaintances and cherished friends in his native land, all of whom were Presbyterians and Independents. Naturally enough these sought religious association with him; he, without hesitation, accepting their proffered fellowship and offering them his church ministrations in both his public and private ministry.

This freedom gave offence to his Seceder brethren. But this was not all. He was sent on a missionary tour in Western Pennsylvania to hold a celebration of the Lord's Supper among the scattered Seceders of that then sparsely settled region. On this tour he found many members of other Presbyterian bodies who had not for many years enjoyed the privilege of sitting down together at the Lord's Table. Mr. Campbell's heart was at once in sympathy with these scattered Presbyterians, and though some of them did not belong to his special Church, in his introductory sermon he deplored the divisions existing among the churches and earnestly invited all the pious among his hearers to participate in the communion service. This action gave great offence to his Seceder brethren. He had with him as a travelling companion and fellow-worker a young Mr. Wilson, who became convinced that his senior brother was not sound in the Seceder faith, and he found it his duty to bring the matter before the Presbytery at its next meeting.

The charge against Mr. Campbell contained several complaints, but the principal one was with respect to his open communion practice. When questioned with regard to his views, Mr. Campbell stated, without reservation, that he had always been opposed to religious partyism, while at the same time he insisted that he had not violated any precept of the sacred volume. In all the questions that were asked him, and these were many, he answered in a
candid conciliatory spirit, being desirous to avoid severing his friendly relations with his brethren, and above all to avoid a rupture with the Church, as division was with him a greater sin than difference of opinion with regard to much that belongs to faith and practice.

So narrow was the view of the Presbytery that tried him that their final decision was one of censure. Mr. Campbell appealed to the Synod, and he hoped that this higher court would reverse the decision of the lower. But in this he was disappointed. The Synod found irregularities in the action of the Presbytery, but the censure was allowed to remain.

In view of his great affection for the people with whom he had been religiously associated, and his earnest views with respect to Christian Union, he at first submitted to the ruling of the Synod; but finding that his course only intensified the bitter feeling against him he sent a formal renunciation of the authority of the Synod and withdrew from the Seceders altogether.

It is impossible to express in words the pain he experienced on account of this separation. Every instinct of his nature, and all his deep convictions, were opposed to sectarianism, and when he realised that he was cut off from the brethren with whom he had been associated, although feeling that he had done nothing for which he should have been censured, his remorse was long and painful, and he found comfort only in the fact that his actions, as he believed, had all been in harmony with the Word of God. His defence before the Synod was in many respects remarkable. It contained some of the germs of the later “Declaration and Address,” as the following extract will show:

“How great the injustice,” he exclaims in this appeal, “how greatly aggravated the injury will appear, to thrust out from communion a Christian brother, a fellow-minister, for saying and doing none other things than those which our Divine Lord and his holy apostles have taught, and enjoined to be spoken and done by all his people. Or have I in any instance proposed to say or do otherwise? ... I hope it is no presumption to believe that saying and doing the very same things that are said and done before our eyes on the sacred page, is infallibly right, as well as all-sufficient, for the edification of the church, whose duty and perfection is in all things to be confirmed by the original standard. It is therefore be-
cause I have no confidence in my own infallibility or in that of others, that I absolutely refuse, as inadmissible and schismatic, the introduction of human opinions and human inventions into the faith and worship of the Church. It is, therefore, because I plead the cause of the scriptural and apostolic worship of the Church, in opposition to the various errors and schisms which have so awfully corrupted and divided it, that the brethren of the Union should feel it difficult to admit me as their fellow-labourer in that blessed work. I sincerely rejoice with them in what they have done; and surely they have no just objection to go further. Nor do I presume to dictate to them or to others how they should proceed for the glorious purpose of promoting the unity and purity of the Church; but only beg leave, for my own part, to walk upon that sure and peaceable ground that I may have nothing to do with human controversy about the right or wrong side of any opinion whatsoever, by simply acquiescing in what is written, as quite sufficient for every purpose of faith and duty, and thereby to influence as many as possible to depart from human controversy, to betake themselves to the Scriptures, and in so doing, to the study and practice of faith, holiness and love.”

It will be seen by this extract that, even at this early date, Thomas Campbell was richly imbued with great principles which finally became the slogan of the hosts of Disciples of Christ in their contest against Sectarianism.

In reading the whole of this appeal, it is difficult to understand how the Synod could rule as it did. Mr. Campbell's evident earnestness, his broad, catholic spirit, his willingness to abide by the teachings of the Word of God, his protest against denominational opinionism, and his perfect readiness to submit to every “Thus saith the Lord,” should have influenced the Synod to commend his conduct rather than to find fault with it. But those were days when Sectarianism counted for more than Christianity, and when ignorance being “bliss” it was “folly to be wise.”

Was there a providence in all this? What if he had remained with the Seceders? Would he have been able to lead them out of their narrow channels into the broader views for which he himself contended? No one will believe that he could ever have done this. Human history furnishes many examples similar to the one now under consideration. To go not far from home, it is only necessary to refer to the case of the American colonies. Perhaps this great country would have continued to have been
a sort of vassal to England, had it not been for the oppressive measures which compelled a separation. It may be that disunion is generally a wrong, and sometimes a crime; but these “breaks” in human history are not infrequently like the breaks in the physical development of the earth. A certain line of development runs to its limit, and then it must be reinforced with new elements from without before it can continue in the line of progress. On the other side of these “breaks” we are accustomed to regard the new development as having really no connection with what went before it. But really what went before it was necessary in order that something better might follow. Thomas Campbell's education among the Seceders was no doubt a providential preparation for the greater work which he had to do. But before this work could take on definite form and become an organised religious force, it was really necessary, when the proper time had approached, for the separation to take place which was precipitated by the action of the Synod in sustaining the censure of the Presbytery.

Mr. Campbell's withdrawal from the Seceders did not interrupt his ministerial labors. He had already acquired great personal influence with his neighbours, and also with many in the counties of Washington and Allegheny. Consequently very many people, interested in his plea for Christian Liberty and Christian Union, continued to attend his ministrations wherever he had an opportunity to hold meetings. Sometimes these meetings were held in private houses, sometimes in shaded groves, during the summer season, but seldom in any meeting houses; as, for the most part, these were shut against him by reason of what were supposed to be his heretical notions.

Finally he decided to call his neighbours and friends together in order to confer with respect to the course which should be pursued in the future as to religious matters. Many of his old-time friends, some of whom still held membership in the Seceder or Presbyterian Churches, heartily sympathised with him in the principles which he had enunciated in his preaching and teaching among them. The proposition for a conference meeting was, therefore, readily acceded to, and a meeting was accordingly arranged at the house of Abraham Altars, who lived near Washington, Pennsylvania, and who, though not a
member of any Church, had shown himself to be an earnest friend of the principles advocated by Mr. Campbell.

It is perhaps impossible to over-estimate the importance of this conference meeting. Most of those attending were members of some of the numerous sectarian churches in the counties of Washington and Allegheny. We have already seen that a very exclusive sectarian spirit prevailed in these churches, but in most of them there were a few noble souls who had grown tired of the jangling voices of denominational Christendom and were ready to hear an earnest plea for the union of all who loved the Lord Jesus Christ better than mere religious partyism. It was not strange, therefore, that these earnest seekers after truth came together with a determination to follow wherever Truth might lead.

Undoubtedly no one anticipated just what the result of the meeting would be. Certainly it was not in the mind of any one to form a new religious denomination. Mr. Campbell himself had so long proclaimed against the divisions of Christendom that even the thought of extending these divisions was practically impossible with him. But man proposes and God disposes. We shall see to what this meeting led.

Thomas Campbell opened the meeting and led in an earnest prayer, invoking divine guidance with respect to the matters to be considered. He then proceeded to review the facts which had brought them together, dwelling with unusual force upon the evils resulting from the divisions among Christians. He further urged that these divisions were as unnecessary as they were injurious, since God had provided in His sacred Word an infallible standard, which was all-sufficient, as a basis of union and Christian co-operation.

He showed, however, that men had not been satisfied with its teachings, but had gone outside of the Bible, to frame for themselves religious theories, opinions and speculations, which were the real occasions of the unhappy controversies and strifes which had so long desolated the religious world. He, therefore, insisted with great earnestness upon a return to the simple teachings of the Scriptures, and upon the entire abandonment of everything in religion for which there could not be produced a divine warrant. Finally, after having again and again reviewed the ground they occupied in the reformation which they felt it their duty to urge upon religious
society, he went on to announce, in the most simple and emphatic terms, the great principle or rule upon which he understood they were then acting, and upon which, he trusted, they would continue to act, consistently and perseveringly to the end. “That rule, my highly respected hearers,” said he in conclusion, “is this, that where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.*

This speech of Mr. Campbell made a profound impression upon his hearers. For some time silence pervaded the Assembly. While most of his hearers had become somewhat familiar with his plea for Christian Union they had never before understood its great simplicity, and yet its far-reaching comprehensiveness. The effect of Mr. Campbell's address was almost magical. It was sometime before any one presumed to break the silence. However, finally, a Scotch Seceder, Andrew Munro, who was a bookseller and postmaster at Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, arose and said: “Mr. Campbell, if we adopt that as a basis, then there is an end of infant baptism.”

So far, Mr. Campbell had not considered consequences at all. He had been solely absorbed with principles. With him, to do right was the chief consideration, then to leave the consequences with Him who doeth all things well. Nevertheless it was evident that the shrewd Scotchman, with his keen logical perception of the relation of things, had forecasted a result, which to some present would likely be a stumbling block in the way of carrying out the principles which Mr. Campbell had enunciated.

But Mr. Campbell himself, though doubtless he had not thought of the particular point which had been made, was nevertheless ready with his answer. “Of course,” said he in reply, “if infant baptism cannot be found in the Scriptures, we can have nothing to do with it.” What followed is tersely stated by Dr. Richardson:

Upon this Thomas Acheson, of Washington, who was a man of warm impulses, rose, and advancing a short distance, greatly excited, exclaimed, laying his hand upon his heart: “I hope I may never see the day when my heart will renounce that blessed saying of the Scripture, ‘Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such

* *Millennial Harbinger*, pp. 280-283.
is the kingdom of Heaven.” Upon quoting this, he was so much affected that he burst into tears, and while a deep sympathetic feeling pervaded the entire assembly, he was about to retire to an adjoining room, when James Foster, not willing that this misapplication of Scripture should pass unchallenged, cried out, “Mr. Acheson, I would remark that in the portion of Scriptures you have quoted there is no reference, whatever, to infant baptism.” Without offering a reply, Mr. Acheson passed out to weep alone; but this incident, while it foreshadowed some of the trials which the future had in store, failed to abate, in the least, the confidence which the majority of those present placed in the principles to which they were committed. The rule which Mr. Campbell had announced seemed to cover the whole ground, and to be so obviously just and proper, that after further discussion and conference, it was adopted with apparent unanimity, no valid objection being urged against it.

Whatever may have been immediately thought of Mr. Campbell's address, he had evidently enunciated, in very distinct and forcible language, a statement which became the keynote in the religious movement which followed, and it has always been among the Disciples the rule by which both their faith and practice have been determined. “Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent,” was entirely a new way of stating religious obligation and duty. Instead of this, the denominations might have more truthfully stated their rule of action in the following language: “Where our creeds speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent.”

In short, these creeds had the same binding force upon the conscience of Christians as the Scriptures had from Mr. Campbell's point of view. His dictum was a complete change in the point of view of appeal. Instead of appealing to the confessions of faith, however valuable these may have been in some respects, Mr. Campbell regarded them, as, upon the whole, disastrous to the “unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” His dictum, therefore, was intended to practically set aside the authority of these human confessions, while it would establish the paramount authority of the Scriptures in everything relating to faith and practice.

It was also intended, in its ultimate reach, to support a legitimate individual liberty, as human creeds should not be made finally binding upon the conscience, and consequently ecclesiastical assemblies for the purpose of
formulating these creeds were quite unnecessary. No set of men, however wise, could make a creed simple enough and at the same time comprehensive enough for the whole of mankind. Only divine wisdom was capable of such an undertaking. Hence Mr. Campbell appealed from ecclesiastical councils to Christ and His Apostles, making the Holy Scriptures all-sufficient and alone sufficient to guide in all things pertaining to the Christian life.

This was a great step forward. It was as the breaking forth of the sun from behind a dark cloud; it was a clear, ringing voice in the wilderness of Sectarianism, crying: Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make His path straight. But it is probable that no one at that time, in that little assembly, where this utterance was first spoken, had any idea of its far-reaching consequences. Some of those who were present had a very high regard for the statement, and thought it ought to be written in letters of gold; but even these never dreamed of what effect it would ultimately have upon the religious progress of the world. Evidently Thomas Campbell himself did not seem to realise what was involved in it. Although he had declared he would have nothing to do with infant baptism, if it could not be found in the Scriptures, it is very certain that he hesitated when he saw that the rule which he had formulated would undoubtedly cut off infant baptism. He tried to apologise for his practice in this respect, and even became irritated when told that he could not baptise an infant and be consistent with the rule he had stated. He tried to justify the practice on other grounds than an appeal to the Scriptures, and for a time it seemed to be a question with him as to whether he should go forward or backward in the matter.

There is to the careful student of history nothing strange in this hesitancy. Perhaps if he had seen the end as he had seen the beginning, Mr. Campbell never would have stated the rule precisely as he did. He was so absorbed with his deep convictions that something ought to be done in the interest of Christian union, and realised so fully that nothing could be effectually done until those who professed to be Christians would abandon all humanisms and traditions of the fathers and return to the simplicity of the Scriptures, that he did not distinctly see where his plea would lead him religiously, nor did he seem to care
at that time, so mightily was he under the influence of the great principles which he believed were involved in a return to the Apostolic faith and practice. When, however, his plea began to be put into practical operation, by an honest application of it to his own faith and practice, he found himself almost unequal to the task of giving up what had been cherished religious convictions. Nevertheless, in the end he conquered, as we shall see as we proceed.

The case of Thomas Campbell ought to make us charitable towards those who are bound in the shackles of human traditions. These will often accept readily the teaching of the Scriptures on a particular matter, while at the same time they will continue to follow their creeds, notwithstanding their actions are contrary to what the Scriptures plainly teach. This very fact is perhaps the most potent influence which stands in the way of Christian Union. Most professed Christians will, without hesitation, accept the Scriptures as their rule of faith and practice, but they do this with a sort of tacit understanding that the Scriptures (in some way) must be made to correspond to their confession of faith. Even now there are not many who would attempt to find fault with the dictum of Thomas Campbell, nevertheless it is unquestionably true that thousands of those who will accept the dictum, just as it is stated, continue to practise what it clearly demands should be surrendered. It is uncharitable to affirm that these Christians are not conscientious. They either put an abnormal construction upon Mr. Campbell's dictum, or else they excuse themselves for making a rigid application of it in their own case, on the ground that there are considerations outside of the Scriptures which must be taken into account, even where the Scriptures speak clearly as to what duty is.

This was the chief difficulty in making a practical application of Mr. Campbell's great utterance. We have seen that he himself hesitated, when he saw exactly what he would be compelled to give up, if he carried out strictly all that the rule he had formulated required. But he was not the only one who hesitated at the demand that this dictum made on the conscience. Several of those who first approved, finally went back, when they found out just what was required of them. In this fact we are reminded
of how some of the disciples of Jesus treated Him when He uttered a hard saying which severely tried their faith. We are told that these 'went back and followed Him no more.

Following Christ has never been an easy matter. He himself said that if any man would come after Him, he must deny himself, take up his cross and follow Him. Denying one's self is at the very beginning a difficult thing to do. Taking up the Cross and following Christ is anything but easy work. To turn away from early religious associations, especially when these have been accepted conscientiously and heartily, and surrender old friends and sacred memories, while at the same time facing a thousand difficulties, which clearly seem to rise up in the path of a forward movement, are conditions that are sure to try men's souls, and generally it will happen that only those who are capable of becoming heroes will be able to stand such a test. Mr. Campbell himself finally burned the bridges and gave himself up thoroughly to the guidance of the rule which he had formulated, heartily accepting the consequences, and trusting implicitly in Him, who promised to be with His disciples always, even to the end of the world.

In accordance with this resolution and with a view to carrying out his purpose more effectively, it was resolved, at a meeting held on the head waters of the Buffalo, August 17, 1809, that the brethren who had remained with him would form themselves into a religious association under the name of “The Christian Association of Washington.” At this time a committee of twenty-one of their number was appointed to meet and confer together, with the assistance of Thomas Campbell, to decide upon the proper measures to be adopted in carrying into effect the important aims of the Association.

With a view to having a regular place of meeting, so that the objects of the Association could be better advanced, the neighbours came together and erected a log building on the Sinclair farm, about three miles from Mount Pleasant, upon the road leading from Washington to that place. This building was designed so it could be used also for a common schoolhouse which was greatly needed in that neighbourhood. In this log building Thomas Campbell continued to meet his hearers regularly,
at the same time residing with Mr. Welch, a respectable farmer, living nearby. A little chamber in Mr. Welch's house was assigned the distinguished preacher, and in this unpretentious room he spent most of his time in study and writing. It was in this room that he wrote his famous “Declaration and Address” which became practically the *magna charta* of the Disciple movement (although it never received any legislative endorsement), or to designate it by a certain phrase which is equally expressive and truthful, the whole document was a Declaration of Independence, though in its fundamental aim it differed somewhat from the aim of the Declaration of Independence written by Thomas Jefferson. While it was a protest against tyranny (and in this respect the two Declarations run parallel) the “Declaration and Address” of Thomas Campbell, not only declared for independence, but for the union of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ.

As this great address embodies the main principles for which the Disciples have always contended, it is well to call attention to some of its parts, in order that the reader may become acquainted with the principles and aims which have characterised the Disciple movement from the beginning to the present time.

As this address is now very easily accessible to every reader who desires to examine it, it is not necessary to give more than a short analysis here of its contents.

The whole document is divided into three parts:

1. The “Declaration,” which gives the plan and purpose of the Association which is issuing the “Address,” for the Address was issued by direction of the Christian Association which had been formed with a view to promote the cause of Christian Union. In this “Declaration” it was declared “that being well aware from sad experience of the heinous nature and pernicious tendency of religious controversy among Christians; tired and sick of the bitter jarrings and janglings of a party spirit, we would desire to be at rest; and were it possible, we would also desire to adopt and recommend such measures as would give rest to our brethren throughout all our churches; as would restore unity, peace and purity to the whole Church of God.” Then after expressing utter despair, in seeking to find rest by continuing amid the diversity and rancour of party contentions, the veering
uncertainty and clashings of human opinions, it declares “our desire, therefore, for ourselves and our brethren would be, that, rejecting human opinions and the inventions of men as of any authority, or as having any place in the Church of God, we might forever cease from further contentions about such things; returning to and holding fast by the original standard; taking the Divine Word alone for our rule; the Holy Spirit for our teacher and guide, to lead us into the all truth; and Christ alone, as exhibited in the Word, for our salvation; that, by so doing, we may be at peace among ourselves, follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.”

Then follow seven specifications as to the formation of the Christian Association, its aims, powers, etc., in which it is declared:

(1.) “That this Society by no means considers itself a Church, nor does it at all assume to itself the powers peculiar to such a society; nor do the members, as such, consider themselves as standing connected in that relation; nor as at all associated for the peculiar purposes of Church Association; but merely as voluntary advocates for Church reformation; and, as possessing the powers common to all individuals, who may please to associate in a peaceable and orderly manner, for any lawful purpose, namely, the disposal of their time, council and property, as they may see cause.”

It will be seen by this that, in the formation of the Christian Association, Thomas Campbell had no idea of starting another religious denomination, the main purpose of the Association being to promote Evangelical religion and Christian Unity. It is well to emphasise this fact at this particular place, as Christian Union and not division was the aim of the Disciple movement from the very beginning.

(2.) The “Address” proper follows this “Declaration.”

The first part of the “Address” is devoted to a discussion of the grand design and native tendency of the religion of Christians, together with the evils of division, and especially the evils of the predominant Sectarian spirit which at that time prevailed so extensively among the numerous denominations. This part of the “Address” is as remarkable for its kindly spirit as it is for its
marvelous arraignment of the evils of Sectarianism and its splendid comprehension of the principles which could alone cure the evils of a divided Christendom. Never perhaps before or since, in the history of Christianity, have this arraignment and this comprehension been so fully, faithfully, and kindly set forth. The “Address” is practically faultless in style, while it is equally faultless in spirit. From beginning to end it is a faithful portrait of the condition of a divided Christendom as it at that time existed, and an earnest, affectionate, and intelligent call to the only principles by which these divisions could be healed, and thereby the union of God's people practically assured. As a specimen of this part of the “Address,” the following liberal extracts are given:

It is, to us, a pleasing consideration that all the Churches of Christ which mutually acknowledge each other as such, are not only agreed in the great doctrines of faith and holiness, but are also materially agreed as to the positive ordinances of the Gospel institution; so that our differences, at most, are about the things in which the Kingdom of God does not consist, that is, about matters of private opinion or human invention. What a pity that the kingdom of God should be divided about such things! Who, then, would not be the first among us to give up human inventions in the worship of God, and to cease from imposing his private opinions upon his brethren, that our breaches might thus be healed? Who would not willingly conform to the original pattern laid down in the New Testament, for this happy purpose? Our dear brethren of all denominations will please to consider that we have our educational prejudices and particular customs to struggle against as well as they. But this we do sincerely declare, that there is nothing we have hitherto received as matter of faith or practice, which is not expressly taught and enjoined in the Word of God, either in express terms or approved precedent, that we would not heartily relinquish, so that we might return to the original constitutional unity of the Christian Church; and in this happy unity, enjoy full communion with all our brethren in peace and charity. The like dutiful condescension we candidly expect of all that are seriously impressed with a sense of the duty they owe to God, to each other, and to their perishing brethren of mankind. To this we call, we invite, our dear brethren of all denominations, by all the sacred motives which we have avouched as the impulsive reasons of our thus addressing them. You are all, dear brethren, equally included as the objects of our esteem and love With you all we desire to unite in the bonds of an entire Christian unity—Christ alone being the head, the centre, His word the rule; an ex-
plicit belief of, and manifest conformity to it, in all things, the terms. More than this, you will not require of us; and less we cannot require of you; nor, indeed, can you reasonably suppose any would desire it, for what good purpose would it serve? We dare neither assume nor propose the trite, indefinite distinction between essentials and non-essentials, in matters of revealed truth and duty; firmly persuaded, that, whatever may be their comparative importance, simply considered, the high obligation of the Divine authority revealing, or enjoining them, renders the belief or performance of them absolutely essential to us, in so far as we know them. And to be ignorant of anything God had revealed can neither be our duty nor our privilege. We humbly presume, then, dear brethren, you will have no relevant objection to meet us upon this ground. And, we again beseech you, let it be known that it is the invitation of but few; by your accession we shall be many; and whether few, or many, in the first instance, it is all one with respect to the event which must ultimately await the full information and hearty concurrence of all. Besides, whatever is done, must begin, some time, some where; and no matter where, nor by whom, if the Lord puts his hand to the work, it must surely prosper. And has he not been graciously pleased, upon many signal occasions, to bring to pass the greatest events from very small beginnings, and even by means the most unlikely! Duty then is ours; but events belong to God.

We hope, then, what we urge will neither be deemed an unreasonable nor an unseasonable undertaking. Why should it be thought unseasonable? Can any time be assigned, while things continue as they are, that would prove more favourable for such an attempt, or what could be supposed to make it so? Might it be the approximation of parties to a greater nearness, in point of public profession and similarity of customs? Or might it be expected from a gradual decline of bigotry? As to the former, it is a well-known fact that where the difference is least, the opposition is always managed with a degree of vehemence inversely proportioned to the merits of the cause. With respect to the latter, though, we are happy to say, that in some cases and places, and, we hope, universally, bigotry is upon the decline; yet we are not warranted, either by the past or present, to act upon that supposition. We have, as yet, by this means seen no such effect produced; nor indeed could we reasonably expect it; for there will always be multitudes of weak persons in the Church, and these are generally most subject to bigotry; add to this, that while divisions exist, there will always be found interested men who will not fail to support them; nor can we at all suppose that Satan will be idle to improve an advantage so important to the interests of his kingdom. And, let it be further observed upon the whole, that, in matters of similar importance to our secular interests, we would by no means con-
tent ourselves with such kind of reasoning. We might further add, that the attempt here suggested, not being of a partial, but of general nature, it can have no just tendency to excite the jealousy, or hurt the feelings of any party. On the contrary, every effort toward a permanent Scriptural unity among the churches, upon the solid basis of universally acknowledged and self-evident truths, must have the happiest tendency to enlighten and conciliate, by thus manifesting to each other their mutual charity and zeal for the truth: “Whom I love in the truth,” said the apostle, “and not I only, but also all they that have known the truth; for the truth's sake, which is in us, and shall be with us forever.” Indeed, if no such Divine and adequate basis of union can be fairly exhibited, as will meet the approbation of every upright and intelligent Christian, nor such mode of procedure adopted in favour of the weak as will not oppress their consciences, then the accomplishment of this grand object upon principle must be forever impossible. There would, upon this supposition, remain no other way of accomplishing it, but merely by voluntary compromise, and good-natured accommodation. That such a thing, however, will be accomplished, one way or the other, will not be questioned by any that allow themselves to believe that the commands and prayers of our Lord Jesus Christ will not utterly prove ineffectual. Whatever way, then, it is to be effected, whether upon the solid basis of Divinely revealed truth, or the good-natured principle of Christian forbearance and gracious condescension, is it not equally practicable, equally eligible to us, as ever it can be to any; unless we should suppose ourselves destitute of that Christian temper and discernment which is essentially necessary to qualify us to do the will of our gracious Redeemer whose express command to his people is, that there be “no divisions among them; but that they all walk by the same rule, speak the same thing, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment?”—We believe then it is as practicable as it is eligible. Let us attempt it. “Up, and be doing, and the Lord will be with us.”

It will be seen from the foregoing that the aim of Thomas Campbell was so noble, so unselfish, so entirely free from a sectarian spirit, and so profoundly catholic, that it is almost inexplicable that such sentiments as he expressed were not cordially accepted by the whole of Christendom at the time this “Address” was published. After further enlarging upon the points already indicated, the “Address” becomes somewhat more specific, as the following extract will show:

In a matter, therefore, of such confessed importance, our Christian brethren, however unhappily distinguished by party
names, will not, cannot, withhold their helping hand. We are as heartily willing to be their
debtors, as they are indispensably bound to be our benefactors. Come then, dear brethren, we
most humbly beseech you, cause your light to shine upon our weak beginnings, that we may
see to work by it. Evince your zeal for the glory of Christ, and the spiritual welfare of your
fellow Christians, by your hearty and zealous co-operation to promote the unity, purity, and
prosperity of His Church.

Let none imagine that the subjoined propositions are at all intended as an overture toward
a new creed or standard for the Church, or as in any wise designed to be made a term of
communion; nothing can be further from our intention. They are merely designed for opening
up the way, that we may come fairly and firmly to original ground upon clear and certain
premises, and take up things just as the apostles left them; that thus disentangled from the
accruing embarrassments of the intervening ages, we may stand with evidence upon the same
ground on which the Church stood at the beginning. Having said so much to solicit attention
and prevent mistake, we submit as follows:

Prop. 1. That the Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and
constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ
and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures, and that manifest the same by
their tempers and conduct, and of none else; as none else can be truly and properly called
Christians.

(2.) That although the Church of Christ upon earth must necessarily exist in particular
and distinct societies, locally separate one from another, yet there ought to be no schisms, no
uncharitable divisions among them. They ought to receive each other as Christ Jesus hath
also received them, to the glory of God. And for this purpose they ought all to walk by the
same rule, to mind and speak the same thing; and to be perfectly joined together in the same
mind, and in the same judgment.

(3.) That in order to this, nothing ought to be inculcated upon Christians as articles of
faith; nor required of them as terms of communion, but what is expressly taught and enjoined
upon them in the Word of God. Nor ought anything to be admitted, as of Divine obligation,
in their Church constitution and managements, but what is expressly enjoined by the
authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles upon the New Testament Church; either in
express terms or by approved precedent.

(4.) That although the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are inseparably
connected, making together but one perfect and entire revelation of the Divine will, for the
edification and salvation of the Church, and therefore in that respect cannot be separated; yet
as to what directly and properly belongs to their immediate object, the New Testament is as
perfect a constitution for the worship, discipline,
and government of the New Testament Church, and as perfect a rule for the particular duties of its members, as the Old Testament was for the worship, discipline, and government of the Old Testament Church, and the particular duties of its members.

(5.) That with respect to the commands and ordinances of our Lord Jesus Christ, where the Scriptures are silent as to the express time or manner of performance, if any such there be, no human authority has power to interfere, in order to supply the supposed deficiency by making laws for the Church; nor can anything more be required of Christians in such cases, but only that they so observe these commands and ordinances as will evidently answer the declared and obvious end of their institution. Much less has any human authority power to impose new commands or ordinances upon the Church, which our Lord Jesus Christ has not enjoined. Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the Church, or to be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament.

(6.) That although inferences and deductions from Scripture premises, when fairly inferred, may be truly called the doctrine of God's holy word, yet are they not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians farther than they perceive the connection, and evidently see that they are so; for their faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power and veracity of God. Therefore, no such deductions can be made terms of communion, but do properly belong to the after and progressive edification of the Church. Hence, it is evident that no such deductions or inferential truths ought to have any place in the Church's confession.

(7.) That although doctrinal exhibitions of the great system of Divine truths, and defensive testimonies in opposition to prevailing errors, be highly expedient, and the more full and explicit they be for those purposes, the better; yet, as these must be in a great measure the effect of human reasoning, and of course must contain many inferential truths, they ought not to be made terms of Christian communion; unless we suppose, what is contrary to fact, that none have a right to the communion of the Church, but such as possess a very clear and decisive judgment, or are come to a very high degree of doctrinal information; whereas the Church from the beginning did, and ever will, consist of little children and young men, as well as fathers.

(8.) That as it is not necessary that persons should have a particular knowledge or distinct apprehension of all Divinely revealed truths in order to entitle them to a place in the Church; neither should they, for this purpose, be required to make a profession more extensive than their knowledge; but that, on the contrary, their having a due measure of Scriptural self-knowledge respecting their lost and perishing condition by nature and practice, and of the way of Salvation
through Jesus Christ, accompanied with a profession of their faith in and obedience to him, in all things, according to his word, is all that is absolutely necessary to qualify them for admission into his Church.

(9.) That all that are enabled through grace to make such a profession, and to manifest the reality of it in their tempers and conduct, should consider each other as the precious saints of God, should love each other as brethren, children of the same family and Father, temples of the same Spirit, members of the same body, subjects of the same grace, objects of the same Divine love, bought with the same price, and joint-heirs of the same inheritance. Whom God hath thus joined together no man should dare to put asunder.

(10.) That division among the Christians is a horrid evil, fraught with many evils. It is anti-Christian, as it destroys the visible unity of the body of Christ; as if he were divided against himself, excluding and excommunicating a part of himself. It is anti-Scriptural, as being strictly prohibited by his sovereign authority; a direct violation of his express command. It is anti-natural, as it excites Christians to condemn, to hate, and oppose one another, who are bound by the highest and most endearing obligations to love each other as brethren, even as Christ has loved them. In a word, it is productive of confusion and of every evil work.

(11.) That (in some instances) a partial neglect of the expressly revealed will of God, and (in others) an assumed authority for making the approbation of human opinions and human inventions a term of communion, by introducing them into the constitution, faith, or worship of the Church, are, and have been, the immediate, obvious, and universally acknowledged causes of all the corruptions and divisions that ever have taken place in the Church of God.

(12.) That all that is necessary to the highest state of perfection and purity of the Church upon earth is, first, that none be received as members but such as having that due measure of Scriptural self-knowledge described above, do profess their faith in Christ and obedience to Him in all things according to the Scriptures; nor, secondly, that any be retained in her communion longer than they continue to manifest the reality of their profession by their tempers and conduct. Thirdly, that her ministers, duly and Scripturally qualified, inculcate none other things than those very articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the Word of God. Lastly, that in all their administrations they keep close by the observance of all Divine ordinances, after the example of the primitive Church, exhibited in the New Testament; without any additions whatsoever of human opinions or inventions of men.

(13.) Lastly. That if any circumstantials indispensably necessary to the observance of Divine ordinances be not found upon the page of express revelation, such, and such only, as
are absolutely necessary for this purpose should be adopted under the title of human expedients, without any pretence to a more sacred origin, so that any subsequent alteration or difference in the observance of these things might produce no contention nor division in the Church.

In these thirteen propositions we have clearly presented the fundamental principles and aims which the Christian Association had in view; and it certainly is worthy of record that no one has ever attempted any serious protest against any of the positions which were assumed in this remarkable “Address.” Surely this fact of itself speaks well for the truth which the document contains and for the spirit which characterises every word in it. The “Declaration and Address” was signed by Thomas Campbell, Secretary, and Thomas Acheson, Treasurer, but it is well understood that the Address itself was written by Thomas Campbell, though it was submitted to the Christian Association and adopted by that body.

The “Address” was followed by an “Appendix,” the object of which was to explain more fully some of the points made in the “Address,” so that no possible misunderstanding could be had with respect to the meaning of the movement which had been inaugurated by the formation of the Christian Association. This “Appendix,” while in places somewhat a repetition of the “Address” itself, is nevertheless a very illuminating document, and is well worthy of the pen of him who indicted the “Address.” At present, it is only necessary to give one extract which deals with an important point, as it relates to the history of the Disciple movement:

First, then, we beg leave to assure our brethren that we have no intention to interfere, either directly or indirectly, with the peace and order of the settled Churches, by directing any ministerial assistance with which the Lord may please to favour us, to make inroads upon such; or by endeavouring to erect Churches out of Churches, to distract and divide congregations. We have no nostrum, no peculiar discovery of our own to propose to fellow-Christians, for the fancied importance of which they should become followers of us. We propose to patronise nothing but the inculcation of the express word of God, either as to matter of faith or practice; but every one that has a Bible, and can read it, can read this for himself. Therefore, we have nothing new. Neither do we pretend to acknowledge persons to be ministers of Christ.
and, at the same time, consider it our duty to forbid or discourage people to go to hear them, merely because they may hold some things disagreeable to us; much less to encourage their people to leave them on that account. And such do we esteem all who preach a free, unconditional salvation through the blood of Jesus to perishing sinners of every description, and who manifestly connect with this a life of holiness and pastoral diligence in the performance of all the duties of their sacred office, according to the Scriptures; even all of whom, as to all appearance, it may be truly said to the object of their charge: “They seek not yours, but you.” May the good Lord prosper all such, by whatever name they are called, and fast hasten that happy period when Zion's watchmen shall see eye to eye, and all be called by the same name. Such, then, have nothing to fear from our association, were our resources equal to our utmost wishes. But all others we esteem as hirelings, as idle shepherds, and should be glad to see the Lord's flock delivered from their mouth, according to his promise. Our principal and proper design, then, with respect to ministerial assistants, such as we have described in our fifth resolution, is to direct their attention to those places where there is manifest need for their labours; and many such places there are; would to God it were in our power to supply them. As to creeds and confessions, although we may appear to our brethren to oppose them, yet this is to be understood only in so far as they oppose the unity of the Church, by containing sentiments not expressly revealed in the word of God; or, by the way of using them, become the instruments of a human or implicit faith, or oppress the weak of God's heritage. Where they are liable to none of those objections, we have nothing against them. It is the abuse and not the lawful use of such compilations that we oppose. See proposition 7, page 17. Our intention, therefore, with respect to all the Churches of Christ is perfectly amicable. We heartily wish their reformation, but by no means, their hurt or confusion. Should any affect to say that our coming forward as we have done, in advancing and publishing such things, has a manifest tendency to distract and divide the Churches, or to make a new party, we treat it as a confident and groundless assertion, and must suppose they have not duly considered, or, at least, Dot well understood the subject.

It will be seen that Thomas Campbell's main contention was around seven great watchwords:

1. Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent.
2. “Thus saith the Lord,” either in express terms, or by approved precedent, for every article of faith and item of religious practice.
3. Nothing ought to be received into the faith or wor-
ship of the Church, or be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament.

4. An agreement in the expressly revealed will of God is the adequate and firm foundation of Christian unity.

5. An assumed authority for making the approbation of human opinions and human inventions a term of communion, by introducing them into the constitution, faith or worship of the Church, is and has been the immediate, obvious, and universally acknowledged cause of all the corruptions and divisions that have ever taken place in the Church of God.

6. The restoration of pure, primitive, Apostolic Christianity, in letter and spirit, in principle and practice, as the only cure for sectarianism.


These splendid watchwords present tersely the main features of Thomas Campbell's great deliverance, and it will readily be seen by the intelligent reader that a legitimate application of what is affirmed in these statements would go far to heal the divisions of Christendom as they exist at the present time, and bring peace where now reign strife and confusion. How Thomas Campbell's great address was received will appear as we proceed.
CHAPTER II

THE CHAOTIC PERIOD—ITS BEGINNING

ONE of the Reformers of the sixteenth century is reported to have been so enraptured with his newly-found treasure—the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ:—that he stood on a goods box at a street crossing in Leipsic, Germany, and called to the people, as they passed along, to listen to his story and be saved. It was all so beautiful to him, and he was so thoroughly convinced of its truthfulness, that he imagined the only thing he had to do was to tell out the simple story to the people, and ask them to accept the remedy for their diseases. But the people almost unanimously regarded him as crazy. He had not sufficiently considered the conditions of the problem of turning the people away from their idols, and consequently, when he came to test the matter, he was thoroughly disappointed.

So it was with Thomas Campbell. He had not reckoned with the strong walls behind which the sectarianism of his day was entrenched. He did not take into the account the selfishness of religious partyism. He had vainly supposed that a plea so simple, so just, so Scriptural, and so much needed, would at once receive the hearty support of all good men in all the denominations around him, if not throughout the entire world. He evidently dreamed of a new Millennial period, of which the “Declaration and Address” was the forerunner and the herald of the coming age. He had thought much and long upon the problem to be solved; he had committed the whole matter to his Heavenly Father; but he had not taken into account the universal law of progress, which always leads through unexpected ways, and never develops in straight lines, passing through different periods, some of these apparently periods of failure, though after all, what seems failure is simply a part of the process of real development.

In harmony with the law of development referred to
the movement had now reached the beginning of the Chaotic Period. So far it had been an honest effort in the interest of Christian Union. As already made apparent, the chief actors had no thought of starting another religious denomination; and when it dawned upon them that their earnest call to union was not heeded by any of the sects of Christendom, they were greatly disappointed. Thomas Campbell was especially grieved when he was charged with starting another religious denomination instead of reducing the number which already existed. He knew that no such purpose had ever animated him in issuing his great “Declaration and Address.” He knew that his whole aim was to heal the divisions of Christendom rather than to multiply them; and though very much discouraged, on account of the manner in which his great plea had been received, he determined to remove, if possible, any suspicion that his purpose was to build up a new sect.

After much meditation and prayer over the matter, he finally decided to apply to the Synod of Pittsburg for membership in the Presbyterian Church. He was encouraged to take this course by several considerations. All his former associations had been with a Presbyterian body, and he regarded his religious views, in the main, as substantially in agreement with the “Westminster Confession of Faith.” Furthermore, most of his associates were in the Presbyterian Church, and many of these were urging him to become definitely identified with their religious body. Indeed, this urgency was so great that he felt that he could not refuse to comply with the cordial invitation.

But perhaps another reason, which influenced him to make the application he did, was his earnest desire to avoid, if possible, any reproach with respect to the possibility of starting a separate religious movement. He felt that if he was in fellowship with some existing religious body the charge of starting another denomination could not be legitimately made. Accordingly, in October, 1810, he made formal application to the Synod of Pitts-burg for “Christian and Ministerial Communion” with that body.

In taking this step Mr. Campbell stated distinctly to the Synod the religious position which he occupied. The
following extract from the minutes of the Synod shows how the application was received: “After hearing Mr. Campbell at length, and his answers to various questions proposed to him, the Synod unanimously resolved, that however specious the plan of the Christian Association and however seducing its professions, as experience of the effects of similar projects in other parts has evinced their baleful tendency and destructive operations on the whole interests of religion by promoting divisions instead of union, by degrading the ministerial character, by providing free admission to any errors in doctrine, and to any corruptions in discipline, whilst a nominal approbation of the Scriptures as the only standard of truth may be professed, the Synod are constrained to disapprove the plan and its native effects.

“And further, for the above and many other important reasons, it was resolved, that Mr. Campbell's request to be received into ministerial and Christian communion cannot be granted.”

It appears that Mr. Campbell requested a copy of the Synod's decision in his case, and the next day Mr. Campbell appeared before the Synod and asked an explanation of the important reasons mentioned in the minute he had received, for which the Synod could not receive him into “Christian and ministerial communion.” The Synod made the following answer to Mr. Campbell's inquiry:

It was not for any immorality in practice, but, in addition to the reasons before assigned, for expressing his belief that, there are some opinions taught in our Confession of Faith which are not founded in the Bible, and avoiding to designate them; for declaring that the administration of baptism to infants is not authorised by Scriptural precept or example, and is a matter of indifference, yet administering that ordinance while holding such an opinion; for encouraging or countenancing his son to preach the gospel without any regular authority; for opposing creeds and confessions as injurious to the interests of religion; and, also, because it is not consistent with the regulations of the Presbyterian Church that Synod should form a connection with any ministers, churches, or associations; that the Synod deemed it improper to grant his request.

When this answer was read to Mr. Campbell, he denied having said that infant baptism was a matter of indifference, and declared that he had admitted many truths
drawn by fair induction from the Word of God. He also acknowledged that he opposed creeds and confessions when they contained anything not expressly contained in the Book; that he believed there are some things in the Westminster Confession of Faith not expressly revealed in the Book. He furthermore declared that he felt himself quite released from the apprehension which he first had with respect to his moral character.

There are a few things which need to be said with respect to this remarkable chapter in the history of the Campbellian movement. First of all, it needs to be emphasised that Mr. Campbell did not mean by this application to the Pittsburg Synod to abandon, in any respect, the plea he had made for Christian Union. Nor does it appear from any facts in the case that he was in the slightest degree frightened into this course by any clamour of Sectarians who sought to invalidate his plea by claiming that he was starting another religious denomination. He grieved over that, but it did not influence him to change his plea for Christian Union. It was never his intention to dissociate himself from other Christians. On the contrary, his whole aim was to bring Christians more closely together. When, however, he found that his advocacy had alienated his old religious associations from him and he was now practically cut off from their fellowship, he was glad when he received overtures from members of the Pittsburg Synod to have at least fraternal relations with the Presbyterian Church.

It has been intimated by some historians that the main consideration which induced him to make the application he did was to relieve himself of the charge that he was vitiating his own plea by starting another religious sect; but it does not appear from any well authenticated facts that this consideration influenced him to any large extent, though it may have done so to some extent. He found himself and those associated with him cut off from all definite fellowship with any other religious body, and as it was no part of his plan to occupy such a position, but rather the contrary, he believed he could do his work more effectually if he could have Christian and ministerial communion with the Presbyterian body. It appears also that in making this personal application, it was understood by the Synod that he represented the Christian Association of
which he was a member, and that the application, therefore, meant the reception of the Association into the fellowship of the Presbyterian Church.

Had the Synod confined its reasons to the last one mentioned, its course would have been consistent, and doubtless the whole controversy would have ended with that enunciation. But as the other reasons given for rejecting the application were open to very serious objections, it is not remarkable that the son, Alexander, should have felt called upon to take some notice of these other reasons given by the Synod.

Just here another important actor comes upon the stage. At this time Alexander Campbell, the son of Thomas Campbell, was, according to Dr. Richardson's biography, about twenty-one years of age, though, according to his father's testimony, he was about twenty-three years of age. This discrepancy is owing to the fact that the family records were lost in a shipwreck, when the family was emigrating to the United States. It seems probable, notwithstanding the very cogent reasons given by Dr. Richardson in favor of September 12, 1788, as the time of his birth, that his father was right in stating that he was born September 12, 1786. Even allowing the latter date to be correct, it is still remarkable that he should have been so thoroughly equipped at that time for the work before him, as is indicated by the part he at once took in the matters under consideration.

Alexander Campbell was born in County Antrim, North of Ireland, and having finished his education at Glasgow University, he sailed from the city of Londonderry on the third of October, 1808, and after a perilous voyage, during which the whole ship's company had almost perished in the Atlantic, he was landed in New York on the twenty-ninth of September, 1809, and on the twenty-eighth of the next month he arrived in Washington, Pennsylvania, where he joined his father, who had preceded him to America, as has already been stated. Alexander had been educated with a view to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church to which he belonged. During his studies at Glasgow University he became intimately acquainted with some eminent men of the Presbyterian Church, and through their influence and his own reading and thinking his faith in creeds and confessions of human
device had become much shaken. However, he was still a staunch Presbyterian when he arrived in this country, as the following extract from his own statement in the *Christian Baptist* will certify:

I arrived in this country with credentials in my pocket from that sect of Presbyterians known by the name of Seceders. These credentials certified that I had been both in Ireland, in the Presbytery of Market Hill, and in Scotland, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, a member of the Secession Church in good standing.

It is rather remarkable that when he arrived in America that he should find his father reading the proof sheets of his great “Declaration and Address,” to which attention has already been called. With respect to this matter the son says:

The first proof sheet that I ever read was a form of my father's “Declaration and Address,” in press at Washington, Pa., on my arrival there in October, 1809. There were in it the following sentences: “Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church, or to be made a term of communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of Divine obligation in the church constitution and management, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles upon the New Testament church, either in express terms or approved precedent.” These last words, “express terms” and “approved precedent” made a deep impression on my mind, then well furnished with the popular doctrines of the Presbyterian Church in all its branches.

In another place (*Christian Baptist*, page 92) he makes the following statement:

I commenced my career in this country under the conviction that nothing that was not as old as the New Testament should be made an article of faith, a rule of practice, or a term of communion amongst Christians. In a word, that the whole of the Christian religion exhibited in prophecy and type of the Old Testament, was presented in the fullest, clearest, and most perfect manner of the New Testament by the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. This has been the pole-star of my course ever since, and I thank God that he has enabled me so far to prosecute it, and to make all my prejudices and ambition bow to this emancipating principle.
It will be seen by these two extracts how the son regarded his father's movement at this particular time. It is well to have his position clearly understood, as some have intimated that the son did not entirely approve of the “Declaration and Address” when it was issued. I have examined a copy of the proof sheet which was corrected by the son, and while a few changes are made (chiefly verbal), there is not the slightest intimation of disagreement with respect to anything stated in the paper. The only thing expunged is a postscript in which some reasons are given for delay in the publication of the Address, and two recommendations for promoting the object of the Christian Association. The first of these is the importance of publishing a sort of catechism with a view to summarising a system of faith and duty as contained in the sacred oracles, respecting the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Christian Churches, and the second recommendation relates to the publication of a periodical for the “express purpose of detecting and exposing the various enormities, innovations and corruptions which infest the Christian Church, which counteract and oppose the gracious tendency of the Gospel— the promotion and establishment of the Redeemer's Kingdom upon earth.”

Perhaps Alexander's opposition to human formulas of faith caused him to object to the publication of the Christian Catechism, and doubtless his practical mind saw that the time had not come for the publication of the Christian Monitor, as the periodical was to be called. But however this may have been, he ran his pencil through the postscript; but it is the only thing he expunged in the paper which had been submitted to him by his father.

Furthermore, it is perfectly evident from Alexander's own statement, made in the Millennial Harbinger of 1837, that he would have remained in the Presbyterian Church had he been allowed that liberty which he always claimed belonged to the child of God. He says:

So fully were we aware of the evils of schism, and so reluctant to assume the attitude of a new party, that we proposed to continue in the Presbyterian connexion, even after we were convinced of various imperfections in the form of its government, in its system of discipline, in its administration of Christian ordinances, and of the want of scriptural warrant
for infant baptism; provided only they would allow us to follow out our convictions by not obliging us to do what we could not approve, and allowing us to teach and enforce only those matters for which we could produce clear, scriptural authority, and make all the rest a subject of forbearance till farther enlightened.

It will be seen by this extract that Alexander was not only in hearty sympathy with the movement, inaugurated by his father, but was perfectly willing to continue to hold his membership in the Presbyterian Church on the conditions mentioned. It is true that he opposed his father in making application to the Pittsburg Synod for formal recognition by that body. The son saw, or thought he saw, what would be the result of the application. He understood more truly the spirit of the times than his father did, and when his father's application was rejected his young and impetuous nature was deeply stirred, and he determined at once to reply to the Synod, in which he would examine the reasons they had given for refusing his father's application.

He accordingly announced in the *Reporter* (a paper published at Washington, Pa.) on the twenty-second and twenty-ninth of October, 1810, a few days after the meeting of the Synod, as follows:

The Christian Association of Washington holds its semiannual meeting at Washington on Thursday, the first of November next, at 11 o'clock. There will be delivered upon that occasion by Alexander Campbell, V.D.S., an appropriate discourse illustrative of the principles and design of the Association, and for the purpose of obviating certain mistakes and objections which ignorance or wilful opposition has attached to the humble and well-meaned attempts of the Society to promote a thorough scriptural reformation, as testified in their Address to the friends and lovers of peace and truth throughout all the Churches.

At the appointed time he delivered a somewhat lengthy address to a large assembly, from Isaiah xlvi: 14; lxii: 10, an extensive report of which is given in Richardson's "Memoirs." From this report it appears that the principles for which he contended were practically the same as those enunciated in his father's "Declaration and Address," though he dealt with some things that were not discussed in his father's great deliverance. How-
ever, taking the two addresses together, the religious views expressed may be summarised as follows:

1. Existing religious parties possess the substance of Christianity, but have in many respects failed to preserve “the form of sound words” in which it was originally presented; and the chief object in the reformation proposed is to persuade to the abandonment of every human system, and the adoption of “the form of sound words” as the true basis of union.

2. Each church should be regarded as an independent organisation, having its own internal government by bishops and deacons, yet not to be so absolutely independent of other churches as not to be bound to them by fraternal relations.

3. They considered “lay preaching” as authorised, and denied the distinction between clergy and laity as Scriptural.

4. They looked upon infant baptism as without direct Scriptural authority, but were willing to leave it as a matter of forbearance, and allow the continuance of the practice in the case of those who conscientiously approved it, as Paul and James permitted circumcision for a time in deference to Jewish prejudices.

5. They clearly anticipated the probability of being compelled, on account of the refusal of the religious parties to accept their overture, to resolve the Christian Association into a distinct church, in order to carry out for themselves the duties and obligations enjoined on them in the Scriptures.

6. That in receiving nothing but what was expressly revealed, they foresaw and admitted that many things, deemed precious and important by the existing religious societies, must inevitably be excluded.

From the foregoing summary it is evident that the combined contributions of Thomas and Alexander Campbell to the movement, of which the Christian Association was the centre, gave it a tinge decidedly Haldanean in its character. Both the Campbells had felt the influence of the teaching of Robert and James Haldane, distinguished Scotch preachers, who, towards the latter part of the eighteenth century and during the first years of the nineteenth century, carried on a great work in Scotland. These men contended for the independence
of each congregation, and they also contended for the Scriptures as the only authoritative guide with respect to religious matters. The practice of lay preaching and the toleration of infant baptism were marked features of their preaching. However, it was with respect to church government where the Campbellian movement finally ran practically parallel with the teaching of the Haldanes. But as the environment in the United States was different from that of Scotland, and the conditions of religious societies were not the same, the Campbells, especially Alexander, soon saw that there were other things to be considered besides the special matters for which the Haldanes contended.

The Haldanean Reformation was aimed chiefly at infidelity and Socinianism in the Established Church, and consequently the movement was mainly in the nature of protest against prevailing evils rather than in any constructive work which would lead to the Restoration of Primitive Christianity. However, it is probable that Alexander Campbell, when he reached his father in America, was more deeply imbued with a spirit of radical reformation than his father was. But, however this may have been, it is certain that from this time forward the son became the acknowledged leader of the movement which had been inaugurated by his father, and the readiness with which the young man entered into the work, and especially the controversial side of it, may be seen from the manner in which he dealt with the Pittsburg Synod's reasons for rejecting the application of his father.

Thomas Campbell was by nature and grace opposed to controversy. He was eminently a man of peace. This very fact was an influential factor in determining him to seek association with the Presbyterian Church, but in doing this he was careful to guard against any ground for suspicion that he had the slightest desire to abandon the Christian Association or give up any of the principles for which he had contended in his “Declaration and Address.” Alexander was of a somewhat different nature. While deeply religious, profound convictions as to the principles he had embraced led him to be more aggressive than his father was, and he began to see, very soon after he arrived in America, that the movement which had been started would require something more than the admirably
constructive phrases, the gentle spirit, and the finely poised conservatism of the “Declaration and Address.” He saw that some radical work had to be done, and much rubbish removed from the walls of Jerusalem before the waste places of Zion could be restored. Hence in the spirit of Nehemiah, when rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, he believed in taking the trowel in one hand and the sword in the other. While he was building he trained himself and all those associated with him to vigorously “contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.” It was not because he loved controversy that he did this, for in some respects he hated the very name of the thing, but because he was fully persuaded that every inch of the ground to be gained must be fought over, and that the movement inaugurated could only succeed, first of all, by breaking down the strongholds of sectarianism in order to make room for a united Church built upon the “foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone.” From this time forward he became practically the leader of the new movement.

At this time, 1811, the Christian Association found itself practically cut off from the fellowship of all the religious denominations around it; and in view of this fact it was deemed expedient to constitute itself into a church for “the enjoyment of those privileges and the performance of those duties which belong to the church relations.” In accordance with this view of the matter a church was organised out of the members of the Association, May 4, at Brush Run, Pennsylvania. Thomas Campbell was appointed elder of the Church, and Alexander Campbell was licensed to preach the Gospel. John Dawson, George Sharpe, John Foster, and William Gilchrist were chosen as deacons. The Communion service was celebrated on the following day, which was Sunday, and both of the Campbells preached.

This definite action, in forming a church and organising it, partly at least in harmony with the principles which the Association had contended for, was not only a new departure, but was also a very important step in the religious movement. On this Lord's Day, as already stated, the first Communion service was held. From the very beginning the Lord's Supper was celebrated every first day of the week, as had been the case in the independ-
ent churches of Scotland. Indeed, this celebration of the Lord's Supper on every Lord's Day became a fundamental feature in the practice of the Disciples. It was believed from the very beginning of the movement that the failure to observe the Lord's Supper weekly was one of the cardinal mistakes of Christendom. It was felt that in the Primitive Churches this Supper held the chief place at the Lord's Day service; that it was for the purpose of celebrating the Lord's death and suffering, that the first Christians came together to break bread, and that a departure from this New Testament teaching was the parent of a great many evils which had infested the Church.

The experiment of attending to this ordinance every Lord's Day proved to be a very strong uniting force among those who participated in it. The meeting together once a week around the Lord's table and remembering His sacrificial death for their sins had a very comforting and strongly uniting influence with the Disciples. In the presence of the emblems which showed forth the death and suffering of their divine Lord, these reformers found an irresistible bond of Christian union and felt a cementing power which came to them nowhere else. Consequently from a practical point of view this weekly Communion service became a mighty force in cementing the hearts of the brotherhood together and holding them in the grace of the spirit and service of Christian Union.

As soon as the organisation of the Church took place, Alexander started out on his first preaching tour. During his absence a new meeting house was built. The Church continued to meet every Lord's Day and also to celebrate the Lord's Supper. In these meetings it was observed that some of the members did not partake of the emblems, and these gave as a reason for their action that they did not feel authorised to do so because they had never been baptised, though they had been sprinkled. This at once introduced the question of their former baptism, the proper subject of baptism having been introduced much earlier in the movement. Joseph Bryant, one of the men who refused to take of the Supper, insisted on being immersed, as he no longer regarded sprinkling as baptism. He was accordingly immersed on July 4, 1811, by Thomas Campbell. This action presented an-
other crisis in the history of the Christian Association, for soon after this baptism a number of persons who, at first, heartily joined the Association, now withdrew their membership, as they were unwilling to follow what they saw was the logic of events.

During this year Alexander Campbell made several preaching tours through parts of Ohio and West Virginia. His father was also active in propagating the views presented in his “Declaration and Address.” In the meantime a number of practical questions came up for consideration. Among these may be mentioned ordination, the authority of local congregations, the apostolic form of Church government, etc. All these were carefully considered and settled according to what was believed to be the teaching and example of the Word of God.

However, the situation at this time was by no means satisfactory. These brethren launched their boat on a wide, wide sea, but they were not sure just where it would land. The whole movement at this time was evidently chaotic, and with less conscientious and less earnest men and women the cause would have seemed hopeless. But not so with these great souls. They had practically burned all the bridges, and had given themselves fully to a forward movement, and while they realised something of the great difficulties over which they must triumph in order to succeed, they did not, for a moment, hesitate with respect to the great work before them.

This was especially true of Alexander Campbell. Though young in years, he had already practically mastered the great principles by which he was guided. His habits of study were of the most rigid kind. His systematic way of doing things enabled him to use profitably every moment of time at his disposal. While he gave to his studies a somewhat extensive range, he allowed nothing to interfere with his special study of the Word of God. The Bible was his constant companion, especially the New Testament. With a Greek Testament in his pocket, he followed his plow, and when allowing his horse to rest at the end of the rows, he would read a chapter for meditation during the next interval of work. In this way, like the Psalmist of old, the Word of God was his constant meditation by day and by night. He also read
much of Church history, becoming thoroughly acquainted with the rise and progress of the Church through the ages of the past, and in this way he made himself thoroughly equipped with respect to all the controversies, both within and without the Church, during its entire history. Indeed, so absorbed was he in his studies and the great cause to which he had committed his life, that there was no place in his heart for discouragement, even in the face of the chaotic condition of things which at this time prevailed all around him. He realised that he practically stood alone. His father he loved with the deepest affection, also reverenced his judgement with respect to many things; but he knew quite well that his father's work had been chiefly accomplished in the inauguration of the movement, the principles and aims of which had been set forth so lucidly in the famous “Declaration and Address.” But he knew also that the Creative Period had passed, and that there had been practically an overthrow with respect to the aims which had been in view at the beginning. It was no longer doubtful that Christendom was not going to give up its partyism without a severe struggle. It was also further evident that the movement which had been launched was not only checked, so far as its advance toward the union of Christians was concerned, but had been so far hindered that many of the original members had gone back again to the sects, while those that remained were virtually drifting somewhat hither and thither without very definite conclusions as to what the end would be.

In this crisis Alexander Campbell was the real hero. He alone seemed to have an unconquering faith that victory would ultimately perch upon their banner. Perhaps there is nothing in the life of this great man which more distinctly characterised him, and marked him out as one of God's great champions of the faith, once for all delivered to the saints, than his conduct in the crisis of the movement at this particular time.

When God wants men for a particular purpose, he educates them. Moses was providentially placed in the Egyptian Court, where he could be prepared for the service of delivering the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt. When the right hour came he was removed from the Egyptian court and spent forty years of further prepara-
tion as a farmer in the land of Midian. His education at Heliopolis and in the court of Pharaoh was the first preparation, but he needed something more than this before he was fully prepared for the great work. This latter preparation he received by coming in contact with a new civilisation, new laws, new customs, and above all by having an opportunity for study and meditation in the fields with nature and nature's God.

Alexander Campbell in many respects passed through a similar experience. He received his early training in the school of sectarianism. His early religious life was developed where he was enabled to secure the advantages of a worthy academic education, as well as a knowledge of religious societies as they then existed in Ireland and Scotland. In association with some of the noblest religious spirits of those countries, he began to realise, even before he reached America, the necessity of a distinct and emphatic religious reformation. His long voyage at sea gave him ample opportunity for reflection with respect to the matters which had interested him during his academic course in Glasgow University, so that when he landed in America, like Moses when he reached the land of Midian, he was already partially prepared for the great work which, in the providence of God, he had been called to do. It was no doubt providential that his lot was cast at the very beginning of his life in America, where he was free from the disturbing and corrupting influences of the great city; but where he could commune with nature and with God without the obtrusive interference of those influences which often take captive the young heart before it has become thoroughly consecrated to serve the Lord.

His new environment was especially conducive to the development of that love of liberty which characterised him throughout his entire life. America itself had a charm for him. He had fondly dreamed of a land that was free from social castes and political oppression, as well as where religious freedom was guaranteed by the national constitution. In some of these respects he was disappointed. He found sectarianism even more pronounced in America than he had found it in Europe, though it manifested itself in a somewhat different fashion. In Europe the contest was chiefly between the state
churches and non-conforming churches; while in America, where there were no state churches, the sectarian spirit found its opportunity and channel through the different antagonistic denominations into which religious society was divided. This sectarian spirit was constantly manifesting itself in the religious communities with which Mr. Campbell came into contact. His great soul rebelled against the whole thing, and he soon began to denounce it in unsparing terms. Perhaps the language he used in these earlier days was not always wisely chosen, but no one can doubt that his language never actually overstated the ugly character of the sectarianism which then existed in the religious communities where his work was, for the most part, confined.

As ignorance was perhaps the chief factor in this prostitution of a true religious development, it is probable that Mr. Campbell did not make sufficient allowance for the prevalence of this ignorance, nor did he make sufficient excuse for its existence, in view of the opportunities which the average church member at that time possessed. Mr. Campbell was especially severe on the clergy, and yet the chief difficulty with this clergy was the want of education. Most of the preachers at that time had never seen a college, and many of those who had received a reasonable academic education had very little or any knowledge of the world. Confined as they had been to their local districts, and thereby hindered from coming into contact with the great movements of the age, they were incapable of appreciating a wide and comprehensive view of the Gospel, and a broad religious culture, such as Alexander Campbell found were necessary in order to take the world for Christ. At times he was evidently somewhat impatient with respect to the environment in which he was placed, but his faith never wavered, nor did his convictions ever hesitate. He seemed not to have counted the final outcome of his advocacy. He evidently felt that his present duty was all that concerned him; the final outcome he left with God.
CHAPTER III

A NEW DEPARTURE AND NEW FRIENDS

SOON after Alexander Campbell joined his father in America, he formed the acquaintance of Miss Margaret Brown, daughter of John Brown, of Brooke County, West Virginia. This acquaintance led to their marriage, which was consummated March 13, 1811, the marriage ceremony being pronounced by Mr. Hughes, a Presbyterian minister. Mr. Campbell immediately settled at his wife's paternal home on the waters of Buffalo Creek, the site of the present village of Bethany. Here he lived for more than half a century, and it was here that he died and was buried in a beautiful cemetery near his home. The village was shut out almost entirely from the world by the abrupt cliffs that overhung it and the short windings of the Buffalo Creek, the meanderings of which compassed about twenty-one miles, though it is only seven miles by the road to Wellsburg, where the creek empties into the Ohio River.

The following interesting account of how Alexander Campbell came to locate at Bethany, W. Va., is by Professor W. B. Taylor, of Bethany College, and is appropriate just here, as illustrating the fact that the greatest issues of life are sometimes determined by an apparently very small matter:

Thomas Campbell had formed the acquaintance of a kindred spirit named John Brown, who resided on Buffalo Creek, in Virginia. He was not only a man of deeply religious life, but of fine literary taste. In a casual conversation Thomas Campbell promised Mr. Brown some favourite books, and sent them down by his son, Alexander. He became interested in Mr. Brown's library, and also in his eighteen-year-old daughter, whom he now met for the first time. He at first repeated his visit to borrow books, but soon for other companionship than books. On March 12, 1811, Alexander Campbell and Margaret Brown were married, and he came to make his home at Buffalo, and became an efficient farmer, directing and aiding in the
cultivation of his father-in-law's farm while pursuing his studies and preaching on the Lord's Day. He always carried his Greek New Testament in his pocket, and while others lounged and the team rested he snatched some truth from the inspired Word of God.

Bethany was almost as near the centre of the earth as any other place in those early days. There were no national pikes, no railroads, no cities west of the Alleghenies. Bethany was only seven miles from the Ohio River, the only thoroughfare of travel between the East and West. There was no telegraph or telephone in those days. Indeed, the first electric telephone was invented and used in Bethany by Professor Dolbear, Bethany's professor of science. He also invented a wireless telegraph which was refused by the Patent Office on the ground that it was contrary to science. The location in this Switzerland of America was favourable to reflective thought and the working out of the principles of the great Restoration. But because of intense persecution the Campbells and friends proposed a religious colony “away out in Ohio.” Mr. Brown opposed the scheme, and prevailed upon Alexander Campbell, his son-in-law, not to leave Bethany by giving to him and his wife the homestead and the fine farm hanging like an oriole's nest in the broad bend of the winding Buffalo. When he withdrew, the scheme failed, and thus, in another way, Bethany saved this movement from fossilising. This splendid farm became the base of Mr. Campbell's private fortune and furnished much of the means for carrying on his mighty work.

It was in this romantic spot that he settled and began his life work in carrying forward the religious movement which had been inaugurated by his father in Western Pennsylvania. From this time forward Bethany becomes the centre of influence rather than Washington and the country round about it, and it is from this new point that we must start in our consideration of the New Departure, which soon took place, and the new friends that were found.

Their first child was born March 13, 1812. This fact brought into the foreground, in a practical manner, what had already occupied the mind of Mr. Campbell ever since he landed in America. As soon as he read the third proposition of the great “Address” of his father, he saw that the principles there announced must necessarily lead to the abandonment of infant baptism. The proposition reads as follows: “That (in order to Christian Union and communion) nothing ought to be inculcated upon Christians as articles of faith, nor required of them as terms
of communion, but what is expressly taught and enjoined upon them by the Word of God. Nor ought anything to be admitted, as of divine obligation in their church constitution and management, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles upon the New Testament Church, either in express terms, or by approved precedent.”

On reading this over, Alexander asked his father “in what passage or portion of the inspired oracles he could find an expressed precedent for the baptising or sprinkling of infants in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.” His father's answer was, “It is merely inferential, but to the law and testimony we make our appeal. If not found therein, we, of course, must abandon it. But we could not unchurch ourselves now and go out into the world and then turn back again and enter the Church merely for the sake of form or decorum.”

The difficulty thus raised by the son was not settled at that time. But the son was not satisfied with the way in which it was disposed of by his venerated father. Alexander began at once to read everything he could find in support of the doctrine of infant baptism. He said he preferred to take this course because he wished to find out, if possible, the strongest grounds by which it could be justified. In this investigation he found a very curious contradiction among those who advocated its claims. In short, he found that every position maintained by the Pedo-Baptists was actually refuted by the Pedo-Baptists themselves. In other words, where one Pedo-Baptist founded it, another repudiated this foundation, and sought to sustain it in another way. This confusion only confirmed Mr. Campbell in the conviction that after all “there might be no just grounds for it at all,” and consequently, after the fullest and freest investigation of the whole matter, he decided that he had never been baptised, and that consequently it was his duty, in order to be loyal to the Word of God and his own convictions, to at once act in harmony with what now seemed to be an imperative obligation.

He had formed the acquaintance of a Baptist preacher by the name of Matthias Luse, and he determined to apply to him for baptism. He accordingly started on his way to see that gentleman, but he stopped at his father's
house to acquaint him of the purpose he had formed. While there, one of his sisters privately informed him that she did not consider her baptism valid, and therefore wished to be immersed, and asked him to present the matter to her father. Whereupon he surprised his sister by announcing to her that he was then on his way to seek immersion at the hands of Mr. Luse.

When he presented the matter to his father, the latter had very little to say except to remark, “I have no more to add. You must please yourself.” As the arrangements had been made with Mr. Luse for the baptism of himself and sister, his father decided to be baptised at the same time. Accordingly on June 2, 1812, his father, mother, wife, sister, James, and Sarah Henon, and himself, in all seven persons, were baptised into the Christian faith. He had stipulated with Elder Luse that his baptism should be “into” the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and not “in” the name, as was then, and is now, usual among the regular Baptists. Elder Luse rather hesitated, saying that it was unusual among the Baptists to baptise “into” the name, but he finally acceded to the wish of Mr. Campbell, remarking, “He had no doubt as to the propriety of into the name, but it had not been so done in his Israel,” namely, the Red Stone Baptist Association.

As this was an important turning point in the life of Alexander Campbell, and also with respect to the religious movement of which he now became the acknowledged leader, it may be well to give his own account of the facts and incidents connected with the important action which led to this somewhat new departure:

The first proof sheet that I ever read was a form of my father's “Declaration and Address,” in press in Washington, Pennsylvania, on my arrival there in October, 1809. There were in it the following sentences: “Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the Church, or be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of Divine obligation, in the church constitution and management, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles upon the New Testament church; EITHER IN EXPRESS TERMS OR BY APPROVED PRECEDENT.” These last words “express terms” and “approved precedent” made a deep impression on my
mind, then well furnished with the popular doctrines of the Presbyterian church in all its branches. While there was some ambiguity about this “approved precedent,” there was none about “express terms.” Still a precedent, I alleged, might be in “express terms,” and a good precedent might not be clearly approved or expressly stated by apostles or evangelists with approbation.

While reasoning with myself and others, on these matters, I accidentally fell in with Doctor Riddle of the Presbyterian Union church and introduced the matter to him. “Sir,” said he, “these words, however plausible in appearance, are not sound. For if you follow these out you must become a Baptist.” “Why, sir,” said I, “is there, in the Scriptures, no express precept for, nor precedent of, infant baptism?” “Not one, sir,” responded the Doctor. I was startled and mortified that I could not produce one. He withdrew. Turning around to Mr. Andrew Munro, the principal bookseller of Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., who heard the conversation; I said:—“Send me, sir, if you please, forthwith, all the treatises you have in favour of infant baptism.” He did so. Disclaiming the Baptists as “an ignorant and uneducated population,” as my notions were, I never inquired for any of their books or writings. I knew John Bunyan's “Pilgrim's Progress,” and had often read it; but I knew not at that time that he was a Baptist.

All the members of the Washington Christian Association, whose “Declaration and Address” my father had then written, were not only all Pedobaptists, but the most leading and influential persons in it were hostile to the Baptist views and practice. So to work I went to maintain my positions in favour of infant baptism. I read much during one year on the subject.

I was better pleased with Presbyterianism than with anything else, and desired, if possible, to maintain it. But despite of my prejudices, partialities, and prospects, the conviction deepened and strengthened that it was all a grand Papal imposition. I threw away the Pedobaptist volumes with indignation at their assumptions and fallacious reasonings, and fled, with some faint hope of finding something more convincing, to my Greek New Testament. But still worse. I found no resting place there; and entering into conversation with my father on the subject, he admitted that there was neither express terms nor express precedent. But, strange to tell, he took the ground that once in the church, and a participant of the Lord's supper, we could not “unchurch or paganise ourselves”; put off Christ and then make a new profession, and commence again as would a heathen man and a publican. Having the highest esteem for his learning, and the deepest conviction of his piety and devotion to the truth, his authority over me then was paramount and almost irresistible. We went into discussion. He simply conceded, that we ought
not to teach or practise infant baptism without Divine authority; but, on the contrary, preach and administer the apostolic baptism. Still, however, we ought not to un-Christianise ourselves and put on Christ, having not only professed and preached the Christian faith, but also participated in its solemn rites. We discussed this question, and all that family of questions, at sundry interviews, for many months. At length I told him that, with great reluctance, I must dissent from all his reasonings upon that subject and be baptised. I now fully and conscientiously believed that I never had been baptised, and consequently, I was then, in point of fact, an unbaptised person; and hence could not consistently preach baptism to others, of which I had never been a subject myself.

His response was:—“I have, then, no more to add. You must please yourself.” On leaving in the morning, he asked me when, where, and by whom, I intended to be immersed. As to the place, I preferred to be baptised near home, among those who were accustomed to attend my preaching; as to the time, just as soon as I could procure an acceptable Baptist minister. The nearest and, indeed, the only one known to me, was Elder Matthias Luse, living some thirty miles from my residence. I promised to let my father know the time and place, as soon as I obtained the consent of Elder Luse.

Immediately I went in quest of an administrator, of one who practised what he preached. I spent the next evening with Elder Luse. During the evening I announced my errand. He heard me with pleasure. Having on a former occasion, heard him preach, but not on that subject; I asked him, into what formula of faith he immersed. His answer was that “the Baptist church required candidates to appear before it, and on a narration of their experience, approved by the church, a time and place were appointed for the baptism.”

To this I immediately demurred, saying:—That I knew no scriptural authority for bringing a candidate for baptism before the church to be examined, judged, and approved, by it, as prerequisite to his baptism. To which he simply responded: —“It was the Baptist custom.” “But was it,” said I, “the apostolic custom?” He did not contend that it was, admitting freely that such was not the case from the beginning. “But,” added he, “if I were to depart from our usual custom they might hold me to account before the Association.” “Sir,” I replied, “there is but one confession of faith that I can make, and into that alone can I consent to be baptised.” “What is that?” said he. “Into the belief that Jesus is the Christ, the confession into which the first converts were immersed. I have set out to follow the apostles of Christ and their master, and I will be baptised only into the primitive Christian faith.”

After a short silence he replied, saying:—“I believe you are right, and I will risk the consequences; I will get, if possible, one of our Redstone preachers to accompany me. Where do
you desire to be baptised?” “In Buffalo Creek, on which I live, and on which I am accustomed to preach. My Presbyterian wife,” I added, “and, perhaps, some others will accompany me.”

On the day appointed Elder Henry Spears, from the Monongahela, and Matthias Luse, according to promise, met us at the place appointed. It was the 12th of June, 1812, a beautiful day; a large and attentive concourse was present, with Elder David Jones of Eastern Pennsylvania. My father made an elaborate address on the occasion. I followed him with a statement of the reasons of my change of views, and vindicated the primitive institution of baptism, and the necessity of personal obedience.

To my great satisfaction my father, mother, and eldest sister, my wife, and three other persons besides myself, were that same day immersed into the faith of that great proposition on which the Lord himself said that he would build his church. The next Lord's day some twenty others made a similar confession, and so the work progressed, until in a short time almost an hundred persons were immersed. This company, as far as I am yet informed, was the first community in the country that was immersed into that primitive, simple, and most significant confession of faith in the divine person and mission of the Lord Jesus Christ, without being brought before a church to answer certain doctrinal questions, or to give a history of all their feelings and emotions, in those days falsely called “Christian experience,” as if a man could have Christian experience before he was a Christian! *

This action of Mr. Campbell and those who followed his example had considerable effect upon the church at Brush Run, and also the Christian Association. Some of the members were disinclined to repudiate their infant baptism, and felt somewhat out of place in a church which was tending toward the Baptist position. Consequently, they gradually ceased to meet with the members of the Association, and many of them united with some of the religious denominations in their communities. It was evident from this time that the Christian Association would have little or no sympathy from the Pedo-Baptist Churches. It had nearly always been treated by these communities with much suspicion, as to the tendency of its teaching, and there was no longer any doubt as to where the principles laid down in the “Declaration and Address” would logically lead, and as a consequence Mr. Campbell found himself practically without friends in any religious quarter except among the Baptists, and even

* Millennial Harbinger, 1848, pp. 280-283.
many of these were not quite sure as to his soundness in the Baptist faith.

It is worth while, just here, to note a few important facts. First of all, it is certainly very remarkable that the exceedingly liberal views presented in the “Declaration and Address” had made so little progress up to this time. No other association had been formed; no other community had been specially influenced; no other church had been organised. With the general interpretation put upon the principles there had been substantial agreement, so far as leading men had expressed themselves; certainly there had been no serious objections in any quarter. Nevertheless, the movement did not seem to move. Most all of the denominations persuaded themselves that they were already in accordance with all that was true in the “Declaration and Address,” and as this document recognised substantially the state and character of the churches, they felt there was nothing specially for them to do unless it was to increase their zeal and efforts in the direction of Christian Union. Even in respect to this matter, they felt that Thomas Campbell's zeal far exceeded his knowledge, since the union of Christendom seemed an impractical thing, though it might be very desirable from many points of view.

There can be no doubt about the fact that this is the interpretation that was placed upon the movement up to the time the Campbells were baptised. It was generally regarded as a somewhat harmless thing, since its main contention for Christian Union was practically impossible. The men who were advocating it were regarded as men of the highest religious character, but were nevertheless, visionaries, whose main plea could never be realised in the actual development of Christianity. Of course the ignorance of the clergy, to which attention has already been called, must be considered in this connection. At the same time, no matter what may have been the predisposing causes, it can scarcely be doubted that the very liberality of the movement, up to 1812, was the principal cause of its slow progress. Ignorant people, especially, must have something clear-cut and intensely definite in order that they may understand it and be influenced by it. Thomas Campbell's teaching was far above the heads of the people whom he was seeking to influence. They
saw in his great paper “men as trees walking,” but did not get any clear vision of his comprehensive principles and aims.

Some have thought that if the Campbells had adhered to what was evidently their first intention, their movement would have been much more successful than it has been. But in this, as in other things, man proposes and God disposes. There is nothing clearer to an intelligent comprehension of the facts than that the whole movement was a gradual unfolding. Doubtless the original purpose was all that could have been expressed when the movement was first inaugurated. It is unusually wise to proceed gradually in any movement where education is necessary in order to success. Christ told His disciples that he had “many things to tell them, but they could not bear them” at that time. Indeed, had He told them everything before the Day of Pentecost, it is probable they would have gone back, like some others did, on account of His hard sayings. But when they were endued with power from on high, these timid disciples became as bold as lions in the advocacy of the truth with which they were inspired. Cowards were translated into heroes, and they immediately began to “turn the world upside down” with their definite and forceful preaching.

It is highly probable that a fuller revelation of the meaning of the Disciple movement, earlier than that which came in 1812, would have been fatal in many respects to the movement itself; but if the new departure had not been taken, it is almost certain that the movement would have broken down through the weight of “glittering generalities,” which, though containing the seeds of things, lacked practical illustration in definite realisation, in order to make the movement a mighty force for the great work of saving souls and breaking down the walls of sectarianism.

Another important matter needs to be noticed just here. From this time forward infant baptism was numbered with the traditions of the fathers. Thomas Campbell knew that there was no Scripture to sustain it, nevertheless he regarded it, until his final surrender, as an expedient, or a matter for toleration. Everything had to be tested by the Word of God. Where the Scriptures speak any one might speak, but where the Scriptures are
silent all must be silent. This watchword now became practical in every step of the
movement.

The result of this practical turn of affairs required the most careful investigation of every
question that came up for consideration; and while the new departure lost the Association
some friends, it put new life into those who remained, and armed them with a definite plea
which before this time was somewhat shadowy, and evidently ineffectual in influence upon
the Christian world.

However, there was still no purpose in the minds of the Campbells to become identified
with any religious denomination, such as then existed, or might exist. They were thoroughly
committed against denominationalism. While their plea was now more fully defined, it still
maintained its consistency in advocating Christian Union and opposing the divisions of
Christendom.

It is proper to state just here that the Disciples have always been true to the practice of
believer's baptism as adopted by the Brush Run Church. In a late work on “The Fundamental
Error of Christendom” the present writer attempts to show that infant baptism had its origin
in the doctrine of “Baptismal Regeneration,” and he quotes liberal extracts from Neander and
other writers of Church history to sustain his contention, and then attempts to show why the
practice should now be discontinued. He treats the matter under three general heads, as
follows:

1. It is undoubtedly unscriptural.

2. It is unreasonable.

3. It is unnecessary, as infants do not need baptism. He gives some of its evils, as
follows:

(1.) It practically substitutes flesh for faith, and makes the Church a fleshly institution
instead of a spiritual household, as was clearly intended by its divine Founder.

(2.) It takes away from the individual the highest privilege which the Gospel confers,
viz., the privilege of choice. This is one of the most fatal evils of infant baptism.

(3.) It sets aside personal responsibility by assuming that others may do an act for us
which can only be performed by ourselves.

(4.) It destroys the beautiful symbolism of the gospel, and thereby practically annihilates
what was intended to be a striking and perpetual proof of Christ's resurrection. By
substituting flesh for faith and sprinkling for immersion the whole teaching of the sixth
chapter of Romans becomes meaningless; and at the same time the significant monument
which divine
wisdom has erected to testify to the doctrine of the resurrection has been completely demolished. But as this doctrine is fundamental in Christianity, it becomes at once evident that whatever is responsible for Infant Baptism must be a fundamental error, since infant sprinkling has taken away the great monumental proof of the resurrection. And as Baptismal Regeneration is responsible for infant baptism, it follows, with irresistible force, that the former is really what I have characterised it, viz., the Fundamental Error of Christendom.

(5.) We have already seen that infant baptism is supported by the notion that there is either a magical charm in baptism itself, or else there is a magical charm in being born of believing parents. Either the baptism itself, *ex opere operato*, produces a moral change in the child, or else a moral change is produced in the child by the faith of the parents. In the first case, a power is ascribed to baptism which it does not possess, while the pernicious doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is inculcated and enforced; in the latter case the equally pernicious doctrine that faith is propagated by fleshly descent is practically affirmed and inculcated; and yet this doctrine literally destroys precisely what is characteristic in Christianity, viz., spirituality, personality, and individuality.

(6.) The practice of infant baptism brings into the churches a large number of unregenerated members, and thereby makes Church life formal, cold, and often fruitless. Do we ask for an explanation of what we see and hear as respects the want of earnest consecration among the members of the Churches? Much that will help in such an explanation may be found in the fact that many Church members have never been regenerated in the true, scriptural sense of that term. The Church has become a fleshly institution. Men and women are in it simply because their fathers and mothers were in it. In other words, they are members by virtue of their flesh relationship to those from whom they are descended. This fact is fatal to spiritual development, and practically destroys the very meaning of the Church.

(7.) Infant baptism displaces the baptism of believers, and to that extent makes void a commandment of Christ by a tradition of men. This evil cannot be over-estimated. It might be considered from many points of view, but I need not detain the reader with more than one or two of the numerous evils growing out of this substitution. In the first place, the whole order of the gospel has been perverted by it. The New Testament order is preaching, hearing, believing, and then baptism; but the substitution, to which attention is called, begins with baptism instead of ending with it. Infants are supposed to be changed from children of wrath to children of God by the priest's sprinkling water upon them in the name of the Holy Trinity; and yet when these children are grown up, evangelicals regard their conversion as necessary in order to their salvation. Surely nothing could be more
contradictory than such notions. But this is not all. The worst remains yet to be told. If infant baptism is allowed to take the place of believer's baptism, what becomes of the authority of Christ? Undoubtedly, infant baptism must be surrendered, or else Christ's supreme authority in religious matters can no longer be enforced. Our loyalty to Him ought to make our decision both quick and unmistakable as regards this important matter. Are we equal to such courageous action? It is simply a question of Christ or men, which? What answer are we ready to give?

It was perhaps at this particular point that the religious movement inaugurated by the Campbells met its most determined opposition. Infant baptism was an inheritance, bequeathed from parents to children. It belonged to a large period of the Church, and it was therefore barricaded by most of the associations and traditions of ecclesiastical history. Any contests against established customs or institutions are almost sure to be characterised by uncertainty as to success, as well as by bitterness of spirit in the contending parties.

Infant baptism is an established practice; or, to use a legal phrase, it is already in possession, and this is said to be nine points in law.

Let me illustrate what I mean. Suppose I wish to sell Mr. Jones a new range for his kitchen. I may not have much difficulty in convincing him of the superiority of the range I offer him over the new one he now possesses. But he reasons somewhat as follows: “My old range, though not so good as the new one, really answers my purpose. It will do. I have used it for many years, and it has done good, faithful service. It will continue to do this service for many years to come; so I will hold on to it rather than throw it away and substitute for it a new range which would require a considerable outlay of money.” This practically settles my range enterprise. There would perhaps be little difficulty in selling Mr. Jones my new range if his old one was out of the way. The main difficulty is in getting rid of the old range; and consequently, before I can get my new range into Mr. Jones' kitchen, it is not enough for me to convince him that mine is better than his, but I must show him how he must advantageously dispose of the one he now has.

This illustration will help us to understand why so many people hold on to infant baptism, even after they
are convinced that believer's baptism is much better. They somehow or other persuade themselves that the former will do; and especially since it has been in service so long, and has connected with it so many sacred associations. And, curiously enough, this view of the matter is strongly emphasised the moment we claim that baptism has no regenerative power. When it is suggested that baptism is in no way connected with salvation, immediately the question arises, why then should any one make trouble about whether it is administered in infancy or in old age? Consequently, those who have been baptised in infancy do not care to change to what really promises no special advantage. In other words, they do not care to exchange even a worthless range for one that is equally worthless. Nor is that all. An *ex post facto* law is always distasteful; and it is not therefore strange that those who have been baptised in infancy should often rebel against the demand made upon them to submit to believer's baptism—a baptism which virtually requires them to undo what has already been accomplished. What, then, is a legitimate argument against infant baptism, and how can the practice be overthrown? I answer, unhesitatingly, by a return to Christ's supreme authority in the matter, instead of listening to what men have decreed. I do not for one moment question the powerful influence of family ties, as respects the question under consideration. Christ has clearly taught that unless we love Him more than father or mother, houses or lands, we cannot be His disciples. Hence we must consult Him rather than paternal love or child love, even though His authority should break the most sacred ties of the flesh. But as regards the case now before us, the moment we accept Christ as our sole leader, that moment there will be perfect harmony between His teaching and all the rational demands of family life. The restoration of Christ's supreme authority will at once put baptism in its right place; and when this is done the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration will no longer have influence, and, as a consequence, infant baptism will gradually fall into disuse. The evil practice has come out of Baptismal Regeneration, and in order to effect a cure we must remove the cause of the evil; and as this cause has been found in a perverted view of baptism, in conjunction with
the doctrine of original sin, our present hope is in carrying our case over all the traditions of an apostate Church back to Christ Himself, who divinely commissioned His Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, and to baptise those who believed it. And as proof that these Apostles did baptise only those who were believers, we need go no further than simply examine carefully all the cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament. Such examination will soon reveal the fact that infant baptism is wholly without a shred of divine authority. Here, then, is the true remedy of the practice, and the case resolves itself into the simple query, “Shall we obey God rather than men?” *

From the foregoing considerations, it is not difficult to understand that the movement which had taken on this new departure would no longer be received with even toleration by the Pedo-Baptists. It struck at the very vitals of the Pedo-Baptist churches. It was a call, not only to Christian Union, but to such a union as required the Pedo-Baptists to give up a practice which was equivalent to giving up their household gods. Infant baptism and sprinkling for baptism were really fundamental in their organizations, and as the Campbellian movement had now repudiated both of these, it could no longer be regarded with the least favour by those who upheld Pedo-Baptist views.

The movement was now regarded by the Pedo-Baptist Churches as nothing short of an effort to establish another denomination, and it was rather difficult for the Campbells to defend themselves against this particular charge; nor was it possible for them to do so, except upon the ground that the Scriptures required them to take the course they had, and that any union of Christendom that did not make a “Thus saith the Lord” the final appeal, with respect to faith and practice, would be a union, not of Christians, as such, but a denominational union, which would contain many things contrary to the Scriptures, and therefore such a union could not be approved, even if it were practical.

Having arrived at these conclusions, the Campbells began to look around them as to what was the next thing to be done. They were now without any religious associa-

* See p. 71, etc., “Fundamental Error of Christendom.”
tions whatever, except what was furnished by the few members who still remained with them. Indeed, they were practically regarded as religious outlaws, or rather Ishmaelites, whose hand was against every religious denomination in Christendom, and consequently they were no longer regarded as worthy of receiving even the ordinary civilities belonging to religious intercourse. But all this only “drove the Brush Run Church more closely together.”

Its members were diligently engaged in studying the Scriptures. Meeting every Lord's Day, as they did, to break bread and to attend to the Apostolic teaching, they continued to grow in grace and in knowledge of the truth. Never was the effect of unworthy opposition and persecution more emphatically illustrated than in their case, though it was precisely what ought to have been expected in view of the true nature of denominationalism and the selfishness of bigotry. They did not receive large numbers into their fellowship, but there were, from time to time, additions to their little church. But best of all, these additions usually came in under very strong convictions as to duty, and as to the meaning of the movement with which they became identified. There were very few drones in the hive. Every man and woman was equipped with at least a New Testament, which was carried about with them, and from whose pages these Disciples received their weapons of warfare. They were tempted on all sides, but like their great Master, when tempted in the wilderness, they constantly found their power to resist temptation in an appeal to the Word of God. “It is written,” was with them an all-sufficient testimony with respect to every question that had to be debated.

It is true that this appeal often had very little effect upon their enemies. The ignorance which prevailed with respect to the Scriptures was strongly against this appeal. Many did not seem to care what the Scriptures said. They were influenced mainly by customs and traditions rather than by any “Thus saith the Lord” that might be quoted. They were practically steeped in the prejudices which they had received in their early lives, and they seemed almost incapable of listening to anything reasonable that would not harmonise with these prejudices.

In view of these facts it is by no means strange that
alienation, even of a personal kind, began to be manifested throughout the whole community where the influence of the Brush Run Church was felt; and yet, notwithstanding this state of things, the Campbells continued their advocacy by making frequent excursions into such contiguous regions as seemed to be most inviting, especially in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia. In the meantime, Alexander Campbell gave considerable time to labours on his farm. This out-of-doors exercise contributed largely to the development of his physical constitution, and doubtless did much to prepare him for the great mental labours which he was afterwards called to perform. It was not long until these mental labours were taxed to their uttermost.

While the action of the Brush Run Church, in regard to baptism, had completely alienated its Pedo-Baptist friends, it, at the same time, attracted to it the Baptists in the neighbourhood. However, there were not many of these anywhere near the church, but there were a few, and these were acquainted with the stand which the Brush Run Church had taken and soon became much interested in the little church. Immediately Mr. Campbell and his associates were urged to unite with the Redstone Baptist Association, which was the name of the Association to which these Baptists belonged. But, as already stated, Mr. Campbell “had no idea of uniting with the Baptists any more than with the Moravians or the Independents.” He had formed a very unfavourable opinion of the Baptist preachers, though he regarded the Baptist people generally with much more appreciation. He found the latter earnest and with definite convictions, though they were chiefly wedded to a few shibboleths, some of which, however important, were almost vitiated by the narrow spirit with which they were advocated. The time had come, however, when some definite action had to be taken, with respect to his relations to his new friends; and as they had cordially invited him and the church with which he was associated to unite with the Redstone Association, the matter was placed before the church, fully discussed, and it was finally decided to make formal application to be admitted into the Association. Mr. Campbell himself afterwards explains the facts and incidents connected with this matter, as follows:
I had unfortunately formed a very unfavourable opinion of the Baptist preachers as then introduced to my acquaintance, as narrow, contracted, illiberal, and uneducated men. This, indeed, I am sorry to say, is still my opinion of the ministry of that Association at that day; and whether they are yet much improved I am without satisfactory evidence.

The people, however, called Baptists, were much more highly appreciated by me than their ministry. Indeed, the ministry of some sects is generally in the aggregate the worst portion of them. It was certainly so in the Red Stone Association thirty years ago. They were little men in a big office. The office did not fit them. They had a wrong idea, too, of what was wanting. They seemed to think that a change of apparel—a black coat instead of a drab—a broad rim on their hat instead of a narrow one—a prolongation of the face, and a fictitious gravity—a longer and a more emphatic pronunciation of certain words, rather than scriptural knowledge, humility, spirituality, zeal, and Christian affection, with great devotion, and great philanthropy, were the grand desiderata.

Along with all these drawbacks, they had as few means of acquiring Christian knowledge as they had either taste or leisure for. They had but one, two, or, at most, three sermons; and these were either delivered in one uniform style and order, or minced down into one medley by way of variety. Of course, then, unless they had an exuberant zeal for the truth as they understood it, they were not of the calibre, temper, or attainments, to relish or seek after mental enlargement or independence. I, therefore, could not esteem them, nor court their favour by offering any incense at their shrine. I resolved to have nothing specially to do with them more than other preachers and teachers. The clergy of my acquaintance in other parties of that day, were, as they believed, educated men; and called the Baptists illiterate and uncouth men, without either learning or academic accomplishments, or polish. They trusted to a moderate portion of Latin, Greek, and metaphysics, together with a synopsis of divinity, ready made in suits for every man's stature, at a reasonable price. They were as proud of their classic lore, and the marrow of modern divinity, as the Baptist was of his “mode of baptism” and his “proper subject,” with sovereign grace, total depravity, and final perseverance.

I confess, however, that I was better pleased with the Baptist people than with any other community. They read the Bible, and seemed to care but little for anything else in religion than “conversion” and “Bible doctrine.” They often sent for us and pressed us to preach for them. We visited some of their churches; and, on acquaintance, liked the people more and the preachers less. Still I feared that I might be unreasonably and by education prejudiced against them; and thought that I must visit their Association at Uniontown, Pennsylvania, in the autumn of 1812. I went there as an
auditor and spectator, and returned more disgusted than I went. They invited me “to preach,” but I declined it altogether, except one evening in a private family, to some dozen preachers and twice as many laymen. I returned home, not intending ever to visit another Association.

On my way home, however, I learned that the Baptists themselves did not appreciate the preachers or the preaching of that meeting. They regarded the speakers as worse than usual, and their discourses as not edifying—as too much after the spirit and style of John Gill and Tucker’s theory of predestination. They pressed me from every quarter to visit their churches, and, though not a member, to preach for them. I consented through much importunity, and during that year I often spoke to the Baptist congregations for sixty miles round. They all pressed us to join their Redstone Association.

We laid the matter before our church in the fall of 1813. We discussed the propriety of the measure. After much discussion and earnest desire to be directed by the wisdom which cometh from above, we finally concluded to make an overture to that effect, and to write out a full view of our sentiments, wishes, and determination on that subject. We did so—some eight or ten pages of large dimensions, exhibiting our remonstrance against all human creeds as bonds of union, or communion, among Christian churches, and expressing a willingness, on certain conditions, to cooperate or to unite with that Association; provided only, and always, that we should be allowed to preach and teach whatever we learned from the Holy Scriptures, regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom. A copy of this document, we regret to say, was not preserved; and when solicited from the Clerk of the Association, was refused.

The proposition was discussed at the Association; and, after much debate, was decided by a considerable majority in favour of our being received. Thus a union was formed. But the party opposed, though small, began early to work, and continued with a perseverance worthy of a better cause. There was an Elder Pritchard, of Cross Creek, Virginia; an Elder Brownfield, of Uniontown, Fayette Co., Pennsylvania; an Elder Stone, of Ohio, and his son, Elder Stone, of the Monongahela region, that seemed to have confederated to oppose our influence. But they, for three years, could do nothing. We boldly argued for the Bible, for the New Testament Christianity, vex, harass, or discompose whom it might. We felt the strength of our cause of reform on every indication of opposition, and constantly grew in favour with the people. Things passed along without any very prominent interest for some two or three years.

At the close of 1815 and the beginning of 1816, the town of Wellsburg, the capital of our county, had not a meeting house of any sort whatever. I had often spoken there in the courthouse, and was favourably heard. A Baptist church, three
miles above, on Cross Creek, under the pastoral care of Elder Pritchard, a Maryland minister, of very high Calvinistic views, was the only Baptist meeting house in the county. We had two or three families in Wellsburg, with some five or six members; and so not only the Baptist cause, but all forms of Christianity in Boone County were very low. I proposed the building of a meeting house in Wellsburg, and volunteered my services for three or four months to raise a portion of the means. To these our few friends in time consented; and, accordingly by our conjoint labours—I raising 1000 dollars by solicitation—the house was reared. But this became the cause of my heterodoxy, and of seven years' persecution. I soon ascertained that Elder Pritchard regarded his little church on Cross Creek, with its little frame building, enough for the Baptists in Wellsburg and Cross Creek also; and that my proposing to build a house in Wellsburg was done with intent to undermine and nullify his influence and church.

I could not at first assent to such a representation. I had, indeed, been repeatedly solicited to speak to his church; but on my second visit, being treated discourteously by Elder Pritchard, I was constrained to believe there was some fleshly principle at work. I never again visited them as a church. Reports of my heterodoxy began to radiate to Uniontown, Monongahela, and Ohio. A coalition was formed. The next Association convened at Cross Creek. On being nominated to preach on the Lord's Day, I was objected to by Elder Pritchard on the ground that I was "living in the neighbourhood, as it were, and that, according to Baptist custom in Maryland, the church at whose house the Association was held always had the privilege of selecting, out of all the members present, any one whom they chose to speak on the Lord's Day; and that custom decreed that those from a distance ought to be heard rather than those in the neighbourhood—such as Brother Campbell—whom the Church could hear at any time." By this objection the Association substituted for my name that of Elder Stone, of Ohio. Thus I was disposed of from the same principle which inhibited the building of a meeting house in Wellsburg—that is, I was too near Cross Creek meeting house, living only ten miles distant.

But Elder Philips, of Peter's Creek, the oldest and best preacher in the Association, as I thought, called on me next morning and insisted on me to preach because of a multitude that had come from a distance, who had deputed him to have the decision reversed, and in whose behalf he spoke to me. I was constrained to refuse, as I would not violate the decision of the Association on the appeal of Elder Pritchard. He went away with much reluctance. Meanwhile, Elder Stone was suddenly taken sick, and Elder Philips came a second time to urge me to yield to their request. I still refused, unless a special and formal request was tendered to me by Elder Pritchard in person. He assured me it would be tendered
me. Accordingly, soon as I appeared on the ground, I was invited and enjoined to preach by the Elder Pritchard himself.

Not having a subject at my command, I asked to speak the second discourse. Elder Cox preceded me. At the impulse of the occasion, I was induced to draw a clear line between the Law and the Gospel, the Old Dispensation and the New, Moses and Christ. This was my theme. No sooner had I got on the way, than Elder Pritchard came up into the tent and called out two or three of the preachers to see a lady suddenly taken sick, and thus created much confusion amidst the audience. I could not understand it. Finally, they got composed, and I preceded. The congregation became much engaged; we all seemed to forget the things around us and went into the merits of the subject. The result was, during the interval (as I learned long afterwards) the over-jealous Elder called a council of the preachers and proposed to them to have me forthwith condemned before the people by a formal declaration from the stand—repudiating my discourse as “Not Baptist Doctrine.” One of the Elders, still living and still a Baptist, said: “Elder Pritchard, I am not yet prepared to say whether it be or be not Bible doctrine; but one thing I can say, were we to make such an annunciation, we would sacrifice ourselves, and not Mr. Campbell.”

Thus originated my SERMON ON THE LAW, republished, a year or two since, in the Millennial Harbinger. It was forced into existence; and the hue and the cry raised against it all over the country obliged me to publish it in print. It was first issued from the press in 1816, and became the theme of much discussion; and by a conspiracy of the Elders already named, it was brought up for trial and condemnation at the next Association at Peter's Creek in 1817. I may, I presume, regard its existence as providential; and although long unwilling to believe it, I must now think that envy, or jealousy, or some fleshly principle, rather than pure zeal for divine truth, instituted the crusade which for seven successive years was carried on against my views as superlatively heterodox and dangerous to the whole community.

Till this time we had laboured much against the Baptists with good effect—so far, at least, as to propitiate a very general hearing and to lay a foundation for, as we conceive, a more evangelical and scriptural dispensation of the gospel amongst them. Till this time, however, we had literally no coadjutors or counsellors without the precincts of our little community, amounting only to some hundred and fifty persons.

Sometime in 1814 or 1815, I have not a very certain recollection of the precise date, a certain Mr. Jones, from England, and a Mr. George Forrester, from Scotland, appeared in Pitts-burg—the former an English Baptist; the latter, rather a Haldanian than a Scotch Baptist. They were both much in advance of the regular Baptists of Bedstone Association, and
I had hoped for assistance from them. But neither of them could found a community in Pittsburg. Elder Jones migrated westwardly, and Mr. Forrester went into secular business. Neither of them, however, had progressed beyond the limits of James Haldane or Andrew Fuller. *

The union with the Baptists gave the Campbells a much wider opportunity for disseminating the principles of the “Declaration and Address.” While this paper did not specifically repudiate either sprinkling for baptism or infant baptism, we have already seen that what it did say necessarily involved practically the new departure which the Church at Brush Run had taken. Speaking where the Scriptures speak and keeping silent where they are silent necessarily involved the repudiation of both sprinkling for baptism and infant baptism. Hence, the church had taken the only logical position that was possible while holding to the teaching of the “Declaration and Address.” Of course the union with the Baptists was not involved; and it may be seriously doubted whether the Brush Run Church acted consistently in this respect. The Baptists were unmistakably a denomination and belonged to the sects of Christendom, as these were understood by the Campbells, and the repudiation of sectarianism was the main contention for which the Brush Run Church really stood; consequently, the action of the church in associating itself denominationally with the Baptists was excusable only on the ground that the petitioners stated definitely and clearly the terms upon which they must be accepted, and these terms involved the liberty to proclaim the principles for which they had been contending.

* Millennial Harbinger, 1848, pp. 345-349.
FOR a time the union with the Baptists seemed to work well. There is no doubt about the fact that at first this union proved advantageous to the Campbellian movement. Among the Baptists there were some liberal-minded preachers and members who heartily sympathised with the Campbells in their earnest plea against sectarianism, and their equally earnest plea for reformation, and these gave the Brush Run Church a hearty welcome into their fellowship. But there were others who looked upon the principles and aims of this Church as inimical to “Baptist usage,” and there were not a few who saw real dangers ahead to the Baptist Zion.

There were certain important points of agreement between the Campbells and the Baptists, but these points were chiefly with respect to the action and subjects of baptism, and the main features of church organisation. But there were also wide differences, and those who opposed the union made the most of these differences from the very beginning. These differences may be summarised as follows:

(1) As regarded the office and work of the Holy Spirit, especially in conversion. By this time Mr. Campbell had completely changed his views with regard to the subject of regeneration, as it was popularly understood by the Baptists. In the union that had been effected, the Brush Run Church refused to be bound by the Philadelphia Confession of Faith as a doctrinal standard. This confession was practically the same as the Westminster Confession, though it was slightly modified in a few respects, so as to fit the Baptist latitude and longitude of America. In short, this confession was intensely Calvinistic. While the Campbells did not propose to make any philosophical views of the Divine Government a test of
religious fellowship, nevertheless, as a working hypothesis, Mr. Campbell regarded the view of regeneration presented by the Philadelphia Confession as altogether unsatisfactory, nor could he reconcile it with the teaching of Paul that “faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God.” The Baptists, however, very generally accepted the doctrine of the Philadelphia Confession, though many of them did not know exactly what it meant, and consequently there was at this particular point considerable antagonism from the very beginning of the union.

(2) For some time before the union Alexander Campbell had held to the notion that there was considerable difference between the Old Testament and the New, in reference to their respective authority upon Christians. He claimed that Christians are not under Moses, but under Christ, and that the Old Covenant has been superseded by the New. In 1812 he wrote to his father, as follows:

How many disciples of Moses are to be found in the professed school of Jesus and how few among the teachers of the New Testament seem to know that Christian ministers are not able ministers of the Old Testament, but of the New. Do they not, like scholars to their teachers, run to Moses to prove forms of worship, ordinances, discipline, and government, in the Christian Church when asked to account for their practice?

To the Baptists, such questions as these seemed to indicate rank heresy, and it is not to be wondered at that some of the Baptists at this time took exceptions to Mr. Campbell's position.

(3) He and the Baptists differed also with respect to the ordination and authority of ministers. While for the sake of order, Mr. Campbell believed in a very simple ordination, at the same time he denied the Baptist view with respect to what this Baptist view carried with it. From the very beginning of his advocacy he repudiated the distinction between what was called “laity” and “clergy.” Indeed, his “Third Epistle of Peter,” which was published in an early number of the Christian Baptist, contains the most fearful flagellation of the clergy that was ever published. In some respects it did the clergy injustice, but as a picture of the clergy, at the time this was written, it may not be a very great exaggeration. In any case, its influence was very considerable, and had
something to do with bringing about the separation from the Baptists which finally took place.

(4) Another difference was in the administration of the Lord's Supper. The Baptist usage was to administer the Supper either monthly or quarterly, and they also practised close communion, but the Brush Run Church made the Supper the principal part of every Lord's Day service. This was a fundamental feature of the new movement, and soon became a powerful factor in holding the little band of Disciples together when they were persecuted by their religious neighbours. It was here that “Baptist usage” again became a potent influence in opposition to the new teaching, and this very fact clearly demonstrated the influence of usage over principles when these two come in conflict.

(5) At this time, Mr. Campbell had begun to look at the meaning of baptism as he had not done since he had landed in the United States. In his debate with Mr. Walker he clearly foreshadowed the doctrine of “Baptism for the remission of sins,” which afterwards became a cardinal feature in his contention. The Baptists held to the view that the sins of the penitent believer are pardoned before his baptism, and that his baptism is simply a door into the Baptist Church and an expression of loyalty to Christ, because his sins are pardoned.

(6) Another charge, that some of the Baptists made at this time, was that the Campbells were practically Unitarians. This charge was grounded chiefly on the fact that Mr. Campbell repudiated as tests of fellowship all speculations concerning the Trinity. He was himself, at this very time and ever afterwards, largely in sympathy with those who call themselves Trinitarians. He also believed and taught the Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, but he preferred to express the relations of the Godhead in Scriptural language rather than in the language of the schools, and he utterly refused to make a test of fellowship of any speculation with respect to the matter. He strongly held to the conviction that whosoever believeth with all his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, believes, so far as faith goes, all that is necessary to becoming a Christian, and is at the same time worthy of fellowship in the Christian Church. All the Baptists, however, were not satisfied
with his position on the subject of the Trinity, and this was made a reason for questioning the wisdom of the union which had taken place. In after years, even Mr. Jeter defended Mr. Campbell from this charge.

(7) The Baptists believed and practised what they called a “Christian experience” before baptism, and as a condition to entrance into the Baptist Church. This “experience” was regarded by Mr. Campbell as wholly unscriptural, for according to Apostolic teaching a hearty confession of faith in Christ as the son of the living God was all that the New Testament required in order to baptism, and that any one who was baptised upon this confession of faith had a right to all the privileges and blessings of the Church of God.

These differences express the chief barriers in the way of the union which had been formed. It is probable that many Baptists did not know at the beginning that these differences actually existed; at least they did not know that they existed to the extent that they did. Looking at the facts as they appear at this day, it is by no means wonderful that it soon began to dawn on the Baptists that they had practically bargained for more than they anticipated in the union which had been formed. However, it is only fair to both parties to say that Mr. Campbell and his friends stipulated for freedom with respect to the very things to which the Baptists afterwards objected. If this stipulation was not in direct terms, it was clearly implied in the statement which was made to the Redstone Association when the Brush Run Church asked for admission.

Notwithstanding these differences and antagonisms the Brush Run Church's relation to the Baptists was, in the main, for a time at least, advantageous to the New Movement. On account of Mr. Campbell's superior ability and education, he was very much in evidence among the Baptists whenever they had need of his help. The Brush Run Church itself was no longer very prominent in view of the wider fellowship into which it had entered. But Alexander Campbell became now very widely known, and he was everywhere hailed as champion of the Baptist faith, notwithstanding there were a few Baptist ministers who were extremely jealous of him, and were constantly on the lookout for an opportunity to destroy his influence.
However, in the main, the current of things ran smoothly at this time, and Mr. Campbell gave himself chiefly to the pursuits of agriculture and itinerating among the Baptist churches.

But the wave of peace in the Baptist Zion did not continue long. In 1816, Mr. Campbell attended the annual meeting of the Redstone Baptist Association, and was unexpectedly asked to address the Association, which he did with his usual earnestness and power. It was at this time he delivered his celebrated Sermon on the Law, which was really the entering wedge of separation between him and the Baptists.

This sermon emphasised what has since become, even among well-informed Baptists, as orthodox as could be desired. But at the time of its delivery the Baptists very generally regarded its teaching as rank heresy. Mr. Campbell's contention was that Christians are not under Moses' law, but under Christ. He further contended that Christ was the “end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth,” that the law was for a special people and for a special age, and for that people and age it was the will of God, but for the people of the whole world and for the Christian age the law of Moses does not meet the case, and consequently Christians are not under the law, except so far as Christ has incorporated the law in His own teaching.

At the present day it seems somewhat strange that any one could have ever imagined that Mr. Campbell's position was heterodox. It seems to the average Christian intelligence that Mr. Campbell was proclaiming the very essence of truth itself; and yet it is only fair to the Baptists of 1816 to state that they were in no minority of professing Christians at that time in the interpretation put upon Mr. Campbell's teaching. We must remember that most of the religious denominations in Western Pennsylvania and Western Virginia were at that time dominated by a clergy of little, or no, education, and this clergy were themselves governed by traditions, rather than by an appeal to the Word of God. Many of these were good men, but they were extremely narrow in their views of the Christian religion, and were, upon the whole, legalists of the kind that would “kill a cat on Monday for killing a rat on Sunday.” Of course, Mr. Campbell's
broad, Scriptural views, with respect to the Old Covenant and the New, could not do otherwise than shock the religious convictions of these apostles of religious bigotry. The consequence was that his enemies in the Redstone Association made this an occasion for renewed hostility to him and the Church which had been admitted into the Association.

Finally a plan was made by these enemies to exclude him from the Association in 1823. A rule was adopted as to the reception of the congregations into the Association, provided that all the congregations which had been “constitutionally” admitted should be permitted to continue their connection. The design of this rule was not seen at the time of its adoption, but it soon leaked out that Mr. Campbell's enemies had a man for moderator who intended to apply the rule to exclude all the congregation which had come in with the Campbells.

The plan was this: The Constitution of the Redstone Association required a recognition of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith; but these had been admitted under a special protest against all the confessions of faith; therefore the moderator would rule that they had not been “constitutionally” received, and must be excluded from any further connection with that body. Alexander Campbell, having heard of the course that was to be taken, immediately proposed to the Brush Run Church to give him and others letters of honourable dismissal from the Brush Run Church. This was done, and Mr. Campbell with all the other members, who had been dismissed from the Brush Run Church, proceeded to form a church in Wellsburg, Virginia, now West Virginia. In the meantime, this Wellsburg Church applied for admission into the Mahoning Association, in Ohio, and was accordingly accepted. When, therefore, the Redstone Association had its meeting, in which Mr. Campbell and others were to be excluded from its fellowship, the leaders of the movement against Mr. Campbell were deeply chagrined when they found their bird had flown, as he was no longer a member of their Association, therefore not under their jurisdiction. The following statement of the faith of the Wellsburg Church was presented to the Mahoning Association:
We have agreed to walk together in obedience to the authority and institution of our Lord and King, as exposed in the form of sound words delivered unto us by the apostles, evangelists, and prophets, of the Saviour, and recorded in the Holy Scriptures of the volume called the New Testament. Our views of this volume are briefly these:—We believe that the whole Christian religion is fully and explicitly developed in it, and that nothing is ever to be added thereto, either by any new revelations of the Spirit, or by any doctrines or commandments of men; but that it is, as presented to us, perfectly adapted to all the wise and holy ends of its all-wise and benevolent Author.

From this volume, with the Old Testament Scripture, which we also receive as of divine inspiration and authority, we learn everything necessary to be known of God, his works of creation, providence and redemption; and considering the Old Testament as containing the Jew's religion as fully as the New contains the Christian, we avail ourselves of both as containing everything profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and instruction in righteousness, to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work. But we adhere to the New, as containing the whole Christian religion. The New teaches us—and we solemnly declare our belief of it—that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, the Saviour, that was to come into the world; that died for our sins, was buried, and rose again on the third day from the dead, and ascended to the right hand of the Majesty on high; that after his ascension he sent down the Holy Spirit to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, by giving testimony of the Saviour, and by confirming the word of the apostles by signs, and miracles, and spiritual gifts; that every one that believeth, by means of the demonstration of the Holy Spirit and the power of God, is born of God, and overcometh the world, and hath eternal life abiding in him; that such persons, so born of the Spirit, are to receive the washing of water as well as the renewal of the Holy Spirit in order to admission into the Church of the living God.

And that such being the natural darkness and enmity of the children of men, and their hearts so alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, and by their wicked works, none can enter into this kingdom of heaven but in consequence of the regeneration or renewal of the Holy Spirit. For it is now, as it ever was, that only to as many as received Him, who are born not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, but of God, does He give power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in His name. For we are born again not of corruptible seed, but by the incorruptible seed of the word of God, which abideth forever.

Our views of the church of God are also derived from the same source, and from it we are taught that it is a society of those who have believed the record that God gave of His Son,
that this record is their bond of union; that after a public profession of this faith, and immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they are to be received and acknowledged as brethren for whom Christ died. That such a society has a right to appoint its own bishops and deacons, and to do all and everything belonging to a church of Christ, independent of any authority under heaven. *

It will be seen that this document makes the very discrimination between Jews and Christians, and also portions of the Bible which was mainly the ground of allegation against Mr. Campbell with reference to his "Sermon on the Law." It is also characterised by several other statements, quite in harmony with the principles which had been enunciated in all Mr. Campbell had said or written before this time. Nevertheless, he was cordially received, and after a time this Association abandoned its creedal statements and agreed to take the Word of God as its Rule of Faith and Practice, the whole body of Baptists practically adopting Mr. Campbell's principles and aims.

Before this union with the Mahoning Association, Mr. Campbell had a memorable debate with Rev. John Walker, a minister of the Secession Presbyterian Church, held at Mount Pleasant, Ohio, in the year 1820. This debate was attended by a great concourse of people and created much local interest. In the year 1822 he held another debate with Rev. William McCalla, on Christian Baptism. This was held in Washington, Mason County, Kentucky. As these two debates were published, they enabled Mr. Campbell to disseminate very widely the views which he entertained on the whole subject of baptism, and incidentally on many other matters connected with the Christian religion.

It is proper to state that, at first, Mr. Campbell was opposed to oral debates, but after these two experiments he became satisfied that this was a most excellent way to propagate the views which he held. But, however this may have been, his debates gave him very considerable notoriety. His name was now prominent in all the churches, both Baptist and Pedo-Baptist, within the regions where the debates were held, and after their publication, these debates were circulated far and wide, and did much to give Mr. Campbell the prominence which he

* "History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve," by Hayden.
now had as a religious teacher, especially throughout Kentucky, Ohio, and the middle West.

In 1823, he became the publisher of the *Christian Baptist*, which was continued for seven successive years. This periodical became a most potent factor in the advocacy of the cause for which he was contending. As he still regarded himself a member of the Baptist Church, he named his periodical “The CHRISTIAN BAPTIST,” but in its columns were to be found some unsparing criticisms upon the Baptists themselves, as well as other religious denominations. Indeed, in these days he was practically a free lance, and did not hesitate to attack any knight of sectarianism, no matter how strongly fortified he seemed to be. This fearlessness of Mr. Campbell, his sublime courage in dealing with his adversaries, compelled admiration, even where his course of action may not have been approved. Some of his articles in the *Christian Baptist* are unequalled in strength by anything that was ever written before or since, and there is no doubt about the influence of these articles upon the religious convictions of the people during the years now under consideration. That Mr. Campbell himself was deeply conscious of the need of such a periodical is proved by the following extracts from the preface of the first number:

No man can reasonably claim the attention of the public, unless he is fully persuaded that he has something of sufficient importance to offer. When so many writers are daily addressing the religious community it may perhaps be demanded why another should solicit a reading? When so many religious papers are daily issuing from the press, why add another to the number? To these and similar queries it may be answered —that, of all the periodical religious papers of this day, with which we have any acquaintance, but a few are of an independent character. They are generally devoted to the interest of some one or other of the religious sects which diversify the devout community; so much so, at least, that, being under control of the leading members of the respective sects, under whose auspices they exist, and to whose advancement they are destined, they are commonly enlisted in the support of such views and measures as are approbated by the leaders of each sect. And such must every sectarian paper be. It is a rarity seldom to be witnessed to see a person boldly opposing either the doctrinal errors or the unscriptural measures of a people with whom he has identified himself, and to whom he looks for approbation and support. If such a person appears in any party, he soon falls under the frowns of those who
either think themselves wiser than the reprover, or would wish so to appear. Hence it usually happens that such a character must lay his hand upon his mouth, or embrace the privilege of walking out of doors. Although this has usually been the case, we would hope that it would not always continue so to be. If this, however, had not usually happened, we would have had no Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c. If the party from which these sects sprang had received the admonitions and attended to the remonstrances of these bold and zealous men who first began to reprove and testify against it for alleged errors and evils existing in it, no separation would have taken place. Had the well-meant remonstrances of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, been acknowledged and received by the sects to which they belonged, the mother would have been reformed, and the children would have lived under the same roof with her. But she would not. They were driven out of doors, and were compelled either to build a house for themselves or to lodge in the open air. As it has happened to those called teachers of religion, so it has happened to religious papers. Hence it is generally presumed that a paper will soon fall into disrepute if it dare to oppose the views or practices of the leaders of the people addressed. Editors generally, too sensible of this, are very cautious of what they publish. Some of them are very conscientiously attentive to avoid giving offence; insomuch, that when an article is presented for insertion, the first objection to it sometimes is, “The people will not like this, and you know a man must please his customers.” All this may do very well when a writer proposes to please his readers, or when he pledges himself to support the tenets or practices of any people. But when the exhibition of truth and righteousness is proposed, neither the passions nor prejudices of men—neither the reputation nor pecuniary interest of the writer should be consulted.

To this course we have heard it objected, that, “should a writer on religious subjects assert the truth, oppose error, and reprove unrighteousness, with Christian fidelity, regardless of pleasing or displeasing men, he might expect to starve to death if he seek his living thereby, or to be imprisoned and perhaps beheaded as John the Baptist was, should circumstances permit.” We shall not, in the meantime, oppose or assert the truth of this objection. We shall submit the principle to the test of experience, and practically prove its truth or falsehood.

It is probable that the Christian Baptist was the first religious periodical, published in this country, that aimed to be wholly unsectarian, and free to say whatever the editor conceived to be the truth. He himself evidently was not entirely persuaded that such a periodical would be supported, but Alexander Campbell would never stop
to consider what might be the result of any advocacy of his. The only question that concerned
him was what was his duty in the case. He always left the consequence with Him who sees
the end from the beginning. This is what he says about that matter:

We now commence a periodical paper pledged to no religious sect in Christendom, the
express and avowed object of which is the eviction of truth and the exposure of error, as
stated in the Prospectus. We expect to prove whether a paper perfectly independent, free
from any controlling jurisdiction except the Bible, will be read; or, whether it will be blasted
by the poisonous breath of sectarian zeal and of an aspiring priesthood. As far as respects
ourselves, we have long since afforded such evidence as would be admitted in most cases, of
the disinterested nature of our efforts to propagate truth, in having always declined every
pecuniary inducement that was offered, or that could have been expected, in adopting a
course of public instruction suited to the times, the taste and the prejudices of men. Of this an
apostle once boasted, that he had deprived his enemies of an occasion to say that he had
made a gain of them. Yea, he affirms that, “as the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop
me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia.” But, adds he, “what I do, I will do that I may
cut off occasion from them that desire occasion.” So say we.

He evidently did not wish to give offence to any of the religious parties by which he was
surrounded, much less to the Baptists, with whom he was at this time associated. Nevertheless, he claimed the right to criticise them, as well as others, whenever and wherever they seemed to go away from the Divine Standard. And this he did not fail to do ever afterwards, and in one article, published in the Christian Baptist, he distinctly states that he
would prefer to be ecclesiastically associated with pious Pedo-Baptists than with some of the
Baptists with whom he was acquainted. While he always had a sincere affection for the
fidelity of the Baptists with respect to the subject and action of baptism, he nevertheless was
often mortified at their narrow sectarian spirit, and he did not hesitate to say so. But here is
what he says about the attitude he desired to occupy with respect to denominations:

It is very far from our design to give any just ground of offence to any, the weakest of the
disciples of Christ, nor to those who make no pretensions to the Christian name; yet we
are assured that no man ever yet became an advocate of that faith which cost the lives of so many of the friends and advocates of it, that did not give offence to some. We are also assured that in speaking plainly and accordant to fact, of many things of high esteem at present, we will give offence. In all such cases we esteem the reasoning of Peter unanswerable. It is better to hearken unto God, in his word, than to men, and to please him than all the world beside. There is another difficulty of which we are aware, that as some objects are manifestly good, and the means attempted for their accomplishment manifestly evil, speaking against the means employed we may be sometimes understood as opposing the object abstractly, especially by those who do not wish to understand, but rather to misrepresent. For instance—that the conversion of the heathen to the Christian religion is an object manifestly good all Christians will acknowledge; yet every one acquainted with the history of the means employed, and of the success attendant on the means, must know that these means have not been blessed; and every intelligent Christian must know that many of the means employed have been manifestly evil. Besides, to convert the heathen to the popular Christianity of these times would be an object of no great consequence, as the popular Christians themselves, for the most part, require to be converted to the Christianity of the New Testament. We have only one request to make of our readers —and that is an impartial and patient hearing; for which we shall make them one promise, viz., that we shall neither approve nor censure anything without the clearest and most satisfactory evidence from reason and revelation.

About this time the centre of the movement had changed from Pennsylvania and Virginia to Ohio and Kentucky. The union with the Mahoning Association gave the Campbells a wider influence, especially among the Baptists. The Creed of the Association was as follows:

1. Three persons in the Godhead—The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. I. John v: 7.

2. Eternal and personal election to holiness, and the adoption of children by Jesus Christ the Redeemer. Eph. i: 4, 5.


4. The depravity of all mankind, in all the faculties of the soul, the understanding, will, and affections. Col. i: 18; Acts xxvi: 18; Eph. iv: 18, 23; John v: 40; Rom. viii: 7.

5. Particular redemption by the blood of Jesus Christ. Rom. v: 9; Isa. xxxv: 10; John vi: 37, 39.

6. Pardon of all sin through the merits of Christ's blood to all true believers. I. John i: 7; Col. i: 14; Acts x: 43.
7. Free justification by the righteousness of Christ imputed to all true believers. Jer. xxxiii: 6; I. Cor. i: 30; Rom. ix: 5, 18, 19.


9. The perseverance of the saints in grace, by the power of God unto eternal life. John x: 27, 28, 29; Col. iii: 3, 9; John x:29.

10. Water baptism, by immersion of the whole body of the party, so as to be buried with Christ by baptism; and not by sprinkling or pouring, as the manner of some is. Mark i: 9, 10; John iii: 23; Acts viii: 38, 39; Rom. vi: 4; Col. ii: 12; Heb. x:22.

11. The subjects of baptism: those who repent of their sins and believe in Christ, and openly confess faith in the Son of God. Matt, iii: 8; Acts viii: 37; x: 47.

12. The everlasting punishment of the finally impenitent in as unlimited sense as the happiness of the righteous. Matt, xxv: 4146; Mark iii: 29; Rev. xiv: 11.

13. We believe that the first day of the week is Lord's Day, and that it ought to be held sacred to the memory of Christ's glorious resurrection, and devoted in a special manner to the duties of religion.

Finally, we believe the Holy Scriptures to be the only and certain rules of faith and practice.

While at this time the leadership of the movement had been transferred to his son Alexander, Thomas Campbell was by no means inactive during the years preceding the issuance of the Christian Baptist; and as it is important to indicate some of the facts with which he was intimately associated, during the interval between the issuance of the “Declaration and Address” and what followed in the next decade, it is thought well to give the facts of this history in the language of the son, who wrote the life of his father; and although there is a slight repetition in it of matters already considered, it is believed that the following liberal extract is important just here, as the facts are narrated by Alexander Campbell himself, and he is entitled to be heard in so important a case:

Having now for some three years sought, and laboured for congenial Christian society in the Southwest without finding it, Father Campbell again determined to seek such society elsewhere. About this time his son Alexander, who was engaged in teaching a classical seminary on Buffalo Creek, Brooke County, Virginia, expressed to his father, by letter, his desire that he would return to Western Virginia and assist him in his educational labours where he could also enjoy that
Christian society which he had failed to find in the West. Accordingly in the Autumn of 1819, he removed his family to Washington County, Pennsylvania, the former field of his evangelical labours, within a few miles of his son's residence, and in the vicinity of one of the first two congregations of the current reformation which he had planted some ten years previously. In connection with his duties as assistant in the classical department of Buffalo Seminary, he resumed the pastoral care of the Brush Run congregation, in the vicinity of which he now resided.

After an absence of some ten years, Father Campbell found, upon his return to Washington County, that but little effort had been made to advance the cause of that religious reformation which he had inaugurated in the year 1810, upon the basis of his “Declaration and Address” before the Washington Christian Association.

Besides the two congregations which he had constituted in 1810, but some four congregations had been added. Of these, two had been formed in Brooke County, Virginia, one in Harrison County, Ohio, and one in Guernsey County, Ohio, so that at the beginning of the year 1820 their numerical strength in all could not much have exceeded two hundred members. The two congregations in Brooke County were established chiefly by the ministerial labours of his son Alexander Campbell, who, about the year 1816, visited the cities of Philadelphia and New York, in the character of a Baptist minister, to raise funds for the erection of a church edifice in the town of Wellsburgh. The other congregation was organised, and, for some time, met in his own house. Prior to the formation of these churches, Father Campbell and his son Alexander, during the years of 1811, 1812, 1813, and 1814, had been occasionally making preaching excursions in the counties of Jefferson, Belmont, and Harrison, Ohio; and up into Western Pennsylvania, as far as the foot of the Laurel Ridge, into the counties of Westmoreland and Fayette. In those days meeting houses were but few in those sections of the country, and, therefore, their addresses to the people were mostly delivered in their barns and forests, where often vast crowds assembled to hear the word. Much of the good seed of the word was, during this period, thus sown broadcast among the people. The two congregations of Harrison and Guernsey Counties were a portion of the fruit of their labours in that region. They found also many excellent brethren in the above named counties of Pennsylvania, in connection with the Baptists. And about the year 1815 a union of these six congregations upon the inspired word alone, was proposed and effected between them and the Baptists during one of the sessions of the Redstone Baptist Association in Western Pennsylvania.

The union on principle was, however, neither so cordial nor so general as could have been desired. Not a few of the Baptists of that Association were yet enslaved to the authority
of creeds and Church standards of orthodoxy. The disaffection, however, was much more among the preachers than the people. Most of the latter, indeed, gladly heard the word; while not a few of the former manifested not a little of the leaven of jealousy and envy toward those who were eloquent and mighty in the defence and advocacy of the Divine word alone as the proper standard of the Christian Church in all matters of faith, doctrine, and practice.

This disaffection was not a little aggravated by a discourse delivered before this Association at its next session after the union. Alexander Campbell was appointed to deliver the opening discourse of said session, in 1816. This discourse known now as his Sermon on the Law gave great offence to a number of their preachers. Measured by their standard, the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, it was anything but orthodox—wholly inconsistent with their preconceived notions both of the Law and the Gospel. As this sermon has since been given to the readers of the *Millennial Harbinger*, we shall not notice the line of argument adopted by the speaker to show that Christians are not under the law of Moses; or, that we are convinced or convicted of sin, converted and saved by the Gospel, and thereby furnished for all good works, without the need of a legal religion, primarily and exclusively instituted for the natural seed of Abraham, and which never did, nor never could, justify any one who worshipped under it. This view of the law gave great offence to some two or three of the preachers; who, however, never attempted to meet in fair and open discourse the merits of the argument. But to men aspiring to clerical pre-eminence, the thought or feeling of defeat could not be anything other than mortifying. And who can set bounds to the hostile attacks of mortified pride and envy? Messrs. Brownfield, Fry, and a few other malcontents, were unwearied in their opposition to Father Campbell and son, because of their uncompromising opposition to the idol of that faction, of which these men were the leaders.

Year after year, before this Association, they were indicted by a self-constituted ecclesiastical court, on the charge of heterodoxy, and made to answer to the indictment. Contrary to all righteous law, they were repeatedly placed in jeopardy for the same offence, the accused having shown in the previous trial that the charge of heresy, on the ground of rejecting the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, was a *non sequitur*, and accordingly had been acquitted by the jurors; but as the jurors in the case were not unanimous, this self-constituted court demanded another trial. In a subsequent trial their hope seemed to be that if they could not sustain the charge of heresy, they could, in the meantime, tamper with the prejudices and weaknesses of brethren under their influences, and thereby lessen the unanimity of the Churches in favour of the defendants in the case, and increase the chances of success in their ultimate excommunication from the Baptist communion.
At no subsequent trial had they any charge to prefer against the defendants, but by the arts of intimidation and misrepresentation, they now hoped to be able to gain a majority of votes in favour of their excommunication. Father Campbell and son foreseeing their unhallowed purpose, and the iniquitous means in use to accomplish it, withdrew their connection from the Redstone Baptist Association, and united themselves with the Mahoning Baptist Association, which had its session shortly before that of the Redstone Baptist Association, and by this step frustrated the preconcerted measures of the latter for the excommunication of Father Campbell and son, with the six congregations of the same faith and order, from the fellowship and communion of the regular Baptists.

The Redstone Baptist Association having shortly met in convention, what must have been their surprise and mortification upon receiving a letter from Father Campbell and son, in the name of the congregations whom they had formerly represented as a constituent part of that said Association, informing said body that said congregations were to be regarded as no longer in connection with them, they having recently united in Church-fellowship with the Mahoning Baptist Association, on the Western Reserve, with which they now stand in Christian Church-fellowship. The Mahoning Baptist Association, being much more enlightened and liberal in their views of the truth, cordially received Father Campbell, with the other delegates of said Churches who accompanied him, into Church-fellowship upon the New Testament platform alone. This new connection with the Baptists was desirable on several accounts. It gave a ready access to the families and congregations of the most intelligent portion of religious society in that region of country. Most of the ministers and congregations composing this Association had but little respect for the authority of human creeds as terms of Christian Church-fellowship. Not a few of these Churches, in after years, when taught the institutions of the Lord more perfectly, became identified with the Disciples. After the aforesaid union of the Disciples with this Association, its progress was evidently toward a radical reformation in principle and practice. It assumed every year less the form of an ecclesiastical body met to legislate for the churches under its care, and to determine the faith and standing of these churches. As the faith and order of the primitive churches were better understood, the preaching brethren felt more like urging the claims of the Divine love as set forth in the Gospel for the salvation of sinners, than of legislating for the Christian Churches; a work which they now began to see had been fully and infallibly done by those prime ministers of Christ, the apostles, whom he had placed upon twelve thrones to give laws to his people; and that instead of instituting a court of inquiry for ascertaining the standing of churches as to faith or orthodoxy, they could much better employ the time
“in teaching and exhorting the brethren to love and good works,” and “to examine themselves whether they were in the faith.”

Father Campbell during this period, made several preaching tours through that region, and did much in edifying and confirming the brethren in the faith and order of the apostolic churches. After a few years every vestige of a regular Baptist Association had worn off these annual meetings. They were now called “Big Meetings.” Vast crowds assembled daily, for some three or four days. Many congregations, scattered over an area of some one hundred and fifty miles square, were represented at these meetings. The order of exercises was, first to receive the reports of the delegates with respect to the numerical strength and order of Christian worship of each congregation, and the things that were wanting; after which, the exercises consisted of songs of praise, prayer, preaching, teaching, and concluded with a series of exhortations from a few of the elders. During these meetings numbers frequently came forward and confessed the Lord. And such at present is the character of these annual assemblages of the brethren whenever held throughout the States.

The reader cannot but perceive in this brief narrative of the progress of truth, its mighty power when received by men of honest minds, not only to deliver them from the dominion of error, but also to impart to the mind and heart a peace and joy which is peculiarly the fruit of the pure word of the Lord as it was preached and taught by his apostles. Father Campbell, upon every such exhibition of its power, felt himself but the more assured of the correctness of his positions, and was but the more convinced of the futility and folly of preaching any other Gospel, or teaching any other doctrine to save and beautify men than that which was plainly preached and taught by the holy apostles. Nor did any one more sincerely regret than did Father Campbell, the substitution of theological systems and religious philosophies for the living and effectual word of the Gospel, in its gracious and glorious facts, so clearly and forcibly set forth by the preaching and teaching of the holy Twelve. Himself misguided by his religious teachers, he was made to feel the bewildering influence of such religious speculations during the early period of his ministry. Year after year had he spent in reading and critically examining the best and most orthodox works of the age, in search after the truth that saves and beautifies its possessor.

How diverse soever the conclusions of their authors, they all laid their premises upon proof-texts drawn from the Bible; and if the premises were made up of the Scriptures, and the reasoning fair, conclusion must be in accordance with Divine Truth. And, hence, every religious system thus based upon the Bible, was a proper foundation for the true Church of Christ. But Father Campbell finally came to another logical conclusion, that if Scriptural deductions were the proper
material for the foundation of the Christian Church, then the existence of sectional Churches is all right, they being all Scriptural. This was to him indeed a startling conclusion. But this conclusion was inadmissible; it proved too much; it would justify divisions in the Christian Church. But the apostles most pointedly condemn all such divisions as schisms in the spiritual body of Christ, and the founders of them as carnal men, who have not the spirit of Christ; he concluded, therefore, that there must be some flaw in the premises. He therefore re-examined the premises, and asked the question: Are deductions from isolated passages of the Holy Scriptures the contextual and proper meaning of those passages? They cannot be; for all heresies have been thus originated and propagated. The true contextual meaning of the passage has been overlooked or disregarded and perverted, so as to teach error rather than the truth taught by the context. Again, it was asked: Are deductions fair and legitimate though they be the material which the Head of the Church has made the foundation of his Church? A careful and devout reading and study of the holy Scriptures led Father Campbell to a very different conclusion. As there is but one mystical body or Church of Christ, it must have its own appropriate foundation. Father Campbell, in quest of this foundation, abandoned as hopeless all those theological works which had been for years his daily study in connection with the Bible. He now reads and examines the Bible alone to the rejection of all uninspired writings. His search ere long is crowned with success. A person, yes, a person, and not a theory or system of doctrine, is the one and only true foundation. Father Campbell, in quest of this foundation, abandoned as hopeless all those theological works which had been for years his daily study in connection with the Bible. He now reads and examines the Bible alone to the rejection of all uninspired writings. His search ere long is crowned with success. A person, yes, a person, and not a theory or system of doctrine, is the one and only true foundation of that Church against which neither earth nor Hades shall prevail. But it was from no scriptural inference that he had arrived at this great truth. The question was forever settled by a plain and positive declaration: “Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God,” said Peter. “Blessed art thou, Peter, for upon this rock I will build my Church,” said Christ. Paul, a wise master-builder, like Peter, also laid the foundation. Other foundation, said he, can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus the Christ. For the confirmation, peace, and joy of believers, Father Campbell was wont to represent the members of Christ's body as the living stones of a great spiritual temple, all rejoicing in one spirit, having the one hope, the one Lord, the one faith, the one baptism, and the one God and Father of all.

With the discovery of this grand fundamental truth of the Christian Church and institution, Father Campbell closed forever his readings of religious controversies. The Bible thenceforth, with him, was the book to which he bowed with a most devout and reverential spirit, and most heartily vowed exclusive allegiance to the teachings of Moses and Christ, of apostles and prophets. *

*“Life of Thomas Campbell,” by Alexander Campbell.
In August, 1826, a meeting of the Mahoning Baptist Association was held at Canfield, Ohio, and among the ministers in attendance were Thomas Campbell and Alexander Campbell, A. Bentley, Walter Scott, Sidney Rigdon, Thomas Miller, William West, Corbley Martin, and Jacob Osborne. This was a memorable meeting, and especially the meeting on Sunday, which was held in the Congregational meeting-house in the centre of the town. The following extract gives a vivid description of what took place:

At a very early hour it was filled and many around it endeavoured to hear. Rigdon and Scott preached in the morning. Some having heard the eloquent preacher from Pitts-burg, left the meeting, supposing they had heard Mr. Campbell, whose name had already become famous. Mr. Campbell followed after a brief recess. He founded his discourse on Malachi iv:2: “Unto you that fear my name, shall the Son of righteousness arise with healings in his wings.” He announced his theme, “The Progress of Revealed Light.” His discourse abounded in thoughts so fresh, he made his theme so luminous and instructive that the most rapt attention followed him throughout the delivery.

Seizing on the evident analogy between light and knowledge, and using the former, as the Scripture everywhere does, as a metaphor for the latter, the eloquent preacher exhibited the gradual and progressive unfolding of divine revelation under four successive periods of development, which he characterised as, 1st. The Starlight Age; 2d. The Moonlight Age; 3d. The Twilight Age; 4th. The Sunlight Age; and employed these respectively to explain, 1st, The Patriarchal; 2d, The Jewish Dispensation; 3d, The Ministry of John the Baptist, with the personal ministry of the Lord on the earth; and 4th, The full glory of the perfect system of salvation under the apostles when the Holy Spirit was poured out on them, after the ascension and coronation of Jesus as Lord of all. Under his remarks, and applications of the theme, the whole Bible became luminous with a light it never before seemed to possess. The scope of the whole book appeared clear and intelligible; its parts were so shown to be in harmony with each other, and with the whole, that the exhibition of the subject seemed little else to many than a new revelation, like a “second sun risen on midnoon,” shedding a flood of light on a book hitherto looked upon as dark and mysterious. The style of the preacher was plain, common-sense, manly. His argumentation was sweeping, powerful, and convincing; and above all, and better, his manner of preaching formed so pleasing and instructive a contrast with the customary style of taking a text merely or of sermonising in which the mystery prevailed and the “dark-
“The day of light, so illustrious in its beginning, became cloudy. The Papacy arose and darkened the heavens for a long period, obscuring the brightness of the risen glory of the Sun of righteousness so that men grouped in darkness. By the reformation of the 17th century that dark cloud was broken in fragments; heavens of gospel light are still obscured by many clouds—the sects of various names—the promise is that ‘at evening time it shall be light.’ The primitive gospel, in its effulgence and power, is yet to shine out in its original splendour to regenerate the world.”

That discourse was never forgotten. It never will be. It formed an era in respect to the gospel on the Western Reserve. The shell of sect-sermons was broken. The Bible was a new book; its meaning could be comprehended; its language could be understood.

Alexander Campbell’s visits to the Western Reserve included attendance at the ministers’ meetings, as well as the annual gatherings of the Association, and his presence at all these assembles gave a new impetus to the movement, which began to spread in all directions throughout Northern and Eastern Ohio, as well as in some parts of the south and west.

* “History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve.”
CHAPTER V

WALTER SCOTT AND THE NEW
DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM

IN August, 1827, the Mahoning Association met at New Lisbon, Ohio. Walter Scott, who was then preaching at Steubenville, Ohio, was appointed Evangelist. On the way to this meeting, Alexander Campbell stopped at Scott's home and asked him to attend the meeting. Scott rather hesitated, but finally threw himself into the work with all the zeal which he possessed.

He was born October 31, 1796, in Dumfriesshire, Scotland, and was educated at the University of Edinburgh. He came to America in 1818, and at first settled in Pitts-burg. He there met Mr. Forrester, who had been closely associated with the Campbells from the very beginning of the movement and was thoroughly in sympathy with their leading contention. It was not long until Mr. Scott became deeply interested, and when Mr. Campbell met him on his way to the meeting of the Mahoning Association at New Lisbon, Scott was already much inclined to give himself wholly to the new movement. Both in his personality, education, and remarkable gifts as a speaker, he was just the man for the crisis which had arisen. As soon as he had a clear comprehension of the Gospel, as it was now presented to him, he became an enthusiastic advocate of it. To use the language of Professor C. L. Loos, who heard him frequently, “he was filled with an all-consuming passion to preach to men. It was to him the restored light of heaven that now shone forth in full radiance after ages of observation. His speech was like fire. His setting forth of the newly found truth was wondrously complete, exact, and clear. The people saw the Scriptural doctrine, such was the logical accuracy and symmetry of his arguments, so vivid was his presentation of it. It broke upon the people like a new revelation from heaven. The New Testament—the whole Bible—now became greatly intelligible to them.”
The present writer knew him intimately for several years, and he bears willing testimony to the truth of this characterisation. Scott was a marvel as a speaker when he was at his best, and not the least characteristic was his great simplicity. He was child-like in this respect. His discourses were as luminous as night itself, and his earnestness as warm as heat itself. He has been rightly classed with Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, and Robert Richardson as constituting one of the Big Four of the reformation in its early days. Barton W. Stone belonged to another group, viz., Stone, John Smith, John Rogers, and John T. Johnson.

In his debates with Mr. Walker and McCalla, Alexander Campbell had used two arguments against infant baptism which were entirely new to the Baptists at that day. One was that the arguments usually made by the Pedo-Baptists on the ground that the Old and New Covenants are practically identical, is entirely faulty, since the Old Covenant has been abrogated by the New. This identity of the Covenants, or the Testaments, as they are usually called, was the very foundation of Mr. Walker's contention; and it was in the complete annihilation of this foundation that Alexander Campbell's victory over Walker was so apparent. Nevertheless, the irony of this whole matter consisted in the fact that Mr. Campbell's position on this subject was the very ground of the opposition to him in the Redstone Baptist Association. His debate with Mr. Walker, in its principle, was only a repetition of his great sermon on the Law which had given such offence to some of the leaders of the Bedstone Association in 1816. But when Mr. Campbell gained his signal victory over Walker many of the Baptists began to re-examine the relation of the Covenants, and not a few came over to Mr. Campbell's position.

Another new argument was based upon the design of baptism. In his debate with Mr. Walker, he foreshadowed his view on this subject, but it did not take very definite form until his debate with Mr. McCalla. In the latter debate, he said, “the water of baptism, then, formally washes away our sins. The blood of Christ really washes away our sins. Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed. Yet he had no solemn pledge of the fact, no formal acquittal, no formal purgation
of his sins, until he washed them away in the waters of baptism.”

While this was not a very clear statement of the case, from a Scriptural point of view, it evidently shows that Mr. Campbell was attaching much more importance to baptism at this time than was usually done by the Baptists, their position being that baptism has nothing whatever to do with remission of sins, but is a mere expression of loyalty to Christ after the penitent believer's sins are pardoned. Mr. Campbell's position meant more than this, though it did not mean as much as it did when he came to see a little further into the subject. A Baptist preacher once quoted the above quotation to John Smith, of Kentucky, in proof that Mr. Campbell at one time said what was not far from the truth as regards the design of baptism, and that his position was very different from what he afterwards held. Mr. Smith replied by saying that “Mr. Campbell said what he did in the McCalla debate while he was a Baptist, but when he left the Baptists he had more sense.”

It was Walter Scott who gave emphasis to the doctrine of “baptism for the remission of sins.” * The scene of his first proclamation of that great truth was at New Lisbon, Columbiana County, Ohio. The Baptist Church at that place had become acquainted with Scott, during the meeting of the Mahoning Association, and consequently were delighted when he made an appointment to preach a series of discourses in their Church on the “Ancient Gospel.” Scott was a most eloquent speaker, and the people of the community were equally pleased that they were to

* “Mr. Scott's biographer, Wm. Baxter, ascribes the authorship of the new doctrine of “Baptism for the remission of Sins” to Mr. Scott. This is not correct. Mr. Campbell had talked this matter over with Mr. Scott some time before the New Lisbon meeting; Mr. Scott finally acquiescing in Mr. Campbell's view. It is true that Mr. Scott was the first to preach baptism as one of the conditions of forgiveness, but he did not discover this important truth. Mr. Campbell came to adopt it somewhat gradually, but before Scott preached it, Mr. Campbell had fully accepted the view which has ever since been held by the Disciples. As a matter of fact, neither Mr. Campbell nor Mr. Scott claimed to have discovered it. They both claimed that it was as old as Christianity itself, and Mr. Campbell subsequently was at pains to show that it was the view held by the oldest theologians of all ages of the Christian Church. Campbell and Scott simply claimed that they uncovered this truth and gave it practical significance at a time when it was almost buried under the rubbish of traditions. Neither Mr. Campbell nor any of his associates claimed to have discovered anything; all any one claimed was a return to the Apostolic faith and practice.
have the privilege of hearing a man so distinguished for his pulpit power.

When Scott arrived on Sunday to fill his appointment, every seat in the building was literally crowded, and soon even standing room was at a premium. Scott was just the man to be moved to the highest point of his power by such an occasion. The following vivid description of this meeting is worth quoting:

His theme was the confession of Peter, Matt, xvi: 16: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” and the promise which grew out of it, that he should have entrusted to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The declaration of Peter was a theme upon which he had thought for years; it was a fact which he regarded the four gospels as written to establish; to which type and prophecy had pointed in all the ages gone by; which the Heavenly Father had announced when Jesus came up from the waters of Jordan and the Spirit descended and abode upon him, and which was repeated again amid the awful grandeur and solemnity of the transfiguration scene. He then proceeded to show that the foundation truth of Christianity was the divine nature of the Lord Jesus—the central truth around which all the others revolved, and from which they derived their efficacy and importance—and that the belief of it was calculated to produce such love in the heart of him who believed it as would lead him to true obedience to the object of his faith and love. To show how that faith and love were to be manifested, he quoted the language of the great commission, and called attention to the fact that Jesus had taught his apostles “that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” He then led his hearers to Jerusalem on the memorable Pentecost and bade them listen to an authoritative announcement of the law of Christ, now to be made known for the first time, by the same Peter to whom Christ had promised to give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which he represented as meaning the conditions upon which the guilty might find pardon at the hands of the risen, ascended, and glorified Son of God, and enter his kingdom.

After a rapid yet graphic review of Peter's discourse, he pointed out its effect on those that heard him, and bade them mark the inquiry which a deep conviction of the truth they had heard forced from the lips of the heart-pierced multitudes, who, in their agony at the discovery that they had put to death the Son of God, their own long-expected Messiah, “cried out, Men and brethren, what shall we do?” and then, with flashing eye and impassioned manner, as if he fully realised that he was but re-echoing the words of one who spake as the Spirit gave him utterance, he gave the reply, “Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for
the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” He then, with great force and power, made his application; he insisted that the conditions were unchanged, that the Word of God meant what it said, and that to receive and obey it was to obey God and to imitate the example of those who, under the preaching of the apostles, gladly accepted the gospel message. His discourse was long, but his hearers marked not the flight of time; the Baptists forgot, in admiration of its scriptural beauty and simplicity, that it was contrary to much in their own teaching and practice; some of them who had been, in a measure, enlightened before, rejoiced in the truth the moment they received it; and to others, who had long been perplexed by the difficulties and contradictions of the discordant views of the day, it was like light to weary travellers long benighted and lost. The man of all others, however, in that community who would most have delighted in and gladly accepted those views, so old and yet so new, was not there, although almost in hearing of the preacher, who, with such eloquence and power, was setting forth the primitive gospel. This was Wm. Amend, a pious, God-fearing man, a member of the Presbyterian Church, and regarded by his neighbours as an “Israelite indeed.” He had for some time entertained the same views as those Mr. Scott was then preaching in that place for the first time, but was not aware that any one agreed with him. He was under the impression that all the churches—his own among the number, had departed from the plain teachings of the Word of God. He had discovered, some time before, that infant baptism was not taught in the Bible, and, consequently, that he was not a baptised man; the mode of baptism seemed also to him to have been changed, and he sought his pastor, and asked to be immersed. He endeavoured to convince him that it was wrong, but finding that he could not be turned from his purpose, he proposed to immerse him privately, lest others of his flock might be unsettled in their minds by his doing so, and closed by saying that baptism was not essential to salvation. Mr. Amend regarded everything that Christ had ordained as being essential, and replied that he should not immerse him at all; that he would wait until he found a man who believed the Gospel, and who could, without any scruple, administer the ordinance as he conceived it to be taught in the New Testament.

He was invited a day or two before to hear Mr. Scott, but knowing nothing of his views, he supposed that he preached much as others did, but agreed to go and hear him. It was near the close of the services when he reached the Baptist Church and joined the crowd at the door, who were unable to get into the house. The first sentence he heard aroused and excited him; it sounded like that gospel which he had read with such interest at home, but never had heard from the pulpit before. He now felt a great anxiety to see the man who was
speaking so much like the oracles of God, and pressed through the throng into the house. Mr. Dibble, the clerk of the church, saw him enter, and knowing that he had been seeking and longing to find a man who would preach as the Word of God read, thought within himself, “Had Mr. Amend been here during all those discourse I feel sure he would have found what he has so long sought in vain. I wish the preacher would repeat what he said before he came in.” Greatly to his surprise the preacher did give a brief review of the various points of his discourse, insisting that the Word of God meant what it said, and urging his hearers to trust that Word implicitly. He rehearsed again the Jerusalem scene, called attention to the earnest, anxious cry of the multitude, and the comforting reply of the apostle, “Repent, and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” He invited any one present who believed with all his heart, to yield to the terms proposed in the words of the apostle, and show by a willing obedience his trust in the Lord of life and glory. Mr. Amend pressed his way through the crowd to the preacher and made known his purpose; made a public declaration of his belief in the Lord Jesus Christ and his willingness to obey him, and on the same day, in a beautiful, clear stream which flows on the southern border of the town, in the presence of a great multitude, he was baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.*

The effect of this preaching and the baptism of Mr. Amend were electrical. The whole community was stirred. Mr. Scott continued his labours during the following week and many others, who had been unable to accept the usual teaching upon the subject of conversion, saw for the first time their way into the Kingdom of God. The result was that Scott's name and the new doctrine became practically household words, and from that time forward the great Evangelist continued to give baptism a prominent place in the preaching of the Gospel. He afterwards generalised the whole scheme of redemption under three heads:

1. Evangelical.
2. Transitional.
3. Ecclesiastical.

But at the time just now under consideration, his scheme comprehended the whole subject under seven divisions:

1. It introduced Faith on Evidence. 2. Repentance on Motive. 3. Obedience on Authority. 4. It put the gift of the

Holy Spirit where the Scriptures put it. 5. It restored the creed of our religion to its proper place and eminence above all other things in the gospel. 6. It limited the faith and love of the gospel to a person; not a doctrine or a fact. 7. It delivered from false centres of affection, as well as false centres of faith; for while it held up the Lord Jesus Christ in his divine nature or faith, it also held him up in his offices for affection; for it baptised men for remission of sins by his blood. A doctrine was no longer the centre.*

This style of preaching was at least intelligible to the popular mind. The whole subject of conversion was at this time much obscured by mysticism, abstract operations of the Holy Spirit, and indefiniteness as to the time when and place where the penitent believer could be assured of pardon. Among the Baptists, what was called a “Christian experience” was usually accepted as the evidence of pardon. These “experiences” were sometimes very curious and ludicrous. They nearly always lacked dignity and were, for the most part, wholly without even a Scriptural reference, to say nothing of misapplication of Scripture, even when it was mentioned. The new doctrine, however, had both Scripture and definiteness to recommend it. Whoever read the New Testament with care could not fail to see that there was in many passages a close connection between baptism and remission of sins, and these Scriptures became a powerful instrumentality in the hands of as eloquent a preacher as Mr. Scott was. He quoted these texts with a full assurance of faith, and there was no doubt as to their meaning from his point of view. To the average inquirer his preaching was like a new revelation from Heaven. Hundreds of people declared that they now for the first time could read their titles clear, for the reason that they could quote the Word of God for every step they had taken in accepting the Gospel of Christ.

Of course there were some who railed against the new doctrine. It was called “Salvation by Water,” or “Water Salvation.” With those who were more serious and better informed it was regarded with very great suspicion, because it seemed to verge closely upon the doctrine of “baptismal regeneration.” In view of this fact, not a few of the preachers became alarmed, and began a strong opposition to Scott and his new doctrine of baptism. But

*”Historical Documents,” p. 7.
all the same Scott was really sweeping everything before him. The whole Western Reserve was deeply affected by the new movement. The Mahoning Association practically unanimously came over to the movement, abandoning their articles of faith, and agreeing to take the Word of God as their all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. Mr. Scott's preaching was quite different from the popular preaching in another respect. He insisted that faith is personal, not doctrinal. In short, it was a hearty acceptance of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God. With him it was not so much that the creeds were wrong in this or that respect, but they had nothing to do with the sinner's salvation. He was called upon to look to Christ for this, to believe in Christ with all his heart, and the question of doctrine, if any such question should arise, could be settled after he became a Christian. It was the duty of an evangelist to preach the Gospel, and this comprehended facts, commands, and promises; facts to be believed, commands to be obeyed, and promises to be enjoyed. The facts were all embraced in the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Mr. Scott declared that this Christ is our Prophet, Priest, and King. Our Prophet to teach us, our Priest to intercede for us, and our King to rule over us. The transitional part of Christianity was covered by the conditions of the Gospel, namely faith, repentance, and baptism, the last being the consummating act of the penitent believer in passing from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God; or in other words, baptism is the act by which the penitent believer's state is changed; faith changing the heart, repentance the life, and baptism the state. Perhaps some of these generalisations were not specially insisted upon at the time now under consideration, but these became the watchwords of the movement during its progress after this time.

But Mr. Scott was not only an efficient evangelist; he was also a graceful and effective writer. He became actively associated with Mr. Campbell in the very beginning of the Christian Baptist. Indeed, Mr. Campbell consulted him in making the arrangements for the publication of that periodical, and Mr. Scott became a regular contributor to its pages, usually writing under the pseudonym of “Philip.” Many of the most trenchant articles of that
remarkable magazine were written by Mr. Scott. It was chiefly in these articles that he laid
the foundation for his subsequent mature works, such as the “Messiahship or the Great
Demonstration.” This latter is one of the most remarkable books that were produced during
the lifetime of Mr. Scott. His work on the “Gospel Restored” was of great value to the
Reformation at the time it was issued from the press. It is yet a classic with the Disciples, and
doubtless the young preachers could not do better than to read these works of Mr. Scott. As
the “Gospel Restored” is founded upon a very luminous generalisation, it may be well to
quote from its preface the following paragraph:

In the tenth number of the *Millennial Harbinger*, for 1831, the restoration of the true
gospel is referred to, in the following manner: “Brother Walter Scott, who, in the fall of
1827, arranged the several items of faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, the Holy
Spirit, and eternal life, restored them in this order to the church under the title of the ancient
gospel, and preached it successfully to the world—has written a discourse,” etc. In the
*Evangelist*, for 1832, the following paragraph, of the connection between the above elements
and sin, which they are intended to destroy, occurs: “In regard to sinners and sin, six things
are to be considered—the love of it, the practice of it, the state of it, the guilt of it, the power
of it, and the punishment of it. The first three relate to the sinner; the last three to sin. Now
faith, repentance, and baptism refer to the first three, the love, and practice, and state of sin;
while remission, the Holy Spirit, and the resurrection relate to the last three, the guilt, and
power, and punishment of sin. In other words, brethren, to make us see the beauty and
perfection of the gospel theory as devised by God; faith is to destroy the love of sin,
repentance to destroy the practice of it, baptism the state of it, remission the guilt of it, the
Spirit the power of it, and the resurrection to destroy the punishment of sin; so that the last
enemy, death, will be destroyed.

It will be seen by the foregoing that Mr. Scott made at least three very practical
contributions to the great movement which he had espoused, and whose principles he
advocated with such ability.

(1.) His insistence upon the personal element in the Gospel as a thing to be preached,
rather than doctrines, whether true or false. With him all Gospel preaching centered in Jesus,
the Christ, the Son of the living God.
(2.) His insistence that baptism is the consummating act of the sinner's return to God; that when the sinner believes with all his heart, repents sincerely of his sins, the final act by which he definitely takes his stand on the side of Christ, is baptism; and this makes conversion depend upon the action of the subject, and practically assumes that conversion itself is active, just as the Greek word which expresses it requires it to be, for “epistrepho” is in the active voice. Conversion, therefore, is not something that is done for the sinner, or in the sinner, but something he himself does. He must, therefore, believe for himself, repent for himself, be baptised for himself; the last act consummating the transitional part of his return to God. By dividing the whole of Christianity into the three parts indicated by Mr. Scott, namely, evangelical, transitional, and ecclesiastical, the whole subject took on a new aspect in the popular mind; and Mr. Scott's preaching, as well as that of those associated with him, became well nigh irresistible, not only because of the important matter presented, but also because it was presented with such clearness, force, and enthusiasm.

(3.) Mr. Scott made a very distinct and important contribution to the movement in his differentiating the Church, or the ecclesiastical part of Christianity, from the other two parts, to which attention has already been called. He showed that in this relationship the penitent baptised believer had certain promises made to him which could now be realised and enjoyed. These promises were remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of Eternal Life.

Mr. Scott's work was very influential in shaping the character and giving success to the religious movement with which he had become so enthusiastically identified. When he espoused its cause, he practically burned the bridges and gave himself unreservedly to its advocacy both day and night. In some respects, he was the most scholarly man, excepting the Campbells, who was identified with the movement at this time. But it was as a public speaker that his influence was most felt. His magnetic personality, behind a voice which was matchless in its unique melody, gave him unrivalled power in the pulpit. His earnestness, also, was like a flame of fire. He knew
no such word as fail, and when he was pleading with sinners to accept the Saviour, or with sectarians to abandon their denominational positions, he was practically irresistible.

But not the least element of power was the definite, reasonable, and Scriptural plea which he had to present. His new doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins may have been overworked occasionally, and in the case of a few men who accepted this doctrine, there was doubtless sometimes an imperfect statement of it; so that the opposition to it was not altogether without some foundation in reason. Nevertheless, as it was stated by Scott and advocated by the more intelligent men associated with him, it was a most potent element in evangelisation. The difficulty with the popular doctrine of conversion was mainly in the fact that there was no place in the whole process where the sinner could know definitely that his sins were forgiven. He was taught to rely upon feeling, or what was called “Christian Experience,” and as this was variable, and altogether without Scriptural warrant, it did not bring a satisfactory assurance to those who were seeking salvation. The mourners' bench was substituted for obedience, and the sinner was urged to rely upon emotional states for the evidence of his pardon. Scott's new view of the matter gave the assurance of the Word of God. When the sinner believed in the Lord Jesus Christ with all his heart, confessing Him before men, and turning away from his sins, he was then ready to be baptised, and this baptism was the consummating act on his part of his return to God, and he had the assurance of Scriptural testimony that his sins were pardoned; consequently he was not left in doubt as to his religious state, for if the Word of God is to be believed, then he was undoubtedly forgiven, because he had done what that Word requires in order to forgiveness.

It was not affirmed that no one could obtain forgiveness except through the ordinance of baptism; but it was affirmed that baptism was included in the Divine Plan, and that when the sinner had the privilege of meeting all the conditions of this plan, baptism was the place where and time when he received forgiveness of sins through faith in the name of Christ and through the efficacy of his redeeming blood.
Whatever else may be said of this contention, it certainly had great advantages as an evangelistic method. It had definiteness. It dealt with time and place. It drew a distinct line between the sinner out of Christ and the believer in Christ. The advocates of this view utterly repudiated the popular doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but, at the same time, they advocated an important place for baptism in the evangelistic programme. Instead of baptism being an ordinance of the Church, they insisted that it was an ordinance of the Gospel. It came before the Church, and was one of the conditions of the Gospel ante-ceding Church relationship.

In looking over the whole field of operations, as this field presented itself during Mr. Scott's active evangelistic work, it seems highly probable that his view of the design of baptism had more to do with his great success than perhaps any other thing. In any case, it must be admitted that the new doctrine was very attractive to those who studied the Scriptures, and it is also true that the earnest way in which this doctrine was preached greatly stimulated the study of the Scriptures as they had not been studied before this doctrine was preached.

It was not long until Scott had gathered about him other men who became very influential in carrying on the work in the Western Reserve. Such men as Joseph Gas-ton, John Whitacre, John Secrest, James G. Mitchell, Adamson Bentley, Cyrus Bosworth, John Henry, Marcus Bosworth, Jacob Osborne, the Haydens, and many others too numerous to mention, became active participants in the movement during its early stages, many of whom were second only to Scott in their evangelistic zeal and their intelligent, forcible advocacy of the plea. But it was Walter Scott who brought into the movement the emphatic evangelistic element, and it is perhaps due to him more than to any one else that the movement has always been characterised for its strong note of evangelism. However, it is only fair to state the fact that the Stone movement in Kentucky, which ultimately reached Ohio, and some parts of the Western Reserve, was also characterised by a strong evangelistic tendency. But the Stone movement very largely ignored, or else did not at least emphasise the third important fact in preaching the whole Gospel. From a Scriptural point of view, in order to preach the
whole Gospel, it is necessary to declare first of all that men are sinners, and second, that Jesus is the Saviour of sinners, and third, how this Saviour saves these sinners. The Stone movement dealt very earnestly and intelligently with the first two, but, after all, it left the sinner uncertain as to how the Saviour would save them. This last was the thing that Scott made clear as it had not been made before. It was the added statement in the Gospel message which gave the sinner an assurance that when he had complied with the conditions of the Gospel, he was undoubtedly saved from his sins, and that he had the Word of God to substantiate his contention. It will be seen, therefore, that while the Stone movement was evangelistic in its character, it did not do much more than had been done, in the days that were passed, with respect to a definite Gospel message. It was, therefore, from the Western Reserve, under the influence of Walter Scott that the full evangelistic note of the Reformation rang out. This fact should be accepted as one of the well attested facts connected with the genesis of the Campbellian Reformation.

As a specimen of the nature of the contention with respect to baptism, in the early days of the Reformation in the Western Reserve, the following incident is an example of many others that might be mentioned. At one of A. B. Green's meetings there was a Miss Langworthy among the converts. The Congregational minister became much excited at seeing the people so deluded and led away in error, as he supposed them to be. Mr. Green had taught the converts simply to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour, and to trust honestly to His Gospel Word of Promise, “He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.” The Congregational minister came in the crowd to the meeting, and noting Miss Langworthy's presence, he took the liberty to call her attention to the danger of the error she was embracing. “Why,” she innocently responded, “has not the Lord told us to come and be baptised?” “Oh, I tell you,” said the minister, “it is a most pernicious doctrine, and you are exposing yourself and being damned if you believe it.” “But,” she responded, “the Saviour said that 'he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved,' and now if I believe on Him with all my heart and am baptised, will
He damn me?” This ended the discussion. Meantime, Green did not say a word, perceiving that the young woman in her tears and simplicity was effectually defending the faith. Such incidents only strengthened the cause which was advocated by the Reformers of that period.
CHAPTER VI

SCRIPTURAL MEANING OF BAPTISM

The doctrine of Christian baptism for the remission of sins became such a prominent feature of the reformatory movement that it deserves a separate chapter for a somewhat exhaustive statement with regard to it.

It is probable that in no other respect have the “Reformers,” as they were called in those days, been more shamefully misrepresented. However, it is probable that the misrepresentation, at least in many cases, was unintentional. The new view was so radically different from the general understanding of the matter by religious teachers, at the period under consideration, it is not at all remarkable that many thoroughly conscientious, and even intelligent, people regarded the doctrine of baptism, as presented by the “Reformers,” as essentially the doctrine of “baptismal regeneration.” Every one knows how difficult it is to overcome honest prejudices. It is charitable to believe that very many of those who opposed the new doctrine did so because they thoroughly misunderstood its meaning, and especially as it required of them an entire reconstruction of their views as to the design of baptism. But another reason may be given for the violent opposition which the new doctrine received. Alexander Campbell himself admitted that the early Church made baptism and regeneration equivalent terms, and from a Scriptural point of view this contention was justifiable. The difficulty in the case was mainly in the meaning Mr. Campbell ascribed to regeneration, not to baptism. Regeneration was used in the sense of a process of which baptism was simply the consummating act. But the popular view of regeneration, during the time of the Campbells, was that “Regeneration” is an act of God. It is not simply referring to Him as its giver, and, in that same sense its author, as He is the giver of faith or of repentance.
It is not an act by which argument and persuasion, or by moral power, He induces the sinner to reform. But it is an act of which He is the agent. It is God who regenerates. The soul is regenerated. In this sense the soul is passive in regeneration, which (subjectively considered) is a change wrought in us, not an act performed by us. ... Regeneration is not only an act of God, but also an act of His almighty power. Raising Lazarus from the dead was an act of omnipotence. Nothing intervened between the volition and the effect. The act of quickening was the act of God.” *

It can readily be seen that those who held to this view of regeneration could not admit that baptism had anything to do with it, since it is “wholly an act of God.” But Mr. Campbell's contention was that this doctrine of regeneration was itself unscriptural, and also contrary to the teaching of the Ante-Nicene fathers. However, if regeneration is to be confined simply to a divine act, an implantation of the new life in the sinner by the Holy Spirit, or by God Himself, as Dr. Hodge presents the matter, then Mr. Campbell and his associates did not believe that baptism had anything to do with the question of regeneration. Hence their contention had to do with the word *regeneration* rather than with *baptism*. No one taught more earnestly the importance of faith and repentance, as antecedents of baptism, than Mr. Campbell and those associated with him. His book on baptism is entitled “Christian Baptism, with its Antecedents and Consequents.” In this book Mr. Campbell sets forth, in a very comprehensive manner, his whole view, and the following liberal extract will serve to correct any false impression that may have been entertained with respect to his mature teaching with respect to the matter:

In the evangelical dispensation of justification, it is in some sense connected with seven causes. Paul affirms that a man is justified by *faith*: Rom. v:1; Gal. ii: 16; iii: 24. In the second place, he states that, “we are justified freely by his grace “: Rom. iii: 24; Titus iii: 7. In the third place, on another occasion, he teaches that “we are justified by Christ's blood “: Rom. v: 9. Again, in the fourth place, he says that “we are justified by *the name* of our Lord Jesus, and by *the spirit* of our God “: I. Cor. vi: 11. To the Galatians, in the

* “Systematic Theology,” by Dr. Hodge.
fifth place, he declares, that “we are justified by Christ”: Gal. ii: 16. In the sixth place, Isaiah says, “we are justified by knowledge”: Isa. liii: 11. And James, in the seventh place, says, “we are justified by works”: chap, ii: 21. Thus, by Divine authority, faith is connected as an effect, in some sense, of seven causes, viz. Faith, Grace, the Blood of Christ, the Name of the Lord, Knowledge, Christ, and Works. May it not, then, be asked, “Why do so many select one of these only as essential to justification? This is one of the evidences of the violence of sectarianism.

Call these causes or means of justification and they may severally indicate an influence or an instrumentality in the consummation of this great act of Divine favour. He that assumes any one or two of them, as the exclusive or one only essential cause of a sinner's justification, acts arbitrarily and hazardously, rather than discreetly or according to the oracles of God. We choose rather to give to them severally a Divine significance, and consequently, a proper place in the consummation of evangelical justification. We feel obliged to use the same reason and discretion in ascertaining the developments of this work of Divine grace, that we may employ in searching into the works of God in nature and in moral government. How many agents and laws of nature co-operate in providing our daily bread? Suns rise and set, moons wax and wane, tides ebb and flow, the planets observe their cycles, morning, noon, and night, perform their functions, the clouds pour their treasures into the bosom of the thirsty earth, the dews distil their freshness on the tender blade, and the electric fluid, unobserved, in perpetual motion, as the anima mundi ministers to life in every form of vegetable, animal, and human existence.

Why, then, to reason's ear should it sound discordant or to reason's eye appear uncouth, that, in the scheme of redemption and regeneration, God's instrumentalities should be as numerous and as various, yet as co-operative as those in outward and sensible nature?

Again, let us survey the works of man to man, his modes and forms of action in the consummation of some grand scheme of human benefaction. Take, for example, that philanthropist who, standing on the seashore, descries a shipwrecked crew clinging to a portion of the wreck, tossed to and fro among the foaming billows of an angry sea. He calls to his son and commands him to seize a boat and hasten to the rescue. He obeys. Cheerfully he plies the oars, and fearlessly struggles through many a conflicting wave, till he reaches the almost famished and fainting crew. He commands them to seize his arm and let go the wreck, and he will help them into his boat. They obey, and, all aboard, he commands them to grasp each his oar and co-operate with him in seeking the port of safety. They cheerfully co-operate, and are saved.

The spectators and the narrators of this scene form and express very different views of it. One says the perishing crew
were saved by a man on the shore; another, by his son; another by a boat; another, by getting into a boat; another, by rowing themselves to the shore; another, by a favourable breeze.

They all told the truth. There is no contradiction in their misrepresentations. But a philosopher says they were saved by all these means together. Such is the case before us.

These means may be regarded as causes co-operating in the result, all necessary, not one of them superfluous. But some one of them, to one person; another, to a second person; another, to a third person; and another, to a fourth, appears more prominent than the others; consequently, in narrating the deliverance, he ascribes it mainly to that cause which, at the time, made the most enduring impression on his own mind.

But the calm, contemplative thinker thus arranges these concurrent causes. The original or moving cause was the humanity and kindness of the father that stood on the shore and saw them about to perish. His son, who took the boat and imperilled his life, was the efficient or meritorious cause. The boat itself was the instrumental cause. The knowledge of their own condition and the kind invitation tendered to the sufferers was the disposing cause. Their consenting to the condition was the formal cause. Their seizing the boat with their hands and springing into it was the immediate cause. And their co-operating rowing to the shore was the concurrent and effectual cause of their salvation.

Had any one of the Apostles been accosted by captious, inquisitive, and speculative partisans for a reconciliation of all he had said, or that his fellow-labourers had said in their narratives, or allusions to particular persons, scenes, or events happening in his presence, or under his administration of affairs; had he been requested to explain and reconcile them with what he, or others of equal authority, had on other occasions said or written concerning them, doubtless, in some way he could and would have explained them. Indeed, in the common experience of all counts of enquiry, and tribunals of justice, where numerous statements are made on questions of facts, by a single witness, and, still more, when a plurality are examined, such diversified representations are made rather to the confirmation than to the detriment or disparagement of the import or the credibility of these statements. How often, and by how many cavillers have the Four Gospels been subjected to such ordeals, on such pretences? But who has yet found good reasons to disparage or discredit these narratives on account of such assaults or misunderstanding?

No question agitated since the era of Protestantism has occupied so much attention, or concentrated a greater amount of learning and research than the question of justification by faith; not, indeed, because of the inherent difficulties of the subject, but because of the defection and apostasy of the papal hierarchy, and the thick pall of darkness and error with which
it had developed the whole Bible. One extreme generates another. Hence the terminology of
the most orthodox schools on this subject is neither so scriptural nor so intelligible as the
great importance of the subject demands.

To harmonise the seven statements found in the Bible on this subject, we know no
method more rational or more scriptural than that indicated in the illustration given. We are
pardoned and treated as righteous, or, in other words, we are justified by the grace of God the
Father, as the original and moving cause; by Christ his Son, and by the blood or sacrifice, as
the meritorious cause; by faith and knowledge, as instrumental causes; by our convictions of
sin and penitence, as the disposing cause; and by works, as the concurrent or concomitant
cause. This, however, is justifying God in justifying us. “You see,” said the Apostle James,
“how faith wrought by works,” in the case of Abraham, when he offered up his son upon the
altar;” and by works his faith was made perfect.” Indeed, true faith necessarily works;
therefore, a working faith is the only true, real, and proper faith in Divine or human esteem.

Faith without works is no more faith than a corpse is a man. It is, therefore, aptly, by
high authority, regarded as “dead.” Faith alone, or faith without works, profits nothing. But,
as Romanists taught works without faith, Protestants have sometimes taught faith without
works. The latter quote Paul, and the former quote James, as plenary authority. But the two
Apostles have fallen into bad hands. Paul never preached faith without works, nor James
works without faith. Between these parties, the Apostles have been much abused.

Controversies generate new terms or affix new ideas to words. The question between
Calvin and Arminius—or between their followers—is not the identical question between Paul
and the Jews, or James and nominal Christians.

The works of the law, and the works of faith are as different as law and gospel. Works,
indeed, are to be considered as the embodiments of views, thoughts, emotions, volitions, and
feelings. They are appreciable indications of the states of the mind; sensible exponents of the
condition of the inner man. For example he that seeks justification by the works of the law is
not in a state of mind to be justified by the blood of Christ, or by the grace of God; he is
ignorant of himself, ignorant of God; consequently, too proud of his powers to condescend to
be pardoned or justified by the mere mercy and merits of another. Rich, and independent in
his views of himself, he cannot think of being a debtor to the worth and compassion of one
who contemplates him as ruined and undone forever. He is too proud to be vain, or too vain
to be proud of himself. In either view, he cannot submit to the righteousness of faith. For this
purpose, Paul says of the Pharasaic Jews, “They, being ignorant of God's righteousness and
going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted
themselves to the righteousness of God,” or to that righteousness which God has provided for the ungodly.

On the other hand, the works of him that is justified by faith are exponents of an essentially different state of mind. He is humble, dependent, grateful. Feeling himself undone, ruined, a debtor without hope to pay, he sues for mercy, and mercy is obtained; he is grateful, thankful, and humble, before God. In this view of the matter, to justify a man for any work of which he is capable, would be to confirm him in carnality, selfishness, and pride. But, convinced, humbled, emptied of himself, and learning, through faith in the gospel, that God has provided a ransom for the ruined, the wretched, and the undone, he gladly accepts pardon through sovereign mercy, and humbles himself to a state of absolute dependence on the merits and mercy of another. Justification by faith in Christ is, then, the embodiment of views in perfect harmony with truth, with our condition, with the whole revealed character of God, and, necessarily, tends to humility, gratitude, piety and humanity; while justification sought by works as naturally tends to pride, ingratitude, impiety, and inhumanity.

Such being the true philosophy of justification by faith, and of justification sought and supposed to be obtained by works of law, we need not marvel that the God of all grace, after having sent his Son into our world to become a sacrifice for us—to die for our sins, and to rise again for our justification—should have instituted faith in him, in his death, burial, and resurrection, as the means of a perfect reconciliation to himself, commanding us not only to cherish this faith in our hearts, but exhibit it by a visible death to sin; a burial with Christ to sin, and a rising again to walk into a new life, expressed and symbolised by an immersion in water, into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, not as a work of righteousness, but as a mere confession of our faith in what he did for us, and of our fixed purpose to walk with him. Hence, it is the only suitable institution to such an indication, as being, not a moral work of righteousness, but a mere passive surrendering of ourselves to die, to be buried, and to be raised again by the merit and aid of another.

Baptism, is, therefore, no work of law, no moral duty, no moral righteousness, but a simple putting on of Christ and placing ourselves wholly in his hand and under his guidance. It is an open, sensible, voluntary expression of our faith in Christ, a visible embodiment of faith, to which, as being thus perfected, the promise of the remission of sins is divinely annexed. In one word, it is faith perfected. Hence, when Paul exegetically develops its blessings, he says, “But you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our Lord.” Thus justification, sanctification, and adoption—the three most precious gifts of the gospel—are evangelically connected with faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and baptism unto his death.
The immediate baptism of the first converts after faith is satisfactorily explained in this view of it: three thousand in one day believed and were baptised. The jailer and his family were enlightened, believed, and were baptised the same hour of the night. Paul himself, as soon as he had recovered from the influence of the supernatural brightness which deprived him of sight, and before he had eaten or drunk anything, was commanded without delay, to be forthwith baptised. “And he arose and was baptised.” Baptism, with them, was the perfecting, or confession of their faith. The Ethiopian eunuch, on his journey in the desert, is as striking an example of this as are the cases named. It was “putting on Christ” as their righteousness.

Baptism, without faith, is of no value whatever; for in truth, baptism is but the actual and symbolic profession of faith. It is its legitimate embodiment and consummation. And whatever virtue there is in it, or connected with it, is but the virtue of faith in the blood of Christ applied to the conscience and to the heart. The burial in water is a burial in Christ and with Christ. “For in him shall all the seed of Israel,” the believing children of Abraham, “be justified,” and in him, “and not in themselves, shall they glory.” It is, then, the sensible and experimental deliverance from both the guilt and the pollution of sin; and for this reason, or in this view of it, believing penitents, when enquiring what they should do, were uniformly commanded by the ambassadors of Christ to be “baptised for the remission of sins “as God’s own way, under the New institution, of receiving sinners into favour, through the death, burial, and resurrection of his Son into whose name especially, as well as by whose mediatorial authority, they were commanded to be, on confession, buried in baptism.

Salvation, in the aggregate, is all of grace; and all the parts of it, consequently, gracious. Nor do we, in truth, in obeying the Gospel, or in being buried in baptism, make void, either law or gospel, but establish and confirm both. *

Of course it must be conceded that some of the opposition to the new view of baptism was owing to the ignorance of the clergy at the time it was announced and advocated.

In the regions where the Campbells, Mr. Scott, and their associates laboured there were very few educated men in the ministry of any of the religious denominations. This was especially true of the Baptists, with whom Mr. Campbell had become identified after his immersion. These ignorant ministers began a most persistent opposition to the Campbellian movement, and they made their attack

on the leaders of this movement mainly from the point of view of baptism and regeneration. It is easy to see how Mr. Campbell could be charged by ignorant men with holding heretical views on the subject of the work of the Holy Spirit, as well as on the design of baptism. If regeneration was directly wholly a divine act, then Mr. Campbell was necessarily heterodox as regards the work of the Holy Spirit and also the design of baptism.

But when Mr. Campbell's view became thoroughly understood many of the more intelligent ministers of the Baptist Church, as well as other denominations, could very easily see that the whole matter in discussion turned upon the meaning of the word regeneration rather than the meaning of baptism. At any rate, it became increasingly certain that Mr. Campbell was, from a Scriptural point of view, not only orthodox, but his position offered an immense advantage as an element in evangelical work. It was from this practical point of view of the new position, as we have already seen, that Mr. Scott and those associated with him in evangelistic work demonstrated the great value of baptism as one of the conditions in the Gospel plan of salvation. It ought to be stated just here that while the Disciples have always held to the view of baptism as presented in the foregoing considerations, they have never made the acceptance of their view a test of religious fellowship. Indeed, they have urged their view mainly on the ground of its scripturalness and its practical character in the evangelistic programme.

In a work entitled “The Fundamental Error of Christendom,” * a very conservative view is presented, and yet it is certain that this view is generally adopted by the Disciples of the present day.

It is believed that a practical solution of this difficult problem may be found in at least three directions. In the first place, we may limit regeneration to the antecedent work of the Holy Spirit through the Gospel in producing faith and begetting in us the new life, and then allow that baptism may take the place of a covenant, or “Sacramentum,” in which the believer takes upon himself the obligations of the Divine government, while at the same time he receives the assurance of pardon by relying upon the testimony, “He that believeth and is baptised shall

* By W. T. Moore, Christian Publishing Co., St. Louis, Mo.
be saved.” In the second place, the term “regeneration” may be regarded as including everything belonging to the new birth, or the return of the sinner to God; and in this case baptism would be properly the consummating act of all that is involved in the change, or the decisive act by which the believing penitent definitely takes up his cross to follow Christ. This view would seem to be in harmony with Peter's teaching (I. Peter iii:21) that baptism is the “answer (Greek decision) of a good conscience towards God.” Hence it is the act by which the penitent believer definitely and fully accepts Christ and takes his position on the Lord's side. Or, in the third place, we need not concern ourselves with any special theory of either regeneration or baptism, but simply insist upon all that the Lord has commanded, without formulating anything whatever.

This last is, doubtless, the safest course to pursue, and consequently this is the course many Disciples would most earnestly recommend in order to Christian union. From almost the very beginning of the Christian era down to the present time speculations and theories with regard to baptism have been a perpetual source of discord and strife, and even now there really seems little hope of peace while we are engaged in adding to or taking from the Word of God. In my judgment, it is quite useless to think seriously of Christian union until the baptismal question is solved, and it seems to me that no satisfactory solution will be reached unless we are willing to take a practical view of the whole matter by simply following the plain teaching of the Scriptures.

But I am thankful there is a sure way to peace, and this is by recognising the supreme authority of our Lord Jesus Christ in this matter as in all other things. He has evidently spoken definitely upon the baptismal question. There can be no doubt about the fact that He commanded it. Indeed, He himself submitted to baptism in order that He might fulfill all righteousness, or ratify every Divine institution. Ought we not to be as loyal to Him as He was to His Father? Surely if we call Him Lord, Lord, we ought to do the things which He says. And if, when He tells us to be baptised, we willingly submit to the ordinance, it does not matter much whether we understand the whole meaning or not. When the Israel-
ites were told to look to the brazen serpent and be healed, it is by no means certain that any of them understood the philosophy of the Lord's appointment; but all the same, both safety and loyalty required implicit obedience to what they had been divinely commanded to do.

No one supposes that Naaman understood the secret of Divine healing when, in obedience to the commandment of Elisha, he dipped seven times in the River Jordan; and yet he could not have been healed had he not done what the prophet told him to do. Is not this, after all, the best way to treat the question of baptism? The Lord has commanded it, and His Apostles everywhere practised it. Is not this a sufficient reason why we should attend to it as soon as we heartily believe in the Lord Jesus Christ?

Surely there is no need for hair-splitting on this question any more than other questions which have furnished such a battleground for Christians of all ages. Loyalty is what our Divine King wants, and this can only be given to Him by a hearty submission to His will whenever and wherever that will is made known. This, I believe, is the only sure solution of the baptismal question; and as this question lies at the very basis of all feasible plans for permanent Christian union, I most earnestly hope that all who love our Lord and Master, and would surrender everything in order to honour Him, will, from this day forward, determine, by the help of God, to be true to Christ's commandments, even though this should involve submission to the Divine ordinance of believer's baptism.

It would be easy enough to quote volumes from the writings of the Disciples, positively contradicting the charges which have been made against them in reference to their teaching concerning the design of baptism. As already intimated, they have perhaps sometimes been honestly misunderstood, but evidently no legitimate construction of their teaching will yield the notion that they have at any time ever taught the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as that doctrine is understood in the popular mind. Undoubtedly the text which has been the battleground between Disciples and their opponents, with respect to the design of baptism, is Acts ii: 38, and it may be well to give an exposition of this passage from one of their
writers, as this will show not only the Disciple view of the legitimate place of baptism, but also will illustrate their inductive method of settling everything by the teaching of the Scriptures:

Let us study carefully the following passage: “And Peter said to them: Repent and be baptised each one of you, upon the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts ii:38.)

There are at least two extreme views with respect to this passage, and these both have a bad influence on the practical results of evangelistic labour. One view makes too much of baptism, teaching in effect the doctrine of “baptismal regeneration,” while the other makes too little of baptism, and consequently this fine saying of Peter is very seldom if ever used in the ministry of those who hold this view. Indeed, it is believed that not many preachers of the evangelical sort ever quote this passage at all in these beginning days of the twentieth century.

Now, why is this? Has the passage ceased to possess any binding force, as an authoritative declaration of the Holy Spirit? Is it no longer to be consulted when seeking to know the Divine way of dealing with earnest inquirers? I ask these questions because I have a notion that the passage has special importance in determining the way of salvation. Not that it settles everything. Not that it even settles anything without the concurrent evidence of other Scripture. But if the most obvious interpretation of this text, not only does not contradict other parts of the Word of God, but is really supported by the whole tenor of Divine teaching, then we should certainly be slow to neglect it in our preaching, and especially in instructing earnest inquirers. It seems to me its importance is emphasised in the light of the facts in which it stands. It is the first deliverance of the Holy Spirit's teaching after the fulfilment of the promise which our Lord made to His disciples. The disciples were commanded to “tarry at Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high.” At Pentecost they received that power, and Peter, the very person who had been specially chosen to open the new kingdom, is the speaker. He preaches a most remarkable sermon, concluding with a splendid climax: “Therefore, let all the house of Israel
know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” Never was there a finer summary of the gospel facts than this. Jesus, the historical name, is here; Christ crucified is here; Christ the Anointed One is here; and the Lord, the One having all authority in heaven and earth, is here. What more was needed as far as faith was concerned? The people had clearly set before them the Lord Jesus Christ, embracing everything that was necessary to be addressed to their faith. No wonder they cried out: “Men and brethren, what must we do?” Peter's answer was: “Repent and be baptised, every one of you, upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” (Acts ii: 38.)

Now it may be well to notice the order in which the Apostle places the various items in this text. The inquirers were told to “repent and be baptised.” They were deeply moved by Peter's sermon—so much so, that they were pricked to the heart, and cried out. Surely here was real conviction. Consequently the Apostle does not tell them that they must believe—they, doubtless, already had sufficient faith to obey Peter's command; and so he just told them what to do, and then exhorted them to do it. And the promise was that, following their obedience, they were to receive remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Now, can there be any reasonable doubt that this is the order in which the items stand related? Of course, much depends upon the force of the proposition eis, which in the Authorised Version is translated “for.” And we think it will help us to determine the exact meaning of eis here, if we consider the whole phrase, eis aphesin hamartioon,—“for the remission of sins.” The phrase only occurs in three other places, viz., Matt, xxvi: 28; Mark i: 4; Luke iii: 3. Hence four occurrences exhaust the New Testament use of eis aphesin hamartioon, rendered in the authorised version uniformly “for the remission of sins,” and in the revised version “unto the remission of sins.” Now if we can certainly determine the force of eis in the phrase as found in Matthew, Mark and Luke, we think there is no doubt that it should have the same force in Acts ii: 38. In Matthew xxvi: 28, it cannot have a retrospective significance, since it is impossible to suppose that Jesus shed His blood.
because the sins of the world were already pardoned. And it is just as evident that John did not preach the baptism of repentance because the sins of the people were pardoned, but in order to remission (Mark i: 4; Luke iii: 3). Now as the force of eis is unmistakably prospective in all the other occurrences of the phrase, it must have the same force in the passage under consideration, unless there are good and valid reasons why the uniformity of meaning should be broken. No such reasons, I feel sure, can be given. On the contrary, there is strong corroborative evidence that the Pentecostians did not have their sins pardoned when Peter told them to “repent and be baptised.”

It is altogether improbable that he would have told them to repent because their sins were pardoned. Nor is it possible to suppose that their inquiry is the language of sins forgiven. They had been charged, only a few moments before, with crucifying the innocent Jesus. Surely they were not such characters as could expect the remission of sins without sincere repentance. But baptism is placed between the repentance and the remission of sins, which was promised, and consequently, it cannot be said that they were to be baptised because of the remission of sins any more than it can be said that they were to repent because their sins were remitted. Hence we conclude that every rule of fair exegesis compels us to recognise the fact that Peter told these Pentecostians to repent and be baptised upon the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins.

But, it may be asked, how can this interpretation be made to harmonise with many passages which do not mention repentance and baptism as in any way connected with remission of sins? Let us just here state a canon of criticism which is most important in this discussion. When the Scriptures promise a blessing, that blessing may depend upon more, but can never depend upon less, than the conditions expressed in any given case. For instance, when salvation is promised to any one who calls upon the name of the Lord (Rom. x: 13), it is evident that nothing short of this calling will meet the case; but no one would seriously contend that calling upon the name of the Lord entirely exhausts all that is required in order to salvation. Precisely so is it as regards faith. Whenever the Scriptures state this as the condition of
salvation, and mention nothing else, it should be remembered that salvation cannot be predicated without this faith, but it does not follow that no other conditions are understood, because they are not specially stated in the particular case referred to. Surely the command to believe does not exclude repentance, calling on the name of the Lord, confession of Christ, etc. And if it does not exclude these, why is it essential to suppose that it necessarily excludes baptism? I demur to that method of reasoning which leaves the Word of God in hopeless confusion.

But we are told that the remission of sins is promised to faith as the only condition, and Acts x: 43 is quoted in proof. Now it is not stated here that this faith is the only condition. Undoubtedly, remission cannot depend on less than this, but it may depend on more. It is not even said that whosoever believeth in Him shall have remission of sins, without adding “THROUGH HIS NAME.” This important phrase is often overlooked, as if it were not in the text. The believer receives remission of sins THROUGH HIS NAME. Let us put this statement by the side of Acts ii: 38: “Repent and be baptised every one of you upon the NAME of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins,” etc., and we readily see how the believing penitent receives remission of sins through His NAME. Evidently baptism brings him to that NAME whereby we are said to be saved. (Acts iv:12.) It is furthermore evident that there is no antagonism between these two passages. Acts ii: 38 is in perfect harmony with Acts x: 43. One is really the explanation of the other, because a fuller statement of practically the same thing. Hence we should not allow some foolishly extreme sacramental notions of baptism to crowd this divine ordinance out of its proper place. What is generally understood by Baptismal Regeneration is a dangerous heresy, and should be earnestly repudiated by all Christians, but repentance and baptism upon the name of Jesus Christ are in order to the remission of sins. At least that is what the Apostle Peter taught at Pentecost, and we have already seen that he taught practically the same thing at the house of Cornelius. Not only did he tell these Gentiles that “through His name, whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins,” but he concludes by “com-
manding them to be baptised in the name of the Lord." Surely nothing could be clearer than
the teaching of Peter on this subject. Is his teaching authoritative now? If not, why not? But if
it is, what becomes of many modern methods of evangelising?

There remains but one other point to be noticed, and that is necessary to meet the first
extreme to which attention has been called. What is the force of epi too anomati Ieesou
Christou? This I have translated: “Upon the name of Jesus Christ.” Now what does this
mean? Does it not signify clearly that whatever efficacy there may be in baptism is derived
wholly from the name of Jesus Christ? The baptism which Peter demanded was grounded
upon the all-prevailing NAME—the only name by which any one can be saved. Hence all
who were baptised at Pentecost would understand that their whole reliance for remission of
sins, from an important point of view, rested upon the name of Jesus Christ. They did not
trust in the water, nor even in the act of baptism; but they were baptised, relying upon the
name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and the value of baptism was chiefly owing to
the fact that it placed these penitent believers in contact with the name in which all
redeeming power is concentrated. Upon this name they based their trust, as it, in its proper
place, possessed the potent charm to put away sins.

This view of the matter does not in the slightest degree change the chronological order. It
still leaves baptism a condition precedent to remission of sins; but it does change the
emphasis from the baptism to the name from which baptism receives mainly its real
significance. This, I think, is a gain to the cause of truth; and if I am justified in this
conclusion, it seems to me a legitimate accentuation of the right word or phrase is the only
thing that is necessary to redeem this passage from the extremes to which it has been
subjected, and restore it to its rightful authority in directing inquiring souls in the way of
salvation.

Baptism is joined to the death of Christ—(Rom. vi: 3); it is joined to the burial of
Christ—(Rom. vi:4); it is also joined to the resurrection of Christ—(Col. ii:12). These are
what are usually called the facts of the Gospel, and when stated in the language of the
inspired record,
they furnish the foundation of everything in Christianity. Baptism is joined to the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt, xxviii: 19). It is also joined to faith, repentance, and confession (Mark xvi:16, Acts ii:38; Acts viii:37). Finally it is joined to remission of sins, gifts of the Holy Spirit and adoption into the family of God (Acts ii: 38; Gal. iii: 26, 27).

Thus it will be seen that baptism has under it the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; over it the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; before it faith, repentance, and confession; following it remission of sins, gift of the Holy Spirit, and children of God. In short, baptism is the key stone which binds all these together. We have here twelve most important things all joined to one another by a Scriptural baptism which forms a common centre around which all these different parts of the Gospel—the facts, conditions, sanctions, and promises—are grouped, and without which the symmetry of the whole would be broken and consequently the scheme of redemption left in utter confusion. This being true, it is surely wisdom to say, “what God had joined together, that let no man put asunder.”

Perhaps the chief mistake that has been made, as regards the meaning of baptism, is that it stands for only one thing, whereas it is rather the connecting link for many things. It is the place where all the elements of the Gospel meet, where they all coalesce, and thereby become harmoniously co-operative in the plan of salvation. Hence, while baptism doubtless has a significance all its own, it seems to me its chief office is to bring all the different parts of the Gospel into practical union in one great overt act of obedience.

We may now easily account for the variety of views with respect to the design of baptism. As already intimated, it is the place where the facts, commands, sanctions, and blessings of the Gospel normally meet—where the divine and human sides of salvation are brought together in orderly co-operation. But as baptism is joined to so many things, and as the human mind is prone to seize upon one thing only at a time, and that always the one thing most agreeable to preconceived opinions, it follows that it is not difficult to understand how there exists so much confusion upon a subject which is as clear as sun-
light when we once occupy the proper standpoint with respect to it.

It is a well-known fact that if a ray of light pass through a prism and be thrown on a screen, the ray will be divided into seven different colours. It is also known that if these colours are painted on a wheel in their proper proportions, and then the wheel is turned rapidly, the colours will all blend and make what we call white light. Just so with baptism. It may be regarded as the wheel by the action of which all the elements of the Gospel are blended into the clear light of salvation. Without the action of this wheel these elements remain in separate parts, and while in this state of separation they are often treated by theologians as if they actually contradict each other. But this is mainly for the reason that these elements are considered separately, as if each one was, in itself, the whole of the plan of salvation. But we must remember that, as in the case of light, all the colours are necessary and each colour must be in its legitimate place, and in its right proportion, in order to produce perfect light, so must all the elements of the Gospel be included in their normal places and proportions in order to give us the perfect plan of salvation. An undue emphasis upon any part, or the leaving out of a part, would at once destroy the harmony of the whole, and in some cases might endanger the efficacy of the plan.*

In this connection, it is well to understand the fact that the objection made to the Disciple view of the design of baptism, was mainly owing to a misconception as to what baptism really is. The usual reply to Disciples, when they insisted upon it being for the remission of sins, was that there is no efficacy in water to wash away sins, thereby making water practically the only thing to be considered in baptism. But water is only one of the things belonging to baptism. We have already seen that the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ are under it; the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit over it; faith, repentance, and confession before it; and remission of sins, gift of the Holy Spirit, and the hope of eternal life after it. Water is simply the element in which the baptism takes place, and is, therefore, not the baptism as a whole, but only a part of it. Strictly speaking, bap-

* See “Fundamental Error of Christendom,” by W. T. Moore.
tism is the *proper action*, while all other things belonging to it should be considered as accessories, but evidently necessary accessories. The failure of any of these to be present would endanger the validity of the baptism. While the Disciples have very generally associated remission of sins with baptism, in doing so they have assumed that baptism means everything that is ascribed to it in the Scriptures. Of course, a superficial view, as to what the baptism is, would make the Disciples' contention simply absurd, but when what they contended for is clearly understood, it is difficult to see that their position is contrary to the teaching of Scriptures and the practice of the Apostles. Disciples do not teach, they never did teach, that baptism, even when it is considered from its full import, ever *procures* remission of sins. They have always taught that, in the final analysis, the blood of Christ is what washes away sins, and consequently this blood is the *procuring cause* of our salvation. Nevertheless, they have taught that we must come in contact with that blood in order to secure the efficiency of it; and as Christ shed His blood in His death, we must come to where He shed His blood, in order to meet the blood in its cleansing power. The Apostle Paul says that “as many as were baptised into Christ were baptised into His death,” and consequently in this baptism they would come in contact with the cleansing blood. Disciples have always been very careful to discriminate between a logical *cause* and an *occasion*. To illustrate this point, it is only necessary to say that the *cause* of the loud explosion in a gun is not simply the pulling of the trigger. This pulling of the trigger is the last apparent cause or *occasion* of the explosion. There are several other things that are antecedent to the pulling of the trigger, and that are absolutely essential before the explosion can take place. Among these antecedents may be mentioned the quality of the powder, the form of the gun barrel, the proper arrangement of the percussion cap and powder, the existence of a surrounding atmosphere, etc., etc. Any of these conditions being absent, the loud report of the gun might not occur.

Now there must be the proper antecedents of baptism, such as the blood of Christ, faith, repentance, etc., before baptism itself can be worth anything whatever. But when
these antecedents exist, the baptism is the *occasion*, or to use the figure already introduced in the case of the gun, baptism is the trigger, which, when pulled, brings into active exercise the *efficient causes* which are essential to salvation.

In this case it might appear to some that, after all, baptism is an essential part of the whole plan of salvation, and consequently, if the trigger is not pulled, or if baptism does not take place, no result will follow. Surely no result will follow in harmony with the whole plan, but in the case of the gun the explosion can take place without pulling the trigger at all, as there are other ways of firing the gun without using the regular method, though in such cases we would depart from the plan upon which the gun is made. When Disciples have advocated baptism, with its proper antecedents, as the means by which remission of sins is secured, they always are to be understood as referring to the *whole regular plan* of salvation as taught in the Holy Scriptures. They have always admitted that God may forgive sins in exceptional cases without baptism, but that baptism is included in the *regular plan* as taught by Christ and illustrated in the practice of the Apostles.

It will be readily seen that when the Disciples' position is clearly understood, the charge against them that they teach a water salvation is not only absurd, but actually false, and ought not to be repeated by any one who may be informed upon the subject, and who at the same time has a proper respect for the truth of history.

It has been thought proper to treat this matter somewhat exhaustively for the reason that perhaps the Disciples have been more shamefully misunderstood with respect to this part of their contention, than at any other point. It has been seen that this misunderstanding has largely come from a wrong view of what baptism is and how it is related to the plan of salvation. Furthermore, those who have objected to the Disciples' position have not sufficiently considered the difference between a *perfect plan* and a *perfect obedience* which meets all the conditions of the plan. The plan of salvation is perfect, but a failure to comply with every condition in that plan may not be fatal to him who is honestly striving to do what the Lord has enjoined upon him. But Disciples have con-
stantly insisted that we ought not to lower the plan itself in order to make provision for the failure of human weakness to do everything that the Lord has commanded. They have insisted upon proclaiming the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth, and then leave the consequences with God, who knows how to make allowance for those who make mistakes, when making them “ignorantly through unbelief.” As the Apostle Paul received mercy on this account, those who are as honest as he was, and who at the same time do not strictly obey one of the conditions of the Gospel, will no doubt be mercifully dealt with by Him who is more than a God of Justice, but also a God of Love.
CHAPTER VII

SEPARATION OF BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES

IT has already been seen that the relations between the Reformers and the Baptists became somewhat strained soon after the Campbells united with the latter. This condition of things continued, notwithstanding Mr. Campbell did valiant service for the Baptist cause with his periodical, the *Christian Baptist*, up to the time when it was discontinued. Finally it became evident that Mr. Campbell and his friends could no longer remain in fellowship with the Baptist denomination. There was never any formal exclusion from the Baptist Church. In a few instances individuals were excluded, though in most cases, where there was an antagonism between the two parties, a majority of the Baptists became identified with the Campbellian movement. In some instances, as in the case of the Mahoning and Stillwater Associations, many of the Baptist Churches sided with the Campbells.

However, at this time the tension between the two wings was very acute, and this tension arose mainly from the considerations which have already been presented. Most of the Baptists at this period were decidedly Calvinistic, though probably very few of them knew why they were so. They were not theologians, but they had inherited this doctrine from their ancestors, and they believed it was their duty to defend it against all encroachments.

The Campbells insisted that all such questions as were involved in the hyper-Calvinism of the day should have no place in determining the fellowship of Christians. Much of the great “Declaration and Address” was devoted to showing the true ground of Christian Union, and perhaps no part of the “Address” was more forcibly presented than that which condemned philosophical or theological speculations as tests of Christian fellowship. Both of the Campbells had, at one time, believed heartily in the popular Calvinism of the day. Alexander Campbell
continued to be a Calvinist in a mild form throughout his life, though he persistently refused to make this a question of fellowship among Christians. Indeed, one of the cardinal rules by which he was guided in the interpretation of the Scriptures was that inferences, however apparently logical, must not be insisted upon as conditions of Christian fellowship. Only a clearly expressed Scriptural precept or example must be regarded as binding upon the followers of the Lord.*

Perhaps at this time, as ever afterward, the Disciples mainly leaned to the Arminian view of the Divine government, but even the most pronounced Arminian did not make his Arminianism a barrier in the way of Christian Union. In fact, many theological speculations have been tolerated among the Disciples from the very beginning of their movement to the present time; but generally they have adhered strictly to the dictum of the Campbells, “where the Bible speaks, we speak: where the Bible is silent, we are silent.”

But many Baptists could not easily surrender the theological tenets which they held as sacred as their household gods. These Baptists became bitterly opposed to the Campbellian movement, which was regarded by them as extremely heretical with respect to the tenets which they held as sacred.

Of course there were many who sympathetically shared with the Campbells in pleading for a Reformation, who, at the same time, remained in the Baptist Churches. But when the time of separation came, many Baptist Churches came over in a body to the new movement, or else members of these churches united with it.

This separation was somewhat gradual. As already intimated, in a preceding chapter, the trouble began as early as 1816, when Mr. Campbell delivered his celebrated sermon on the “Law.” From that time forward he was more or less suspected by many of the Baptist clergy, and finally, about the years 1828, ’29, and ’30 it became evident that the Disciples would have to occupy a separate position, though this was contrary to their wish, and certainly contrary to the whole aim of the Campbells when they began their reformatory movement.

Mr. Campbell continued to publish the *Christian Bap-

*See *Millennial Harbinger*, 1843, pp. 4-5; 1846, pp. 325-326.
tist until July, 1830, when that periodical was discontinued, he having already started the Millennial Harbinger with the beginning of that year. This later periodical was to take the place of the former, while it was, at the same time, greatly enlarged and its scope also considerably extended. He abandoned the name of the former periodical, for the reason that it had to him a denominational appearance, which he had never liked, but it now could no longer be tolerated. Millennial Harbinger seemed to him to appropriately express what he was aiming to bring about. He was advocating a new age for the Christian Church. Indeed, while a separation from the Baptists seemed to be a necessity, it was by no means his choice. When he united with the Baptists he distinctly stipulated that he would not have to accept the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, and furthermore, he was to have liberty to advocate what he conscientiously believed. But this condition, in his agreement with the Baptists, seemed no longer to have weight with the Baptist denomination as a whole. Mr. Campbell claimed to be a reformer. He found many things among the Baptists that he thought ought to be changed. He conscientiously exercised the liberty which he stipulated should be his when he united with the Baptist Church. But the Baptists, as a whole, refused to be reformed. They still hung to their old habits and old creeds. In this they evidently illustrated the history of human nature. We can always see the need of reformation in others, but when the limelight is turned on ourselves, the case is very materially altered. While Mr. Campbell was pleading, from the Baptist point of view, that other religious denominations needed reformation, his Baptist brethren heartily applauded him, and even went so far as to proclaim him a great champion of their cause. When he had his debates with Mr. Walker and Mr. McCalla, the Baptists lined up on the side of Mr. Campbell and gave him their hearty support, though, as already remarked in another chapter, Mr. Campbell's main argument against infant baptism was founded on exactly the same truth as that defended in his great sermon on the “Law,” which had given the Baptists their first suspicions that he was unsound as regarded the Baptist faith. It was quite another thing when Mr. Camp-
bell turned away from the Pedo-Baptist denominations and began to insist that the Baptists themselves were largely governed by the “traditions of the fathers,” rather than by a legitimate understanding of the Holy Scriptures. The Baptists resented his well-intended efforts at their reformation. Many of them claimed that they did not need reformation, and so his good efforts in this respect were persistently rejected by a large number of the denomination, and especially by a number of Baptist leaders who seemed to be wholly unable to understand either Mr. Campbell's real position or their own shortcomings.

However, the work of reformation continued to spread in many directions; in some places in sweeping tides of influence similar to that which emanated from Western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Northeastern Ohio. Some of these movements will be considered in subsequent chapters, when it will be seen that the principles advocated by the Campbells and those associated with them had become common property with other religious people in many other parts of the country.

The splendid advocacy of the Millennial Harbinger became a new inspiration to the reformers in propagating their plea, but by this time they were a little careful about forming any kind of denominational alliances. Evidently Mr. Campbell and those associated with him had given up the idea of securing the co-operation, or even sympathy, of the denominations as they then existed. It became increasingly apparent that the movement must stand on its own merits, and though it might, by virtue of its isolation from all other bodies, be regarded as another denomination, there seemed to be no help for anything else than the position which the movement now assumed. It was passing out of the chaotic period and taking on definite, well-defined characteristics of its own. One of the main contentions of Mr. Campbell was that the people must have the right to decide for themselves with respect to their faith and practices, and this was the controlling reason in starting the Millennial Harbinger. Indeed, it is worth while to quote the preface to the first volume of that periodical, as this will give Mr. Campbell's position at the time when he had given up all hope of uniting with any other religious denomination which at
that time existed. Referring to the chaotic condition of religion at the time when the *Harbinger* was started, Mr. Campbell used the following vigorous language:

Time, the great innovator, brings to pass everything. Gradual but unceasing is its march. It never slumbers. It never pauses. It gives maturity to everything.

When we are taught to read the volume of Nature, or rather the great library of God, and have made some proficiency in the volume of Revelation, we discover that there is an admirable analogy between the volumes of Creation and Redemption. As is the progress of natural, so has been the progress of supernatural light. First there are glimmerings of dawn—then the twilight—then the risen day, and then the radiance of noon. So is not only the faith of the just, which brightens more and more until the perfect day; but also such are the developments of the light of life.

Starlight and moonlight ages are no more. The *Sun of Mercy* has arisen. But as in the natural, so in the moral world, there are clouds and obscurations. There are interceptions of the light of the sun. There are eclipses partial and total. In a total eclipse there is a darkness of night. There have been both partial and total eclipses of the Sun of Mercy since his rising. Not only have there been cloudy and dark days, but actual darkness like that of night.

Had not a thick vapour arisen from the unfathomable abyss and hid the Sun of Mercy and of Life from human eyes, neither the *beast* nor the *false prophet* could have been born. Wild beasts go forth in the night, and in darkness commit their depredations. So the apocalyptic “wild beast” was the creature of night and darkness.

Vapours arise from the waters, and from the unfathomable ocean the densest fogs arise. When we dream of troubles, we wade through deep waters. Hence, the commotions and troubled agitations of communities are symbolised by the waters of the great abyss. From these commotions, these deep waters, arose the symbolic fog, the figurative vapours which overspread the heavens and hid the Sun of Righteousness from the eyes of mortals. The volumes of traditions, the cabalistic dogmas, the eastern philosophy, the pagan speculations, combined and modified, intercepted entirely, or totally eclipsed the light of the moral sun. Nearly all the earth was overspread in this darkness. The middle of this period has properly been called the “dark ages.”

Though the eclipse was total in Rome, it was not so everywhere. But the fairest portions of the Old World shared in it, and it was partial almost everywhere, where it was not total.

*Why was this so?* is one question; but *Was it so?* is another. That it was so needs no proof, because all agree in the belief of this fact. We know some reasons, which may be offered, why
it was so. But now we only appeal to the fact that it was so. This darkness has been only partially dissipated.

The Bible was brought out of prison, and Luther bid it march. He made it speak in German, and thus obtained for it a respectful hearing. It was soon loaded with immense burthens of traditions, drawn from the cloisters and the cells where it had so long been incarcerated. It soon became unable to travel with its usual speed—and then stopped the Reformation. They took the points off of the arrows of truth, and blunted the sword of the Spirit, so that the enemies of the truth could not be conquered.

About the commencement of the present century, finding that notes and comments, that glosses and traditions were making the word of God of little or no effect—I say, the pious of several of the great phalanxes of the rival Christian interests did agree to unmanacle and unfetter the testimony of God, and send it forth without the bolsters and crutches furnished by the schools; and this, with the spirit of enquiry which it created and fostered, has contributed much to break the yoke of clerical oppression, which so long oppressed the people—I say clerical oppression; for this has been, and yet is, though much circumscribed, the worst of all sorts of oppression. The understandings, the consciences, the feelings, the bodies, and the estates of men have been seized by this most relentless of tyrants. All who have demanded the first fruits and tithes; all who have paralysed the mind and forced the assent or secured the homage of the conscience have not been tyrants. Neither have all they who have rejected and reprobated this system, been humane, courteous, and merciful.—There are exceptions, even among priests. If the clergy never could reform the system, the system always could reform them. To repudiate this system, is to desecrate the priest; and whatsoever has profaned or made common the priests, has been not only unchurched, but unchristianised. Such have been the past fates of those who ventured to depart from the consecrated way. But a new order of things has, within the memory of the present generation, begun. Many of the priests have become obedient to the faith, and the natural, political, and religious rights of men have begun to be much better understood. All these indications are favourable to the hopes of the expectants of the restoration of the ancient order of things. But nothing has contributed so much to the hopes of the intelligent, and nothing can more conduce to the regeneration of the church, than the disentanglement of the Holy Oracles from the intricacies of the variant rules of interpretation which the textuaries have fashioned into a system the most repugnant to all we call reason, common sense, and analogy.

In the happiest state which we can ever expect on earth, we can only, as individuals, enjoy as much of the favour of God as the most intelligent and devout of the first converts; and, as
communities, we could enjoy no more Christian peace and joy than some of the first congregations after the first promulgation of the gospel. Greater temporal felicity might be enjoyed, but the spiritual attainments of many of the congregations cannot, in the aggregate mass of religious communities, be much, if at all, surpassed.

Place the whole of any community, or even the great mass of any community, under influences similar to those which governed them, and what the most sanguine expect from a Millennium would in social and religious enjoyments be realised. But there is no fixing bounds to the maximum of social and refined bliss which would flow from the very general or universal prevalence and triumphs of evangelical principles. To see a nation bowing, with grateful and joyous homage to the King Eternal, immortal, and invisible, mingling all their affections in their admiration and love of him who had obtained immortality for man, would open a new fountain of enjoyments of which we have not yet tasted. To see even a few scores of intelligent Christians, in whom we confide as fellow-soldiers and fellow-citizens, and joint heirs of the heavenly inheritance, meeting around one and the same Lord's table, and uniting in the praises and adorations of one and the same common Lord and Saviour, imparts to us a joy which we are unable to express. What we should feel, or how we should feel, among myriads of such, is not for us now to conjecture. But of this in its proper place.

All I wish to remark on this occasion is, that the first step toward the introduction of this glorious age, is to dissipate the darkness which covers the people and hides from their eyes the Sun, the quickening, renewing, animating Sun of Mercy. We expect no new Sun, no new revelation of the Spirit; no other than the same Gospel and the same religion, only that it shall be disinterred from the rubbish of the dark ages, and made to assume its former simplicity, sublimity, and majesty. The demons of party must be dispossessed, and the false spirits cast out. The human mind must be emancipated from the bondage of error, and information not only augmented, but extended to all the community.

Light is certainly increasing—charity enlarging the circle of its activities—the mountains of discord diminishing, and the deep valleys which separated Christians, are filling up. But much is to be done before all flesh shall enjoy the salvation of God. If all who love the Lord and the salvation of men would unite their energies and bury the tomahawk of party conflicts, no seer could predict how rapid would be the march and how extensive the triumphs of the Gospel.

But the mighty agent, or rather the successful means, of this most desirable revolution, will be the Ancient Gospel. There are many gospels now preached. The gospels of every sect are something different from each other, and something different from the apostolic. There can be, in truth, but one
gospel; but there may be many new-modified and perverted gospels. Some make their own God and worship him; and all who create a new God invent a gospel to suit his character. Surely no man of good common sense can imagine that the god of the Calvinists and the god of the Arminians are the same god. He that fancies that the god of the Trinitarians and the god of the Unitarians are one and the same divinity, can easily believe in transubstantiation.

The wisdom and the power of God, when combined, will be surely adequate to accomplish the most extraordinary promises on record. Now the placing of all nations under the dominion of his Son, under the reign of favour, under the influence of all that is pure, amiable, and heavenly, is promised; and by what means so likely to be accomplished as by that instrument which is emphatically called the wisdom and power of the Almighty? That instrument is the old gospel preached by the Apostles. This is almighty, through God, to the pulling down all the strongholds of infidelity and profanity, to the subversion of Atheism, Deism, and Sectarianism. It proved its power upon the nations once, and it begins to prove its power again. The sword of the spirit has been muffled with the filthy rags of philosophy and mysticism until it cannot cut through the ranks of the aliens. But so soon as this gospel is promulged in its old simplicity and in its native majesty, it will prove itself to be of God, and as adequate as in days of yore. It will pierce the hearts of the King's enemies; and, while it slays their enmity, it will reconcile them to the authority and government of the Prince of Peace.

In prosecuting one of the great objects of this paper, and, indeed, the leading object, this point will not be lost sight of. Our modern gospels, like the metaphysics of the schools, have been inoperative, except to alienate men from one another, and to fill some with spiritual pride, and to abase others under a morose humility. Here we see them exulting in enthusiasm, and there melancholy under a system of doubts. Between these two classes there is the opinionative, the speculative, the cold and stiff formalist—exact in the ceremonies, and precise in all the forms of religion, without the power. Some from a bolder and independent mind, and from a happy constitutional temperament, dared to be pious and to aspire after a higher enjoyment of the spirit of religion. But these do not give character to the age.

One of the two great reformers attacked the practices, and the other the opinions of the earlier part of the sixteenth century. The former was by far the more useful and puissant reformer. He gave the deadliest blow to the beast. The other, intent on making men think right, only made converts from among the converted. This has always been the case. As Luther excelled Calvin, so did Wesley excel the Erskines. They both began upon communities called Protestants, but degenerating Protestants. Wesley directed his energies to the
works of men, and the Erskines to their heterodox opinions. Wesley excelled his own more metaphysical brother, Fletcher. Fletcher was as far superior to Wesley as a reasoner and metaphysician, as Luther was to Calvin. The reason is obvious: the gospel called for a change of conduct—for obedience on new principles. It presented great operative principles, but called for immediate submission to new institutions. Luther's plan was more in unison with this than Calvin's; and Wesley's more than Fletcher's. Hence more visible and more useful in their tendencies. Practical men have always been the most useful; and, therefore, practical principles have been more beneficial to mankind than the most ingenious and refined speculations. Symmes might have amusingly lectured a thousand years upon his visions and fancies; but Christopher Columbus, in one voyage, added a new world to the old one.

The ancient gospel spoke by facts, and said little about principles of action of any sort. The facts, when realised or believed, carried principles into the heart without naming them; and there was an object presented which soon called them into action. It was the true philosophy without the name, and made all the philosophy of the world sublimated folly. It was ridiculous to hear Epicureans and Stoics reasoning against Paul. While they were talking about atoms of matter and refined principles, about virtue and vice, Paul took hold of the resurrection of the dead, and buried them in their own dreams. He preached Jesus and the resurrection; he proclaimed reformation and forgiveness of sins; and before they awoke out of their reveries, he had Dionysius the Mayor of the City, the Lady Damaris, and other notable characters immersed into Jesus.

The ancient gospel left no man in a reasoning mode about any principle of action. It left him in no doubt about the qualities or attributes of faith. It called for the obedience of faith; and by giving every man an opportunity of testing and showing his own faith by his works, it made no provision for cases of consciences, nor room for philosophic doubting. But I do not here eulogise it, but only intend to say that it is the only and the all-sufficient means to destroy anti-Christ, to heal divisions, to unite Christians, to convert the world, and to bless all nations; and viewing it in this light, we shall find much use for it in all that we shall attempt in this work.

In detecting the false gospels, nothing will aid us so much as an examination of their tendencies, and a comparison of their effects with what the Millennium proposes. The gospel of no sect can convert the world. This is with us a very plain proposition; and if so, the sectarian gospels are defective, or redundant, or mixed. To one of these general classes belong most of them.

Many topics will demand our attention in this work, as the preceding prospectus indicates. How we shall attend to these and manage them, we can now make no promise—time
alone will show. We only claim an impartial and an attentive hearing. We ask for nothing—not a single concession upon trust. What we cannot evince and demonstrate, we hope all will reject. What we enforce with authority and evidence, we hope that the thoughtful and devout, the rational and the inquisitive, the candid and the sincere, will espouse and carry into practice. What will not, what cannot, console the unhappy, cheer the disconsolate, confirm the weak, reform the transgressor, purify the ungodly, save the world, and ennoble the human character—we shall rejoice to see repudiated.

I have heard that it is decreed to attempt to destroy this paper as soon as it appears. A correspondent informed me this day that in one city a large subscription had been got up in the way of joint stock to oppose this paper. If they can logically, Scripturally, and religiously strangle it in life's porch, or despatch it as his Majesty King Herod despatched the innocents of Bethlehem—I say, let them do it. But I never can believe, upon human testimony, that he can be an impartial judge who has condemned, or erected the scaffold before the victim is tried.

When opposed by the interested, by those whom the corruptions of Christianity feed with bread and gratify with honor, I will call to mind the history of all the benefactors of men, and draw both comfort and strength from the remembrance that no man ever achieved any great good to mankind who did not wrest it with violence through ranks of opponents—who did not fight for it with courage and perseverance, and who did not, in the conflict, sacrifice either his good name or his life. John, the harbinger of the Messiah, lost his head. The Apostles were slaughtered. The Saviour was crucified. The ancient confessors were slain. The reformers all have been excommunicated. I know that we shall do little good if we are not persecuted. If I am not traduced, slandered, and misrepresented, I shall be a most unworthy advocate of that cause which has always provoked the resentment of those who have fattened upon the ignorance and superstition of the mass, and have been honoured by the stupidity and sottishness of those who cannot think and will not learn. But we have not a few friends and associates in this cause. There are many with whom it shall be my honour to live and labour, and my happiness to suffer and die.

The ancient gospel has many powerful advocates; and the heralds of a better, of a more blissful order of things, social and religious, are neither few nor feeble. No seven years of the last ten centuries, as the last seven, have been so strongly marked with the criteria of the dawn of that period which has been the theme of many a discourse and the burden of many a prayer.

I have thought proper to quote the entire preface, as it harmonises with what has been said in the introduction.
to this volume with reference to the rise and progress of the Reformation of which it treats. While Mr. Campbell does not use exactly the same figure of speech that we have used, he nevertheless reaches practically the same conclusion that we have done. His Starlight, Moonlight, and Sunlight Ages were ever afterwards favourite epochs of his in treating the gradual development of the Christian religion through the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations.

However, the preface which has been quoted in full is valuable mainly for the light which it throws on the condition of the religious world at the beginning of the year 1830, and for the splendid courage which Mr. Campbell shows in his attack upon the things that hinder the progress of the Christianity of Christ. His motto from this time on was “Let there be light,” and he began at once to earnestly contend for “the faith once for all delivered to the saints,” no matter where this contention might lead him and those associated with him. At this time he seems to have had no concern whatever with respect to the outcome of the movement. He seems to have been overwhelmed with the conviction that the darkness of chaos should be dissipated, and that the light of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ should shine unto the people. This he conceived would bring a new age, and the rising of the light of the Sun of Righteousness, or of Mercy, as he calls it, was the dawn of the new age which would usher in the complete restoration of Christianity as portrayed in the New Testament in all of its essential features.

It may be that Mr. Campbell was dreaming when he anticipated the new age in the name of his periodical. But dreams must often antedate the realisation of these dreams. Idealisation goes before realisation. The poets are often the forerunners of the historians. To see visions was one of the signs which were to accompany the introduction of Christianity into the world. It was one of the signs of the New Age, as Mr. Campbell anticipated it, in his *Millennial Harbinger*.

The separation of the Disciples from the Baptists, or rather the separation of the Baptists from the Disciples (for the latter expresses more truthfully the real fact of the case), did not retard the movement which had been inaugurated by the Campbells. Indeed, it is probable
the movement, as a well-defined and distinct thing, was accelerated by the action of many Baptist Churches withdrawing fellowship from the Disciples. These Baptist Churches, by their action, placed themselves in the attitude of persecutors, though they doubtless acted from a conscientious sense of duty. They could not keep up with the progress which the Disciples were leading. The latter had started out with the prominent idea of reformation, and the Baptist Churches were also included among those who needed reformation. At this time the Baptist Churches were practically divided into two classes, namely, those who were called Reformers, and those who still retained the Baptist faith as expressed in the Philadelphia Confession.

From 1824, up to the time the *Millennial Harbinger* was started, the “Reformation” became more and more aggressive, the result of which told very decidedly upon many Baptist Churches, as well as some Associations. During this whole period the leaven of the Campbellian movement was working, and the views of the “Reformers” were spreading in various directions through Ohio, Western Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Virginia, though gaining adherents mainly in Ohio and Kentucky. Even in 1826, Mr. Campbell had no idea of leaving the Baptists. During that year he wrote: “I and the Church with which I am connected are in full communion with the Mahoning Baptist Association of Ohio; and through them with the whole Baptist Association in the United States; and I intend to continue in connection with these people so long as they will permit me to say what I believe, to teach what I am assured of, and to censure what is amiss in their views and practices. I have no idea of adding to the catalogue of new sects. This game has been played long enough.” It will be remembered also that Mr. Campbell stipulated for these very privileges when he joined the Baptist denomination, and consequently he cannot be charged with having deceived any one with respect to the position which he occupied. But it has already been seen that, in the controversy between the Baptists and the “Reformers,” the Mahoning Association sided with the latter. This Association was finally dissolved in 1830, notwithstanding Mr. Campbell was present and opposed this radical action. But it was im-
possible for even him to stay the tide which was flowing in the direction of the “Reformers,” and he finally, reluctantly, consented to the transformation of the Association into a “Yearly Meeting,” which would have no authority, and would meet only for acquaintance and mutual edification. Other Baptist Associations followed the example of the Mahoning Association, and many Baptist Churches became identified with the “Reformers,” though in not a few cases these churches were divided.

Just here it is well to remember that Mr. Campbell and those immediately associated with him were not wholly responsible for the new leaven that was influencing the Baptist Churches.

So far we have traced the movement through certain individuals who were prominent leaders, but it is important to notice the fact that some of the earlier pleadings for reformation came through churches, rather than through individuals. A few of these churches may be mentioned.

In 1820, a Baptist Church in New York City, chiefly made up of Scotch people, who had come over from the old country, issued a very important document, which doubtless had considerable influence upon many other Baptist Churches, as well as upon individuals, into whose hands the document came.

After quoting many passages of Scripture referring to baptism, the document continues as follows:

From these several passages we may learn how baptism was viewed in the beginning by those who were qualified to understand its meaning best. No one who has been in the habit of considering it merely as an ordinance can read these passages with attention, without being surprised at the wonderful powers, and qualities, and effects, and uses, which are there apparently ascribed to it. If the language employed respecting it, in many of the passages, were to be taken literally, it would import that remission of sins is to be obtained by baptism, that an escape from the wrath to come is effected in baptism; that men are born children of God by baptism; that salvation is connected with baptism; that men wash away their sins by baptism; that men become dead to sin and alive to God by baptism; that the Church of God is sanctified and cleansed by baptism; that men are regenerated by baptism; and that the answer of a good conscience is obtained by baptism. All these things, if all the passages before us were construed literally, would be ascribed to baptism. And it was a
literal construction of these passages which led professed Christians, in the early ages, to believe that baptism was necessary to salvation. Hence arose infant baptism, and other customs equally unauthorised. And, from a literal construction of the words of our Lord Jesus, at the last Supper, arose the awful notion of trans-substantiation.

But, however much men have erred in fixing a literal import upon these passages, still the very circumstances of their doing so, and the fact that the meaning they imputed is the literal meaning, all go to show that baptism was appointed for ends and purposes far more important than those, who think it only an ordinance, yet have seen.

It is for the churches of God, therefore, to consider well, whether it does not clearly and forcibly appear, from what is said of baptism in the passages before us, each taken in its proper connection, and this baptism was appointed as an institution strikingly significant of several of the most important things relating to the kingdom of God; whether it was not in baptism that men professed, by deed, as they had already done by word, to have remission of sins through the death of Jesus Christ, and to have a firm persuasion of being raised from the dead through him, and after his example; whether it was not in baptism that they put off the ungodly character and its lusts, and put on the new life of righteousness in Christ Jesus: whether it was not in baptism that they professed to be born from above, and thereby fitted for an entrance into the kingdom of God, that is, the Church of God here on earth; whether it was not in baptism that they professed to be purified and cleansed from their defilement, and sanctified and separated to the service of God; whether it was not in baptism that they passed, as it were, out of one state into another, out of the kingdom of darkness into the Kingdom of God's Son; whether if any were ever known or recognised as having put on Christ, who had not thus been buried with him in baptism; whether, in fact, baptism was not a prominent part of the Christian profession, or in other words, that by which, in part, the Christian profession was made; and whether this one baptism was not essential to the keeping of the unity of the Spirit.

And if, on reflection, it should appear that these uses and purposes appertain to the one baptism, then it should be considered how far any one can be known, or recognised, or acknowledged as disciples, as having made the Christian profession, as having put on Christ, as having passed from death to life, who have not been baptised as the disciples of Christ.*

It is said that this document made a deep impression upon the mind of Walter Scott, and had much to do in gaining him to the great reformatory movement. It will be seen that the document shows the same reverence for

the Scriptures that Thomas Campbell does in his “Declaration and Address.” Whether this latter document had reached the New York Church and wrought its influence upon that church is not certain, though it is certain that the church, even before the Christian Baptist was started, was practically in line with the Campbellian movement. Other churches soon became prominent agitators and propagandists of practically the same principles as those advocated by the Campbells, so that the movement was really, almost from the beginning, a movement among and from the Baptist Churches themselves, rather than a movement upon these churches from the Campbells and those immediately associated with them.

A small church at Pittsburg, Pa., had been gathered by George Forrester, a Haldanean preacher, who supported himself by conducting an academy. It was this church which first influenced Walter Scott, when he arrived in the United States, in 1818. It was here also that Thomas Campbell conducted an academy for a short time. This church had for its pastor Sidney Rigdon, who afterwards became prominent as a preacher among the Disciples, as well as subsequently a leader among the Mormons. Walter Scott was serving the Haldanean Church while Rigdon was the pastor of the regular Baptist Church. A union was soon formed between these two churches, and this united church became the third church of the Reformation.

The formation of the second church at Wellsburg, now West Virginia, has already been referred to, as having been constituted by twenty members, dismissed from the Brush Run Church, and afterwards becoming identified with the Mahoning Association of Ohio. With respect to the church at Bethany, W. Va., Professor W. B. Taylor writes as follows:

“Few people realise how truly the Bethany Church is the mother church of the Restoration. It is the Brush Run Church transplanted, which was organised as a congregation of immersionists in June, 1811. It was later received into the Redstone (Pa.) Baptist Association with a distinct and written statement that they were to be guided only by the Scriptures. The members were badly scattered, Mr. A. Campbell living more than ten miles distant from the little log
meeting-house. Because of the removal of Thomas Campbell and his family; the widening duties of Alexander Campbell and his consequent absence from their meetings; the intense opposition of the Presbyterians, who dominated the community religiously; and the jealousy and intrigues of the Baptist preachers and leaders within the Redstone Association, the Brush Run congregation declined. Mr. Campbell and his father and their families were impelled to take membership with the Wellsburg, Va., Church in 1816 or 1817, after he had raised money for erecting their present building. They now escaped from the Redstone Association and entered the Mahoning Association. The little Brush Run Church was greatly persecuted, but continued their meetings, for nearly fifteen years aided by an occasional visit from Mr. Campbell, who rode from home over the most wretched roads for this eleven miles, preached to them for hours, and then returned the same day. This is the service of a man with deep conviction, little realising the greatness of his service and example.

“The Campbells retained their membership with the Wellsburg Church until ‘the spring of 1829,’ when the church was organised at Buffalo, now Bethany. The records of the Brush Run and the early records of the Bethany Church have been lost, but the early clerk's book of the Wellsburg Church contains this historic statement: ‘In the spring of 1829 Mr. A. Campbell and his father, T. Campbell, and their families and several others withdrew to organise a new society at Buffalo, thus very much weakening our congregation.’ The exact date of the organisation is not given. It was during the winter of 1829 that Mr. Campbell sat in the Constitutional Convention of Virginia, and according to a statement of Mrs. Decima Campbell Barclay, his daughter, he did not return home until the last of April or first of May, in that year. So the Bethany Church was organised in May, 1829.

“An old and yellow newspaper clipping, without name of paper or date, came into my hands in 1906, stating that the church at Bethany was organised in 1829 and held its meetings in a warehouse on Mr. Campbell's farm, near the mill, and that the remaining members of the Brush Run Church, who were in sympathy with ‘the reformers,’ united with the new congregation and the Brush Run
Church was disbanded. If this record be reliable, and I believe it is, because the time of organisation and place of meeting are confirmed by Mrs. Barclay, then the Bethany Church is a continuation of the Brush Run Church. Its first membership was made up of the Campbells, their families, and the brethren of the Brush Run Church in sympathy with the 'reformers.' This makes out the case and establishes its real origin in June, 1811, less than two years from the issuing of the 'Declaration and Address.'

“The original building at Brush Run was removed from its foundation, now overgrown with weeds and briars, to West Middletown. It was first used as a blacksmith shop, and now for a stable. The first building in Bethany was a small stone building on the site of the present building. It was erected in 1830 and 1831, and did service for twenty years. In that building Thomas Campbell preached his farewell sermon June 1, 1851. Immediately after this it was torn down and the present brick building was erected in its place. An effort is now being made to preserve this historic edifice and in connection with it to erect a memorial church in honour of the heroes of The Faith, who worshipped and laboured here. From this pulpit Mr. Campbell preached for years. From this sacred desk President Pendleton, Walter Scott, President Woolery, and Professors Milligan, Graham, Loos, and many of our noblest preachers have sounded forth the ‘Word of Life.’

“In coming years, when Christian Union shall be an accomplished fact, this will be one of the most valued buildings in Christendom, taking its place with Asbury, Epworth, and Old South Church.”

Other churches became prominent centres of influence in carrying on the work of the Reformation. It is not necessary now to name all these, though some of these have a very special place in the history of the movement. Among the most important may be mentioned the churches at Warren, Ohio, at New Lisbon, at East Fairfield, at Lordstown, at Youngstown, Sharon, Newton Falls, Paynesville, Mentor, Ravenna, Aurora, Akron, Salem, and many others which need not here be named. The one church, however, of the Ohio group which exerted as much influence as any other was the Sycamore Street Church,
in Cincinnati, which is now represented by the Central Church of that city. This church sprang from the Enon Baptist Church of Cincinnati, about 120 of whose members were granted letters from that church, in 1828, to form a new church, which at first settled for a while on Sycamore Street, and then removed to Walnut Street, and finally to Ninth and Central Avenue, the present location of the Central Christian Church.

After the formation of this new Baptist Church, Elder James Challen was elected pastor, at a salary of $300 per annum. At first the church adopted a modified creed, containing ten articles, the preamble of which affirms allegiance to Jesus Christ as the foundation of the Church, and furthermore, that in “all matters of religion we will take the Word of God in its legitimate connections and relations as of the highest authority, and of permanent obligation, and agree to receive it as our infallible guide and unerring rule, both of faith and practice.”

It was not long, however, until the Enon Baptist Church became dissatisfied with the course pursued by the new church, and this mother church sent a communication to the new church severely condemning the course of the latter with respect to several things. After a somewhat protracted and lengthy correspondence, the brethren who had been dismissed from the Enon Baptist Church became practically a separate church, and finally located on Sycamore Street, with James Challen as their pastor, as already stated. D. S. Burnett was one of the prominent leaders of the new movement, and was ever afterwards closely connected with this new church, and served it as pastor at two different times, for several years. From this time, he and James Challen occupied a distinguished position in advocating the new movement, especially in Southwestern Ohio. The former was a man of remarkable power in the pulpit; he was, indeed, one of the most eloquent men connected with the Disciple movement at this time, while the latter was a wise counsellor, a most exemplary Christian, and a man of considerable literary attainments. This new church moved from Sycamore Street to the corner of Eighth and Walnut, where it remained until what is known as the Central Christian Church was built at the beginning of the seventies. Perhaps no church in the Reformatory Movement has been
more influential in shaping the course of the movement than the one now under consideration. From the very beginning it has been a seed church, sending its members throughout the South and Southwest, where they have been instrumental in planting churches. For a long time it practically carried nearly the whole weight of responsibility in directing the missionary operations of the Disciples. In the later years it has become a downtown church, and it has been somewhat difficult to keep up its membership to the high standard of influence which the church formerly represented. Nevertheless, it is even to-day one of the strong churches of the brotherhood.

The church at Warren, Ohio, is another church which deserves special mention. This church early became prominently identified with the Disciple movement, and has always been a strong church, and has perhaps exerted as much, if not more, influence in favour of that movement than any other church in the Western Reserve. It was organised September 3, 1803, as a Baptist Church, by Elder Charles B. Smith. At the same time Adamson Bentley took pastoral charge. Soon after this steps were taken to build a new meeting house; and meantime services were held in the Courthouse, where the Lord's Supper was administered for five years. Bentley soon became an enthusiastic convert to the principles and aims of the Campbellian movement, and under the influence of Walter Scott, he became actively engaged in advocating the plea of the Disciples. The whole church practically followed his leadership.

Bentley was, in many respects, a remarkable man. He was born July 4, 1785, in Allegheny County, Pa., though his parents, while he was yet young, removed to Brook-field, Ohio. Here young Bentley was compelled to struggle under many difficulties in obtaining a fairly respectable education. He began to preach at nineteen, and was at that time a pronounced hyper-Calvinist. But when he became identified with the Disciple movement his Calvinism did not trouble him any longer. In the course of his ministry he travelled extensively in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. He was a man of much dignity, and carried with him a very strong personal influence. He was remarkable for what is called “levelheadedness.” He was a wise man, and therefore a great
leader. He came to the side of Campbell and Scott when his influence was very much needed, and it is doubtful whether any other man than Scott himself exerted a more powerful influence in favor of the Disciple movement in the Western Reserve than did Adamson Bentley.

Other churches and men in the Western Reserve deserve special mention, but space will not permit the notice of these in detail, and there is no particular need for this in a general history, as these churches and men receive considerable attention in books devoted to the Disciple movement in particular localities.
CHAPTER VIII

THE STONE MOVEMENT

SO far little has been said about the Disciple movement in Kentucky, for the reason that another movement, similar to that advocated by the Campbells, had antedated the issuance of the “Declaration and Address” by several years. In this movement, Barton W. Stone was the principal actor. He was born December 24, 1772, near Port Tobacco, Maryland. In 1779 his mother removed to Pittsylvania County, Virginia. Very early in life he determined to qualify himself for a barrister, and in order to acquire a liberal education for this purpose, he stripped himself of every hindrance, denied himself strong food, and lived chiefly on milk and vegetables, allowing himself only six or seven hours sleep out of the twenty-four. When he entered Guilford Academy, North Carolina, where he received his early education, a great religious revival was being conducted in the town, and the influence of this made a strong impression upon young Stone's mind, and finally changed the purpose of his life. Of this change he himself speaks as follows:

I now began seriously to think it would be better for me to remove from this academy, and go to Hampton Sidney College, in Virginia, for no other reason than that I might get away from the constant sight of religion. I had formed the resolution and had determined to start the next morning, but was prevented by a very stormy day. I remained in my room during that day, and came to the firm resolution to pursue my studies there, attend to my own business, and let everyone pursue his own way. From this I have learned that the most effectual way to conquer the depraved heart is the constant exhibition of piety and a godly life in the professors of religion.

Prior to this time he was much perplexed with respect to religion. During a great revival among the Baptists he says:
I was a constant attendant, and was particularly interested to hear the converts giving in their experience. Of their conviction and great distress for sin, they were very particular in giving an account, and how and when they obtained deliverance from their burdens. Some were delivered by a dream, a vision, or some uncommon appearance of light—some by a voice spoken to them, “Thy sins are forgiven thee”—and others by seeing the Saviour with their natural eyes. Such experiences were considered good by the church, and the subjects of them were received for baptism, and into full fellowship. Great and good was the reformation in society. Knowing nothing better, I considered this to be the work of God, and the way of salvation. The preachers had the art of affecting their hearers by a tuneful or singing voice in preaching.

About this time came in a few Methodist preachers. Their appearance was prepossessing—grave, holy, meek, plain, and humble. Their very presence checked levity in all around them—their zeal was fervent and unaffected, and their preaching was often electric on the congregation, and fixed their attention. The Episcopalians and Baptists began to oppose them with great warmth. The Baptists represented them as denying the doctrines of grace and of preaching salvation by works. They publicly declared them to be the locusts of the Apocalypse, and warned the people against receiving them. Poor Methodists! They were then but few, reproached, misrepresented, and persecuted as unfit to live on the earth. My mind was much agitated, and was vacillating between these two parties. For some time I had been in the habit of retiring in secret, morning and evening, for prayer, with an earnest desire for religion; but being ignorant of what I ought to do, I became discouraged, and quit praying, and engaged in the youthful sports of the day. *

These extracts are given, not only to show the formative influences which wrought upon the character of B. W. Stone, but also to show the character of the religion which prevailed at that time. It has already been stated that a reformation was sadly needed, and that undoubtedly, in the providence of God, the time had come when this reformation must begin. This state of things is further illustrated in Mr. Stone's own experience. He says:

According to the preaching and experience of the pious in those days, I anticipated a long and painful struggle before I should be prepared to come to Christ, or, in the language then used, before I should get religion. This anticipation was completely realised by me. For one year I was tossed on the waves of uncertainty—labouring, praying, and striving, to ob-
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tain saving faith—sometimes desponding and almost despairing of ever getting it. The doctrines then publicly taught were that mankind were so totally depraved that they could not believe, repent, nor obey the Gospel—that regeneration was an immediate work of the Spirit, whereby faith and repentance were wrought in the heart. These things were portrayed in vivid colours, with all earnestness and solemnity. Now was not then the accepted time—now was not then the day of salvation; but it was God's own sovereign time, and for that time the sinner must wait.

After passing through a period of severe struggle with respect to his religious life, Mr. Stone at last united with the Presbyterian Church, and soon thereafter, having finished his course at the Academy, he became a candidate for the ministry in the Orange Presbytery, and placed himself under the direction of William Hodge, whose sermon on the text “God is Love” was the final determining factor in Mr. Stone's conversion. He now set himself earnestly to the study of the Confession of Faith, and the more he studied it, the more his perplexities increased. The doctrines of Calvinism, taught in the Confession, were the chief difficulties in Mr. Stone's way. He could not reconcile these with what he conceived to be the teaching of the Bible, and at his final examination, when asked if he was willing to accept the Confession, his answer was “As far as consistent with the Word of God.” This answer clearly indicated the character of the man. Even at that early period we see clearly the indications of the coming events with which his future history was to be intimately identified. When God raises up a man for a special purpose, we can generally trace that purpose in the formative influences which enter into the making of the man. The experiences through which Mr. Stone had passed were all educational, and were doubtless necessary in the providence of God to fitly prepare him for the great work to which he had been called. But his humility was such that, if this work had been revealed to him at this early period, he would doubtless have shrunk from it, as Moses did when God called him to lead the children of Israel out of the land of bondage.

After preaching a short time in Virginia and North Carolina, in the year 1796, he visited Kentucky and commenced preaching at Caneridge in Bourbon County, where he finally settled, preaching part of the time at Caneridge.
and part of the time at Concord. It was during this time that those remarkable religious exercises, known as the “jerks,” were manifested in many parts of the country. Mr. Stone's own account of these curious revival scenes is not only interesting, but will serve to acquaint the reader with the conditions of religious society at the beginning of the nineteenth century:

The bodily agitations or exercises attending the excitement in the beginning of this century, were various, and called by various names;—as, the falling exercise—the jerks—the dancing exercise—the barking exercise—the laughing and singing exercise, etc. The falling exercise was very common among all classes, the saints and sinners of every age and of every grade, from the philosopher to the clown. The subject of this exercise would, generally, with a piercing scream, fall like a log on the floor, earth, or mud, and appear as dead. Of thousands of similar cases I will mention one. At a meeting, two gay young ladies, sisters, were standing together attending the exercises and preaching at the time. Instantly they both fell, with a shriek of distress, and lay for more than an hour apparently in a lifeless state. Their mother, a pious Baptist, was in great distress, fearing they would not revive. At length they began to exhibit symptoms of life, by crying fervently for mercy, and then relapsed into the same death-like state, with an awful gloom on their countenances. After awhile, the gloom on the face of one was succeeded by a heavenly smile, and she cried out “Precious Jesus” and rose up and spoke of the love of God, the preciousness of Jesus, and the glory of the Gospel, to the surrounding crowd, in language almost superhuman and pathetically exhorted all to repentance. In a little while after, the other sister was similarly exercised. From that time they became remarkably pious members of the church.

I have seen very many pious persons fall in the same way, from a sense of the danger of their unconverted children, brothers, or sisters—from a sense of the danger of their neighbours and of the sinful world. I have heard them agonising in tears and strong crying for mercy to be shown to. sinners and speaking like angels to all around.

The jerks cannot be so easily described. Sometimes the subject would be affected in some one member of the body, and sometimes in the whole system. When the head alone was affected, it would be jerked backward and forward, or from side to side, so quickly that the features of the face could not be distinguished. When the whole system was affected, I have seen the person stand in one place, and jerk backward and forward in quick succession, their head nearly touching the floor behind and before. All classes, saints and sinners, the strong as well as the weak, were thus affected. I have
enquired of those thus affected. They could not account for it; but some have told me that those were among the happiest seasons of their lives. I have seen some wicked persons thus affected, and all the time cursing the jerks, while they were thrown to the earth with violence. Though so awful to behold, I do not remember that any one of the thousands I have seen ever sustained an injury in body. This was as strange as the exercise itself.

The dancing exercise. This generally began with the jerks, and was peculiar to professors of religion. The subject, after jerking awhile, began to dance, and then the jerks would cease. Such dancing was indeed heavenly to the spectators; there was nothing in it like levity, nor calculated to excite levity in the beholders. The smile of heaven shone on the countenance of the subject, and assimilated to angels appeared the whole person. Sometimes the motion was quick and sometimes slow. Thus they continued to move forward and backward in the same track or alley till nature seemed exhausted, and they would fall prostrate on the floor or earth, unless caught by those standing by. While thus exercised, I have heard their solemn praises and prayers ascending to God.

The barking exercise (as opposers contemptuously called it) was nothing but the jerks. A person affected with the jerks, especially in his head, would often make a grunt or bark, if you please, from the suddenness of the jerk. This name of barking seems to have had its origin from an old Presbyterian preacher of East Tennessee. He had gone into the woods for private devotion, and was seized with the jerks. Standing near a sapling, he caught hold of it, to prevent his falling, and as his head jerked back, he uttered a grunt or kind of noise similar to a bark, his face being turned upwards. Some wag discovered him in this position, and reported that he found him barking up a tree.

The laughing exercise was frequent, confined solely with the religious. It was a loud, hearty laughter, but one sui generis; it excited laughter in no one else. The subject appeared rapturously solemn, and his laughter excited solemnity in saints and sinners. It is truly indescribable.

The running exercise was nothing more than that persons feeling some of these bodily agitations, through fear, attempted to run away, and thus escape from them; but it commonly happened that they ran not far before they fell, or became so greatly agitated that they could proceed no further. I knew a young physician of a celebrated family who came some distance to a big meeting to see the strange things he had heard of. He and a young lady had sportively agreed to watch over and take care of each other, if either should fall. At length the physician felt something very uncommon, and started from the congregation to run into the woods; he was discovered running as for life, but did not proceed far till he fell down, and there lay till he submitted to the Lord, and afterwards
became a zealous member of the church. Such cases were common.

I shall close this chapter with the singing exercise. This is more unaccountable than anything else I ever saw. The subject in a very happy state of mind would sing most melodiously, not from the mouth or nose, but entirely in the breast, the sounds issuing thence. Such music silenced everything, and attracted the attention of all. It was most heavenly. None could ever be tired of hearing it. Doctor J. P. Campbell and myself were together at a meeting, and were attending to a pious lady thus exercised, and concluded it to be something surpassing anything we had known in nature.

Thus I have given a brief account of the wonderful things that appeared in the great excitement in the beginning of this century. That there were many eccentricities, and much fanaticism in this excitement was acknowledged by its warmest advocates; indeed it would have been a wonder, if such things had not appeared, in the circumstances of that time. Yet the good effects were seen and acknowledged in every neighbourhood, and among the different sects it silenced contention and promoted unity for a while; and these blessed effects would have continued, had not men put forth their unhallowed hands to hold up their tottering ark, mistaking it for the ark of God.

Since the beginning of the excitement I had been employed day and night in preaching, singing, visiting, and praying, with the distressed, till my lungs failed, and became inflamed, attended with a violent cough and spitting of blood. It was believed to be a dangerous case and might terminate in consumption. My strength failed, and I felt myself fast descending to the tomb. Viewing this event near, and that I should soon cease from my labours, I had a great desire to attend a camp-meeting at Paris, a few miles distant from Caneridge. My physician had strictly forbidden me to preach any more till my disease should be removed.

At this camp-meeting the multitudes assembled in a shady grove near Paris, with their wagons and provisions. Here for the first time a Presbyterian preacher arose and opposed the work, and the doctrine by which the work amongst us had its existence and life. He laboured hard to Calvinise the people, and to regulate them according to his standard of propriety. He wished them to decamp at night, and to repair to the town, nearly a mile off, for worship in a house that could not contain half the people. This could not be done without leaving their tents and all exposed. The consequence was, the meeting was divided, and the work greatly impeded. Infidels and formalists triumphed at this supposed victory, and extolled the preacher to the skies; but the hearts of the revivalists were filled with sorrow. Being in a feeble state, I went to the meeting in town. A preacher was put forward, who had always been hostile to the work, and seldom mingled
with us. He lengthily addressed the people in iceberg style —its influence was deathly. I felt a strong desire to pray as soon as he should close, and had so determined in my own mind. He at length closed, and I arose and said, let us pray. At that very moment, another preacher of the same cast with the former, rose in the pulpit to preach another sermon. I proceeded to pray, feeling a tender concern for the salvation of my fellow creatures, and expecting shortly to appear before my Judge. The people became very much affected, and the house was filled with the cries of distress. Some of the preachers jumped out of a window back of the pulpit, and left us. Forgetting my weakness, I pushed through the crowd from one to another in distress, pointed them the way of salvation, and administered to them the comforts of the gospel. My good physician was there, came to me in the crowd, and found me literally wet with sweat. He hurried me to his house, and lectured me severely on the impropriety of my conduct. I immediately put on dry clothes, went to bed, slept comfortably, and rose next morning relieved from the disease which had baffled medicine, and threatened my life. That night's sweat was my cure, by the grace of God. I was soon able to renew my ministerial labours, and was joyful to see religion progressing. This happy state of things continued for some time, and seemed to gather strength with days. My mind became unearthly, and was solely engaged in the work of the Lord. I had emancipated my slaves from a sense of right, choosing poverty with a good conscience, in preference to all the treasures of the world. This revival cut the bonds of many poor slaves; and this argument speaks volumes in favour of the work. For of what avail is a religion of decency and order, without righteousness?

There were at this time five preachers in the Presbyterian connection, who were in the same strain of preaching, and whose doctrine was different from that taught in the Confession of Faith of that body. Their names were, Richard McNemar, John Thompson, John Dunlavy, Robert Marshall, and myself; the three former lived in Ohio, the two latter in Kentucky. David Purviance was then a candidate for the ministry, and was of the same faith. The distinguishing doctrine, which we boldly and everywhere preached, is contained in our Apology, printed shortly after that time, which I desire to be reprinted with these memoirs of my life, affixed to the same volume. From some of the sentiments of this Apology we afterwards dissented, especially on the Atonement, as stated in that book.

The distinguishing doctrine preached by us was, that God loved the world—the whole world, and sent his Son to save them, on condition that they believed in him—that the gospel was the means of salvation—but that this means would never be effectual to this end, until believed and obeyed by us—that God required' us to believe in his Son, and had given us
sufficient evidence in his Word to produce faith in us, if attended to by us—that sinners were capable of understanding and believing this testimony, and of acting upon it by coming to the Saviour and obeying him, and from him obtaining salvation and the Holy Spirit. We urged upon the sinner to believe note, and receive salvation—that in vain they looked for the Spirit to be given them, while they remained in unbelief—they must believe before the Spirit or salvation would be given them—that God was as willing to save them now, as he ever was, or ever would be—that no previous qualification was required, or necessary in order to believe in Jesus, and come to him—that if they were sinners, this was their divine warrant to believe in him, and to come to him for salvation—that Jesus died for all, and that all things were now ready. When we first began to preach these things, the people appeared as just awakened from the sleep of ages—they seemed to see for the first time that they were responsible beings, and that a refusal to use the means appointed was a damning sin.

The sticklers for orthodoxy amongst us writhed under these doctrines, but seeing their mighty effects on the people, they winked at the supposed errors, and through fear, or other motives, they did not at first publicly oppose us. They painfully saw their Confession of Faith neglected in the daily ministration by the preachers of the revival, and murmured at the neglect. In truth, that book had been gathering dust from the commencement of the excitement, and would have been completely covered from view, had not its friends interposed to prevent it. At first, they were pleased to see the Methodists and Baptists so cordially uniting with us in worship, no doubt, hoping they would become Presbyterians. But as soon as they saw these sects drawing away disciples after them, they raised the tocsin of alarm—the confession is in danger!—the church is in danger! O Israel to your tents!

These sticklers began to preach boldly the doctrines of their confession, and used their most potent arguments in their defence. The gauntlet was now thrown, and a fire was now kindled that threatened ruin to the great excitement; it revived the dying spirit of partyism, and gave life and strength to trembling infidels and lifeless professors. The sects were roused. The Methodists and Baptists, who had so long lived in peace and harmony with the Presbyterians, and with one another, now girded on their armour, and marched into the deathly field of controversy and war. These were times of distress. The spirit of partyism soon expelled the spirit of love and union—peace fled before discord and strife, and religion was stifled and banished in the unhallowed struggle for pre-eminence. Who shall be the greatest? seemed to be the spirit of the contest—the salvation of a ruined world was no longer the burden, and the spirit of prayer in mourning took its flight from the breasts of many preachers and people. Yet
there were some of all the sects who deplored this unhappy state of things; but their entreatling voice for peace was drowned by the din of war.

Though the revival was checked, it was not destroyed; still the spirit of truth lingered in our assemblies, and evidenced his presence with us. One thing is certain, that from that revival a fountain of light has sprung, by which the eyes of thousands are opened to just and proper views of the gospel, and it promises fair to enlighten the world, and bring them back to God and his institutions. *

In the concluding chapter of the Biography of Stone, Mr. John Rogers, the author of that Biography, gives a careful and apparently unbiased account of these revival manifestations, quoting various opinions, and finally reaching the conclusion that the manifestations were entirely abnormal and cannot be approved in the light of any intelligent understanding of Scriptural teaching. Mr. Rogers was himself a personal witness of these manifestations, and what he says ought to have considerable influence in forming a judgment as to the character and influence of what was at the time, no doubt, regarded as manifestations of the Spirit of God.

After reviewing the history of these and similar manifestations, Mr. Rogers concludes as follows:

In view then of the fanatical, bitter, and censorious spirit which often associates itself with these bodily agitations, and is highly promotive of them, the writer is decidedly opposed to them.

Having now given a brief history of these strange bodily agitations, as they have appeared in association with Christianity, both in the Old World and the New; having given the views in regard to them, of such men as Wesley, Whitefield, Erskine, Edwards, Richard Watson, and Professor Hodge; and having presented several reasons why we are opposed to them, we come now to a most important practical enquiry, viz: the true source of these exercises, as associated with religion. We have seen that Wesley, Whitefield, Erskine, Edwards, Watson, and others, have countenanced them as tokens of the divine favour. That Professor Hodge takes a decided stand against them, as the offspring of natural causes, and as wholly resolvable into an “infectious nervous disease“; as injurious to the best interests of religion, and discountenanced by the plainest teachings of the Scriptures. We have seen that enthusiasm and fanaticism, in their wildest shapes, have attended them—that jealousy, envy, hatred, evil suspicions, bitter revilings,

heart-burnings, unholy schisms, and strifes, have followed close in their train—that spiritual pride, censoriousness, a Pharisaic disposition, and a spirit that trusts too much in suggestions, impulses, and consequently, that underrates the word of God, is often associated with them. We have seen that to regard them as tokens of the divine favour is of the essence of fanaticism—that to suppose they are divine attestations of the truth of any dogma, is the most consummate nonsense, not to say presumption. We have also seen, that the gospel as presented by the Apostles never produced such results; and that consequently, the gospel, presented as it should be, will never produce them. But as they have been superinduced by the preaching of Calvinists and Arminians of almost every sect, may it not be, that there is some capital error that is common to them all, which is suited, in favourable circumstances, to produce them?

This is our decided conviction. And we now with all plainness, assert, that in our judgment this error relates to justification, or the doctrine of pardon. We would not be misunderstood here. We do not mean to say, that what is called orthodoxy on this subject is at fault, as to the grounds of pardon. So far as it teaches that, without the shedding of blood, there is no remission—that we are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus—that we have redemption in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins—that the blood of Jesus purges the conscience—cleanses from all sin—it occupies the true ground. But we do mean to assert, most distinctly, that it is seriously at fault, as to the means of enjoying an assurance—scriptural assurance, of that great blessing. Everything in orthodoxy, whether Calvinistic or Arminian, is out of joint here. All is at loose ends—nothing definite. Penitents are taught to strive, and seek after some undefined and undefinable influence or operation of the Spirit, by which they may know they are pardoned, and accepted of God. Their imagination is addressed and set at work to conjure up, what that something they are in search of may be; and what they may, or may not regard as proper evidence of pardon. Suppose from a clear view of his goodness, they feel that they love God because he first loved them,—and that they love the Saviour who has died to redeem them;—this alone can be no satisfactory evidence of pardon—for pardon is not love, nor is love an evidence that they who possess it, are pardoned. What is called regeneration, or a change of heart, is no evidence of pardon, for it is wholly distinct from it, and always goes before it. Indeed, so far from its being an evidence of pardon, it is only a preparation for it. True penitents then, under orthodox teaching, have no definite criteria by which to assure themselves of their pardon. They have no better evidence, than strong impressions, impulses, suggestions, feelings, or the agreement of their exercises of mind, with those of others, and thus trusting
to such uncertain evidences, “measuring themselves by themselves and comparing
themselves among themselves,” they have no rational or scriptural assurance of pardon, and
by apostolic authority are pronounced unwise. Here then, in this vague, undefined, and
undefinable notion of orthodoxy, where everything is left to conjecture, to impulse, to mere
feeling, to imagination, we have found an adequate cause of all these extravagances of which
we are speaking; and that therefore we may not wonder that persons of fervid imaginations,
and nervous temperaments, under the influence of this notion become the victims of every
vagary, every strong impression, or impulse of the mind—and are led by an ignis fatuus
through all the marshes, and swamps, and quagmires of religious enthusiasm and fanaticism
in their strangest and wildest forms. Here we have found a fountain opened, in the land of
orthodoxy, from which flow out, in various districts, these evil streams. *

Mr. Stone's work in the two churches of Caneridge and Concord was a great success,
though he could not deliver himself from the doubts which were in his mind with respect to
the doctrines of Calvinism set forth in the Confession of Faith. Nor was he alone with respect
to these theological troubles. Other members of the Presbytery shared with him in his
convictions, and the final outcome of the matter was that six of these withdrew from the
Lexington Kentucky Synod, and constituted themselves into a Presbytery which they called
the “Springfield Presbytery.” At this point, Mr. Stone's own account is very interesting. He
says:

Soon after our separation, I called together my congregations, and informed them that I
could no longer conscientiously preach to support the Presbyterian church—that my labours
should henceforth be directed to the advance of the Redeemer's kingdom, irrespective of
party—that I absolved them from all obligations in a pecuniary point of view, and then in
their presence tore up their salary obligation to me, in order to free their minds from all fear
of being called upon hereafter for aid. Never had a pastor and churches lived together more
harmoniously than we had for about six years. Never have I found a more loving, kind, and
orderly people in any country, and never have I felt a more cordial attachment to any others. I
told them that I should continue to preach among them, but not in the relation that had
previously existed between us. This was truly a day of sorrow, and the impressions of it are
indelible.

Thus to the cause of truth I sacrificed the friendship of two

large congregations, and an abundant salary for the support of myself and family. I preferred
the truth to the friendship and kindness of my associates in the Presbyterian ministry, who
were dear to me, and tenderly united in the bonds of love. I preferred honesty and a good
conscience to all of these. Having now no support from the congregations, and having
emancipated my slaves, I turned my attention cheerfully, though awkwardly, to labour on my
little farm. Though fatigued in body, my mind was happy, and “calm as summer evenings
be.” I relaxed not in my ministerial labours, preaching almost every night, and often in the
daytime, to the people around. I had no money to hire labourers, and often on my return
home, I found the weeds were getting ahead of my corn. I had often to labour at night while
others were asleep, to redeem my lost time.

Under the name of Springfield Presbytery we went forward, preaching, and constituting
churches; but we had not worn our name more than one year, before we saw it savoured of a
party spirit. With the man-made creeds we threw it overboard, and took the name Christian—
the name given to the disciples by divine appointment first at Antioch. We published a
pamphlet on this name, written by Elder Rice Haggard, who had lately united with us.
Having divested ourselves of all party creeds, and party names, and trusting alone in God,
and the word of his grace, we became a by-word and laughing stock to the sects around; all
prophesying our speedy annihilation. Yet from this period I date the commencement of that
reformation, which has progressed to this day. Through much tribulation and opposition we
advanced, and churches and preachers were multiplied.

Finally what was called the “Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery” was
published. As this document is fundamental in what is called the Stone Movement in
Kentucky, it is here given in its entirety, and, though intended to be somewhat humorous, it
cannot fail to impress the reader that the men who signed it were far in advance of most
religious teachers of that particular period:

THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT OF THE
SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY

For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of the testator; for a
testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all, while the testator
liveth. Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. Verily, verily, I say
unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it
bringeth forth much fruit. Whose voice then shook
the earth; but now he hath promised, saying, yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, yet once more, signifies the removing of those things that are shaken as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.—Scripture.

THE PRESBYTERY OF SPRINGFIELD, sitting at Cane-ridge, in the County of Bourbon, being through a gracious Providence in more than ordinary bodily health, growing in strength and size daily; and in perfect soundness and composure of mind; but knowing that it is appointed for all delegated bodies once to die; and considering that the life of every such body is very uncertain, do make, and ordain this our last Will and Testament, in manner and form following, viz:

Imprimis. We will, that this body die, be dissolved, and sink into union with the Body of Christ at large; for there is but one Body and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling.

Item. We will, that our name of distinction, with its Reverend title, be forgotten, that there be but one Lord over God's heritage, and his name One.

Item. We will, that our power of making laws for the government of the church, and executing them by delegated authority forever cease; that the people may have free course to the Bible, and adopt the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

Item. We will, that candidates for the Gospel ministry henceforth study the Holy Scriptures with fervent prayer, and obtain license from God to preach the simple Gospel, with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven, without any mixture of philosophy, vain deceit, traditions of men, or the rudiments of the world. And let none henceforth take this honour upon himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.

Item. We will, that the church of Christ resume her native right of internal government—try her candidates for the ministry, as to their soundness in the faith, acquaintance with experimental religion, gravity and aptness to teach; and admit no other proof of their authority but Christ speaking in them. We will, that the church of Christ look up to the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest; and that she resume her primitive right of trying those who say they are apostles, and are not.

Item. We will, that each particular church, as a body, actuated by the same spirit, choose her own preacher, and support him by a free will offering, without a written call or subscription—admit members—remove offences; and never henceforth delegate her right of government to any man or set of men whatever.

Item. We will, that the people henceforth take the Bible as the only sure guide to heaven; and as many as are offended with other books, which stand in competition with it, may cast
them into the fire if they choose; for it is better to enter into life having one book, than having many to be cast into hell.

*Item.* We will, that preachers and people, cultivate a spirit of mutual forbearance; pray more, and dispute less; and while they behold the signs of the times, look up, and confidently expect that redemption draweth nigh.

*Item.* We will, that our weak brethren, who may have been wishing to make the Presbytery of Springfield their king, and wot not what is now become of it, betake themselves to the Rock of Ages and follow Jesus for the future.

*Item.* We will, that the Synod of Kentucky examine every member, who may be suspected of having departed from the Confession of Faith, and suspend every such suspected heretic immediately; in order that the oppressed may go free, and taste the sweets of gospel liberty.

*Item.* We will, that Ja-----, the author of two letters lately published in Lexington, be encouraged in his zeal to destroy partyism. We will, moreover, that our past conduct may be examined into by all who may have correct information; but let foreigners beware of speaking evil of things which they know not.

*Item.* Finally we will, that all our sister bodies read their Bibles carefully, that they may see their fate there determined, and prepare for death before it is too late.

SPRINGFIELD PRESBYTERY | L.S.
June 28th, 1804.

John Dunlavy,
Richard M’Nemar,
B. W. Stone
John Thompson,
David Purviance.
Robert Marshall,

Witnesses.

THE WITNESSES’ ADDRESS

We, the above named witnesses of the Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery, knowing that there will be many conjectures respecting the causes which have occasioned the dissolution of that body, think proper to testify, that from its first existence it was knit together in love, lived in peace and concord, and died a voluntary and happy death.

Their reasons for dissolving that body were the following: With deep concern they viewed the divisions, and party spirit among professing Christians, principally owing to the adoption of human creeds and forms of government. While they were united under the name of a Presbytery, they endeavoured to cultivate a spirit of love and unity with all Christians; but found it extremely difficult to suppress the idea that they themselves were a party separate from others. This difficulty increased in proportion to their success in the ministry. Jealousies were excited in the minds of other denominations;
and a temptation was laid before those who were connected with the various parties, to view
them in the same light. At their last meeting they undertook to prepare for the press a piece
entitled Observations on Church Government, in which the world will see the beautiful
simplicity of Christian church government, stripped of human inventions and lordly traditions.
As they proceeded in the investigation of that subject, they soon found that there was neither
precept nor example in the New Testament for such confederacies as modern Church
Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, etc. Hence they concluded, that while
they continued in the connection in which they then stood, they were off the foundation of the
Apostles and Prophets, of which Christ himself is the chief corner stone. However just,
therefore, their views of church government might have been, they would have gone out under
the name and sanction of a self-constituted body.

Therefore, from a principle of love to Christians of every name, the precious cause of
Jesus, and dying sinners who are kept from the Lord by the existence of sects and parties in
the church, they have cheerfully consented to retire from the din and fury of conflicting
parties—sink out of the view of fleshly minds, and die the death. They believe their death will
be the great gain to the world. But though dead, as above, and stripped of their mortal frame,
which only served to keep them too near the confines of Egyptian bondage, they yet live and
speak in the land of Gospel liberty; they blow the trumpet of jubilee, and willingly devote
themselves to the help of the Lord against the mighty. They will aid the brethren, by their
council, when required; assist in ordaining elders, or pastors—seek the divine blessing—unite
with all Christians—commune together, and strengthen each others' hands in the work of the
Lord.

We design by the grace of God, to continue in the exercise of those functions, which
belong to us as ministers of the gospel, confidently trusting in the Lord, that he will be with
us. We candidly acknowledge, that in some things we may err, through human infirmity; but
he will correct our wanderings, and preserve his church. Let all Christians join with us, in
crying to God day and night, to remove the obstacles which stand in the way of his work, and
give him no rest till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth. We heartily unite with our
Christian brethren of every name, in thanksgiving to God for the display of his goodness in
the glorious work he is carrying on in our Western country, which we hope will terminate in
the universal spread of the gospel, and the unity of the church.

The effect of this document was at once electrical. At first it was not the purpose of Mr.
Stone and those associated with him to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church, but their
conference with representatives of the
Synod convinced them that they could not remain in that Church and at the same time advocate the principles which they then believed. They were committed to the advocacy of Christian union, and this fact alone made it necessary for them to hesitate in taking a step which looked like separation instead of union. But when it became necessary to choose between what they believed to be the teaching of the Word of God and the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, they could not hesitate any longer, and consequently they were compelled to take the step which finally separated them from their former religious associations. Mr. Stone's own account of some of the struggles through which they passed is as follows:

The brethren, elders, and deacons, came together on this subject; for we had agreed previously with one another to act in concert and not to adventure on anything new without advice from one another. At this meeting we took up the matter in a brotherly spirit, and concluded that every brother and sister should act freely, and according to their convictions of right and that we should cultivate the long-neglected grace of forbearance toward each other—they who should be immersed should not despise those who were not, and vice versa. Now the question arose who will baptise us? The Baptists would not, except we united with them; and there were no elders among us who had been immersed. It was finally concluded among us, that if we were authorised to preach, we were also authorised to baptise. The work then commenced; the preachers baptised one another and crowds came and were also baptised. My congregation very generally submitted to it, and it soon obtained generally, and yet the pulpit was silent on the subject. In Brother Marshall's congregation there were many who wished baptism. As Brother Marshall had not faith in the ordinance, I was called upon to administer. This displeased him and a few others.

The subject of baptism now engaged the attention of the people very generally, and some, with myself, began to conclude that it was ordained for the remission of sins, and ought to be administered in the name of Jesus to all believing penitents. I remember once about this time we had a great meeting at Concord. Mourners were invited every day to collect before the stand in order for prayers (this being the custom of the times). The brethren were praying daily for the same people, and none seemed to be comforted. I was considering in my mind what could be the cause. The words of Peter of Pentecost, rolled through my mind, “Repent and be baptised for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” I thought were Peter here he would thus address these mourners. I quickly arose and addressed them in
the same language, and urged them to comply. Into the spirit of the doctrine I was never fully led, until it was revived by Brother Alexander Campbell, some years after.

With the issuance of the Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery, and the acceptance of immersion as the only Scriptural baptism, the new movement was fairly launched in Kentucky, and soon became a potent factor throughout the whole community where Mr. Stone resided, and finally spread to other parts of the country, where the same principles had been making impression, but which had not found organisation until the new movement was fairly launched.

However, it was not long until discouragements began to show themselves. There seems to be a law in morals, as well as in physics, that everything has its dark period. The Apostle Paul says, “that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.” Death, or something like death, is the pathway through which everything has to go, in order to permanent life. The dark period of Christ's life—the temptation—immediately followed his baptism, and this fact simply represents what seems to be a universal law with respect to all development.

At any rate, religious movements are not exceptional as regards this law. Associated with Mr. Stone in the issuance of the “Last Will and Testament” were five other distinguished preachers of the Presbyterian Church, viz., Robert Marshall, John Dunlavy, Richard M'Nemar, John Thompson and David Purviance. Four of these soon left Mr. Stone, two of them, Richard M'Nemar and John Dunlavy, joined the Shakers, while John Thompson and Robert Marshall returned to the fellowship of the Presbyterian Church. Thus Stone was practically left alone to advocate the principles set forth in the “Last Will and Testament.” But in no respect did these discouragements dampen his ardour or cause him to hesitate for a single moment with respect to the great work to which he had committed himself. He continued to preach in various parts of the country, especially in Kentucky and Ohio. In the latter state he succeeded in bringing over to his banner about twelve Baptist preachers, whose adherence to his cause greatly encouraged him and inspired him with new hope concerning the final outcome of the movement which had been inaugurated. He trav-
elled extensively in that state, preaching and baptising the people, his meetings being very largely attended and sometimes accompanied with the manifestations which had been prevalent at Caneridge and Concord in the early days of his ministry.

The movement soon began to take on considerable dimensions, and the whole of central Kentucky became much influenced by it. After Mr. Stone and his co-labourers had adopted believers' immersion as the only baptism, the movement was calculated to influence very considerably the Baptist Churches of both Kentucky and Ohio, and as a matter of fact this result followed, at least in its leavening progress, though not many Baptist Churches became distinctly identified with the movement at this particular period.

After the Campbells issued their “Declaration and Address,” Mr. Stone watched with great interest the development of the Campbellian movement, and during his travels he came in touch with some of the preachers, especially in Northeastern Ohio, who were sympathising with the principles and aims of the “Declaration and Address.” In this way the two movements began to touch each other. At the same time Mr. Campbell was making excursions into Kentucky. In 1823 his debate with Mr. McCalla gave him a very favourable introduction to the Baptists of that state, and subsequently his visits there, as well as the circulation of the Christian Baptist in many parts of the state, were very influential in leavening many Baptist Churches with the principles he was advocating. The result was that by the time the Disciples became a separate people many Baptist Churches and preachers of the state had come over to the reformation standard. This was the state of things when the Millennial Harbinger was started in 1830.

Perhaps the Stone movement has never received ample justice in treating the Disciple movement. Undoubtedly, it was a very important factor in that movement. It is true that Mr. Stone and those associated with him, while accepting believers' immersion as the only Scriptural baptism, did not contend for a strictly baptised membership, allowing considerable liberty to the individual conscience with respect to the matter. This, indeed, was the view held by the Campbells in the beginning of their
movement. The “Declaration and Address” does not specially raise the question at all, though the principles of that Address compelled the abandonment of infant sprinkling.

In 1824 Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stone met for the first time at Georgetown, Kentucky, and they soon became very warm and steadfast friends. It was easy to see by comparison of views that they were aiming at practically the same thing, though they were pursuing a little different route by which to arrive at the end in view. Mr. Stone started his Christian Messenger in 1826, and this became a strong advocate of the principles for which he was contending. The circulation of this magazine, as well as the circulation of the Christian Baptist, at this time became a potent factor in disseminating the principles of the Reformation, though the two bodies, that is, the Reformers and the Christians, still occupied a somewhat separate position.

Meantime, some great churches were planted, and afterwards became very influential in carrying on the work. Most of the churches which were under the influence of Mr. Stone followed his leadership after he left the Presbyterian Church. Caneridge, Concord, Old Union, and many other churches in central Kentucky, and in Ohio, became seed churches for disseminating the principles of the “Reformers.” There were differences between the two bodies in several respects, but these differences were infinitesimal compared with the points of agreement.

We shall see in the next chapter how these differences became subordinated to the great question of Christian union.
CHAPTER IX

UNION OF “REFORMERS” AND “CHRISTIANS”

THERE can be no doubt about the fact that the Stone movement in Kentucky, and in other states, was a valuable forerunner of the Campbellian movement; and had not the “Reformers” (as those associated with Mr. Campbell were then called) been driven into a separate organisation, it is probable that the brethren associated with Barton W. Stone would have felt no difficulty in co-operating with those associated with the Campbells from the very beginning of their knowledge of each other. But by the time we reach the year 1830, the two movements had developed somewhat differently. While no particular name had been agreed upon officially, by either party, by a sort of general consent, the brethren associated with Stone called themselves “Christians,” while those associated with the Campbells called themselves “Disciples of Christ,” though by outsiders they were denominated “Reformers,” or “Campbellites,” as the “Christians” were, by outsiders, denominated “New Lights,” or “Stoneites.”

However, the main differences between the two bodies, at this particular time, from a practical point of view, was with respect to the ordinance of baptism, the “Reformers” requiring baptism in the case of all who sought membership with them, while the “Christians,” though affirming the Scriptural authority for immersion, did not make it an essential condition of membership in their churches.

That the two movements should differ at this point is not to be wondered at. Most of the preachers and members of the “Christian” Churches came from Pedo-Baptist families, while most of the members of the “Reformation “Churches came from Baptist families; and in many cases whole Baptist communities came over to the standard advocated by the Campbells. It is not possible to obtain any
trustworthy statistics as to the respective strength of these movements at this particular time. It is probable that an estimate of seven or eight thousand “Christians,” and a somewhat less number of “Reformers” existed at that time in Kentucky. Some of the ablest men among the Baptists had become identified with the “Reformers,” in various parts of Kentucky, and throughout the Southwest. Notably, such men as P. S. Fall of Louisville, who shortly became pastor of the church in Frankfort, which pastorate he held for twenty-five years. He was also pastor of the church in Nashville for a time. He was an Englishman by birth, well educated, and a man of unexceptional character.

John Smith, known as “Raccoon” John Smith, was another able minister who came from the Baptists to the standard of the “Reformers.” John T. Johnson, the brother of Richard M. Johnson, united with the Baptist Church in 1821, but between the years 1829 and 1830 he examined carefully the position advocated by the Campbells, and to use his own language, he says: “My eyes were opened, and I was made free by the truth, and the debt of gratitude I owe to that man of God, Alexander Campbell, no language can tell.” His addition to the ministry of the “Reformers” greatly accentuated their influence in Kentucky, for Johnson became, perhaps, the most effective evangelist of the movement at that time in the state. What Walter Scott was to the movement in Ohio, John T. Johnson was to it in Kentucky.

As regards the “Christians,” they also had some able men associated with them. Of course Stone himself was everywhere recognised as the leader of their forces; but associated with him were such men as John Rogers, T. M. Allen, John Allen Gano, B. F. Hall, and others of almost equal ability and earnestness; but perhaps those mentioned were chiefly instrumental in leading the forces in Kentucky. Gano was a great evangelist, second only to John T. Johnson, to whom reference has already been made, and Hall was a rising young man with great promise, while T. M. Allen was already a preacher of much influence. As these respective brethren operated largely in the same districts of country, they constantly came in contact with one another, and in this way they came to understand that they were all aiming at prac-
tically the same thing, namely, the overthrow of sectarianism and the union of God's people on a Scriptural platform.

This feeling of substantial unity was accelerated by the publication of the *Christian Messenger*, at Georgetown, Kentucky, edited by B. W. Stone. This periodical was started in 1826, and a careful examination of its pages will show that it advocated very generally the same things for which Mr. Campbell was contending in the *Millennial Harbinger*, and much for what he contended in the *Christian Baptist*, which was circulating in Kentucky at the time Mr. Stone began the publication of the *Christian Messenger*.

Meantime, in 1824, as has already been stated, Mr. Stone and Mr. Campbell had met, while the latter was making a tour in Kentucky, and had become deeply interested in each other personally, as well as theologically. It is one of the beautiful things connected with this particular period in the Reformatory movement that these two great leaders showed no jealousy with respect to each other. Stone was the impersonification of modesty and humility, while Campbell was equally the impersonification of courtesy and fairness. They soon learned to love each other, and this was the forerunner of the final union which took place between the two bodies. The same feeling characterised all the other leaders on both sides, and it is not remarkable, therefore, that in January, 1832, definite steps had been taken to bring the “Reformers” and “Christians” into one religious organisation.

The chief differences between the two bodies were with respect to baptism and the doctrine of the God-head, or “Trinity,” to use the popular term of theology. While the “Christians,” as has already been remarked, for the most part, practised believers' immersion, at the same time they allowed considerable liberty on this question, and consequently among them were some who practised infant baptism, and not a few who had simply been sprinkled. The other point of difference was purely theoretical, and consequently the very principles of both movements rejected this as a test of Christian fellowship. Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stone held to somewhat different views with respect to this matter, but neither was willing to make his
views a barrier in the way of Christian union, while each view was held simply as a private opinion.

This was the situation at the beginning of the year 1832, when a meeting was convened at Lexington, Kentucky, of both parties, with a view to a permanent union.

At this point it is well to give the testimony of Dr. Richardson with respect to the Stone movement, in contrast to the work of the Reformation, as this is found in his “Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” Volume II, pages 198-199.

While the features of this organisation were thus, in a good measure, similar to those of the reformation, in which Mr. Campbell was engaged, there were some characteristic differences. With the former, the idea of uniting all men under Christ was predominant; with the latter, the desire of an exact conformity to the primitive faith and practice. The one occupied itself chiefly in casting abroad the sweep-net of the Gospel, which gathers fishes of every kind; the other was more intent upon collecting “the good into vessels” and casting “the bad away.” Hence the former engaged mainly in preaching, the latter in teaching. The revivalist machinery of protracted meetings, warm exhortation, personal entreaty, earnest prayers for conversion and union, accompanied by a belief in special, spiritual operations and the use of the mourner's seat, existed with the one, while with the other the matters of chief interest were the disentanglement of the Christian faith from modern corruptions of it and the recovery of the Gospel ordinances and ancient order of things. There had, indeed, been an almost entire neglect of evangelisation on the part of its few churches which were originally connected with Mr. Campbell in his reformatory efforts. They had not a single itinerant preacher, and, although they made great progress in biblical knowledge they gained comparatively few converts. The churches of the “Christian Connection,” on the other hand, less inimical to speculative theories, granting membership to the unimmersed and free communion to all, and imperfectly acquainted with the order, discipline and institutions of the churches, made, through an efficient itineracy, large accessions everywhere, and increased with surprising rapidity. They were characterised by a simplicity of belief and manners and a liberality of spirit highly captivating, and possessed, in general, a striking and praiseworthy readiness to receive additional light from the Bible. They gained over, consequently, from the religious community many of the pious and peace-loving, who groaned under the evils of sectarianism, while the earnest exhortations of zealous preachers and their direct personal appeals to sinners obtained large accessions from the world.
This extract will show at once the value of the union of these two bodies. The “Christians” brought into the movement a new evangelistic element, while the “Reformers” brought into it an earnest study of the Scriptures, and an equally earnest plea for conformity to all the Scriptures enjoined. The union was effected upon the platform of a common faith and practice, without saying anything about some differences that existed between the two bodies. It is well, just here, to have an account, inspired by John Smith himself, as it gives a most interesting history of the meeting which took place for the consideration of a union between the two bodies:

At Lexington, especially, on New Year’s day, pursuant to the notice very generally given, many Disciples and Christians came together to talk over, once more, and finally, the points of difference between them, to ascertain whether the proposed union were practicable, and, if so, to agree upon the terms on which it should be affected. It was not a meeting of Elders or Preachers only, but a popular assembly—a mass meeting of the brethren.

While many had laid aside their prejudices, and were ready to consummate the union, some of each party still cherished honest doubts respecting the doctrine of the others. Some Reformers still looked upon the Christians as Arians; and some Christians were adverse to the union, in the belief that the Reformers denied the influence of the Spirit, and attached undue importance to baptism. On the other hand, while the Christians still refused to give up their name, the others were willing to concede that it was no less Scriptural and proper than Disciple. While all did not hold in the same sense that baptism was for the remission of sins, they all agreed that it was a divine ordinance, which could not safely be set aside or neglected. Finally, though they still differed on the question of free or restricted communion, each felt that it was his privilege to commune with the other, since they were all of one faith and one immersion.

On Saturday, the appointed day, a multitude of anxious brethren began, at an early hour, to crowd the old meetinghouse of the Christians, on Hill Street, in Lexington. There were Stone, and Johnson, and Smith, and Rogers, and Elley, and Creath, and many others, all guarded in thought and purpose against any compromise of the truth, but all filled with the spirit of that grandest of prayers, “May they all be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee; that the world may know that thou hast sent me.”

Smith was informed that it had been arranged that one from each party should deliver an address, and plainly set forth, according to his own conception, the scriptural ground
of union among the people of Christ. He was also told that he had been selected by the Disciples, and Stone by the Christians; and that it was the wish of the brethren that they should avoid the spirit and manner of controversy, and give their views of the plan of union freely, but without reference to party distinctions. When this had been announced, the two brethren went aside and conferred in private. Neither knew certainly what the other would say in the critical hour which had now come upon the churches; nor did either, in that moment or solemn conference, ask the other to disclose his mind or heart, touching their differences, more fully than he had already done.

“What is your choice, my brother?” said Stone, at length. “Will you speak first, or last?”

“Brother Stone, I have no choice,” said Smith. “I have already made up my mind about the matter; and what I have to say. can be said as well at one time as at another.”

“I wish you to talk first, then,” said Stone, “and I will follow.” And they returned to the house, as the hour for speaking had already come.

The occasion was to John Smith the most important and solemn that had occurred in the history of the Reformation. It was now to be seen whether all that had been said, and written, and done in behalf of the simple Gospel of Christ, and the union of Christians, was really the work of the Lord, or whether the prayers of Stone, and of Johnson, were but idle longings of pious, yet deluded hearts;—whether the toils and sacrifices of Smith were but the schismatic efforts of a bold enthusiast;—and whether the teachings of Campbell were only the speculations of a graceless and sensuous philosophy. The denominations around mocked, and declared that such a church without a constitution could not stand, and that a union without a creed was but the chimera of a dreamy and infatuated heresy.

Smith arose with simple dignity, and stood, prayerful and self-possessed, before the mingling brotherhoods. He felt, as no one else could feel it, the weight of the responsibility that rested on him. A single unscriptural position taken—the least sectarian feeling betrayed—an intemperate word—a proud, unfraternal glance of the eye—might arouse suspicion and prejudice, and blast the hope of union in the very moment when it was budding with so many promises. Every eye turned upon him, and every ear leaned to catch the slightest tones of his voice. He said:

God has but one people on the earth. He has given to them but one Book, and therein exhorts and commands them to be one family. A union such as we plead for—a union of God's people on that one Book—must, then, be practicable.

Every Christian desires to stand complete in the whole will of God. The prayer of the Saviour, and the whole tenor of his teaching, clearly show that it is God's will that his chil-
dren should be united. To the Christian, then, such a union must be desirable.

But an amalgamation of sects is not such a union as Christ prayed for, and God enjoins. To agree to be one upon any system of human invention would be contrary to his will, and could never be a blessing to the Church or the world; therefore the only union practicable or desirable must be based on the word of God as the only rule of faith and practice.

There are certain abstruse or speculative matters—such as the mode of the Divine Existence, and the Ground and Nature of Atonement—that have, for centuries, been themes of discussion among Christians. These questions are as far from being settled now as they were in the beginning of the controversy. By a needless and intemperate discussion of them much feeling has been provoked, and divisions have been produced.

For several years past I have tried to speak on such subjects only in the language of inspiration; for it can offend no one to say about those things just what the Lord himself has said. In this scriptural style of speech all Christians should be agreed. It cannot be wrong—it cannot do harm. If I come to the passage, “My father is greater than I,” I will quote it, but will not stop to speculate upon the inferiority of the Son. If I read “Being in the form of God, he thought it was not robbery to be equal with God,” I will not stop to speculate upon the consubstantial nature of the Father and Son. I will not linger to build a theory on such texts, and thus encourage a speculative and wrangling spirit among my brethren. I will present these subjects only in the words which the Lord has given to me. I know he will not be displeased if we say just what he has said. Whatever opinions about these and similar subjects I may have reached, in the course of my investigations, if I never distract the Church of God with them or seek to impose them on my brethren, they will never do the world any harm.

I have the more cheerfully resolved on this course, because the Gospel is a system of facts, commands, and promises, and no deduction or inference from them, however logical or true, forms any part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. No heaven is promised to those who hold them, and no hell is threatened to those who deny them. They do not constitute, singly or together, any item of the ancient and apostolic Gospel.

While there is but one faith, there may be ten thousand opinions; and hence, if Christians are ever to be one, they must be one in faith, and not in opinion. When certain subjects arise, even in conversion or social discussion, about which there is a contrariety of opinion and sensitiveness of feeling, speak of them in words of the Scriptures, and no offence will be given, and no pride of doctrine will be encouraged. We may even come, in the end, by thus speaking the same things, to think the same things.
For several years past I have stood pledged to meet the religious world, or any part of it, on the ancient Gospel and order of things, as presented in the words of the Book. This is the foundation on which Christians once stood, and on it they can, and ought to, stand again. From this I cannot depart to meet any man, or set of men, in the wide world. While, for the sake of peace and Christian union, I have long since waived the public maintenance of any speculation I may hold, yet not one gospel fact, commandment, or promise, will I surrender for the world!

Let us, then, my brethren, be no longer Campbellites, or Stoneites, New Lights, or Old Lights or any kind of lights, but let us all come to the Bible and to the Bible alone, as the only Book in the world that can give us all the Light we need.

He sat down, and Stone arose, his heart glowing with love, and every pulse bounding with hope. “I will not attempt,” said he, “to introduce any new topic, but will say a few things on the same subjects already presented by my beloved brother.”

After speaking for some time in a strain of irresistible tenderness, he said “that controversies of the Church sufficiently prove that Christians never can be one in their speculations upon those mysterious and sublime subjects, which, while they interest the Christian philosopher, can not edify the Church. After we had given up all creeds and taken the Bible, and the Bible alone, as our rule of faith and practice, we met with so much opposition, that, by force of circumstances, I was led to deliver some speculative discourses upon these subjects. But I never preached a sermon of that kind that really feasted my heart; I always felt a barrenness of soul afterwards. I perfectly accord with Brother Smith that those speculations should never be taken into the pulpit; but that when compelled to speak of them at all, we should do so in the words of inspiration.

“I have not one objection to the ground laid down by him as the true scriptural basis of union among the people of God; and I am willing to give him, now and here, my hand.”

He turned as he spoke, and offered to Smith a hand trembling with rapture and brotherly love, and it was grasped by a hand full of the honest pledges of fellowship, and the union was virtually accomplished!

It was now proposed that all who felt willing to unite on these principles, should express their willingness by giving one another the hand of fellowship; and elders and teachers hastened forward, ana joined their hands and hearts in joyful accord. A song arose, and brethren and sisters, with many tearful greetings, ratified and confirmed the union. On Lord's day, they broke the loaf together, and in that sweet and solemn communion, again pledged to each other their brotherly love.

This union of the Christians and the Disciples was not a surrender of the one party to the other; it was an agreement
of such as already recognised and loved each other as brethren, to work and to worship together. It was a union of those who held alike the necessity of implicit faith and of unreserved obedience; who accepted the facts, commands, and promises, as set forth in the Bible; who conceded the right of private judgment to all; who taught that opinions were no part of the faith delivered to the saints; and who were now pledged that no speculative matters should ever be debated to the disturbance of the peace and harmony of the Church, but that when compelled to speak on controverted subjects, they would adopt the style and language of the Holy Spirit.

It was an equal and mutual pledge and resolution to meet on the Bible as on common ground, and to preach the Gospel rather than to propagate opinions. The brethren of Stone did not join Alexander Campbell as their leader, nor did the brethren of Campbell join Barton W. Stone as their leader; but each, having already taken Jesus the Christ as their only leader, in love and liberty became one body; not Stoneites, or Campbellites; not Christians, or Disciples, distinctively as such; but Christians, Disciples, saints, brethren, and children of the same Father who is God over all and in all.

His co-operation with Stone and Johnson in the work of bringing the two parties together John Smith always regarded as the best act of his life. “But do you not fear,” said a timid and dissatisfied brother to him that day, “that what you have now done will drive your old Baptist brethren still further from you? You cannot overcome their prejudices against the Arians; and it was certainly bad policy to raise this new barrier between them and the Reformation.”

“I know not,” said Smith in reply, “how that may be; but certain I am that the union of Christians, upon a scriptural basis, is right, and that it can never be bad policy to do what is right.”

“Are there no differences of opinion between you and the Reformers?” inquired others about that time.

“We answer, we do not know,” said the Christians, “nor are we concerned to know; we have never asked them what their opinions were, nor have they asked us. If they have opinions different from ours they are welcome to have them, provided they do not endeavour to impose them on us as articles of faith; and they say the same of us.”

“But have you no creed or confession as a common bond of union?”

“We answer, yes; we have a perfect one, delivered to us from heaven, and confirmed by Jesus and his apostles—the New Testament.”

“How will you now dispose of such as profess faith in Jesus and are baptised? To which party will they be attached as members?”

“We answer, we have no party. It is understood among us that we feel an equal interest in every Church of Christ, and
we are determined to build up all such churches without any regard to their former names.”

“But will the Christians and Reformers thus unite in other sections of the country and in other States?”

“We answer, if they are sincere in their profession, and destitute of a party spirit, they will undoubtedly unite. But, should all elsewhere act inconsistently with their profession, we are determined to do what we are convinced is right in the sight of God.”

It is worthy of mention that at the very time when these events were transpiring in Kentucky, the spirit of union was prevailing over sectarian prejudice in other States also. John Longley, a Christian, writing to Elder Stone, from Bush County, Indiana—the home of John P. Thompson—under date of the twenty-fourth of December, 1831, says:

“The Reforming Baptists and we are all one here. We hope that the dispute between you and Brother Campbell, about names and priority, will forever cease, and that you will go on, united, to reform the world.”

Griffeth Cathey, of Tennessee, on the fourth of January, 1832, writes, in substance:

“The members of the Church of Christ, and the members known by the name of Disciples, or Reformed Baptists, regardless of all charges about Trinitarianism, Arianism, and Socinianism, and of the questions, whether it is possible for any person to get to heaven without immersion, or whether immersion is for the remission of sins, have come forward, given the right hand of fellowship, and united upon the plain and simple Gospel.” *

As in the days of old, when the sons of God came together, Satan came into their midst, so it was with the union meeting which took place in 1832. It was not long until the union was practically severed, on account of certain dissensions which began to arise with those who held to shibboleths, rather than to “where the Bible speaks, we speak, and where it is silent, we are silent.”

However, it was arranged that Elders John Smith and John Rogers should take the field, and do whatever was possible to be done to bring about a permanent union between the two bodies. In the Messenger of January 1832, this fact is stated in the following words:

To increase and consolidate this union, and to convince all of our sincerity, we, the Elders and brethren, have separated two Elders, John Smith and John Rogers; the first known formerly by the name of Reformer, the latter by the name of Christian. These brethren are to ride together through all

the churches, and to be equally supported by the united contributions of the churches of both descriptions; which contributions are to be deposited together, with Brother John T. Johnson as treasurer and distributor.

Perhaps no two men could have been selected who were better qualified for this important task than Elders Rogers and Smith. They were both men of the highest integrity and of the noblest consecration to the cause of Christ. Rogers became the biographer of both B. W. Stone and John T. Johnson, and in dealing with this union movement and the chief men concerned in it he shows a fairness with respect to the issues at stake, and a grasp of all the conditions that eminently qualified him for the task of co-operating with Smith in making the union permanent.

Smith was a man of unusual native talent. He was uneducated, as education is understood generally, but he was well educated for the great work committed to his hands. It is said that Alexander Campbell once remarked that “John Smith was the only man he ever knew who would have been spoiled by a collegiate education.” He was certainly one of God's noblemen. He thoroughly understood the Scriptures, and as a speaker before the people, he was perhaps without a peer in the whole state of Kentucky. Besides he had the confidence of his brethren everywhere, and no one could have been sent among the “Reformers” whose influence would have been greater. These “Reformers” were among those who were questioning the union, and the address which Smith made shows conclusively that they were raising questions which had been entirely ignored at the meeting where the union had been effected. The Address is so comprehensive, and at the same time occupies such an important historical position, that it is here presented without any abbreviation:

Beloved Brethren: It becomes my duty to lay before our brethren and the public the principle from which I acted, when, with many Reformers, so called, and many of those called Christians, we met together, broke the loaf, and united in all the acts of social worship. It will be recollected that all our remarks relative to the Christian brethren are confined to those with whom we have associated about Lexington, Georgetown, Paris, Millersburg, and Carlisle. When the Christians and the Reforming brethren united, as above named, we calculated at the time that the captious, the cold-hearted,
sectarian professor, and the friends of religious systems formed by human device, would misrepresent and slander us. But we do not mind all this. It is no more than we expect from such characters; and we hope we shall always be able to bear reviling like Christians, and not revile again. We do not publish this address with the hope of satisfying or silencing our opposers; but hearing that some of our warm-hearted, pious, Reforming brethren, having heard many reports, and not being correctly informed on this subject, have become uneasy, fearing that the good cause of the Reformation may be injured by the course which we have taken in relation to the Christian brethren, we therefore feel it to be a duty which we owe to our brethren and to the cause which we profess, to lay before them and the public, candidly and plainly, the principle from which we have acted, relative to this matter—which is as follows:

When we fell in company with the Christian teachers, we conversed freely and friendly together. With some one or other of them we have conversed on all the supposed points of difference between them and the Reformers, and all the erroneous sentiments which I had heard laid to their charge, such as the following:

1. That they deny the Atonement. On this point I found the truth to be in substance, about this: That they do not deny the Atonement, but they do deny the explanation which some give of it. At the same time they declare that pardon and salvation here are obtained through faith in the sacrifice and blood of Jesus Christ. They expect, and pray for, all spiritual blessings through the same medium, and hope to overcome at the last, and obtain eternal salvation, by the blood of the Lamb, and by the Word of his testimony. This, substantially, if not verbatim, one of their principal teachers said to me; and this, I believe, they are all willing to say, so far as I have been conversant with them.

When I have conversed with them about the various speculations upon the character of Christ, or the modus existendi of the Divine Being, they have said that, by the misrepresentations and violent opposition of their enemies, they had been sometimes driven into speculations on that subject. They also say they are not only willing, but desirous, that all speculations on that subject may cease forever; and that all should speak of the Saviour of sinners in the language of the inspired writers, and render under him such honour as did the Primitive Christians. So say I; and let Unitarianism, Trinitarian-ism and all other human isms, return from whence they came, and no more divide the affections, prevent nor destroy the union, of Christians forever. Amen and Amen.

2. I have also conversed freely with the Christian teachers upon the subject of receiving the unimmersed into the Church, and of communing with them at the Lord's table. They have said that they have had, and still have, in some degree, their diffi-
culties on this subject. In their first outset they were all Pedobaptists. Having determined to take the Word of God alone for their guide, some of them soon became convinced that immersion was the only Gospel baptism; and they submitted to it accordingly. They went on teaching others to do likewise; the result has been that all, with very few exceptions, belonging to their congregations in this section of country, have submitted to immersion. They have not, for several years past, received any as members of their body without immersion. And with regard to the propriety of communing at the Lord's table with the unimmersed, they are determined to say no more about it, there being no apostolic precept nor example to enforce it. But whatever degree of forbearance they may think proper to exercise toward the unimmersed as best suited to the present state of things, they are determined, by a proper course of teaching, and practicing the Apostolic Gospel, to bring all, as fast as they can, to unite around the cross of Christ—submitting to the one Lord, one faith, one immersion—and thus form one body upon the one foundation, according to the apostolic order of things.

Here I must say, that when the Christian brethren have spread the Lord's table in my presence, they did not invite the unimmersed to participate. When the Apostle said, “Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat,” he did not say this to the unimmersed, or those who were not in the kingdom, but to the Church of God at Corinth, the members of which had heard, believed, and had been immersed. (Acts xviii:8.) In a word, I believe that the Christian teachers with whom I have had intercourse, teach as plainly, and as purely, what the primitive teachers taught, and require as precisely what they required, in order to the admission of members into the congregation of Christ, as any people with whom I am acquainted.

I have not written this for the sake of the Christian brethren, but for the sake of some of our Reforming brethren, who seem to be alarmed, fearing that I and some other Reforming teachers, have injured the good cause in which we have been engaged, by sanctioning all the speculations and errors which have been laid to the charge of the people called Christians, whether justly or unjustly. That our Reforming brethren may be enabled to judge and determine upon the propriety or impropriety of our conduct, when we and the Christian brethren united in all the acts of social worship, we have thought it proper to lay before them what we understand to be the views and the practice of the Christian teachers, in the several important particulars named above.

If, in doing this, we have in any particular been mistaken, or have misrepresented them, we can assure them that we have not done it designedly; they will, therefore, have the goodness to correct the error, and pardon me. On the other hand, if the above named views of the Christian brethren be correct, I would then ask any brother, what law of Christ is violated
when we break the loaf together? Or when we meet with those on the King's highway, who have been immersed upon a profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and are walking in his commandments, by what rule found in the New Testament could we reject them, or refuse to break bread with them?

3. It may be asked, if the people called Christians, who have ceased to speculate upon the character of Christ, have given up their Unitarian opinions? And may it not as well be asked, have they who speculate upon the character of Christ before they became Reformers, given up their Trinitarian opinions?

To both these questions I would answer, I do not know, neither do I care. We should always allow to others that which we claim for ourselves—the right of private judgment.

If either Christians or Reformers have erroneous opinions, they never can injure any person, provided we all have prudence enough to keep them to ourselves. Neither will they injure us, if we continue to believe the Gospel facts, and obey the law of the King. If all who profess to be teachers of the Christian religion would keep their opinions to themselves, teach the gospel facts, and urge the people to obey them, the world would soon be delivered from the wretched, distracting, and destructive influences of mystical preaching.

4. Again, it is asked, when you break bread with those called Christians about Georgetown, etc., do you not sanction all the sectarian speculations of all those who are called by the same name throughout the United States? No. The Christian Churches are not bound together by written, human laws, like many others; and even if they were, I should not believe that I had sanctioned any sectarian peculiarity which might be among them, because I find nothing either in Scripture or reason to make me believe so. If such an idea had been taught in the New Testament, surely the Reformers never would have acted as they have done, and are still doing. For example: after many of us became Reformers, we continued to break bread with many of those who continued to plead for all their old sectarian peculiarities and human traditions—even in our own congregation—without even so much as dreaming that we were sanctioning all or any of their unscriptural peculiarities, or those of the Associations with which we were in correspondence. You will say that all these had come into the kingdom by faith and immersion. Granted: and so had those Christians with whom we broke bread, so far as we know.

Once more. It is well known that Brother G. Gates, as yet, stands formally connected with the Elkhorn Association; and that all the Reformers cheerfully commune with him, as they ought to do, at the Lord's table, not thinking, for one moment, that in so doing they sanction all the peculiarities which belong to that body, and all the other associations with which
they stand formally connected. Similar cases might be multiplied, but we deem it unnecessary.

When our brethren shall have seen this, we hope that they will be satisfied that we have not laid aside our former speculations, and taken up those of any other people. They cannot think that we wish to amalgamate the immersed and the unimmersed in the congregation of Christ. We do not find such amalgamation in the ancient congregations of Christ. Therefore, whilst contending for the ancient order of things, we cannot contend for this.

5. We are pleased with the name Christian, and do desire to see it divested of every sectarian idea, and everything else but that which distinguished the primitive Christians from all other people, in faith and practice, as the humble followers of the meek and lowly Redeemer. And we do believe that the Christian brethren about Georgetown, etc., would be as much gratified to see this as we would be ourselves.

The friends of the Reformation may easily injure their own cause by giving to it a sectarian character; against which we should always be specially guarded. And in order to avoid this, and all other departures from the Apostolic order of things, we cannot, we will not, knowingly sanction any tradition, speculation, or amalgamation unknown to the primitive Christian congregations. On the other hand, we are determined by the favour of God, to the utmost of our ability, to teach what the primitive disciples taught; and in admitting persons into the congregation of Christ, we will require what they required, and nothing more. We will urge the practice of all the Apostolic commands and examples given to the primitive Christians, and thus labour for the unity of the disciples of Christ upon this one foundation. And wherever we find others—whatever they may have been called by their enemies—labouring for the same object, aiming at the same thing, we are bound joyfully to receive them, treat them as Christians, and co-operate with them. And such we believe are the Christian brethren about Lexington, Georgetown, Paris, Millersburg, and Carlisle.

We have now laid before our brethren, candidly and plainly, the principle upon which we have acted, relative to the union spoken of between the Christians and Reformers about Georgetown, etc., which, we think, is perfectly consistent with that from which we have acted for several years past. But if we have done anything which the Gospel or the law of Christ will not justify, we would be glad to know it, as we do desire, above all things, to know the whole truth, and to practise it; and as we think that the best of us, either as individuals, or as congregations, are not fully reformed, but reforming.

We hope that the editors of reforming periodicals (Brethren Campbell, Scott, etc.), if they see this in the Messenger, will notice it in their journals, with such remarks of commendation or correction as they may think proper. We make
this request because we think circumstances actually require it.*

John Roger, Smith's associate, in this great work of unifying the churches which had come into the union, gives his impression also of the situation, and as the representative of the "Christians," it will be seen that he practically endorses all that Smith said to his brethren:

Having just come out of Babylon, it is scarcely possible we are entirely clear of all her corruptions. Already in the light of Heaven we have detected some important errors in our former views; we are determined, therefore, to test every sentiment we hold, by the infallible Word, renouncing error whenever convinced of it, and following the truth wherever it leads, disregarding the frowns and persecutions of the sects. 'Tis through truth which is able to make us wise to salvation; we will, therefore, count all things loss (that come into competition with it) for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord. Now in proof and illustration of our third fact, let us glance at our history.

When we left the Presbyterian Church, we were in the dark upon the subject of baptism, and continued so for a number of years; and the reason is obvious. The human mind cannot investigate every subject at once; and as your minds were engrossed with the consideration of the subjects of faith, special operations of the spirit in order to faith, creeds, party names, and the five points of Calvinism, you never once thought of baptism. But as soon as you had leisure to look about you, and call up your views of baptism and test them by the book, you saw at once, and acknowledged your mistake, and were forthwith baptised by scores; and now there is scarcely a Pedo-baptist among us, so mightily has the truth triumphed. Since that time the subject of apostolic succession, or of a special call to the ministry, has been weighed in the scales of the sanctuary, and in the estimation of many of us found wanting. And even those among us who contend for the doctrine theoretically, reject it practically. This last remark, however, by the way. So also the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, has, within a few years, been brought before us, and much investigated. Some among us have embraced it cordially; others reject it. What then? Shall those who embrace it, condemn those, who though they believe in immersion, cannot go the whole length with us in the matter? God forbid. Or shall those who do not receive it, condemn us who do receive it? I trust not. Charity forbids it. Our principles forbid it. Here then, dear brethren, firmly united upon the book, upon the highest ground that can be taken, let us move forward, investigating every religious subject, testing every sentiment by our creed; cultivating the love

of truth and holiness, never making any opinion a test of Christian fellowship; never resting till we are filled with the knowledge of God's will; in all wisdom and spiritual understanding; that we may walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work. Brethren, mistake us not; we sincerely wish to see promoted among us, a religion which will purify our hearts from all sin, and fill our lives with our good fruits.*

It may be well to quote just here what Mr. Stone himself said with respect to the union. He was evidently deeply impressed by what had been accomplished, and he gives expression to his feelings in the following quotation from an article in his magazine:

We are happy to announce to our brethren and to the world the union of Christians in fact in our country. A few months ago the Reforming Baptists, (known invidiously by the name of Campbellites,) and the Christians in Georgetown and the neighbourhood, agreed to meet and worship together. We soon found that we were indeed in the same spirit, on the same foundation, the New Testament, and wore the same name, Christian. We saw no reason why we should not be the same family. The Lord confirmed this union by his presence, for a good number was soon added to the Church. We agreed to have a four days' meeting on Christmas in Georgetown, and on New Year's Day in Lexington, for the same length of time. A great many elders, teachers, and brethren, of both descriptions, assembled together, and worshipped together in one spirit and with one accord. Never did we witness more love, union, and harmony, than was manifested at these meetings. Since the last meeting we have heard of the good effects. The spirit of union is spreading like fire in dry stubble.

It may be asked, is there no difference of opinion among you? We answer, we do not know, nor are we concerned to know. We have never asked them what was their opinion, nor have they asked us. If they have opinions different from ours, they are welcome to have them, provided they do not endeavour to impose them on us as articles of faith. They say the same of us. We hear each other preach, and are mutually pleased and edified.

It may be asked again—Have you no creed or confession as a common bond of union? We answer, yes. We have a perfect one, delivered to us from Heaven, and confirmed by Jesus and his Apostles—we mean the New Testament. We have learned from the earliest history of the Church to the present time, that the adoption of man-made creeds has been the invariable cause of division and disunion. We have, therefore, rejected all such creeds as bonds of union, and have determined to rest on that alone given by divine authority, being *Christian Messenger, Vol. VI., p. 103.
well assured that it will bind together all who live in the spirit of it.

It may again be asked—How will you dispose of such as profess faith in Jesus and are baptised? To which party shall they be attached as members? We answer: We have no party. It is understood among us, that we feel an equal interest in the prosperity of every Church of Christ, (and of such we all profess to be members,) and are determined to build up and edify all such churches, without any regard to former names by which they may have been called.

To increase and consolidate this union, and to convince all of our sincerity, we, the elders and brethren, have separated two Elders, John Smith and John Rogers, the first known, formerly by the name of Reformer, the latter by the name Christian. These brethren are to ride together through all the churches, and to be equally supported by the united contributions of the churches of both descriptions; which contributions are to be deposited together with Brother John T. Johnson, as treasurer and distributor. We are glad to say, that all the churches, as far as we hear, are highly pleased, and are determined to co-operate in the work.

Some may ask—Will the Christians and Reformers thus unite in other states and sections of our country? We answer —If they are sincere in their profession and destitute of a party spirit, they will undoubtedly unite. They all profess the same faith, they all reject human creeds and confessions— they all declare that opinions of truth are fallible, and, therefore, should not be substituted for truth, nor embodied in an authoritative creed, written or verbal; nor imposed as terms of fellowship among obedient believers. They all profess the same one immersion, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—They profess that all our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles and Prophets taught, and nothing more as of divine authority. In fact, we have just received intelligence from Elder John Longley of Indiana, that these people are also united in his bonds, and great are the blessings of the union. Many are added to the Church. But should all in other states and sections act inconsistently with their profession, we are determined to do what we are convinced is right in the sight of God. Nothing can move us from this purpose, unless we should make shipwreck of faith and a good conscience. From which may our merciful God preserve us. *

It is probable that the question of baptism had not been discussed during the meeting at Lexington. It is also certain that among the churches of the Christians a few were still found who had not been immersed upon a profession of their faith, for Smith practically admits this in his Address, where he says, “the result has been that

* Christian Messenger, Vol. VI., pp. 6-7-8.
all, with very few exceptions, belonging to their congregations in this section of the country have submitted to immersion.” This shows that a “few,” at least, held out against the general practice. It has been asserted that these “few” belonged to congregations of the Christians that had not come into the union, but the language of both Smith and Rogers clearly indicates that this view of the matter is incorrect. Smith says, at the beginning of his Address: “It will be recollected that all our remarks relative to the Christian brethren are confined to those with whom we have associated about Lexington, Georgetown, Paris, Williamsburg, and Carlisle.” Evidently Smith refers to those who had come into the union and not those who were outside of the district comprehended by it. Rogers, in speaking for the Christians uses the following language: “But as soon as you had leisure to look about you, and call up your views of baptism and test them by the book, you saw at once, and acknowledged your mistake, and were forthwith baptised by scores, and now there is scarcely a Pedo-Baptist among us, so mightily has the truth triumphed.” John Smith's “few exceptions” is translated by John Rogers into “scarcely a Pedo-Baptist among us.” But this question of immersion was not raised during the Conference for union, simply because it was believed that all divisive elements would settle themselves if left entirely alone and without agitation. This conclusion was finally justified in the subsequent history of the churches, for only the immersion of believers was practised after this time.

Although there was a temporary halt in this union movement, it was finally consummated in 1835, and in the years that have followed no shadow of a shade of antagonism has appeared with respect to this consummation of what was perhaps the greatest practical fact that had yet transpired, illustrating the position of Christian union on the principles set forth in the “Declaration and Address” of the Campbells.

From the Campbellian point of view this union had its drawbacks. At the time it was consummated the “Reformers” were practically sweeping everything before them in the Baptist Churches of Kentucky, as well as Ohio and other places where the “Christians” had obtained considerable influence. But the union of the “Re-
formers” with the “Christians” seriously affected the trend of the Baptist Churches toward the Reformatory movement. They began to hesitate. Many of those who had sympathised with the Reformation utterly refused to become associated with a movement which had coalesced with Unitarians and Pedo-Baptists. This was the charge made, and as it was used by many Baptist preachers, it soon became a staple objection to the “Reformers.” Their movement was no longer regarded as an effort to reform the Baptist Churches of certain abuses which had grown up among them, but the Reformers were now regarded as willingly affiliating with doctrines and practices which were wholly contrary to well and long established usage of the Baptist Churches.

It can readily be seen how this opposition of the Baptists, from this new point of view, would affect the influence of the Campbellian movement among the Baptist Churches while these things were said of the Reformers.

Of course this was an entire misrepresentation of the facts of the case, but misrepresentation has always been an easy method of propagating error, or hindering the progress of truth. John Randolph, of Roanoke, once said that “a lie would travel from Maine to Georgia while truth was getting her boots on.” This had an illustration in the case now under consideration. It is true, as already remarked, that Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stone disagreed somewhat in regard to their respective interpretations of the God-head. But no one who reads what Mr. Stone said upon that subject can legitimately charge him with Unitarianism. He perhaps never came fully over to Mr. Campbell's position on this subject, although they held a long and friendly discussion with respect to it. Stone seems to have thought it necessary to get rid of the popular theory of the Trinity, by showing that it is essentially unscriptural, while Mr. Campbell, though holding as he did very strongly to much of the popular theology on the subject, nevertheless did not allow it to enter into the question of his plea for Christian union. It is well here to quote from Mr. Campbell with respect to his views:

I have been asked a thousand times, “What do you think of the doctrine of the Trinity—what do you think of the Trinity? Some—nay, many think that to falter here is terrible; that to doubt here, or not to speak in the language of
the schools, is the worst of all errors and heresies. I have not spent, perhaps, an hour in ten years in thinking about the Trinity. It is no term of mine. It is a word which belongs not to the Bible in any translation of it I ever saw. I teach nothing, I say nothing, I think nothing about it, save that it is not a scriptural term, and consequently can have no scriptural ideas attached to it. But I discover that the Trinitarians, Unitarians, and the simple Arians, are always in the field upon this subject, and that the more they contend, the less they know about it. *

It will be seen by this quotation that Mr. Campbell got rid of the difficulty in another way from that proposed by Mr. Stone. From the beginning Mr. Campbell contended that philosophical speculations with regard to anything must not be made a test of Christian fellowship. His whole movement centred about this point, that only plainly expressed precept or example in the Scriptures must enter into the union and communion of saints. Indeed, he was decidedly of the opinion that there is as much virtue in ignoring unimportant things as there is in contending for that which is indispensable. Just here it is well to remark that in all the controversies of those days the Disciples never excluded any one from their churches or hindered any one from being received into their churches on account of difference of opinions with regard to purely philosophical or non-essential matters. As regards the relation of the Disciples to the Baptist Churches, it was always the case that the exclusions came from the Baptist side rather than from the Disciple. In referring to a number of churches in Virginia which had come out of Baptist Churches, Mr. Campbell makes the following statement:

We were pleased to learn that most of these churches were actually forced to withdraw from the Baptist Churches; that in no instance did the brethren in the reformation, when they had the majority, ever cast out the minority.†

On this same subject Mr. Campbell is especially clear with respect to his position in a reply which he makes to Elder Kerr, of Richmond, Virginia, concerning the importance of union:

All the world must see that we have been forced into a separate communion. We were driven out of doors, because

we preferred the approbation of the Lord to the approbation of any sect in Christendom. If this be our weakness we ought not to be despised—if this be our wisdom we ought not to be condemned. We have lost no peace of conscience, none of the honour which comes from God, none of the enjoyments of the Holy Spirit, nothing of the sweets of Christian communion by the unkindness of those who once called us brethren.

“More true joy Marcellus exiled feels,
Than Caesar with a senate at his heels.”

We have always sought peace, but not peace at war with truth. Union in truth, and union with truth are in our esteem true union, real strength, and social bliss. We are under no necessity to crouch, to beg for favour, friendship, or protection. Our progress is onward, upward, and resistless. With the fear of God before our eyes—the examples of the all-wise, good, and renowned worthies of all ages before us to stimulate our exertions and to smile upon our path, with love to God and man working in our bosoms, and immortality in prospect—we have nothing to fear, nothing to lose that is worth possessing. Standing on the Bock of Ages, panoplied with the armour of light, with a helmet, breast-plate, and shield from the armoury of heaven—in our right hand the sword of the Spirit of heavenly temper, and our eyes fixed upon the great captain of Salvation: bulls, anathemas, and decrees are as stubble to Leviathan, and the opposition of the sectarian world as the spider's threads in the path of the elephant. Yet we would be gentle and easy to be entreated by the arguments of love and the indications of the spirit of a sound mind. And if these elders of the people who have occasioned the present disorder and distress are now really as penitent as they profess, let them nullify their decrees and open the door of reconciliation, showing themselves honest and sincere in their overtures for peace.

On the Bible alone we will meet them in heart and hand. We shall open to them our doors, whenever they open theirs to us. If we cannot approve all their “benevolent schemes of this age of enterprise,” we will permit them to give their money and their aids to everything they call good works, and we only claim the right of private judgment, and of pursuing all the schemes of benevolence which we ascertain to be pleasing to God and beneficial to men. Where we cannot agree in opinion, we will agree to differ; and a free intercourse will do more to enlighten us and them, and to reform all abuses than years of controversy and volumes of defamation. I doubt not, but I express the feelings of many myriads of intelligent disciples when I thus reciprocate the first indications of a Christian spirit, and the first approach to the temple of reason and truth.

But, and if the elders of the people are not sincere in these
protestations, and if they will not allow us the right of private judgment, and to every congregation the right to administer its own affairs as we would cheerfully award to them, then be it known to them and society at large, that we are not to blame for the state of things of which they complain; and that although we stretch our hand to the olive branch which they seem to extend to us, it is not because we fear their strength, their influence, or all they can oppose to us; for if in our infancy and imbecility we have, in the face of all their opposition and united efforts, risen in a few years from nothing to many myriads, it is not to be imagined that they can stay our progress, or succeed in a course in which only disaster and ruin have marked their every step. But we love peace, and truth, and co-operation, and united effort in purifying the Church and in converting the world. We, therefore, wait to hear from them more fully on this matter, and we shall consider the rescinding of their decrees as an unequivocal expression of their desire for a better order of things. *

The case of Aylett Raines affords a fine illustration of Mr. Campbell's willingness to suppress differences of opinion, where no real principle was involved, in order to secure Christian union. It is not surprising, therefore, that he willingly assented to the union formed between the “Christians” and “Reformers”; and it is surely a matter to be placed to the credit of his plea for Christian union that two bodies such as the “Christians” and “Reformers” could be united, and yet hold to considerable divergence of opinion with respect to some matters. It should be, furthermore, to his credit that, when he must have known that the union between these two bodies would seriously affect his influence upon the Baptist Churches, he nevertheless cordially accepted his new brethren, and practically gave up the possibility of a further reformation of the Baptist Churches. Whether Mr. Campbell's religious position is true or not, it must be conceded that, throughout all the days of bitter controversy, he was always ready to utterly ignore his own opinions, or his own interests, if these stood in the way of the union of God's people upon the essential things clearly revealed in the Word of God. Mr. Stone deserves equal credit for also making concessions. Undoubtedly the union of the “Reformers” and “Christians” in Kentucky did much to emphasise the practicability of the plan of Christian union which both of these bodies advocated. The “Chris-

tians” had always been in favor of Christian union. This had been a distinctive characteristic of their movement from the beginning, but they had given less attention to the matter of restoration than the “Reformers” had done. The latter were in favor of Christian union, but as already remarked, they had given up the idea of denominational union, which perhaps more or less dominated the advocates of the movement in its earlier period. At this time the “Reformers” believed that Christian union was only possible, or desirable, upon a Scriptural foundation, and hence their contribution to the union which had been effected was mainly from the Scriptural point of view—an earnest insistence upon a “Thus saith the Lord” for everything relating to faith and practice. While the “Christians” were equally anxious about sustaining their religious position by Scriptural authority, they were, however, less vigorous in their demands for a close observance of the New Testament pattern. They were intensely evangelistic, and they contributed to the union a valuable asset in this respect, especially in Kentucky, where the “Reformers” had largely confined their propaganda to the Baptist Churches, rather than to the conversion of the world.

The spirit of the union which took place in Kentucky soon spread into other states, and in some of these a union was effected between the two bodies there also, so that in a few years the “Christian” organisation had become practically identified with the “Reformers.” This former body, however, was not entirely annihilated. In some places they retained their separate churches, and at the present writing they have a considerable membership in several states, notably North Carolina, Ohio, and Michigan. Recently there have been prominent overtures with respect to a union of these and the Free Baptists with the Disciples of Christ.

In reviewing the steps by which the union between the “Reformers” and “Christians” was consummated, it is impossible not to recognise the fact that it was a union where love was the predominant factor rather than theological definition. Simplicity in Christ was the basis of the union. We have already seen that there were substantial doctrinal differences and some practical differences, but all these gave way before the all-conquering
power of Love. These brethren became acquainted with each other, they fraternised with each other in their respective meeting places, they received each other in their respective conferences, and step by step they came to realise that there were no insurmountable differences between them, and gradually those that seemed insuperable at first—real mountains in the way of union—became as mole hills under the melting and cementing power of love. It was a union of hearts, rather than of heads. Doubtless the head difficulty finally vanished, but if their efforts at union had begun with the head differences it is probable that no union would have been consummated.

No man ever gained a wife by simply discussing the differences of their respective theological positions, or social standing, or commercial prospects. The man who would make a proposal to his sweetheart that all these matters must be settled before an engagement could take place would almost certainly be rejected without any further ceremony. These are matters which no doubt need consideration at the proper time, but while winning a sweetheart's affections these things had better be left alone. After the engagement is consummated some of these, or all of them, may be judiciously considered. But the man must not begin with these if he hopes to win his girl.

Human nature is very much the same, no matter from what angle it may be viewed. Christian union can never be an accomplished fact in the history of the Christian religion without the courting process, which wins the affections, and when these affections are won the theological problems will probably adjust themselves without much difficulty. The way to Christian union is by putting all our theological differences into the hot crucible of love, and if they are allowed to remain there long enough they will be melted and easily made to conform to a united Church.

It is evident that the “Reformers” and “Christians” proceeded upon the right principle, as well as the right method. When the time came for union nothing was projected into the platform that would in the slightest degree hinder the fellowship of any one who believed heartily in the Lord Jesus Christ, and was willing to follow His leadership in all things pertaining to the
Christian life. All speculations, opinions, and philosophies, whether true or false, were regarded as of little importance, in comparison with the need of Christian union. In short, both “Reformers” and “Christians” accepted the simple but transcendent fact that a divided Christendom is infinitely worse than even heresy with respect to theological opinions. Surely this statement of the case ought to put Christian people to thinking with respect to the present divisions which exist among the professed followers of Christ.
CHAPTER X

SOME OF THE MEN IN THE UNION

IT is interesting and instructive to study somewhat the characters of the chief men who were instrumental in bringing about the union, or who became identified with the movement about this time. We have seen that the movement had made considerable progress since the year 1823, when the *Christian Baptist* was first published, and if it is to be estimated by the men it produced, then surely no one need be ashamed of it. From the very beginning the movement attracted to it some of the noblest men of that period. Not many of these were highly cultured. Broadly speaking, they were of a middle class of the fairly educated community. Many of them had a very respectable academic education according to the standard of that day; but not a few were simply common sense, brainy, uncultured, men and women who loved liberty, and who were willing to sacrifice everything for what they believed to be the truth.

The earlier days of the movement were specially characterised by this class of adherents. Those were the days which tried men's souls. The movement at first was necessarily belligerent. In some respects it made war on the existing denominations with relentless energy. Part of its plea was the overthrow of denominationalism and the sectarian spirit. It held out the olive branch of peace to all who would accept the terms which the Disciples believed were fundamental in the teaching of the Scriptures, for these terms always and everywhere required the complete surrender of the denominational position, and the hearty acceptance of what was called “the ancient order of things.” At least this was the contention of the Disciples after they had been forced into a separate religious position. Indeed, the “Declaration and Address” foreshadowed this very state of things when it contended for the abandonment of everything sectarian.
and a union upon simply New Testament teaching. From this point of view the movement was intensely aggressive, and the consequence was that it made either friends or foes of all the religious people with whom it came in contact. In many instances it made bitter enemies. Perhaps this could not have been otherwise. There are no stronger prejudices than those that arise out of religious convictions, and there is nothing for which men will sacrifice more than religious associations.

But however this may be, it is certain that the new movement was born and developed in an atmosphere of war. It was really a fighting movement from the start; consequently it carried with it many of the evils of a continuous conflict. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that out of this conflict came some of the strongest men and women of the nineteenth century. They were real heroes of the strife. This fact strikingly illustrates a principle which seems to be universal. The great men and women of all ages in this world's history have been produced in that narrow belt of the earth wherein the seasons are in continual conflict. It may be that John Ruskin has overestimated the value of war in the development of character; still it must be confessed that in the “piping times of peace” there are not many great characters developed. Any way it is certain that religious controversy and opposition are not entirely without their compensation. It is an ugly side of a religious movement; but, after all, it strengthens certain phases of character which are essential to anything like rapid and healthy growth. The strong men of the Disciple movement were very generally deficient in that broad and elegant culture which gives to character its finest, normal development, and makes men and women agreeable, even when they are not intellectually great. But if we wish to find men and women fitted for a struggle, we will pick those who are in the struggle, or who have practically passed through it, or some other similar struggle in which character is made. The leaders on both sides of the union, which has already been considered, were, for the most part, largely moulded in the hot crucible of conflict which everywhere met them in their onward march to victory. And while these men gained force, it is probable that they often lost in ease and grace of manner. Of course there were those who
united in their personality both strength and culture, though this could not be affirmed of very many, and especially during the earlier days of the movement.

The following list of names will be sufficient to show that some great men came into the union from both the “Reformers” and “Christians,” or were identified with it about this time. The chief men of the movement, from the side of the Reformers were, the Campbells (Thomas and Alexander), Walter Scott, Robert Richardson, Philip S. Fall, William Hayden, Adamson Bentley, the Bos-worths (Cyrus and Marcus), John Smith, D. S. Burnett, James Challen, John Henry, Jacob Osborne, Sidney Rigdon, A. J. Ewing, Darwin Atwater, Aylett Raines, Jacob Creath (Senior and Junior), and John T. Johnson. Of those who came into the union from the “Christians” may be mentioned, Barton W. Stone, Samuel Rogers, John Rogers, John A. Gano, John Whitaker, John Flick, Joseph Gaston, Thomas M. Allen, John Secrest, and B. F. Hall.

Several of these men have already been referred to, and some account given of their character and work. They all deserve a much fuller notice than can here be given, but a few of them, owing to certain facts connected with their history, must receive special attention. Among these the name of Dr. Robert Richardson deserves a first place.

While Walter Scott and those associated with him were practically turning the Western Reserve “upside down” with their advocacy of the great plea which they were making, a new man was added to the list of leaders, who became most prominent in the religious movement which had been inaugurated by the Campbells. While Scott was conducting an Academy in Pittsburg, he had for a pupil a young man by the name of Robert Richardson, who had been brought up in the Episcopal Church, but his association with Scott had influenced him to re-examine the whole subject of baptism. Young Richardson was a fine scholar, and being warmly attached to Scott personally, he began a thorough investigation as to his duty with regard to the ordinance of baptism. At last a decision was reached, and he immediately made his way from Pittsburg into the Western Reserve, 120 miles, seeking baptism at the hands of Scott. Scott was at that time engaged in one of his great revival meetings, and his joy
was almost unbounded when he found out the purpose of young Richardson's visit. Richardson was at that time a practising physician near Pittsburg, but as soon as he embraced the “ancient Gospel,” as it was commonly called by the “Reformers,” he gave himself with all the ardour of his earnest nature to the cause which he had espoused.

Perhaps justice has scarcely ever been bestowed upon Dr. Richardson for the part which he took in the great reformatory movement; and yet it is doubtful whether any other man, save Mr. Campbell himself, contributed more to the success of the movement than did Dr. Richardson. His was, in some respects, a unique work. He brought into the movement some elements which were not contributed by others, and without which the movement would have been shorn of a large portion of its strength. He possessed much of the spirit of Walter Scott, his teacher, though he lacked the evangelistic fervor of the latter, and was not gifted in extemporaneous speech as was the great evangelist. Nevertheless, Richardson possessed some personal characteristics, as well as attainments, which differentiated him from all the other “reformers,” and specially qualified him for doing a certain work which he afterwards did.

For years he continued to practise medicine, but during all his lifetime he was an active preacher and writer. In 1835 he was induced by Alexander Campbell to remove to Bethany, where he became Mr. Campbell's co-labourer in conducting the Millennial Harbinger. At Bethany he occupied the chair of Chemistry in Bethany College, and it can be safely said that in this position he was not only eminent as a teacher, but it is probable that no one in the faculty exerted a more salutary influence upon the students of the College than did the “sage of Bethpage.”

Mr. Campbell made no mistake in selecting Dr. Richardson as a right-hand man in the great work which he had undertaken. He was Mr. Campbell's most trusted adviser in the College work, as well as in the management of the Harbinger. But it was in the latter position where Dr. Richardson's influence was most supremely felt. It is a well-known fact that Dr. Richardson's influence over Mr. Campbell was very great, and to him may be ascribed a great amount of the success which attended the religious movement inaugurated by the Campbells.
Dr. Richardson was endowed with splendid intellectual gifts, and he cultivated these with unwearied industry until the close of his useful life. He was especially a fine critic. His scientific studies were helpful to him in forming exact conclusions with respect to Biblical interpretation, and nowhere perhaps did he manifest greater ability than in the field of Biblical exegesis. It was here that he was a great helper to Mr. Campbell. The latter's fondness for generalisation sometimes led him into doubtful statements with respect to particular things. Not so with Dr. Richardson. He was careful about the most minute matters, and while many of his criticisms and Biblical interpretations had upon them the stamp of originality, he never, in a single instance, advocated any position which may not be defended on purely critical grounds. Indeed, it is well known to a few who are still living that he saved Mr. Campbell from some critical mistakes which the latter would have made had it not been for his trustworthy and able co-labourer. Mr. Campbell was so heavily pressed with his numerous engagements, and so overworked with regard to the great things to which his attention was constantly called, that he neither had time nor strength to always give the closest attention to minute matters. It was just here where Dr. Richardson was of supreme value to him. While he and Mr. Campbell would often talk over in a general way the chief points to be considered, it was finally left to Dr. Richardson to work out the details and to make a decision in the case. His judgment was scarcely ever at fault, and his patience in pursuing a subject to the last analysis made his conclusions almost infallible with respect to everything he investigated. He never stopped with the surface of things, but made his examination thorough, so that nothing was left to be considered.

His literary ability was no less than his knowledge of the Bible. He read much, but he studied more. He was a thinker. His library was well selected, and he literally lived in it when he was away from his other duties. He cultivated a fine literary style, and this is shown in all his writings. Of course his *magnum opus* is his “Life of Alexander Campbell,” which is a model of pure English, though it is somewhat marred by cumbersome details of a not very interesting character to the general reader. Still
it should be judged from the point of view of the writer. He was evidently not aiming simply
to produce an interesting life of Mr. Campbell. He was rather looking at Mr. Campbell with a
view to furnishing material for subsequent historians. A popular life of Mr. Campbell is yet to
be written, but when it is written its facts will be mainly furnished by the admirable work of
Dr. Richardson.

It should be said to the praise of Dr. Richardson that his contribution to the religious
movement, with which he was identified, was not specially controversial, though when he
chose to write on controversial subjects he showed himself to be a well-trained logician, and
capable of stating his arguments with clearness and vigour. Nevertheless, his chief
contribution was of a spiritual character, and this was much needed in order to counteract the
controversial tendency which could not be very well avoided in the earlier days of the
Reformation.

From this time we must reckon with four great men who, from the point of view of the
“Reformers,” may be denominated the “Big Four” of the Nineteenth Century Religious
Movement. Each one of these had his special place, and made a distinct contribution to the
great work to which they were all committed. Thomas Campbell contributed perhaps most to
the union sentiment which was prominent at the beginning; Alexander Campbell contributed
most to the constructive features, both theological and ecclesiastical; Walter Scott contributed
most to the evangelistic spirit and work, while Dr. Richardson contributed most to the
devotional and spiritual side of the movement.

Of course there were many others who did valiant service, with respect to all these sides
of the movement, but these four men undoubtedly were the leaders in their respective spheres.

Another name among those mentioned deserves very special emphasis, namely, William
Hayden. Perhaps no one man during the period now under consideration did more active
service than did Mr. Hayden. During his ministry of thirty-five years he travelled 90,000
miles, fully 60,000 of which he made on horseback, more than twice the distance around the
world. During this time he baptised with his own hands more than 1,200 people. He
also preached over 9,000 sermons, that is, about 260 discourses per annum for every year of the thirty-five years of his public life. At one time he preached over fifty sermons in the month of November alone. He was also very active in his private labours, and his peculiar power of winning souls was very great, either in private, or in his public discourses. In the social circle he was especially effective, urging as he did his great message in a charming manner, in which humour and anecdote had their appropriate places.

His mental powers worked with great rapidity and energy. Though not educated in a scholastic sense, his wide experience, his matchless memory, and his constant contact with the problems he had to solve gave him a mastery in the field of service to which he had committed his life. He travelled much with Walter Scott, and as he had a fine musical gift he was of great assistance to Scott in evangelistic work.

What William Hayden was to Ohio, in many respects, John T. Johnson was to Kentucky. He was a model evangelist. While he is usually classed with the preachers who came into the union from the “Christians,” or those associated with B. W. Stone, it is probable that he practically, from the beginning, belonged to both parties. He was first of all a Baptist preacher, but was led to accept the position of the “Reformers” by the writings of Alexander Campbell and the influence of certain men who were associated with the “Reformers.” However, he soon became closely identified with the “Christians,” through his personal relations with B. W. Stone. They lived near neighbours and quickly became warmly attached to each other.

Perhaps no one exerted greater influence in bringing about the union than did John T. Johnson. He was the personification of enthusiasm; he never became discouraged, no matter how dark the days were, or how gloomy the prospect might be. He always realised that behind every cloud the sun was still shining, and he had a supreme faith in the ultimate triumphs of truth. There was not a grain of pessimism in his whole composition. Everywhere he went he was a flame of light and love. He inspired confidence, even when his religious position was practically reprobated. Men loved him, even when they
hated the plea which he made; but as a rule, those who hated his plea and loved him, finally came to love his plea.

In 1832, he was associated with B. W. Stone in conducting the Christian Messenger, which was at that time published from Georgetown, Ky. In this position Johnson did valiant service. But his relation to the press did not in any respect abate his zeal or activity in the evangelistic field. He literally went everywhere preaching the Word. Throughout the South and Southwest his name became a household word among those who loved what he was pleased to call the “Ancient Gospel.” Indeed, it was largely owing to his active evangelistic labours that the plea of the Disciples obtained considerable strength, in the regions where he preached, from this time until his death. He certainly deserves a very prominent place in the memory of those who revere the pioneers of the movement.

John Henry, an Ohio evangelist, did valiant service for the cause of the Reformation both before and after the union. He was perhaps next to Scott, in his power to impress an audience. He was a very rapid speaker, so that when thoroughly aroused his words would flow like an impetuous stream. He and Thomas Campbell travelled together for some time in Ohio, and occasionally they alternated, and preached so that when Campbell preached one evening Henry would preach the next. On one occasion Mr. Campbell announced, at the close of his own service, that next evening the pulpit would be occupied by his friend, John Henry. But he desired to warn the audience that they had better bring their buckets with them, “as the flood gates of the Gospel would be opened by his distinguished brother.” Henry was not specially pleased with this reference to his rapid speaking. But as Father Campbell was distinguished for his deliberate speaking, Henry decided to get even with him. So at the close of his service he announced that Father Campbell would speak the next evening, and he advised the audience to come prepared to remain for a long time, bringing sufficient food to appease their hunger, “as the everlasting Gospel would be preached.” It was generally conceded that Henry had made good his desire to get even with the brother whom he revered very much, but who had
exposed himself to such a retort as Henry could not withhold.

This incident is told not only because it illustrates character, but also for the purpose of indicating the fact that these grand old men occasionally indulged in a bit of humour, just as always happens with men of power; for it is perhaps true that no one has ever been very effective as a public speaker who has been incapable of humour at the right time and place.

Another Kentucky preacher was most instrumental in bringing about the union between the “Reformers” and “Christians,” as well as performing prodigies of valour in the evangelistic field. Samuel Rogers was a man without scholastic education, but he was the impersonification of earnestness and common sense. It is said that over 10,000 converts came into the movement under his immediate preaching. Associated with his active ministry were such men as his brother John, John Smith, John Allen Gano (who was a great exhorter with remarkable persuasive powers), and Thomas M. Allen, who soon after the union removed to Missouri, and became prominently instrumental in planting churches throughout that great state.

Allen belonged to the old school of gentlemen. He first studied law, but finally gave this up for the ministry, and his courteous manner, earnestness, personal dignity, and great simplicity in the proclaiming of his message soon gained for him a widespread reputation as an advocate of the plea for the restoration of primitive Christianity. Undoubtedly the Reformation in Missouri is indebted to him more than to any other man for the position it occupies to-day. Such was his enthusiasm and knowledge of the Scriptures that everywhere he made converts, and most of his preaching was practically pioneer work. He went where there were no churches, preaching in courthouses, school-houses, and in private houses; indeed, wherever he could obtain a hearing. An incident may be related as illustrating this characteristic of the man. A preacher visited a town where Allen, about a year before, had preached in the court-house. He inquired if there were any people in the town belonging to the “Christian Church,” and was referred to a man whom Allen had baptised on the occasion mentioned. When the preacher
went to this man's house, he inquired if he was a member of the “Christian Church.” The man told him he was not. “Are you a Presbyterian?” His answer was, “I do not belong to any Church.” “Why,” said the preacher, “I was told that you belonged to the Christian Church.” “Well,” said the man, “about a year ago a preacher by the name of Thomas M. Allen preached in the court-house, and as he preached what I believed was the truth, and as I had never heard it before preached so plainly, at the close of his sermon I went up and joined him.”

Probably he was not the only man that has joined the preacher, but in this case, doubtless the man did join Christ, but the man's statement was a simple, unsophisticated way of putting the case. He knew nothing about churches, and as a matter of fact the pioneer preachers did not trouble themselves very much about churches. Their main contention was to bring the people to Christ, and they often left them, like Philip left the Eunuch, to go on their way rejoicing, while they themselves went to other fields of labour.

The Creaths, both senior and junior, were strong forces in their day. The junior Creath possessed much of the pulpit power of his distinguished uncle, who was regarded as one of the most eloquent men of that period. The younger Creath became identified especially with the work in Missouri, and though entirely of a different type of man, he was a true yoke-fellow with Allen and others who were largely instrumental in planting the Reformation principles in that great and growing state.

It is thought proper to give a somewhat lengthy notice of Aylett Raines, as his case is not only very instructive to the inquiring reader, but so strikingly illustrates one of the principles of the reformatory movement that it is believed that a somewhat lengthy sketch of him is justifiable, without any invidious discrimination against other men who may have occupied even a more prominent position in some respects than Mr. Raines did.

Aylett Raines was born in Spottsylvania County, Virginia, January 22, 1798. His parents were poor, and he was reared under the pressure of stress and strain from childhood to manhood. His parents were “outer court worshippers” in the Episcopal Church. They had him sprinkled when he was four years of age. In early
manhood he began to doubt the truth of the Christian religion, and he very soon became
decidedly sceptical. Finally he adopted Deism as the true religion. He had been helped into
this belief by reading Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason." But soon he came to the conclusion
that "A depraved heart and corrupt life is the father of all the scepticism in the world." He
now began to consider the various systems of religion that were prevailing at that time. A
prayerful study of the Bible, and especially of the Gospel of John, opened his eyes to the truth
as to the work of the Father and the Son in the salvation of the world. He read and pondered
long upon that text, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that
whosoever believeth on Him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

This was the key of the Gospel by which the door of salvation was unlocked to man. Two
Divine persons, God and His Son; two human sentiments, loved and gave; two universals, the
collective noun "world" and the distributive pronoun "whosoever"; two solemn conditions,
"saved," "perish," incident to and consequent upon belief and disbelief. Faith, salvation—
salvation conditioned upon faith. Faith has to do with testimony, dependent upon the man
exercising his God-given reason, weighing evidence, exercising the power of choice;
obedience has to do with the law, submitting his will to the Divine Will, in compliance with
the plain requirements of the Gospel. Faith and practice were the first principles of religion.

This he saw, yet such was the neutralising power of sectarianism that it was a long while
before he emerged into the full light of the "Sun of Righteousness."

While a great and radical change had passed over the entire horizon of his life, and while
he studied the Bible with reverent zest, still it was years before he came to the full knowledge
of the Gospel of the grace of God. After about two years' study, while still engaged in
teaching, he became the Apostle of Restorationism and began to preach the doctrine of the
final holiness and happiness of all mankind. This he did with such zeal and show of logic,
reasoning from such passages as, "In Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive,"
"Jesus by the grace of God tasted death for every man," that he
found many ready to accept this pleasing and delusive teaching. It allowed the indulgence of
sinful pleasures and promised in the “sweet by and by” eternal felicity. He gathered a
congregation of about thirty and organised them into a church. Let no one think that doubts or
misgivings never disturbed the tranquillity of his mind or the peaceful repose of his soul. The
lax morals of some of those who embraced Restorationism and Latitudinarianism and the
questionable conduct of others at times gave rise to serious and solemn reflection. The
following incident, as related by himself, occurred at one of his meetings held in the woods in
Crawford County, Indiana. While Mr. Raines was teaching, the people became very anxious
to hear him present his views of the final holiness and happiness of all men. As there was no
church in the neighbourhood willing to open its doors to him, to disseminate such harmful
teachings, the people, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, erected a stand in a convenient
grove and made rude seats of logs and planks and a canopy of the leafy boughs of trees. At the
appointed time a vast concourse of the farmers convened to hear him preach. Many of the
“baser sort” also came to have fun and to find confirmation as strong as Holy Writ for their
evil doings.

The speaker commanded the profound attention of this mixed multitude. Mr. Raines
noticed among the crowd a young man considerably the worse for liquor. This man seemed to
be especially concerned, and he began to approach nearer and nearer to the speaker. At last he
stopped just in front of the stand, and only a few feet away from the speaker. His left hand
encircled a small sapling and he was endeavouring to steady his trembling form by its aid. His
countenance betrayed the most intense interest in the speaker's argument. He soon became
wrought to the highest pitch of excitement, and gesticulating with his right hand, he cried out
in maudlin accents: “Make it ought, young man. M-a-ke it o-ut, young man, if you don't I'm a
g-o-ner.” This amused the congregation and confused the speaker. Some one said, “Take him
out,” but no one moved, and Mr. Raines continued his argument and finished his discourse
without further interruption. This little incident, trifling as it seems, created a deep impression
on the speaker and started a
train of thought that later brought forth good fruit. The opening of the eyes of the understanding to behold wondrous things in God's law is sometimes a very slow process. It proved so in this case. The progress was slow, but it was sure. He reasoned as to the products of Restorationism. He reasoned from this aphorism: “By their fruits shall you know them.” Was this young man, dissolute and drunken as he was, a specimen apple of the fruit that grew on the trees of Restorationism? If such the fruit, what the tree? His mind was too clear and his reasoning powers too logical not to see the conclusion to which it pointed. Yet unbelief is sure to err. He had formerly reasoned about Deism in the same way— if it was such a good thing, why did it not produce better fruit?

Reaching this point in his reasoning, it seems strange that the full light of liberty of the Gospel plan of salvation did not dawn upon his mind. It shows how near a man can be to the truth, and yet, really, how far away from it. He was destined to experience a period of recession, and was like the Israelites, when leaving Egypt, although they were soon upon the borders of the promised land, yet were not permitted to enter, but were turned back and wandered in the wilderness for forty years. So he again turned back from the truth which he saw dimly and was involved in the mists again. He tells how he gradually glided from Restorationism into Universalism, and how he was finally cured of both. He writes:

I must not, however, omit mentioning in this place that although when I first imbibed the doctrine of the Restorationists I believed in millions of years of punishment after death as the portion of the finally impenitent, yet by subsequent reading, reasoning, and observation, my mind was imperceptibly changed with respect to the duration of this punishment, so that I ultimately arrived at the conclusion that there could be no punishment at all after death. In this state of mind, I continued twelve months, for it did seem to me that the preaching of Universalism was more prejudicial than beneficial to the human family. While I was a Restorationist, I rejoiced to know that many sinners reformed under my ministry; but after I became a Universalist, if moral reformation was ever produced in any case under my preaching, I do not know it, and I do now affirm before God, who knows that I do not lie, that it is my opinion, an opinion too, which is the result of observation and experiment, that
had I during the time in which I was preaching the above doctrine, been delivering lectures on Owenism, my ministry would have been as advantageous to mankind. I, therefore, rejected Universalism, and became again a Restorationist. In the Spring of the following year, 1828, it was my good fortune to hear Walter Scott preach the ancient gospel, and although I went to this meeting for the purpose of opposing Mr. Scott, after I had heard him, I saw plainly that if I opposed him I would expose myself, for he had taught nothing but the unsophisticated truths of the New Testament—and how could I oppose him?

I, however, still felt a strong antipathy to this Scottism, as it was called, and concluded that I could, in all probability, by hearing him several times detect some monstrous error in his preaching. This induced me to attend his meetings again and again, but the consequence was that I myself was convinced of some fundamental errors in my own method of preaching, and that the preaching of Mr. Scott was in strict accordance with the doctrine of Christ and his apostles.

I now asked what would truth and magnanimity, under such circumstances, require me to do? Must I stifle my convictions? No. This would have been hypocrisy. Must I acknowledge them? Yes. This, then, is the front of my offending, and so long as the lamp of life shall continue to burn in my bosom, or a spark of truth shall animate my soul, I hope magnanimously to acknowledge all divine truths, in so far as I may, through the grace of God, be able to discover them. The preaching of Mr. Scott did not, however, convince me that the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men was not a revealed truth. He, however, convinced me that there was greatly too much speculation in my preaching; that I had disarranged many points of the Gospel; had wholly omitted some; and in short that the form of doctrine into which I was endeavouring to mould the minds of people was essentially different from the apostolic form of sound words, and that until the apostolic mould or form of doctrine should be established and appreciated, the minds of Christian professors would be as diverse as are the diversified counterfeit moulds into which their minds have been cast, and that the result would inevitably be sectarian discord, and all its concomitant evils. As soon, therefore, as I was convinced of this fact, I commenced exhibiting what I then considered and what I still consider to be the primitive form of sound words, and lest I should be labouring under some unknown illusion, (for the Universalists said I was insane), I performed a considerable tour of preaching before I submitted to baptism, and made it a point to promulgate those items of doctrine in reference to which I differed from my former associates, that I might have the benefit of the wisdom of a multitude of counsellors in enabling me to arrive at right conclusions; but all the arguments which during this tour were advanced against the order
which I had espoused rather served to confirm than to unsettle my faith, and the same is true with respect to every argument which I have since heard relative to this subject. Having performed this tour and having obtained a most salutary confirmation of my faith, I immediately rode the distance of forty miles to the house of E. Williams, a highly respectable and able minister of the doctrine of Restoration-ism, living in Portage County, Ohio, in order to convince him of the error of our former course, and communicate to him the new truths which I had received under the preaching of Brother Scott. This E. Williams was a man toward whom I cherished a friendship the most unwavering and ardent. To him I communicated my views and the arguments by which I had been convinced of their correctness, and on the fourth day, after having arrived at his house, enjoyed the superlative satisfaction of receiving from this beloved brother a declaration of his conviction of the truth of those views, and within a few days after, in the transports of joyful hope, we mutually submitted to the ordinance of baptism, still retaining the opinion of the truth of the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men.

Previously to my immersion I was resolved neither to resist nor to encourage by any partial measures, my conviction relative to the truth or falsehood of Restorationism. If true I was willing to believe it, if false to reject it, and whether true or false I knew that the reading of the Scriptures impartially could have no tendency to lead me into error. I therefore resolved to bring my mind, if possible, or at least as much as possible, like a blank surface to the ministry of Christ and his apostles, and to permit them to impress upon it all such characters of truth as they chose. I was aware that prejudice, passion, and imagination are potent governors in this world, and that if I were to arrive at logical and scriptural conclusions I must disenthral myself from their dominion, and become exclusively a creature of testimony. I had seen old professors of error, through the influence of prejudice, resolve to adhere to their errors, when the strongest reason they could urge in their defence was that they had already adhered to them a long time.

I had seen passion make its hundreds of proselytes, who seemed to have neither eyes nor ears for anything which did not inflame their passions, and I had seen imagination carry its votaries into the whirlwinds of extravagant theory, into the most ridiculous and pernicious delusions. Imagination in particular is an irresistible enemy to right conclusion, if not chastened by facts. How often have men imagined that they were teapots, or that they were made of glass. How often have individuals fancied themselves to be in the agonies of death when but for the workings of their imaginations they were in perfect health; and have we not also good reason for believing that the power of unbridled imagination has driven
thousands to insanity and to an untimely grave. As soon as we permit our minds to wander far beyond the limits of facts or beyond the confines of true testimony concerning facts, we sail on an immense and fathomless ocean, without rudder, compass, or ballast. It has not been long since many sections of our country were thrown into a ferment by the Utopian schemes and bewitching sophistries of Robert Owen and his satellites. New Harmony was to be the city of mental independence and the centre of a terrestrial paradise. Multitudes believed the report and hastened in crowds to this sceptical Elysium, but instead of finding the best of everything as they had imagined, many of them plunged themselves into poverty, and the city of mental independence now stands a monument of these creatures of imagination and vain delusion. And who has not heard of the “Pilgrims” who some years ago passed through Ohio? These filthy beings (for they never washed either themselves, or their clothing) were enthusiastically devoted to their system, and ridiculous, irrational, and unscriptural, as it was, so immovable was the faith of many of them that on the banks of the Arkansas, they agonised and starved in the expectation that two sassafras sticks, the one Beauty and the other Bands, would bud and grow in that land of promise. In other cases, men have imagined that they would never die; and whole congregations of religionists have so nearly starved themselves to death under the conviction that it was their duty to starve that medical aid was necessary for their restoration. In Guernsey County in this state (Ohio), an old deformed impostor announced himself to the people as the Eternal God, and about twenty became believers; in about three weeks three of the number were preachers. The Shakers rejected matrimony and taught that they were already in the resurrection, and multitudes believed. But time and space and the reader's patience would all fail were I to attempt to give the thousandth part of the evidence by which the question before us might be illustrated.

Having, therefore, before me these and many other facts in proof of the evil effects produced by the workings of an imagination, uncontrolled by true testimony, I was resolved to examine in the first place the evidences of the Christian religion; and then to endeavour to satisfy my own mind, by an impartial reading of the Scriptures, relative to all the points of doctrine which they might contain. This I was convinced was a rational and logical course and I did not wish to be diverted from it.

I had in my past life been driven to and fro by the bewildering impossibilities of imaginative systems, and had undergone several changes of religious sentiment. I had experienced much chagrin in consequence of these changes, and being still a votary of truth, I wished to elicit her by such advances as should secure her favour, and believing as I did that I was
already in possession of many indubitable gospel facts and truths, I desired to propagate these and these alone until such time as I should legitimately obtain knowledge of other facts and truths. I wished to make sure work of it by building on the rock that I might not again subject myself to the mortification of undergoing at any subsequent period of my life another fundamental change of religious sentiment.

This determination and practice, however, rendered me obnoxious to many evil surmisings. My former friends desired to hear me sing or play the notes of their favourite doctrine, which I, consistently with the above principles and resolutions, could not do, and on the other hand, the advocates for endless punishment were prejudiced against me, because I was not a believer in what they esteemed a fundamental article of Christian faith. Amidst all the uproar which this collision of opinions caused, I was resolved to hold a steady hand and cool head. I told both those who believed and those who did not believe in the final holiness and happiness of all men that I had not changed my opinion with respect to that doctrine; that I was determined to act in subordination to the law of Christ, which says, “Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations,” and that I would not preach anything that would disturb the peace of the Church which I did not consider to be a fundamental fact or truth of the Gospel by our Lord Jesus Christ.

At the Mahoning Association, about five months after my immersion, I was publicly questioned relative to my sentiments, and from the bench on which I stood I did not hesitate to declare to the whole congregation that it was still my opinion that all men would finally become holy and happy. I shall never, whilst I retain my memory, forget the magnanimity of Thomas, Alexander Campbell, and Scott, and several others on that occasion. They acted as men highly elevated above the paltry bickerings of speculative partisans, for though they considered my Restoration sentiments as a vagary of the brain, they did not treat me with contempt, but with firmness and kindness encouraged me to persevere in the Christian race.

Had they pursued with me the opposite course I awfully fear that I might have made shipwreck of faith and a good conscience and become a castaway. Whereas, under the kind treatment, which I received from the chief men of the Restoration, and the increased means of religious knowledge, to which I obtained access after I had left the Universalists, I grew in grace, and knowledge of Jesus Christ with such rapidity that in twelve months or less time, Restorationism had wholly faded out of my mind.

From the period at which I embraced the primitive form of sound words, I was resolved to take no position upon any doctrinal point, far removed from the death and resurrection of Christ, and to insist upon nothing as an article of union.
and communion which God had not required as a condition of salvation. These with me constituted the central point in Christianity, the divinely powerful, the transcendentally glorious magnet around which all our Christian affections should revolve and to which all Christians should be attracted in one body, having one faith, one spirit, one hope, one baptism, one Lord, one God and Father of all Christians. Around this heavenly centre, for the salvation of sinners and the health and nourishment and the growth of the body of Christ, have I laboured, and I thank God that my labour has not been in vain. I have seen men who were philosophically Calvinist and Arminians and Restorationists, members of the same congregation and sitting around the same table of the Lord, and in the joyful fervours of the same Christian love attracted by the one cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, praising God in concert, and there were no divisions among them. How noble an object to be sought, Peace on earth and good will among men, the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace! This then is the sin, a sin against sectarianism, for which I have been drawn, quartered, and gibbeted; yes, the sin of peace making, upon Gospel principles, is that for which I am now to be crucified. Had I buried my convictions in the callous heart of a dastardly hypocrite and continued preaching in my old way, my old sect would have embraced me in brotherly love — a brother serpent! — and with them all would have been well, but as I was constrained, by what I believed to be the truth, nay, for the sake of peace and the salvation of sinners, to cease contending for my former peculiarities, which did not appear to make for peace, nor to contribute much to the salvation of sinners, I have become a monster in human form.

Most of the foregoing facts are furnished by Mr. Raines himself in a sketch of his life. They certainly give a striking illustration of the character of the times in which he lived, as well as the marvellous influence of the truth of God as it finally wrought in this man's life. He was known to the writer of this volume, and it is my opinion that very few men excelled Mr. Raines in a personal knowledge of the Scriptures, or in ability to make these Scriptures intelligible to others. He was eminently an expository preacher, relying almost entirely upon a clear exposition of the Word of God for whatever influence he wished to produce upon his audience. His teaching was as clear as sunlight, his logic almost irresistible, and the earnestness with which he enforced his own convictions carried conviction to others.

There were several other men among those who were distinguished for efficient service about the time the union
took place and immediately thereafter, who deserve very special notice, but as these men have been sketched very frequently in works specially devoted to personal reminiscences, I have felt justified in omitting any further notice of these than has already been given, except so far as they may necessarily fall into the history after this time. Some of the men connected with the Reformation will receive attention in subsequent chapters, as they do not come prominently into view until further along in the history of the movement.

Special attention has been given to Mr. Raines mainly for the reason that he occupied a unique position with respect to the Campbellian movement. His case has always been regarded as a typical one, as illustrating the principles of Christian union advocated by the Disciples. In reviewing his case, the following important conclusions are reached:

1. The Disciples have been right in eliminating all divisive elements from their platform of Christian union.
2. They have been right also in assuming that there is a common ground upon which all who love our Lord Jesus Christ can unite.
3. They have always contended that we must receive each other without regard to doubtful disputation, or speculative opinions.
4. They have contended that men may hold opinions as private property, but when these opinions are likely to produce division or schism they must not be advocated publicly.
5. They have contended that where these opinions are of little or no practical importance they will soon cease to be regarded as valuable by those who hold them, if the essential things are made prominent and these opinions are held in abeyance.
6. Disciples have discriminated between opinions that have little or no Scriptural basis and those that may fairly be inferred from the teaching of the Scriptures, and yet even those that are believed to be supported by the Word of God, where they are simply deductions, without an expressed precept or example, are not to be made questions of fellowship.
7. These conclusions are not only illustrated by the case of Aylett Raines, but also by the union which took
Undoubtedly this union could never have been consummated had there been special emphasis placed upon the points of difference between the two bodies. The union was really on the points of agreement, while the differences were allowed to take care of themselves. The practical result of the whole matter was, in a little time there were no differences, and this is precisely what Mr. Campbell always affirmed would certainly follow when emphasis was put in the right place, namely, on facts, about which Christians are all agreed, and not on opinions, about which they are generally in disagreement.

In confirmation of these conclusions, the following from the pen of Professor Charles Louis Loos, who has been identified with the Disciples almost from the beginning, may be regarded as an authoritative statement with respect to the union between the “Reformers” and “Christians.” Professor Loos writes in the first person from the point of view of the “Reformers,” and his testimony is all the more valuable as he treats so generously the “Christians,” who from his point of view held to some erroneous opinions.

What decided the reformers who stood with A. Campbell to enter into this union with the “Christians”? This is certainly a question of deep interest to us.

Let me give the answer briefly, based on a careful study of the case.

1. As already stated, these “Christians” were earnest biblical reformers, resolved to stand on the Bible alone. They had rejected all creeds; had adopted the immersion of penitent believers as the only scriptural baptism. They were most reverent of Jesus Christ as the Lord of life and glory, and as the Saviour and Redeemer of men by his death on the cross.

2. They were ready and zealous to learn the way of life more perfectly; there was with them no “hitherto and no farther” in Bible knowledge, as with men bound by creeds.

3. Like the brethren of the other side, they were resolved to keep aloof from all speculations on matters of faith and duty, and to teach only the Word, in the thoughts and language of Christ and the apostles.

4. Finally—and this was a capital matter—Stone and his brethren were noted for their noble manliness of character, their piety and religious zeal. They were men worthy of the highest confidence. A. Campbell repeatedly bore strong witness to this.

On these grounds this union was effected. Of course, these
intelligent men on both sides knew very well that it was altogether possible and no uncommon thing, to use scriptural speech and give it a meaning quite foreign to that intended by the sacred writers. This objection was never urged. The confidence in this union, however, was strong because of the eminent character for intelligence, sincerity, piety, and supreme devotion to the Word of God of B. W. Stone and the men who were with him.

It is also well known that these “Christian” reformers for years did not occupy precisely the same ground with A. Campbell and his brethren on the subject of the operation of the Spirit and the object of baptism. Unity on these points, however, was soon reached.

And now as to the result of this union.

This is a very instructive history and of the greatest moment to the proper appreciation of the principles of Christian union proposed by this reformation.

First of all, and most evident, is the fact that by means of this alliance an immense force, in the numbers and the character of the people brought into the union, was added to the army of New Testament reformers. It is not easy to calculate with any sort of accuracy the additional strength thus acquired. There must be taken into the account not only the “Christian” Churches, but eminently also the not inconsiderable company of preachers, not a few of them strong men, that was united with the other body of able ministers of the Word, advocating a return to primitive Christianity, together now constituting a mighty host of valiant reformers. This new increase of strength extended especially over the important territory of Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and later of Missouri, a vast field especially favourable to religious reform. That this accession gave our reformation a mighty impulse is beyond all question. Who acquainted with our history does not know what was gained by winning to our cause such men as Samuel and John Rogers, J. A. Gano, T. M. Allen, Henry D. and Francis R. Palmer, and others that might be named, besides B. W. Stone himself? A long list of younger men, who became great preachers, might be named, who were brought to us by this union. Much of the marvellous advance our plea has made in the States above named and in the great West generally, is beyond doubt largely owing to the union of the “Christians” with the “Disciples.”

But that which is most instructive to us, in this important page of our history, is the demonstration it affords of the justness and safety of the principle of union advocated by the Disciples of Christ and vindicated in this instance.

Let the reader bear carefully in mind the basis of the union effected, and also—and this is very essential to a proper judgment in this case—what the real doctrinal position of this body of “Christians” was, and the character of their preachers, all of which has been stated above. All these conditions
made the proposal of union wise and safe. For, let me repeat it, the principles of union the
Campbells advocated did not justify a coalescence of elements that have doctrinally no
affinity with each other. No fraternal incorporation with us of a people fundamentally at
variance with us in the essential elements of the doctrine of Christ, could have been proposed
or accepted. But the condition of things being as above described, what was the result?

It was this:

In the churches of Eastern Ohio, where an alliance was effected, the supreme power of A.
Campbell and of the doctrinal position he occupied relative to the points of divergence
between the Disciples and the “Christians” soon revealed itself. The penumbra of
Unitarianistic ideas gradually passed away before the powerful arguments of the Campbells,
Scott, and their compeers, and gave place to the full light of truth on the most momentous
facts revealed in the New Testament, the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the atonement based
upon it. Those only who have lived in the very heart of this remarkable transformation can
have a just notion of what it was.

I believe I am justified in saying that, as a general fact, so far as the case demanded it, the
same result followed relative to the “Christians” in Kentucky and in the South and West, and
for the same reasons.

These excellent Christian people on both sides, by this union became truly brethren; they
were no longer two parties, but had now become one. They “loved one another “; were not
only willing, but desirous to “see eye to eye.” This is a capital point in the matter. They were
ready and eager to learn, and they knew and felt that there was no hindrance to this. What
more natural, then, than that the truth, wherever it was among them, and which is always the
stronger, especially in very strong hands, should prevail?

This trace of Arianism, faint and evanescent as it certainly was, had been begotten by the
scholastic speculations of an extreme orthodoxy, in fellowship with a rigid Calvinism that
shocked men, and is now happily passing away. When these godly, sincere seekers after truth
were in fraternal association with men, who, by the blessing of God, were utterly free from
these mischievous and repulsive ideas and habits, the truth concerning Jesus Christ and the
mystery of his death on the cross appeared to them in a new and better light. The causes that
had led them to the position to which they had been driven, were taken away.

But there was a particular, powerful force that operated in behalf of a correct acceptation
of Christ's nature and office. It was this. In our preaching of the gospel we put in the front and
lifted up to the loftiest eminence, as the one supreme object of faith, Jesus Christ, the Son of
the Living God. What other effect could follow with a people who so
preached, that all attention should be fixed upon the exaltation of Jesus Christ, that he might be preached as really worthy of this highest place in the faith, confidence, and hope of men? And this all preached, and the inevitable effect irresistibly followed? To-day we are everywhere one in our faith and preaching in this regard.*

Many other testimonies might be given concerning the spirit and general character of the union which took place in 1832. After 1835 it became an established fact, and the slight differences which existed between the two bodies, prior to the union, were seldom, if ever, referred to after the union was finally consummated. It has already been intimated that the “ Reformers” lost considerably among the Baptists on account of this union, but they gained very largely from other sources, and from the churches that entered into the union with them. As has already been seen, they gained also in the ministry that came in with the “Christians.” Some of the ablest men of the Reformation movement belonged to the “Christian” body.

*”Reformation of the Nineteenth Century,”” pp. 94-99.
CHAPTER XI

APOSTASIES AND OTHER DIFFICULTIES

ABOUT a year before the union of the “Reformers” and “Christians” took place, namely, the latter part of 1830, the delusion of Mormonism came to the front in Northern Ohio. Sidney Rigdon, who has already been referred to as pastor of a church in Pittsburg, and later as a prominent preacher in the Western Reserve, became identified with the Mormon propaganda. Rigdon was well suited in many respects for the work which he undertook. He was a fluent and captivating speaker, though at no time had he ever been thoroughly trusted among the Disciples. He was ambitious and jealous of others, and though possessing some popular characteristics, no one fully believed in him. He was nearly always aiming at some sensational development, and it is not strange, therefore, that the Mormon delusion had special attractions for him.

While living in Pittsburg he was connected with a printing office, and in this way he had access to the manuscript of a Presbyterian preacher by the name of Solomon Spaulding, who had written a story, giving a fanciful account of the nations inhabiting the land of Canaan before the time of Joshua. This manuscript detailed, with considerable minuteness, the life, wars, migrations, etc., of the people he was describing. He further represented that America was settled by the ten lost tribes of Israel, and that the American Indians had their origin in this fact. Spaulding's book was entitled, “The Lost Manuscript Found.” Rigdon came into possession of this manuscript, and spent several years altering and arranging it to suit the purposes he had in view.

Meantime, he began to lose caste with the Disciples. He began his defection by seeking to introduce a common property scheme which he declared was part of the ancient
Gospel, as exhibited in the latter part of Acts ii. At Austintown, Ohio, Mr. Campbell severely condemned his property scheme, and this only accelerated Rigdon's plan to announce his book of Mormon and begin the advocacy of a new propaganda. He had found in Joseph Smith a person suitable in every way to co-operate with him in bringing his delusion to the front. Through a well-laid plan, and with a few men thoroughly dupes, trained for the purpose, the new religion was launched; and for a time it had considerable influence in Northern Ohio, especially in Kirtland, Hiram, Mentor, and a few other places. However, in the main its influence had a short run, and was never very potent among the Disciples, though a great many people were at first easily deluded by its strange fascination and by the apparent sincerity of the men who advocated it.

It is not difficult, after all, to account for this temporary acceptance of Mormonism, however ridiculous it may look to intelligent people at the present time. In judging of those who accepted it, there are several things that must be taken into account. First, the ignorance of the people generally with respect to the Bible, and especially with respect to certain passages which, when literally construed and made to apply to the people at that time, seemed to support some of the contentions made by Rigdon, Smith, and those associated with them. In the second place, the story about the American Indians, the lost tribes, etc., etc., had a fascinating mystery about it that at once captivated the unthinking masses. Third, the doctrine of miracle was supported by numerous passages of Scripture, and Rigdon insisted that the gift of the Holy Spirit, which was to follow repentance and baptism, conferred upon baptised penitents the power to work miracles.

Of course it is easy to see how this Mormon delusion would make an impression. There are always enough people in nearly every community who are ready for change, and especially for the mysterious, who can be trusted to take up with nearly any kind of delusion which has in it a religious element, and is at the same time removed as far as possible from common sense. The recent Dowie delusion is a case which fitly illustrates this particular point.
But, as has already been stated, there were not many defections from the Disciple Churches; only one or two preachers besides Rigdon, and these of little importance, went over to the Mormons. A few of the churches were somewhat distracted at first, but through the earnestness and vigilance of the Reformation preachers not very much harm was done. Hearing of the defection of Rigdon, the venerable Thomas Campbell visited Mentor and vicinity in 1831, and through his wise council and great influence he practically saved the churches from becoming seriously affected by the Mormon delusion.

Meantime, Alexander Campbell vigorously attacked the Book of Mormon in his *Harbinger*, and also in a separate tract of twelve pages, in which he exposed the flagrant falsehoods and contemptible absurdities which the book contains. During the month of June he visited Ohio, spending twenty-two days delivering discourses and exposing the position with such clearness and convincing facts that Mormonism made no further progress, and was driven from Northern Ohio to Independence, Mo., thence finally to Salt Lake City. While Rigdon and his associates were at Kirtland much excitement prevailed there, as will be easily understood from the following description:

Scenes of the most wild, frantic, and horrible fanaticism ensued. They pretended that the power of miracles was about to be given to all who embraced the new faith, and commenced communicating the Holy Spirit, by laying their hands on the heads of the converts, which operation at first produced an instantaneous prostration of body and mind. Many would fall upon the floor, where they would lie for a long time, apparently lifeless. The fits usually came on during, or after, their prayer meetings, which were held nearly every evening.

The young men and women were more particularly subject to this delirium. They would exhibit all the apish actions imaginable, making the most ridiculous grimaces, creeping upon their hands and feet, rolling upon the frozen ground, going through all the Indian modes of warfare, such as knocking down, scalping, etc. At other times they would run through the fields, get upon stumps, preach to imaginary congregations, enter the water and perform the ceremony of baptising. Many would have fits of speaking in all the Indian dialects, which none could understand. Again, at the dead hour of night, young men might be seen running over the fields and hills, in pursuit, as they said, of the balls of fire, lights, etc., which they saw moving through the atmosphere. **"History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve,"** p. 213.
One reason why the churches of the "Reformers" were not much influenced by Mormonism was owing to their intelligent understanding of the Bible and their persistent determination to accept nothing in religious matters that was not as old as the New Testament Scriptures. From the very beginning of their movement they had set their forces against mere emotionalism, as an evidence of acceptance with God. They heartily believed that "faith conies by hearing and hearing by the Word of God," and that all "sights and sounds" and remarkable experiences formed no part of the evidence that any one is a Christian in the true sense of that term.

Outside of the Reform churches, however, where the people had been taught that such scenes as transpired at Kirtland were evidences of the working of the Holy Spirit, the Mormon propaganda found congenial soil, and had it not been for the vigorous opposition of the "Reformers" it is probable that it would have gained considerable influence in Ohio, if it had not become permanently established. The plea which the Disciples made for an intelligible faith was the very thing that practically killed Mormonism in the Western Reserve.

It is said that troubles never come singly. During the same year when Mormonism had its beginning, the "Reformers" in the Western Reserve became greatly excited with respect to the Millennial. Their success in preaching the "ancient Gospel" and the restoration of New Testament Christianity was so great that they became deeply impressed with the idea that the Millennial period was near at hand. The earnest, enthusiastic nature of Walter Scott lent itself easily to the acceptance of this near approach of the Millennium. He imparted his own enthusiasm to many who were associated with him, and the result was that the churches everywhere were more or less affected by this Millennial anticipation. The fruitage of this notion was not conducive to the best development of the plea which the Disciples were making.

Mr. Campbell soon saw that this tendency was likely to go too far. From his point of view there was considerable truth in the contention of Scott and his associates. He had named his new magazine the Millennial Harbinger, and this fact itself indicated that he was on
the lookout for a new age. Undoubtedly this was the predominant idea in naming his magazine as he did. Still Mr. Campbell was always level-headed with respect to everything. He never lost his balance. His enthusiasm never ran away with his judgment. He understood too well the influence which had to be overcome before the Millennial period could arrive. However, his willingness to hear both sides of the question caused him to admit into the columns of the \textit{Harbinger} a series of articles by S. M. McCorkle, a "sturdy layman," and these essays produced a very profound impression, not only in the Western Reserve, but in other quarters where the \textit{Harbinger} was circulated. Mr. McCorkle's essays were very able, from his particular point of view, and they did much to accentuate the excitement which had already been at fever heat with respect to the near approach of the Millennium. Mr. Campbell saw that something must be done to check the abnormal excitement which had already become widespread. Consequently, in 1834, he began in the \textit{Harbinger} a series of articles signed by "A Reformed Clergyman," which, while they reviewed Mr. McCorkle's essays, had in view a much wider purpose, viz., that of checking a tendency which he regarded as hindering the practical work of the Gospel. He used the \textit{nom de plume} of "Reformed Clergyman" with the hope of concealing his personality. In this, however, he was not entirely successful. Though his general style was, to some extent, obscured, there were those who soon began to suspect that Mr. Campbell was himself the real author of the essays.

These essays had the effect of creating a reaction against the extreme views which had been advocated by Mr. McCorkle and others, and in the course of a few years the excitement subsided, at least so far that it was no longer a danger to the propagation of the Ancient Gospel.

By the way, it has always been somewhat difficult to understand just what were Mr. Campbell's views concerning the Millennial period. Over his own initials he began several series of articles in subsequent numbers of the \textit{Millennial Harbinger}, and it is a rather curious fact that, after a few preliminary essays, which never reached any definite conclusion, these series were always discontinued. So far as his views can be made out, from his writings, he evidently believed in the coming of a Millennial period,
but he was never willing to commit himself to any definite time when it would begin. Nor is it clear that he took any particular side in the controversy between Pre-Millennialists and Post-Millennialists. Whatever opinion he may have had, or even expressed, was held tentatively, and in no case was it ever made an important element in his teaching. Like everything else of a somewhat speculative character, it was remanded to the category of opinions, and as such it could have no place in determining Christian fellowship. All such matters were open for legitimate discussion, but they were regarded as belonging to the sphere of knowledge, rather than of faith. They were things concerning which Christians had a right to inquire, but if they were things that could not be determined from the teaching of the Scriptures with definite certainty, every one was allowed to hold any view with respect to them that seemed most reasonable, provided this view was not made an article of faith.

This very liberty to differ, but not to divide, though a cardinal principle with the Disciples of Christ, has always had its difficulties as a working basis. The very simplicity of the creed, namely, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, lent itself to some extent, at least, to the statement which Mr. Rice so constantly and persistently kept repeating in his debate with Mr. Campbell, that the Disciples had among them "all sorts of preachers, preaching all sorts of doctrine." A more exact statement would have been that among the Disciples all sorts of doctrine were held by all sorts of people, but only one doctrine could be legitimately preached from the pulpit of the Disciples, and that was the doctrine of the Cross.

Nevertheless, it is freely admitted that this simple, yet comprehensive creed was sometimes improperly used, and hence it required constant care and strong emphasis upon the limitations of opinionism, in order to keep the movement from being wrecked by the very principle which was its most fundamental characteristic. As regards this threatening danger, Mr. Campbell himself constantly manifested the right spirit in all his discussions with his brethren. He never made even some of his most cherished opinions tests of Christian fellowship. A striking example of his attitude toward speculative theology is pre-
presented in the following extract from a reply which he made to J. Henshall concerning Calvinism and Arminianism:

All my readers can testify that I never wrote an essay on the *election* and *reprobation* of Calvin and Arminius. One or two of my correspondents have on our pages been permitted to give us an essay on Election. But I have not at any time discussed that speculative question. I do not think that we are required either from the book of God or our position as a Christian community to take any ground upon sundry speculative questions on which religious parties have been pleased to place their communion tables. This kind of warfare belongs not at all to us. If we must again fight over all these sectarian battles, one by one, we only build up the things we have been pulling down, and inevitably make ourselves liable to be elected and reprobated by the old stereotyped parties whose views we defend or assault.

Besides, there is nothing salutary or important at stake in these theories, their warmest advocates themselves being judges. The Presbyterian of the highest supralapsarian Calvinism invites to the Lord's Table and to his "sacraments" and "holy communions" the grossest Methodistic Arminians in all the country. So does the most outspoken declamer against Fletcher's left leg of sublapsarian Calvinism invite to his solemnities his extra-fastidious Calvinistic brother. While, then, the sons of creeds so metaphysically repulsive are thus pleased, now-a-days, to stultify their own speculations, what have we to do with such useless jargon? Time was, indeed, in this new world, and yet is in some parts of it, that a strict Calvinist and strict Arminian had no more to do with one another than once had the Jews and Samaritans.

If we are not Calvinists, certainly we are not Arminians. Then why argue against Calvinism as Arminians do, and thus jeopardise an association with them as injurious to them, as it would be offensive to the Calvinists? I say *injurious* to them, for certainly if the theory which says, "You would, but cannot," be anti-evangelical and dangerous, that which affirms "You can, but will not," is equally so, inasmuch as it leads one to think that he possesses a power to please God independent of his own will.

Both theories are full of sophistry. No man has either the *will* or the *can* to please God without the grace of God. With Paul I say, "I can do all the things through Christ who strengthens me"; and with entire acquiescence I assent to the words of the Messiah—"Without me you can do nothing." A man, enlightened by the grace of God, would, indeed, be perfect if he could. To *will* perfection is present to such a one; but, to be perfect in anything but the will, is impossible. So far as my observation and philosophy go, he that assumes the physical ability to please the Lord, evinces the least moral
ability to do it; while he who most laments his inability, is making the greatest endeavours to do his will.

There were other things of a disturbing character which came to the front soon after the union between the "Reformers" and "Christians" took place. Indeed, these things were simmering some time before, and might have hindered the union from being consummated, if they had been pressed by either side, during the conferences. One of these was the name which the united body should wear. Up to this time many of the Disciples had made no particular objection to the name "Reformers," for that was just what they were in fact, but they had for the most part called themselves "Disciples of Christ." The "Christians," however, were not much inclined to give up their name, or to even accept any other, as they believed that this name was divinely given, and was also beautifully appropriate, as honouring Christ, and at the same time furnishing a common name that ought not to be objectionable to any follower of Christ, as it was entirely free from any sectarian taint whatever.

For the next decade the question of name was discussed with great warmth at times in the Christian Messenger, Millennial Harbinger, and other periodicals representing the movement. Mr. Campbell advocated the name "Disciples," or "Disciples of Christ," rather than the name "Christian," for the following reasons:

“It is more ancient—more descriptive—more Scriptural—more unappropriated. . . . For these four reasons I prefer this designation to any other which has been offered."

But Mr. Campbell did not make his view of the matter an article of his faith. Doubtless he was influenced largely in favour of the name "Disciples of Christ" for the reason that the name "Christian" had become identified with the brethren associated with Stone, and these brethren were more or less charged with Unitarianism, for which Mr. Campbell had very scant respect. While it is undoubtedly true that Barton W. Stone was not a Unitarian or an Arian in any just estimate of what he held with respect to the Godhead, nevertheless, he had undoubtedly given some ground for the charge made against him to those who were anxious to find fault. Mr.
Campbell thought that as "Disciples of Christ" was a Scriptural title, and was even older than the title "Christians," it was more appropriate under the circumstances than any other name that had been proposed. But hear his conservatism with respect to the matter. He says:

I am not, however, pertinacious. The brethren all have a vote in this matter and among the candidates for the public favour, I give my vote for the "Disciples," or "Disciples of Christ." This is for the reasons now given of my choice. But I will not contend with any man for a mere name, especially when they are all good. It will be remembered that I have used almost indiscriminately sundry names, and am likely to continue doing so; for where the Lord has made me free, I cannot, without good cause, agree to bind myself.

Those who contended for the name "Christians" based their contention mainly on Scriptural grounds. They held to the view that this name was divinely given when "the Disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." The argument which was made from the meaning of the Greek verb *chrematizo*, translated "were called," was very ingenious, and if not conclusive, it certainly had philosophical and linguistic reasons to support it. It was claimed that these Disciples were called "Christians" by Divine authority, and this made the matter of the name much more important with those who held this view, than if it had been left without any definite Scriptural authority.

All agreed that the right name was important, and they were no doubt correct. He who studies history will know how influential names are. For a striking illustration as to the influence of denominational names, it may be mentioned that the English Baptists are very much more like the Disciples in the United States than they are like the Baptists in the States, most of the English Baptists holding not only to open communion, but to an open membership as well. That is, they admit to their churches Pedo-Baptists without immersion, and also are for the most part intensely Arminian in their views of the divine government. Nevertheless, they are claimed by the Baptists of America as part of their great family, and are everywhere fellowshipped as though there were no differences between them, and simply because the English Baptists retain the denominational name.

At first it looked as if the question of name was likely
to be a troublesome element in the question of Christian union, but after an earnest discussion of the whole matter it was finally settled by declaring that all the names mentioned in the Scriptures are entirely legitimate.

It is also worthy of record that at their great convention held in St. Louis, in 1904, a committee reported in favour of "Church of Christ" as the official name of the body; but after discussion this part of the report was stricken out by an overwhelming majority, simply because it seemed to imply that other Scriptural names are not proper. This action of a great convention has perhaps settled the question for all time to come that Christians of the present day have no right to be more specific in the name by which they are called than were the Christians of New Testament times. These were called "Disciples," "Christians," "Brethren," "Saints," "Children of God," etc., etc. It is now understood that it would rob the inheritance of the followers of Christ if any of these names were taken away from them. It is right to say that the above committee's suggestion had supposed reasons of a legal status behind it.

The same is true as regards the churches; so they called their churches "Churches of Christ," "Churches of God," or simply "Churches," though they recognised that the most distinctive name for the Church as a whole is "Church of God," and this seems to be specially appropriate for the reason that it embraces as a designation all that is suggested in the Godhead.

The settling of this question of a name furnishes another illustration of the practical character of the platform of Christian union to which the Disciples are committed. Where the New Testament has allowed freedom the Disciples say no one shall be bound, but where the Scriptures speak they will speak. This has been their battle cry all the way down their history, and though it has sometimes been illegitimately used, there can be no doubt about the fact that it has had much to do in making the platform of the Disciples a simple but comprehensive ground for the union of Christians.

About this time it became very evident that they had been so thoroughly engrossed by the great plea which they were advocating, and had become so intoxicated by the success which they had nearly everywhere met, that the
internal affairs of the churches had been left largely to take care of themselves, without any proper supervision, or even instruction with respect to order, piety, and spiritual development. No one lamented this state of things more than Mr. Campbell himself, though it was shared by nearly all the leaders of the movement who had given the matter careful attention. So far the movement had been largely evangelistic. It had sought for converts, but had made little or no provision for these converts to be built up in faith, hope, and love. In most cases the churches had no very special order of any kind, except that, so far as the "Reformers" were concerned, they had, from the beginning, made the Lord's Supper a principal feature in every Lord's Day service. Among the "Christians" this practice did not universally prevail, and it required no little tact and Christian courtesy to bring about uniformity, in respect to this matter, after the union took place. Nevertheless, in a short time, all the churches everywhere adopted the practice of celebrating the Lord's Supper every Lord's Day.

But in other respects there was a sad lack of order. There seemed to be very little attention given to the qualifications of those who desired to preach the Gospel. The plea was so simple, and also so attractive, that many began to preach who had little or no qualification for such a sublime work. The result was that "all sorts of men were preaching some sort of doctrine," while many of the churches seemed to think more of a Scriptural precept and example for preaching the Gospel than they did for living the Scriptural, Christian life.

In view of this fact, in 1835, the same year the union was finally consummated, Mr. Campbell issued his Harbinger "Extra," entitled "Order." In this he elaborated his views of Church government, which were largely similar to the Church views advocated by the Haldanes in Scotland. Three distinct officers were recognised, namely, Evangelists, Elders, and Deacons. The Evangelists were the proclaimers of the Gospel, the announcers of the good news, and they were to go from place to place preaching the glad tidings, baptising the people, and bringing them together into churches, and setting these churches in order, ordaining Elders in them, who were to take the oversight and feed the flock of God. The Deacons were to
specially look after the temporal affairs of the churches, though they were to obtain great boldness in the faith, and might even preach the Gospel when opportunity offered. Very few of the churches at this time had regular preaching by a well-equipped minister of the Gospel. Most of the men who were distinguished for conspicuous ability as speakers were kept in the evangelistic field, so as to obtain recruits, for this seemed to be the chief aim of the Disciples during these initial years of their movement. The consequence was that much of the teaching, as well as the exercise of discipline, was confined to the Elders, or Bishops, of each church, it being held as a cardinal principle that every church should have a plurality of overseers.

Some of these Bishops had very few qualifications for the responsible work to which they were called, but not in a few instances these Bishops themselves became active and earnest proclaimers of the Gospel. Nevertheless, it is an undeniable fact that many of the churches suffered on account of the incompetency of the eldership. This was so much the case that the Disciples have been criticised for adopting the system of Church government which prevailed at that time. But these critics do not seem to take into consideration all the facts of the case. It was practically this system or nothing. With very few qualified preachers, and these kept constantly in the evangelistic field, it was simply impossible to furnish well-equipped pastors for these newly formed churches. Furthermore, it is doubtful, even at the present time, whether very much has been gained to the movement by eliminating the Elders from the function of teaching which they once discharged, for however imperfectly the work was done in some cases, it is indisputably true that the modern system, of having the pastor do this exclusively, is open to some very serious objections, and may, in the long run, prove to be quite as much a mistake as that of making the eldership mainly responsible for teaching the churches. After all, the system of church government suggested by Mr. Campbell, and adopted very generally by the Disciples, is very much like the Dutchman's perpetual motion. He told his friends that he had "gone so far along with his invention as that it would now run mit a crank." No system of church government is a
perpetual motion. It has to run "mit a crank." Perhaps these pioneers were not careful enough in selecting their Elders. Some of them were probably "cranks" in the modern sense. Doubtless in many cases the churches had little material from which they could select suitable men. In such cases it might have been better to form a sort of temporary organization, and wait until men were developed, who could, in some degree, at least, meet the conditions prescribed in the New Testament, as to the qualifications of the Elders and Deacons. The difficulty, after all, may not have been with the system, but rather with the way it was used. No system will work except "mit a crank," or with a power behind it that regulates and enforces the system, so it will work.

In any case it is certain that these were anxious times with the leaders of the Reformation or Restoration movement. In seeking to restore the "ancient order of things" it had been found a very difficult matter to make the order fit the modern world, and too much emphasis upon the order became a hindrance instead of a help in carrying on the movement.

After this time most of the Church difficulties grew out of a rigid enforcement of discipline by an ignorant eldership in direct opposition to the fundamental plea of the Disciples that liberty of the individual conscience must be protected against all encroachments from clerical authority.

The zigzag course of progress is well illustrated in the facts of this period. In the days of the Christian Baptist Mr. Campbell had severely chastised the clergy. He had also frequently criticised the slavish subserviency of individual Christians and churches to the domineering arrogance of the clergy. His reformatory movement was now reaping some of the results of his own teaching. He had helped to develop an extreme individualism, and while this was perhaps unavoidable during the earlier days of the movement, it was now a factor that had to be dealt with, and it was frequently a threatening factor, so far as the unity of the movement was concerned. In pleading for liberty the Disciples came perilously close to anarchy, and it required all the tact and ability of the leaders of the movement to bring order out of the confusion.

As regards church organization, perhaps the chief mis-
take that was made, in the early days of the movement, was with respect to the use of the word "Church." Mr. Campbell himself undoubtedly had mainly the correct idea, though he does not seem to have practically insisted upon carrying out his idea in the organization of churches. Writing later upon this subject he says:

The Apostles apply the term church to a single congregation, meeting in a city or village. Thus we have the Church in Jerusalem; the Church at Antioch; the Church in Corinth; the Church in Philippi; the Church in Cenchrea; the Church of the Thessalonians; the Church of the Laodiceans; the Church of Ephesus; the Church in Smyrna; the Church in Pergamos; the Church in Sardis; the Church in Philadelphia.

Besides these we have particular churches, in private houses, such as the Church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila, Rom. xvi: 5; the Church in the house of Nymphas, Col. iv: 15; and the Church in the house of Philemon, verse second. We also read of churches in provinces and political districts, such as the Churches in Judea; the Churches in Galilee; the Churches in Samaria; the Churches of Syria; the Churches of Cilicia; the Churches of Galatia; the Churches of Asia; the Churches of Macedonia; the Churches of the Gentiles;—and they are spoken of as "The Churches of Christ," the "Churches of God," and "the Churches of the Saints."

Such are the various uses of this very important word, as found on a careful consideration and analysis of all its occurrences in the Apostolic writings. It is worthy of remark, that we never read of a church in or of any province or district, such as the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, or the Church of Geneva. We might as rationally look for the Church of America, or the Church of Africa, as for any national or provincial church. Such an idea is as foreign to the sacred style and spirit of Christianity, as that of an Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Baptist Church.

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 be also but one Church of Christ in a city or province. In both cases, however, a Church of Christ is a single society of believing men and women, statedly meeting in one place, to worship God through one Mediator. But, a Church of Churches, or a Church collective of all the Churches in a state or in a 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 recognising this great and important fact.
But the independence and individual responsibility of each and every Christian community for all its own proceedings is more fully set forth in the seven letters addressed, by the Lord himself, through the Apostle John, to the seven Churches, then existing in proconsular Asia. Each and every Church is addressed as though there was not another Church in Asia than itself. No one is praised or blamed for anything beyond its own limits and operations. These were not state or provincial churches, but individual communities. So far from it, three of them are found in one and the same province. Philadelphia, Sardis, and Thyatira were cities of Natolia. And of these, Sardis was not more than forty miles from Smyrna. Besides these seven churches, there were several other churches not far distant from these in Asia Minor not named nor alluded to in their letters. Such were the churches in Galatia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Pontus, Cappadocia, etc.

While this statement is comprehensive and to the point, it is open to at least one objection. While the term church is applied to a single congregation, meeting in a city or village, it never includes a number of churches in the same village or city. It was the misapprehension of this fact that led to the chief mistake which the Disciples made at the beginning, and which has been continued very largely up to the present time. In all the instances of the use of the term church, referred to by Mr. Campbell, it is uniformly in the singular number, and is modified only by the territorial condition. It is always the Church, but the Church at a place, the Church localised. But this local modification in no way changes the meaning of the leading term. Nor is this Church at a place different in any essential feature from any other use of the word, when applied to the children of God, except as to the local modification. When, however, the term church is used in the plural number, then the local modification changes from a definite city or place to a large territory, such as Asia, Judea, Galatia, Macedonia, etc., etc. Hence we read of the churches of these territories, but not the single church of any single province.* This fact is a habit of language. The units of

* There is only one possible exception to this rule. That is found in Acts ix: 31: "Then had the church rest throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria, and was edified." In the Authorised Version it is "churches" and not "church." But as the three oldest MSS. give the singular number, it is probable that church and not churches is the correct rendering. However, there are weighty reasons against this view of the matter which cannot be given here. But assuming that the testimony of the Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and the Alexandrine Codex is
several places, when added together, take the plural form, or have a plural signification. Hence, when the Church in a province is spoken of, the local modification controls the form of the leading term. By adding together a number of places belonging to one province, the local modification, for the time being, changes the singular of the leading term into the plural; and this being true, it is both proper and Scriptural to speak of the Church at Liverpool, the Church at London, the Church at New York, the Church at Chicago, and the Church at Cincinnati, but not the churches at any one of the places, though it would be correct to speak of the churches of these places, when the places are taken together, in a single province. It is also proper and Scriptural to speak of the Churches of England, the Churches of France, Churches of Canada, and Churches of the United States, but not of the Church, in the singular number, of these countries, for the units taken together pluralise the leading term.

But when speaking of the Church of God, without using any local modification, it is always proper and Scriptural to speak of it in the singular number. However, should we speak of it as limited to some province, or large territory, we should certainly use the plural number. Nevertheless, this in no way affects the idea of unity, which is certainly the leading idea, since the term church is only made to surrender its singular form when the local modification is counted, rather than the term church itself.

Up to the time which is now under consideration the Disciples had given very little attention to the Church at all. Their main thought had been about the Gospel. To use Mr. Scott's generalisation, the chief contention of the Disciples had been evangelistic. Conversion and union were the two watchwords which were everywhere emphasised.

Another fact needs to be stated here. The states where the plea was first made were for the most part agricultural states, such as Ohio, Kentucky, Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. The preaching was, therefore, chiefly conclusive, still it is not certain that the case referred to furnishes an exception to the general rule. There are three provinces taken together, and this fact may justify the use of the singular number for the term church, instead of the plural. As when the province is singular the term church becomes plural, so when several provinces are taken together, as in Acts ix: 31, the term church becomes singular.
confined to the country people and the villagers. Very little was accomplished in the cities. In many of the cities, in these states, there was at least one church, but this church, in most instances, made little or no progress, if indeed it did not lose ground. If another congregation was formed at all in the same city it was probably by division, rather than by multiplication. As there was no organic relation between the churches, and each church emphasised its individuality so excessively that it claimed to recognise no jurisdiction whatever from any other church, the result was that, instead of co-operation in the towns and cities where more than one congregation existed, these congregations sometimes became antagonistic rather than helpful in their spirit and conduct towards each other. The result of this want of co-operation, as well as the difficulty of securing good locations and good houses on these locations, made the progress of the Disciples in the cities very slow. However, they ought not to be blamed for this state of things without, first of all, having a clear understanding of the real facts by which they were controlled. Most of them were poor, and to secure a good house of worship in a city, well located, required an expenditure which the Disciples were generally unable to make. They were compelled to put up with poor accommodations, often in an obscure street, and in this way it was impossible for them to reach many of the influential people of the cities where their cause was planted. Indeed, these city churches received many of their additions from the country churches, and had it not been for these accessions from the country it is probable that the city churches would have made even less progress than they did. Still, it is an important fact that much of the spirit of illicit church independence came from the accessions from the country churches, where co-operation in a very effective sense had not been cultivated.

But there was still another factor which must be taken into the account, in judging of the Restoration movement. The following statements of Mr. Campbell clearly indicate a difficulty which has only been hinted at up to the present time:

A corrupt people never yet held fast a pure religion. When they happened to be in possession of a true and pure religion,
objectively considered, they have corrupted its institutions especially in the ratio of their own delinquency. Hence, with me, at least, it has become a law of conscience or of mind, or, if any one prefers it, a law of human nature, to which there is no exception, that the practical piety and morality of any community will never be sounder than their religions and moral institutions; or, the corruptions of religion will always be in proportion to the degeneracy of the people. Hence it follows that we may expect to find the purest and most uncorrupt institutions of religion amongst the most pure and virtuous people. And may I not challenge the faithful pages of ecclesiastic history to adduce a single exception! Nay, is it not most manifest that the more corrupt any community, the more corrupt its institutions of religion; and the more moral and religious the people, the purer and more uncorrupt their religious institutions. . . .

This is a reformation of a lofty daring, but hard to be effected, because it is wholly impracticable for a corrupt people. It required as much perfection in the people as in the system to which they aspire. To ascend is much more difficult than to descend. Even to desire a restoration of primitive Christianity in letter and spirit, in faith and practice, is not possible, except to a highly cultivated and spiritually minded population; and as these are not yet the majority of the best sect in Christendom, we cannot promise ourselves the pleasure of seeing it pervade the whole land in a few years. Nations have become Protestants in one day, so far as saving Peter's pence and servile obedience to a foreign despot is concerned; but what nation ever became Protestant in a day, so far as doing all things whatsoever the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded!

But, as respects the past reformations of England and America, and that in contemplation and in progress now, we have much to say—which cannot be said in this letter. We shall, therefore, bid you God speed in the good cause, for another moon, when we shall have stated that we advocate not a reformation upon a dozen of other reformations; but a full restoration of the original gospel institutions as delineated on the sacred pages, and as practised by the first Christians. More than this we cannot ask, and less than this we dare not attempt, if we expect the Lord to help and bless us in the glorious undertaking.*

Undoubtedly the fact referred to by Mr. Campbell has not been sufficiently considered by those who have written concerning the Disciple movement. The Reformers unquestionably had a very imperfect state of things with which to deal, as well as very imperfect characters out of which to build the new churches according to the princi-

tive pattern. Many of the members of these new churches came from the respective
denominations, and not a few of these never did rise in their church relations above the
denominations with which they were formally associated. But most of them were infatuated
with the individualism of the Disciples, and they did not hesitate to lend their influence to the
perpetuation of a state of things which made earnest co-operation among the churches
practically impossible. The Disciples, in only a few of the cities, have partially restored the
ancient order of things with respect to the Church at a city. Perhaps Kansas City and Des
Moiines, Ia., may be mentioned as coming nearer the primitive style than any other cities
where the Disciple plea has made considerable progress. In these cities the different
congregations are somewhat under a general direction which, to a large extent, avoids the
extreme individualism which has obtained in most of the Churches throughout the United
States. When the Disciples shall everywhere recognise the fact that in every city all the
congregations should be under the direction of one official Board, then, and not until then, is it
probable that they will become a real religious influence in the great cities of our land.
CHAPTER XII

RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD AND RESTORATION

THE movement had now passed through one period, viz., the Creative, and was partly through another, the Chaotic. It had also begun to take on a well-defined organic existence. It is true the organization was still somewhat nebulous, nevertheless some important steps had been taken in this matter. Mr. Campbell's extra on "Order," to which reference has already been made, did much to bring the churches into line with at least a working organization. However, the churches, as a whole, were still without any very definite means by which they could work together with respect to any specific end. When the associations were abandoned, what were called "Yearly Meetings" partially took their place. These meetings were valuable for preaching the Gospel and for mutual acquaintance and fellowship. They furnished an opportunity for the cultivation of brotherly love, which at this time was a very potent factor in the movement; but as regards co-operation, in any definite way, these meetings were of very little value. They were, however, continued from year to year, especially in Ohio and Kentucky, the two states where the movement had received its greatest hospitality.

But as the movement began to enter upon its organic period, it became less and less distinctly a Reformation movement, and more and more a Restoration movement. As the Disciples had now reached a clearly defined separate existence, it became necessary for them to vindicate their right to that existence. The main difficulty in the case was in their contention that their movement was emphatically in the interests of Christian Union. While they were seeking to simply reform the denominations, their plea did not seem to these denominations to be altogether inconsistent; but when they set up an organization of their own and asked all the denominations to
come to their religious position, it looked to these denominations like an invitation for all of them to join the Disciples, and this to the denominations was not a very gracious invitation.

In view of this fact, it became necessary for the Disciples to defend their position wholly on Scriptural grounds. They claimed that they were simply asking the denominations to occupy the primitive platform, or the position recognised by Christ and His Apostles. In other words, the Disciples, from this time forward, claimed that they were aiming to restore the "ancient order of things," or the true faith and true practice of the primitive Church; consequently, they justified their separate existence, and their earnest invitations to other religious people to occupy their position, on the ground that they were not asking others to join them, but rather to join in the restoration of Apostolic Christianity.

Of course, from the very beginning of the movement the claim had been made that the exalted aim was to build upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone. But, while the Disciples were pleading for reformation, rather than restoration, the fundamental principles of their movement were not so distinctly and emphatically affirmed. Now, however, as they were charged with being a new denomination, they felt bound to defend themselves against this charge by setting up their plea for a complete return to Apostolic faith and practice in everything that pertains to the Christian life.

This was a high claim, and as such it required definite and unanswerable reasons to sustain it. These reasons were furnished around the following propositions:

1. The Bible and the Bible alone is all-sufficient as a rule of faith and practice.

2. As this Bible contains the will of God to man, it is capable of being understood, and its teaching applied in all matters pertaining to the Christian life.

3. The full recognition and acceptance of Bible teaching will heal the divisions of Christendom, and unite in one body all professed Christians, who love our Lord Jesus Christ better than those things that alienate and divide them into practically antagonistic denominations.

From the beginning, emphasis had been placed upon
the first of these propositions. The "Declaration and Address" had accentuated the plea for the Bible, and the Bible alone, as a rule of faith and practice. But it did not show very definitely and distinctly how this Bible might be interpreted so as to bring practical union among the followers of Christ. This was the main task which the Disciples had to perform at the beginning of their organic or reconstruction period. If all the denominations had to surrender their denominational positions and unite upon the Bible and the Bible alone, then it was necessary that these denominations should be shown how they might all understand the Bible so as to reach practical unity as regards its teaching. It was useless to contend that Christian union could only be effected by taking the Bible as an infallible rule of faith and practice, unless all could understand without question as to what the Bible really teaches with respect to the great essentials of the Christian faith and practice. The Disciples set themselves to the task of making this position very clear. They contended with the greatest earnestness that the Bible could be understood, so that all might "speak the same things, be of the same mind and the same judgment," with respect to all matters essential to the union of Christians. They contended that just three things were necessary in order to reach practical unity with respect to all important matters contained in the Word of God. These three things were:

1. A reasonable amount of intelligence.
2. Perfect honesty in the study of the Bible.

The first required the dissemination of light; the second a complete willingness to surrender to everything that an intelligent apprehension of Bible teaching demanded; and the third required that the Bible should be treated, in its interpretation, in many respects, just as any other book or facts are treated when we wish to arrive at infallible certainty.

The method which the Disciples adopted very generally was the same as that adopted by scientists in their investigations of nature; and as the matter of Biblical interpretation has so much to do with the plea of the Disciples, at this particular period, it may be well to give a somewhat detailed account of the system of hermeneutics.
which they employed, both at that time and in their subsequent history. The following quotation from one of their ablest writers will suffice for this particular purpose:

The question is often asked, why are there so many theories of religion in the Christian world? Why is it, that those who profess to draw their instruction from the same source arrive at conclusions so widely different? These inquiries are extremely pertinent, and are entitled to a satisfactory reply. All parties unite in declaring the Bible to be the only rule of faith and practice, and yet they all seem to be led by it in different ways. The honest seeker after truth asks us, why is this? "Is the Bible so mysterious as not to be understood? Then why do you direct me to its pages for light and guidance? Does it return answers so ambiguous as to leave the mind in doubt and uncertainty? Then why should I consult it?" We repeat, that these interrogations are pertinent, and should claim the earnest attention of those who profess to be teachers of religion. Men of science are perfectly agreed in their interpretation of the book of nature, and mankind have a right to ask why men of piety are not equally agreed in their interpretation of the book of nature's God. He speaks the same thing in the same language to all, and yet those who profess to study his word for the express purpose of instructing the ignorant in the way that they should go, return answers not only various in their import, but often pointing out directly opposite courses. The consequence evidently is, that the faith of professors is in a great measure transferred from the Bible to the expositors of it. Every person selects the man in whom he has the most faith and follows his directions. A more unfortunate state of things could hardly be presumed to exist with any consistent claims to the appellation of Christianity.

We think a satisfactory solution of this whole matter is contained in the fact, that the inductive method is not used in the investigations of the Bible, as it is in nature. We propose, therefore, for the benefit of the unlearned reader, to endeavour to explain with the utmost clearness, what is meant by this method, to show how it is applied to the investigations of science, how it leads almost necessarily to correct conclusions, and how the same method may be applied with the same result to the investigations of the Bible. We invite special attention to this subject, as one of paramount importance, and as bearing directly upon the evils and difficulties to which we have alluded.

Up to the days of Lord Bacon, men of science were not of "the same mind and the same judgment," but on the contrary, theories and systems were as multiform and discrepant, as are now the theories and systems of religion. Because, up to that time philosophers, if indeed they may be called such, had pursued the same course with respect to nature, that theologians have pursued up to this time with respect to the Bible. What
was that course? We will give it in the language of the celebrated Dr. Dick: "Prior to the introduction of the inductive method of philosophising, men of science were extremely prone to the framing of hypotheses, before they had attentively surveyed and collected the requisite facts. Theory was reared upon theory and system upon system; each of them obtained its admirers and its period of applause, but in consequence of modern researches they have now passed away like a dream or vision of the night." To the same effect, this eminent man elsewhere observes: "A man of genius frequently shuts himself in his closet, and from a few scattered fragments of nature, constructs, in his imagination, a splendid theory which makes a noise and blaze for a little, like an unsubstantial meteor, and then vanishes in air."

The consequence of pursuing such a course as this will readily be imagined. There was no such thing as demonstration and certainty, and hence every theory depended upon its plausibility for its popularity. To some minds this one would seem the more reasonable, to others some other one; a third and fourth would also have their advocates and defenders, and thus the whole scientific world would be divided into parties, none of them knowing whether they were right, but all zealously contending for their peculiar system as this great secret of nature. Now it will be apparent that, pursuing such a course, they could never have arrived at the same conclusions, because they never would have attained to anything more certain than shrewd guesses at the truth. They might have exposed and spent their lives in each other's stolidity and have argued and reasoned forever without coming together, because they began their investigations where they ought to have left off.

Such was the condition of things when Lord Bacon came upon the stage. Theories and speculations and systems were supported and opposed by huge folios of quasi learning and wisdom, while nature was really a closed volume, and the most evident facts in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, the surest and most universal laws of physical science, were either entirely overlooked or seen awry, by attempting to view everything through the previously formed system.

The method of philosophising which he introduced was directly the opposite of this. In general terms, it is "the method in which natural objects are subjected to the test of observation and experiment, in order to furnish certain facts as the foundation of general truths." We adduce, by way of illustration, a few familiar examples: Water was subjected to a certain degree of heat, when it was found to generate steam. This was a single instance. The experiment was repeated again and again with the same result, until the experimenter was perfectly satisfied. Then he announced to the world the general truth that water at that degree of heat is converted into steam. A chemist subjected a quantity of water to a certain process, and found that it resolved itself into two gases,
oxygen and hydrogen. He states the result of his experiment to another chemist, who repeats it with a like result; another does the same, and another, all with the same result, and from these particular cases they infer the general truth and publish to the world their conviction that water is composed of two gases. A philosopher by experiment finds that the pressure of the atmosphere will sustain a column of water thirty feet high; that sound in the ordinary state of atmosphere moves at the rate of about 1,150 feet per second, and so on ad infinitum. Let it be observed, now, that the correctness of these conclusions is not a subject for reasoning and argumentation. He that questions them has but to repeat the experiment—has to show that the facts do not authorise the conclusions, or else he must admit them. The process is simply one by which nature is made to speak out her own meaning. She is not asked to support this system or that, but to declare the true one. Subjected to these tests, everything, animate and inanimate, became vocal with "a revelation of mysteries which had been kept secret from the foundation of the world," and spoke in a voice so clear and certain, that mankind with one consent gave credence to the declaration and became of "one mind and one judgment."

We have seen what caused and perpetuated divisions and parties among men of science. We have also seen how they were all brought to read nature exactly alike, to draw precisely the same conclusions from the great volume that was open before them. And now we submit it to every considerate mind, if the divisions in Christendom are not owing to the absence of this true method of searching the volume of inspiration. It cannot be from a want of intelligence, or honesty, or piety. These are all found in the highest degree among individuals of all the denominations. But the most towering intellect is insufficient to find the truth, if it is not diligently and properly sought after. There were men of genius and learning and patient research before the days of Kepler and Galileo and Newton—but their genius displayed itself in the formation of hypotheses and imaginary systems, their labour and research were expended to support these theories—to force nature to confirm the correctness of their suppositions. So theologians either fabricate themselves, or find fabricated to their hands, certain systems of divinity. These they sincerely believe to be true. Hence all their investigations of the Bible are made with the design of finding proof texts in support of them. Whatever seems to confirm their articles of faith, is elevated in their minds to an undue importance, and whatever seems to conflict with them they either pass over altogether, as among "the deep things of God," or explain away their force by wrestling with them from their legitimate and most evident signification. This is not the result of wickedness and depravity—it does not arise from any irreverence for the word of God, but it is the natural and inevitable consequence of the
system to which they have bound themselves. The man who has inherited or adopted the "faith alone" system, sees it in almost every page of the New Testament, while he who has pledged himself to the system of "works," finds on the same page a confirmation of his belief. The "limited atonement" man, and the "free salvation" man, each finds his doctrine in the same chapter, each is surprised at the dullness of his antagonist in not seeing as he sees, each, (it may be unconsciously to himself,) has favourite texts of Scripture, and others which he reads with a mere passing glance. These men can never "see eye to eye," because they have different media through which they view the word.

They occupy different standpoints in looking at the same things, and hence they must forever present a different appearance. And yet God says to these opponents, "be ye perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," (I. Cor. i:10). Is this possible? Is it practicable? We think it is, to all who are willing to lay aside their prejudices and predilections, and with a sincere desire to know what is the truth, will adopt that method of investigation which, in the scientific world, resulted at once in truth and union. To illustrate more clearly our meaning, and to show how even the most ordinary mind can apply this inductive process to the investigations of the Bible at once with confidence and certainty, we will take the subject of the Christian Faith. We lay down the Scriptural proposition, "There is one faith." The problem for solution is to ascertain what this is. We lay aside all confessions of faith—the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, and we are to determine from an induction of Scripture cases, what is "the faith once delivered to the saints." We say, that pursuing this course, every inquirer will arrive at precisely the same conclusion, which will be beyond doubt, and evidently the true one.

To begin our investigations, we open at the Acts of the Apostles. We do so for a particular reason, namely, because the Apostles were the first who acted under a commission which embraced "all the world"—"every creature,"—and which, therefore, includes ourselves and all others. The philosopher who would experiment on air would not select water or solids; so if we would learn the Christian faith, of course, we are not to inquire of the patriarchal, or of the Jewish Dispensation, but the Christian. It will not be necessary for us to collate all the cases given in this book; we select a few of the plainest, and leave those who may be dissatisfied with our conclusions, to prosecute their inquiries to any desired extent.

The first case is given in the second chapter. Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit, and standing up with the eleven, preaches a discourse to the assembled multitude, who had come up to Jerusalem from the different countries of the world. In this discourse he dwells upon the prediction of the Psalmist,
that God "would not leave his soul in hades, neither suffer his Holy one to see corruption." He shows that this could not apply to David, but that it was spoken of the Christ, and that God had raised him from the dead, so that his flesh did not see corruption. He concludes by saying, "therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." This then was the faith required of them; that "God hath raised Jesus from the dead and made him Lord and Christ."

The second case is in the third chapter. Peter, preaching from Solomon's porch, lays down the proposition, "The God of our fathers has glorified his Son Jesus—but ye killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead." He adds that "those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that (the) Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." This Jesus hath fulfilled the prophecies concerning the Christ, therefore he is the Christ. This case corresponds with the previous one. In both which Peter labours to make the people believe that Jesus of Nazareth hath been raised from the dead and that he was the Christ. The apostles were witnesses of his resurrection, and his resurrection was the proof of his being the anointed Son of God. (Rom. i:4).

The third case which we introduce, is contained in the eighth chapter, and known as the conversion of the eunuch. Philip, we are told, "preached unto him Jesus "; and when the eunuch desired to be introduced into the participation of the blessings promised through him, he told him if he "believed with all his heart" he might. Believed what? Evidently what Philip had preached. He said "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Philip must have taught him to believe this, because he knew nothing about it before. He accepted this as the faith necessary to entitle him to the ordinances.

The fourth case is that of the jailer at Philippi, recorded in the sixteenth chapter. He said to Paul and Silas, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" "And they said, Believe on the Lord, Jesus Christ and than shalt be saved."

These cases will be sufficient to illustrate our meaning. We have only selected a few out of a large number. The curious, or the dissatisfied, will find any desirable number in the preachings and letters of the Apostles. But from these particulars, are we not bound to conclude, that "to believe with all the heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of God," is the "one faith" of the Gospel; "the faith once delivered to the Saints "; the rock upon which the Church is built? If any man questions it, he is not to reason about it—he is not to argue against it—he is not to ask "how can these things be"—it is a question of fact—something either true or false; and all the objections of reason, that the basis is too broad or too narrow—that the faith is too strong or too
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weak, too much or too little, are as irrelevant and unphilosophical, as would be the objection that gold is not malleable, or that air is not elastic. The only pertinent question is, Is it true? is it sustained by the facts?

We are persuaded that when this subject is examined in this light, with no reference to the various confessions of faith in the world, every careful inquirer will reach the same conclusion. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born (begotten) of God." I. John v:1. "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (verse 5th).

Here we leave the subject for the present; at some future time we may accompany the reader through the Acts of the Apostles in seeking responses to other questions of interest and importance. We trust that enough has been said to convince the earnest seeker after truth, that the Bible was not written merely that ministers might have scraps of texts to place at the head of their discourses, but for man; for all men; that it is to be carefully studied, and its directions followed, that he is to let it speak for itself, that he is to hear it and to "take heed how he hears," and that by doing so, it is "able to make him wise unto salvation." We venture also to indulge the hope, that by reading it in the way we have pointed out, all who love its truths and have hope in its promises, will yet "see eye to eye and face to face," that they will "all speak the same things, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

Mr. Campbell himself gave some instruction as to how the Word of God could be infallibly understood. In one place, he says: "Great unanimity has obtained in most of the sciences in consequence of the adoption of certain rules of analysis and synthesis; for all who work by the same rules come to the same conclusions. And may it not be possible that in this Divine science of religion there may yet be a very great degree of unanimity of sentiment and uniformity of practice amongst all who acknowledge its Divine authority?"

He also gives the following rules for interpreting the Scriptures, which he thinks, if properly followed, will lead to practical unity with respect to the meaning of all important matters:

"Rule I. On opening any hook in the sacred scriptures, consider first the historical circumstances of the book. These are the order, the title, the author, the date, the place, and the occasion of it.

II. In examining the contents of any book, as respects

* Christian Union, pp. 18-24, J. S. Lamar.
precepts, promises, exhortations, etc., observe who it is that speaks, and under what dispensation he officiates. Is he a Patriarch, a Jew, or a Christian? Consider also the persons addressed—their prejudices, characters, and religious relations. Are they Jews or Christians—believers or unbelievers, approved or disapproved? This rule is essential to the proper application of every command, promise, threatening, admonition, or exhortation, in the Old Testament or the New.

III. To understand the meaning of what is commanded, promised, taught, etc., the same philological principles, deduced from the nature of language, or the same laws of interpretation which are applied to the language of other books, are to be applied to the language of the Bible.

IV. Common usage, which can only be ascertained by testimony, must always decide the meaning of any word which has but one signification; but when the words have, according to testimony—(i.e., the Dictionary)—more meanings than one, whether literal or figurative, the scope, the context, or parallel passages must decide the meaning; for if common usage, the design of the writer, the context, and parallel fail, there can be no certainty in the interpretation of language.

V. In all tropical language, ascertain the point of resemblance, and judge of the nature of the trope, and its kind, from the point of resemblance.

VI. In the interpretation of symbols, types, allegories, and parables, this rule is supreme. Ascertain the point to be illustrated; for comparison is never to be extended beyond that point—to all the attributes, qualities, or circumstances of the symbol, type, allegory, or parable.

VII. For the salutary and sanctifying intelligence of the oracles of God, the following rule is indispensable:—We must come within the understanding distance." *

As the catholicity of the Disciple plea depended upon the possibility of all intelligent, honest persons reaching the same conclusion with respect to the essentials of Christian union, it is easy to see how important it was that a method of Biblical interpretation should be adopted, by which the Bible could be infallibly understood by those who were seeking a common ground on which to unite the divided forces of Christendom. From this time forward the Disciples were under the most solemn obligation to make good their contention that Christian union is only possible by a union of Christians, not denominations, and such a union cannot even be hoped for unless all will turn to the Word of God and heartily seek, by a scientific method, to reach practically the same conclusions with respect to its teaching.

At any rate, this was the new order of things which came with the new period in the history of the Disciple movement. The emphasis placed upon Christian union, from this point of view, turned every one to the study of the Word of God, rather than to creeds and confessions of faith, or doctrinal statements, with regard to denominational differences. Undoubtedly this view of the whole matter was a crucial test of the position occupied by the Disciples. If they could make clear their contention that the Bible can be understood, and that it teaches substantially the same essential things for all Christians, then undoubtedly the position assumed by the Disciples would be not only defensible, from the Scriptural point of view, but would also be eminently catholic, since it would provide a basis for Christian union upon which all could stand.

There were, however, objections made to this position on the ground of its uncharitableness. It was affirmed that those who held to it were intensely narrow, and that the position practically annulled the contention of Mr. Campbell and his associates that opinions must not be made tests of Christian fellowship. On this very subject Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stone at first somewhat differed, and this difference caused Mr. Campbell to write an essay on "Opinionism," in which he draws the distinction between opinions with respect to doubtful matters, and a faith that is certain with respect to facts. In reply to Mr. Stone, he says:

Opinions are always, in strict propriety of speech, doubtful matters, because speculative. If ever the word be applied to matters of testimony, to laws, institutions, or religious worship, we must be confounded in our faith and practice. If, in his style, opinion apply equally to immersion and the doctrine of the Trinity then it will apply equally to the Messiahship of Jesus, the resurrection of the dead, eternal life, and every item of the Christian faith and hope. One man may say, "I am of the opinion that Jesus did not die for our sins; that his death was that of a martyr or witness for the truth of God's philanthropy, and as an example for us." And another is of the opinion that immersion, the Lord's table, and the literal resurrection of the body, are all carnal notions and unworthy of a spiritual man. Both appear to be honest and pious men. Shall the Christian divide the ground with them, and only say he is of a different opinion? This is not the charity which rejoices in the truth.
I know that *baptism* means immersion as certainly as I know that *manus* means a hand, and *penna* a pen; or as certainly as I know that *sprinkling* is not pouring, and *pouring* is not dipping. I know as certainly that *eis* means into, as I do that *in* does not mean *out*, nor *out*, in. I believe as certainly the Christian facts as I believe any events of the American Revolution. I will not say that he who says he is of the opinion that George Washington lived two hundred years ago, and was the same person who is called Oliver Cromwell, is to be regarded as a believer of the American history, but only differing in opinion from me. I cannot regard him as only differing in opinion from one who maintains that we are, from the New Testament, as much bound religiously to observe Easter and Christmas, as we are the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper. He may call me uncharitable, but I will be honest though I hazard his contumely.

But here is the error. We are represented as refusing communion with him with whom God communes, if we do not recognise as a fellow-citizen every one whom God regards as one of his people. Has God anywhere commanded us to sit down at the Lord's Table with a person who refuses to be immersed because he was sprinkled? Or has he enjoined upon me to treat any person as a brother in the Lord because he has recognised him as such, when he fails to keep the ordinances of the Lord? It is only in obedience to the Lord, not on the principle of expediency, but because the Lord has enjoined it, that we are to associate with any person as a brother in the Lord. Nor do I say that none are Christians but those who walk orderly; we only say that we are commanded to associate with those only who do walk orderly. If we can dispense with the neglect or disobedience of one Christian, we may with another; and so on till we have in the Church all the vices of the world.

We are always safe when we act constitutionally, or according to the law of our Sovereign Lord the King; unsafe when we act from our opinion, or sense of expediency, or the fitness of things. He who is so enlightened as to say that *immersion into the name*, etc., is the only baptism Jesus Christ appointed, and that none can enter into the kingdom of Jesus but such as are immersed or born of water, and yet takes upon himself to set this institution aside upon his own opinion of expediency, presumes more upon his opinion and upon the pliability of his Lord and Master, than we for the universe dare presume. Of all men, he who knows his Master's will, and does it not, is most obnoxious to the displeasure of the Lord.

To say that *a new state of things has arisen*, to which the New Testament laws and usages will not apply, is at once to set aside the perfection and applicability of the book, and to weaken the obligation of every Christian institute, and our own hands in waging war against error.
Call not this an opinion; or, if you do, call my belief that Jesus is the Son of God an opinion too; and every thought, volition, and affection of the heart, an opinion.*

In view of misunderstandings and misrepresentations with respect to the religious position of the Disciples, Mr. Campbell was urged to publish a volume that would set forth their principles and aims in a clear and unmistakable manner, so that all who still misrepresented would be left without excuse. Accordingly, in 1835, he published a book, entitled, "Christianity Restored," which contained in an orderly manner some of the essays that had been published in the *Christian Baptist* and *Millennial Harbinger*. The first part of this book is devoted to "Principles and Rules by which the Living Oracles may be intelligently and certainly interpreted," showing conclusively Mr. Campbell's conception of the importance of a correct system of hermeneutics.

In the preface to this book he refers to the fact that the Disciples had now become practically a separate people, and furthermore that their principles and aims had been fully announced. He says:

> We flatter ourselves, that the principles are now clearly and fully developed, by the united efforts of a few devoted and ardent minds, who set out determined to sacrifice everything to truth, and follow her wherever she might lead the way: I say, the principles on which the Church of Jesus Christ—all believers in Jesus as the Messiah—can be united with honour to themselves, and with blessings to the world; on which the Gospel and its ordinances can be restored, in all their primitive simplicity, excellency, and power, and the church shine as a lamp that burneth to the conviction and salvation of the world: I say, the principles by which these things can be done, are now developed; as well as the principles themselves, which together constitute the original gospel and order of things established by the apostles.

The object of this volume is to place before the community in a plain, definite, and perspicuous style, the capital principles which have been elicited, argued out, developed, and sustained in a controversy of twenty-five years, by the tongues and pens of those who rallied under the banners of the Bible alone. The principle which was inscribed upon our banners when we withdrew from the ranks of the sects, was:—"Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to him as our Lawgiver and King, the only test of Christian character, and the

* *Millennial Harbinger*, Vol. II., p. 103.
only bond of Christian union, communion, and co-operation; irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments, and traditions of men."

This cause, like every other, was first plead by the tongue; afterwards by the pen and press. The history of its progress corresponds with the history of every other religious revolution, in this respect:—that different points, at different times, almost exclusively engrossed the attention of its pleaders. We began with the outposts and vanguard of the opposition. Soon as we found ourselves in possession of one post, our artillery was turned against another; and as fast as the smoke of the enemy receded, we advanced upon his lines. . .

But to contradistinguish this plea and effort from some others, almost contemporaneous with it, we would emphatically remark that—while the remonstrants warred against human creeds, evidently because those creeds warred against their own private opinions and favourite dogmas, which they wished to substitute for those creeds,—this enterprise, so far as it was hostile to those creeds, warred against them, not because of their hostility to any private or favourite opinions which were desired to be substituted for them; but because these human institutions supplanted the Bible, made the word of God of non-effect, were fatal to the intelligence, union, purity, holiness, and happiness of the Disciples of Christ, and hostile to the salvation of the world.

Unitarians, for example, have warred against human creeds, because those creeds taught trinitarianism. Arminians, too, have been hostile to creeds, because those creeds supported Calvinism. It has indeed, been alleged that all schismatics, good and bad, since the days of John Wycliffe, and long before, have opposed creeds of human invention, because those creeds opposed them. But so far as this controversy resembles them in its opposition to creeds, it is to be distinguished from them in this all-essential attribute, viz.: that our opposition to creeds arose from a conviction, that whether the opinions in them were true or false, they were hostile to the union, peace, harmony, purity, and joy of Christians; and adverse to the conversion of the world to Jesus Christ.

Next to our personal salvation two objects constituted the sumnum bonum, the supreme good, worthy of the sacrifice of all temporalities. The first was, the union, peace, purity, and harmonious co-operation of Christians—guided by an understanding enlightened by the Holy Scriptures; the other, the conversion of sinners to God. Our predilections and antipathies on all religious questions arose from, and were controlled by, these all-absorbing interests. From these commenced our campaign against creeds. We had not at first, and we have not now, a favourite opinion, or speculation, which we would offer as a substitute for any human creed or constitution in Christendom.

We were not indeed at first apprised of the havoc which
our principles would make upon our opinions. We soon, however, found our principles and opinions at war on some points; and the question immediately arose, Whether shall we sacrifice our principles to our opinions, or our opinions to our principles. We need not say that we were compelled to the latter; judging that our principles were better than our opinions. Hence, since we put to sea on board this bottom, we have been compelled to throw overboard some opinions, once as dear to us as they are now to those who never thought of the difference between principle and opinion.

Some of those opinions—as the most delicate and tender buds are soonest blighted by the frost—immediately withered, and died under the first application of our principles. Infant baptism and infant sprinkling, with all infantile imbecility, immediately expired in our minds, soon as the *Bible alone* was made the only measure and standard of faith and duty. This foundation of the pedobaptist temple being instantly destroyed, and the whole edifice, leaning upon it, became a heap of ruins. We explored the ruins with great assiduity and collected from them all the materials that could be worked into the Christian temple; but the piles of rubbish that remained were immense. . . .

Our views and attainments in the knowledge of Christianity, such as they are, are, we think, the necessary results of our premises and principles of interpretation. Certain it is, that by them we were led into those views of the ancient gospel and order of things, which we were enabled to exhibit in the publications of the year 1823. While we state this fact distinctively to arrest the attention of the reader to a candid and jealous examination of them, we would not be understood as alleging, that all who have since embraced these views, or who now contend for them, are indebted to our labours for their knowledge of original Christianity. The same principles of interpretation have led others to the same conclusions from the same premises; and thus have we been mutually helpers to one another. The momentous importance of some of our conclusions, we humbly think, entitles our premises and principles of interpretation, to a strict and impartial consideration; and this is all the favour we petition from any reader into whose hands this volume may happen to fall.

It will be seen by this contention how thoroughly Mr. Campbell and those associated with him dealt with themselves, as well as other religious people, in reaching the simple platform to which they had now come, and also the great value that was placed upon a proper method of interpreting the Word of God. Further on, in the body of the hook, he gives his views with respect to human creeds and also with respect to the only basis upon which it is possible to have Christian union. He says:
No human creed in Protestant Christendom can be found, that has not made a division for every generation of its existence. And I may add—the more thinking, inquisitive, and intelligent the community which owns a creed, the more frequent their debates and schisms.

But the Bible will do no better, if men approach it with a set of opinions, or a human symbol in their minds. For then it is not the Bible, but the opinions in the mind, that form the bond of union. Men, indeed, had better have a written, than an unwritten standard of orthodoxy, if they will not abandon speculation and abstract notions, as any part of Christian faith or duty.

But all these modes of faith and worship, are based upon a mistake of the true character of Revelation, which it has long been our effort to correct. With us, Revelation has nothing to do with opinions, or abstract reasonings; for it is founded wholly and entirely upon facts. There is not one abstract opinion, not one speculative view, asserted or communicated in the Old Testament or New. Moses begins with asserting facts that had transpired in creation and providence; and John ends with asserting prophetic or prospective facts, in the future displays of providence and redemption. Facts, then, are the alpha and omega, of both Jewish and Christian revelations.

But that the reader may have before his mind in one summary view, the whole scheme of union and co-operation, which the living oracles and the present state of the Christian religion in the world demand; which has been, at different times and in various manners, illustrated and sustained in the present controversy, against divisions,—we shall here submit it in one period.

Let the Bible be substituted for all human creeds; facts, for definitions; things, for words; faith, for speculation; unity of faith, for unity of opinion; the positive commandments of God, for human legislation and tradition; piety, for ceremony; morality, for partizan zeal; the practice of religion, for the profession of it;—and the work is done.

It will be seen by these two extracts that the only hope Mr. Campbell now had of Christian union was a complete restoration of primitive Christianity in its faith, doctrine, and life. The idea of Reformation was now entirely abandoned and Restoration became the battle cry of the Disciple hosts.

However, it is important not to misunderstand this apparently radical position of the Disciples. It was never assumed by them that even they themselves perfectly realised their ideal. They always recognised the difference between the historical church and the ideal church. One of these represents the perfect church, as it is described
in the New Testament, the other represents the imperfect church, as it is realised in ecclesiastical history. One is what the Holy Spirit would have the Church to be; the other is what it has been in the lives of weak men and women.

From this point of view it is evident that even the primitive Church was not entirely blameless. It had its petty quarrels about many things; and in the character of its membership it was far from being perfect. But the Disciples claimed that the New Testament pattern of the Church is perfect, and that this is the ideal which we must set before us in all our efforts to realise to the fullest extent the Divine ideal of what the Church should be.

Having now given to the world a clear statement of its principles and aims, the new organization was fairly launched; and though uncharitably criticised by many, and often misrepresented by some, the opposition which it received only served to intensify the convictions of the Disciples, as to the correctness of their position, and inflamed their zeal to propagate their plea for the conversion of the world and the union of Christians. While this separate position was not of their own choosing, they finally reached the conclusion that this was perhaps the better position to occupy, since nothing short of a restoration of New Testament Christianity would bring order out of the confusion of Christendom, and at the same time lead to the conversion of the world.

Looking at the matter from this point of view, and reviewing the whole movement from the beginning, Mr. Campbell was perhaps justified in saying what he did in the following extract:

Still it may be better as it is, that a new organization, founded upon the New Institution alone, and neither upon unity of opinion, nor upon similarity of experience, should have been created and made to witness with equal impartiality and fidelity against Baptists and Pedi-baptists. So it has, indeed, come to pass; and the consequence is that its voice is being heard in its numerous periodicals, by its many ministers and churches, and by the most extraordinary and rapid growth of any community since the Protestant reformation. Heard truly, in all denominations, insomuch that the spirit that was some fifteen years ago working but in a few churches, is now gone abroad into the land, and is imbuing all
parties more or less with its influences. Sentiments, too, that when first avowed by us, were deemed heretical and dangerous, are now promulgated from the high places of sectarianism with applause; and the very rules of interpreting scripture, for which we have been most shamefully reproached, are now the standard of orthodoxy in some of the most respectable and highly evangelical schools both in the Old and New Worlds.*

*Haley's "Dawn of the Reformation."
CHAPTER XIII

RESTORATION AS AN IDEAL AND AS A REALISATION

THE Campbellian movement having now entered upon its Reconstruction and Development period, it must henceforth be regarded as a new religious organization with definitely defined principles and aims. Already the movement had gained adherents in several states other than Ohio and Kentucky, although these two states were the chief centres from which the movement was carried westward and southward. A few churches were established in the East, but it never made any substantial progress in that direction, nor did it progress with much force towards the South or toward the North, though quite a number of churches were established in Virginia, Maryland, the Carolinas, Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia, these churches being planted chiefly by evangelists from Kentucky, who also carried it into Missouri. From Ohio it was carried into Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and some other Western states.

Bethany, W. Va., became the head centre of the movement, as here was where Mr. Campbell lived, and from this place he issued his publications. His name had already become famous through these publications, his public addresses, and especially his debates. Two of these debates have already been noticed, viz., the one with Mr. Walker and the other with Mr. McCalla. In 1829, at Cincinnati, he held a debate with Robert Owen, in which Mr. Campbell defended the Christian religion against the assaults of that noted infidel. Mr. Owen had challenged the entire clergy of America to meet him in open debate, and as no one else accepted this challenge, Mr. Campbell felt it his duty to do so in the interests of a common Christianity. This debate gave Mr. Campbell a widespread reputation in both America and Europe. It was perhaps one of the most remarkable debates, with respect to the Christian religion, ever held, if indeed it can be called a debate at all. It was generally conceded by
those who heard it that Mr. Campbell's defence of the Christian religion was overwhelming in its conclusiveness. Indeed, at the last Mr. Owen practically abandoned the contest, and in one of the most remarkable extemporaneous speeches ever made, Mr. Campbell, for twelve hours, defended the Christian religion in a manner which has seldom been equaled, and perhaps never surpassed.

In the same city, in January, 1837, he held a debate with a Roman Catholic—Bishop Purcell—on the following propositions:

1. The Roman Catholic institution, sometimes called the Holy Apostolic Church, is not now, nor was she ever catholic, apostolic, or holy; but is a sect, in the fair import of that word, older than any other sect now existing; not the "mother and mistress of all churches" but an apostasy from the only true, apostolic, and catholic Church of Christ.

2. Her notion of apostolic succession is without any foundation in the Bible, in reason, or in fact; an imposition of the most injurious consequences, built upon unscriptural and anti-scriptural traditions, resting wholly upon the opinions of interested and fallible men.

3. She is not uniform in her faith or united in her members, but mutable and fallible as any other sect of philosophy or religion—Jewish, Turkish, or Christian—a confederation of sects under a politico-ecclesiastic head.

4. She is the Babylon of John, the Man of Sin of Paul, and the Empire of the Youngest Horn of Daniel's sea monster.

5. Her notions of purgatory, indulgences, auricular confession, remission of sins, transubstantiation, supererogation, etc., essential elements of her system, are immoral in their tendency and injurious to the well-being of society, religious and political.

6. Notwithstanding her pretensions to have given us the Bible and faith in it, we are perfectly independent of her for our knowledge of that book and its evidences of a divine original.

7. The Roman Catholic religion, if infallible and unsusceptible of reformation, as alleged, is essentially anti-American, being opposed to the genius of all free institutions and positively subversive of them, opposing the general reading of the Scriptures and the diffusion of useful knowledge among the whole community, so essential to liberty and the permanency of good government.

Concerning the result of this debate the following resolutions by a large public meeting held at the close of the discussion, were passed:
1. Resolved, that it is the unanimous opinion of this meeting that the cause of Protestantism has been fully sustained throughout this discussion.

2. Resolved, that it is our opinion the arguments in favour of Protestantism, and the objections to the errors of popery, have not yet been met.

3. Resolved, that we look forward to the publication of this discussion as a powerful antidote to the sophistry and arrogance of all the advocates of Romanism; and that we have the fullest confidence in submitting it to the impartial decision of the American people.

4. Resolved, that we approve of the spirit and temper, and were pleased with the power of argument and the authorities by which Mr. Campbell sustained his positions, and concur with him in possessing no unkind feeling or prejudices towards individuals, but believe the principles of Romanism inconsistent with our free institutions.

Some years after the debate, Bishop Purcell, in conversation with at least two trustworthy witnesses, gave it as his opinion that Mr. Campbell was one of the ablest defenders of Protestantism that had ever spoken on the subject, and furthermore that his fairness as a disputant was worthy of all praise. It is well known that Mr. Owen was lavish in his praise of Mr. Campbell's courtesy, as well as his conspicuous ability as a defender of the Christian faith.

These debates were afterwards published, and their circulation throughout the country had considerable influence upon the religious movement which Mr. Campbell was specially advocating. He accomplished also a great deal for his cause during his travels in several of the states.

Meantime Mr. Stone had moved from Georgetown to Jacksonville, Ill., and had associated with him John T. Johnson in the editorship of the Christian Messenger, which was now published from Jacksonville. This latter place became headquarters for the advocacy of the new movement, especially in Illinois, where the principles of the Restoration began to make considerable headway. When Mr. Stone located at Jacksonville, in the autumn of 1834, he found two churches, a "Christian" and "Reform" Church. They worshipped in separate places. He refused to unite with either until they united. Their union was finally effected, and the united church, under the leadership of Mr. Stone, became an effective illustra-
tion of Christian union, for which he was pleading in his periodical.

In addition to the Millennial Harbinger and Christian Messenger, several other religious periodicals were in the field about this time, and these assisted very much in spreading the principles of the Restoration movement. But after all, the main agency in establishing churches was the evangelistic fervour which had characterised the movement from the beginning. In Kentucky, such men as John Smith, John T. Johnson, John Rogers, Aylett Raines, B. F. Hall, John A. Gano, Carl and Allen Kendrick, L. L. Pinkerton, and others continued to proclaim the simple Gospel, as they had learned it, wherever they could secure a hearing. We have already seen how the same Gospel was early proclaimed in northern Ohio. In the southern part of the state the chief evangelists were Walter Scott, D. S. Burnett, James Challen, L. L. Pinkerton, L. H. Jameson, and J. J. Moss.

The movement in Indiana had its origin mainly among the "Christians" and Baptists, but soon gained largely from other religious sources, but chiefly from the world, by primary conversion. The pioneers in this work were J. P. Thompson, Beverly Vawter, John O'Kane, Elijah Goodwin, J. M. Mathes, John Wright, L. H. Jameson, S. K. Hoshour, B. K. Smith, and Benjamin Franklin. Perhaps the two most noted were O'Kane and Franklin. The former was appointed by the churches of Rush and Fayette Counties, in 1833, as a missionary to travel through the state, and he soon became a powerful advocate of the principles of the Restoration movement, and through his instrumentality numerous churches were planted in various parts of the state. In Illinois, the labours of B. W. Stone were strongly supported by such men as D. P. Henderson, W. W. Happy, Josephus Hewett, John T. Jones, and others.

The cause was early established in Missouri. The first preachers of the new movement were Thomas McBride and Samuel Rogers. These came to the state about the time Missouri was admitted into the Union. "They traveled from settlement to settlement, carrying with them a blanket on which to sleep, provisions, and the indispensable coffee pot, as the distance between settlements was so great that they often camped out by the wayside." * Dur-

* Haley's "Dawn of the Reformation."
ing the decade between 1827 and 1837, a large number of preachers, connected with the new movement, emigrated to Missouri from Kentucky. Among these were Joel H. Haden, T. M. Allen, M. P. Wills, F. R. Palmer, Absalom Rice, James Love, Jacob and Joseph Coons, Jacob Creath, Esthan Ballinger, Allen Wright, M. Sidenor, Henry Thomas, Duke Young, and Doctor Ferris. From this fact it will be seen that Missouri was literally invaded by the Restoration preachers from Kentucky. Most of these preachers had been identified with the "Christians" before the union took place with the "Reformers." But the churches, which they established in Missouri, before the union took place, readily fell into line with the union movement, and it was not long until the Disciple plea became a potent religious factor throughout the entire state. So decidedly did the principles of the Restoration movement take effect in Missouri, that it is to-day the banner state, both in the number of churches and membership, and perhaps also influence, when compared with other states where the greatest success has been achieved.

In Iowa, the first church was organised in 1836, by David R. Chance, at Lost Creek, and the first regular ministers were Aaron Chatterton and Nelson A. McConnell. Other pioneer preachers, such as John Rigdon, S. H. Bonham, Jonas Hartzel, John Martindale, Pardee Butler, Daniel Bates, D. P. Henderson, Allen Hickey, S. B. Downing, and J. K. Cornell also became efficient evangelists at this particular time.

While other states had here and there churches established during this pioneer period, the states mentioned became the chief centres of the movement just before and after the union of the "Christians" and "Reformers."

No trustworthy statistics can be obtained as to the number of Disciples during the decade under consideration. Many of the churches did not keep a record of their membership, and as there was no general organization wherein the churches were represented, very little trustworthy information can be obtained except what is scattered through the various periodicals of that day. However, a patient look through the reports from the churches and evangelistic field makes it evident that the whole number of Disciples must have been in the neighbourhood of 100,000, perhaps 150,000, as the former is a very con-
servative estimate. The greatest increase had followed the lines of emigration, moving from the two chief centres, Ohio and Kentucky, westward; though with considerable deflection toward the south and northwest. Nearly every preacher was an evangelist, and it is surprising at the present time how many of these devoted their untiring energies to preaching the Gospel, without money, and without price. Most of them were uneducated men, but they knew their Bible, and they knew the people with whom they came in contact; and adapting their message to the people, the result was a very rapid spread of the great plea for which they contended.

The difficulty was to take care of the churches they were planting. At this time there seems to have been little thought about what would become of the converts when the evangelist left. Generally he stayed only a week or two, and then went on to other fields of conquest. The new converts, where the new church was planted, were frequently without leadership of any kind that was at all competent to help these young disciples. The eldership, which had been proposed in Mr. Campbell's extra on "Order," worked well enough in some places. Where there were men capable of performing the functions of the elder's office, the churches got on very well; but in most cases the men who were appointed to the eldership had few if any of the qualifications described in the New Testament; and the result was that these churches would have been better off without any elders at all; and yet, one of the features of this system was that every church should itself be set in order, and that, too, with a plurality of elders. In some churches there was at least one man who might have been useful in overseeing the flock, but from the very beginning of the movement the "one man system," as it was called, was considered as a relic of the apostasy, and could not therefore be tolerated for a moment.

Mr. Campbell himself began to see some of the fruits of his own teaching. In the *Christian Baptist* he had flayed the clergy with such tremendous vigour that his own people would have nothing to do with the system which seemed to recognise the "one man power." Of course it was easy to pervert Mr. Campbell's teaching, and this was what was frequently done by those who ad-
vocated what was little less than a wild democracy in the administration of the churches. Mr. Campbell's attack on the clergy was simply a strong protest against the abuse of an order of things, which, when legitimately used, had its foundation in the Scriptures; and it is perhaps an undeniable fact that there was much ground for a vigorous onslaught upon the clergy during the time he published the *Christian Baptist*. Progress is never in straight lines, nor does everything move in parallel columns. One thing at a time is the general law by which progress is made. If we have too many irons in the fire some of them will burn. When Mr. Campbell saw an evil he struck at it with all the might he could control. Sometimes in killing the evil he crucified the good that was under it, and the ghost of this crucified good frequently came up in after years to haunt him, as did the ghost of an efficient ministry rise up to haunt him while he was trying to stay the anarchal tendencies which characterised the churches toward the close of the Chaotic period.

But he was never unequal to an emergency, even if he himself was the cause of it. The *Harbinger* for 1838 opens with a luminous statement concerning the religious outlook, and it clearly foreshadows a reaction with respect to several things, and one of these is, there must be more attention given to the care of the churches, to the development of the spiritual life, and to co-operation for effective work, so that a new day might come to the churches, and thereby help the evangelistic zeal to become a permanent force. The following extract is very suggestive:

The times are yet truly degenerate. It is, indeed, an age of improvement in everything but moral and religious living. New roads, canals, cities, and projects innumerable engross the attention of the community; and benevolent schemes, domestic and foreign, have almost exhausted the copiousness of our vernacular for suitable designations. Against all these improvements we utter no complaint; but we do say, that the great multitude of professors are as carnal, selfish, sensual, and worldly as ever: that living, talking, acting religion—vital piety—heaven-toned, heaven-taught, heaven-inspired piety and virtue, are not the characteristics of the Christian profession in the present century; nor ever will they be while there is so much opinionism and sectarian contention—so much party spirit and party zeal as now urge the movements of
ecclesiastic bodies. Multitudes, indeed, yearly assume the Christian name, and of these we doubt not there are many excellent spirits determined for eternal life; but what are these to the great aggregate? How few congregations, neighbourhoods, families, and even individuals, are living as though they were seeking the eternal city—the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens—as though they earnestly desired the coming of the Lord and the glories that shall follow!

To extend the Christian profession, rather than to elevate it, has been too much the spirit of modern enterprise. To extend it is, indeed, most desirable and most consonant to the suggestions of the Christian spirit; but few seem to apprehend that to elevate it is the surer and speedier way to extend it. The boundaries between the church and the world are not sufficiently prominent to strike the attention of the truly inquisitive. The heavenly character of Christ's religion is so deeply veiled under the garb of expedient conformity to worldly maxims and worldly interests, that it is too dimly seen to command the attention of even those who ardently seek for some substantial joys to fill an empty mind.

Our brethren in the cause of reformation are indeed surrounded with some unpropitious circumstances. They begin with theory, and their opponents are determined always to keep them in it. The reformer is too often regarded as the assailant, and the objects of his benevolence feel as though they ought to stand upon the defensive. So we have been often regarded. But while we earnestly contend for the faith anciently delivered, we ought to remember that even that faith was delivered for the sake of its living, active, and eternal fruits.

We say that we intend the second volume to have a supreme regard to the practical side of the questions introduced. It will no doubt be still somewhat controversial. While error, immorality, and impiety, are on earth, every good man must, less or more, be a controversialist. Not to be a controversialist is not to be a Christian in such cases. But a controversy for opinions, for abstractions, is only an abuse of the freedom of speech—and of this sort there have already been many thousands to many. Whatever can purify the heart, enlarge the soul, refine the manners, and elevate the aspirations of Christians, we regard as fairly practical. And in order to personal excellence and happiness, there is nothing more direct and potent than a full discharge of relative duties. On these, then, we must labour more and more; for of this species of labour we daily perceive a growing, a rapidly increasing need.

The passion for wealth and power was never more active and impetuous in any community than it now appears to be in these United States. The very frame of our government, our constitution, laws, bills of rights, are all occasionally defied, and trodden under foot, and threatened with utter prostration and ruin at the impulse of these passions. Mobs, arson, murder, in order to put down offensive opinions, or to
prevent the discussion of them, are now the order of the day; and all opinions are fast becoming offensive which impede, even by the restraints of civil institutions, the passion for wealth and power.

Such, alas! being the facts, the undeniable facts, too well proved already in surrounding society, how, we ask, ought Christians to watch and pray that they may not be abandoned to temptation—that they may be kept pure and unspotted from the vices of this age? To those desirous to make their calling and election sure we desire to lend a helping hand in the following volume.

In this same volume there are many indications that clearly point to the fact that Mr. Campbell, at this time, was fully conscious that the Restoration movement might, after all, run off the track. In calling attention to a few fundamental things, and emphasising these almost exclusively, the great practical side of the Christian life was likely to be neglected; and yet, without this, mere exactness in Scriptural teaching, concerning what at that time was called "first principles," would end, at best, in only a partial return to New Testament Christianity. The Disciples had been so much engaged in spreading their principles that they came perilously near losing sight of the practice of these principles; and this was especially true with respect to the organization and development of the churches. It was now time to begin earnest work at this end of the line, and this was precisely what Mr. Campbell began to do through the Harbinger, and through other means at his command. In this work he had a strong and faithful helper in B. W. Stone, through the Christian Messenger. A new day began to dawn, though it was some time before the sun shone brightly.

Another trouble began to manifest itself, and this also was owing to placing too much emphasis upon an exact reproduction of apostolic Christianity in every respect. As a matter of fact, there has never been a time since the Apostles when Primitive Christianity, in its faith, doctrine, and life, could be fully reproduced in both principle and method, for the reason that methods are always changing. Principles are eternal, but methods are transient. As a matter of fact, the Disciple movement, from the very beginning, developed directly opposite to some of the methods of the Apostles. This was especially true as regards some features of evangelism. The Apostles
made their chief attack upon the great cities, the centres of civilisation, commercial enterprise, and literary activity. They went from city to city and sought to "turn the world upside down" by first turning the cities upside down. The Disciples began their evangelistic operations in the country and villages; and even at the present time they have failed to make a very determined effort to capture many of the great cities. In a few cities their influence is strongly felt, but in most of the cities throughout the United States, as well as other countries, they are not a force.

Now it is probable that the Disciple movement would have failed entirely if the pioneer preachers had confined themselves chiefly to the cities. They were unsuited for city work, and their zeal would perhaps have conquered their patience in dealing with city problems. It was perhaps a wise Providence that guided them to leave the cities mainly alone, and plant their churches in the country and villages. This at least is what they did, and it is highly probable that this, at the time, was a wise course to pursue.

Another fact has to be taken into account with respect to the extreme view of exactness which became so prevalent during the thirties. The Apostles did not have to deal with an abnormal Christianity. They had a plain, unmistakable issue to make. This was with heathenism on one side, and Judaism on the other. But the Campbellian movement had to deal with an apostasy which, while it "began to work" during Apostolic times, did not become fully developed until the Middle Ages.

Several religious movements antedated that made by the Disciples. These all did something in restoring the ancient order of things. But when the Disciple movement began, it had to deal with not only the unconverted millions, but also with abnormal churches and professing Christians who illustrated only a partial return to the primitive faith and practice. Mr. Campbell, at least, recognised this fact, and while he contended for the perfect plan of salvation, as revealed in the Scriptures, he nevertheless constantly recognised that there might be a very conscientious, imperfect obedience to all that this plan implies. In short, he recognised the difference between the New Testament ideal and the human realisation of
this ideal. The former of these could not be improved; the latter furnished a problem for constant attention, education, and development, and also for the exercise of charity toward those who did not, in every respect, reach the ideal.

Looking at the matter from this point of view, he did not make any one feature of the plan of salvation to comprehend the whole plan, and he constantly recognised the fact that some of the features, under certain circumstances, might be omitted, without entirely vitiating Christian character, though this view of the matter did not hinder him from contending earnestly for everything that the New Testament enjoins with respect to the Gospel and the Church.

However, he soon saw that some of the Disciples, in making their plea for the New Testament ideal, were running to a fatal extreme in not recognising the state of religious society with which they had to deal, and also the imperfections of human nature in realising a perfect ideal. This brought him to say some very earnest things in the *Harbinger* of 1837.

In a letter to a sister, who had addressed him from Lunenburg, with respect to whether there are any Christians among Protestant parties, Mr. Campbell says:

In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore, no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against his church. This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects.

But who is a Christian? I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will. A perfect man in Christ, or a perfect Christian, is one thing; and a "babe in Christ," a stripling in the faith, or an imperfect Christian, is another. The New Testament recognises both the perfect man and the imperfect man in Christ. The former, indeed, implies the latter. Paul commands the imperfect Christians to be perfect (II. Cor. iii: 11), and says he wishes the perfection of Christians. "And this also we wish" for you *saints* in
Corinth, "even your perfection;" and again he says, "We speak wisdom among the perfect" (I. Cor. ii: 6), and he commands them to be "perfect in understanding" (I. Cor. xiv:20) and in many other places implies or speaks the same things. Now there is a perfection of will, of temper, and of behaviour. There is a perfect state and a perfect character. And hence it is possible for Christians to be imperfect in some respects without an absolute forfeiture of the Christian state and character. Paul speaks of "carnal" Christians, of "weak" and "strong" Christians; and the Lord Jesus admits that some of the good and honest-hearted bring forth only thirty fold, while others bring forth sixty, and some a hundred fold increase of the fruits of righteousness.

But every one is wont to condemn others in that in which he is more intelligent than they; while, on the other hand, he is condemned for his Pharisaism or his immodesty and rash judgment of others, by those that excel in the things in which he is deficient. I cannot, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their own knowledge and consent, as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven. "Salvation was of the Jews," acknowledged the Messiah; and yet he said of a foreigner, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, a Syro-Phenician, "I have not found so great faith—no, not in Israel."

Should I find a Pedo-baptist more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually minded, and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him who loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians. Still I will be asked, How do I know that any one loves my Master but by his obedience to His commandments? I answer, In no other way. But mark, I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedo-baptist more spiritually minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, than one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former rather than the latter would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian. So I judge, and so I feel. It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known. With me mistakes of the understanding and errors of the affections are not to be confounded. They are as distant as the poles. An angel may mistake the meaning of a commandment, but he will obey it in the sense in which he understands it. John Bunyan and John Newton
were very different persons, and had very different views of baptism, and of some other things; yet they were both disposed to obey, and to the extent of their knowledge did obey the Lord in everything.

There are mistakes with, and without depravity. There are wilful errors which all the world must condemn, and unavoidable mistakes which every one will pity. The Apostles mistook the Saviour when he said concerning John, "What if I will that John tarry till I come?" but the Jews perverted his words when they alleged that Abraham had died, in proof that he spake falsely when he said, "If a man keep my word he shall never see death."

Many a good man has been mistaken. Mistakes are to be regarded as culpable and as declarative of a corrupt heart only when they proceed from a wilful neglect of the means of knowing what is commanded. Ignorance is always a crime when it is voluntary; and innocent when it is involuntary. Now, unless I could prove that all who neglect the positive institutions of Christ and have substituted for them something else of human authority, do it knowingly, or, if not knowingly, are voluntarily ignorant of what is written, I could not, I dare not say that their mistakes are such as unChristianise all their professions.

True, indeed, that it is always a misfortune to be ignorant of anything in the Bible, and very generally it is criminal. But how many are there who cannot read; and of those who can read, how many are so deficient in education; and of those educated, how many are ruled by the authority of those whom they regard as superiors in knowledge and piety that they can never escape out of the dust and smoke of their own chimney, where they happened to be born and educated! These all suffer many privations and many perplexities, from which the more intelligent are exempt.

The preachers of "essentials" as well as the preachers of "non-essentials," frequently err. The Essentialist may disparage the heart, while the non-Essentialist despises the institution. The latter makes void the institutions of Heaven, while the former appreciates not the mental bias on which God looketh most. My correspondent may belong to a class who think that we detract from the authority and value of an institution the moment we admit the bare possibility of any one being saved without it. But we chose rather to associate with those who think that they do not undervalue either seeing or hearing, by affirming that neither of them, nor both of them together, are essential to life. I would not sell one of my eyes for all the gold on earth; yet I could live without it.

There is no occasion, then, for making immersion, on a profession of the faith, absolutely essential to a Christian—though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort. My right hand and my right eye are greatly essential to my usefulness and happiness, but not to my life; and as I
could not be a perfect man without them, so I cannot be a perfect Christian without a right understanding and a cordial reception of immersion in its true and scriptural meaning and design. But he that thence infers that none are Christians but the immersed, as greatly errs as he who affirms that none are alive but those of clear and full vision.

I do not formally answer all the queries proposed, knowing the one point to which they all aim. To that point only I direct these remarks. And while I would unhesitatingly say, that I think that every man who despises any ordinance of Christ, or who is willingly ignorant of it, cannot be a Christian; still I should sin against my own convictions, should I teach any one to think that if he mistook the meaning of any institution, while in his soul he desired to know the whole will of God, he must perish forever. But to conclude for the present—he that claims for himself a license to neglect the least of all the commandments of Jesus, because it is possible for some to be saved, who, through insuperable ignorance or involuntary mistake, do neglect or transgress it; or he that wilfully neglects to ascertain the will of the Lord to the whole extent of his means and opportunities, because some who are defective in that knowledge may be Christians, is not possessed of the Spirit of Christ, and cannot be registered among the Lord's people. So I reason; and I think in so reasoning I am sustained by all the Prophets and Apostles of both Testaments.

This whole letter is copied here because of its historical importance. No other deliverance of Mr. Campbell so thoroughly reveals his real feelings toward the religious denominations as this does. It is really esoteric in its character, and gives us a view of Mr. Campbell's heart-life which must elevate him in the estimation of even his enemies.

Nevertheless, this deliverance was entirely too liberal for some of the brethren who were unable to occupy Mr. Campbell's point of view. Carrying their notions of Scriptural exactness to an extreme which could only be reached by ignoring all the Protestant movements of the past, as well as the imperfections of human nature, they had come to the conclusion that under no circumstances could men be called Christians who failed, in any respect, to meet all the conditions of the Gospel and the institutions of the Church. Consequently, this deliverance of Mr. Campbell brought on him at once the severest criticism from some of the super-sound brethren who did not believe that any part of the plan of salvation could be
omitted without unchristianising those who made the omission. In reply to strictures from his brethren, Mr. Campbell, in the same year, animadverts as follows:

1. We were solicited by a sister to explain a saying quoted from the current volume of this work, concerning finding "Christians in all Protestant Parties." She proposed a list of questions, involving, as she supposed, either insuperable difficulties or strong objections to that saying, and because she well knew what answers I would have given to all her queries, I answered them not; but attended to the difficulty which I imagined she felt in the aforesaid saying.

2. But we had still more urgent reasons than the difficulties of this sister to express such an opinion:—Some of our brethren were too much addicted to denouncing the sects and representing them en masse as wholly aliens from the possibility of salvation—as wholly anti-Christian and corrupt. Now as the Lord says of Babylon, "Come out of her, my people," I felt constrained to rebuke them over the shoulders of this inquisitive lady. These very zealous brethren gave countenance to the popular clamour that we make baptism a saviour, or a passport to heaven, disparaging all the private and social virtues of the professing public. Now as they were propounding opinions to others, I intended to bring them to the proper medium by propounding an opinion to them in terms as strong and as pungent as their own.

The case is this: When I see a person who would die for Christ; whose brotherly kindness, sympathy, and active benevolence know no bounds but his circumstances; whose seat in the Christian assembly is never empty; whose inward piety and devotion are attested by punctual obedience to every known duty; whose family is educated in the fear of the Lord; whose constant companion is the Bible; I say, when I see such a one ranked amongst heathen men and publicans, because he never happened to inquire, but always took it for granted that he had been Scripturally baptized; and that, too. by one greatly destitute of all these public and private virtues, whose chief or exclusive recommendation is that he has been immersed, and that he holds a Scriptural theory of the gospel; I feel no disposition to natter such a one, but rather to disabuse him of his error. And while I would not lead the most excellent professor in any sect to disparage the least of all the commandments of Jesus, I would say to my immersed brother as Paul said to his Jewish brother who glorified in a system which he did not adorn: "Sir, will not his uncircumcision, or unbaptism, be counted to him for baptism? and will he not condemn you, who, though having the literal and true baptism, yet dost transgress or neglect the statutes of your King?"

3. We have a third reason: We have been always accused of aspiring to build up and head a party, while in truth we have always been forced to occupy the ground on which we now
stand. I have for one or two years past laboured to annul this impression, which I know is more secretly and generally bandied about than one in a hundred of our brethren may suspect. On this account I consented the more readily to defend Protestantism; and I have, in ways more than I shall now state, endeavoured to show the Protestant public that it is with the greatest reluctance we are compelled to stand aloof from them—that they are the cause of this great "schism" as they call it, and not we.

Now, with this exposition in mind, let us examine the meaning of the alleged concession. And first let me ask, What could induce us to make it at this crisis? or, I should more correctly say, to repeat it so strongly?

No one will say our opponents have compelled us by force of argument to make it. Themselves being judges, we have lost nothing in argument. All agree that the "concession" was uncalled for—a perfect free-will offering.

Neither can they say that we envy their standing, or would wish to occupy their ground; because to say nothing of our having the pure original gospel institutions among us, regarding us merely as a new sect, like themselves, we have no reason to wish to be with them, inasmuch as we have the best proselyting system in Christendom. Faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, with all the promises of the Christian adoption and the heavenly calling to those who thus put on Christ, is incomparably in advance of the sectarian altar and the straw—the mourning bench, the anxious seat, and all the other paraphernalia of modern proselytism. That it is so practically as well as theoretically, appears from the fact of its unprecedented advances upon the most discerning and devout portions of the Protestant parties. No existing party in this or in the fatherlands has so steadily and rapidly advanced as that now advocating the religion of the New Testament. It has been successfully plead within a few years in almost every state and territory in this great confederacy, and even in foreign countries.

All agree, for a thousand experiments prove it, that all that is wanting is a competent number of intelligent and consistent proclaimers, to its general if not universal triumph, over all opposing systems. We have lost much, indeed, by the folly, hypocrisy, and wickedness of many pretenders, and by the imprudence and precipitancy of some good brethren; yet, from year to year it bears up and advances with increasing prosperity, as the present season very satisfactorily attests.

Do we, then, seek to make and lead a large exclusive sect or party? Have we not the means? Why then concede anything—even the bare possibility of salvation in any other party, if actuated by such fleshly and selfish considerations? With all these facts and reasonings fresh in our view, I ask, Is not such a concession—such a free will offering, at such a time, the most satisfactory and unanswerable refutation that
could be given to the calumny that we seek the glory of building a new sect in religion? If, then, as some of our opponents say, we have made a *new and unexpected concession* in their favour, we have done it at such a time, in such circumstances, and with such prospects before us, as ought (we think) henceforth to silence their imputation and reproaches on the ground of selfish or partizan views and feelings.

Some of our fellow-labourers seem to forget that *approaches* are more in the spirit and style of the Saviour, than *reproaches*. We have proved to our entire satisfaction, that having obtained a favourable hearing, a conciliatory, meek, and benevolent attitude is not only the most comely and Christian-like, but the most successful. Many of the Protestant teachers and their communities are much better disposed to us than formerly; and I calculate the day is not far distant when many of them will unite with us. They must certainly come over to us whenever they come to the Bible alone. Baptists and Pedo-Baptists are daily feeling more and more the need of reform, and our views are certainly imbuing the public mind more and more every year.

Now it will be seen that Mr. Campbell's view does not in any respect abridge, modify, or change any of the conditions of salvation, as these are set forth in the New Testament Scriptures; but he nevertheless contends that a perfect obedience is not absolutely necessary under certain conditions in order to salvation. This was his contention from the beginning of his religious movement down to the time of his death, and it certainly does relieve him from the charge of bigotry, on one hand, while it shows also that he steadily, earnestly, and with conspicuous ability contended for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, on the other hand. Mr. Campbell's great mind took in the whole situation. He saw all around the periphery of the circle. The plea for which he contended was not only a plea for a return to apostolic faith and practice, but it was a plea also for the use of such methods as would make the plea practical, and therefore well adapted to the age in which he lived.

It was at this very point where some of the men, associated with him, failed to live up to his high comprehension of the whole situation, and this made his task, to set in order the things that were wanting, a somewhat difficult one during the latter part of the decade between 1832 and 1842. Nevertheless, during these years he gave much attention to primary matters relating to organization and
development rather than to an emphasis upon evangelism, which had already come perilously near to running away with the churches.

Perhaps one passage of Scripture, viz., Matt, v: 48, had much to do with the kind of contention which some of the Disciples waged during these transitional years. They held that all obedience should be perfect, in order that they themselves should be perfect, and this perfection was as much a command as anything else in the Bible. But this passage has been forced into a service where it does not legitimately belong. Some have supposed that it teaches the doctrine of a perfect life, in all respects equal to that of our Heavenly Father. Others have thought that it simply indicates the highest ideal, but it takes for granted that no one will ever be able to realise that ideal. This view is certainly untenable from almost any point of view. God would certainly not enjoin upon any of His creatures an impossibility. However, this view has been accentuated through the ages by a wrong translation. As the verse stands in the old version, it is in the nature of a command. But this must seem at once harsh and unnecessary to all enlightened criticism. The very idea of a command to perfectness is at once repulsive, and it is not too much to say that perfectness can never be attained in that way.

But really the whole passage has been wholly misunderstood. It is a promise rather than a command. It is a future end rather than a present attainment. It is a benediction conferred, and not an ideal to be realised through human effort. We do not mean by this that human effort is not involved. The promises are all conditional; they depend upon the fulfilment of human obligation, and consequently we cannot hope for the perfection of character, which is the end of all our struggles, without the struggles which lead up to it.

Let us now notice some special points which are essential to a clear understanding of the passage:

(1) The Greek verb—eseste—is the future indicative, and cannot, therefore, be properly translated, as it is in the authorised version, but should have a future signification. It should also be noticed that teleioi, which is construed with eseste, literally means an end, a closing act, a consummation, fully accomplished, brought to a com-
pletion; hence perfect, or without shortcoming in any respect of a certain standard. Taken altogether the phrase esesthe oun humeis teleioi should be rendered, "Ye, therefore, shall become perfect, even as your Heavenly Father is perfect." The revised version is almost identical with this.

(2) A second consideration is very important. What is the subject under discussion? Christ is evidently teaching His Disciples how they should act with respect to those who are not friends. He brings before them the fact that their Heavenly Father makes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust. He then promises that they shall be like Him in this respect. The promise does not necessarily have a wider significance. It ought not to be pressed further than the particular point to which special attention is called. The idea is this: if the Disciples should simply render evil for evil or good for good they would do no better than the heathen; and, to encourage them to a better life, the Master assures them that, in the respect urged, they shall become like their Heavenly Father.

(3) This suggests an important attainment of character. When Christ delivered His Sermon on the Mount His Disciples had made very little progress in the Divine life. They were yet babes, and knew little or nothing of the real manhood to which they should come in the future years. Indeed, His Apostles never did manifest much strength of character until the Day of Pentecost and afterwards. When they received the "enduement from on high" they ceased to be weaklings, and became courageous, flaming heralds, bearing the message of salvation to a lost world. Furthermore, after the descent of the Holy Spirit they seemed to have a new disposition. Practically they began to live in harmony with the promise which Christ made in the text under consideration.

If this view of the passage is correct then it is evident that the indwelling Holy Spirit is an essential condition to any proper manifestation of a perfect life. All our efforts at self-restraint, or the cultivation of the highest graces, must necessarily come to naught unless we have the constant help of the Divine Paraclete. Hence, it will be seen that a proper understanding of the passage, to
which we have called attention, will greatly assist us in a proper conception of growth in the
Divine life.

Taking this view of the whole matter, it is easy to see how a purely legalistic construction
of Christianity cannot be realised in either theory or practice. Furthermore, it is clearly
foreshadowed in the imperfections which are everywhere about us, that all high attainments in
the Christian life are necessarily gradual developments. Even revelation itself is a gradual
unfolding. The Church went slowly down into the apostasy, and must come back in precisely
the same way. Under the different religious movements much has been achieved. Neither one
of these movements accomplished everything. Nor was it possible for any one to do this. The
Campbellian movement must not be regarded as an exception. It has had a special work to
perform, and that is to simplify the whole problem of Christian Union by eliminating
everything that is not a common ground, thus requiring the denominations to give up all their
divisive elements and accept the New Testament creed, viz., that Jesus is the Christ, the Son
of the living God, as the foundation of the Church, and then require a "Thus saith the Lord"
for everything that relates to the Divine life. This was the splendid ideal which the Disciples
set for the acceptance of all who would aim to exemplify the teaching of Christ and His
Apostles, while at the same time it invited the exercise of that charity which makes provision
for the weakness of human nature, and the imperfect environment through which Christianity
has to make its way to final triumph.
CHAPTER XIV

PROVIDING FOR EDUCATION AND WORKING AT CHRISTIAN UNION

WHEN the year 1840 had fully come the Restoration movement had passed through the dawn and had reached the rising of the sun on the new day which was beginning to be realised by those who had been working through the confusion of Chaos to the time of order and development. No one saw the need for this more than did Mr. Campbell. In the preface to the *Harbinger* of that year he says:

The cause of education becomes a more and more interesting object in pursuance of this plan. We must begin at the nursery. We must have family, school, college, and church education, adapted to the entire physical, intellectual, moral, and religious constitution of man. Of these the first in time, place, and importance, is the domestic and family training. We have been dreaming for ages, and are only just now awaking to the importance of education—not merely to its importance, but to the *rationale*—the philosophy of the thing called Education.

To this subject, as essentially connected with the speed and progress of the current reformation, a more full and marked attention shall be paid. An uneducated person is not competent to the full display of Christian excellence—to the full manifestation of Christian character. No person is well educated—is properly taught or trained, that is not a Christian. But we cannot fashion human nature but in the soft clay of its infancy and childhood—"As the twig is bent the tree's inclin'd."

This clearly indicates a new departure with respect to education, but he properly begins this education in the family circle, and during the year he writes a number of articles on family culture, under the title of "Conversations at the Carlton House." These conversations are among the best things Mr. Campbell ever wrote, and they show very conclusively the importance which he attached to a religion that should have its foundation and inspira-
tion largely in the home circle. This was one of the things he felt the Disciples needed. They had been so much occupied with discussions and evangelistic work that, to some extent, family culture had been neglected, as well as the spiritual development of their churches. All this need was now clearly in his vision.

Nor was he alone in this respect. Nearly all the periodicals of this year emphasise the same things. The Christian Messenger, edited by the saintly B. W. Stone, lent its great influence in the same direction. Perhaps no less emphasis was placed upon the importance of preaching the Gospel, but undoubtedly more emphasis was placed upon living the Gospel. Everywhere the Disciples seemed to be working up to the importance of holding the ground which they had gained, as well as the great importance of advancing into regions which were yet unoccupied. In the autumn of 1836, Bacon College was founded at Georgetown, Kentucky, and Walter Scott was elected President, pro tern. At that time he and John T. Johnson were publishing the Christian, and this periodical gave earnest support to the new educational enterprise. Indeed, John T. Johnson was the principal mover in founding this College, and to him more than to any other man may be ascribed the honour also of supporting it.

The College was removed to Harrodsburg, Kentucky, in 1840, and James Shannon was elected president, Samuel Hatch, Professor of Natural Science, Samuel H. Mullins, Professor of Ancient Languages, Henry H. White, Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering, George H. Matthews, Principal of Preparatory School. About a hundred students were enrolled during its first year in its new home.

President Shannon was a strong character. He afterwards became President of the University of Missouri, located at Columbia, and did much to give to that institution the position it occupied during his presidency. The trustees of Bacon College in announcing their prospectus for 1840 and 1841 make the following statement, with respect to his character and equipment:

For the information of those who may desire to know something in reference to the literary and moral character of President Shannon, the trustees would state from ample credentials they have in their possession, that he was educated
at the Belfast Academical (now Royal) Institution, Ireland, where he received a medal as being the best Latin scholar in a large class that entered with him, and the first prize in Greek the May following—took prizes in Mathematics, Moral and Natural Philosophy, and ranked among the first in several studies to which no prizes were awarded.

On leaving College early in 1820, he acted as first assistant for eighteen months in one of the best private academies in the North of Ireland, under the conduct of Mr. James Carley, who certifies that "Mr. James Shannon, in teaching Latin, Greek, French, and the various English branches, proved himself an excellent scholar and a very useful teacher, and was, as to his conduct, perfectly correct and unexceptionable."

Shortly afterwards the Presbytery of Monaghan gave him a letter in which they allude to his character as being fair and unspotted, and assert, that "in his several examinations before them, in Classics, Logic, Moral and Natural Philosophy, he gave proof of superior talent and unwearied application."

In 1821 he removed by engagement, from Ireland to Georgia, to take charge of the Sunbury Academy, where he taught four years and three months, and of the high estimation in which he was held there, a letter from H. J. Ripley, Professor for the last fourteen years in the Theological Baptist Institution, at Newton, Massachusetts, gives sufficient evidence; he writes, "I have never known a teacher in whose ability and faithfulness so much confidence might be reposed." After this he officiated as Pastor of the Augusta Baptist Church, for nearly four years, teaching a private school part of the time. In 1830 he was appointed professor of Ancient Languages in the University of Georgia, where he remained for six years. The Faculty of that Institution thus write of him: "To long experience in the profession of teaching, to which he is ardently attached, and superior abilities both natural and acquired, Professor Shannon adds untiring industry and perseverance, unyielding firmness and energy, in the discharge of his duties, and unsuspected integrity and probity of character." Such testimonials might be multiplied from men of the first standing in Ireland and America, of all denominations—as Prof. Olin, now President of the Wesleyan University, among them Judge Clayton, a member of Congress--Dr. Wm. Brantly, now President of the Charleston College, S. C., who writes that "he (Mr. Shannon) will compare advantageously with the best European scholar," but these are deemed sufficient. For the last four years he was President of the Louisiana College, at Jackson, which has been raised to a state of great prosperity under his administration.*

In his inaugural address, Mr. Shannon sets forth, in a very lucid manner, and with very much strength of statement, his views of education. After discussing the im-

portance of both physical and intellectual development, he uses the following language as to the necessity of a religious education:

Still, however, when we have carried education, with reference to intellect, to the farthest verge of perfection, if we stop here, we have neglected that which is most important, and without which nothing has been done to any valuable purpose. Did man possess no higher faculties, than those of intellect, he would be at best but a reasoning brute; and the education of his intellectual powers would only capacitate him to be more extensively mischievous to the human race. How appalling the spectacle to all benevolent minds, to behold lions and tigers endowed with the godlike intellect of educated man. How fearful the ravages that would naturally ensue. And yet, it is most obvious, that those ravages would not be worse, nor the desolations more fearful, in the grovelling attitude of the brute, than if that attitude were exchanged for man's erect and noble form. The education of intellect, then, may prove a curse, rather than a blessing, both to the possessor, and to mankind in general.

Who, that is not utterly bereft of reason, would choose to live the life, and die the death of Napoleon, or Lord Byron? What rational parent could hold up the character of either of them for the admiration and imitation of his beloved children? And yet they were gifted with intellect of the highest order; and that intellect was cultivated to a degree that is rarely attained by the most favoured of the human family. Why is it, then, that the soul should instinctively recoil at the bare thought of running the race, and sharing the fate of these highly gifted, but misguided men? Oh, it is the voice of Nature, unambiguously bearing testimony within us that there is in man a something infinitely more noble than animal passions; or even than intellect of the highest order, and cultivated to the utmost limit of perfection. That nobler something consists in man's moral and religious faculties, by which he is allied to God, to holy angels, to good men—and, in short, to everything morally great and good on earth, or in heaven. Yes, there is in the most obscure peasant, that ever lived on the face of the earth, that which is infinitely more noble than intellect, the most exalted that God ever conferred on a created being.

I hail it as one of the most auspicious omens of the nineteenth century, that it is now generally admitted by all, who understand the philosophy of mind, even by sceptics and infidels themselves, that man possesses by nature a religious organization; that his religious faculties are the highest and most authoritative with which he is endowed; and, consequently, that they should rule, guided by intellect properly enlightened.

Were man by nature destitute of moral and religious facul-
ties, he must always remain in that condition. A being with one faculty more, or one less, than man possesses, would not be man, but something else.

Besides, if men were not by nature possessed of religious faculties revelation to them would be of as little use as light to a man born blind. Indeed, it would be physically and morally impossible to make to them a revelation of a moral or religious character, for the plain reason, that they would be physically incapable of receiving it; and the idea of a revelation made to such persons, would present as palpable a contradiction as that of revelation unrevealed. Neither could children be religiously educated, if they were not religious by nature. You cannot create faculties by education;—nor can you educate faculties, which do not exist, any more than you can improve the sight of a man who has no eyes.

It may be regarded, then, as undeniable, if not self-evident, that man possesses by nature religious faculties; and that the perfection and glory of his being consist in the development and supremacy of those faculties, under the guidance of enlightened intellect. Were we naturally destitute of a religious organization, intellect, however exalted, could serve no other purpose, than to pander ignobly to the base and selfish gratification of the animal passions.

Indeed, it is the religious, and not the intellectual organization, that furnishes an infallible criterion, by which to distinguish the man and the brute. It is this, that exalts man to an unmeasurable distance above the lower tribes. The distance intellectually between the highest specimens of the brute, and the lowest of the human family, is so small as to be imperceptible. Nay, it is even questionable, whether there may not be found some brutes possessing more intellect than some men. But to brutes you can never impart, by any system of education whatever, religious or moral feelings, although you can educate their intellect. The plain and obvious reason is, that you cannot educate faculties which do not exist.

But, as we have already seen, the idea would be most horrific that brutes should possess the intellect of men; and the effects would be no less desolating and horrific in man's erect and noble form, than in the grovelling attitude of the brute. Hence, when intellect alone is educated, and the religious faculties wholly neglected, or abused, a class of beings is produced, which, for the sake of distinction, may be called human brutes—the Napoleons, the Murrells, the Dantons, the Marats, and the Robespierres, of our race, the scourge and curse of mankind—differing from the actual brute, from lions and tigers, mainly in being accountable, and in possessing superior intellect, which capacitates them to commit ravages so much the more fearful, and to spread havoc and desolation to a more alarming extent. Whereas, had the moral organization of these men been properly educated, they might have shone conspicuously among the most distinguished benefactors of the
human race; might have been as immortal in honour, as they are now in infamy; might have lived unspeakably blessed themselves, and the source of unnumbered blessings to their fellow-men.

From these reflections, it must be obvious, that, were there no hereafter, and were our highest hopes and aspirations confined to the present life, still, the grand point in education would be the proper training of the moral sentiments. Better neglect everything else in education, than this. Nay, if this is neglected, the less intellect men have, and the less that intellect is cultivated, the better. However startling and extravagant, at first view, this sentiment may appear to some, it is but a corollary to the proposition, that lions and tigers are less mischievous and miserable in their own nature, than they would be with the superadded intellect of man.

Let it be noted here, that our reasoning hitherto has proceeded on purely philosophical principles—on plain and undeniable matters of fact, presented alike to the observation of all, who can and will think. Whether, therefore, revelation be true, or untrue—whether there be, or be not a future state of rewards and punishments, such as the Bible discloses—still it is undeniably plain, that, in the great business of education, even with an exclusive reference to human happiness in this life, a proper moral and religious training is the grand and all-important interest, the one thing needful. But it is no less plain, that the Bible in its doctrine and precepts, its hopes and fears, rewards and punishments, is the only perfect and infallible guide to the attainment of this grand object. Consequently, the Bible is true, or God has designedly organised men so that it is essential to their perfection and happiness, even in this world, to believe a lie. Yet, to suppose that God could have acted thus, would be blasphemy of the darkest shade. And, hence, if the Christian Scriptures be calculated, in the very nature of things, to produce the highest style of man, (as is admitted by all who understand the philosophy of man's organization, not excepting infidels themselves), then it does follow, clear as demonstration, that Christianity is from heaven; and that to deny this proposition, is to blaspheme God.*

This College was finally removed from Harrodsburg, and incorporated with Kentucky University, at Lexington, and is now denominated Transylvania University. During the year 1840 the charter was obtained for Bethany College, and the next year Alexander Campbell was elected President of the College, and the College was opened in November the first time for the reception of students. The Faculty of the College at this time consisted of the following professors: A. F. Ross, late Professor of New
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Athens College, Ohio, Professor of Ancient Languages and Ancient History; Charles Stewart, of Kentucky, Professor of Algebra and General Mathematics; Dr. R. Richardson, Professor of Chemistry, Geology, and the kindred sciences; W. K. Pendleton, of the University of Virginia, Professor of Natural Philosophy, and such of the Natural Sciences as came not in the course of Dr. R. Richardson. Besides a general superintendency of the Institution, the President was assigned Mental Philosophy, Evidences of Christianity, Moral and Political Economy. A Professor of English Literature, to whom should be assigned Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Elements of Criticism, etc., remained to be appointed, with such tutors as the exigencies of the Institution might require.

It will be seen by the limited number of professors that Mr. Campbell's plan for a College was not very ambitious at this time. Nevertheless, he was building wiser than he knew. This was only a beginning with some very able men associated with it. Perhaps no College has ever illustrated the truthfulness of the saying ascribed to General Garfield, that "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log, and a student on the other, will make a University," more than Bethany College did throughout its whole history under the Presidency of Alexander Campbell. Practically, he was the College. The other men associated with him were really able in their respective departments, but it was Mr. Campbell who gave the stamp which made Bethany College a great power for good. His morning class lectures soon became famous. These were a great feature of the College. His idea was to make the Bible fundamental as a text-book, and in order to emphasise this feature of instruction he spent a half-hour or more every morning at the close of the Chapel service in lecturing on the Bible. He began with Genesis, and closed the session with lectures on the New Testament.

These lectures had a wide range. They were not specially critical, nor were they even exegetical, except in a very slight degree. They were discursive, but above everything moral and religious. The object was evidently to impress young men with the principles that enter into the building of character. From this point of view the lectures were an eminent success. Hundreds of men would bear testimony to the fact that their lives were
strongly shaped by these lectures. One might not remember anything very special that Mr. Campbell said in these lectures, but he would remember that every time he went away from them he felt he was a bigger man. They had the power to develop growth. They were stimulating in a high degree in their moral uplift. They broke through the conventionalities of most College curriculums, and went to the centre of life at once. While they did not underestimate the value of intellectual development, they emphasised with intense enthusiasm, and an overwhelming conviction, that heart-life is essential to any worthy real manhood.

No one who heard these lectures, for even one session, can ever get away from their impression upon him. He will ever see that great personality, physically, as well as mentally and spiritually, remarkably developed, sitting in a chair before him, and talking as familiarly about the Bible and its application in character building, as if talking about the most common and familiar things of life. It was partly owing to Mr. Campbell's easy manner, comprehensive sweep, and intense earnestness that the student was so marvelously affected. In the pulpit he was equally impressive, and yet he seemed not to be conscious that he was speaking at all, the task was so easy for him. Students often thought they would like to hear some one else in the Bethany pulpit, but one or two experiments usually satisfied them. There was at once a cry for the "old man eloquent" to take his place again. No one in the Bethany pulpit could satisfy the students except the man whose right it was to speak there.

In founding Bethany College Mr. Campbell had the principles of his Restoration movement very distinctly in view. He felt that the time had come when the Disciples must provide for an educated ministry. Most of the men who had been associated with him in the great work which had already been accomplished had come from the various denominations, and some of these were well educated, as, for instance, Walter Scott, P. S. Fall, James Shannon, B. W. Stone, John T. Johnson, Dr. Robert Richardson, Dr. S. E. Shepperd, and others that might be named; but a large number of the preachers of the Restoration movement had little or no academic training at all. Nevertheless, they were most effective helpers in
the great work which had to be done. During the period through which the movement had come these men did a work which perhaps no other men could have done half so well. The Gospel which they had to preach was specially characterised by simplicity. This was a fundamental feature with respect to the plea which they had to make. All abstruse, metaphysical theology was put aside, and Christ and Him crucified furnished the staple material for every sermon. To believe in Christ, as the Son of the living God, and to obey His commandments was all that was necessary, on the human side, to make Christians and to keep them in the way of life everlasting. In Scriptural phraseology, "to know God and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent, is life eternal."

This kind of preaching was a new revelation to the world, and the earnest, uneducated men among the pioneers of the Restoration movement could deliver this message with a great deal of power.

But Mr. Campbell realised that the time had come to the movement when this class of men could not be very efficiently instrumental in meeting the conditions which had arisen. The movement was now passing out of the Chaotic period into Organization and Development. The reconstruction time had come. Already the fiat "Let there be light" had been spoken. Even some of these days of re-creation were passed, and the work already done. The movement was going on toward the fully developed, thoroughly equipped, and effective Church, just as the days of reconstruction of the earth led up to the final end in view, viz., the creation of man. Mr. Campbell plainly saw that a better educated ministry would be needed for the coming days, and Bethany College was intended by him to become a centre of educational influence for the equipment of such a ministry as would be needed in the future. It was an entirely new idea to build a College practically on the Bible, to make it the chief textbook, and to emphasise its teaching as more important than the teaching of all other books in the world.

It was not accidental that the little village of Bethany was the place selected for the location of this College. It is better to say that it was providential. No more lovely spot, in view of natural conditions, could have been found. Every outlook from the College campus is in-
spiring and health-giving. The spot selected is away from the corrupting influence of the world. Everything about Bethany lends itself to communion with the great Creator. Some have thought that it was a great mistake for even Mr. Campbell to locate in such an obscure place, but the historian of the future day will perhaps record the fact that this very location had much to do with the success of the movement which aimed at the restoration of the primitive Gospel and Church.

In the founding of Bethany College we have another illustration of Mr. Campbell's supreme faith in the ultimate triumph of the cause to which he had committed everything he possessed. Without any suitable building, or a penny of endowment fund, he launched the enterprise. Out of his own private funds he furnished $15,000 with which to begin buildings, suitable for classrooms, etc. He afterwards appealed to the brotherhood for an endowment fund, and made several excursions through different parts of the United States, with a view of soliciting funds for this purpose. As his brethren were generally poor at this time, he met with only partial success. But undaunted in courage and supreme in the faith that this was the right thing to do, and that the College was an imperative need, he began the task which would have deterred any one else who was not controlled by the same purpose which animated him. He had written some articles in the *Harbinger* for 1839 and 1840 leading up to the establishment of the College. In these articles are indicated the great aim which was constantly before his mind. In one of these he says:

The cardinal thought in this scheme is our *beau ideal* of education, viz.—that the formation of moral character, the culture of the heart, is the supreme end of education, or rather is education itself. With me education and the *formation of moral character* are identical expressions.—An immoral man is uneducated. The blasphemer, the profane' swearer, the liar, the calumniator, the duelist, the braggadocio, the peculator, etc., etc., are vulgar, barbarous, and uneducated persons. But such is not the popular opinion. Why? Because, as De Fellenberg avers, the formation of character by means of schools—*i.e.* by means of systematic discipline and instruction—is a new thought. Schools were first established for other purposes; and when established, the formation of character was not an element in their system—*nor is it so yet.* This
statement, which certainly is true, deserves the gravest reflections of the gravest men; and is, to my mind, a justifiable reason—an imperious demand for the new institution to which we are calling the attention of Christians and philanthropists of every name. We contemplate a scheme in which the formation of the physical and intellectual man shall not be neglected, but which shall always be held in subordination to the moral man. In which, in one word, the formation of moral character, the cultivation of the heart, shall be the \textit{Alpha} and the \textit{Omega}, the radical, regulating, and all-controlling aim and object in all the literary and scientific studies, in all the exercises, recreations, and amusements of children and youth.*

It is worth while to give Mr. Campbell's own statement of the opening of the College, and the outlook as he saw it. He says:

This Institution commenced its career on the day appointed, under more favourable auspices than could have been expected. The contemplated number of students were not all in attendance, a few having been detained through personal or family afflictions, and some other difficulties, till the ensuing Spring. Seldom have so many students from regions so remote and various, been assembled at the commencement of any literary institution. The Professors also, according to expectation, were all present—one only, Mr. W. W. Eaton, of St. John's, New Brunswick, excepted. The appointment of this gentleman to the chair of English Literature at the October meeting of the Board, was so recent as to preclude his presence at our commencement. Meanwhile, till his arrival, his place, in part, is filled by the other Professors, and in part by a special teacher appointed \textit{pro tempore}.

To organize, arrange, and classify a new Institution, composed of so many youth of such diverse studies and attainments, from the Graeca Majora, and various branches of mathematical and physical sciences, down to the elements of literature, without any previous knowledge of their habits, proficiency, or the methods of instruction under which they had been so far educated—is a task and a labour which none but the initiated and experienced can comprehend.

We have already formed more than twenty classes. Of these the first meets at half-past six in the morning. To form and establish that most healthful and useful habit of rising early, I chose that early hour for my lectures on sacred history, for Bible-readings, and worship. My residence being just three-fourths of a mile from the College, gave me for November and December, a very invigorating exercise of riding or walking that distance every morning before daylight. For January and February, Professor Stuart will occupy that hour,
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while I occupy his from eight to nine. Our classes are not all disposed of till about half-past four in the evening.

Having been no little retarded and disappointed in getting some rooms of our College edifice finished before this time, we have to contend with the difficulties of having the classrooms in the Steward's Inn. Studying, reciting, and boarding in one edifice, though spacious, is by no means so desirable. A degree of confusion under the best police imaginable is, in such cases, inevitable. This calls for greater labours on the part of the Professors, and occasions more discipline than would likely occur under our anticipated arrangements. We expect to be in the College edifice early in the Spring. It affords, however, this advantage, that a more intimate acquaintance is formed with the manners and habits of every pupil than is possible in other circumstances, it being almost impossible to conceal, for any length of time, any impropriety of behaviour from the observation of some of the Professors.

We are peculiarly happy, in the main, in the assortment of students which has fallen to our lot. About one-third of them are professors of religion; and with a very few exceptions, they are all good students. I have seldom known so many diligent and orderly students, in the same aggregate, in any Institution. We have had, indeed, a few cases of discipline; and, from the evident good effect of these, we are confirmed in our opinion that a prompt, decided, and impartial course, will, notwithstanding the great defects in family culture and discipline, in most cases succeed well; provided, only, that corresponding efforts are made to increase the intelligence and moral feeling of the subjects of such disciplinary proceedings.

It is worthy of remark, however, that those pupils who are pampered and indulged at home, whose passions are gratified, and whose habits are measurably left to the capriciousness of youthful impulse, are easily distinguished from those whose better fortune it is to have more prudent and strict parents—parents that do not regard luxurious eating, drinking, amusement, and all manner of indulgence as the best tokens of parental tenderness and affection, and the great end not only of education, but of human life. Solomon the Wise gives some useful hints on this subject; amongst which will be found some of considerable value even yet—such as, "He that loveth his son chastens him betimes," and "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," "Folly is bound up in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction" (or strict discipline) "will drive it far from him."

From the indications before us, and the experiment begun, we are more sanguine than ever that if the Christian and benevolent public will second our efforts and our enterprise, as we are confidently of opinion that they ought, our begun Institution can and will be made a source and foundation of extensive blessings to society, both civil and religious. But from an exhibit of all that has been actually donated or subscribed to
this institution, which we intend soon to publish, it will appear that we have not been seconded with that liberality of feeling and assistance which an undertaking of such magnitude and promise would seem to command. The times, we admit, are hard, and form a very plausible and handsome excuse for those who believe more in investments in the various stocks and speculations of this day, promising ten, twenty, or fifty per cent, per annum, than in those stocks which, though they promise ten thousand per cent, through ages of ages, do not instantly fill the pocket with the filthy rags or tinkling symbols of our commercial and political currency. But we yet anticipate the liberality of the Christian and benevolent portions of our country, and will yet suffer our patience to have her proper and full effect.*

The next year, in the July number of the Harbinger, the first list of donations to the College was published, and this publication shows that $17,688.00 had been pledged, and $7,923.00 had been paid. During this time the College building proper, four stories, 83 x 45, a Steward's Inn, 107 x 36 feet, four stories, had been completed, and one wing of a mansion house, 17 x 24 feet, two stories, was well on the way to completion. Accommodations were ready for 150 students at the opening of the next session.

The catalogue for the second session showed 156 matriculates, representing eleven states, and the College commencement July 4, 1843, the second anniversary, was attended by about 1,500 people. Phillip S. Fall, of Kentucky, was present at the second anniversary, and was added to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Fall was a well educated man himself, and for a considerable length of time conducted a female college at Frankfort, Ky., which was one of the best of its kind in the state. In the Harbinger for March, 1843, another list of donations was published, amounting to $25,370.75 in subscriptions, and $11,681.66 paid, so that the whole amount subscribed in the two years reached the handsome sum of $43,169.00 and cash paid $21,922.82.

As a specimen of the kind of moral instruction which Mr. Campbell gave to his students, it is thought proper to print the whole of his address at the Commencement exercises of the College, July 4, 1843, entitled "Valedictory Address to the Students of Bethany College."
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Alas, with all our firm purposes, and our most sanguine hopes and wishes, we all shall
never meet again in this place; and, indeed, in no other place on earth—perhaps not to all
eternity ever meet as members of one and the same community.

How very impressive and solemn the reflection that a scene is now transpiring never again
to be repeated,—that in the great drama of our social existence this scene occurs but once to
all eternity; and yet its aspects and bearings upon our future existence and character may be
lasting as the infinite cycles of endless duration. This view of this solemn crisis calls for a few
valedictory remarks. Accept, my young friends, a few reflections, and a word of advice from
one who cannot but feel a peculiar interest in your future course and destiny.

With most of you, gentlemen, myself and the other members of the Faculty of this
College, have formed a very pleasing and agreeable acquaintance. The relations hitherto
subsisting between us have been of the most intimate and responsible character on both sides.
They are such as cannot fail to impart a very intimate knowledge, not indeed of our mere
intellectual constitution, but of our whole moral temperament, habits, and dispositions. You
know us and we know you, in ways and manners in which others know us not, and in which
you cannot so well know each other. I repeat that our acquaintance with the most of you,—
nay, indeed, with all of you,—is such as to interest us all more or less in your future destiny.

In the first place, then, your various talents, acquisitions, and habits, to say nothing of
circumstances, may afford you an opportunity of forming characters and of filling places in
society of no ordinary importance to yourselves and to that community in which you are to
employ all those faculties and acquisitions in the various relative duties of our social
existence.

Many of you have not only heard from us the adage that "educated mind governs the
universe," but are also capable of comprehending its great and solemn import. If this be true of
the Supreme Intelligence Himself, it is also true of all the great functionaries by which He
executes his purposes in the government of every department of the world. I care not how
loudly envious ignorance may prate against learning, nor how the uneducated portions of
society may seem to disparage its possessors, man is so constituted and the world so formed
that superior intelligence, associated with moral excellence, must give an authority and power
to bless, to which inferior intelligence and excellence must bow in proper time and place.

Not only will an afflicted patient, when seized by some portentous malady, seek for the
most skilful physician; an injured client, in some pressing emergency, employ the ablest
counsel; but society itself, whether political or religious, will, in every important crisis, select
those whom nature, education, and moral excellence, have made conspicuous to fill those high
and lofty places of important trust, or to discharge those
weighty responsibilities which involve the supreme interests of a people or embrace in the wide range of their operations the more enduring fortunes of posterity. As when a fierce tempest breaks upon the mighty ocean, and bears upon the summit of its mountain billows the feeble bark of man's creation, the most skillful mariner is called to the helm, and the lives and fortunes of all committed to his hands; or, as when a country is assailed by some invading foe, the bravest patriot, and most distinguished soldier is made commander-in-chief; so in every great emergency, and in all the other relations and crises of society, the man that is best qualified for the occasion, whose education and character best qualify him to serve the public in that capacity, will, in every well regulated community, be called to that place, despite of all that envy, ignorance, and superstition can urge against his claims.

But, gentlemen, when I speak of educated mind, by that epithet you know that I include more than mere intellectual development—more than mere literary and scientific attainments. True, indeed, that the cultivation of the intellectual powers in the habits of acquiring and communicating intelligence, and the acquisition of just views of nature and religion, of literature, science, and art, and also the expansion and corroboration of these faculties are all-important parts of education, are essential to the full and perfect moral advancement of our spiritual and social nature; still all this falls essentially and radically short of our conceptions of a good or complete education.

With us it is a settled point, that, could any one mind possess all the intellectual powers, acquisitions, and resources, of the three great master spirits of modern science,—Bacon, Locke, and Newton,—and with them survey physical, intellectual, and moral nature—scale the heavens—traverse the orbit of every planet belonging to seventy-five millions of suns;—could he compute all the forces, sum up the series of all their various movements, and penetrate into their peculiar mechanism; and could he analyse our own planet, detect its peculiar structure, explain all the laws of its various and mysterious strata, enumerate and expound all its subtle elements, their numerous and various combinations in its mineral, vegetable, and animal creations, and then take to himself the well fledged wings of the strongest imagination, and fly off into all the metaphysical subtleties of matter and spirit—define their respective boundaries—contradistinguish their differential attributes—compute their abstract and combined influences in all the physical and mental phenomena with which the universe abounds; I say, could he thus develop and comprehend all, and more than all, mortals ever knew of things terrestrial and celestial—of things concrete and abstract—if yet his spiritual nature, his moral powers, and capacities were a moral desolation—his heart convulsed with the work-
nings of a towering ambition, an inordinate selfishness, and the impulses of unbridled sensuality—his soul alienated from God and devoted to the pursuit and enjoyment of the forbidden pleasures of sin—he is an uneducated man, in the proper sense of that much abused and greatly perverted term.

Thus contemplated, man, in the zenith of all his intellectuality, enslaved to passion, is but a splendid ruin—his soul a waste and howling desert—without a single oasis, without one green or bright spot on which hope can look with any pleasing anticipation. His cultivated intellect, and his giant powers—his stores of literature and science, make him greatly capable of extending mischiefs—of ruining thousands or millions. The moral atmosphere around him is filled with a deadly contagion—his breath is more destructive than the simoom of the desert—his example a pest more to be dreaded than the sword of the conqueror—than the fires of the Inquisition. We need not expatiate on the deeds of a Nero, a Caligula, a Danton, or a Robespierre. A single Voltaire, by his writings and his conversations, is a greater curse and more to be deprecated than two Napoleons. A Napoleon has strewed the field of war with bones of slaughtered legions; while a Voltaire has replenished hell with untold multitudes of infidels and debauchees. The one makes the earth to tremble under his war chariots, his mounted and mail-clad warriors—he shakes the heavens with the clangor of his trumpets and the thunder of his cannon—he entails years of lamentation and bitter sorrows to bereaved parents and heart-broken widows; while the other has caused the regions of the lost to resound with the eternal wailings of destroyed multitudes, deluded by the delicious poison of his pernicious eloquence, and made to drink down eternal destruction in the medicated wine of his delusive yet bewitching reasonings.

We have not yet been taught the arithmetic of everlasting ruin; and no algebraic process can compute the mischief which a single Hume, Volney, Voltaire, or Bulwer, can secretly infuse into the hearts of a nation by the fascinations of a tasteful and bewitching style, and a fancy capable of the ingenious fictions and enchanting plots of forbidden pleasure.

But we all can make the contrast between an ambitious Caesar, deluging the earth with blood for the sake of empire,—a Tamerlane, desolating India, Persia, Egypt, and the fairest portions of Asia at the impulse of the accursed lust of power and insatiate domination,—a profane Mahomet, laying waste the garden of the world at the bidding of his demon passions, of fraud and friction; I say, we can compare these master spirits of iniquity, transgression and sin, these mighty actors in the desolations of the world, with the Apostles of humanity, the philanthropists and public benefactors of our race, who have, in the chastened strains of heaven-taught poetry, or by
the eloquent pleadings of a divine benevolence, or by useful inventions in the arts of human improvement and civilisation, advanced the cause of humanity, emancipated the world from the bondage of ignorance, superstition, and error. We can point to a Claude of Turin, a Wickliffe of England, a Luther of Saxony, a Tyndale, a Zuinglius, a Howard, a Clarkson, a Franklin, a Washington bestowing their numerous and various benefactions on our races; all tending to human advancement in science, useful arts, morality, religion, and happiness. For, my young friends, all power is less than the power of blessing—

.... Oh, how Omnipotence
Is lost in love! Thou great Philanthropist,

Father of angels, but the friend of man,
hast taught us that philanthropy, evangelical philanthropy, is but another name for morality, religion, and happiness.

The acquisition and confirmation of virtuous habits is, therefore, young gentlemen, an essential item, the most fundamental and all-pervading element of a rational education:—nay, it is the very aim and grand object of it all. Without this, all learning, all science, all art, is vain or useless, or worse than useless to the possessor. On this point, however, we are all agreed—theoretically at least, agreed.

I would, then, my young friends, at present remind you of but three things:—

First, there are no holidays in the school of virtue. All her days are, indeed, holy days; but there is no vacation in her school. Her sessions are not for months nor years, but for life. In other branches and schools of education frequent interludes are necessary; for we have all learned, with King Solomon, that "much study is a weariness of the flesh." This many of you have fully proved. You, therefore, occasionally need to unstring the bow of your intellectual application. Your physical energies can be expended, and therefore need to be recruited. Every mental effort wastes a portion of our animal vigour. You have, gentlemen, merited, and you need, a respite. But I would deeply impress it upon your attention that there is no respite in the school of moral culture. Wherever you go, whatever you think, say, or do, not only are the claims of virtue ever constant, imperious, and obligatory, but your course is either backward or forward, upward or downward. On her altars the fire forever burns. She must be worshipped in every impulse, volition, action, passion of the soul. Her discipline must be habitual. She must reign queen of all your thoughts, words, and actions. It is, however, a pleasing reflection, that, when we choose a virtuous course of action, habit not only makes it easy, but natural and delightful. To a mind intent on truth, justice, and goodness, the highest gratification is correspondent action. The labours of the lyre and the toils of the piano are enchantingly delightful to the amateurs of
music. To the miser there are no toils in counting his gold. The lover is never fatigued in revealing his passion to his mistress. And hence it is that "wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are paths of peace."

But in the second place, gentlemen, industry is just as necessary to forming and strengthening these habits as it is to acquiring either learning or wealth. No man can excel in earth or heaven, in time or to eternity, without industry. Talent and industry are the two main pillars of all human greatness. The one, without the other, cannot excel. But industry, without talent, will do more than talent without industry. A thousand become great and good by industry for one who is either great or good by genius or natural birth. Self-denial is therefore as necessary in rising to eminence on earth as in heaven—as necessary to becoming a scholar as a saint. Wherever labour is counted a disgrace, learning, virtue, and religion, are at a low ebb. There are no drones in Virtue's hive. Neither loungers nor loafers are found in the porticoes of literature, science, or virtue.

I congratulate many of you, my young friends, on your industrious habits. Some of you are models of industry and attention to business. You need but to persevere to be both great and good: I mean, to be honourable and useful men; for this, with me, is the standard of human greatness and goodness. I need not tell you what industry has done in the schools of human greatness. Inquire for the greatest King in Israel, the greatest prince in Greece, Rome, England, Prussia, Sweden; you will find that they were individually the most industrious and laborious men of their respective generations. Who of American philosophers, orators, statesmen, scholars, theologians, physicians, etc., have risen to the highest degree of eminence in their respective callings? Like Newton, Bacon, Locke, they were as much distinguished for labour as for genius. Those who, like the present Lord Brougham, sleep five hours and labour sixteen; or, like our late lamented Attorney-General, distinguished alike for genius and learning, have been the architects of their own fortunes by their superior industry and great devotion to some worthy object. Industry, however, is not pre-eminently worthy of regard and cultivation because of its indispensability to the acquisition of learning, wealth, or fame; but because no man can be strictly moral without it or eminently honourable, useful, or happy, but in the continued practice of it.

I shall not, however, lecture you to death on a subject on which most of you have frequently heard me before; but will simply add, what I presume you will admit, that, on this subject at least, there is no incongruity between my theory and my practice. I would then have you to know that whatever influence I may have acquired, and whatever good I may have been the humble instrument of accomplishing, I owe preeminently to this course. With me, indeed, it has long since
been a habit, without the necessity of a single effort. I was early taught the following lesson:

"But what truth prompts, my tongue shall not disguise: The steep ascent must be with toil subdued; Watchings and cares must win the lofty prize Propos'd by heaven—true bliss and real good. Honour rewards the brave and bold alone; She spurns the timorous, indolent, and base; Dangers and toil stand stern before her throne, And guard, so Heaven commands, the sacred place. Who seeks her must the mighty cost sustain, And pay the price of labour, care, and pain."

Finally, gentlemen, in bidding you a cordial and affectionate adieu, I would only add, that we desire you to remember, not only on your journey home, but when at home, and wherever you may go, that you either are, or have been students of Bethany College. If not the first fruits, you are either the buds or blossoms of her future hopes. She is struggling into life; and as she is ambitious to be distinguished not merely for her literary and scientific standing amongst the American Colleges, but for her supreme regard to moral culture and moral eminence, you will be inspected with a jealous eye by her friends, and also by her enemies, if any such she have. It is as much in your power now, in her infancy, to honour her, as it will be in her power hereafter to honour you in your maturity. I do not mean to say that you should merely utter a good name for her; for this I believe all, or almost all of you, are both able and willing to do. But I supremely desire, and earnestly request that you will honour her by your virtues. This is all we ask; and in asking this, we tender you the best advice we could give, since to be virtuous is to be useful, honourable, and happy.

That you may not only safely arrive at home, enjoy a pleasant vacation, and return to your studies with new energy; but that you may pass honourably and usefully through life, be useful citizens of the state, excellent and exemplary members of the Church, and ultimately attain to the resurrection of the just, is my unfeigned desire, and I believe, also, of every member of the Faculty.*

We have now seen the beginning of two important Colleges that are hereafter to occupy a prominent position in the Restoration movement. Education is henceforth to be co-ordinated with evangelism, and when these two are made to co-operate with each other, as was the aim of the pioneers of the Restoration movement, then will be realised something of the ideal which Mr. Campbell set before himself and those who were associated with him. It was
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the day of small things with regard to education, but it was the beginning of great things which would afterwards be realised in the oncoming days.

I have given considerable space to the inauguration of these two Colleges because they mark a very distinct period in the progress of things. They both look forward to an educated ministry, and this would mean an attack upon the cities as well as the country and villages with the great plea which the Disciples were making. As has already been remarked, their teaching eldership was an important factor in the success of the country churches, but it would not work in the cities. Perhaps it was never faithfully tried with such elders as were properly in the program for which the Disciples contended in their scheme of Church organization. But, however this may be, it is certain that it had not been a success in the city churches, and as there were very few educated preachers at that time, the city churches had themselves very largely been failures, so far, at least, as growth in numbers was concerned. Many of these city churches had remained stationary, or else had grown less influential than they were during the first few years of their existence. This fact made a strong impression upon Mr. Campbell's mind, as well as upon the minds of others who thought about the matter, and this was doubtless one of the considerations taken into account, in reaching the conclusion that Colleges must become important factors in the future development of the Restoration movement.

Going back to the year 1840, it is easy to see that the forward movement in educational matters had in no way lessened the evangelistic zeal of the Disciples. The reports from the evangelistic field are very encouraging. Such evangelists as John Smith, John T. Johnson, John Allen Gano, R. C. Ricketts, B. F. Hall, etc., were very active in Kentucky, while in Indiana such men as John O'Kane, Benjamin Franklin, Elijah Goodwin, L. H. Jameson, and John B. New, were equally successful in winning souls to Christ. In Missouri great things were also accomplished under the leadership of such men as T. M. Allen, Jacob Creath, Jr., Samuel Rogers, Allen Wright, and a number of other efficient evangelists. In Illinois the good work was carried on by B. W. Stone and a number of other earnest proclaimers of the Ancient Gospel. At the
same time progress was made in many other directions under the leadership of evangelists whose names will be mentioned at the proper time.

In looking over the reports of these men, it is evident that at least 2,000 converts were made every three months, and perhaps many more, for undoubtedly the reports from the field represent only a small portion of the work done, as many evangelists did not report accessions at all, and in any case only a part of the field is comprehended in the reports made. While the statistics are far from being trustworthy, as covering the whole ground, it is fair to estimate that not less than 20,000 additions per annum were made during the next decade, beginning with 1840. Of course there were losses to be subtracted, both by death and otherwise, so that perhaps the net gain per annum should be placed at about 15,000, and this would make the number of Disciples, when we reach the year 1850, about 200,000, which estimate perhaps is not far from the facts of the case.

Considering that this success had to be achieved in the face of the most violent opposition that can be imagined, it is certainly a strong proof that the plea which the Disciples made had much in it that met the popular demand. The people were tired of the sights and sounds, the mystic interpretations of the Scriptures; the utter want of definiteness as to the terms of salvation, the uncertainty as to time and place, when assurance of sins forgiven could be realised, and the complex systems of theology, which the preachers vainly tried to make the people comprehend, all contributed to an environment which invited Disciple preachers to enter and occupy. They had also the courage of their convictions, and the spirit of self-sacrifice which enabled them to deny themselves of every comfort, often going without money and without price to doors that were opened to the knocking of the simple Gospel, as it was proclaimed by the Restoration preachers. These preachers seldom would not heed a Macedonian cry, and never, if it was possible for them to answer it.

Thus the glorious work went on, and it is a real inspiration to read the letters of these pioneer evangelists as they tell of the struggles and triumphs, the bitter opposition and the victories, the suffering for Christ's sake,
and the joy of final success. As all this is depicted most vividly in their short but usually very comprehensive communications, it is hoped that some time some one may gather all these letters from the beginning of the movement up to the year 1850, and publish them in a volume. It would be a most interesting volume for the preachers of the present day to read, and would be full of inspiration as well as of much instruction that is needed at the present time.

The year 1841 was made memorable on account of a union meeting which was held in Lexington that year, beginning the second day of April, to attend which all the religious parties had been cordially invited. This meeting had been proposed and advocated by John T. Johnson, who was always in the front rank of every movement in favour of Christian union. He had realised a taste of it in the union between the "Reformers" and "Christians," and his great heart fairly palpitated with joy in the prospect of a still wider union of the followers of Jesus Christ. His proposition met the view of Mr. Campbell, who wrote to him in the following language:

"Beloved Brother Johnson:

Your motive is an excellent one, and I will travel one hundred miles out of my way to attend such a meeting in Kentucky, on my return from Washington the ensuing Spring. Let us have a real big meeting on the subject of Union, on Truth, and in Truth."

Although this invitation was extended to all denominations, as a matter of fact, not one representative participated in the meeting, except Dr. Fishback, who was already practically in sympathy with the Disciples, and actually united with the Church at Lexington shortly after the meeting. Truly has it been asked, where were the leaders among the Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians?

However, the union meeting was held according to appointment, and continued for three days. In view of the importance of this meeting, it is believed that a full report of what took place, as well as Mr. Campbell's animadversions upon the same, should be carefully preserved, therefore we quote the account as given by the Secretaries, H. B. Todd and G. W. Elley.
Agreeably to the above public notice a very large audience assembled in the Christian meeting house in Lexington, Ky., at eleven o'clock. After prayer and praise, Brother J. T. Johnson explained the object of the meeting, and moved that Brother Asa E. Runyan, of May's Lick, be chosen president, and H. B. Todd and George W. Elley, secretaries. Unanimously adopted.

The meeting being thus duly organised, Brother Johnson offered the following resolution, which was read, and after a short discussion carried unanimously in the affirmative:—

Resolved, That Christian union is practicable.

It was then, on motion of the same,

Resolved unanimously, that Brethren Fishback and Campbell be requested to address the convention on the subject of the foregoing resolution, in the order of their names.

The Convention then adjourned till half-past two o'clock. Met according to adjournment at half-past two P.M. Dr. Fishback then addressed the audience for about two hours. An account of the position sustained by him in the discourse, and the discussions growing out of it, will be found below.

On motion of Brother Campbell, it was then

Resolved, That the discourse of Brother Fishback, and those to be delivered during the meeting, be made the subject of free inquiry and criticism.

On motion of the same,

Resolved, That Brother Shannon be requested to deliver, at seven o'clock this evening, a discourse on the sin of schism. Adjourned till seven o'clock.

In pursuance of the foregoing resolution, at the time appointed, Brother Shannon delivered a discourse; in which, after showing that all who sincerely love the Lord Jesus, and truly believe on Him, could be united in one holy and happy brotherhood without any sacrifice of truth of conscience, he proved from various scriptures, and especially from the fifth chapter of Galatians, that sects among Christians were ranked by Paul among the works of flesh (such as drunkenness, etc.) which exclude men from the kingdom of God.

Adjourned till half-past ten o'clock next morning.

Saturday morning met according to adjournment. Brother Campbell then addressed the meeting till half-past four P.M. (with exception of a short intermission for dinner), in proof of the following proposition:—

Resolved, That the union of Christians can be Scripturally effected by requiring a practical acknowledgment of such articles of belief and such rules of piety and morality as are admitted by all Christian denominations.

Adjourned till seven P.M., after which hour the Convention was occupied during the evening in the discussion of the first discourse.

Dr. Fishback, in his address, and in the discussion of it in reference to Christian union, maintained that the first object
ought to be to give to the Scriptures in the view of the mind their appropriate divine origin, authority, and use—not merely as a sufficient rule of faith and practice in religion, but also as the only means of spiritual ideas, knowledge, and faith; and to place Jesus Christ as the Light of the World, and as Prince and Saviour upon his throne.

He maintained that religion, or the knowledge of God, before the fall was natural to the state of man, but since the fall it has not been, on account of the change that has taken place in his relation to God and to spiritual things by sin, and that it entered the world by revelation after the Fall, and has ever existed only by its influence. He affirmed that natural religion, or Deism, is false, and has in fact no proper existence independent of revelation, and that it is a product of a Pagan tradition and of false philosophy of the human mind, and was incorporated with Christianity in an early period of its history, and involves in it the denial of the total depravity of man so far as the knowledge of God and of spiritual things is concerned, and denies that God and the fact of the creation of the heavens and the earth out of nothing are objects of faith according to the Scriptures, or in the Scriptural use of the term.

He maintained that the assumption of natural religion without revelation supersedes, nullifies, and denies the divine origin, instrumentality, and the use of the Word of God as the means of obtaining spiritual ideas and of communicating original spiritual knowledge and of converting the world, and creates the necessity for the doctrine of the immediate physical operation of the Spirit in the production of faith, instead of the spiritual moral influence by the word in the record God hath given of his Son, and makes the faith of that word no better than the faith that Simon Magus had.

He alleged that the Spirit of God has ever been essentially omnipresent, but after the sanctification and exaltation of Jesus Christ he was graciously poured out and continues poured out, and is graciously omnipresent to bless the word of the Gospel wherever it is faithfully taught, and used for the conversion of sinners and for the sanctification of the saints.

He attributed the divisions among professedly Bible Christians, and the prevalence of sectarianism, and the existence of Roman Catholicism to the want of true views of the divine origin, authority, and use of the word of God in religion and morality, and unscriptural views of Jesus Christ as Prince and Saviour and Lord of all.

On the subject of baptism he maintained that without contending for the truth of any particular view of the mode or subject, there is Scriptural ground for an honest difference of opinion among the sincere Disciples and followers of Jesus Christ, laid in the weakness and imperfection of man, and that they ought not to disown one another at the Lord's Table as Christians on account of their difference.
Monday morning at nine o'clock, the meeting was again introduced by prayer and praise, and a free and full conversation continued by interrogation, explanations, and general remarks upon the points made and defended by Brethren Shannon and Campbell. A vote was then taken upon the resolution of Brother Campbell, which was carried unanimously in the affirmative by an immense congregation.

An invitation was also affectionately given to all persons to offer any objections which they might have, in the way either of inquiry or discussion.

The meeting then adjourned after passing the following resolution—Resolved, That the Bible, and the Bible alone, is a sufficient foundation on which all Christians may unite and build together, and that we most affectionately invite all the religious parties to the investigation of this truth.*

It is certainly very remarkable that Mr. Campbell should have addressed the meeting from half past ten in the morning until four in the afternoon, with the exception, of a short intermission for dinner. The people were there for business, and were evidently deeply interested in the great subject which had brought them together, and they were not, therefore, influenced by the style of to-day when an address must not exceed thirty minutes if it is listened to with patience. It is worth while also just here to give Mr. Campbell's comments upon this meeting, and especially what he says about William F. Broaddus, as this will illustrate, not only Mr. Campbell's views with respect to Christian union, but also the sectarianism of those with whom he had to contend. He says:

If the Prince of Peace, his doctrine, miracles, passion, and death, were misconceived, misrepresented, and perverted to his dishonour and that of his cause and people, it is not to be regarded as an object of wonder and astonishment that even now the sons of peace, the friends of Christian union and holy co-operation in the Christian kingdom, with their schemes of benevolence and peace offerings, should be misunderstood, calumniated, and reproved by many of the partizan leaders of the present disputatious and sectarian age. Partially acquainted with the workings of this schismatical spirit, its waywardness, pride, intolerance, and proscription, I confess I am one of those who were by no means sanguine that a move on the subject of union made by any of us, would meet with a favourable regard from the thorough partizan and well pen-
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sioned leaders of the people, who owe to a partizan creed, to a partizan conscience, and to the spirit of war, their position and influence in society. Still, I was pleased to hear of a union meeting however proposed and undertaken, knowing that the discussion of the great questions involved in that subject must be auspicious to the cause of truth and to the advancement of those holy principles which are destined, at no very distant day, to triumph over everything that now opposes their onward and upward march.

True, indeed, I anticipated that a union meeting, so far at least as the Baptists were concerned, proposed by our brethren in Kentucky, would not appear to them quite so congruous as though it had emanated from those associations that did so magnanimously and piously excommunicate us from the kingdom of God, and treat us as aliens from their spiritual commonwealth.

The customs of society, political, and sectarian, have made it courteous and just that the stronger and proscriptive party should first rescind their anathemas and tender the olive branch of peace to the weaker and more aggrieved party, and thus open up the way for a better understanding, and a more liberal and just administration of their affairs, as preliminary to a holy and cordial co-operation in the way of truth, and peace, and righteousness. But so it was, that sundry indications of an era of better feelings, and some private propositions of union on the part of the Baptists, encouraged and emboldened our brethren in Kentucky, who have ever been forward to propose union, and to sacrifice much for it, dispensed with usual formalities, and issued an invitation to meet in convention and discussion on this all-absorbing question, in reference to which ten thousand prayers daily ascend to heaven from all the pure hearts in all the four quarters of the world.

I was glad of the occasion on two accounts:—First, because while always advocating the cause and peace and union among all the children of God, I had, times without number, been assailed and calumniated as engaged in raising up and in leading a new sect. In refutation of this imputation, I have been, perhaps, always too ready to sacrifice views and feelings—everything but the essential elements of life—the gospel institutions in their naked facts and documents; and to seize every indication of repentance or a change of views and feelings on the part of them who have so inconsiderately, so zealously, and, we think, wantonly, imagined, and plotted our ecclesiastical destruction, and to convert it into a token for good, a symptom of returning reason, and to meet it in the spirit of meekness, mildness, and forgiveness. In the second place, if the schism now existing between them and us be a sin against the Lord of all, against the constitution, peace, dignity, and prosperity of the Christian kingdom, it lies not at our door! We have given to the world, to heaven and earth, a fresh pledge that we are for peace, union, and co-operation, with all who love the
kingdom and the appearing of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The terms of union discussed were equal, and equally honourable to all parties, requiring no greater concession from any one party in Christendom than from another. The adoption of the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing else but the naked book of God, as the expression of our faith, the guide of our worship, and the code of our morals.—We agreed to ask no more from others than we were willing to offer ourselves—the concession, surrender, and abandonment of every tradition, form, or custom, derived from our fathers, not clearly found on the pages of revelation.

How then, gentle reader, think you was the overture met? An old Methodist preacher, perhaps in his dotage, issued his card denouncing the meeting, and attempting to calumniate those as of some damnable heresy who sought the union of all good men. And still less to have been expected, and more to have been deprecated, Elder W. F. Broaddus issued, under date of March 25th, an order prohibitory of the Baptists in Kentucky coming to the meeting at all. Having learned that our friend Broaddus had either volunteered or been invited into Kentucky to rally and command the broken forces of the party, I could not but admire with what graceful ease the Reverend Gentlemen, as Metropolitan of the State, issued his first bulletin, and with what promptitude and ready acquiescence the denomination venerated the signal and kept within their tents. He, however, ventured within the amphitheatre, and dared to be a silent spectator and attentive auditor—an approach so awfully responsible, as, in his judgment, to be jeopardised by no one but himself, with the exception of President Malcolm of Georgetown College, who presumed on one occasion to appear amongst us—not, however, without the cautious preparation of paper and lead.

I was truly glad to see them on the ground, hoping that, as it was in Goldsmith's days,—"some who came to laugh remained to pray,"—they might lend a candid ear and discover how unreasonable it is to oppose those who have shown at least an equal devotion to the Bible and its genuine institutions as those ancients from whom they are vainly and falsely proud of having descended. But, alas, Elder Broaddus came not with such intent, if the sequel may be taken in evidence, together with his previous inhibition. He was once and again invited, as all present were, to take part in the meeting, to commend or to oppose, to acquiesce or to discuss, to set forth his reasons and objections, and to correct our mistakes and errors if he supposed us wandering from the ways of peace and truth. We reviewed in his presence his address to the Baptists inhibiting their attendance; and at considerable length, and with the kindliest feelings, exposed his numerous mistakes and consequent misrepresentations of our views and designs. To all which he responded not a word. When interrogated by
some of his friends on the singularity of his attitude and course, he intimated, as I learned, his
intentions (in Parthian style) to send his arrows after us by way of the Baptist Banner and
Pioneer. He was to pioneer us in the rear. My informant was either a faithful witness or a true
prophet; for every "Pioneer" and every "Banner" that has reached us since our return, contains
a sheaf and arrows pointless in truth, though well feathered indeed, and baptized not in the
water of brotherly kindness and Christian benevolence, but in the true marah, the bitter
fountain of sectarian pride and intolerance.

Determined, too, on opening a new campaign, he adroitly concludes his first missile by
the following kind words:—"Meanwhile, let this prepare our brethren for the onset shortly to
be made upon them by these Unionists." Yes, indeed, let this his assault upon our meeting
prepare the brethren for the onset. He ought to have said, "Let this my onset prepare the
Baptist brethren for our defence." This word "onset," or I am mistaken, is a word long to be
remembered. The world now knows our friendly feelings, our forgiving dispositions. It is now
a matter of history that we have been most wantonly assailed, proscribed, and persecuted for
many years by a portion of the best pensioned of the Baptist clergy. Amongst all the thousand
dollars men, and the fifteen hundred dollars men, of whom Mr. Broaddus is one, if I am
rightly informed—(for he has brought his theology to a good market in Lexington,)—there is
not one neutral. They have all united against reformation. Thousands of the people, and many
of the most spiritually minded of the ministers (who fortunately never get such high salaries),
are either silent or friendly as respects our pleadings. I say, that we have been proscribed and
persecuted so far as calumny and misrepresentation and the charge of damnable heresy is
concerned is a matter of record. We patiently endured it all. But now a respite had come:
peace, meek-eyed peace, in dove-like complaisance, smiled upon us. The Baptist people in
some places not only talked of union, prayed for union, but even proposed union. We seized
the first favourable movement and hailed the first indication of better times.—The old
campaign in fact historically closed with March, 1841. April found us all in terms of amity, in
overtures of peace, and a union meeting was actually held. But what will the future historian
say?—A Baptist and well pensioned Metropolitan Elder, through the Baptist Banner and
Pioneer, forbids the cessation of hostilities—opens a new campaign—and makes the first
"onset"—and by an unequivocal signal calls upon the whole Baptist community to prepare for
a new war against reformation. O Temporal O Mores! Will this not be a memorable era? What
singular incidents give conspicuity to very ordinary men! Ah! when shall the time come when
the professed followers of the great Peacemaker will follow the things that make for peace and
the things by
which they may edify one another! When they will no longer cry Peace! Peace! with their tongues, while war and destruction are raging in their hearts.

One point, however, in the midst of all the mist and vapour thrown around it, which I presume will long prevent union with any party in Christendom, was placed in bold relief. That point confirms our dogma—*that sects never can unite*. *It* is impossible. We reserve the theoretic demonstration for another time. We have now before us a practical one. The only idea of union that can enter the brain of a true sectarian is, *Amalgamation with a party*. Baptists themselves can rise no higher in their understanding of the term *union*, nor in their aspirations after the thing, than union or coalescence with themselves as a sect. A vision as far from my head and heart as the coalescence of oil and water, or the union of Jew and Mussulman, or the traditions of Omar or Ali. It is only on the Bible, the naked Bible, that good men in all parties can unite. The partizan features and attributes must be annihilated. Everything that makes the Baptist, or the Presbyterian, or the Methodist, must be destroyed before the people now wearing these names can unite. Whatever makes the Baptist, the Methodist, and the Presbyterian, is not of God, but of man. Immersion is of God; but immersion does not make a Baptist. Method is of God; but method does not make a Methodist. Elderships and Presbyteries are of God; but we have both, and are not Presbyterians. There are not a few who seem unable to learn this lesson.

The angles on professors make the parties. Angles will as soon make circles, as sectarians unite in one great communion. By coming into closer intimacies and forming nearer relations the angles might be worn off by attrition, and the living stones perfectly fitted for the temple of God's spirit, might be laid close together and form one solid mass—one habitation of God through the Spirit.

I never cherished a scheme so Utopian as the scheme of union which floats in the minds of some professors. Men unite not as masses, but as individuals. We come together one by one, not in nations nor organised masses. Parties, like nations, indeed, may hold an armistice—they may agree on a cessation of hostilities—they may even propose a reciprocity of kind offices—they may open their respective houses, pulpits, and communion tables to each other—they may form a confederation of communities to a certain extent; and still reserve certain peculiarities for further discussion. But as voluntary associations farther they cannot go. Yet this would be but an ecclesiastic, not a Christian union; and only a partial ecclesiastic union.—Christian union is a more intimate, spiritual, celestial sort of thing, into which we can enter only in our individual capacity and upon our own individual responsibility. It presupposes closer acquaintance, stronger personal confidence, more spiritual attachment, a real oneness of spirit,
a full coalescence of souls in the joint participation of the same Holy Spirit.

But to return to our meeting. In the "onset" of Mr. Broaddus it is misrepresented, grossly misrepresented—as much misrepresented as were our views in his inhibiting address forbidding the presence of the Baptists. Mr. Broaddus has already an apology in advance of this fact. He was in some matters rather taken by surprise. He took no notes—he made no record. This, together with his occasional agitation of spirit, which overwhelmed him in silence and embargoed his tongue, may have originated those phantasies in his brain, reported in his notices of the meeting. The following synopsis of our speeches on union are neither just nor true:

"The great body of them desired union with those only who will adopt their distinguishing peculiarity, which, after all that can be said about it, is neither more nor less than this—that if a man will confess the name of Jesus, and be immersed, he is entitled to citizenship in the Christian kingdom, no matter what erroneous opinions he may entertain upon the whole subject of religion." The falsehood and misrepresentation of which synopsis Mr. Broaddus clearly develops by giving the resolution which I had the honour to offer, to support, and to see carried unanimously by a large assemblage of Christians, viz.,—"Resolved, That union among Christians can be Scripturally effected by practically acknowledging such articles of belief and such rules of piety and morality as are admitted by all Christian denominations."—

Now among all pious and conscientious persons, it must be a question, How any one of ordinary sense, in one and the same paragraph, could exhibit two views of the grounds of union so perfectly antagonistic and contradictory. He represents the whole drift of the discussion to be about mere confession and baptism, "no matter what erroneous opinions any one may entertain upon the whole subject of religion"; and then affirms that we require a "practical acknowledgment of such articles of belief and such rules of piety and morality as are admitted by all Christian denominations." Let any candid man reconcile these two versions of the discussion, if he can! Mr. Broaddus had condemned the meeting before it existed—he came into the house determined to condemn—and he could not help pronouncing sentence of condemnation on the whole matter.

A second misrepresentation, equally palpable, though less injurious is,—"One of the proclaimers told us with great apparent delight, that after being baptized for the remission of his sins, he continued to preach the restoration of all, having been previously a Universalist." This I affirm is positively false. The preacher said that he never preached these sentiments afterwards; nay, he ceased to think of them, and finally forgot the very arguments which he used to support them. This was alleged in proof that if mere opinions, though false, were not opposed and made matters of essential importance,
they would naturally die in the minds of those who cherished them. Brother Raines, the proclaimer alluded to, wrote something to the same effect, which was published in the *Millennial Harbinger* some years since. Bigots and prejudiced persons are not good witnesses in any case. They never hear right.

This misrepresentation is introduced to prove a false representation which I instance as a third calumny:—"Provided a man believes, confesses, and is immersed, he may place any construction he pleases on the Bible; and as long as he will cry out, Down with your creeds, and come to the Book! he ranks a good and acceptable member of the Christian fraternity. If he should embrace the doctrine of the real presence—of the annihilation of unbelievers, no matter."

A fourth misrepresentation:—"Mr. C. and others frequently, during the meeting, intimated that the Baptists could unite with them without sacrificing anything." This is not true. I never said so—I never thought so. "Without sacrificing anything!" Preposterous! They must sacrifice everything that is incompatible with taking the Book, the whole Book, and nothing but the Book of God for their creed, discipline, and behaviour. On this ground only did any sensible Christian ever dream of a union with any Baptist community.

Fifth:—"Sometimes during the meeting we (the Baptists) were classed with drunkards, revellers, and murderers." This is positively false, as far as I was present, and I believe I was never absent one moment in which Mr. Broaddus was present.

There are other and various misrepresentations of myself and brethren in this "onset" and assault upon the meeting, on which, at present, I have not room to dilate. Dr. Fishback, though a Baptist, took much interest in the meeting, and delivered one of the best discourses—nay, indeed, I believe the best discourse I ever heard from a Baptist preacher in my life. I could wish to have had it printed and sent to all the sectarian world. He was obliged to assume, in some of his numerous speeches, principles which he did not believe—because, as he told us, he seemed to have to speak for or represent all the Protestant parties, as they were either afraid or ashamed to appear in the meeting. I do not pretend to quote his words in this particular; but one thing I can say, he represented very ably and eloquently the Pedo-Baptist world on their great peculiarity.

I intend to prosecute this expose, as I have only examined one of Mr. Broaddus' addresses, and even that but partially. I do hope our brethren will not respond to Mr. Broaddus in the spirit and style of his "onset," nor attribute to the Baptist denomination the doings or sayings of one man, and especially of one of no higher standing among them for talents, education, and general biblical knowledge and attainments, than Elder Wm. F. Broaddus. I should exceedingly regret that the good feelings existing between a multitude of that denomination and our brethren should be interrupted, or that a new defensive
war should be commenced because of the follies and waywardness of an individual.*

This meeting made it evident to the Disciples in attendance that they could expect no sympathy from the leaders of the denominations with their plea for Christian union. It was no longer doubtful with Mr. Campbell, at least, that Christian union could come only by overthrowing the denominations as such, or, at least, overthrowing everything that made them denominations. This had been his contention for several years, but it was now a settled conviction with him that the fight would have to be continued until the divisive elements which had come into the Christian profession should be entirely eliminated, and then, and then only, would Christian union be an accomplished fact. The disappointment of John T. Johnson was very great. He had hoped for a very different result. His great heart had fairly palpitated with joy at the prospect of such a conference as had been planned. But he was not the man to be utterly cast down at any disappointment. The conviction that this overture was in the right direction sustained him in the hour when disappointment came. He was further sustained by the fact that he was now assured that their victory in Kentucky, at least, would depend entirely upon the efforts of the Disciples themselves, and the assurance also that this very failure of the denominations to be represented in the meeting would unite the forces of the Disciples more closely than ever, while at the same time it would increase their zeal and energy in pushing forward their plea.

CHAPTER XV
BEREAVEMENT, AND PROGRESS BY DISCUSSION

In the Fall of 1842 Mr. Campbell made an excursion into East Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York, specially in the interests of Bethany College, but at the same time with a view to helping the Disciple movement in these particular localities. The movement had not made very great progress in any of these sections, though to some extent it had taken hold in East Virginia. Mr. Campbell had always taken a deep interest in the cause in his own state, but had not traveled very much in the state to promote it. In the winter of 1829-30 he was a member of the convention to amend the state constitution. During this time he became personally acquainted with such men as ex-President Madison, Chief Justice Marshall, John Randolph, of Roanoke, and others, and his ability and statesmanship being very emphatically recognised, his fame extended to various parts of the state. He had also some controversy with a Dr. Thomas who created trouble among the Disciples in Eastern Virginia, on account of certain views he was advocating concerning the state of the dead. According to a rule which the Disciples had followed from the beginning, they would not refuse to fellowship Dr. Thomas on account of the views which he held. However, Dr. Thomas was not willing to hold these views as private property, but began to advocate them as a very distinct and important article of his faith. He finally entered into covenant not to press his ideas any further publicly, but he did not live up to this agreement, and consequently his advocacy made some trouble for a little time. Mr. Campbell's presence in East Virginia, in 1842, was timely, and had the effect to practically destroy what little influence Dr. Thomas had exerted as a factionist.

In the Spring of 1843 the venerable B. W. Stone visited Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky. Two years before this he
had received a paralytic stroke which somewhat disabled him, but at the time he began his farewell visits to the states mentioned, he was able to walk, and also to occupy the pulpit. It is said by those who heard him that, while his speech was somewhat impaired by paralysis, his mind appeared to work more vigorously than it had done for many years. He actually spoke and wrote with the old-time energy of his best days. He met with an ovation everywhere, for he was everywhere loved and venerated. His biographer, John Rogers, gives a full account of this visit, and it is only necessary to record here his reception at Old Cane Ridge, Bourbon County, Kentucky. During his stay in Kentucky he twice visited this scene of his early ministry. The meeting with his old friends was very affecting, and there was no place where he was remembered with more tenderness than at Cane Ridge. On his return from this visit he writes in his *Christian Messenger*, for September, 1843, as follows:

The Senior editor, B. W. Stone, has just returned to his post, after an absence of several months in Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky. His health is greatly improved. He designs to continue in the faithful discharge of his editorial labours in the future. He was greatly pleased to meet with many of his old Christian brethren; some like himself, pressed down with the weight of years, and attendant infirmities, and standing on the eve of time, soon to hear the summons, "Come up hither." He is happy to state that bigotry and party spirit are fast receding and dying in the hearts of Christians of all denominations. In their brotherly embraces I was cordially received as a brother, and as cordially did we unite in worship without one hard speech, act, or thought. O, that this temper and conduct might universally prevail among Christians! It would be a blessing indeed to themselves, and to mankind—it would recommend religion to the acceptance of the world, and hurl the soul-destroying monster, sin, from his long usurped throne in the human heart. God and his truth would be glorified, heaven would descend on earth, and shame, infidelity and scepticism, and smile them from existence. What but bigotry and party spirit prevent these glorious events? *

There were a number of things which were specially noticed with respect to the movement in Kentucky, and as these impressions are valuable, as indicating the progress that had been made by the movement since he left Kentucky, it is instructive to quote what he says:

*"Life B. W. Stone," p. 93.*
Religion where I have been is onward in its march, but not so triumphant as I fondly anticipated to find it, from the vast numbers who had recently professed the faith of Christ in these countries. Several things of a serious nature, conspired to check its progress, in my opinion. These I will expose in brotherly love, hoping that the exposure may be profitable to all.

I. There has been more labour expended in reaping down the harvest, than in preserving it when reaped—there has been more care to lengthen the cords, than to strengthen the stakes (of Zion)—more zeal to proselyte, than to build up in the faith and hope of the Gospel. This is most certainly and lamentably true. And the correction of this evil demands our special attention. But as an apology for this state of things, it may be remarked, that in the commencement of our plea for reformation, in regard to the terms of pardon, it was all-important these matters should be made prominent; especially the design of baptism. For here we differed with all the sects; and in reference to the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, we were much misunderstood and misrepresented by them. It behooved us, therefore, to make this point prominent. Besides, the importance of this item, to a proper understanding of the gospel scheme, and to a rational reception of Christ, as our Saviour, required that it should be thoroughly investigated. We perceived that the various denominations were making frames and feelings the evidence of pardon—that they taught penitents to expect some immediate revelation of their pardon—by the removal of their burden of sin. And we saw most plainly, in the light of the Word, and of common sense, that pardon, being an act of God, is not a matter of feeling, and can only be known by divine testimony. As I can never know by my feelings that a sin which I have committed against my neighbour is pardoned, nor in other way than from that neighbour himself; so I can only know that the sins I have committed against my heavenly father, are pardoned, by a revelation in words from himself. We perceived, too, most plainly, that the opposite view leads to enthusiasm and fanaticism of every grade. We felt it therefore to be our duty to expose this error, and hold up the truth in regard to this important question. But now that the battle has been fought and the victory, to a great extent, won—that thousands upon thousands of converts have been made, many of whom are dying for want of the wholesome and strengthening provisions of the gospel—our teachers still harp upon first principles. The young preachers who came in among us in the midst of this conflict, entered with great spirit and ardour into the war, and having distinguished themselves in this warfare, in regard to first principles, and knowing little else, they seem unprepared and quite indisposed to change their course. But it is my deliberate judgment, if we would not convert our great victory into the most overwhelming defeat, we must leave, measurably, the
first principles, and "go on to perfection." We must build ourselves up on our most holy faith, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. In the strength of the Lord we have gained much ground, but if we would not lose our reward we must carefully and diligently cultivate it. Let us study practical Christianity, under Christ, as we have studied first principles—let us pray for greater measures of the Spirit, to help us, and the stakes of Zion will be as strong as her cords are long.*

It will be seen by these two extracts that Mr. Stone was taking the same view of the movement which we have seen Mr. Campbell had about this time. These great men were both impressed with the fact that the doctrinal side of the movement had perhaps not received too much emphasis, but undoubtedly the practical side had been somewhat neglected. Evidently they both realised that the time had come when it was necessary to bring up the practical side, if the movement was to be a decided success.

Mr. Stone further enlarged upon the needs of the cause in Kentucky, as follows:

II. Another thing which checks the work of religion everywhere, but especially in Kentucky, is extravagance in worldly things. Thousands of brethren there are wasting the Lord's goods. They seem to have forgotten, or never have been taught, that they themselves are living sacrifices to God. If they are Christians, their whole soul, body, and spirit, are his, and all the substance they possess. They are but the Lord's stewards, to manage to his interest and glory what he has entrusted to them and to render a just account to him in the day of judgment. Dare we then waste it, or spend it in the pride of life, and to please the lusts of the flesh and of the eye? O, what an awful reckoning there will be at the last day! There must be a reformation here, else all our labours will be lost, and the work put into more faithful hands. . . .

III. Another thing that has, without doubt, checked the growth of religion is, that brethren have too greedily followed in the wake of the world, by conforming to its spirit and practice. By this means many have involved themselves and friends in debt, and have failed to pay their lawful contracts, to the ruin of themselves and others. This is a source of great distress in societies, and has almost destroyed confidence in one another.†

It will be seen that the second and third points which he makes are after all common to every movement and to every age. Human selfishness and worldly-mindedness

* "Life of Stone," pp. 94-95. †Ibid., pp. 96-97.
BEREAVEMENT AND PROGRESS

are things that have hindered the progress of Christianity from the Day of Pentecost until the present hour. Nevertheless, it is well to reproduce these early statements of the saintly Stone that his brethren, through all generations, may know his estimate of these ungainly things which stand in the way of the progress of Christ's great cause.

After the return of this venerable man of God to his home, in Jacksonville, Ill., he continued his editorial duties until a very short time before his death. The last article he wrote for the press was addressed to a young man who had graduated at the University of Missouri, and who asked Mr. Stone's advice as to the best course to pursue in order to prepare himself for a useful ministry of the Gospel. The following is Mr. Stone's reply:

"MY SON:—You have just graduated at the University of Missouri, at the age of twenty years. You had previously devoted yourself to the Lord, and identified yourself with his people; now you inquire of me what course I would recommend to you, in order that you may be a profitable preacher of the gospel; for in this you have determined to spend your days. You say what we know experimentally to be true, that your collegiate studies have occupied the most of your time, and left but little to the study of the Bible; of this you are in a great degree ignorant. The subject of your inquiry is of vast importance to you, and to the cause you have determined to advocate; and I will, at your urgent request, give you the best advice I know.

I. Retire to your study in your father's house, and make that room a proseuche, or place of prayer. Take with you there a large polyglot English Bible, with the Septuagint translation, and Griesbach's Greek Testament, Dr. Parkhurst's and Greenfield's Lexicons; and Greenfield's Greek Concordance. Read the Old Testament regularly from the beginning, with the Septuagint before you, by which you will be better able to understand the writer. Should you find anything dark or unintelligible, note it down on a small blank book and take it to your near neighbour, Elder T. M. A., [T. M. Allen] who will gladly assist you to the right understanding of the passage. When you read the New Testament, have Griesbach's Greek Testament open before you. Should difficulties occur, examine the translation by Parkhurst's or Greenfield's Lexicon, and more especially by the Greek Concordance. This is the safest and most certain method of finding the true meaning of the words. Take short notes of all the important things you may find in your reading. Forget not to mingle prayer to your God for direction into all truth, and that the wisdom from above may be afforded you.
II. In the intervals of your Bible studies, read Church history; Mosheim's I recommend you to read first; then D'Aubigne on the Reformation; then Dr. Neander on the first three centuries. Take short notes of all important facts. Forget not meditation and prayer—pray always—pray without ceasing—Keep yourself in the love of God. Vain will be your studies without these.

III. When you have read your Bible through carefully, not hurriedly, turn back and read it again, with the commentary of Henry, and others, lately collated for the Baptist Society. Have by you also Dr. McKnight on the Epistles; and consult these commentaries on all difficult passages. I do not recommend a general reading of them; as this would consume much time to little profit. Commentators generally labour to make the Scriptures bend to their peculiar systems, and to speak the language of Ashdod, or some other barbarous dialect. Hence the danger of becoming too conversant with them. Yet continue in prayer.

IV. During your studies, let your seat be always filled in the house of God every Lord's Day and other days appointed for divine worship. Pray and exhort publicly among the brethren. This will prepare you for future operations. Many fill their heads with studied divinity, and when they go forth to preach, know not how to speak, and have to supply the lack by reading a discourse written, or committed to memory. Remember, my son, reading is not preaching.

V. Keep yourself, as much as practicable, from too much company and irrelevant conversation. These too often intrude upon your studies and devotions.

VI. When you are by your brethren sent forth to preach, confine your ministration to practical subjects. Young preachers are too fond of polemic divinity, and abstruse subjects. Vanity is at the bottom, and will ruin them, if not checked by an humble spirit.

VII. Let the glory of God and the salvation of souls be your polar star; then will your labours be blest in the world; and a crown of righteousness be given you at the coming of the Lord.

VIII. You are blessed with a wealthy, pious father, who is able and willing to support you without the aid of the churches. Go then to the destitute, and build on no man's foundation, taking nothing for your services. Many poor preachers have to confine themselves to the churches, or get no help. You will not be under this necessity. May the Lord go with you, and be to you a father and helper in every time of trouble. Be humble." *

In October, 1844, Mr. Stone, with his wife and youngest son started on his last preaching tour. Of this tour and the death of this saintly man, T. M. Allen, who knew him

* "Life of Stone," pp. 97-100.
long and intimately, and loved him most ardently, writes as follows:

In the month of October, 1844, Elder Stone made his last visit to his children, relatives, and friends, in Missouri. On the 19th (Saturday) of that month, he reached Bear Creek, Boone County, where the brethren were assembled in annual meeting. Here he had the pleasure of being greeted by many of his old Kentucky brethren and friends. He was quite debilitated, and being in feeble health, he soon left the meeting house, and did not return until Monday, the 21st. He was labouring under his paralytic affection, and was otherwise very feeble; but he took the pulpit and made his last public effort in the cause of God and man. It was like all his efforts, able and interesting. But appearing firmly impressed with the belief that it was an effort that would close his public career, he was unusually solemn and impressive. He spoke as if tottering over the grave. His comfort and instruction to Christians—his advice and warning to sinners, will never be forgotten. All were weeping around, and hung with breathless silence and profound interest on the solemn and interesting words that fell from this venerable man of God, now almost worn out in the best of all causes. His great age, his whitened locks, his feeble frame, his deep and ardent piety, his pure morality and unblemished character, together with his great ability as a Christian teacher—the presence of many of his friends, who had known him almost from the beginning—all conspired to make his last sermon unusually solemn. Thirteen additions were obtained, mostly on that day. The congregation, with weeping eyes, and hearts of love for Elder Stone, gave him "the parting hand" and bade him a long farewell. Thus usefully and interestingly closed the eventful public career of this excellent man of God. He spent a day or two with his son, Dr. Stone, and left quite unwell for his home in Illinois. He could get no further than Hannibal, on the Mississippi River, where he breathed his last in peace, at his son-in-law's, Captain S. A. Bowen's.*

In a preceding chapter of this volume, some account of Mr. Stone's life and character is given. It is only needful to say here that he died as he had lived, in the hope of a blessed immortality, and with the strong persuasion that the principles he had advocated were according to the will of God, and would ultimately triumph. He had been misrepresented again and again with respect to his views of the atonement. It is true that for a time he seemed to be somewhat confused as to that great matter, but after he and Mr. Campbell had compared views in a

Mr. Stone finally settled the whole matter by accepting heartily what was practically orthodox ground, though at the same time rejecting speculative views of the Trinity and the atonement as tests of Christian fellowship. As a matter of fact, he never did hold to anything like the Unitarian position, and from the start he was misunderstood largely because he did not accept the shibboleth of others with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity. He believed in calling Bible things by Bible names, and his very soul abhorred the notion that salvation depended upon the echoing of doctrinal statements which cannot be understood by the common people. At the same time, no one has held more firmly, or advocated more earnestly the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, or believed more implicitly in the fact that the preaching of the Cross is both the wisdom of God and the power of God to the salvation of souls. Owing to this charge of Unitarianism against Mr. Stone, and also a certain reference that was made to the matter in the "Campbell and Rice debate," in justice to Mr. Stone, and for the purpose of settling the question beyond all controversy, it is thought proper to publish the following correspondence which took place only a short time before Mr. Stone's death. It will be seen by this correspondence that, while Mr. Stone was never a Trinitarian, in the theological import of that term, he surely cannot be charged with holding to Unitarianism, as that term is understood in popular theology. The correspondence is as follows:

MAY'S LICK, KY., Dec. 14, 1843.

ELDER B. W. STONE:

Dear Brother—In the late discussion between N. L. Rice, (The Presbyterian Champion) and Alexander Campbell, Mr. Rice, argued, or said, that his opponent held in fellowship in his Church, Unitarians who made our Saviour a mere man, a created being, and who openly denied the divinity of Christ. He seemed willing to drive Brother Campbell from the fellowship of Christians and of course from heaven, because he would not drive you from the church on earth, and of course to hell—as he always gave your name in truth. Now, my dear brother, it is a fact of great solemnity, that the Presbyterians held you in their bosoms when your faith and piety were no better than they are now—and that now they are willing to denounce you, refuse the cup of blessing to you, and even consign you to endless torment, in order to asperse...
Brother Campbell, and destroy the influence of our pious teaching. But it seems to me they are not satisfied with this, but willing to resort to wilful falsehood and slander. I therefore hope you will state once more, before you leave the state of action, though it be the thousandth time, that you never taught any such sentiments, and call on Mr. Rice to take back the slander. I hope you will publish your statement in the Christian Messenger, and send it to Mr. Rice at Paris, Kentucky. Then we shall know that he wilfully falsifies when he thus represents you, as he has been doing through this state. I do think it is due to yourself and to the cause you have so nobly and so successfully plead.

May the Lord preserve you for your posthumous influence from the aspersions of wicked and unreasonable men!

A. KENDEICK.

REPLY

DEAR BROTHER KENDRICK:—Brother Campbell has to suffer on my account, what I have had long to suffer for him. He is malevolently assailed for holding me in fellowship, for the reasons you have stated; and I have been equally malevolently assailed for holding him in fellowship, because of his supposed errors. I have feared the real object of our opposers is, to divide and conquer, and not because they love the truth, as it is in Jesus. The most zealous against us I generally find to be those who possess the least of the spirit of Christianity. Would our opposers love Brother Campbell more, and willingly hold him in fellowship, were he to repudiate me? No such thing. They care as little for him as they do for me. Though they fear him more, they do not love him better.

I am now on the eve of time, busily arranging my affairs for eternity. The vessel which is to bear me to my eternal destination across the ocean is now in view. Soon I shall bid farewell to earth, and be borne to another world. What I say may be considered as the words of a dying man, for which a speedy account must be rendered.

Mr. Rice is now in the acme of life; and in the confidence of his learning and natural endowments, feels his importance, and vaunts aloud in the presence of men. He takes the liberty to detract from others what he never gave, and to build for himself an indestructible monument of fame. Should he live to my age, it is hoped his mind will be so mellowed by years that he will remember with sorrow his present course. But to the point:—

You inform me that Mr. Rice publicly charged me with being a Unitarian, who made our Saviour a mere man—a created being, and who openly denied the divinity of Christ.

Now I reply, for the last time, (so I now think) that at no time of my long life did I ever believe these doctrines. I neither taught them either publicly or privately, from the pulpit or the press. I am bold to say, no man ever heard them.
from me, or read them in any of the essays I have written and published on the doctrine of Christ. How Mr. Rice obtained his information I can only conjecture. He must have been very confident of its correctness, or, as a Christian or gentleman, he would not have dared thus to charge me before so numerous a crowd of people, and I not present. It looks like slander and back-biting, of which, one would suppose, Mr. Rice—the high-minded Mr. Rice, was incapable.

His evidence for believing and publishing these things of me may be *fama clamosa*; (but what man of brains will admit her testimony, as often false as true?) or he may have believed them by detaching an expression from my essays written and published. For example, he may have seen in my writings this quotation, "There is one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ." Ah! exultantly he may have said, I have now caught him; he is verily a Unitarian, for he calls the Son of God a man—the man Jesus Christ—he must then believe him to be a created being. If Mr. Rice knows no better, we inform him that these are the words of inspired Paul. If by them I am condemned a heretic, so is Paul; but Paul never believed that Christ was a mere man—a created being; and by him have I been taught to believe the same.

It is well known to all that know me, that I differed from the Presbyterians on their speculations in their Confession of Faith on the Trinity, when I was a Presbyterian. Yet I was unanimously ordained by the Presbytery and held in communion by them. I was never charged with these things until I withdrew from them.

A person by reading the Scriptures may, by detaching texts and inferences, come to the conclusion that Unitarianism and all its doctrines are taught in that Book. This thousands of very intelligent men have done. It cannot be strange if Mr. Rice, with his ingenuity and prejudice against an humble uninspired man, should by the same means come to the conclusions he has publicly stated against me. I should not wonder if he, by the same means, should prove any Trinitarian writer (those who wrote the Confession of Faith not excepted) to be a Unitarian. Even Professor Stuart can see but a light shade of difference between the notion of a derived being, (as the orthodox view the Son of God to be), and of a created being, as the Arians assert he is. To quibbling there is no end. I have long since viewed the practice as useless and dangerous, and leave it to those who are fond of trifles.

I do not expect to change the mind of Mr. Rice by anything I have said or can say; for he boasted, as I am informed, that he was dyed in the wool, and therefore unchangeable. He will still affirm what he said against me, maugre all evidence. A noted physician of Spain had introduced a system of physic, upon which he had practised and taught through life. When he became old, one of his former students advised him before he died to make a recantation of the system, as it was now
found to be wrong, and injurious to the community. "Sir," said the old doctor, "let all Spain perish first; for I have written and published it." So may Mr. Rice say, Let Stone's name be forever blasted, and infamy be forever attached to his character, before I retract, for I have said and published it to the world.

For the sake of others, I will briefly state my belief on those doctrines with which I am charged:—

1. "With us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him," (eis auton, for him). I. Cor. viii: 6.

2. And (there is) one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him, (di' autou). I. Cor. viii: 7.

From these texts I have concluded that the Father is the but one God—called by Jesus himself "the only true God." John xvii: 3. This one God the Father is distinguished from all other beings in the universe by this attribute, "of him are all things." In the Greek it is ex hou, of, or out of whom are all things. This is conceded by all to mean that he was the efficient or prime cause of all things in the universe. In the following verse Jesus Christ is called the one Lord, besides whom there is not another in the universe possessing the same attributes here ascribed to him, as "by whom all things, and we by him." In the Greek it reads di' hou, by whom. This attribute dia, with the genitive, is nowhere ascribed to the Father, the one God; for it means the instrumental cause, as every Grecian will admit, and, therefore, cannot apply to the Father, the prime and efficient cause of all things.

3. According to this common sense exegesis, I believe that "God created all things by (dia) Jesus Christ." Heb. i:12. "That he created the worlds and heavens, with all the inhabitants of heaven, whether they be angels, principalities, or powers—all were made by him,"

(di' autou,) the instrumental cause, not up' autou, the prime cause; this upo can only apply to the Father in the case; and all these things were made for him, (eis auton,) as being the heir of all things.

By the son the Father rules the universe; for the Apostle adds, "By him (di' autou) all things consist" i.e., are kept in being and order, by him, the Lord and maker of all.

By the Son, or Word, the Father spake to the world all the words of salvation; for "God in these days has spoken unto us by (dia) his Son;" by whom (di' autou) he saves, and will at last "judge the world in righteousness"; and (dia) by whom he wrought miracles, wonders, and signs, for the confirmation of truth.

These undisputed truths, so clearly revealed, naturally were linked with another important truth; seeing all things were made by him, therefore, "he was before all things." He that descended is the same also that ascended up where he was before, above all angels, principalities, and powers unto heaven itself. Just before he ascended, the Son prayed to the Father
to glorify him with himself, with the glory he had with him before the world was. This with many other texts proves that the Son, or Logos, existed in glory with the Father before the world was—before all created things in the universe; without him was not one thing made that is made.

This glorious being is the Son of God, and therefore Divine—the children of men are human, because begotten and born of human parents—so is the Son of God divine, because begotten of the divine Father.

I have rejected the speculations respecting Jesus by many, which rejection is the sum or foundation of the heresy attached to me by the self-styled orthodox. The Jews concluded that Christ had made himself God and equal to God, because he said, I am the Son of God. Though our Lord refuted the inference of duality of Gods in very plain language, yet the Jews would not open their eyes to conviction; but accused him of blasphemy, for saying he was the Son of God; for which he was put to death. Christians have adopted their speculation that he is the one God, equal to the Father, because he called himself the Son of God.

Some say that he is the eternal Son of God. This unscriptural and contradictory phrase I have also rejected as a mere speculation, and so have many of the orthodox and evangelists. Why are not they charged with Unitarianism too! These latter say he was never the Son of God till born of Mary—"that holy thing which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God." From this text they argue that he was never the Son before; but that holy thing, when born, shall be called, in future, the Son of God; and was, therefore, never Son before. This reasoning will prove fatal to their whole system. Isaiah ix: 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father." From the argument above, it follows that he never was such till born; for then, in future, he shall be called such. Would it not be better to omit these speculations, and confine ourselves to the language of Scripture on this doctrine? So I think; and have but little interest in them.

4. I believe the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the World, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. I believe that all power and authority in heaven and earth are given unto him, and that he is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him; that in him are all the measures of wisdom and knowledge; that it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell—the fulness of the godhead, the fulness of the Spirit, the fulness of grace and salvation. When we see him we see the Father—his image, his character, his glory, and perfection. Let me lose life before I would detract from my Lord one ray of his glory. To him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb be everlasting praise! Amen!

B. W. STONE.
The loss of Stone to the movement was deeply and widely felt. He was the very embodiment of all that is noble and saintly in character. Even those who opposed his religious views most bitterly, willingly acknowledge his splendid character. His death came, too, at a time when his counsel was greatly needed. There had not been much reaction from a tendency which has already been noticed, viz., doctrinal Tightness, rather than practical efficiency. The result of this tendency was to foster debates. Nearly everywhere these were encouraged, and while perhaps the Disciples did not specially lead in this encouragement, they certainly were more than willing to accept any reasonable challenge that might be made to them. The very atmosphere was full of the spirit of discussion.

It is perhaps true that this state of things could not be well avoided. The Disciple plea was necessarily aggressive. It struck at the very foundation of sectarianism. It unequivocally denied the right of the sects to exist, and it was the implacable enemy to everything that divided the people of God. On the principle that self-preservation is the first law of nature, the denominations put themselves in battle array against this dangerous foe. They very largely ceased fighting each other for the time being, and unitedly made war upon the common enemy. Thus the conflict began and continued for a number of years. It was at its highest point of development in 1843.

Stone was a man of peace. He avoided conflict wherever it could be done without endangering the truth. He was, however, courageous, and feared not any man when his convictions led him to defend the truth. But he saw the danger of the tendency to run the movement on purely intellectual lines, and consequently, during the latter part of his life he was constantly urging the practical side of the Christian life, rather than the doctrinal. Indeed, from the beginning, he had not felt much interest in the discussion of points of difference. He rather favoured the policy of letting these alone, and emphasising the points of agreement, believing that differences would cease to exist, or at least cease to be noticed, when we were high enough in the Divine life to see over the top of these. He realised that the valleys that lie between the mountains are noticed only when we are low down where these valleys exist, but when we have reached a
higher position we see only the mountain tops, and the valleys practically disappear.

Mr. Stone's influence on the Restoration movement has never been fairly estimated. He was so overshadowed by the great men at Bethany that his real worth has not received the attention it deserves. It is true he was not a leader like Mr. Campbell was. Indeed, in this respect, there was no other man anything like the equal of Campbell. He was a born leader, and if it had not been for his wise counsel, his almost infinite courage, and his indomitable energy, it is practically certain that the movement would have been wrecked long before it reached the time now under consideration. Mr. Campbell was not at first favourable to debates himself, but feeling the strength of his position, and also the importance of bringing it in a popular way before the people, he was not disinclined to discussion where and when he felt this would be to the advantage of the cause he was pleading.

The Presbyterians in Kentucky had been considering for some time the propriety of meeting Mr. Campbell in public debate with one of their champions. They finally selected Mr. N. L. Rice, who at that time was well known as one of their strongest men, and particularly well equipped for a discussion with such a man as Mr. Campbell. Accordingly, in 1843, arrangements were made for a debate, in harmony with the following programme:

1. The debate shall commence on Wednesday, 15th November.
2. To be held in the Reform Church.
3. Judge Robertson, selected by Mr. Rice, as moderator. Col. Speed Smith, selected by Mr. Campbell. And agreed that these two shall select a president-moderator. In case of either of the above named gentlemen declining to act, Judge Breck was selected by Mr. Rice, as alternate to Judge Robertson—and Col. Caperton as alternate to Col. Speed Smith.
4. In the opening of each new subject, the affirmant shall occupy one hour, and the respondent, the same time; and each thereafter half hour alternately to the termination of each subject. The debate shall commence at ten o'clock a. m., and continue until two o'clock p. m., unless hereafter changed.
5. On the final negative no new matter shall be introduced.
6. The propositions for discussion are the following:

I. The immersion in water of a proper subject into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is the one, only
Apostolic, or Christian baptism. Mr. Campbell affirms—Mr. Rice denies.

II. The infant of a believing parent is a scriptural subject of baptism. Mr. Rice affirms—Mr. Campbell denies.

III. Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins. Mr. Campbell affirms—Mr. Rice denies.

IV. Baptism is to be administered only by a bishop or ordained presbyter. Mr. Rice affirms—Mr. Campbell denies.

V. In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the word of truth. Mr. Campbell affirms—Mr. Rice denies.

VI. Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical. Mr. Campbell affirms—Mr. Rice denies.

7. No question shall be discussed more than three days, unless by agreement of parties. Each debatant shall furnish a stenographer.

9. It shall be the privilege of the debaters to make any verbal or grammatical changes in the stenographer's report, that shall not alter the state of the argument, or change any fact.

10. The net available amount, resulting from the publication, shall be equally divided between the two American Bible societies.

11. This discussion shall be conducted in the presence of Dr. Fishback, President Shannon, John Smith, and A. Raines, on the part of the Reformation; and President Young, James K. Burch, J. F. Price, and John H. Brown, on the part of Presbyterianism.

12. The debatants agree to adopt as "rules of decorum" those found in Hedges' Logic, p. 159, to wit:

   Rule I. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the point at issue, should be clearly defined, that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them.

   Rule II. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality, in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and a desire for truth with himself; and that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong, and his adversary in the right.

   Rule III. All expressions which are unmeaning or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided.

   Rule IV. Personal reflections on an adversary should, in no instance, be indulged.

   Rule V. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

   Rule VI. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced, on either side, should be examined with fairness and candour; and any
attempt to answer an adversary by arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, cavilling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honourable controversy.

On the day appointed, the debate commenced with Honourable Henry Clay, Chief Moderator. It is not necessary here to give an extended account of this debate. The disputants were as different as two men could possibly be. Mr. Campbell dealt mainly in generalisation, looking at the Christian system in its comprehensiveness, and showing with admirable clearness how every part of the system fits exactly the place assigned to it in the Book of God's revelation. Mr. Rice, however, seemed not to care for comprehensive matters at all, but seemed most concerned with the exceptions to these, and as it has been said truly, there are no rules without exceptions, Mr. Rice made as much as he possibly could make out of the exceptions which he found to Mr. Campbell's comprehensive statements. Of course this method had a certain advantage before a popular audience, as there are few people who can keep the whole system of truth in their minds while that system is under consideration, but they can always see a special opening that has been made in the compact lines of a consistent argument. Mr. Campbell was a comprehensive general, marshalling his forces in regular military order, and conducting the battle according to the most approved rules of military tactics; while Mr. Rice was practically a guerrilla captain, always on the lookout for a special opportunity to strike a blow at some unguarded point, and whose victories were always won, if won at all, by suddenly entering the lines of his opponent at these apparently weak places. He never gave battle where the terms were equal, nor were his tactics generally in harmony with the accepted rules of honourable discussion. Mr. Rice's method in this respect seemed to be actually constitutional. He seemed to have no conception of Christianity as a great whole, but saw only certain parts of it at a time, and these he tried to co-ordinate with his specific system of theology, without any apparent regard to the consequence that might accrue to the harmony which exists in God's revelation to man.

It is impossible to follow this debate to the end, but it may be well to give a specimen of the respective styles of
the disputants. While discussing the first proposition, Mr. Campbell said:

The question now before us concerns the *action*—the thing commanded to be done. This is, of course the most important point—the significant and all-absorbing point. Paul gives it high rank and consequence when he says, "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism." There are not two modes of any one of these. When we have ascertained that one action called baptism, there can be no other. I said yesterday, and I repeat it this morning, that it is wholly sophistical to talk of two modes of baptism, unless, indeed, it be two ways of immersing a person. In this sense there may be a plurality of modes. A person may be immersed backwards or forwards, kneeling or standing. Other modes than these there cannot be. Sprinkling is not a mode of immersing; neither is immersion a mode of sprinkling. If sprinkling, pouring, and immersion be modes of baptism, then I ask, what is the *thing* called baptism? Who can explain this? Of *what* are these three specifically different actions, the mode? If sprinkling be a mode, and pouring a mode, and immersing a mode, then baptism is something *incognito*—something which no philologist or lexicographer can explain. I pronounce these modes an unmeaning, sophistical jargon, which no one can comprehend.

Baptism is not a *mode*—it is an *action*. The word that represents it is improperly, by Mr. Carson, called a word of *mode*. It is a specific action; and the verb that represents it is a verb of specific import; else there is no such verb in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin.*

In reply to this argument of Mr. Campbell with respect to the specific definiteness of *baptidzo*, Mr. Rice contended that *baptidzo* expresses the *thing done*, the application of water to a person or thing, but does not express the mode of doing it.

Now, if Mr. Campbell had been specially concerned in answering his opponent according to his folly, he could have said, "If the baptism is the *thing that is done*, then undoubtedly Mr. Rice would find his argument a boomerang reacting upon himself. Suppose the matter is tested by an imaginary baptism. We have present three candidates: one wishes to be immersed, another to be sprinkled, and another poured. Let us now look carefully at what is *done*. In the first case the candidate is immersed. What is the baptism? Surely not the *person* who is baptized, for he is the subject; not the *water*, for
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that is the element in which the baptism takes place, not the administrator, for he performs the baptism; not the ceremony, for that is what proclaims it Christian baptism; but it is what is done, according to Mr. Rice, and what is done in this first case is immersion. Now what is the thing done in the second case? Evidently it is sprinkling. If you ask the same questions as we have in the first case, it will be found that the thing done is the baptism, and not the accessories which belong to it. But the thing done in this case is sprinkling, and not immersion. If we test the third case the same way, we shall find that the thing done in this case is also the baptism. Now what was the thing done in the first case? The answer is, immersion. What was the thing done in the second? The answer is, sprinkling. What was the thing done in the third case? The answer is, pouring. Now, is not immersion a distinct action from sprinkling, and pouring a distinct action from either immersion or sprinkling? If so, it follows that we have three distinct things done; and if the thing done in each case is the baptism, then it follows that we have three distinct baptisms, and not three distinct modes of doing the same thing—three different things performed. But as Paul says there is one baptism, it is evident that Mr. Rice does not agree with Paul, so that seeking to get away from the force of Mr. Campbell's argument, he "jumped out of the frying pan into the fire."

But from another point of view, Mr. Rice's argument is extremely weak and self-contradictory. If the Greek verb baptidzo means to immerse, to sprinkle, and to pour, or, to put it in another way, if this verb contains all three of these things done, then undoubtedly no one can be properly baptized until he is immersed, sprinkled, and poured.

But Mr. Campbell did not follow Mr. Rice in the fashion that would have been effective before a popular audience, and if he had done so, he would have scarcely met the case from a broad, comprehensive point of view.

The debate was published in 1844, and has had a large circulation. Taken altogether, it presents a very able discussion of the propositions that were under consideration; but it is doubtful whether the influence of the debate helped the cause of Christian union. It probably widened
the breach between the Presbyterians and the Disciples. Doubtless, in many individual cases Mr. Campbell's great arguments brought conviction, but the general influence of this debate, as well as others held during these days of discussion, did little more than draw the lines clearly between the Campbellian movement and the religious denominations. But this was a debating period, and it is probable that upon the whole these debates helped to clear the atmosphere, and to definitely define the great principles for which the Disciples contended, although in defining these principles the spirit of the movement, as a union movement, was to some extent undoubtedly changed from what it was at the beginning. But we must not forget that the movement had reached the period of reconstruction and development, and that this period necessarily required a separation of things that differed, as well as the co-ordination of things that legitimately belong to the Christian system.

Notwithstanding some benefits were derived from debates, it must be conceded that there were evils also which grew out of this debating period which probably overbalanced the good that resulted from them. A few of these evils may be enumerated as follows:

(1) The debates were often about things that the Disciples did not make conditions of fellowship. The whole movement centralised on essentials. Doubtless some of the questions that were discussed were important, such as the "operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion," "the design of baptism," "the doctrine of foreordination and election," etc., etc. But as these were questions of philosophy rather than fact, they could not be decided very certainly, and as they related to methods of the Divine government rather than the principles, the frequent discussion of them was perhaps not very profitable. The "how" of these things belonged to the sphere of opinionism, which the Disciples completely repudiated in their plan for Christian union.

(2) These debates tended to create a spirit of legalism, by making the letter much and the spirit little. The constant appeal to the exact statements of Scripture, while right in itself, may be abused when transferred to the forum. Exactness of Scriptural quotations was a thing to be highly commended, but an undue emphasis with re-
spect to this method of teaching was calculated to create a spirit of legalism which, in the long run, was no help to the cultivation of either brotherly love or the best interests of the truth. There is a logic of the heart as well as of the head, and this former was almost entirely ignored in the predominance of the latter.

(3) Very generally these debates magnified the system of Christianity rather than the author of the system. No doubt that, in some cases, men were more attracted to the Disciple movement on account of its convincing logic, than they were on account of its helpfulness in the development of the spiritual life. During many of these debates there was not much attempt to magnify the Master, but everything was made to serve the triumph of each side in the controversy, and this controversy was generally about things that were not indispensable to the salvation of the world.

(4) While debates were intended to assist in bringing about Christian union, they frequently had the contrary effect by emphasising a party spirit. Doubtless when they were conducted with an earnest desire on both sides to simply find out the truth, with respect to the matters discussed, then the result was in the interest of Christian union, because any union that is not based upon the truth cannot be regarded as of supreme value. But for the most part the debates of the period now under consideration were not conducted in the spirit of earnest inquiry, but rather with a view to partisan triumph.

(5) They often had a bad effect upon the unity and peace of neighbourhoods. This of itself made them seriously objectionable. While it is true that Christ came to put even the members of a family against each other, at the same time the ultimate aim of His coming was peace on earth and good will among men. It is probable that these debates were justified, if justified at all, mainly on the ground that truth always begets antagonism when it comes in contact with error. Doubtless where these debates were overwhelmingly conclusive on one side, the result was beneficial to the neighbourhoods where the debates were held; but when the neighbourhoods were about equally divided with respect to the contest, there was usually more harm done than good.

(6) They were generally contests for party victory more
than for the triumph of the truth. They stimulated a vicious method of studying the Scriptures by seeking to find those passages which seemed to sustain partyism. Each party to the debate was sure to discount the importance of all the Scriptures quoted to sustain the other side. This made the study of the Scriptures a sort of onesided affair, putting undue emphasis on the passages that were helpful to only one side, and treating indifferently the passages which seemed to help the other side.

(7) They generally ended with a victory proclaimed for each side, rather than a victory for the truth. Indeed, it was the victory for partyism that was mainly involved, though perhaps those who engaged in the debates were not conscious of this fact. Not the least evil was the transference of this spirit into the pulpits after the debates were concluded.

It is not here affirmed that all the debates were characterised as represented in the foregoing enumeration; but at the same time it must be confessed that many of them are fitly described in the description just given. Their evil tendency was perhaps not so clearly seen at the first, but after several years of experience in seeking union by friction, the Disciples began to change their tactics with respect to this matter, and the result is that, at the beginning of the twentieth century, they are much less belligerent than they were during the nineteenth century.

Perhaps their desire to be Scriptural in everything led them to place the emphasis upon Tightness rather than upon goodness; forgetting, or, at any rate, not realising that the highest reach in ethics is not the right, but the good—*the summum bonum*; but to be right and to be good are both important, and neither is of much value without the other. Those who lived through the debating period will remember that it was a common thing for Disciples to carry about with them their Bibles, and especially the New Testament, and they were always ready to give to every man that asked them a reason of the hope that was within them, though sometimes they did this without much meekness or fear. They quoted the Scriptures to *prove* that they were right, and thus far they did well, but it is to be feared that many of them stopped at that particular point, and did not go on to quote Scripture that they were practising what they preached. It was this
failure to reach the highest good, or the *sumnum bonum*, that grieved both Mr. Campbell and Mr. Stone, during the period under consideration. They both felt that many Disciples were studying the Scriptures with a view to proving their *system of religion was right*, but they did not study the Scriptures with a supreme anxiety to know how to build up Christian character.

After all, the Disciples ought not to be judged severely because of the tendency which has been indicated. They were in a period when the course they pursued was perhaps the inevitable result of the environment in which they were living. It has already been suggested that their main contest was with sectarianism, and this ugly thing had to be treated sometimes with considerable severity, and nearly always with a courage that often degenerated into a counter-partisan spirit. Doubtless courage was necessary, but it ought to have gone on to the top of Peter's great pyramid of character, *viz.*, *Jove*, or as Paul puts it in his triad, "Now abides Faith, Hope, and Love, but the greatest of these is Love."

But the Disciples were learning some things with respect to themselves. Doubtless they had to pass through the experience of the debating period in order to fully understand that Love is greater than either Faith or Hope. In the later days they are beginning to realise this great fact, and as they look backward to the days of conflict, with the various religious denominations, they are sometimes uncharitable toward the heroes of that day. The work that had to be done during the middle of the nineteenth century was very different from the work that has to be done in the twentieth century. It ought, furthermore, to be remembered that the Disciple movement in the nineteenth century did much to make the environment for the twentieth century, and had it not been for the vigorous contest which was waged by the pioneers of the movement it is probable that we would have to fight over the very battles in the twentieth century which they fought for us in the nineteenth century.
CHAPTER XVI

CONFLICT AND GROWTH

DURING the next two or three years the movement was characterised by at least three things:

1. The interest in education continued to grow. The various periodicals published by the Disciples at this time all advocated the founding and support of colleges, and these began to multiply, even faster perhaps than was wise at that particular period. Nevertheless, it has always been true that whatever is in the air may become epidemic. The profound interest which had been developed in education became almost epidemic with the Disciples in the establishment of colleges, so that it was not long until a number of these had been started without any adequate support. Very few people will be influenced by the experience of others. Each man must have his own experience before he will believe in a particular course of action. Even children will not believe their parents with respect to certain things; but these children must pass through an experience for themselves before they can be persuaded that what their parents have already told them is undoubtedly true. All this is very discouraging; and yet, if it were not true this world would be a paradise in a very little time. If we all profited by the experience of others, to the extent that we ought, of course none of the mistakes made by our ancestors would be repeated in our own case, and this would soon give to the world a civilisation without a single fault. The mistake the Disciples made, with respect to the establishment of too many colleges, or rather the attempt to establish them, was a very natural one under the circumstances. It was zeal without knowledge, and this is not the only case to be recorded with respect to such zeal in the history of the race.

2. The same tendency was manifested with respect to the planting of churches. These began to multiply far
beyond the possibility of providing them with proper overseers and means of spiritual development. But there was really no help for this. The evangelists in the field were doing a splendid work. Everywhere they were gaining victories for the simple Gospel, as they preached it. The news from the evangelistic field, at this time, presents a succession of triumphs in nearly all of the western and southwestern states. Not to plant churches was to give up the conquest of the country, and no one thought of that. Those who have criticised the early pioneers at this particular point have not reckoned properly with the facts. There was nothing else for them to do as evangelists (and nearly every preacher was an evangelist); they were compelled to take the course they did. To stop with those who had been gathered together and build them up in faith, hope, and love, was an impossibility, and even if it had been possible, it would have perhaps been unwise at this particular time. Of course there would be waste. There always is some waste in the building of anything. It is a most unreasonable criticism that has been made on the fathers of the movement by some of our wise pastors who stay strictly at home, draw large salaries, and enjoy the social life of a church, which perhaps owes its existence to the very enthusiasm of the pioneers. When a house is built all the material gathered is not usually used up in the construction of the building, and yet the very things that are thrown away are essential, in order that the workmen may have scope for the development of the general plan.

3. The growth of the organization idea has already been referred to. This now began to take form in the cooperation of churches. In Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, Indiana, and Iowa, as well as in Virginia, and a few other states, there was a profound feeling that, in order to do the work that was needed to be done, a very definite and earnest co-operation of churches must be provided for. In Kentucky this movement was led by John T. Johnson, who was always active in every good work. At that time he and B. F. Hall were editing a Church journal from Georgetown, Ky., and this journal gave no unmistakable sound as to the importance of co-operation, and also with respect to a sound financial system. Johnson reckoned the moneyed concerns of the Church to em-
brace four general items, and it is worth while to give these items and the development of his financial scheme in his own words:

1. The expenses of the church, in respect to her internal concerns.
2. The relief of the poor and destitute.
4. All other calls of necessity.

Now the first question that arises is this: How much shall be raised? In order to answer this, the field to be occupied and cultivated must be viewed and the means of the church considered. There can be no doubt that the object to be accomplished calls for the utmost stretch of our benevolence. Let us, then, endeavour to ascertain the Scriptural demand, if any has been made. This being done, it is presumed that no citizen of the kingdom would hesitate as to duty. It is required of a man according to what he has. Let us, then, endeavour to ascertain the Scriptural demand, if any has been made. This being done, it is presumed that no citizen of the kingdom would hesitate as to duty. It is required of a man according to what he has. And as the Lord loves a cheerful giver, so he has required of us to give cheerfully, as he has proposed or given to us. We are his stewards and must improve the talent he has given us. We are most positively forbidden to amass treasure upon the earth. We are, therefore, to keep what we have in actual employment in doing good.

What proportion of the means with which we are blessed shall be devoted to the cause? We may not be able to determine this point with mathematical certainty; but every lover of the cause whose soul is imbued with a desire for the conversion of the world, and whose mind is properly instructed in these matters; in a word, whose affections are supremely set upon heavenly things, may come to a safe conclusion. If I am worth $1,000, would it be oppressive to give $3.00 per annum for the advancement of the eternal interests of mankind? Would it be too much for the member worth $5,000 to give $15.00? Or for a member worth $10,000 to give $15.00? In the general, such a donation to the cause would not be felt, or if felt, it would be to the generous contributor as the savor of life unto life. Such a system as this, if practised, would soon bear the gospel over America and Europe. The present poor, pitiful state of things is enough to make a Christian blush and hide his head. Look at the noble, generous hearted Christians at Jerusalem. They gave all into the Apostle's hands. They distributed to all as they needed. When this became too burdensome to the apostles, the church chose seven men, whose office it was to attend to those temporalities. Ananias and Sapphira concealed a part of theirs and were struck dead. Let us take care how we conceal, or draw back from duty. But what general system would embrace the principles laid down by the apostles? I will suggest one to which I am willing to yield:
1. Let the elders and deacons chosen by the congregation, be a committee to raise and disburse the funds.

2. Let the names of the members be arranged in the alphabetical order.

3. Let each member promptly furnish the committee the value of his or her estate.

4. Let the congregation determine by themselves as a body, or by their committee, what sum shall be raised (annually) to accomplish the objects set forth, as far as practicable.

5. Let the committee ascertain, at an equal rate, what each member has to pay, and affix it to his or her name.

6. Let the members be furnished, each, with his or her quota, in writing.

7. Let the payments be made in monthly proportions.

8. Let the payments be made to the treasurer of the Committee, without a collector.

9. Let the Committee disburse all the funds, as they are demanded by the exigencies as they arise.

10. Let the reports of the Committee be made, in writing, to the Church quarterly.

11. Let those who cannot perceive the propriety of the measure, bear with those who prefer its adoption.

12. Let those who prefer to aid by subscription, or otherwise, do so.*

In an article of his in the *Christian Journal*, of March 28, 1846, under the head of "Triumphs and Defence of the Reformation," he gives a very full and informative view of the work that had been done, as well as some of the things that are still wanting. In this luminous article he refers especially to the progress that had been made among the Baptists themselves with respect to the things that were decidedly wrong at the beginning of the Reformatory movement. The spirit of this Address may be gathered from the following extract:

Within a few years past, the different religious parties have manifested toward each other and the reformation, a forebearing, tolerant, and kind spirit, which has been calculated to cheer the heart of the Christian philanthropist. Such have been the demonstrations on the part of our Baptist friends, the hope has been inspired that, at no distant day, a union with us would be proposed by them upon the Bible alone, freed from the speculations, opinions, traditions, and philosophy of men. Such a union would shake the religious world to the

centre and accomplish a revolution, the extent and blessings of which would overwhelm the most enthusiastic with astonishment. But these inspiring hopes are frequently blasted by the firebrands which are occasionally hurled at us in the most contemptuous and indignant manner, by the war-spirits of the party. On such occasions, we are strongly tempted to apply the rod of castigation; but regret and concern for the person—a supreme regard for the authority of the Lord Jesus, and the most ardent desire for the conversion of the world, subdue our resentment, and urge us to be kind and conciliatory. The religious world is too fiery already; and, so far from pandering to the angry passions, we should pour oil upon the troubled waters. It is much more pleasant to praise than to censure; and on many occasions it is not only allowable, but justifiable, to cast the mantle of oblivion over the past.

But there are times when truth, justice, and propriety, demand a faithful exposure, that posterity may profit by the past. Every reformation, since the great apostasy, has been most bitterly and shamefully opposed. The basest intrigues and combinations, and the grossest misrepresentations have been resorted to; but the truth has finally triumphed.

The present reformation has not escaped. It has been the subject of the most unprovoked, ungodly assaults; and its progress has been opposed by the most pernicious influences. We have been objects of bitter malignity and unmeasured abuse; and if, at any time, we indulged in exposing the recklessness and wickedness of such conduct, it has furnished an additional stimulant for unbounded ridicule and vulgar abuse. Our motives have been adjudged dishonest; our religious profession has been scoffed at; and the doctrine advocated by us, has been treated as the result of human philosophy—as the offspring of deluded human ambition. If we have committed blunders under such circumstances, it is not a matter of wonder. It is rather astonishing that so few errors have been committed—more especially, as we have been infested (as is the case more or less with every party) with spies and traitors in the army. My beloved brethren: The circumstances which surround us most imperiously demand that we should be "prudent as serpents and harmless as doves"; that we should be guarded in all that we say and do, lest an injury be inflicted which can never be repaired. We have had to battle for victory against fearful odds. We have had to contend and toil hard for every inch of ground we have gained; and we have been most unfeelingly reproached because we have gained no more. The conquest, however, has been unparalleled, except in the primitive age. Victory has crowned our efforts thus far. And many of our opponents have judged it safest to turn a deaf ear to our preaching. They have witnessed the mighty power of the ancient gospel. They have seen it sweep the land like a tornado. A community of 200,000 or more, banded
together in the holiest ties of brotherhood, in less than eighteen years, furnishes unequivocal demonstration of its power; and even the locking of doors has not proved a safeguard against it.

In such a case we have no use for cowards or drones. We have no compromise to make. The divine system, as laid down in the New Testament, must be received and submitted to most unreservedly. The unity of the Church—not only in name but in fact—and the conversion of the world, must be recognised and laboured for. To accomplish objects so desirable—so transcendentally important, there are needed true, loyal, iron-hearted soldiers of the cross, the ruling passion of whose souls is the love of God and love to man. The merely ambitious, envious, sectarian spirit must be crushed, as of Satanic origin.

It can be said in truth, and it has been most abundantly and joyfully realised by thousands of choice spirits of the parties of the day, that the present reformation, as regards the ancient gospel and ancient order of things, with their accompanying blessings, privileges, and enjoyments, is far in advance of anything that has been plead since the great apostasy. It is emphatically a return to primitive Christianity, as impressed upon the pages of the Divine Volume.

The Ancient Apostolic Gospel has been restored in all its purity. Men are addressed by it as rational, intelligent, and accountable beings; and immediate confession and obedience to the Saviour demanded. This discovery and practical presentation of the gospel is sufficient of itself to constitute a man the benefactor of his race. This has not only been done, but professors of religion are now left without apology for their scandalous and ruinous divisions. The sinner is pointed to obedience as with the light of the sun; and the Christian is led infallibly to the true Church. The Saviour, as with the voice of thunder and a scathing blast of lightning, has denounced the unauthorised, ungodly schisms which exist under the pretended sanction of his Name; as if he ever gave countenance to their names or creeds—or ever sanctioned their abuses of the Gospel!

Our efforts may be derided; we may be insulted, mocked, and scoffed at; the most vulgar epithets may be applied to us; the pen of detraction and slander may subject us to the hatred and odium of many; but the impartial historian will award ample justice in transmitting to posterity a faithful narrative. These divine principles, acted out by our children, will redeem our names and motives from temporary obloquy; and the advocates of this reformation will be hailed as the benefactors of the nineteenth century. But the most delightful reflection of all is, that the Saviour will award the plaudit, "Well done," at the great day, before an assembled universe.

Those of every party and of every name, who have experienced the superlative bliss of intelligent submission to this
divine system, have felt and acknowledged their gratitude to God, that their lives were spared to realise it; and they have felt and expressed their great obligations to those who were the agents in the divine administration, in bringing them into the glorious liberty and light of its gospel.*

In Ohio, also, there were very marked advances made with respect to co-operation. When the Baptist Associations came over to the Reformatory movement, simply "yearly meetings" were substituted for the meetings of the Associations. These yearly meetings began to develop toward meetings for business, as well as for preaching the Gospel. Several churches began to work together in sending out an evangelist, and also co-operated with respect to other things. But every step of this kind taken was more or less opposed by men who thought they saw in this tendency a shadow of an ecclesiasticism, a thing they dreaded more than almost any other calamity that might befall them. Mr. Campbell himself was constantly quoted by these hesitating brethren. His articles in the Christian Baptist against the clergy and against ecclesiasticism were eagerly brought forward as proof that he himself was opposed to the entering wedge which Christian co-operation was supposed to be. But Mr. Campbell, in the Millennial Harbinger, frequently repudiated this interpretation placed upon his earlier writings. He claimed that his articles in the Christian Baptist were aimed at abuses rather than legitimate uses. He earnestly advocated in the Harbinger the co-operation of churches, and insisted that this was absolutely necessary in order that the Restoration movement might be a great success. Indeed, some of the strongest articles ever written by him were written in the 40's, in support of organised work, both in individual churches and also in a co-operative system that would enable many churches to work together.

Walter Scott also strongly sustained the movement in favor of co-operation. He had been for several years located at Carthage, Ohio, near Cincinnati, and had done much both with pen and tongue to forward the movement in southern Ohio. But in 1844 he left Carthage and located in Pittsburg, where he preached for both the church
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in Pittsburg and the one in Allegheny City; and at the same time he edited a paper, entitled the "Protestant Unionist" which did most excellent service for Protestantism as a whole, as well as for the Restoration movement to which he was specially committed. From this point he made excursions into various parts of the country, where he was always received with enthusiasm by the people, as he had at this time reached his most mature manhood.

In Missouri the co-operation movement had made considerable advance by the middle of this decade. Under the leadership of T. M. Allen several churches in several parts of the state were accustomed to co-operate and hold yearly meetings. Almost the only reliable statistics that can be found about this time are given by Mr. Allen in his reports to these co-operative meetings. For several years he made annual reports of the progress of the cause, and from these reports, as well as from a few other sources, it is evident that before the year 1850 the Disciples numbered in Missouri not less than 50,000, and it is also evident that not the least influential factor in bringing this great result was the co-operation of the churches, even in the somewhat limited way which prevailed at that time.

In Iowa and Indiana, the same tendency was distinctly manifested. In both of these states the cause was greatly benefitted by the union of forces in sending out the Gospel and in providing for the care of the weaker churches that were unable to support themselves. At the beginning of the year 1845, the first really general co-operative society was formed. This movement was led by D. S. Burnett, of Cincinnati, and the headquarters of the Society were located at that city. The following preamble and constitution, with the officers, will sufficiently indicate the scope of this society, as well as the lofty aim which its founders had in view:

"Whereas, the Sacred Scriptures, the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and the Greek of the New, are the only authoritative divine standard, containing the only revelations of God to the human race extant; and,

Whereas, it is the duty of Christians, who are called "the light of the world," to acquaint the human family with those revelations, by faithfully and thoroughly translating and cir-
culating them; We, whose names are undersigned, resolve to unite our labours under the following

CONSTITUTION

Article I. The name of this Association shall be the American Christian Bible Society.

Article II. It shall be the object of this Society to aid in the distribution of the Sacred Scriptures, without note or comment, among all nations.

Article III. Each contributor of one dollar annually, shall be a member.

Article IV. Each contributor of twenty-five dollars at one time, shall be a life member.

Article V. Each contributor of one hundred dollars shall be a life director.

Article VI. All Bible Co-operations, or Societies, agreeing to place their surplus funds in the Treasury of this Society, shall be auxiliaries, and shall have the right to appoint one director; and for every fifty members, they shall be entitled to another director. The Parent Society, located in Cincinnati, shall be entitled to one director, and another director for every twenty-five members; all which directors shall assemble at the time and place of the annual meeting.

Article VII. A Board, consisting of a President, nine Vice-Presidents, Corresponding and Recording Secretaries and Treasurer, together with twenty-five Managers, shall be appointed annually to conduct the business of the Society. The President, two Vice-Presidents, Secretaries, Treasurer, and sixteen of the Managers, shall reside in Cincinnati, or its vicinity. The members of the Board shall continue in office until superseded by a new election and shall have power to fill such vacancies as may occur in their number.

Article VIII. The Board of Managers, and their officers, shall meet monthly, or oftener, if necessary, at such time and place as they shall adjourn to; seven of whom shall be a quorum.

Article IX. The Board of Managers shall have power to appoint such persons as may have rendered essential services to the Society, members for life, or life directors.

Article X. At the meeting of the Society, and of the Board of Managers and Directors, the President, or in his absence the Vice-President first upon the list then present, and in the absence of all the Vice-Presidents, the Treasurer, and in his absence such member as shall be chosen for that purpose, shall preside.

Article XI. The annual meeting of the Society, and Directors, shall be held in Cincinnati, on the day before the last Wednesday in April, in each year, or at any other time, at the option of the Society; when the accounts of the Treasurer shall be presented, and a President, Vice-Presidents, Secretaries, Treasurer, and such other officers as they may deem
necessary, together with a Board of Managers, shall be chosen the ensuing year, by the Directors entitled to vote on the Treasurer's books, at the beginning of the said month.

Article XII. The President shall, at the written request of six members of the Board, call a special meeting of the Board of Managers, causing at least three days' notice of such meeting to be given.

Article XIII. The whole of the minutes of every meeting, shall be signed by the Chairman and Secretary.

Article XIV. No alteration shall be made in this Constitution, except by a vote of two-thirds of the Society and Directors present at an annual meeting.

President.
D. S. BURNETT, Cincinnati.

Vice-Presidents.

Corresponding Secretary.
J. J. Moss, Cincinnati; B. S. LAWSON, M.D., Cincinnati; ALEX. CAMPBELL, President Bethany College; WALTER SCOTT, Pittsburg; JOHN T. JOHNSON, Kentucky; JOHN O'KANE, Indiana; H. P. GATCHELL, Iowa; EPHRAIM A. SMITH, Georgia; ELEAZER PARMLY, M.D., New York City.

Recording Secretary.
JAMES CHALLEN, Cincinnati.

Treasurer.
THURSTON CRANE, Cincinnati.

Managers.
J. RAY, M.D., Cincinnati; OWEN OWENS, Cincinnati; S. S. CLARK, Cincinnati; W. P. STRATTON, Cincinnati; GEORGE TAIT, Cincinnati; GEO. W. RICE, Cincinnati; A. TROWBRIDGE, Cincinnati; G. VANAUUSDAL, Cincinnati; JAMES HOPPLE, Cincinnati; THOMAS EMERY, Cincinnati; N. S. HUBBELL, Cincinnati; J. GETZENDIER, Cincinnati; JAS. LESLIE, Cincinnati; WM. LOCKWOOD, Cincinnati; GEO. S. JENKINS, Cincinnati; JOSIAH FOBES, Cincinnati; THOMAS TAYLOR, Philadelphia; T. FANNING, Tennessee; T. M. ALLEN, Missouri; JOHN T. JONES, Illinois; A. CRIFIELD, Kentucky; S. CHURCH, Pennsylvania; W. HAYDEN, W. Reserve, Ohio; WM. CLARK, Jackson, Mississippi; FRANCIS K. DUNCAN, Baltimore.

While this Society was opposed by some reactionary men, on the ground that it was a society and not a church, it evidently marks the beginning of better things for the Disciples of Christ. It was thought by some that even Alexander Campbell did not specially approve of the Society, but in the Harbinger for 1845 he distinctly affirms
that his main objection was grounded upon the fact that the movement had not received the
general concurrence and support of the whole brotherhood, and furthermore there was no
particular need for a separate organization of this sort, for the reason that the same work
proposed was being already done by other religious parties, and especially by the Baptists.
Nevertheless, he was extremely friendly to the men who had undertaken the matter, and was
hopeful that the Society might do much good.

This Society did not count for very much as an effective organization, but it was most
valuable as indicating that the time had come when the Disciples, as a whole, must work
together in some effective organization; and as they claimed to take the Bible and the Bible
alone for their rule of faith and practice, it was thought by Mr. Burnett and those associated
with him, that a Bible Society was the very thing to give expression to the faith of the
Disciples which they professed to have in the book which they proposed to follow. We shall
see shortly how this Society led to another, when the Disciples practically began their general
co-operative work.

Meantime other things were taking place in 1845. The Trustees of Bethany College this
year elected W. K. Pendleton Vice-President of the College. He had married Mr. Campbell's
daughter, Lavinia, October 14, 1840. He had also been serving in the College as one of its
professors, and in 1846, his name appears on the title page of the January number of the
Millennial Harbinger as associate editor with Alexander Campbell.

Mr. Pendleton had been educated at the University of Virginia, and was connected with
the Pendleton family of East Virginia; and as he became intimately associated, not only with
Mr. Campbell, but also with the religious movement from this time until his death, it is well to
give a somewhat detailed account of his life and character, especially as he deserves a very
high place among the men who made the movement what it is:

Dr. Pendleton was perhaps the best representative man among the better educated class of
the Disciples. He was intellectual and scholarly; but this does not express that which
characterised him most of all. He possessed that indescribable charm which comes only of
good breeding, and which cannot be produced by any of the ordinary
methods of collegiate education. It has its roots in mother-culture, and always dates back to the home circle. A true man is, therefore, practically made before he enters the college or university. The latter may be important in the full development of a strong manhood, but without the foundation furnished in the right kind of home life, the after-glow will always be obscured by occasional clouds of ominous hue. This fact emphasizes the great value of a true family life in order to the production of characters that will live in history.

William Kimbrough Pendleton was born in Louisa County, Virginia, September 8, 1817, and died September 1, 1899; consequently he was eighty-two years old, lacking one week, when the end came. Having lived over three-quarters of a century, through one of the most remarkable periods in the world's history, and having contributed no small portion of interest to that period, he went peacefully to rest, amid the scenes where most of his active life had been spent.

He was of English descent, and his ancestors, both paternal and maternal, from the earliest history of this country, occupied distinguished positions in the state and the church. His mother was brought up under Episcopal influence, but his father, Colonel Edmond Pendleton, did not become a member of any church until the son was sixteen years of age. However, having become an earnest reader of the Christian Baptist and Millennial Harbinger, he was finally baptized and became an earnest advocate of the religious movement inaugurated by Alexander Campbell and others.

At that time the new religious movement was freely discussed in nearly every family in Virginia. Colonel Pendleton's home was no exception to this rule. Every position of the "Reformation," as it was then called, received the fullest and severest investigation; and while listening to these discussions, the son had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the principles of the great religious movement, which he, in after years, advocated with such distinguished ability.

From his earliest boyhood his education was carefully provided for. After attending for several years the best schools in that part of the state, he entered the University of Virginia, where, besides the academical school, he
studied the law two years and was licensed to practise. During most of this time he had been a regular reader of the *Christian Baptist* and *Millennial Harbinger*, and a constant and earnest student of the Word of God. He acted also as amanuensis for his father in conducting some epistolary discussions with a Baptist preacher and others; heard Elder S. Higgason and James Bagley preach for years, besides hearing occasionally many of the most distinguished preachers among the Disciples; was constantly in company with Disciples at his father's house; and above all, and before all, was carefully trained from his infancy by a pious mother—"a woman possessing the gentleness and mildness of a child, combined with the firmness and courage of a Spartan mother—extremely modest and unobtrusive, yet when drawn into conversation, showing great depth of thought and clearness of perception and a mind well stored with information." Such was the character of the religious influences brought to bear upon him, and under these, having come to a full understanding of his duty, he was in June, 1840, immersed by Alexander Campbell, at the Mt. Gilboa Church, Louisa County, Virginia, being at the time in the twenty-third year of his age. In the fall of 1840 he was married to Lavinia M., daughter of Alexander Campbell, a lady of brilliant intellect and beautiful Christian character, who died in the spring of 1846.

In August, 1848, he was again married—this time to Clarinda, also a daughter of Alexander Campbell. Mr. Campbell's celebrated letters from Europe were addressed to this daughter. She was greatly beloved by all who knew her, and was thoroughly devoted to the cause of Christ. She died in January, 1851, rich in good works, and "meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light." In the autumn of 1855, he was again married—to Catherine H., daughter of Judge Leceister King, of Warren, Trumbull County, Ohio.

In all the positions which Mr. Pendleton filled he gained distinguished honour for himself. He finally resigned the presidency of Bethany College and settled at Eustis, Fla., where he bought him a beautiful home on the lake of the same name. It was here in this Florida home, among the orange trees, in company with his books and magazines, that he spent the latter years of his life.
Through his influence a church was organised at Eustis and a comfortable building erected. He was on a visit to Bethany, W. Va., when he died. There was perhaps no spot on earth that was more sacred to him than Bethany, and it was no doubt in harmony with his own wishes that his earthly life should close there.

In closing this altogether too brief notice, only a few characteristics, which seem to have been prominently associated with Dr. Pendleton, can be mentioned.

(1) He was a gentleman. Much is meant by this characterisation. There is the width of the poles in difference between a gentleman and a genteelman. The latter often makes a favourable impression upon society, when, in fact, he does not carry with him a single mark of a gentleman.

Christianity does much for the most rugged natures, but it does not always make a gentleman. However, it is well to distinguish between the Christianity of Christ and that which is labeled Christianity, but which very inadequately represents the mind of the Master. But even the best form of Christianity has uphill work with some men to make them gentlemen. It is just here that environment tells with great force. But there is something else besides environment. Heredity is a controlling factor. In making a gentleman there is nothing more important than stock. Perhaps a man is influenced most by his mother in the matter under consideration. Her softening, refining influence often tells with overpowering effect in developing gentlemanly characteristics. This was one of the important factors in Dr. Pendleton's life. His mother was a most remarkable woman, and to her he was most indebted for those special qualities which made him the gentleman he was.

(2) Dr. Pendleton was not only a gentleman, but a gentleman of the old school. This means much with those who lament the fact that the gentlemen of this school are rapidly passing away. There are only a few of them left. Dr. Pendleton was one of the most distinguished of this class. It is a class, too, which cannot be very well described. They are men whose presence you feel, but you cannot analyse the force which touches you. You are swayed by courtesy, suavity, and delicacy, but you cannot tell exactly how these are combined or what the method precisely is which brings them to bear upon your
own personality. You bow with respect to the man who stands in your presence, realising his supreme manhood and yet not knowing how that manhood really affects you. Dr. Pendleton was a master in this unconscious art. He never seemed to know he was graceful, but his every movement in the social circle personified the old Latin "otium cum dignitate." I have never known a man who could make himself more at ease, more interesting, or more impressive whenever he chose to do so. He was not the least obtrusive. He gave one a sense of his humility more than anything else. He was modest to a high degree, but at the same time he moved with a consciousness of power, which gave every action its normal proportion and made his whole conduct symmetrical and dignified.

(3) He was not so much technically a scholar as he was an educated man. This is a distinction which needs to be emphasised. It is possible for a man to be a scholar without education, and it is equally possible for a man to be highly educated without possessing much scholarship. Dr. Pendleton was not specially a scholar. There were some things in which he excelled. He was well up in philosophical studies. He was also no mean linguist. But he made no special claim to an extended technical scholarship of any kind. Nevertheless, he was perhaps the most widely read man in the ranks of the Disciples. He read all the choice books of even modern literature, while the old masters were as familiar to him as his household gods. His literary faculty was of the finest quality. His soul seemed to respond with the liveliest appreciation to every touch of genius. He was fond of music, and was a most excellent judge of paintings and sculpture. He had an eye for the beautiful in both nature and art, and few men have ever excelled him in verbal criticisms with respect to such matters, though he never seemed to regard it worth while to place his animadversions upon paper. He lived too much in the seclusion of his own home. He had little or no ambition, as the world understands that term. He seemed to be satisfied with the kingdom of the family, and in his associations with home life he found his chief enjoyment.

(4) It has already been stated that Christianity, when properly understood and practised, does much for culture.
It is easy to see how this must be so. Christianity has largely to do with the heart. Perhaps nothing distinguishes the religion of Jesus Christ more than its appeal to the affections; and as there can be no true culture until the heart is touched, it is not surprising that a character strongly dominated by the Gospel will necessarily become transformed by the Gospel's influence. Dr. Pendleton was first of all a Christian. Christ within him, the hope of glory, dominated all his faculties. He never made his religion demonstrative. He was not boisterous about anything. He simply moved along, in the easy tenor of his way; and though constantly engaged in either study or work he performed everything without noise or friction, and consequently the world around him often forgot that a great man was hid away from the multitude in the heart of his family, where his wife and children only knew how great a character he was.

(5) His life was a constant demonstration of the truthfulness of the Scriptural saying, "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength." It has already been stated that he was not demonstrative. He never pushed himself to the front. He positively shrank from public notoriety. He was not indifferent to public approbation; but he certainly did not do what he did to be seen of men. Perhaps he carried this tendency of his nature to excess. It is probable he would have been more useful to the general public if he had been more self-seeking. He lived in an aggressive age. During the past fifty years there has been no time when any man could wait on the coming of success. The Micawberian policy will not work in this age of the world. We must not wait for something to turn up, but we must turn it up ourselves, in order to be sure that our task is accomplished. Dr. Pendleton was too reserved for the active, turbulent, struggling age in which he lived. He was sometimes accused of indolence by those who thought he ought to have occupied a more prominent place than he did. But he was not indolent. He was a hard student and an indefatigable worker. But he studied and worked in circles that were not open to the inspection of the public. It is no doubt perfectly true that he could have become a much more effective power for the public good, if he had allowed himself to even fill the public places that were always ready
for him. But he could neither seek public position nor fill it at the expense of that quietness which seemed so essential to the development of his better manhood. What, therefore, appeared to be indifference to public endeavour was only an excessive timidity, or reserve, which did not permit him to come before the public with his methods of work. Perhaps it is true, after all, that men who are keyed like he was are unfitted for the rugged and demonstrative duties of public life. Still, we must not forget that the world needs men of different temperaments. It took both Aristides and Themistocles (though very different in almost every respect) to save Greece from the Persian invasion.

(6) Dr. Pendleton was specially gifted as a writer. He was the possessor of a remarkably clear and polished style. All his literary work had the finish of a master. He was associated with Mr. Campbell in conducting the *Millennial Harbinger*, from the year 1844, and for about thirty years his contributions to that periodical were among the best that appeared in its columns. Many of his controversial papers give evidence of his fine logical powers, while all his writings clearly demonstrate that his rhetoric was scarcely ever at fault. His wide reading brought him into contact with the best thinkers of all ages, and his own style, though polished from the beginning, was greatly improved as the years went on by his contact with the masters of literature. He was truly the Addison of the reformation.

(7) As a preacher and lecturer, he was able and interesting. He was overshadowed in the Bethany pulpit by his distinguished father-in-law, but he could have become eminent as a pastor of a city church. His social qualities being of the highest order, he would have been personally popular with his congregation; and if he had given himself to the work of preparing and delivering sermons he would have been undoubtedly a success as a preacher. His sermon in "The Living Pulpit" on "The Ministry of the Holy Spirit" is one of the ablest in that volume, and the writer of this sketch has heard him deliver sermons superior even to the one just mentioned.

As a lecturer he was pleasing and instructive. He carried his elegant manners with him on the platform.
Though somewhat timid, he was nearly always self-possessed when he came before the public.

But he did not lecture simply to please. He meant everything he said to be useful to his hearers; hence his lectures were packed full of facts and matter which could not fail to be helpful to his audiences. These audiences listened with breathless interest to his matchless sentences, delivered in a manner which showed deep earnestness, though there was almost an entire lack of passion in anything he said. It was on account of this lack of passion that he failed to be a great orator, for he possessed every other qualification necessary to sway the multitude. But popular eloquence is not rhetoric nor logic, nor even ordinary earnestness; it is fire; enthusiasm; a flame which cannot be extinguished; it is a sweeping conflagration, overcoming all opposing winds and carrying everything before it. This, Dr. Pendleton did not possess. He was a logician; he was a rhetorician; he was highly educated; was polished in his manners and presented an attractive and dignified personality. He was graceful in his movements, elegant in those characteristics which make up a refined and noble manhood; but he lacked the one thing needful to make a popular orator. Let no one misunderstand this statement. He was not cold. His whole nature was warm and genial. To those who knew him best he was a model of cordiality and sympathy. But the quality of enthusiasm did not overflow. It was held in solution with other things; but it nowhere showed itself as a separate, overflowing river, bearing everything down in its resistless course. This is an essential quality of true eloquence, and without it eloquence may have a name to live by, but it is really dead.

It is only necessary to say a few words in conclusion. I had the pleasure of knowing President Pendleton long and well. In the classrooms of dear old Bethany I learned to love him as an instructor and friend. I have never forgotten his personal interest in me. Frequently since then he has cheered me with words of encouragement. Only a little while before his death I received a letter from him, which I would now publish, as a specimen of his beautiful style, were it not for the delicate personal allusions in it with respect to myself. It is a delight to bear this testimony to his gracious and splendid manhood.
With the new help which Mr. Campbell had in conducting the *Harbinger*, he was enabled to give more time to the general field; consequently, in March, 1845, in company with R. L. Coleman, he made another tour through Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina, meeting many old friends, making new friends, securing contributions for Bethany College, and speaking either in private or public almost constantly during his trip. Later on in the year he made another tour westward, through southern Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. In all these states he saw evidence of the progress of the movement with which he was identified. At the same time he was made conscious of the need of a more effective system of co-operation among the brethren, and especially an enlargement of views with respect to educational matters. The *Harbinger* for this year shows unmistakable evidence of the impression he had received during these excursions.

About this time the Evangelical Alliance was organised, and Mr. Campbell makes several references to it in the *Harbinger* for 1846. In these references he pointed out the resemblance of the movement to that of the "Christian Association," which was founded in Washington, Pa., in 1809, and from which was issued the great "Declaration and Address," written by Thomas Campbell. While he does not endorse everything in the Constitution of this Alliance, and does not believe that it offers a complete solution of the Christian union question, he nevertheless uses the following significant language:

I said at the beginning, I say at the close, of my notice of the Evangelical Alliance, that I thank God and take courage at every effort, however imperfect it may be, to open the eyes of the community to the impotency and wickedness of schism, and to impress upon the conscientious and benevolent portion of the Christian profession the excellency, the beauty, and the necessity of co-operation in the cause of Christ as prerequisite to the diffusion of Christianity throughout the nations of the earth.

In another place he thanks God for the Evangelical Alliance and declares that he "will co-operate with it so long and as far as he may be allowed to do so."

This clearly indicates how willing Mr. Campbell was to fraternise with those who were seeking any closer alliance that might seem to lead to Christian union. He never
thought it possible to unite all Christians upon any platform where difference of opinion must be taken into account, but he always had the greatest faith that union could be effected on the simple Bible conditions by which Christians are made and sustained in the Christian character.

In the preface of the *Harbinger* for 1847, referring to the formation of this Alliance and other indications of the progress of true Christianity, he says:

The signs of the times are, in some respects, more auspicious now than at any former period in the memory of the living generation. When, before, since the great apostasy, did the world, European and American, hold a convention for the furtherance of union among Christians, and for the purpose of forming an alliance in favour of catholic truth against sectarian heresies and error? When did the heathen world before ever stretch out its hands to Christendom, imploring them to come over and help them to extricate themselves from the snares and toils of Paganism? The world without the Christian profession, and the world within it, are alike discontent with themselves and their condition, and are alike calling for help.—Ought we not, then, to be more earnest, more sanguine, and more laborious than ever before in the furtherance of the Gospel, and in the maintenance of our truly enviable position in relation to the present attitude of the whole Christian and Pagan world?

Referring to the rise and progress of the Disciples, he gives a clear indication, not only as regards the great work that had been accomplished, but also the work that still had to be done:

We have seen an immense community rise in the lapse of thirty years. They have renounced the tyranny of opinionism—they have repudiated the schismatical tenets of a morbid Protestantism—they have abjured allegiance to papistical traditions—they have rallied around a few cardinal salutary and sublime truths, and have vowed to build their faith, their hope, and their love upon the firm foundation of Apostles and Prophets; and without regard to differences in mere opinions, they have resolved to receive, cherish, and sustain one another as brethren in the family of God.

But among these thousands and myriads of men, formerly of all creeds and parties, there are all sorts of spirits, all conceivable varieties of intellect and disposition—one that require a bridle, and some that demand a spur. We have the diffidence and tardiness of age, and the waywardness and impetuosity of youth. Some must preach, and some must hear;
some must write, and some must read; and who can say to A, Do this, and he does it; or to D, Withhold thy hand, and he obeys. In such a conflicting state of affairs, the harmlessness of the dove with the wisdom of the serpent are of the greatest importance. Indeed, all the graces of the spirit of Christ are indispensable to the setting in order the things that are wanting, and to the maintenance of "a unity of spirit in the bonds of peace."

For these, and many such reasons, there appears yet much to be done to increase the knowledge, to perfect the character, and to direct the energies of a great and mighty people. Having been long conversant with all these matters, and most intimately acquainted with all the things from the beginning and very generally known to, and knowing, the master spirits of reform, I cannot consent to fold up my arms and retire into a state of indolent repose. I feel it, then, not only a duty which I owe to the Lord and to the brethren, to stand up to my labours in this department, as well as in all other fields in which I am engaged, but am thankful to him that he has called me to this work and toil, that, however unable to meet my own wishes or those of my brethren in the manner of the performance of my labours, I feel as strong in the desire, and as ardent in the purpose to continue at my post, and still to contribute my mite to the furtherance of that great revolution that is now both publicly and privately going forward in the world. To this work also I have the earnest and importunate requests and desires of very many brethren, and shall therefore expect their indulgence and their aid in every way they can further the prosperity of the cause of reformation.

In these paragraphs Mr. Campbell shows very clearly his optimism, which seems never to have forsaken him through all the conflicts of those days which tried men's souls. While he does not hesitate to state some things on the dark side of the picture, at the same time it is impossible not to admire the courage and hope with which he begins his new volume. In all this he shows his incomparable qualities as a leader. The one thing that looms up as the most remarkable among the very remarkable things of that day is the amount of work which he was capable of performing, and perhaps in no other period of his life did he accomplish more than the period between 1845-1850.

About this time a similar movement began to attract some attention in England. The origin of this movement may be briefly stated as follows: Mr. William Jones, of London, was the first to introduce among the Baptists of that country some of the writings of the Disciples of
America, and especially the writings of Alexander Campbell. Mr. Jones differed in a few particulars from some of the teachings of Mr. Campbell, but in the main he was heartily in sympathy with the principles advocated by the leaders of the American movement; and, consequently, he published a periodical, the *British Millennial Harbinger*, in which were republished leading articles written by the Disciples of America. Meantime, he had a lengthy correspondence with Mr. Campbell, in which Mr. Campbell set forth specifically the principles and aims of the Restoration movement with which he was identified. For a time Mr. Jones gave himself heartily to the advocacy of the Restoration movement in England, but finding that he was likely to come in conflict with his own brethren, if he continued to advocate the new movement, he went back to the Baptist ranks and continued there as long as he lived. However, Mr. James Wallace, of Nottingham, started the *Christian Messenger*, and through this the Restoration movement was advocated in England. In 1883 a report was made by the General Evangelistic Committee of the Churches of Christ in Great Britain and Ireland, giving some account of the rise and progress of the movement on that side of the Atlantic. This report concludes as follows:

But it would be a mistake to suppose that there were no germs of reformation in the United Kingdom before Mr. Jones began the publication of his *Millennial Harbinger*; for a careful glance through our early magazines reveals the fact that several churches, in various places, arose about the same time, and previous to obtaining any knowledge of Mr. Campbell and his work. These were, for the most part, unknown to each other, but were teaching and upholding the same things. In the North, were Auchtermuchty and Grangemouth; in the South, Bristol and probably London; and between these distant points were found churches in Coxlane, Wrexham, and Shrewsbury; also, one in Dungannon, Ireland, about which, as well as some of the others, an interesting story could be told. These churches stood isolated for years, but steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine, the fellowship, the prayers, the teaching, and breaking of bread on every first day of the week; and each, in turn, was equally surprised and pleased to find it was not alone in pleading for a restoration of the ancient order. How these churches came to exist may be accounted for by the fact that during the greater part of the eighteenth, and the early part of the nineteenth century, the spirit of God had been moving the minds of such men as Glas, Sandeman,
Walker, M'Lean, the Haldanes, and others, to plead for a restoration of the pure Gospel. And by these instrumentalities the Lord prepared the way for the reception, in our own land, of the more complete restoration pleaded for by Alexander Campbell.*

It will be seen from this extract that while the movement received great help from America, and was probably organised and developed mainly through the writings of the American Disciples, and especially the writings of Alexander Campbell, there were a number of churches ready to receive the principles of the Restoration movement, just as was the case in this country, even before the "Declaration and Address" of the Campbells was published. But it is well to notice the fact that the movement in England, Scotland, and Ireland was somewhat different from the movement in this country in several particulars, though in the main the principles were identical. We notice three respects wherein the difference was considerable.

1. As regards the ministry of the Word, the churches in the old country not only depended upon what they called "mutual teaching," but they actually made this a matter of faith, contending that their practice in this respect is distinctly and emphatically enjoined in the Scriptures. Doubtless this view of the matter was emphasised by the fact that the brethren in that country were impressed with the notion that they ought to swing their movement as far away from the clerical domination which prevailed in the state church as it was possible for them to do; but as extremes beget extremes, they evidently carried the movement too far in one direction; and as the leadership which they depended upon for teaching most frequently needed teaching itself, the kind of teaching which the churches received was not very helpful in spiritual growth, and often the domination of the elders was even more tyrannical than that tyranny against which the churches were making their protest.

We have already seen the movement in America had developed somewhat along the same lines for at least several years. But the brethren in America never contended very seriously that this was the only Scriptural view to take of the matter. Indeed, the American move-

* "Life of Timothy Coop," p. 137.
ment has never asserted any very positive views with respect to church organization and development. They have always recognised that the main features only are set forth in the New Testament, and that there is much left to the sanctified wisdom of the churches themselves as regards particulars. They have always advocated the gift of teaching in the Church, but as Walter Scott once said, "The Church is not all mouth," and, consequently, they have never regarded what is called "mutual teaching" with the same favour, or to the same extent, as it is regarded in the old country.

2. Another point of difference was with regard to the reception of money from those who were not Christians. It became a fixed rule with the brethren in Europe to receive no money from unbaptised people. This was a great hindrance to the progress of their cause. The people of that country, more than anywhere else, are inclined to contribute something to any church they may attend, and when their contributions were refused by the Disciples they ceased attending their services. The result was that very few "outsiders" attended at all, and consequently it was impossible to make anything like considerable progress when the churches had no one in attendance except their own members.

In America the churches have always received contributions from any source whatever, believing that, if these contributions should come from even Satan's adherents, it was a wise expedient to weaken Satan's kingdom as much as possible by using the resources of his followers for a much better cause than that for which the resources would be used if not accepted by the churches. Whether this view of the matter is correct or not, this was partially at least the ground on which this practice was sustained. It was furthermore contended by the American churches that, as the weekly contributions were collected from a miscellaneous audience, it was impossible to always discriminate between the Christians and those who were not Christians, without practically insulting the latter, and thus driving them away from attending the meetings.

3. But perhaps the most radical difference between the two movements was with respect to those who should partake of the Lord's Supper. In both countries ibis Supper
was administered every Lord's Day. This was regarded by all as the practice of the primitive churches, and it was insisted upon by all as a part of every Lord's Day service. Indeed, in many places, both in the Old Country and in America, the Lord's Supper was regarded as the chief feature of the Lord's Day worship. But in the Old Country a sort of police arrangement was in force nearly everywhere, by which all unbaptised persons were rigidly excluded from participation in this fellowship. In this country the practice of the Disciples was, and is yet, to teach what the Scriptures say on the subject, and then leave the matter with each individual as to whether he will participate in the communion or not. In short, they neither invite nor exclude.

It is only fair to the brethren on the other side of the Atlantic to state the fact that they were probably largely influenced to take the course they did from the nature of the state churches of that country. These state churches reckoned all persons members of the church from a territorial point of view, and, consequently, it was with the view of protesting against this territorial membership that the Disciples made their protest against what they called open communion. However, the tendency of all these restrictions was to give the movement in the Old Country a very exclusive character, and thereby it was weakened in its hold upon the popular heart. But however this may be, it evidently made very slow progress. Some very excellent men were attracted by its principles, but when they came into the churches and realised the cold exclusiveness which existed among the members, these great souls either became inactive or else left the movement entirely and joined other communions. The result was that very few men of any reputation became permanently identified with the churches of the Old Country; and up to the present time this has been a marked feature, and also partially accounts for the slow progress that has been made.

At the same time it should be remembered that the movement in Europe has been from the west towards the east, and we have already seen that progress in this direction is always very feeble, if, indeed, it makes any headway at all. Later we shall see that an American reinforcement was sent to Europe for the purpose of helping on the work there, and to-day even this has not been
a marked success. Perhaps after all we may have to conclude that the new movement was never intended to progress eastward, for even in this country it has made little headway east of where it started.

Mr. Campbell had much desired to revisit his old friends in the Old Country, and having received a cordial invitation from the churches there, communicated by Mr. J. Wallace in most affectionate terms, he resolved to make this visit as soon as possible. The communication of Mr. Wallace was dated January 26, 1846. Accordingly, Mr. Campbell began to make his preparations for the voyage. As Mr. Pendleton had been appointed Vice-President of Bethany College, and was also at this time one of the editors of the Harbinger, Mr. Campbell saw his way to leave his work in this country, for at least a short time, in the trusted hands of his son-in-law and Dr. Robert Richardson, whom he always trusted in every emergency. He set sail, in company with Mr. James Henshall, on May 4, 1847, and reached Liverpool at the close of the month, where he was met by J. Davies, of Mollington, and Messrs. Woodworth and Tickle, of Liverpool. He was soon very much at home among the brethren and at once began his campaign in the Old Country. His letters from Europe during this and the next year, addressed to his daughter, Clarinda, are of special interest, and will be found in the Harbinger for 1847 and 1848. During this visit he frequently met with the brethren in England and attended their annual meeting at Chester, where a liberal subscription was made to Bethany College. It was during his visit in Scotland that he was put into prison. In reference to this matter, he writes:

I was incarcerated, because of mere speculative and doctrinal dissent from the opinion of a certain class of anti-slavery men. My liberty was taken away by "liberty men." ... I am aware it will be said I was imprisoned for a libel. But who libeled me from Edinburgh to Banff? I libeled no man—I spoke the truth. There were three Rev. James Robertsons in Edinburgh, and one was accused of insulting and abusing his mother. His exclusion from a Church for that offence is a matter of record in Dundee.

I did not specify any one of the three Rev. James Robertsons. Why did only one of them accuse himself by professing to be the man? Why did not the other two find cause for a libel? The truth is no libel in Scotland.*

The whole affair of this matter is so ridiculous that we have no patience to make a record of it here. Suffice to say that Mr. Campbell was released from prison, and his accuser brought to shame, if, indeed, he was capable of a virtue of that kind.

While in England, Mr. Campbell was highly honoured by some of the great men of the nation, and his public addresses made a deep impression upon all who heard him.

Meantime, the cause continued to progress in the United States. Perhaps the most active evangelistic period in the history of the movement was between the years 1835 and 1845. About the latter date the leaders of the movement very generally began to turn their attention to the matter of retaining the ground which had been gained, and this somewhat retarded the evangelistic enthusiasm for at least a short time. Still the work continued to spread.

The year 1848 was a notable year from almost every point of view. It was marked by revolutions involving Austria, Italy, Sicily, France, England, and Ireland; indeed, more or less affecting the whole of European society. The French Republic was proclaimed on February 26th, and officially recognised by England on March 1st. On December 20th, Louis Napoleon was proclaimed President of the French Republic, and quiet for a time began to manifest itself.

During this year the Mexican war was concluded and peace made February 8th, while the discovery of gold in California sent thousands of adventurers from the eastern states to the Pacific coast. Wisconsin was also, during this year, admitted to the union as a state. During the same year General Zachary Taylor was elected President of the United States.

It was a time of both settling and unsettling. The Disciples themselves were in a state of transition. Mr. Campbell had been pleading from the year 1841 for some definite organization of all the forces in an aggressive forward movement. In this advocacy he had met with considerable opposition. A few of the very able men in the movement hesitated at the formation of any society, on the ground that the Church itself is the only divinely authorised agency for evangelising the world, and Mr.
Campbell's own statements were quoted from the *Christian Baptist* in support of this contention. He protested against the construction placed upon his words and constantly affirmed that he meant only to protest against such societies as were propagating their own selfish interests rather than the cause of Christ. However, about this time began the conflict between those who favoured a missionary society, and those who opposed all societies for which there could not be found a "Thus saith the Lord" justifying their existence. In the discussion which followed, Mr. Campbell was never treated fairly by those who opposed societies. It is one of the inalienable rights accorded to every man to explain his own words. It was the habit of those who opposed societies to quote Mr. Campbell from the *Christian Baptist*, but they failed to quote from the *Millennial Harbinger* his explanation of the *Christian Baptist* statements. But in this respect these opponents of missionary societies simply illustrated an ugly phase of human nature. Men generally are wont to do the very things these special pleaders did; but it is certainly a phase of human nature that needs to be reproved much more than any opposition to missionary societies.
CHAPTER XVII

THE PERIOD OF ORGANIZATION

FOR several years the trend of the movement had been toward organization, but for the most part this organization was confined to the churches and a few districts where were held what were called "co-operative meetings." Two or three state meetings had reached the embryo stage, and one at least, that of Indiana, was fairly on its feet. In every quarter there was a feeling that there ought to be some general society where conference could be held and co-operation secured in carrying on the work, not only in America, but also in foreign lands. The great, whole-hearted leaders of the movement believed heartily in the commission which the risen Lord had given to His Disciples. They felt, therefore, that an obligation was laid upon them to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. But they also plainly saw that this could not be done effectively without a much better co-operation of the churches than any that existed in the year 1849. The Bible Society, which had been organised four years before this time, was a beginning in the right direction, but it did not meet a great need as a missionary society would. There were other societies already in existence for the circulation of the Bible, and this was being done very effectively, and it was really mainly on this ground that Mr. Campbell rather doubted the propriety of founding such a society, as he was always disinclined to organize a work that was already being well done, no matter who was doing it. He especially rejoiced that the Baptist Bible Society was accomplishing a great deal, and he was not sure that another society, very similar to this, was specially needed. But after the Bible Society was founded he gave it his hearty support.

Still, he saw, and many others saw, that this Society did not meet the whole case. Consequently, a meeting was
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called of brethren and representatives of the churches to assemble in Cincinnati, October 24, 1849, for the purpose of taking council with respect to a number of things that needed general attention, and more especially to consider the propriety of starting a General Missionary Society. There was some hesitancy at first as regards the time selected, as the cholera was devastating many parts of the country during 1849. However, the time was finally fixed and the meeting assembled.

The whole number in attendance at this first meeting of a general character among the Disciples was about 200, and considering all the circumstances, the difficulty of travel, the unhealthy condition of the country, and many other hindering causes, the attendance was very encouraging. There were 156 delegates actually enrolled. The churches represented were 100, from eleven different states. One state meeting, that of Indiana, sent messengers, who were appointed during the state convention held at Indianapolis a little while before this meeting at Cincinnati. Many of the delegates came from a long distance, some from the Atlantic states, and as far south as New Orleans. A number of the delegates came in on horseback, in some cases taking several days for the journey. It was really a great occasion, and the great men of the movement were there. Owing to illness, and also bereavement in his family, much to his regret, Mr. Campbell was unable to be present, but he was splendidly represented in the Convention by his son-in-law, Professor Pendleton, who was at that time co-editor of the Harbinger. Mr. Pendleton wrote out an account of the meeting afterwards, and we are indebted to this account for most of the facts concerning the meeting.

After considering several preliminary matters, John T. Johnson, of Kentucky, offered, and the Convention adopted, the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the "Missionary Society," as a means to concentrate and dispense the wealth and benevolence of the brethren of this Reformation in an effort to convert the world, is both Scriptural and expedient.

Resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed to prepare a Constitution for such a Society.

In pursuance of this resolution a Constitution was pre-
pared and presented, and after full discussion and various amendments, substitutions, etc.,
adopted as follows:

CONSTITUTION

Article 1st. This Society shall be called the American Christian Missionary Society.

Article 2d. The object of this Society shall be to promote the spread of the Gospel in destitute
places of our own and foreign lands.

Article 3d. The Society shall be composed of annual delegates, Life Members, and Life
Directors. Any Church may appoint a delegate for an annual contribution of ten dollars. Twenty
dollars paid at one time shall be requisite to constitute a member for life, and one hundred dollars
paid at one time, or a sum which in addition to any previous contribution shall amount to one hundred
dollars, shall be required to constitute a director for life.

Article 4th. The officers of the Society shall consist of a President, twenty Vice-Presidents, a
Treasurer, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Recording Secretary, who shall be elected by the
members of the Society at its annual meeting.

Article 5th. The Society shall also annually elect twenty-five managers, who together with the
officers and life directors of this Society, shall constitute an Executive Board, to conduct the business
of the Society, and shall continue in office until their successors are elected, seven of whom shall
constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Article 6th. Two of the Vice-Presidents, the Treasurer, the Secretaries, and at least fifteen of the
managers shall reside in Cincinnati or its vicinity.

Article 7th. The Executive Board shall have the power to appoint its own meetings, elect its own
Chairman, enact its own By-laws and Rules of Order, provided always that they be not inconsistent
with the Constitution; fill any vacancies which may occur in their own body, or in the offices of the
Society during the year, and if deemed necessary by two-thirds of the members present at a regular
meeting, convene special meetings of the Society. They shall establish such agencies as the interest of
the Society may require, appoint agents and missionaries, fix their compensation, direct and instruct
them concerning their particular fields and labours, make all appropriations to be paid out of the
treasury, and present to the Society at each annual meeting a full report of their proceedings during
the past year.

Article 8th. All moneys or other property contributed and designated for any particular
missionary field, shall be so appropriated or returned to the donors, or their lawful agents.

Article 9th. The Treasurer shall give bonds to such an amount as the Executive Board shall think
proper.

Article 10th. All the officers, managers, missionaries, and
agents of the Society, shall be members in good standing in the Churches of God.

Article 11th. The Society shall meet annually at Cincinnati, on the first Wednesday after the third Lord's Day of October, or at such time and place as shall have been designated at the previous annual meeting.

Article 12th. No person shall receive an appointment from the Executive Board, unless he shall give satisfactory evidence of his Christian character and qualification.

Article 13th. No alteration of this Constitution shall be made, without a vote of two-thirds of the members present at an annual meeting, nor unless the same shall have been proposed at a previous annual meeting, or recommended by the Executive Board.

The Constitution having been adopted, a committee was appointed to nominate the various officers required. They reported the following persons, who were duly elected:

President: A. CAMPBELL, Bethany, Virginia.

Vice-Presidents: 1st, D. S. BURNETT, Cincinnati; 2nd, DR. IRWIN, Cincinnati; 3rd, WALTER SCOTT, Pennsylvania; 4th, T. M. ALLEN, Missouri; 5th, W. K. PENDLETON, Virginia; 6th, JOHN T. JONES, Illinois; 7th, JOHN O'KANE, Indiana; 8th, JOHN T. JOHNSON, Kentucky; 9th, TOLBERT FANNING, Tennessee; 10th, DR. DANIEL HOOK, Georgia; 11th, DR. E. PARMLY, New York; 12th, FRANCIS DUNGAN, Baltimore; 13th, RICHARD HAWLEY, Michigan; 14th, DR. JAMES T. BARCLAY, Virginia; 15th, FRANCIS PALMER, Missouri; 16th, J. J. MOSS, Ohio; 17th, M. MOBLEY, Iowa; 18th, WILLIAM ROWZEE, Pennsylvania; 19th, ALEXANDER GRAHAM, Alabama; 20th, WILLIAM CLARK, Mississippi.

Corresponding Secretary: JAMES CHALLEN, Cincinnati.

Recording Secretary: GEORGE S. JENKINS.

Treasurer: ARCHIBALD TROWBRIDGE.

Managers: T. J. MELISH, Cincinnati; GEO. TAIT, Cincinnati; S. S. CLARK, Cincinnati; DR. B. S. LAWSON, Cincinnati; T. J. MURDOCK, Cincinnati; S. H. HATHWAY, Cincinnati; ANDREW LESLIE, Cincinnati; LEWIS WELLS, Covington; THURSTON CRANE, Cincinnati; C. H. GOULD, Cincinnati; DR. N. T. MARSHALL, Cincinnati; R. J. LATIMER, Cincinnati; JAMES LESLIE, Cincinnati; W. A. TROWBRIDGE, Cincinnati; JOHN TAFFE, Cincinnati.

Foreign Managers: SAMUEL CHURCH, Pennsylvania; GEORGE MCMANNUS, Illinois; R. L. COLEMAN, Virginia; WILLIAM MORTON, Kentucky; P. 8. FALL, Kentucky; ELIJAH GOODWIN, Indiana; S. S. CHURCH, Missouri; A. GOULD, New York; ALEXANDER HALL, Ohio; J. B. FERGUSON, Tennessee.
A motion being made to give an opportunity to persons to become Life Members and Life Directors, according to the terms of the Constitution, the brethren very promptly manifested their appreciation of the scheme by their subscriptions. In a few minutes fifty-two persons were entered as life members, paying $20 each, and eleven as life directors, paying $100 each—making two thousand one hundred and forty dollars subscribed in one evening, by members of the convention alone, to this most benevolent and laudable enterprise. Besides this there were $30 presented in small donations. This was a beginning not to be despised, and the hope was expressed that it would be an example to excite the emulation of others.

Besides these contributions to the A. C. M. Society, very liberal subscriptions were made to the A. C. Bible Society. The claims of this Society upon the brethren generally were submitted to the consideration of the Convention and, after a full and candid discussion of its merits and defects, there was a unanimous and cordial concurrence in the following resolutions respecting it:

Resolved, That the Bible Society, located in Cincinnati, known by the name of "The American Christian Bible Society," be, and hereby is, recommended by this Convention to the cordial support of the brethren.

Resolved, That this Convention commend the course of the American Christian Bible Society in co-operating with the American and Foreign Bible Society, and recommend to this Society to continue their friendly co-operation.

In order to render the Missionary and Bible Societies, as far as practicable, mutual helps to one another, and to commend them both to the patronage of the brethren generally, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the American Christian Missionary Society be, and hereby is, recommended to the cordial support of the brethren, and that the managers of the American Christian Bible Society be requested to furnish said Missionary Society with such Bibles as they may need in their Missionary efforts.

These verbal commendations will doubtless have their weight with the Churches and the brethren, but we regard, as much more satisfactory, the liberal contributions made by the members of the Convention, and trust that the brethren far and wide will imitate them, not in word, but also in deed.

Having thus disposed of these two important and commendable societies the Convention proceeded next to the
consideration of such measures as might conduce to a more efficient organization and co-operation among the churches, and to greater love, piety, and zeal in the hearts of the Disciples. On this subject the following commendatory resolutions were presented and passed:

Resolved, That, in all our deliberations, in all our efforts to organize in God's Kingdom, the moral rather than the material purposes of an organization be kept steadily before us;—that we have the conversion of the world and the perfection of the brotherhood in holiness always before us.

Whereas, it is essential to a general union in the furtherance of the cause of our blessed Redeemer, that the brethren should confer with each other in the search after truth; and whereas the cultivation of the social and religious sympathies is necessary to bring into zealous and efficient action the energies of the brethren, therefore—

Resolved, That we respectfully recommend to the Churches the propriety of forming among themselves State and District meetings, to be held annually and quarterly, in such way as may seem expedient, and that the Churches in their Primary Assemblies be requested to send to their annual meetings, by their messengers, the number of members in their respective congregations, with the name of the Post-office.

Whereas, it appears that the cause of Christianity has suffered from the imposition of false brethren upon the Churches, therefore,

Resolved, That we recommend to the Churches, the importance of great care and rigid examination, before they ordain men to the office of evangelists.

Resolved, That this Convention earnestly recommend to the congregations to countenance no evangelist who is not well reported of for piety and proper evangelical qualifications, and that they be rigid and critical in their examination of such report.

Resolved, That we strongly commend to the Churches the duty and importance of organising and establishing Sunday Schools in every congregation.

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed to make out and publish a catalogue of such books as would be suitable for present use.

Resolved, That a Corresponding Committee of five be appointed from different States, to cooperate with the Executive Committee of the Tract Society on the subject of Sunday School books.

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the Tract Society be requested to superintend the publishing of Sunday School books.

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed to cooperate with the Publication Committee of the Tract Society, as a committee of revision.
The following brethren were then appointed on a committee to prepare a catalogue of books, already published, which can be recommended to the brotherhood: Brethren Burnett, Moss, C. Kendrick, Scott, and Pendleton.

The Nominating Committee then presented the following names for a Corresponding Committee: Isaac Errett, and A. S. Hayden, Ohio; A. Campbell, Virginia; W. Scott, Pennsylvania; S. S. Church, Missouri; L. H. Jameson, Indiana; S. J. Pinkerton, Georgia; J. B. Ferguson, Tennessee; J. T. Jones, Illinois; A. Graham, Alabama.

Whereas, the Lord's day being a monumental institution, pointing continually to one of the most important events which has ever transpired among men, the resurrection of Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead, an event, the remembrance of which should thrill every heart with sacred joy; and whereas, the sanctification and due observance of this institution is essential to the progress of piety and good morals; therefore,

Resolved, That we earnestly recommend to all our brethren in the Lord, the importance of sanctifying and observing the day in their conversation and behaviour; and especially that they may refrain from starting, and if possible, prosecuting any journey, either of business or pleasure, on this holy day.

Resolved, That there is a great need of increase of personal piety and devotion, especially in the three particulars of daily reading the Scriptures, secret prayer, and family instruction and worship, and that this Convention recommend to the teachers to urge upon the brotherhood everywhere a more faithful performance of their duties.

Resolved, That the President be requested, in the name of this Convention, to address a fraternal letter to the Disciples of Eastern Virginia in Convention assembled in Richmond, at their annual meeting on the 24th of November, 1842, and request their consideration of her proceedings and their cooperation.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to prepare a concise and appropriate address to our Christian Churches and brethren generally, embodying and recommending the sentiments, principles, and measures agreed upon in this Convention, and that the same be published, together with the report of the proceedings of the Convention.

It is worth while to mention the fact that the most eminent men connected with the Restoration movement were present and took part in this great movement. Such men as John O'Kane, Elijah Goodwin, George Campbell, J. B. New, L. H. Jameson, S. W. Leonard, J. M. Mathes, S. K. Hoshour, Milton B. Hopkins, Benjamin Franklin, and John M. Bramwell, were from Indiana; James Challen, D. S. Burnett, B. N. Watkins, James S. Mitchell, Wil-
liam Hayden, John T. Powell, Jasper J. Moss, J. M. Henry, Jonas Hartsell, T. J. Murdock, and Wm. Pinkerton, from Ohio; John T. Johnson, Dr. L. L. Pinkerton, William Morton, Henry T. Anderson, Carroll Kendrick, Dr. J. Shackleford, John Young, W. B. Mooklar, C. J. Smith, Waller Small, R. C. Ricketts, and S. B. Bell were there from Kentucky; Dr. J. T. Barclay, Professor W. K. Pendleton, and Newton Short were there from Virginia; Robert B. Fife, and W. H. Hopson from Missouri; H. D. Palmer, from Illinois; Walter Scott, from Pennsylvania, and Richard Hawley, from Michigan.

A number of other names might be mentioned, but these are sufficient to show that the men who attended the Convention were the men who made the movement, and who had, therefore, a right, if anybody had the right, to take the important step which they did. And this suggests (and it is a fact) that before this time, and ever afterward, the men who have advocated missionary societies, are the very men who more than any others have defended and propagated the Restoration movement; while, with very few exceptions, the men who have protested against missionary societies have been men very little known, and for the most part without any general influence, and even in a few cases where the men have been prominent they have been noted for their opposition rather than for any leadership in aggressive work. Speaking broadly, they have been men who lived in Grumble Corner rather than in Thanksgiving Street.

When the news of the Convention was carried to Bethany, Mr. Campbell greatly rejoiced at the result. In the *Harbinger* for the next month he makes the following comments with respect to the matter:

Our expectations from the Convention have more than been realised. We are much pleased with the result, and regard it as a very happy pledge of good times to come. The unanimity, cordiality, and generous concurrence of the brethren in all the important subjects before them, were worthy of themselves and the great cause in which they are all enlisted. Enough was done at one session, and enough to occupy our best energies for some time to come. Bible distribution and evangelical labour—two transcendent objects of Christian effort most essential to the conversion of the world—deserve at our hand a very cordial and generous support. We may rationally anticipate, from the indications afforded during the session, that
they will be liberally patronised and sustained by all the brotherhood. The suggestions deferentially submitted to all the brotherhood, for their concurrence and action in reference to the necessity and importance of periodically meeting, in given districts, large or small, as the case may be, for consultation and practical effort in the advocacy of the cause in all their localities, must, we think, meet the approbation of all the Intelligent and zealous brethren and Churches everywhere; and, we doubt not, will give great efficiency to the labours of evangelists in those districts.

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. The Christian Bible Society, co-operating with the American and Foreign Bible Society—now approved by all the churches present, and commended by them to all the brethren, removes all my objections to it in its former attitude and will, no doubt, now be cordially sustained in its claims for a liberal patronage from all our communities. 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, in dispensing the blessings of the gospel amongst many that otherwise would never have heard it. 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. There is, indeed, nothing new in these matters, but simply the organised and general cooperation in all the ways and means of more energetically and systematically preaching the gospel and edifying the Church. We have always been, more or less, commending and sending abroad the Bible, and sustaining evangelists in their missions to the world. But we have never before formally, and by a generous co-operation, systematically assumed the work. Union is strength, and essential to extensive and protracted success. Hence, our horizon, and with it our expectations, are greatly enlarged.

The other matters commended to the brethren are more or less important, but these are the grand events of the Convention. Sunday Schools, and their libraries; Tract Societies, under an enlightened and judicious supervision, are also great auxiliaries, and made more or less expedient, if not even necessary in keeping up with the spirit and character of the age. The world is being flooded with the offerings of the press. To save the youth from a flood of trashy, unedifying, and sometimes impious publications, it is expedient that something be done in the way of self-defence, if not in the way of making inroads upon the grounds of the great adversary of the salutary truth of sound literature and Christian learning. But, of all these matters, we will doubtless have occasion to speak more fully hereafter. Meantime, we thank God and take courage, and commend these instrumentalities to the
prayers of all the holy brethren, and to the blessing of the Lord.

The action of this Convention marks an important era in the Restoration movement. We have followed it through its Creative period, and also through its Chaotic period—we have seen how its progress has always been in zigzag courses. Sometimes it has moved to the right, sometimes to the left, and occasionally it has retreated, but it has never gone forward in straight lines. However, it has, upon the whole, gone forward, and at the close of the year 1849 it had at least become fairly organised, and had entered upon the period of development.

The action of the Convention thrilled the churches everywhere with a new enthusiasm, and the great leaders of the movement returned to their fields of labour with new hopes as to the final outcome of the movement. While all who were engaged in the inauguration of this enterprise deserve much credit, perhaps the two men who deserve most praise were D. S. Burnett, of Ohio, and John T. Johnson, of Kentucky. These men had been paving the way for this great Convention for several years, and after they saw the fruit of their labours somewhat realised in the inauguration of the Missionary Society, they were overwhelmed with rejoicing and now threw themselves into the work of making the Society a success as perhaps no other two men did at that particular period.

Professor Charles Louis Loos, who personally attended the Convention, gives his recollection of the great interest manifested at the Convention, when the call for contributions was made, and he declares that, considering that, this was the first effort of the kind, the result was extremely gratifying. In a few minutes $2,500 were subscribed for the new society, while about a like amount was subscribed for the Bible and Tract Societies, making $5,000 in all, subscribed by the members of the Convention. Surely, for the day of small things, this was a great result.

Soon after the Convention adjourned, according to the instructions, the Board began to plan for at least one foreign mission. They had already learned that Dr. James T. Barclay, of Virginia, had offered himself for such a mission; and after considerable correspondence with him,

*Millennial Harbinger, 1849, pp. 694-695.*
he was formally appointed, June 11, 1850, "to engage in teaching, preaching, and the practice of medicine among the Jews at Jerusalem." September 11th of the same year he left New York and arrived at Jerusalem February 7, 1851.

The Board was fortunate in the selection of their first foreign missionary. Dr. Barclay had many qualifications for his work. He was not only a well educated man, but an enthusiast in whatever he set himself to do. He was especially a missionary enthusiast. For ten years he had been associated with the Restoration movement. Through the preaching of R. L. Coleman, one of the leading preachers of Virginia, at that time, he became convinced that infant baptism had no foundation in the New Testament, and that the immersion of believers is the only baptism commanded by Christ and practised by the Apostles, consequently he gave up his membership in the Presbyterian Church and united with the Disciples.

It is not certain that the place selected for this first foreign mission was as wisely selected as was the missionary himself. Doubtless, sentiment had a great deal to do with deciding upon Jerusalem as the place. It was the place where the Gospel was first preached in its fulness after the descent of the Holy Spirit. It is probable that the Board was influenced by the feeling that, as their religious movement was practically a new "beginning," and that undoubtedly this mission would be the "beginning" of their foreign missionary work, the coincidence, if not vital, would at least be suggestive and inspirational, and, consequently, without regarding the matter from other important points of view, it was enthusiastically determined to send Dr. Barclay to that particular field. While it cannot be said that very much was accomplished in the way of converts, it can truthfully be said that, after all, the mission was not a failure. It did much to cultivate a missionary spirit at home. Perhaps no other mission would have had the same reflexive influence upon the home churches. The very sentiment that had decided upon this field wrought mightily upon the churches which were to furnish the contributions to sustain the mission.

Another thing was accomplished by the mission. Dr. Barclay finally wrote a book entitled, "The City of the
Great King," and the publication of this book was worth all the mission cost, if, indeed, nothing else had been done. It was the greatest book of the kind that had been written up to the time of its publication, and it is doubtful whether anything has been written since that equals it in intrinsic value. The "City of the Great King" received the highest commendation of critics in both America and Europe, and it continues to be an authority on Jerusalem up to the present time. Many of Dr. Barclay's facts, contained in this volume, were obtained through his own personal researches, and the book, therefore, contains considerable original matter. It also co-ordinates all these facts with the Gospel which he preached, and this gave his book a distinct value with regard to the mission which he had established.

As already intimated, the mission was practically almost barren, so far as converts were concerned, and at the beginning of the Civil War it was finally abandoned. Nevertheless, its influence in stimulating missionary activity among the Disciples was very considerable, and this of itself was worth a great deal to the cause; and while some have criticised the Board for establishing this mission at the place where it was started, it is doubtful whether any other mission, at that particular time, would have done as much to create a missionary spirit as this mission did.

Another important development came immediately after the organization of the Missionary Society. Sunday Schools began to create a widespread interest among the Disciples. One of the Committees appointed by the Missionary Convention was on Sunday School literature. This Committee had been foreshadowed by an appeal in behalf of Sunday Schools, and signed by A. S. Hayden and Isaac Errett. The outcome of the whole matter was a growing conviction that Sunday Schools must be fostered, and furthermore, that they must be provided with libraries suitable for children to read.

This was evidently a very important move, and the present unparalleled interest in Sunday Schools among the Disciples may be fairly traced back to this initial movement, and not the least important feature of this early emphasis upon the importance of Sunday Schools is the suggestive fact that co-operation is really the parent of
successful enterprise. From that day till this, the Sunday School cause has been kept prominently to the front by the leaders of the Restoration movement, believing, as they have, that the best way to capture the world for Christ is to capture the children for Him.

About this time the co-operation idea began to develop in the organization of State Missionary Meetings. One of the resolutions adopted by the American Christian Missionary Society, when it was first organised, was a recommendation to the brethren in the states to organize state meetings. It is perhaps impossible to determine, with definite certainty, as to which state took the lead in this important matter. In several of the states yearly meetings were held, but these did not aim at any systematic, definite co-operation of churches. The meetings were mainly for preaching the Gospel and social enjoyment. Both Ohio and Missouri excelled in these yearly meetings. They were also a prominent feature of the Kentucky brethren. We have already seen that these meetings were continued in Ohio, in place of the annual Baptist Associations. In Missouri we have a record of these meetings, as far back as 1837, but the first state meeting in Missouri was held at Fayette, September 10, 1841. T. M. Allen, reporting this meeting, says that a congregation on the Lord's Day following was "the largest religious collection I ever saw in the state of Missouri. It was estimated that there were between three and five thousand persons present, and from 400 to 500 communicants at the Lord's Table." There were fifty-two accessions during the meeting. However, this State Meeting differed from the Annual Meeting, mainly in the large attendance of preachers, and in the choosing of state evangelists. The following preachers were present at this Fayette meeting: Hatchett from Illinois, Thomas Smith, of Kentucky, F. R. Palmer, J. H. Hayden, J. P. Lancaster, H. L. Boone, Joel Prewitt, W. Burton, M. P. Willis, T. M. Allen, W. White, William Reed, Henry Thomas, and a number of others whose names are not recorded. These meetings continued to be held annually even before the organization of the General Missionary Society. However, after 1849, these meetings began to take on a more distinctly business character.

The Kentucky State Meeting was definitely organised
May 9, 1850. A constitution was adopted, and the following officers were elected: J. T. Johnson, president; G. W. Williams, vice-president; J. Curd, treasurer; G. W. Elley, secretary; J. Wasson, H. Foster, A. O. Redd, W. Morton, J. Henshall, T. Smith, J. G. Allen, W. Standeford, J. Smith, G. Poindexter, managers.

This meeting was attended by the leading preachers and brethren of the state. Alexander Campbell was also present, and in commenting upon the meeting, he pays the following tribute to the eloquent speech made by the venerable Jacob Creath, Sr., at the close of the convention:

Though his once brilliant eye is quenched in darkness, and his subduing voice is broken into weak tones, still, he rises in his soul while nature sinks in years; and with a majesty of thought which naught but heaven and hope can inspire, he spoke to us a few last words, which so enraptured my soul, that, in the ecstasy of feeling produced by them, when he closed there was silence in my heart for half an hour; and when I recovered myself, every word had so passed away, that nothing remained but a melancholy reflection that I should never again hear that most eloquent tongue, which had echoed for half a century through Northern Kentucky, with such resistless sway as to have quelled the maddening strife of sectarian tongues, and propitiated myriads of ears and hearts to the divine eloquence of Almighty love. Peace to his soul; and may his sun grow larger at its setting, as his soul expands in the high hope of seeing as he is seen, and of loving as he has been beloved.*

This remarkable eulogy not only indicates something of the power of Jacob Creath as a speaker, but it shows the character of Mr. Campbell in his generous willingness to accord to his fellow workers the highest praise when it was deserved. Among the workers of that day there seems to have been not even the slightest jealousy with respect to one another. Devoted as they were to a common cause, they delighted to honour one another as a part of their religious duty, and each man seems to have felt himself more highly honoured when he was honouring his fellow worker. During this meeting the following preamble and resolutions were heartily adopted:

Whereas, there is among the baptized a slow and doubtful progress in the literature of the Holy Oracles—perhaps consequent from decadence or falling away among them, and, in *Millennial Harbinger*, 1850, p. 404.
many instances, an improvement in spiritual life scarcely appreciable: And whereas, it is the will of our Lord and Master that the call should be preserved in Him; that the saved should be perfected; that the justified make higher attainments in sanctification, and all of us be kept holy, unblamable, and unreprovable in His sight.

I. Resolved, therefore, That we recommend to the Churches, without exception, that they adopt a plan of instruction, or of teaching the Holy Scriptures, that shall meet the necessities of all the new converts; and that they cause these converts to study the word of God regularly and permanently, under the supervision of the constituted superintendents of the Church.

II. Resolved, That we also recommend to the Churches, that, in order to strike out the best plan of teaching the Scriptures, they make this subject a matter of solemn, religious, and frequent contemplation and reflection.

On motion of Brother Morton, the following resolutions were adopted:

1. Resolved, That we recommend to the favourable consideration of all the brotherhood, Bethany College, and especially the chair of Sacred History, as being subservient to the sustaining and advancement of the kingdom of Jesus Christ our Lord.

2. Resolved, That we regard the prosperity of Bacon College as standing connected with our honour and interest as a Christian community.

3. Resolved, That the Trustees of Bacon College be requested to establish a chair of Sacred History; and to enable them to do so, we pledge ourselves to use our influence among the several Churches to raise the sum of $20,000 within five years, for the purpose of endowing such a chair.

4. Resolved, That we regard female education, in all its departments, as being inseparably connected with the present and future good of the human race; we do, therefore, heartily recommend to the patronage of our brethren, and to the community generally, all those female institutions conducted by our brethren in different parts of the State.

These resolutions are quoted for the purpose of showing the scope of the State Meeting which was indicated at this early period. The object of this meeting was evidently not strictly missionary, in the ordinary sense of that term. It comprehended teaching, and especially education in the Colleges. Evidently the pioneers, in the organization period, were not sticklers as regards a very limited sphere for the operation of the State Society. It was reserved for a later period, when nothing except that which was covered by the word "missionary" could pass either the General Society or the State Society. In these early days there seems to have been no apprehension,
among those who attended the meetings, that these societies contained in them an embryo ecclesiasticism. It will be seen, in after years, however, that this embryo grew up to be at least an imaginary, real beast, with all the heads and horns indicated in the Book of Revelation. The intrepid, active John T. Johnson was present, and offered the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas, the supreme importance of giving a faithful translation of the Bible into the languages of all the nations, in order to its universal dissemination, is felt and acknowledged by all Protestant denominations in America and Europe. And Whereas, this Convention convinced by the necessity of consistency of conduct in a matter involving the destiny of man, and the high and solemn responsibility resting upon it, most deeply regrets the timidity which has heretofore operated to hinder the undertaking to give the American Republic a correct and faithful English translation of the Bible. This Convention feels that it is due to the republic of letters—to the high and solemn issues involved—to themselves, as the advocates of a return to pure, primitive Christianity—and what is more important than all, to the great head of the Church, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and whereas, the American and Foreign Bible Society having taken this high ground, in regard to foreign languages, it is deemed courteous, and every way fit, that they should participate in an enterprise so responsible and important. Therefore,

Resolved, That we recommend to the favourable regard of our brethren generally, the efforts made by our Baptist brethren in having a new version of the Holy Scriptures, and would be happy to concur with them in this great and important undertaking.

Resolved, That a Corresponding Secretary of the American Christian Bible Society be requested to communicate the above resolution, with a preamble, to the Board of Managers of the American and Foreign Bible Society.

Resolutions were also passed, urging the "establishment of Sunday Schools in all the churches, to be under the strict supervision of the officers of said churches."

Among the workers most prominent at this time in the state of Kentucky may be mentioned John T. Johnson, John Smith, William Morton, George W. Elley, Dr. J. G. Chinn, John Rogers, Samuel Rogers, Aylette Raines, Dr. Adams, R. C. Ricketts, Philip S. Fall, L. L. Pinkerton, John I. Rogers, William Pinkerton, B. F. Hall, Z. F. Smith, R. C. Rice, John A. Gano, E. Y. Pinkerton, and W. F. Patterson.
The Indiana State Meeting has already been referred to as the only state meeting that sent delegates to the General Convention held in 1849. This State Meeting dates back to June, 1839. In June, 1842, it convened in Connersville, and divided the state into four missionary districts, and appointed an evangelist to labour in each of these districts; and part of his labour was to ascertain the location of churches, number of members, date of origin, names and address of elders, etc., and to collect or obtain pledges for missionary funds.

It appears from the scanty records available that the success of this State Meeting was not very remarkable at that time, but it maintained its organic position through many discouragements. Some of the noble men of the earlier period co-operated with this State Meeting. Such men as John T. Thompson, Dr. R. T. Brown, John O’Kane, Elijah Goodwin, Love H. Jameson, H. R. Pritchard, John B. New, and J. M. Mathes, were nearly always in evidence during these annual conventions.

In May, 1852, the Ohio State Meeting was organised. This meeting was not altogether harmonious, in view of certain reports which had been circulated with respect to Dr. J. T. Barclay, who had gone as a missionary to Jerusalem. He was charged with being a slaveholder, and was therefore unworthy of the support of the brethren. This difficulty was foreshadowed by a correspondence between Mr. Kirk and Mr. Errett. In a letter to Isaac Errett, Mr. Kirk refers to this matter, and says:

Now, Brother Errett, in the name of religion and humanity, can we consistently sustain either Brother Barclay as a missionary at (in) ancient Palestine, or how can we co-operate with a missionary society that sends such a character, guilty before high heaven and all good men, of such ungodly conduct? My soul, come not thou into their secret assemblies.

To this letter, Isaac Errett makes reply, as follows:

WARREN, February 21, 1852.

DEAR BROTHER KIRK:

Yours of the 15th inst. is to hand. I have not sooner responded because I wished to consider well the whole matter before I uttered a word, one way or the other. It has caused me much trouble of mind, and has given another to the thousand reasons existing before for wishing this whole accursed system of American slavery banished from our guilty land.
But after duly considering the whole matter, I cannot see it as you do. I know nothing about it, only what your letter states. From your statement it seems, first, that Brother Barclay *inherited* these slaves—he did not buy them; second, he offered them their freedom if they would leave the State. This certainly does not look like the proposition of any 'ungodly' man; nor does it prove that 'in his zeal to carry the gospel to the heathen at Jerusalem, he sold heathen at home.' The condition of their leaving the State was, I presume, a *necessary* condition, owing to the difficulties which clog any effort to emancipate in Virginia. Brother Barclay being about to leave, could not become personally responsible for their good behaviour, and without this, if I am rightly informed, they could not be emancipated on the soil; third, they preferred to stay with Brother Tyler. This, then, is not *involuntary* servitude. You say that Brother B. gave Bro. Tyler considerable inducement to purchase them. I presume the *inducement* was that he offered to sell them at a merely nominal price, as he did not relish the traffic in human flesh, and found it necessary to guard in some way against the consequences of their refusal to leave the State. One, you say, was 'so old that Bro. Tyler would not purchase.' She selected her master, and Bro. Barclay provided for her future wants through Bro. Tyler. Is this, too, ungodly? What more could he do? If I had a Christian lad bound an apprentice to me, would that be binding Jesus Christ in the person of his child? If I hire a Christian girl at one dollar a week, is that hiring Jesus Christ at one dollar a week? If I *wrong* or *abuse* them, then Jesus considers it an insult offered to him. If I confer blessings on them in his name, he considers it done to him. Now, so far as your letter goes in the statement thus far quoted, I cannot see that Brother Barclay has been actuated by any other motive than a desire to do the best for the slaves that the circumstances would allow him to do. He certainly did not wish to make money of them. Brother Barclay's whole cause has shown a self-sacrificing disposition, a disregard of filthy lucre, an earnest love of souls. . . . In the hopes of breaking every yoke,

Your brother, 

ISAAC ERRETT.

In April, Charles Brown, of North Bloomfield, wrote a letter similar to that of Kirk, opposing all support to the American Christian Missionary Society, on account of Dr. Barclay's position with regard to the slavery question. When the Convention met at Wooster this matter was brought up, and the following notes made by Mr. Errett show plainly how he felt about the matter:

May 12. Met in convention at ten. Was put on committee to prepare a constitution and business for the meeting.
After dinner had a meeting of committee—Bro. Brown began to make trouble. In the afternoon convention saw Bro. A. Campbell. C. B. made much trouble, speaking every two minutes and much delaying business. After the afternoon session met at Bro. Lake's to prepare a constitution. Had great debates with C. B. Got ready for reporting by 8 o'clock. Then came the tug of war. C. B. presented a counter report. The evening was spent in tedious discussion with him. I made but one little speech, which had a pacifying tendency. Did not adjourn till after ten. Very weary with the toils of the day. May 13th. Morning session very unpleasant. C. B.'s course most unwarrantable. I made short speech which came just in time to do good.*

It ought to be stated in this connection that Mr. Errett was himself strongly an anti-slavery man, but he was first of all a Christian, and a man of judicial temper, and was never carried away by some side issue. His heart was in the work of the great Restoration movement, and he was especially anxious to help with the organization of the movement so that its work could be accomplished. At this time he was rapidly becoming the leader of the movement in Ohio, and it is not remarkable, in view of his character and position, that he should have taken the reasonable view of the matter which is indicated in his letter to Mr. Kirk.

However, the constitution of the Society was adopted, and from that day to the present the Ohio Missionary Society has been a model in many respects. Indeed, it has led all the other state societies in efficiency, and it is at the present time considerably in advance of any other state society in respect to work accomplished. Such names as D. S. Burnett, T. J. Melish, Benjamin Franklin, William Hayden, R. R. Sloan, J. P. Robison, J. H. Jones, A. L. Soule, John McElroy, W. A. Belding, J. J. Moss, Almon B. Green, James Hadsell, Earle Moulton, W. A. Lillie, Charles Brown, E. A. Hawley, Jacob Hoffman, Harmon Reeves, and F. Williams, were among those who attended this first meeting, May 12, 1852.

The first President of the Ohio State Meeting was David S. Burnett, and A. S. Hayden and T. J. Melish were appointed Secretaries. The Board of Managers was located at Bedford, and consisted of A. L. Soule, J. P. Robison, William Hayden, James Egbert, A. A. Comstock, J. W.

*Memoirs Errett, p. 137.
Lanphear, C. Lake, W. A. Lillie, Sidney Smith, Jacob Huffmann, and Ransom Benedict. In the second year Isaac Errett accepted the Corresponding Secretaryship, and the work of the organization commenced in earnest. The receipts this year were $2,383.04.

It was not, however, until 1861, that this society began its best work. At that time R. R. Sloan, of Mt. Vernon, Ohio, was appointed Corresponding Secretary, and it was mainly through his energetic and wise management that the Society soon led all the others as an efficient organization.

The Illinois Christian Missionary Society was first organised in 1856, and though this Society has kept up its organization to the present time, not until recently has it been distinguished for accomplishing great things. In 1883, the membership of the state was placed at 50,000, but no very trustworthy statistics can be obtained as to what the Society accomplished up to that time.

The New York Missionary Society was organised in 1861, that of Michigan in 1868, that of Nebraska in 1868, that of Iowa in 1869, that of West Virginia in 1870, that of Virginia 1876, that of California 1876, that of Maryland 1877, that of Georgia 1879, that of Oregon 1879, that of Wisconsin 1880, that of Pennsylvania 1882, that of Arkansas 1883, that of North Carolina 1883, that of Texas 1883, that of Colorado 1883, and that of Kansas 1883.

Other State Meetings have been organised, but there are no available statistics at hand with respect to the date of these organisations. However, as there are now Disciples in all the states and territories of the United States, they have their annual State Meetings, and in some of these there is a decidedly growing interest in these cooperative organisations.

It must not be imagined that progress in this respect was made without opposition. From the very beginning of the Disciple movement there have been practically at least two classes of men engaged in the work, whose interpretations of the principles and aims of the movement have materially differed. One of these classes has made the conditions of fellowship and cooperation as simple as possible, narrowing down the whole field of discussion to a hearty faith in Jesus the Christ, the Son of the
living God, and implicit obedience to His plain commands. The men of this class have sharply
distinguished between principles and methods, holding the former to be eternal, while the
latter are more or less subject to change. From the beginning these men have been in an
overwhelming majority, though a respectable minority has placed considerable emphasis upon
subordinate things; and while not making these exactly a test of Christian fellowship, they
have magnified their importance, so as to make their advocacy a disturbing element in nearly
every department of the general work. Some of these men, in the early days of the movement,
were men of much ability and unexceptionable character, and this made their opposition all
the more formidable. In using the dictum of Thomas Campbell—"Where the Scriptures speak
we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent we are silent," they gave it a very literal and
rigid application. Indeed, their application of it would have spoiled many of their own
practices, had they not skipped it when these practices were under consideration. In short, they
evidently used the dictum in an illicit manner; but all the same it helped them in their narrow
interpretation of the Bible. They were for the most part simply legalists, demanding the
"pound of flesh" with an exactness that was always fatal to their own cause, because they
could not very well make the application of the Campbell dictum, that they would in some
cases, without logically making it in all; and when they applied it to certain practices of their
own, they found that it was a boomerang which, while destroying their enemies' works,
rebounded upon themselves; consequently, whether they were right or wrong, their position
did not seem to be tenable to a large majority of the Disciples.

At the same time these men became a constant disturbing element, and some of this class
have continued with the movement down to the present time. Nor is this to be regarded as an
altogether regrettable fact. To use the language of the Apostle, "No chastisement for the
present seems to be joyous, but grievous; afterwards it works the peaceable fruit of
righteousness to them who are exercised thereby." It is probable that this class of men have
been providentially allowed to pursue their invariable opposition to any of the efforts at
progress, which the Disciples
have made, for the reason that they have acted as a sort of "break-water" against the flood of
new schemes and new organisations, which are always sure to follow in the line of an
aggressive and progressive movement. Doubtless these men have been an annoyance to those
who have had no sympathy with their legalistic notions, and in some cases they have been a
great hindrance to the progress of right thinking and right action; but, upon the whole, it is
well to regard them as a providential force which has had its philosophical relations to the
Disciple movement. When looked at from this point of view there is no occasion for
discouragement because some men, who were probably born in the objective case, have been
allowed to oppose what a large majority of the brethren regard as indispensable to the success
of the cause. It is unreasonable to suppose that we must have all clear days in order to the
proper development of nature's growth. It is better to agree with Longfellow that some days
"must be dark and dreary," and these dark and dreary days are absolutely necessary in the
government of the physical world. Equally true is it that in the religious world we must have
some dark and dreary days. The centrifugal and centripetal forces of nature are equally
important, and it is by the proper action of these that harmony is produced in the physical
world.

But however this may be, it is a historical fact that a small portion of the Disciple forces
has been, from the very beginning, practically in opposition to the main body with respect to
nearly everything that means progress. These men fought the missionary society as a "man-
made" institution, and the progress that was made was in spite of their opposition. However, it
should be noticed that all the great men of the movement were constantly in the front of the
battle all along the line. Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, Dr. Robert
Richardson, the Haydens, John T. Johnson, John Allen Gano, D. S. Burnett, James Challen,
Dr. L. L. Pinkerton, John Rogers, John Smith, John O. Kane, Love H. Jameson, John B. New,
Isaac Errett, Benjamin Franklin, and many others who might be mentioned, were all in the
front rank pleading for the best things during this period of organization. These names are
sufficient to indicate that the real leaders of the movement were on the side of progress,
and utterly opposed to a legalistic interpretation of either the dictum of the Campbells, or the Bible itself.

Progress about this time was not confined to missionary organisations. Considerable attention was also given to educational development. New colleges began to spring up in various places. Shortly after the organization of Bacon College and Bethany College, a college was established in Tennessee called "Franklin College," and this was presided over by Tolbert Fanning, a man of considerable ability and some scholarship, but who belonged to the opposition class, to which reference has just been made. But as a large majority of the Disciples never thought of making difference of opinion a test of fellowship, or even a test of co-operation, they were proud of Franklin College, and always reckoned it as one of their educational institutions. However, this college became the centre of an influence which has widened since then, through the advocacy of a periodical called the *Gospel Advocate*, published in Nashville, Tenn. For a number of years this paper has been edited by David Lipscomb, and its influence has not only been reactionary, but has bordered very closely upon the schismatical, though in the main it advocates very ably the chief principles for which the Disciples have always contended. As a matter of fact, this Nashville advocacy is really the only crack in the Disciple lute, and while it makes some discords, it is probable the outcome will be for good instead of evil.

Other colleges were established in several places. Hiram College, Ohio, was founded in 1850, and James A. Garfield was once a professor in it. Butler College at Indianapolis, Ind., was also established in 1850, Christian University at Canton, Mo., followed in 1853, and this was the first college in the United States to grant to women all the privileges granted to men. Eureka College, at Eureka, Ill., was founded in 1855, Oskaloosa College, at Oskaloosa, Iowa, in 1856, while Kentucky University, which had formerly been Bacon College and Transylvania University, was founded in 1858. This has recently reverted to the name Transylvania.

Colleges for the education of women were also organised during this period. One of the most important of these was Christian College, located at Columbia, Mo.
The charter for the incorporation of this was granted by the Legislature of Missouri, January 18, 1851. The grounds and buildings of the college were formally dedicated July 2, 1852. This college has always maintained a leading position for the education of young women in the West. Its first meeting in the new building purchased for it was held September 15, 1851. John Augustus Williams was its first president.

Another college for the education of orphan girls was established at Midway, Kentucky, in 1849. To Dr. L. L. Pinkerton is due the credit of originating this school, though he was ably supported by John T. Johnson, J. Ware Parrish, and W. F. Patterson. The college was soon fairly well endowed, and has been a strong factor for good in the state of Kentucky. Other colleges of later origin will be noticed in the proper place.

In the revival which took place with respect to education the same apparent mistake was made as that with regard to the establishment of too many churches. Some have thought that if the brethren, about this time, had concentrated their efforts and their contributions in support of one college, this could have been well endowed, and fairly well equipped; and, consequently, by the present day there would be at least one great college equal in many ways to the best in all the land. But owing to the effort to build so many colleges, none of these has been properly supported, and the result is that the Disciples have not a single college anywhere that is liberally endowed or equipped as it should be. All this is easily said, but it belongs to that sad refrain, "It might have been," and this is always more or less the result of a morbid imagination in dealing with past events. Strictly speaking, a college is like a tree; it cannot be made, it must grow. All the money in the world cannot make a college. Money will help, if wisely used; but a college must be developed through the regular, legitimate course which marks all progress. It must be subjected to the storms, just as a tree is; and as these storms help the tree to grow, so the struggles through which a college has to pass may help it to grow. Most men who unfavourably criticise the number of colleges that have been started among the Disciples fail to note the fact that these colleges are yet in the growing period, and that therefore the very con-
ditions of trial through which they are passing are absolutely necessary in order to make them what they ought to be. It is true that some of these may fail, while passing through the struggle, but in that case they only illustrate the law of the survival of the fittest. Those that are worthy will doubtless forge to the front in the long run, though the struggle may be hard and the victory delayed. One difficulty in regulating this matter was that the Disciples, from the very beginning, had no directing power among them by which the founding of these colleges could be regulated. Every community was a law unto itself, and generally these colleges sprang up through local influences, often for the purpose of benefitting a town where the college was located, the citizens subscribing to it mainly for the advantages that would accrue to them through the location of the college. These sporadic efforts were practically without remedy. Nor should any one grieve over their seemingly abnormal growths. They were legitimate offsprings of the period when they had their birth, and as to whether they shall continue to live or not, will depend entirely upon how they adjust themselves to the new days of the twentieth century.
CHAPTER XVIII

THE OLD AND THE NEW

ABOUT the middle of the fifth decade of the nineteenth century, the movement fairly passed out of its Chaotic period into something like an organization period. The churches began to work together through the societies which had been formed, and the colleges became centres of great influence in preparing men for the ministry. Up to this time most of the men who were educated at all had come into the movement from other religious bodies. But a new class of men was demanded with the new period on which the movement had entered. While the older men continued in the lead of the movement, a number of younger men began to be prominent and influential. A second generation of preachers came actively into the work, so that we must now begin to meet with such names as Isaac Errett, Benjamin Franklin, A. S. Hayden, D. P. Henderson, Moses E. Lard, Alexander Proctor, G. W. Longan, Henry T. Anderson, J. W. McGarvey, Robert Milligan, W. H. Hopson, L. B. Wilkes, and others of the older men of this second generation, and these must be reckoned with in the future progress of the work. There were still other strong men, younger than these, who soon began to be active in the ministry, but whose names do not come prominently into view until the sixth decade, which was the decade of the Civil War. The controversy with respect to Missionary Societies had practically ended with a decided victory for those who favoured these Societies. But the movement was not free from other troubles. It has been seen that from the beginning the aim was to steer clear of side issues and to insist upon only the things that are necessary to Christian character and growth. Nothing distinguished the movement more than the elimination of doubtful questions with respect to faith and practice. But notwithstanding the emphasis which was placed upon this central idea,
every now and then some one refused to be bound by the limitations with respect to opinionism.

It has already been seen that certain doctrinal questions, such as Mormonism and Thomasism, had forced themselves upon the Disciples, and for a time became a disturbing element. That the Disciples refused to make a side issue the principal thing was illustrated again in the case of Jesse B. Ferguson, a prominent and eloquent preacher of Nashville, Tenn. Ferguson insisted upon ventilating his theory of Restoration, the very thing practically that was a test case with respect to the admission to the ministry of Aylett Raines. Aylett Raines simply agreed to preach the Gospel without referring to his peculiar views of the future life. Ferguson did not do this. He set forth his views in both his pulpit and in the press. The result was that his influence was practically destroyed, and the movement which he inaugurated, though somewhat disturbing for the time, was without any general effect upon the progress of the Disciple cause. Other defections of a similar kind took place shortly, but all of these failed to make any substantial breach in the Disciple lines, while every man who attempted to set up some theory, instead of the simple faith to which the Disciples had clung all the way down their history, soon killed himself rather than the cause with which he had been identified.

It has already been seen that a new generation of preachers was beginning to take a prominent place in the Disciple movement. The old men were still actively engaged in the pioneer work. Very few of them had even partially retired from the field. Most of these had been evangelists from the beginning, but a few had become pastors of churches and were still serving these churches very acceptably.

However, some of these men were beginning to feel the weight of years. The first of the real leaders to fall in the conflict was Thomas Campbell, the author of the "Declaration and Address." He had for some time been in feeble health, though his mind continued clear and he occasionally wrote something for the Harbinger. All his contributions breathed the same spirit as that which was so manifest in the great paper which practically inaugurated the Disciple movement. He fell asleep January 4,
1854, and his passing away was as gentle as his life had always been.

It is perhaps impossible to estimate the influence of Thomas Campbell's life on the Disciple movement. He was the very embodiment of the three graces to which the Apostle Paul calls attention in the thirteenth chapter of first Corinthians, and he especially illustrated in all he said and did the greatest of these three, viz., love. In every sentence he ever wrote, and in every sermon he preached, love was the supreme characteristic.

In June, 1851, he delivered his farewell sermon, and this sermon, even if he had never said anything else, is worthy to immortalize his name. The text was, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself." After explaining the text, he concludes as follows:

Now, brethren, I have given you the key and the compend. I can do no more. Whoever has, by studying this blessed book, fallen in love with God, and is doing the things therein commanded, and which are comprehensively summed up in the two great commandments which we have been considering, is on the way to eternal bliss, and he will see in all things nothing but God. If we have any desire to be eternally happy, and to exist for the purpose for which we are made, let us make the contents of the Bible our study night and day, and endeavour, by prayer and meditation, to let its influence dwell upon our hearts perpetually. This is the whole business of life in this world. All else is but preparation for this; for this alone can lead us back to God—the eternal and unwasting fountain of all being and blessedness. He is both the Author and Object of the Bible. It has come from him, and is graciously designed to lead us to him—"unto all the riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Let us make it our continual study, therefore, to search out its precious contents, that we may know and enjoy him who has created us for his own glory; so that we shall ultimately see him as he is, and be with him where he is, and sit down with him upon the throne of his glory. And this every one shall do, who fulfils these commandments, for on them hang all the law and the prophets; and it is also written, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." And, "of Him are we in Christ Jesus, who of God has made us unto wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption," so that in all things we are
complete in Jesus—glory to his ever blessed name! This sets man at the head of the whole creation, next to God, where Christ, who has saved us by his death, and now lives to intercede for us perpetually, also sitteth. My brethren, we are persuaded that our gracious Father, who has done so much for us, will withhold from us no good gift. Yea, he is more willing to give than we are to ask, for he invites and exhorts us to ask. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, who, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone, or if he ask for a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in Heaven, give good gifts to them that ask him?" "All things whatsoever ye ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive."

How rich and precious are these promises of our blessed Lord! But, my brethren, why should we doubt, since we already have the greatest gift—even the Holy Spirit—the Comforter, or Advocate, whom our blessed Saviour promised he would send to abide with his disciples forever. And this is "the earnest of our inheritance" given to us who believe in Christ, "in whom, also," says the Apostle Paul, "after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory "; and again, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" Thus, my brethren, we are thoroughly furnished unto every good word and work. God our Heavenly Father, hath not withholden from us even his Holy Spirit, a part of the Trinity in Unity; so that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all graciously and mercifully united in providing, procuring, and effecting our salvation. The Holy Spirit, by the law and the prophets, puts us into possession of the salvation provided for us by the Father, in sending his well beloved and only begotten Son into the world, to die for our sins. It is through the Spirit that we have been furnished with this divine illumination, and from it alone have we derived all definite and reliable knowledge of the adorable character and attributes of our Creator, of our duties to him, and our own future and everlasting destiny.

Oh, my brethren, what an exalted condition God has placed us in, with respect to his whole creation! He has not only said, "He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God and he shall be my son," but our blessed Lord also says, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come unto him and will sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." What is
this, my brethren? Did ye hear it? Who says this? The same who said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Yes, it is the divine word, and let us take heed to its blissful promises. Let us give ourselves up to the word of God, to its guidance, to the diligent study of its blissful contents, to meditation, to prayer, and to the love of God, that we may love him with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves, for this is the sum of the law and the prophets.

These things being so, my beloved brethren, "Let us run with diligence the race set before us, looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of the faith; who, for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." His promises can never fail, for they are sure and steadfast as his unchangeable and eternal nature. Some things he has promised conditionally, but this does not affect his veracity. He is both willing and able to perform all things which he has graciously promised concerning us. Let us, therefore, fall back upon his Word, upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus himself being the chief cornerstone, and God himself the author of the whole. For it all rests upon his infallible word— infallible both as respects authority and power, and sooner shall heaven and earth pass away, than one jot or tittle of it fail of its final and complete accomplishment.

We have thus, my beloved brethren, as fully as our time will justify and my failing capacity enable me, pointed out the road which will surely lead to eternal life. Let us adopt the prescription given for the way, and exercise ourselves into godliness night and day, searching the Scriptures continually, that we may come rightly to comprehend and truly to realise the revealed character of our God, and thus fully to enjoy his salvation.

In conclusion, my dear brethren, I can say no more to you, as the last words of a public ministry, protracted, under the merciful care of our Heavenly Father for more than three score years, in this my farewell exhortation to you on earth—I can say no more than what I have already so often urged upon you, "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy soul, and all thy mind, and all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself," for in so doing, the powers of hell shall not prevail against you. May the Lord God impress these truths upon our hearts, and enable us all, "through faith and patience, to inherit the promises"—keeping us by his power, until it shall please him in his infinite mercy to take us home to himself, to the enjoyment of "the inheritance of the saints in light"; and the praise, honour, and glory of our salvation, be eternally his, through Jesus, world without end. Amen.

THE death of this great man produced a profound impression wherever his name was known, and among the
Disciples it was really a household word. Resolutions of condolence and respect were passed by numerous churches and societies, and letters breathing the same spirit were received by the family and friends from almost every quarter of the land.

But he was a man of faith, and as such, though dead like Abel, he still speaketh. His words will continue to be talismans for the Disciple hosts. This very year the Disciples everywhere are preparing to go up to Pittsburg to celebrate the inauguration of the movement, which was the result of his great paper published in 1809.

Another old hero of the early conflicts fell in 1856. This was John T. Johnson, the great Kentucky evangelist. This distinguished preacher of the Gospel died at Lexington, Mo., where he had been preaching to a crowded congregation before he was attacked with pneumonia. He became ill on the 8th of December, and on the Thursday week following he fell asleep in that Jesus whom he had so constantly preached as the resurrection and the life.

Of all the men connected with the Restoration movement, John T. Johnson was perhaps the most indefatigable, active, earnest, and hopeful. He was always at work, was practically on fire whenever he was dealing with souls, and he never became discouraged, no matter how dark the days might seem. He was in some respects a phenomenon. In every good work he took an active part. In the union movement between the "Reformers" and "Christians," which was consummated in Kentucky and other places, he was a most influential factor. He belonged to both parties. His convictions had been largely formed through the teaching of Alexander Campbell, and he was largely influenced to join the Restoration movement through the reading of Mr. Campbell's periodicals. At the same time he was intimately associated personally with Mr. Stone and those associated with him, so that he came into the Restoration movement the friend of both the "Reformers" and "Christians." Though an evangelist, in the truest sense of that term, his influence was very great in organising the movement and developing it along the lines of spiritual growth. Perhaps no other one man did more for the American Christian Missionary Society than he did. Everywhere he went he secured life
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members and life directors for this Society. He was equally active in behalf of the Kentucky Female Orphan School. In one of his letters addressed to Carroll Kendrick, he says: "What say you of the destitute Female Orphan Society? My wife has subscribed $100. It must go. Brother Fall has subscribed $500, I am told—noble. Oh, the luxury of imitating the Saviour in relieving the poor and needy, especially the little orphan girl. The appeal is irresistible." This was a postscript to a letter, and was evidently intended to be private, but Mr. Kendrick published it in order to show the spirit of the man.

His death produced a profound sensation. While he was growing in years, he was still vigorous in health up to the time of his last attack. He was preaching with his usual energy, and numerous converts were being made at his last meeting. He fell just as he would have preferred, with the harness on. He only stopped pleading with sinners when he was no longer able to speak, and this fact indicates the character of the man.

Numerous eulogies have been pronounced upon this beloved evangelist, and perhaps none of these have overstated the value of his services to the great cause to which he committed all his talent and energies. He was not a scholar in the technical understanding of that term, but he was much more than this. He was a full-grown man with a heart flowing over with love for humanity, every pulsation of which was in sympathy with the salvation of souls. He literally lived to save others, and gave his own life in this great service. He was more than any other man the leader of the forces in Kentucky, and his influence is to-day felt among all the churches of that state. Eternity alone can tell what John T. Johnson did for the Restoration movement.

The following personal sketch was written by one who knew him well. The article gives a vivid picture of the man and his methods:

He is now in the sixty-fifth year of his age, and a few weeks since made, in our hearing, this remarkable statement: "I have been at a protracted meeting for the last three years, and during the last three weeks, I have spoken twenty-two discourses." In illustration of his devotion to the work to which, for twenty-three years, he has given his entire time, it will be sufficient to state, that during the unparalleled winter
of '51-2, he continued preaching night and day, in the villages of Mason and Fleming Counties, Kentucky. The mercury, for days together, remained below zero, the piercing wind whirled the light snow through the dense air—the cattle sought the sheds, or remained tumbling behind any defence that offered against the cutting blast—fowls remained on the roost, or dropped from it dead; even the crows ventured not abroad against the double terror of frost and storm. The labours of servants were limited to the care of the stock, and the piling of fuel upon the heated and blazing hearths. Still, J. T. Johnson was traveling from point to point, preaching to the perishing the unsearchable riches of Christ. His stature is about five feet eleven inches, his form remarkably slender and erect, his hair, once jet black, is now sprinkled with white, has become thin and much of it has fallen; yet we never could think him bald. His general complexion, the colour of his eyes and hair, indicate a decidedly bilious temperament. When introduced to him in the private circle, you recognise at once the well-bred, high-toned gentleman. No length of acquaintance, no amount of fatigue, ever tempts him into the clownish in manners. His conversation easy, perfectly familiar, sometimes with his intimate friends even chatty, is still chaste, dignified, and almost wholly of things pertaining to the kingdom and patience of the Saviour. The necessity of greater liberality, commendations of such churches and individuals as he thinks have "acted nobly"—and the interests and prospects of the Orphan School, of Bethany College, of Bacon College, the movements of his preaching brethren, the necessity of preserving labour, paid or not paid—such are some of the themes that employ his tongue, and rest continually upon his noble and generous heart. When he rises in the pulpit, his movements, countenance, and utterance, imply slight embarrassment—the result of unaffected diffidence; and although abundant courage will appear before he closes, and a becoming confidence in his ability to propound and illustrate the Gospel, yet his respect for his audience never forsakes him.

His manner is difficult of description. You will think, likely, on hearing him for the first time, that his "preparatory remarks" are rather extensive, and you may perhaps wonder when his sermon will commence. He is into his sermon from the first word, and after speaking of various matters pressing upon his attention, if he thinks the great object he has in view will be secured by such a course, he will return to his first point and make it the last. Though eminently capable of arranging and delivering methodical and logical discourses, yet, to do this is not his object, but to bring his hearers to believe, and to feel and to obey the Gospel.

He may be thought, by those who do not know him, a "revivalist." Such he is not—at least not in the usual meaning of the term revivalist, but the farthest from it imaginable.
There is no cant, no affectation—his speech being merely earnest conversation. It never enters his mind to play the orator. His addresses are characterised by devotion to the teaching of the New Testament, by obvious sincerity and an all-pervading desire for the salvation of his hearers. He is speaking of moral courage, or its importance, its propriety, its congruity with manliness. "If there be," he remarks, "an object on this earth supremely pitiable, one is almost tempted to say contemptible, it is a man who, in days of prosperity and health, stops his ears to the Gospel of Christ, and, through fear of his fellow-worms, refuses to obey the Saviour, but who, when death stares him in the face, will cry out, and implore the prayers of the people of God. And will the Lord hear the cry of such? What does it say in effect? "Lord, I have lived in sin, I have done thy cause what harm I could, but can do no more, I can serve Satan no longer—now, O Lord, receive my poor soul." "Because I called and you refused, I will laugh at your calamity and mock when your feet cometh." Remember these fearful words. We do not limit the power or benevolence of God, but he will not be mocked. Beware, Beware! Or he is speaking of the inherent demerit of sin, of sowing to the flesh. Turning to the female portion of his audience, he will perhaps speak thus, "I am declining and I know it. A few more years will probably close my career, and yet I sometimes hope to see the day when no female will be found on the dark side, sowing to the flesh. When I see a noble, generous-hearted female, whom all admire, advocating the cause of sin by her example, I blush inwardly."

But though we might give perhaps the precise words, it is impossible to give any notion of the speaker's manner, so entirely his own, and on which so much depends.

The venerable Walter Scott wrote in the *Christian Age* as follows:

The doleful tidings of our brother's death was yesterday (twenty-eighth) telegraphed to Bro. Richard M. Bishop, thus:

"Eld. JOHN T. JOHNSON died here (Lexington, Mo.) last evening (twenty-fourth December), of Pneumonia. O. H. P. STONE, M.D."

The above despatch carries to the bosoms of the brethren and relatives of the deceased so great a burden of grief, of woe, of wailing and tears, that any effort on our part to increase or intensify it by words would be equally indiscreet, unfeeling, and unavailing. The stroke has fallen on our hearts with the unexpectedness of a jet of lightning from a cloudless sky—like a thief in the night!—a thief in the night—"Behold," says Christ, "I come as a thief in the night."

Lord, what is man that thou shouldst magnify him—that thou shouldst set thy heart upon him—that thou shouldst visit him every morning and try him every moment?
What is life? In Deity it may be, and indeed it is, a rich, deep, overflowing, and unfathomable fact; but in man—what? A vapour—a lucid interval between the cradle and the grave—a bird on the wing to a far foreign clime—a beauteous face smitten by the hand of time into a hillock of wrinkles—a bright-eyed boy changed to a grasshopper, staff in hand—a craft riding 'mid rocks and whirlpools—a sweet flower on winter's stormy breast! Through what hosts of crowding contradictories is traced the devious path of human existence! The atom and the universe—the drop and the ocean—the single ray and the full-orbed sun at noon—the sweet and the bitter—love and hatred—good and evil—pain and pleasure—all have to be encountered in the solemn march and fatal battle of life. But can we extract from this chaos of contradictories that now enshrine our nature no summer, no brighter idea of life than that it is a vapour—a group of wrinkles—a lucid interval—a wreck—a flower? Surely there are two sides to the picture of humanity. Surely there is the fixed as well as the fugitive; the essential as well as the accidental; the immortal as well as the mortal; the divine as well as the human. If, then, from among the sands, the molecules, the atoms, the little things of nature, of society and of men, a man selects the permanent, the essential, the immortal, the divine, and dedicates to the diffusion and defence of these eternal things among mankind his body, soul, and life, can we deny to the same the title of "great man"? We cannot. With the afflicted Prince of Israel, therefore, on the loss of Abner, his general, we say, on the death of our noble and unsurpassed preacher, Bro. Johnson—"This day a great man has fallen in Israel."

His greatness, however, was not that of empire, of the code, or mere patriotism, or of philosophy, or of art; it was the greatness of goodness—the greatness of unflinching toil and universal success in the noblest of all causes—the cause of human redemption. In these he was truly great—perhaps unsurpassed by any other servant of the Most High on the field. He is gone; alas! Shall we ever see his like again?

Bro. Johnson originally belonged to the bar. From this he went to Congress. In 1812 he entered the army, and was an aid to General Harrison when war raged on our northern frontier. At Fort Meigs he had his horse shot under him while carrying a despatch to the officer in command. In religion he first joined the Baptists; but on gravely considering the gospel as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, he became convinced that we were correct in announcing it in the language of inspiration. Leaving the Baptist brethren, therefore, he felt it to be his duty to lend the influence of his good name and the force of his great talents to the support of the current Reformation.

If of the image of Christian civilisation, science, and art, are to be lower extremities, and law and religion the body and
arms, is not individual character the head and diadem of the whole? And is not character a
generalisation in which is found the solution of the great and manifold problems indicated by
divine providence? Is it not to the development of this that all political, moral, spiritual, and
material forces in all their strength directly or indirectly work? It is character that makes God;
the want of it, Satan. Bro. Johnson was a character; but who is prepared to give a lifelike
portrait of him—of one in whom were united the nice discriminations of law, the breadth of
the legislator, the courage of the soldier, and the purity, simplicity, zeal, labour, and grandeur,
of the saint?

Our principles require to be aroused, quickened, invigorated, and developed. Among the
providential maxims by which the machinery of the moral universe is guided, vitalised, and
conserved, the law of suffering is one. This operates with such extent of effect that the Most
High himself does not escape. In this "vale funereal"—this "vale of tears"—the Father of our
Lord Jesus Christ may be regarded as the "Chief Mourner."

Bro. Johnson entered voluntarily with all saints into the melancholy train, and suffered
and sympathised, and groaned, with God and the creation.

"Sweet are the uses of adversity,
Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in its head."

Bro. Johnson, in the brave virtues of self-sacrifice, courage, and adherence to purpose,
had few rivals—no superiors. Who can record the necessities he endured in his long career, of
hunger and thirst and cold, of weakness and weariness, pain and sickness, danger and
difficulty? It was not conscience and scripture alone that formed the model of his life, but
Christ, "who went about constantly doing good." There is one universe, one God who made it,
and one will to rule it. Through Christ Bro Johnson seized with a strong grasp on this will and
made it the rule of his own life, and was most urgent in commending it to others.

In his ministry he showed great respect for character, but none for persons. While,
therefore, his gifts fitted him for evangelical labour in the higher and better-educated portion
of society, his graces of benevolence and condescension admirably qualified him for waiting
on the poor. His gospel reached both these extremes, and so did his fireside labours. He won,
by the simplicity and power of his appeals, both rich and poor to the obedience of the faith.

Nothing is more sordid than a low, censorious spirit; nor is there anything more noble
than to defend the absent and the innocent. Bro. Johnson's character sparkled and was made
radiant by these qualities; but while he was forward to defend both God and his neighbour, he
was very slow to resent any-
thing said of himself or done to himself personally. He comforted himself in conscious rectitude—in conscious innocence.

Christ was no idler; he was a labourer—not a loiterer; and a great man in the ancient world was called a man of *magna labore, magna diligentia*—of great diligence, of great labour. In these things Elder Johnson must have had "rejoicing in himself," as Paul says. "and not in another."

It is said of Christ that, "though rich, for our sake he became poor." "The foxes have holes," he said, "and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has not where to lay his head." No man had fairer prospects of making himself, if he desired it, rich than the deceased. He saw clearly that covetousness was a popular sin, and that if men do well to themselves the world will praise them; but neither the prospect of wealth nor worldly applause could shake the steadfast purpose of his soul, or turn him aside from Christ and man's redemption.

Bro. Johnson's oratory was of a fiery and heroic type—in most instances irresistible. It pleased, instructed, convinced, and charmed all souls to the obedience of the faith. He baptized vast numbers of people. And although he seemed cheered by the fact, and somewhat gratified by the brethren's approbation of his public effort, yet no man cared less than he for the honour that comes from men. He willingly surrendered his reputation with men for the sake of souls and the honour of heaven.

To live for ourselves is no proper purpose of life. Bro. Johnson saw this, and therefore placed his eye steadily on the great ends of human existence—the elevation and perfection of his own nature, the good of man, and the glory of God. He is now going to reap the highest reward of excellence—fellowship with God; or, as Paul says—"He has gone to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in Heaven, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, whose blood speaketh better things than the blood of Abel, and to God the Judge of all." This is the sum and high reward of all his toils and all his excellence.

About two months after the death of John T. Johnson, Jacob Creath, Sr., also died. He was one of the earliest advocates of the movement in Kentucky, and was excluded from the Elkhorn Association because of his advocacy of the principles of the Reformation. Reference has already been made to Mr. Campbell's estimate of his eloquence, and the following sketch by George W. Elley, a personal friend of Mr. Creath, will be appreciated by
those who are interested in life pictures of the old pioneers:

Bro. Creath was a remarkable man in some respects, for although his education and reading were quite limited, yet he was possessed of all the elements necessary to ensure, with proper culture, the development of a genius rarely to be found in men. He was born a subject of Great Britain, in the province of Nova Scotia, February 22, 1777. At the age of ten, his parents emigrated with him to Virginia. At twelve he was added to the Baptist Church, and at eighteen he commenced his ministerial history among them. At twenty-two he married the daughter of Job Carter, of Lancaster County, Northern Neck, Virginia, and in the year 1800 they emigrated to this State and County.

But few men possessed more of the elements necessary to a popular orator than Bro. Creath. He possessed a fine face, a remarkably keen and interesting pair of eyes, which sparkled with animation and benevolence; a voice as loud, and yet as rich, as our best church organs, and with a commanding and controlling power over its intonations. As a pulpit orator, he had but few, if any, equals in the State, or West. Bland and affectionate in his intercourse with all men, he very naturally exerted a very large and controlling influence among the Baptists. He possessed but little of that sectarian spirit that too commonly exists among the leaders of the various party dogmas of all sects, and was emphatically a man of peace and forgiveness. A malicious temperament or feeling towards those who opposed him formed no part of his character, yet he had, during his early history in Kentucky, many strong and untiring adversaries among the Baptists; but he came off in all his contests with the spoils. I have often heard him detail his early conflicts whilst among the Baptists, and upon his dying couch heard him, with uplifted hands to heaven, say that he "freely forgave every human being all their supposed injuries, as well as those which were real, for Christ's sake."

He remained with the Baptists till 1827, when, after much inward conflict between his early convictions and associations, which had greatly endeared him to very many of his brethren, he was compelled to change his religious associations and views, for a system which, in some respects, he regarded of a higher and purer origin, and which led him to connect himself with those brethren who were contending for a purer speech, and a more primitive order in faith and practice. Like his old companions in the former army, Elder John Smith, Wm. Morton, and others, when he moved, hundreds of others journeyed with him, and sometimes whole congregations would go in the mass. Always true to the cause, and the friends he allied with, so long as his convictions were in unison with them, he continued not only with equal, but increased zeal, to
plead the cause of truth and righteousness, and the freedom of speech and conscience. As a sermoniser he generally felt himself fortified with ample means when before a congregation, but when he had connected himself with the Christian brethren, at a time when the great conflict of society was with facts and arguments, and when the entire system of preaching was necessarily changed, he often expressed himself as unable to leave off his old habits of declamation for arguments and close logical reasoning. As an exhorter, he possessed rare and valuable talent, and often produced powerful effects upon his audiences. But few men could discriminate in abstruse cases with more quickness than he could; and in all matters of church law, he was remarkably pointed and clear. Among his preaching brethren he was gentle and affectionate, assuming no arrogant superiority on account of his age, and the experience of over fifty years in the ministry.

For the last seven years he had been totally blind, by a sudden attack of jaundice, as he thought, at Memphis, Tennessee, when on his way to Mississippi, to see his daughters. Under this affliction, however sorely he felt it, he was submissive, and without a murmur. He received it as coming from the hand of God, and bore it with constant patience. By this sudden and unexpected stroke he felt that an end had been brought to his public ministry, and the unspeakably high privilege of reading the word of God. It was, indeed, an affliction irreparable in this life, but he knew how to turn it to the best account. He possessed, both by nature and association, unusual qualifications for the social circle; and being a common favourite among the brotherhood, he sought to spend much of his time in their society, which, in a great measure, destroyed the recollection of his blindness. He often spoke, either in word or exhortation, with the Churches, and always received their kindest sympathies.

Reference has already been made to the Bible Society which was organised a few years before the American Christian Missionary Society was organised. At the Convention, when this latter Society was organised, a vote of confidence and commendation was passed by the Convention with respect to the Bible Society. It was soon seen, however, that this Society was not specially needed, and it was finally discontinued, and the Disciples very generally supported the American Bible Union, a society which had for its object, mainly, the translation of the Bible. This Society was warmly supported by Mr. Campbell, and he was assigned the book of Acts for translation. He gave himself very earnestly to this work and finished it in the spring of 1855. It is generally conceded that, in undertaking this important revision, he made a
mistake. His mind was not specially adapted to that kind of work. He was fond of generalisation, and always felt himself cramped when he had to plod through details, such as this revision work required. But true to his traditional habit, he gave himself practically up to this slavish work while he had it on hand, taking little exercise, and confining himself almost the whole of his time to his studio. The consequence was he came out of the task somewhat broken in health, from which he never perhaps entirely recovered.

The co-operation of the Disciples and Baptists in this revision enterprise brought their leaders closely together, and did much to break down the antagonism which had resulted in a separation of the two bodies at the beginning of the third decade.

However, this good-fellowship was somewhat marred by the appearance of a book, entitled "Campbellism Examined," by Rev. Jeremiah B. Jeter, of Richmond, Va. Dr. Jeter was a prominent minister in the Baptist Church, and his book was intensely partisan in its character. In many respects it was an entire misrepresentation of the Disciple position, and in scarcely anything did it do justice to their religious movement. The book was reviewed by Mr. Campbell in a series of articles which were published in his magazine, the *Millennial Harbinger*.

Dr. Jeter's main point of attack was with respect to the teaching of the Disciples concerning the office and work of the Holy Spirit. He claimed that their position on this subject was superlatively heterodox. In this contention he grossly misrepresented the Disciples. No one can read the utterances of the leaders of the movement without feeling that such a charge is wholly unfounded. Mr. Campbell's great opening speech on this subject, in the Campbell and Rice debate, is of itself sufficient to annihilate every position which Mr. Jeter assumed in his book. It is said that the Hon. Henry Clay, who heard this masterly address, was thoroughly captivated by it, and afterwards declared it was the finest piece of logic and rhetoric to which he had ever listened.

But the position of the Disciples with respect to spiritual influence did seriously protest against the popular notions on that subject. Undoubtedly, very erroneous views were held by many at that particular time with
THE OLD AND THE NEW

respect to the work of the Holy Spirit in the matter of conversion. This was so much the case that superstition had taken the place of facts, while "sights and sounds" and occult impressions had largely superseded the plain teaching of the Word of God. It was against these excesses and perversions of Scriptural teaching that the Disciples made their strong protest, and it was largely because they did so that their position was misunderstood by some and repudiated by many. In this was illustrated a very common habit with people who do not think. We often imagine that a doctrine is denied, when the abuse of it comes under protest.

Dr. Jeter's book was received among the Baptists with mingled feelings of approbation and protest. Most of the least informed among the Baptists regarded its appearance as providential, and hailed its arguments with supreme delight. However, there were not a few among the more intelligent Baptists who shook their heads, and were by no means pleased with either the arguments or the spirit of Dr. Jeter's book. For some time there had been a growing feeling among the ablest Baptist ministers that the position of the Disciples was in the main right, and that opposition to these views was only a proof of the ignorance of those who made it. One of the men who, in his early ministry, had been most outspoken in his opposition to the Disciples, was John L. Waller, of Louisville, Ky., one of the ablest preachers and theologians of his day. He died in 1854, but some time before his death he became intimately acquainted with Mr. Campbell, and after a careful examination of the latter's teaching, Dr. Waller practically gave up his opposition, and expressed his hearty agreement with the sage of Bethany in nearly all of his contentions. Dr. S. W. Lynd, of Cincinnati, was another able Baptist minister who was disposed to do Mr. Campbell justice. He wrote some articles severely criticising Dr. Jeter's book and practically agreeing with Mr. Campbell in all of his positions except his view of the design of baptism. But this view of the design of baptism was never made an article of faith with the Disciples, though they regarded it of much importance, and this being the case, it is easy to see how such men as Dr. Lynd and Dr. Waller could heartily co-operate with the Disciples, not only in respect to Biblical revision,
but also in respect to everything else pertaining to religious work. Indeed, it is highly probable that had John L. Waller lived some years longer, there might have been effected a union between the Baptists and Disciples before the death of Mr. Campbell; and it is not too much to say that this would have been the crowning glory of Mr. Campbell's great soul, for he always regretted the separation that had taken place, and was ever ready to meet his Baptist brethren, even more than half-way, in any effort that looked towards the union of the two bodies.

Mr. Jeter's book was not only reviewed in the Harbinger by Mr. Campbell, but received its final quietus in a book published by Moses E. Lard, in 1857. This was an able and exhaustive review of Mr. Jeter's book, and though somewhat caustic in its style, and not always correct in its expositions of Scripture, it was, nevertheless, a most remarkable production by a man as young as Mr. Lard was at the time he wrote his review.

Mr. Lard was a graduate of Bethany College, and was in some respects unsurpassed as a thinker and preacher among the second generation of those who were eminent as leaders of the Disciple movement. He was born in Tennessee, but migrated with his parents to Missouri when he was about fourteen years of age. In this latter state he grew up among the earlier settlers; and though without the culture which comes from a refined environment, he nevertheless soon became distinguished for having a vigorous mind, as well as great power as a speaker. His review of Mr. Jeter, from the point of view occupied, left nothing more to be said. It was simply overwhelming. Every sentence was as concise as it could be made, and was as incisive as it was concise. The general effect of the book was practically to close the controversy between Baptists and Disciples, with respect to the matters discussed by Dr. Jeter and Mr. Lard. Intelligent Baptist preachers conceded the victory to the Disciples, while the more spiritually minded and conservative Disciples admitted that Mr. Lard's review, while conclusive with respect to the issues involved, was nevertheless not altogether amiable in spirit, and upon the whole did not tend to help the union spirit which had begun to develop among the Baptists and Disciples.

Another disturbing element came to the front about
this time. A publication society had been organised, and had received some support in contributions, and also in the endorsement of the Missionary Convention. However, this Society did not receive the sympathy of many Disciples. Mr. Campbell himself was doubtful about its usefulness, and when some of the money contributed to the American Christian Missionary Society was diverted to this Publication Society, the Harbinger no longer hesitated to declare its opposition. The chief defender was Benjamin Franklin, who was at that time editor of the Christian Age, a paper published at Cincinnati, and the only influential weekly paper devoted to the plea of the Disciples in existence at that time. Mr. Franklin was a man of great energy and equally great courage. He was somewhat deficient in scholarly attainments, but he made up for this in common sense and his knowledge of the people. If he had been a politician he would probably have been reckoned among demagogues, as he certainly understood how to make use of the ad captandum vulgus in carrying his point. But he was too conscientious, too devoted to the cause which he had espoused, to knowingly use his popular power for illicit ends. Nevertheless, he was a strong force to deal with when he was in opposition.

Professor Pendleton conducted the controversy with Mr. Franklin with respect to this Publication Society, Mr. Pendleton attacking, and Mr. Franklin defending the Society. The correspondence finally degenerated into personalities, and was discontinued without any immediate result, except to embitter feelings among the brethren where love ought to have reigned. Later, however, the Publication Society was discontinued, as also the Bible Society, which had been started a few years before the American Christian Missionary Society was organised.

The chief difficulty with the Publication Society was that it was not properly supported, and could accomplish very little with the meagre means it had at its disposal. Undoubtedly, it was a move in the right direction, but it was born out of due time. The Disciples have never had a publication house worthy of the name. They have been compelled to either bury their books where it was simply impossible for them to reach the general public, or else go to publishing houses entirely outside of the brotherhood. Recently there has been a rising feeling
that the time has come when such a publishing society, or firm, is greatly needed.

In 1856, the Kentucky Christian Education Society was organised. The men chiefly responsible for this important movement were William Morton, Philip S. Fall, R. C. Rice, R. C. Ricketts, Dr. L. L. Pinkerton, Z. F. Smith, and, indeed, nearly all the leading preachers and brethren of that state. It was felt that a great many indigent young men who were wishful to enter the ministry had not the financial means to secure a collegiate education, and as a majority of those who wish to enter the ministry belong to this very class, this organization really became a necessity in order to help these indigent young men to equip themselves worthily for the great work of preaching the Gospel. This society soon secured a respectable endowment fund, and has already spent a large sum in assisting about 600 young men to enter the ministry. It offers a solution of perhaps the most difficult problem which the Disciples have to meet in this twentieth century, viz., the supply of a well-educated ministry. It is not easy to endow colleges for the education of these young men, while it is impossible for them to attend college for want of the necessary financial means to do so. Thousands of young men are turned away from their aspirations to enter the ministry simply because they see it is impossible to obtain an education commensurate with the position they will be called upon to fill, and realising that they must occupy a place where they will be discounted, if they do not obtain a college education, they at once turn away from the ministry and seek some other calling. This Kentucky Education Society solved the problem for that state, at least to a large extent, and the result is seen in the ministry which has been educated by the aid of this Society. If other states would do as Kentucky has done, there would be no longer much complaint about the inadequate supply of preachers for the churches.

While the Disciples were passing through this transitional period, where they were reaching out for organization and co-operation, they did not cease their evangelistic efforts. Some great meetings were held about this time, and among these may be mentioned one that was held with the Fourth and Walnut Street Christian Church in Louisville, Ky. D. P. Henderson, whose name has already
been mentioned, was the chief preacher at this meeting. The remarkable character of the meeting was in its continuation for months, and in the simplicity of the methods adopted. Henderson's style was very unique. Nearly all the time he was speaking he held the Bible in one hand, and slightly gestured with the other. He did not quote the Scriptures as preachers usually do, but he read nearly every passage out of the Bible itself, so as to be exact in all the quotations he made. His discourses were, as a rule, simply running comments upon the Scripture used, and were without rhetorical finish, and frequently with no logical sequence. Very often each discourse would be a commentary on several selected passages of Scripture, and not infrequently a whole chapter would be brought into requisition as the basis of what he had to say.

From week to week he kept up the interest by this simple style of preaching, and the result was a great ingathering of souls. He continued to be the pastor of the church for some time after this great meeting, and did much to plant the cause firmly in the city.

Mr. Henderson, during the latter years of the saintly Stone, was co-editor with him of the Christian Messenger, when it was published at Jacksonville, Ill. He was also largely influential in founding Christian University at Canton, Mo., as well as intimately connected with other enterprises among the Disciples. He was one of the epoch-making men of his time.

In the year 1858 J. O. Beardslee was sent to Jamaica to take charge of a mission work on that island. Mr. Beardslee had already had experience in work there as a missionary. But, having united with the Disciples, he now went as their second missionary to a foreign field. This mission, like the Jerusalem mission, was not productive of many converts, though it reacted favourably upon the churches at home somewhat as the Jerusalem mission did. Both of these missions were valuable as experiments, if for no other reason. They partially satisfied the Disciples' longing for a world-wide spread of their principles. Mr. Beardslee was well equipped for the work which he undertook, and he laid the foundation for the subsequent success which has crowned the Jamaica mission.

In closing the year 1859, Professor W. K. Pendleton
takes a backward look at what had been accomplished up to that particular time, and we cannot do better than close this chapter with some extracts from his suggestive review. He says:

The closing of the year suggests to us many reflections of great value to the soul. It is like the pauses, which the mariner makes in his voyage over the wide and trackless sea, that he may take reckonings of his progress, and from a survey of the wastes over which he has drifted, find his true position, and correct his course for future sailing. For life, each one's life, is but a short sail on his little tract of the measureless sea of time, over which his bark is driving, but too often darkly, before the whirl and pulse and fitful gusts of his own passions, and it needs, that in calm days of meditation and tranquil faith, he should pause for observation upon the celestial lights, which, ever steady in the heavens, rear their eternal beacons high above 'the tempests that toss us on earth, and point us, unerringly and alone, to the true haven of the soul. We are approaching the end of another year,—we are about to close another volume of our communings with a widely scattered and rapidly growing brotherhood, and we would linger a moment, before we part with the past, that we may catch some good inspiration from its spirit, to fit us for the labour and life of the future.

The year has been one of great activity among the Disciples—never has the gospel been proclaimed with more earnestness or its power more joyfully manifested in the conversion of souls. From every part of the wide union the story of its triumphs is sent up to us, and we feel fully warranted in saying, that during the last twelve months not less than thirty or forty thousand converts have been enlisted under the banners of the Cross. Hundreds of churches have been planted and organised, in districts where, hitherto, we have scarcely had a name, and their influence and power are steadily increasing and constantly exerted to the further extension of the principles of pure, primitive, apostolic Christianity, both in faith and practice. The tendency is perpetually towards greater and closer unanimity. Our brethren are emphatically one. One in faith, one in the great spirit of missionary work, in the most general and particular sense of the word, and one in the "doctrine of Christ." Never have we had greater reason to confide in the impregnable strength of the ground which we occupy, than now. Very generally, we are enjoying the demonstration of experience. The blessed words of the Saviour have been brought to fulfilment in our hearts—"My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be God, or whether I speak of myself."—We have thrown ourselves upon the test of experience, and in the blessed and wonderful results,, we find that God is truly with his word;--and we have
nothing to do but to go on in the plain and simple path of duty, as prescribed in his Sacred Oracles, and wait for his blessing. It will surely come, as we have richly and abundantly found, in a thousand fields of conflict and patient labour of love and hope.

Every one, who considers, must perceive that the enrolling columns of our strength are advancing from victory to victory. Our zeal is growing with a steadier flame; our liberality in sustaining the great machinery of missionary work, particular and general, at home and abroad, is pouring forth more constant supplies for the furnishing and support of labour; our spirit of unity is concentrating with greater and greater energy and directness upon the great head of the church, and radiating fountain of all our light, and the controlling power of all our circles of effort; and our experience of the power and efficiency of the word and spirit of God, in bringing to blissful fulfilment, both in our hearts and upon the world without, every promise that he has given to our hope, is daily rising up into fuller and clearer consciousness before us, till we look around us and exclaim, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner."

The lesson of the parable of the wicked husbandman is before us to-day, in the present fortunes of the Church. The selfish and barren husbandry of old organisations is bringing forth no fruits. The fields have become beaten and hard under the superficial and misdirected ploughings and borrowings of "scientific orthodoxy." The meagre management scarcely feeds the hungry managers, and there is no return for the honour of the householder. His messengers are beaten and repulsed; the heir himself is cast out, that they may seize upon the inheritance; and therefore, "the kingdom is taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Here is the secret of our power. It is in faithful work. Unremitted, laborious, prayerful labour in the great vineyard for rich and abundant fruits to lay at the feet of the Master. We need no theories of spiritual husbandry, while we hold in our hand the perfect manual of our daily tasks, furnished by the infallible Teacher himself. Let us go forth and plough and sow and reap, looking ever to God for the increase, and he will surely give it!

Our zeal is not yet commensurate with the power which Providence has committed to us, and which is daily augmenting under his blessing. Still we have done much;—this we can lay our hands upon;—we can call it up before us statistically, and read somewhat, too, of its spiritual significance;—and this, we think it neither unbecoming nor unprofitable to do. It is good to "commune with our past hours, and ask them what report they have borne to Heaven." Good for us as individuals,—good for us as a people, serving our God, and feeling responsible for our standing and work before him, in
the peculiar position to which, in his gracious providence, he has called us.

The machinery of the gospel dispensation is not complex. It has all the simplicity which ever characterises the methods of sublime power. Its work is simple,—only to 'bring efficaciously into the hearts of the fallen, the power of the resurrection. This is the whole of it, and for this we have the missionary and the Church. The New Testament recognises no other human agencies, and we do not need them. The missionary, indeed, is but the circulating medium between the Church and the world. The endorsement of the Church gives him credit;—and upon her permanency and character as a fulcrum, does he plant his power and throw forth the reaction of his efforts for the conversion of the world. But the Church has more than this to do. She has to nourish and keep alive and in health her own body, without which she must be powerless for her high mission. For this end she is distributed into convenient congregations,—churches, (and this, let it never be forgotten, is the peculiar design of these organisations), but within these, and, much more largely and noticeably, if we could think, around and without these, is the great wide world, lying under wickedness, calling by its destitution and darkness, by its perpetual wail of sin-born ignorance and misery, calling upon the Church universal—to send them—What? Simply—"The Gospel." To deliver to them practically, and in its saving power, the glad tidings of Eternal life.

More and more every day, we perceive, are our brethren feeling the force of this simple and sublime order for the redemption of the world, and steadily are their energies sweeping into line for its execution. The disciples are awakening to the great practical demand which exists for missionary labour, because, more and more, do they realise the power of the gospel unto salvation to every one that believeth it. With this conviction in the head; with the confirmation of it, which the spreading triumphs of our efforts are, with cumulative evidence, perpetually pouring in upon our observation; and with the love of God and of man stirring in our hearts, what else can we be, but a missionary people! Every Christian is called upon to work in the spirit of his Master, and to tell the way of salvation as best he can. The mechanic at his bench; the farmer in his fields; the professional man in the circle of his patrons; the boy to the companion of his sports; the girl to each gentle spirit that walks with her through the eloquent flower?; the master to his servant; the father and mother to their children; and all these, through the missionary and the Church, to the whole world.

With the growth of this feeling has our Missionary Society grown, for what is this but an arrangement for the harmonious and united expression of our faith in the gospel as the power of God for the conversion of the world, and a practical ac-
knowledgment of the obligation, which we feel to rest upon us, to preach it to every creature? During this year, whose close is now gathering about us for a final farewell, the public interest in this blessed movement of our missionary spirit has been displayed in nearly a two-fold ratio to anything we have ever had to cheer us before; and, at our recent anniversary meeting, every heart seemed nerved with fuller assurance of faith and cheered with brighter visions of hope, as we heard, from state after state, recitals of the victories won by the power of the preached word. Our Christian sympathies have gone out generously, towards the far East, and to the Isles of the sea. The Jerusalem Mission and the Jamaica Mission are not only established, but already liberally and surely provided for, for three years to come. Can a people be wanting in faith, either in the power of the gospel, or in the necessity of its power for the healing of the nations, who thus throw out their arms to the distant ends of the earth, and acknowledge their obligation to send abroad the knowledge of God and of Christ? . . .

Bro. Franklin, I think, has recently said, that we have three thousand preachers. I trust we have more. In one sense, we should have three hundred thousand—one in every disciple. But this is not the sense in which we have three thousand. Of these, of course there are many who have no special or high advantages of education, and but little else to help them on in their work, but their own zeal, the word of God in their heads and hearts, good natural sense, a godly conversation, and the confidence and approval of their brethren. Their success, therefore, cannot be ascribed to the cunning words of man's wisdom; it must be in the power of the gospel, which they preach. Yet they do not succeed,—and we thank God, that such is the simplicity of the gospel, that even the simple may declare it to the conviction and salvation of souls.

If we have three thousand preachers, we have also a numerous and efficient band of editors and assistant writers. We can now think of eleven monthlies, beside our own, and two weeklies, and one two-weekly, that regularly go forth into their respective spheres, carrying words of instruction, and comfort to many minds and hearts, and contributing, each in its measure, to the advancement of the cause. The commission of the Saviour was, "Go preach the Gospel," and this the Apostles did, both by the living voice, and the still more enduring language of the pen. In this way has it come down through the ages, fresh and powerful today, as when first proclaimed in Jerusalem; and it is still, and, since the art of printing, much more the wisdom of the Church to wield with a liberal hand this potent instrument for her purpose. We are gratified to see that our brethren are fully alive to this great duty and that so many valuable auxiliaries of this kind are sustained amongst us. A new year will soon open upon us, and it may serve to extend the sphere of usefulness
of some of these valuable co-workers, by introducing them to new subscribers, and we, therefore, name them as follows:

Monthlies:—Challen’s Illustrated Monthly, Philadelphia, Pa.; Christian Record, Indianapolis, Ind., E. Goodwin, Editor; Bible Advocate, Jacksonville, Ill., E. L. Craig, Editor; Christian Evangelist, Fort Madison, Iowa, D. Bates and A. C. Chatterton, Editors; Christian Advocate, Franklin College, Tenn., T. Fanning, Editor; Christian Baptist, Goldsboro, N. C., J. T. Walsh, Editor; Christian Banner, Coburg, C. W. D. Oliphant, Editor; Western Evangelist, Santa Rosa, Cal., G. O. Burnett and J. N. Pendegast, Editors; Journal of Education, Shelbyville, Tenn., C. L. Randolph, Editor; The Israelite Indeed, New York, G. R. Lederer and M. J. Franklin (Converted Jews); The British Millennial Harbinger, J. Wallis, Editor, Nottingham, England; The Christian Advocate and Southern Observer, Adelaide, South Australia.


Besides the above, Bro. M. E. Lard, of St. Joseph, Mo., proposes to publish The Christian Quarterly Review. We learn that he has received a large number of subscribers already, and there is no doubt of its appearance in January.*

Then, after referring to progress that has been made in educational matters, he concludes as follows:

These are among the encouraging signs of the times—the sure elements of large process and cheering triumphs in the future. In the face of them, who does not smile at the ill-natured folly that talks of "The Reformation as a failure "! When the young and vigorous plant is darting its roots far and wide and deep into the soil, and shooting its spreading arms boldly out into the open air, and raising its head steadily and bravely up in the face of storms and frosts and droughts, growing and strengthening every day, in spite of them all, how silly to be croaking about insects on the leaves, or mourning over the want of chemical refinement in the soil. A prudent regard to such things is well enough, but we will neither kill the plant nor stay its growth, nor predict its destruction and overthrow, because these offences, which must needs come, are here and there discovered by the evil searching microscopes of conceited cynics. By the power of a vigorous life, let us throw them off as we grow, and leave the prophets of evil to starve up the figments of their own fancy.

We rejoice, then, in our prospects for the future;—but we pause to-night, before the close of this hasty article, just as the clock is on the stroke of twelve,—to throw another glance over the departed year:—and here and there, the eye rests

* Harbinger, 1859, pp. 710-711.
upon a grassy mound, or a modest stone, and we are reminded that not a few have fallen in the warfare, to stand beside us no more on earth. Some were gentle spirits; tender as the love that redeemed them, and we look upon their graves with grateful tears, while we think how meekly and confidingly they went to their account. Others were armour-clad soldiers of the Cross, true and brave to the last. With reverence we linger over the graves of them all. Theirs is the memory of the just, and it shall never perish. Long and familiarly will thousands pronounce the reverend names of E. A. Smith, James Shannon, Calvin Smith, John A. Smith, W. W. McKenney, Wm. Clark, and the devoted Sister Williams, as though they still lived on earth; and from the recital of their noble deeds of charity and faith, in self-sacrificing consecration to the service of Christ, catch fresh inspirations for their own conflicts under the same great leader. We place them in that great cloud of fitnesses that compass us about, and with the thought that their eyes are still lovingly upon us, would "lay aside every weight and the sin that doth so easily beset us, and run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of the faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." *

* Millennial Harbinger, 1859, pp. 713-714.
CHAPTER XIX

TURBULENT PERIOD

THE new decade opened with portentous rumblings of a coming storm. Everywhere there were signs of political and religious unrest. During the first year Lincoln was elected President of the United States, and on December 20th a Convention at Charleston declared South Carolina withdrawn from the Union of the States. The whole country was in a state of great agitation, and no one pretended to foretell just what the final result would be. War—grim, civil war—was the most probable outlook for the future. Nor was it long before this was realised. On April 12th, of 1861, the guns in Charleston Harbor opened upon Fort Sumter, and the echo of these guns reverberated throughout the whole country, accusing the North to its impending danger, and the South to a determination to settle the vexing questions, which had long divided the two sections politically, by the arbitrament of the sword.

This was a sad day, especially for the Disciples of Christ. They were nearly evenly divided in their membership between the two sections involved. They had from the beginning of their movement protested against war. Mr. Campbell's great address on war, delivered during the Mexican War, presented the views very generally held by the Disciples.

Their whole plea was a protest against the war-spirit, and in this, as well as in other things, they exemplified the faith and practice of the early Christians. Of course, there were some exceptions to this rule on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line. Nevertheless, it is believed that the general trend of sentiment was in opposition to any kind of war, and more especially to a civil war, where brethren would be in hostile conflict with one another.

However, it was not long until the matter was brought to a practical test. There are always at least three classes of men connected with every great movement. First, there
is the implacable radical, the man who is always ready for anything that is in opposition to the established order. Second, there is the equally implacable conservative, who feels it his duty to defend the established order, no matter how much it may need reformation. Another class have been denominated "middle of the road men," and this is not an inept characterisation. These last recognise the importance of progress, and in this respect they have considerable sympathy with the radicals. But they do not believe in progress at the expense of overturning institutions and customs which ought to remain permanent in order that legitimate progress may be made.

All three of these classes were prominently in evidence among the Disciples during the Civil War. There were some hot-heads on both sides, who could see no good whatever in anything that did not harmonise with their radical views; and then there were others, who had scant respect for anything that meant change with respect to established institutions and customs. There was, however, a very large class among the Disciples who occupied a middle ground. While they were progressive in all that means legitimate progress, they were decidedly opposed to that radicalism which practically destroys the possibility of progress, simply because it sweeps away the very foundation on which progress is made. These moderate men were equally opposed to that settled conservatism which hinders every aspiration to go forward, simply because it always illustrates the sentiment of the prayer-book, "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be." These moderately disposed brethren were in a large majority, during the whole period of the Civil War, and undoubtedly the Disciples were largely held together by the influence of this predominant class.

However, it was a severe test of one of the cardinal principles which had always been prominent in the Disciple advocacy. From the very first they had advocated Christian union, and so far they had illustrated this in their own history by holding together, notwithstanding they had come through several rather trying tests, but no such test as the war had been made. Now that the country had entered upon a fratricidal strife, the Disciple plea for Christian union would be tested to its utmost capacity of endurance. Their plea against human creeds,
as bonds of union and communion, had been regarded by their religious neighbours as a rope of sand. It was believed by the denominations that when some crisis came the Disciple union would fall to pieces, and thereby would teach the folly of Christian union on the platform which they had advocated. It was a staple argument of many denominational leaders that a Christian organization, such as the Disciples contended for, could not stand in a great crisis. But these prophecies of evil were not fulfilled. The Disciples went through the war without any serious breach in their lines, and when the war was over, the temporary alienations were quickly healed, while many of the denominations actually divided, and some of their divisions which then took place have never been healed.

Undoubtedly, at certain times the pressure was very great on the Disciple lines. Their General Missionary Society was organised for a definite purpose, viz., the preaching of the Gospel in this and other lands; and it had been the policy of this Society, from the day of its organization, to avoid all entangling alliances with matters which were not regarded as its specific work. Notwithstanding this policy, at the annual meeting of the Society in October, 1861, Dr. J. P. Robison, of Ohio, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That we deeply sympathise with the loyal and patriotic of our country in their present efforts to sustain the government of the United States, and we feel it our duty as Christians to ask our brethren everywhere to do all in their power to sustain the proper and constitutional authorities of the union.*

There were many in the Convention who sympathised with the sentiment of this resolution, but who at the same time deemed it entirely out of order, as it was a departure from the settled policy of the Society. Without following the discussion of this resolution, and the action of the committee with respect to it, it is sufficient to say it was ruled out of order by the chairman, Isaac Errett, of Michigan, though he himself fully sympathised with the resolution, and would have been glad to see it passed. Two years later, at the annual meeting, the following resolutions were passed, with very few dissenting:

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

Resolved, That we unqualifiedly declare our allegiance to said Government, and repudiate as false and slanderous any statements to the contrary.

Resolved, That we tender our sympathies to our brave and noble soldiers in the field who are defending us from the attempts of armed traitors to overthrow our government, and also to those bereaved and rendered desolate by the ravages of war.

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

At this Convention, D. S. Burnett, who was at that time Corresponding Secretary of the Society, in his report, made reference to the war in the following vigorous but pathetic paragraph:

The disaster of the nineteenth century has come, which white-haired sire and fair-browed son prayed never to see. But it has come, like some splendid and blighting comet, driving commerce and trade from their channels and the blood out of our hearts. The world gazes on the scene aghast, and the religion of Christ, made for man, not knowing his distinctions of tribe and nation nor his ocean and mountain boundaries, visits alike the field golden with harvest or incarnadine with human gore, and still brings her pardon-bearing mercy to all. Our work, then, is unchanged except by the difficulties which it is the victory of faith to overcome. Many of our churches have been represented on the great battlefields in the struggle for the integrity of the Union, and several of our preachers have followed their flock through the dangers which environed them on the field of slaughter, ministering caution to the living and comfort to the dying, while we all have prayed that God would hide us from the evil until the storm be passed, and that he would so guide that storm that when the cloud of war lifted, the temple of free constitutional government would stand unscathed, revealing its beauty and strength and proportions unshorn tor our posterity, as we received it from our fathers. Recognising our * Report of A. C. M. Society.
religious obligations in its maintenance, let us address ourselves to the duty of lifting higher the banner of the cross and carrying it farther than ever before.

The stress of the war influence was felt more decidedly within the border states, such as Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri. In the last named state, a number of the most prominent ministers connected with the Disciples issued an address, which as a matter of history deserves to be preserved. The Address was as follows:

To all the holy brethren in every State, grace and peace from God, our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ:

The undersigned, your brethren in the Lord, residing in the State of Missouri, in view of the present distress, which is wringing all our hearts, and the danger which threatens the Churches of Christ, would submit to your prayerful consideration the following suggestions:

(1). Whatever we may think of the propriety of bearing arms in extreme emergencies, we cannot by the New Testament, which is our only rule of discipline, justify ourselves in engaging in the fraternal strife now raging in our beloved country. To do so, therefore, would be to incur the displeasure of our blessed Lord and Saviour.

(2). It is our duty in obedience to many judgments of Christ and the Apostles, and in compliance with the last prayer of our Saviour, to remain as we have thus far so happily continued, a united body. But this cannot be if, in accordance with our prejudices and political opinions, we join in this deadly strife. Is not the "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" more to be desired than all that could possibly be gained by such a strife, attended as it must be by the loss of this unity, and the reign of passion in our hearts?

(3). Knowing, as all history teaches and as the experience of many of us can testify, that active military service almost invariably destroys the religious character of Christians who are drawn into it, we cannot discharge our duty to Christ, if we see our young brethren rushing into this vortex of almost certain ruin without an earnest and affectionate remonstrance.

(4). If we remain true to this line of duty, not allowing the temptations of the time, however enticing, or however threatening, they may be, to turn us aside, we shall be able greatly to glorify the name of our Lord, who is the Prince of Peace. For we may present to our countrymen, when restored to their right mind by the return of peace, a body of Disciples so closely bound by the Word of God alone that not even the shock of Civil War nor the alarm produced by religious systems crumbling around could divide us. How rapid and glorious in that event would be the subsequent triumph of truth throughout the whole land! This heavenly triumph is
clearly within our reach. If we fail to grasp it, how unworthy we shall prove of the Holy cause we plead.

(5) We are striving to restore to an unhappy and sectarianised world the primitive doctrine and discipline. Then let us pursue that peaceful course to which we know that Jesus and the Apostles would advise us if they were living once more and here among us. Let us for Jesus' sake endeavour in this appropriate hour to restore the love of peace which he inculcated; which was practised by the great body of the Church for the first three hundred years, in an utter refusal to do military service; which continued to be thus practised, by the true Church throughout the dark ages, and which has been so strongly plead by many of the purest men of modern times, our own Bro. A. Campbell, among the number.

(6) We conclude by entreating the brethren everywhere to study conclusively "the things which make for peace, and those by which one may edify another." And "the very God of peace sanctify you wholly," and "the peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your kinds and hearts through Jesus Christ.

B. H. SMITH, SAMUEL JOHNSON, E. V. RICE,
J. D. DAWSON, J. W. MCGARVEY, T. M.
ALLEN, J. K. ROGERS, J. W. COX, J. J. ERRETT,
H. H. HALEY, T. P. HALEY, J. ATKINSON, R. C.
MORTON, LEVI VAN CAMP.

Notwithstanding all the trying influences to which the Disciples were subjected, during the war period, they never lost faith in their great plea for Christian union, nor did they fail to practise this union among themselves wherever it was possible for them to do so. Indeed, nothing that has ever taken place in their history did more to emphasise the strength of their plea than did these unsettling and trying days of the Civil War between the North and the South. Of one thing they may be justly proud, viz., the predication of their enemies, that their union would not hold in a crisis, was clearly proved to be a false prophecy.

During the same period they were subjected to some very severe internal contentions. In 1860, a small defection in the ranks began to show itself in Jacksonville, Ill. W. S. Russell, a recent graduate of Bethany College, became convinced that he had a call to reform the Reformation. During his college course he had spent much time in studying mental philosophy. His constant companions were such writers as Cousin, Morrell, and Sir William Hamilton. It must be admitted that the books of these
men furnished rather indigestible food for undergraduates. But it was at this very time when Mr. Russell formed his fundamental convictions with respect to the human mind in its relation to the operations of the Holy Spirit. After he left college he began at once to preach his peculiar views with respect to spiritual influence, and so earnest was he and so persistent was his demand for the acceptance of his views that it was not long until the church over which he was pastor was divided. Another preacher, I. N. Carmen, of Ohio, who was also a graduate of Bethany College, fully sympathised with Mr. Russell's views, and together they aimed to lead a movement which was calculated to produce trouble, and even schism, in all the churches where these views were propagated.

Here came another test with regard to the fundamental principles of the Disciple movement, and as this principle is clearly set forth in Dr. Richardson's "Principles and Objects of the Religious Reformation," it is thought proper to give the following liberal extract, setting forth the distinction between faith and opinion:

This distinction is of the utmost importance, and lies at the very threshold of religious reformation and Christian union. Without a proper recognition of the difference between faith and opinion, it is impossible to make any progress in a just knowledge of Divine things, or to obtain any clue by which the mind can be extricated from the perplexed labyrinth of sectarianism. Notwithstanding, however, that it is so important to distinguish between these things which are so radically different from each other, they are everywhere confounded; the fallible deductions of human reason are continually mistaken for the unerring dictates of inspiration, and human authority is blended with that which is Divine. Human opinions, indeed, are the plastic cement in which partyism has imbedded the more solid yet disconnected scriptural materials of its partition walls. Or, to employ another figure, a theory, consisting of any number of favourite opinions, smoothly intertwined, forms the thread upon which various Scripture doctrines and texts are strung and curiously interwoven, so as to assume a form and meaning wholly artificial and unauthorised. When men thus fail to make any distinction between the express relations of God and the opinions which men have superadded, and when they have already committed the great error of adopting indiscriminately, in the religious system of a party, an incongruous mixture of opinions with the things of faith, the mistiness and obscurity which surround the former overspread by degrees the latter also. Hence it has come to pass that matters of belief and mere speculations
upon religious subjects are usually classed together as "religious opinions"; and when we speak of a man's religious opinions, we are constantly understood to mean, or at least, to include, his belief. Hence, too, the divine communications themselves have lost much of the authority and respect which are justly due to them by being thus reduced to a level with human opinions, and by the implication that they are so limited in their range of subjects, and so deficient in clearness, as to require additions and explanations, from uninspired and fallible men, in order to render them intelligible and complete. The question, accordingly, is no longer, What say the Scriptures? How reddest thou? What hath the Lord spoken? but What do the Scriptures mean? What thinkest thou? What do the standards of my Church, or the leaders of my party say?

In opposition to views and practices so erroneous, we urge:

1. That the Scriptures mean precisely what they say, when construed in conformity with the established laws of language.

2. That the Bible contains the only Divine revelations to which man has access; and that these revelations are perfectly suited by their Divine author to the circumstances and capacity of man to whom they are addressed.

3. That true religious faith can be founded upon this Divine TESTIMONY alone.

4. That opinions are mere inferences of human reason from insufficient and uncertain premises, or conjectures in regard to matters not revealed, and that they are not entitled to the slightest authority in religion by whomsoever they may be propounded.

The measure of faith is, then, precisely the amount of Scripture testimony, neither more or less. What this distinctly reveals, is to be implicitly believed. Where this is obscure or silent, reason must not attempt to elaborate theories or supply conclusions, and impose them upon the conscience as of Divine authority. By the practical recognition of this principle, the theological systems and theories which have distracted religious society, are at once deprived of all their fancied importance, and, consequently, of all their power to injure. Those remote speculations; those metaphysical subtleties; those untaught questions which have occupied the minds of the religious public to the exclusion of all the important, yet simple truths of the gospel, are at once dismissed as the futile reveries of uninspired and fallible mortals. When these are thus dismissed, the human mind is left alone with the word of God. It is brought into direct contact with the Divine law and testimony, from which alone the light of spiritual truth can emanate, and this light is no longer obscured by the mists of human opinionism and speculation.

If this distinction were truly appreciated by the Protestant world, there would be a speedy end of those controversies by
which it has been so long disturbed. For it is undeniable, that there is an almost universal agreement among the evangelical denominations, in regard to the great revealed truths of Christianity; and that they are separated, alienated, and belligerent, for the sake of certain favourite opinions, which have been promul gated by their founders. Each one admits that there exists this common Christianity, apart from denominational peculiarities, and that salvation is possible in any of these parties; yet each continues to urge its distinctive tenets, and maintain its peculiar opinions, as though the salvation of the world depended upon these alone. Human opinions and speculations, then, have manifestly too much authority with the religious public, and are too highly honoured in being made the great objects for which each party lives and labours. If, then, they were clearly distinguished from the revealed truths, upon which, like parasites, many of them have grown; if they were fairly separated from all connection with the Divine testimony from which they derive a stolen nourishment and borrowed vigour, they would appear at once in their true character, as matters wholly foreign and insignificant, and would be allowed to droop and perish with all the bitter fruits they have so profusely borne.

It is preposterous to expect that men will ever agree in their religious opinions. It is neither necessary nor desirable that they should do so. It is nowhere commanded in the Scriptures that men should be of one opinion. It is there declared that there is "one faith" but is nowhere said there is one opinion. On the contrary, differences of opinion are distinctly recognised, and Christians are expressly commanded to receive one another without regard to them (Rom. xiv: 1). As well might we expect to conform the features of the human face to a single standard, as to secure a perfect agreement of men's minds. Hence there can be no peace, unless there be liberty of opinion. Each individual must have a perfect right to entertain what opinions he pleases, but he must not attempt to enforce them upon others, or make them a term of communion or religious fellowship. They can do no harm, so long as they are private property, and are regarded in their true light, as human opinions possessed of no Divine authority or infallibility. It is quite otherwise, however, when leading and ambitious spirits take them up for the warp and the Scriptures for the woof from which they weave the web of partyism. The flimsy and ill-assorted fabric may please the taste of a few, while it will be despised and derided by those who manufacture an article no better from similar incongruous materials, and thus a contention is perpetuated, with which human selfishness and pride have much more concern than either piety or humanity.

It is, accordingly, one of the primary objects of the present reformation, to put an end to all such controversies, by reducing human opinions to their proper level, and elevating
the Word of God, as the only true standard of religious faith. Hence it was, in the very beginning, resolved to "reduce to practice the simple original form of Christianity, expressly exhibited upon the sacred page, without attempting to inculcate anything of human authority, of private opinion, or inventions of men, as having any place in the constitution, faith, or worship of the Christian Church; or anything as a matter of Christian faith or duty, for which there cannot be expressly produced a Thus saith the Lord, either in express terms, or by approved precedent." Every proposition or doctrine, then, for which there is not clear Scriptural evidence, is to be regarded as a matter of opinion; and everything for which such evidence can be adduced, is a matter of faith—a fact or truth to be believed.

It will be seen by this extract that the Disciples have no objection to opinions, while they are not made the means of division among the followers of Christ. Indeed, they have always advocated the freest possible investigation with respect to all matters, even hinted at in the Word of God, but their cardinal principle, viz., "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," made it absolutely necessary for them to reject, as a bond of union and communion, any and every thing for which they could not find a "Thus saith the Lord" in either expressed terms or in approved precedent. Of course this view of the matter would make Mr. Russell's contention a divisive element the moment he insisted upon it in his public addresses. Had he retained his opinions, or even expressed them as merely opinions, he would not have been regarded as a schismatic, but when he exalted these opinions into clear revelation of the Word of God, and insisted upon them as fundamental in the Divine life, it was found necessary to meet his contentions with decisive argument. This was most effectively done by Professor W. K. Pendleton, in the Harbinger for 1860, and the result was that soon the "tempest in a teapot" subsided.

But there was another contention which came to the front about this time which was much more serious. This was the communion question, involving the relation of the Disciples to Pedo-Baptists at the Lord's Supper. This question arose chiefly out of a correspondence between Richard Hawley, of Detroit, and Isaac Errett, who was at that time pastor of the church in Muir, Mich. Mr. Hawley refers to a discussion which had taken place with
regard to this matter in the *Millennial Harbinger* for 1837, and wishes to know how the churches should act with respect to Pedo-Baptists who might meet with the Disciples at the communion table. We give Mr. Errett's reply in full, as it is not only a great statement of the case from his point of view, but also shows the breadth of the movement as a union movement, even at this crucial test. Mr. Errett's letter is as follows:

**MUIR, MICH., August 20, 1861.**

DEAR BROTHER HAWLEY:—Yours of the 15th is to hand, and deserves a much more complete reply than I at present can give it. It is a hurrying time, and I can only take a few minutes to answer your inquiries. As to the admission of unimmersed persons to the Lord's table, our view is,

1. That in primitive times there is no doubt that all who came to the Lord's Table, as well as all who participated in prayer, singing, etc., were immersed believers; and we are trying to bring back that state of things.

2. But the corruptions of Popery, out of which the Church has not yet half recovered, have made the people of God an erring, scattered, and divided people.

3. We are pleading for further reformation; our plea proceeds on the integrity of previous pleas—it is a plea for the re-union of the scattered people of God. It does not recognise *sects*, on human bases, as divine—but it recognises a people of God among the sects, and seeks to call them out.

4. We are compelled, therefore, to recognise as Christians many who have been in error on baptism, but who in the *spirit* of obedience are Christians indeed. (See Rom. ii: 28, 29). I confess, for my own part, did I understand the position of the brethren to deny this, I would recoil from my position among them with utter disgust. It will never do to unchristianise those on whose shoulders we are standing, and because of whose previous labours we are enabled to see some truths more clearly than they. Yet, while fully according to them the piety and Christian standing which they deserve, it is clear that they are in great error on the question of baptism—and we must be careful not to compromise the truth. Our practice, therefore, is *neither to invite nor reject* particular classes of persons, but to spread the table in the name of the Lord, for the Lord's people, and allow all to come who will, each on his own responsibility. It is very common for Methodists, Presbyterians, etc., to sit down with us. We do not fail to teach them on all these questions, and very often we immerse them. As to our practice generally, my impression is, that fully *two-thirds* of our churches in the United States occupy this position; those churches which originally were Baptist, are rather more unyielding.
For myself, while fully devoted to our plea, I have no wish to limit and fetter my sympathies and affections to our own people.

Truly your Bro.,

ISAAC ERRETT.*

This same year Isaac Errett became an associate editor of the *Harbinger*, and during the next year he wrote some of the ablest articles that were written in defense of the position which he took in the letter just quoted. Indeed, the discussion of this question was conducted with a vigor scarcely ever equaled in any of the discussions which the Disciples have conducted among themselves. The chief leaders on Mr. Errett's side were himself, Professor Pendleton, Dr. Richardson, and A. S. Hayden. Those on the other side were G. W. Elley, of Lexington, Ky.; Benjamin Franklin, who was at that time editor of the *American Christian Review*, and a few others of less note. The spirit of the discussion was admirable, and it was really exhaustive of the whole question. No very radical views were advocated by either side. The position of Mr. Franklin is clearly set forth in the following extract, from an editorial in his paper:

There are *individuals* among the sects who are not sectarians or who are more than sectarians—they are Christians or persons who have believed the Gospel, submitted to it, and in spite of the leaders been constituted Christians according to the Scriptures. That these individuals have a right to commune there can be no doubt. But this is not communion with the "sects."

What is the use of parleying over the question of communion with *unimmersed persons*? Did the first Christians commune with unimmersed persons? It is admitted that they did not. Shall we then deliberately do what we admit they did not do?

When an unimmersed person communes without any *inciting or excluding* that is *his own* act, *not* ours, and we are not responsible for it. We do not see that any harm is done to him or us, and we need make no exclusive remarks to keep him away, and we certainly have no authority for inviting him to come.

If it is to be maintained that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God;" that "as many of us as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," as we have it in the Scriptures, and that none were in the Church or recognised as Christians in apostolic times who were not immersed, it is useless for us to be talking about
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unimmersed Christians, and thus weakening the hands of those who are labouring to induce all to enter the kingdom of God according to the Scriptures.

We have nothing to do with any open communion or close communion. The communion is for the Lord's people, and nobody else. But if some imagine themselves to have become Christians according to the Scriptures when they have not, and commune, as we have said before, that is their act and not ours. We commune with the Lord and his people, and certainly not in spirit with any one who are not his people, whether immersed, or unimmersed. We take no responsibility in the matter, for we neither invite nor exclude.

Mr. Elley's position is set forth in the following five questions. He thought when these questions are fairly answered the whole controversy will end:

1. Can any person be a Christian who is not in Christ, or who has not put him on?
2. If not, can any put him on who has not been baptized "into him"?
3. Can any one be freed from sin who has not, from his heart, "obeyed the form of doctrine" delivered to him by the Holy Spirit? If not, can he rightfully be allowed to break the loaf by the action of God's Church?
4. Can an unsaved or unpardoned person be allowed to eat and drink the Lord's body and blood by Church consent?
5. Is baptism demanded of penitents in order to pardon or sonship?

Mr. Errett in answering Mr. Elley's five questions asked a number himself, and commented as follows:

1. Can any person be a Christian who is not "in Christ," or who has not put him on?
2. If not, can any one put him on who has not been baptized "into him"?
3. Can any one be freed from sin who has not obeyed the form of doctrine delivered to him by the Holy Spirit? If not, can he be rightfully allowed to sing and pray, and give money, by the action of God's Church?
4. Can an unsaved and unpardoned person be allowed to sing and pray and contribute money, by Church consent?
5. Is baptism demanded of penitents, in order to pardon or sonship? Do not the prayers and praises and contributions, and the Christian sympathies and friendship of God's house, belong to the children? And shall we take the children's bread and give it to the dogs?
6. Did the first Christians show Christian love to unimmersed persons? And shall we deliberately do what we admit they did not do?
7. Did the first Christians receive money from unimmersed persons? Did they ask unimmersed persons to sing, or pray, or give thanks? Did they in any sense recognise as Christians the unimmersed?

We trust our brethren are not about to plant themselves on that position of affable diminutiveness occupied by the regular Baptists—that baptism is a mere prerequisite to Church membership and communion while every other Christian right and act of fellowship may be freely shared with the unbaptised. Although, in Professor Hawley's letter, the question took the form of communion in the bread and wine, it is essentially a question whether we shall have any religious fellowship whatever with unimmersed persons. The reply to this question must admit some additional Bible principles beyond what the Review or Bro. Elley seem to have in their horizon.

But we are not done with our catechising. We want these brethren to see that they themselves step outside the strict construction of gospel conditions, the moment they begin to decide on our relations to any of the religious bodies around us; nay they have already done so, and are condemned by the things which they allow. Let us ask:

1. Do the Scriptures recognise any as Christians, or accept any to baptism, on the narration of a religious experience?
2. Do they admit any to baptism who come with the avowal that their sins have already been pardoned?
3. Do they recognise admission to Church membership by subscription to human articles of faith?
4. Does the Gospel recognise any baptism but that "for the remission of sins"?
5. Did any come to the Lord's table in primitive times who had not been baptized for the remission of sins?
6. Did the apostles or first Christians invite to the Lord's table "all immersed persons who have piety"? Did they have fellowship with immersed persons, not members of the Christian Church? Did they receive persons to membership who had been immersed by unimmersed persons?

1. And shall we deliberately do what we admit they did not do?*

Mr. Richardson, in his usual, clear, and logical manner, puts the case as follows:

Whatever bigots may argue on one side, or latitudinarians urge on the other, the usage of our brethren, the usage of our brother in this manner is undoubtedly correct. It has been found, that the Scriptures do not definitely point out the actual religious position of sincere believers, who, from untoward circumstances, have mistaken sprinkling for baptism, or in helpless infancy have been irretrievably committed to
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an incomplete or perverted form of Christianity. This being, then, an untaught question, it has, according to Paul's command to Timothy been most properly "avoided," and it is to the discussion of this question that I objected in my letter to you, and not to the consideration of the course which the Church should pursue in relation to such persons. It is from the inability of the Church to determine the exact status of such persons, that it has been judged proper to leave the decision with their own consciences, and with the Searcher of Hearts; and hence, they are neither invited nor prohibited. It would amount to nothing but jangling to discuss the position of any such individuals, since the New Testament furnishes no cases precisely similar, though, as I may hereafter show, it does not leave us wholly without hindrance as to the spirit in which they should be met. Hence, we neither discuss nor decide them, for, as Brother Franklin very correctly observed in noticing your article, "When an unimmersed person communes without any inviting or excluding, that is his own act, not ours, and we are not responsible for it. We do not see that any harm is done to him or us, and we need no exclusive remarks to keep him away, and we certainly have no authority for inviting him to come." Again Bro. Franklin very justly remarks: "We have nothing to do with any open communion or close communion. The communion is for the Lord's people, and nobody else. If some imagine themselves to have become Christians according to the Scriptures, when they have not, and commune, as we said before, that is their act and not ours. We commune with the Lord and his people, and certainly not, in spirit, with any not his people whether immersed or unimmersed. We take no responsibility in the matter, for we neither invite nor exclude." This is a plain statement of our position and practice in the matter, which no one has a better opportunity of knowing than Bro. Franklin, from his constant and extended communications with the churches over the whole country.

Hearing thus, I think, fully vindicated all that I have said on this subject, I might here very properly, and certainly very agreeably to myself, leave the whole matter to any who wish to prolong the discussion. As it has, however, become evident that there are amongst us some extremists on both sides of the question, it seems to me that it may be useful, in several respects, to pay a little further attention to them, and, by defining their position, to enable them to see a little more clearly where they stand, and, if practicable, convince them that they have unwittingly both blended questions that are wholly distinct, and mistaken, in some degree, the ground occupied by the Reformation. No sooner is it understood that we do not prohibit pious persons from communing who may belong to other religious communities than both classes of these extremists at once unite in the mistaken idea that this is tantamount to inviting them, and the whole sect to which they belong besides.
Both wish to be so understood—the one class that they may themselves enjoy a "communion with the sects"; and the other, that they may, by this perversion, render the wise and conservative course of the brethren odious in the eyes of the uninformed, and so gain some place of favour for their own exclusivism. Undoubtedly this interpretation is to the former almost the dawn of a millennial day of peace; while with the latter, it is "open communion in its worst form; allowing all to come, regenerate and unregenerate; breaking down the landmarks separating Christ's from human kingdoms; letting in all the Mormons," etc., etc. That any intelligent brother should construe the absence of a prohibition in the case of a few particular individuals into a general invitation to all the world, or to all the sects, would, I confess, appear singular to me, did I not know how great confusion of thought there is in reference to this whole subject, on the part of some really estimable brethren. In regard, then, to the former of these classes, to which I wish to devote the remainder of this letter, I would remark, that they greatly mistake the nature of the concession often made that "there are Christians among the sects," when they go so far as to designate the individuals in question; and still more when they suppose this concession to sanctify the sect. I seldom pay any attention to the titles of communications in our papers, as they are often irrelevant to the matter, and sometimes given according to the fancy of the printer, and I did not at first really notice the heading of your article in the Harbinger, until it was challenged by Brother Franklin. I must say that I think Brother Franklin's strictures entirely just. Upon the principles of the Reformation, we can have no "communication with the sects," or with sectarians. So far from admitting the claims of sectarianism, or conceding to it countenance or toleration, its great and special purpose is to overthrow and destroy Reformation. Its principal aim has ever been to expose the wickedness and folly of the divisions that exist, and to urge all to abandon them, and unite under one leader, even Christ, the Lord. Such a thing, then, as "communion with the sects," would be at once a complete nullification of our plea, and a total abandonment of our position. I trust that nothing I may write on the subject will be put into the Harbinger under such a title, as I have never for a moment sanctioned or thought of such a thing as "communion with the sects," and I will therefore take the liberty of designating the title under which this is to appear, if published, viz., "Informal Communion"—which expresses briefly the precise case under consideration, viz., that of a person communing without being formally invited; just as we may have informal hospitality, when a stranger takes a seat at a table with a family, without an invitation, yet not forbidden. Such an occurrence would not be regarded as a standing invitation to all the world to come and sup with the family, neither would the members of the family be thereby
justified in abandoning their own table and their home, in order to become boarders and citizens at large.

When we say that there are "Christians among the sects," we do not mean Christians in the full sense, according to the requirements of the New Testament. We mean imperfect, embryo Christians, if you please, in certain most important points of the Christian profession, while, in other aspects, they may be regarded as full-grown, and even excelling in faith and works of charity. We use the same style employed by the Lord himself, when he said to Paul, persecuted at Corinth, "I have much people in this city." But Paul could not know who these people were, until they themselves rendered it manifest by coming out and obeying the truth. Neither can we know who are "Christians among the sects," except as they show a willingness to keep the commandments of Jesus. The concession is with us at best a mere matter of opinion, which, on our own principles, can never be made a ground of religious action. The charity that "hopeth all things," may lead us to think that God has received many who have never properly understood the Gospel and its ordinances; but since this same charity "rejoiceth in the truth," it can never have, where the word of truth is silent, the guidance and companionship of Faith. Hence, to go on from the general concession that there are "Christians among the sects," to determine what particular individuals are Christians, so that we may have communion with such "Christians among the sects," is to overstep the boundaries prescribed to us. And to leave out the "Christians" altogether, so as to come at last to "communion with the sects," is a clear abandonment of everything that distinguishes the Reformation. This Reformation has a mission, which is clearly to "restore pure, primitive, apostolic Christianity, in letter and spirit, in principle and practice," and to gather together the people of God under one Lord, through one Faith, one baptism, and one Spirit. It can never prove unfaithful to this noble purpose, and can make no compromise of principles and institutions derived directly from the sacred word.*

Professor Pendleton, in replying to George W. Elley, sums up the whole argument in thirteen divisions, in which he makes it clearly evident that the Disciple practice, neither to invite nor exclude Pedo-Baptists at the Lord's table, was not only in harmony with Disciple history, but also in harmony with reason and the Scriptures.

In his first article on this subject, he makes it very plain that the doctrine of close communion is contrary to the whole spirit of the Disciple Reformation. He concludes his remarks as follows:

It is important to keep clearly and always before the mind the great principle of our movement in the Reformation. We must remember that we are labouring, not to introduce a totally new Church, but to restore the things which we are wanting in one already existing; not to overthrow what is good, but to teach the way of the Lord more perfectly. Error as to ordinances may exist where there is genuine faith. Error is always injurious, but not necessarily fatal. In some points we do all offend—and in humility let us forbear. To restore the erring in the spirit of meekness, is the part of a true Christian charity. The transition from systems of error to the prescribed order of revelation must be gradual. The introduction of the new economy by our Saviour was a work of long preparation, and by methods of great forbearance and prudence. The prayer and alms of Cornelius were acceptable to God, and he was honoured by special and very convincing evidences of the Saviour's confidence and respect, in order to lead him to a fuller knowledge and reception of the new revelations concerning his kingdom. He was treated as a member, while yet ignorant of its regulations.—He was a disciple in heart, through faith and in the spirit of obedience, while yet without the outward forms of recognition.

If Peter had been left to his Jewish prejudices and exclusivism, he would doubtless have refused to admit Cornelius to baptism. It was the overwhelming evidence of his reception by God that compelled the apostle to say, Who shall forbid that he shall be baptized? So ought it to be with us. Can we deny that God has recognised, and is still recognising, the truly pious and full of faith and good works in the many divisions of professed Christians as really and truly his people! Will any one take the absurd position that the noble list of illustrious men who have been the light and ornament of religion in the ages that are past, and whose piety and learning are still the admiration and glory of the Lord's people—that all these, because of an error, not on the significancy or divine authority of baptism, but what we must be allowed to call its *mode,*—that all these, because of such an error, must be pushed from our ranks as reprobate—torn from our Christian affections, as heretics—thrust from the communion of the body and blood of the Saviour, whom for a long life they so truly loved and devotedly served, and counted no more worthy of our Christian fellowship than so many heathens and publicans? The conclusion is too monstrous for any but the hidebound zealot of a cold and lifeless formalism. I should feel that I had injured the Christianity which I profess and which I love, could I recall that even for a moment I had allowed my head so to interpret its pleading mercy, or my heart so to restrict its wide-embracing charity.*

The men who conducted this discussion were real giants in their intellectual grasp and *little children in*
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the spirit which they manifested. The discussion did great good. It served to clear the atmosphere. Two classes of extremists had been at work from the very beginning of the movement, viz., the extreme radical and the extreme conservative. The former was ready to throw open the Lord's table to all comers, and to practically assume the responsibility for so doing; while the extreme conservative wished to block the way against the possibility of any unbaptised persons partaking of the emblems at the Lord's table. The "middle of the road men" in this controversy were again victorious, as they have always been through the entire history of the Disciples.

After the discussion had ended the Disciples settled down to the position they had always held, and in theory, at least, this is their position to-day. However, for the truth of history, it ought to be stated that their practice in this respect is not always and in every place uniform. It can scarcely be doubted that some of their preachers make it fairly evident to Pedo-Baptists that they are practically invited to participate in the communion service if they choose to do so. Indeed, in later years the churches seem to have become less concerned about this particular matter. However, there are a very few places where there could be any trouble with respect to this question, as there are very few Pedo-Baptists who care to bring this question to a test. Very generally they are as much indisposed to obtrude themselves at the communion table as the Disciples are to receive them. Really it is a question that settles itself, and need not be a matter of contention in any respect whatever.

It is rather curious that at a time when the whole country was stirred from centre to circumference by the Civil War, the Disciples should be earnestly engaged in discussing their internal affairs. As I have said in another place, usually the period of a movement which brings with it introspection brings with it also the beginning of intellectual growth. It is the time which marks the dawn of culture, and real, substantial progress, and at such a time there is sure to be considerable conflict between the past and the present. Ignorance is always the implacable enemy of legitimate progress. Hence there can be no real forward movement in any religious work with-
out reaching a period where conflict will be surely developed between the two opposing forces to which I have called attention.

As has already been intimated, the war settled several things. It at any rate stimulated activity. It also tended to turn the eyes of the Disciples from their religious neighbours to a careful consideration of their own faith and practice.

This introspection, as I have called it, led to an earnest desire on the part of many to make progress somewhat commensurate with the demands of the new conditions of society which had been evolved out of the war. These were called the "progressives."

There were others, however, who refused to accept the changed conditions; or, if they were compelled to accept them, they utterly refused to adapt themselves to these conditions. These men were called "anti-progressives." Thus, two opposing forces were definitely formed; still, notwithstanding that the opposition between them has sometimes been even bitter, these parties have, after all, contributed to the vigor, growth, and harmony of the movement.

It is a great mistake to suppose that opposite forces necessarily bring disaster. In commercial life we do not hesitate to say that competition is the life of trade. It is really the life of everything. Nature teaches us a great lesson on this subject. Where on the globe is it that we find the best developed men and women, both intellectually and physically? Do we look for them at the extreme north or at the extreme south? Certainly not. They are found on a narrow belt of the earth, all the way around, just where the seasons are in eternal conflict, just where all the opposing forces of life are most active. The same is true with respect to the moral or religious world. Hence opposition, when legitimately met, is a means of progress. It is not strange, therefore, that the Disciple movement had to pass through the experiences I have indicated; nor is it strange that the conflict precipitated became a formative force in developing the churches in the direction of legitimate growth. It is true that for a time there was a certain amount of danger that the controversies of the period would lead to division. There is always danger in everything that makes for life. Death is the end of
all danger. The war itself, as we have already seen, put a heavy strain upon the fellowship of the Disciples, North and South, while the communion question affected for a while the convictions of the whole body. Meantime, the organ question was beginning to occupy considerable attention. It was discussed in the *American Christian Review*, and the *Millennial Harbinger, Lard's Quarterly*, and other periodicals of less influence. Such men as Moses E. Lard, A. S. Hayden, Benjamin Franklin, John W. McGarvey, and Isaac Errett participated more or less in the organ discussion during the period under consideration. These men for the most part wrote temperately, but there were evidently underneath what they said very positive conviction and deep feeling.

Those who opposed the organ discussion, during this period, did so on the ground that it was unscriptural, and that consequently they could not worship where it was used. They held that those who advocated its use could have no conscience in the matter, and consequently by the law of love they ought to refuse to do that which wounded their brethren.

But the advocates of the organ contended that their plea was not contrary to Scripture, even if there was no precept or example for the use of the organ in worship. There were some, however, who contended that a legitimate interpretation of the Scriptures really yields a support to the use of the organ. They also contended that they had a conscience in the matter just as much as their anti-organ brethren; and consequently they felt it to be their duty to contend for the use of it.

As a practical matter, the organ question was more threatening in its influence upon the union of the Disciples than was the communion question. Indeed, some preachers utterly refused to occupy the pulpit where an organ was played, and in some cases the brethren of a church separated from each other on this very question. Still, even when this separation took place, there was no formal breaking of a general fellowship. The organ churches and the anti-organ churches alike maintained their position among the Disciples, and continued to fellowship each other.

Other disturbing elements were also prominent at this time, though for the most part these were insignificant.
in their influence, compared with the communion question and the organ question. Mr. Lard was now publishing his *Quarterly,* and it gave no uncertain sound with respect to the importance of maintaining extreme conservative grounds. He was himself, in his personality and contention, a complete contradiction. From one point of view he was an intense radical, having little or no patience with any one who was unwilling to follow his extreme radical views. But from the point of view of maintaining the ground which had formerly been occupied by the Disciples he was an extreme conservative, and he maintained this position up to the time of his death, though some time before his death he advocated a doctrine of the future life which came perilously near to universalism, and in this he illustrated his tendency to radicalism, to which reference has already been made. In his *Quarterly* he was inclined to take pessimistic views of many things, and especially of little things. The word "reverend" on a doorplate was itself evidence of unsoundness in the faith of the man who lived in the house, while the publishing of a "synopsis" of the principles and aims of a church was exactly equivalent to a renunciation of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Referring to a synopsis of this kind, he says:

There is not a sound man in our ranks who has seen the "Synopsis" that has not felt scandalised by it. I wish we possessed even one decent apology for its appearance. It is a deep offence against the brotherhood—an offence tossed into the teeth of the people who for forty years have been working against the divisive and evil tendency of creeds. That it was meant as an offence by the brethren who have issued it, I cannot think. Still their work has a merit of its own, a merit which no lack of bad intention on their part can affect. Our brethren will accept this "Synopsis" for what it is, not for what it may possibly not have been designed to be. We are told that this "Declaration" is not to be taken as a creed. But will this caveat prevent its being so taken? Never. When Aaron's calf came out, had he called it a bird, still all Israel, seeing it stand on four legs, with horns and parted hoofs, would have shouted, A calf, a calf, a calf. The brethren "meeting at the corner of Jefferson Ave. and Beaubien Street, Detroit," may call their work in classic phrase a "Synopsis," or gently, a "Declaration "; but we still cry, a creed, a creed. It is not the mere title of the work that constitutes it a creed, but its matter and form, together with the manner in which it is issued, and the sanctions by which it is accompanied. This
"Synopsis" is a creed without the appropriate label—a genuine snake in the grass, wearing a honeyed name.

On its appearance in the *American Christian Review*, Bro. Franklin expressed his strong disapprobation of this "Synopsis," while "John," an anonymous writer, in his burlesque of it has left us in no doubt as to the estimate in which he holds it. With these sound men I fully agree, except in so far as they seem inclined to treat the "Synopsis" as a small matter. With the writer of this it has a painful significance—painful, because symptomatic of the following items:

1. That some of our brethren have lost their former well-grounded opposition to creeds, and now are ready to traffic in these unholy things. This indicates a diseased state of the body. How far this disease extends will be seen by the extent to which the "Synopsis" is endorsed.

2. That these brethren are no longer willing to be styled heretics for the truth's sake, but now wish to avoid that odium by adopting the customs and views of the sects of the day and thus to become themselves a sect.

3. That what the world needs in order to learn the faith of these brethren is not the Bible alone, but the Bible and a "Synopsis of their faith and practice." With them, then, the Bible is an insufficient enlightener of the human family.

For all these symptoms of degeneracy our brotherhood will feel something more than mere regret. They will feel profoundly ashamed.*

Both Mr. Lard and Benjamin Franklin continued to emphasise these infinitesimal matters until it looked at one time as if the whole movement might be wrecked by an undermining of microbes. The foregoing extract from the *Quarterly* shows the spirit of the advocacy of this very able but extremely conservative magazine. Sometimes things have to get worse before they get better. The Disciple movement was passing through a dark period just as the country was. But there was a brighter day close to hand, as there was also for the country, when the war ended in the spring of 1865. This brighter day will be considered in subsequent chapters.

Meantime we have to record the death of three of the greatest men connected with the Disciple movement. The first one to fall was Walter Scott. He had been in somewhat failing health for a year or two, but really continued to be actively engaged in the Master's work up to the very last. His earthly career was closed April 23, 1861. His life and character have already been sketched in an earlier part of this work, but the following description

* "Lard's Quarterly."
of Scott as a preacher will doubtless be interesting to the reader. It was written by William Baxter, his biographer, who personally heard the discourses to which reference is made:

He was about middle height, quite erect, well formed, easy and graceful in all his movements; his hair black and glossy, even to advanced age; he had piercing black eyes, which seemed at one time to burn, at another to melt; his face was a remarkable one, the saddest, or gladdest, as melancholy or joy prevailed; his voice was one of the richest I ever heard, suited to the expression of every emotion of the soul—and when his subject took full possession of him, he was an orator. I have heard Bascom, and Stockton, and many other gifted ministers, but none to compare with him; he stands alone.

Once, on what might be termed an ordinary occasion, when there was no special interest, or expectation, he began to describe the gathering of the saints to their final glorious home; he was for a time sweet and tender, but all at once his form dilated, and his face glowed as if he had caught a glimpse of the King himself, coming in the clouds of heaven. I shall never forget his attitude, as, with face upturned, and hand outstretched, he stood describing the scene he really seemed to behold. I have often wondered since how any speaker could even venture on such an attitude as he assumed, and wondered that even he could maintain it so long—but the end was not yet; he cried out: "It reminds me of a scene in the mountains of my native north;" and then dashed off in a life-like description of the gathering of the clans in the Highlands of Scotland at the call of some renowned and beloved chief. On a mountain summit stood the chieftain, and as the wild notes of the bugle-horn re-echoed from rock and ravine, and spread over the valley, the whole plain below was, in a moment, filled with his devoted followers, who, wrapped in their plaids, had been concealed in the blooming heather; every eye in that host was turned to the chief whose summons they had heard and whose form stood out clearly defined on the mountain top, and upward to him in a living stream they went; he shouted a welcome as they came, and back from the thronging host came an answering shout, for they were not only his soldiers but his kinsmen; and when they reached the place where their leader stood they were happy and invincible.

This was the figure used to illustrate the glad awakening of those who long had slept in the dust, and their rising to meet the Lord in the air. No description can do justice to his manner, or reproduce the scene which he described, but he made his hearers see it; for my own part, I distinctly heard the notes of that wild music and clearly and distinctly saw the tartans stream as up the warriors pressed to meet their beloved chief.

The next discourse that I shall notice was under far dif-
different circumstances. The audience, in the instance just given, was composed of some two or three hundred people, and the scene he described, which made such an impression on me, was, doubtless, one that flashed upon his mind at the moment. But now he had before him as many thousands as he had hundreds in the former instance. The vast assembly met in a beautiful grove. Many of them had known the speaker for a score of years, and not a few of them had been brought into the fold of Christ under his ministry; others had come from a great distance, attracted by the fame of the preacher, and I doubt not, that he had made careful preparation to meet the expectation of the thousands who thronged to hear.

His theme was the Transfiguration of Christ, which he described with such marvelous power, that his audience seemed to be witnesses of the wonderful scene which transpired upon the holy mount. He set forth the meeting of the Saviour, Moses, and Elijah, as a glimpse vouchsafed to mortals of the heavenly state, or a living tableau of translated, resurrected, and transformed humanity, of which classes, translated Elijah, the resurrected Moses, and the transfigured Lord, were the respective types; and to this task he brought a power of description so new, forcible, and impressive, that many, while they listened with wonder, mingled with awe, felt like Peter, who, in the presence of the magnificent display, which the preacher made to seem a reality, exclaimed, "Master, it is good for us to be here; let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias," and numbers, I doubt not, felt themselves that day nearer heaven than ever they had been before. For an hour that grove seemed holy ground, solemn and joyful as the summit of Tabor, for there, with the wondering, glad disciples, we seemed to stand, and, like them, to see and hear the glorious immortals; we saw the Man of Sorrows with face brighter than Moses when he descended from Sinai; we saw him lay away his seamless coat and put on garments of light and beauty, more glorious far than the robes of Aaron when he stood before the mercy seat, while the pearly cloud overshadowed all, and from its snowy depths came the words of Jehovah, as he presented to the faith of the apostles and the world the glorified One in the impressive words, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him."

The reader will observe that I make no attempt to reproduce the sermon, that is impossible; but to show the impression that it made upon my own mind and that of others. It is not many sermons that people will remember for twenty years or more, but this was one of the few of which the impression is never effaced. No man there could remember the glowing words used to paint the glorious scene, but many I know will never forget the glowing picture while life and memory endure.

The last discourse that I shall notice was delivered during the State meeting, held at Georgetown, Kentucky, in 1846. Quite a number of able preachers were present, among them
President Shannon, L. L. Pinkerton, B. C. Ricketts, E. H. Forrester, E. C. Rice, and the Kendricks. Most of these had preached during the meeting, and, near its close, it was announced that Walter Scott would preach on Sunday night.

The audience was large and intelligent, composed of persons from all the principal towns of the Blue Grass region. Lexington, Frankfort, Richmond, Paris, Harrodsburg, Shelbyville, and others were represented. It was my lot to accompany the preacher into the pulpit, which gave me an opportunity of observing the effect of the sermon on the listening throng. His theme was the Golden Oracle, as he termed it, as set forth in the declaration of Simon Peter—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." His exordium was solemn, impressive, grand; his language reminding me of the finest passages of Milton, and almost with his first sentence I saw that he had established a warm sympathy between himself and his hearers. He spoke of the nature of Christ, as gold mingled with clay—the fine gold of Divinity, with the clay of humanity; and then from the Old and New Testament gathered all the glorious names which prophets and apostles applied to the Son of God—names of power, excellency, and glory, and showed how they set forth the nature of him around whom they clustered, who not only wore, but was worthy of them all.

All felt that he was giving expression to their own highest conceptions of the Saviour which they had never been able to embody in words, and so fixed and intense became the attention, that the entire audience would unconsciously sway to and fro, as waves at the will of the wind, with every gesture of the speaker; if he cast his eyes upward, his hearers seemed gazing up into heaven; now a glad smile would light up every face, and anon every eye would be dim with tears; and, at the close of some marvel of description, a deep murmur or sigh might be heard, as though all had held their breath under the spell of his eloquence.

The interest was sustained throughout, and some of the passages were the finest I ever heard from the lips of a man. In one portion of his discourse he spoke of Christ as the Prophet, Priest, and King. He sought the Prophet among all those who had delivered the messages of God to men; but found him not at Sinai, nor at Carmel, where God owned Elijah by fire; nor among the long line of those who wept over Israel's sorrows and captivity like Jeremiah; or who, like Isaiah, heralded the dawning of a brighter day; but bowing in agony in the Gethsemane, the Great Prophet he sought was found. He bade kings and conquerors, in pomp and majesty, march by—we saw Nimrod, and Nebuchadnezzar, and David, and Solomon in all his glory; Cyrus, and Alexander, and the great Julius, swelled the procession; but the King he sought was found in Pilate's Judgment Hall, a soldier's purple cloak, thrown over him in mockery, for a regal robe; his scepter, a
reed; for a diadem, a cruel crown of thorns, for subjects, rude soldiers with knees bent in scorn, and crying in derision, "Hail, King of the Jews."

Next a procession of priests passed by—Abel, who reared his altar not far from the gates of Eden; Melchisedec, wearing crown and mitre; Aaron, in priestly robes, bearing the names of the chosen tribes on the breastplate near his heart, with all who had ministered to God in tabernacle or temple, who had offered sacrifice at the altar, or sprinkled the blood of atonement on the mercy-seat, but the Priest he sought he found on Calvary, offering himself up to God on a bloody cross, at once both priest and victim, praying for those who nailed him there, and from whose bleeding heart the viler soldier soon plucked his vile spear away. But he left us not weeping, at least not in sorrow, for he showed us the risen, glorified One, at the right hand of the Majesty on high, where he ever liveth to make intercession for us.*

Another hero and close associate of Scott died April 7, 1863. This was William Hayden, the sweet singer, who accompanied Scott in many of his evangelistic tours, and was himself one of the most effective evangelists of his day. Both of these men died in the triumphs of the faith which they had so successfully preached.

Closely following the death of these two men was that of Alexander Campbell. March 4, 1866, will always contain a sad message for the Disciples of Christ. On that day Alexander Campbell, the acknowledged leader of the Disciple movement, passed into his rest. Mr. Campbell had been a most indefatigable worker. It is almost incredible that one man should have accomplished so much. For forty-five years he labored with an energy rarely, if ever, equaled, and certainly never excelled. In addition to numerous sermons and addresses and travels from continent to continent and state to state, during which time he was speaking and talking almost constantly, he produced a real library of controversial essays, and dissertations which are as remarkable for their vigor of style, comprehensiveness, and wide reading as any similar literary productions of any other man; and, perhaps, when regarded from the point of view of quality, they must take rank in the highest class of theological polemics.

It has been truly said of him that his character was without a spot. His bitterest enemies failed to find a *"Life of Scott," pp. 343-349.
flaw in his character for truth, integrity, and goodness. To those who knew him well, he was most cheerful, gentle, genial, just, and devout; and was as dearly beloved for his goodness as he was venerated for his greatness. And it was in his social life, in the midst of his friends and relatives, especially around his own ever-thronged and ever-hospitable fireside, that Mr. Campbell was most truly loved and honoured—and there the vacuum can never be filled. His manner towards the humblest domestic of his household was kind and engaging. Never were the inborn characteristics of a gentleman more certainly and happily manifested than in him. Children loved the sight of him. None knew him but to love him. His amiable disposition made him a native gentleman. Mr. Campbell was not self-assertive, but deferential and devout. He belonged to that class of men who will lead under any circumstances, whether they desire it or not. It will ever be remembered to his honour, that with an almost unbounded personal influence over a religious community, numbering hundreds of thousands, he never sought the least ecclesiastical control. Although the telegram from Wheeling, announcing his death, spoke of him as "Bishop Campbell," it will surprise many to learn that he was merely one of the bishops of the congregation meeting in Bethany, and that outside of this he never sought and never exercised the least ecclesiastical authority.

Nature, education, and circumstances made him a luminous, radiating centre, but his position also made him equally a focal point, where were concentrated the rays emitted by a thousand minds—his correspondents on both continents. The suggestion and queries of every mail were invaluable. No man ever more scorned the idea of imposing his name upon a party than he did. He felt humbled when any one would put "ite" to the syllables which designated him, or the members of the Christian Church from among other men. In the newspapers which have lately alluded to him, he is generally spoken of as the talented founder of the Christian Church. Neither he, nor those who have been stigmatised as his followers, have felt flattered by that word founder. He founded nothing that he called, or they call, religion. He was often at special pains to show not only that the things which he taught were in the Bible, but that they had been
severally recognised by leading authors, at different periods in the history of the Church.*

In another volume I have considered what will be his place in history; and this is what I have said:

It may be too early to determine yet with definite certainty just what this place will be. Perhaps we are not yet sufficiently removed from the controversies involved in the religious movement in which he was engaged to enable us impartially to consider his whole influence upon the religious world. However, I think the following points may be mentioned, even if it is not safe to emphasise them:

He was the apostle of true religious liberty. I emphasise the word which qualifies "religious liberty," and I do this for the reason that this phrase has been much abused. Luther struck for religious liberty, but he afterwards tied the very hands he had set free. He broke the power of the pope, but in doing this, like Samson in the temple of Dagon, he himself fell while he destroyed his enemies. As a matter of fact, the Vatican was exchanged for Augsburg. While he proclaimed liberty of conscience to the people, he at the same time allowed himself to be bound hand and foot by the Augsburg Confession of Faith.

Mr. Campbell's plea was for complete liberty. Hence he not only persistently opposed human creeds and confessions of faith, on the ground that they had produced divisions and disaster in the Christian world, but he also opposed any attempt at making a creed for his own people, however imperative at times the need may have seemed to be. Having become free himself, he utterly refused to again be bound, nor was he willing to bind any one else with the chain which he himself had cast off. His was a plea for true liberty, and we do not doubt that history will ultimately recognise the fact.

He was a great discoverer of truth. He was not a creator. He was not what most critics would call a philosopher. He was certainly not specially gifted for what is generally understood as originality of thought. Probably he was not original at all. But who is? Sometimes what is called originality is nothing more than obscurity of thought, or else it is only a new way of stat-

* See "Lectures on the Pentateuch."
ing what is not true. Mr. Campbell had one source from which he started with everything. The Bible was the fountain whence all living streams emanated that ran through his mind.

He did not try to be original. He was too humble for that. He did not try to create; there was too much already created which needed only orderly arrangement. He was satisfied to uncover the hidden treasures which he found on nearly every page of the book of revelation. Hence what Newton, Davy, Galvani, and others were to nature, Alexander Campbell was to the Bible. He came to it reverently, asking simply to know what the Bible taught. He did not ask the Bible to say what he said, but to tell its own story in its own words, and he was perfectly willing to listen and follow its teaching without any questioning whatever. In short, Mr. Campbell was a man of faith, and in everything he sought to be governed simply by a "thus saith the Lord." This disposition made it impossible for him to deal in philosophy for a religion.

Such in brief is an outline of Mr. Campbell's character and work. The former was incomparable in almost every respect, the latter is still on trial, but so far it has stood some of the severest tests, and at present it is believed to contain little that may be regarded as wood, hay, and stubble, and much that is gold, silver, and precious stones. In the fiery trials to which every man's work must be subjected, that which is true will endure, while that which is false will perish. In my judgment the future record of the historian will emphasise the fact that Alexander Campbell did a work which will endure for all generations.*

D. S. Burnett, himself a preacher of rare gifts, thus described Mr. Campbell as a preacher:

Mr. Campbell was a remarkable preacher. Not an orator, such as Whitefield, Summerfield, or the Irish Kirwan. He had not the voice, gesture, or pathos of either of them. He could not, like them, raise a storm and quell it at will; and yet he would draw as large a congregation, hold them longer, and leave them furnished with much more comprehensive views of truth and duty. He spoke more sensibly, more rhetorically, and more Scripturally than either of them, and his work on earth will abide longer. We can imagine few more pleasurable

* "Reformation of the Nineteenth Century,"
sights than this grand preacher, delivering an extempore discourse, while supporting himself, enfeebled by dyspepsia, on his cane, in the midst of the largest and most intellectual audiences our country could afford. Thus he stood like Paul on Mars' Hill, among the orators and statesmen of Kentucky, at an early day, in the largest hall of Lexington; thus he entranced the elite of Richmond in 1830, and of Nashville shortly after; thus, shortly before that, he held spell-bound for two hours, the Legislature of Ohio, before breakfast, ready to depart; it was thus, in 1833, he addressed, with great power, the sceptics of New York, two successive evenings, in their own Tammany Hall, with such suavity as to draw praise from every lip, and secure a vote of thanks from the men whose air-built castle he demolished. These speeches flowed from his lips like the water from the rock smitten by the prophet, and the people felt like famished Israel as they drank the cooling draught, that a hand of power had relieved their thirst. All were charmed with the man, and impressed with the majesty of the Scripture.*

He was not an orator in the popular sense of that term, but according to Archbishop Whately's definition he was an orator. If the orator is the man who can by honourable means carry his point before an audience, then undoubtedly Mr. Campbell has high claims to be ranked among the great orators of the world.

But it is not from this point of view that our estimate of him must be made. Orators come and go and often they are soon forgotten; but Mr. Campbell's influence will remain; his work will be permanent. It is safe to say that no theologian of the United States has accomplished as much as he did. It is true he had associated with him some noble souls and great commanders of the people. But his ability to hold these to his standard and make them available in his work were not among the least of his powers. Very few men who accepted the plea which he was making ever deserted him. Of course, any cause will suffer from the loss of men for one reason or another; but it is a remarkable fact that throughout the whole history of the Disciple movement there have been very few desertions, and even in the few cases that might be mentioned, these men were governed by considerations over which Mr. Campbell and other leaders had no control.

Perhaps, after all, one of his finest characteristics was
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his extreme humility. While he had self-assertion when this was needed, it was at the same time tempered with a courtesy which was born of a genuine humility. At almost any time he would have been assigned by those associated with him to the highest place; but he never sought this distinction, and utterly refused to sanction the name which outsiders gave to the Disciples, i.e., "Campbellites." Perhaps no one connected with the movement was more averse to this name than he was himself. He laid all honours at the feet of Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God. During the last years of his life he seemed to take little interest in talking about anything else than the matchless leader to whose great cause he had devoted his life. Among the last words which he uttered on earth were praises to him who is Prophet, Priest, and King.
CHAPTER XX

THE ORGANIC AND RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

AFTER the close of the war and the death of Mr. Campbell, the Disciple movement entered fully upon its reconstruction and development period. We have now followed it through its Creative period, its Chaotic period, and partially through its Organic and Development period, and we must now follow it through the completion of this last period, under the leadership of many new men. To change the figure, we have seen the movement in the blade, then in the ear, and now we must look for the full corn in the ear.

In 1866, the number of Disciples had reached not very far from 450,000, perhaps as many as 500,000. It is impossible to secure many trustworthy statistics with respect to either the number of churches, or the number of communicants at this time, but the estimate given is sufficiently accurate to show that very great progress had been made, notwithstanding the violent opposition which the movement had received from nearly all the denominations. It has already been seen that the movement was intensely aggressive; but for the first fifty years it was practically without any very definite organic direction. The Missionary Society was the only general organization that offered any possible contact for comprehensive co-operation, and as this was held strictly to simply missionary work, nearly all other matters connected with the movement were left to take care of themselves, and had little or no general oversight. A number of religious journals and magazines had from time to time sprung up, the life of some of which was of short duration, but others continued to circulate among the brethren and exert considerable influence. The Millennial Harbinger had been the chief organ of the movement, after the Christian Baptist was discontinued. At the death of Mr. Campbell Professor Pendleton became the editor-in-chief, and he was also elected President of Bethany College, to take
the place of Mr. Campbell. The editors of these magazines and papers came to be practically general bishops, and exercised nearly as much power as the bishops do in some of the religious denominations. During the lifetime of Mr. Campbell, his editorial advice, with respect to the direction of the movement, was very generally accepted without question. But even before his death some other editors had begun to share with him the position which he had so long held without competition. Moses E. Lard, the editor of *Lard's Quarterly*, has already been referred to. Benjamin Franklin was at that time editor of the *American Christian Review*, published at Cincinnati. This position he continued to hold as long as he lived, and his paper became a most influential factor in directing the movement and giving it a certain type which it began to receive soon after the Civil War was ended. Many, however, began to feel that the reactionary tendency of Mr. Franklin's paper was not conducive to the best interests of the Disciple movement. In the special type of the movement for which he contended he had the support of Mr. Fanning, who was the editor at this time of the *Gospel Advocate*. While these two men differed with respect to several things, their united influence made the advocacy of their journals a very decided force in the development of what a considerable number of Disciples believed was wholly contrary to the spirit and aim of the Disciple movement, while it was directed by the pioneers. Mr. Franklin was a splendid type of the kind of man adapted to the special work he undertook to do. He spoke in the language of the people. His character was above reproach, and he was indefatigable in his labours and unselfish in his devotion to the cause. For a time he seemed to be in hearty sympathy with a forward movement, but it was not long until the influence of his journal was thrown right across the lines of progress, as a great many Disciples understood what progress meant.

At this juncture a new leader and a new journal came to the front. Isaac Errett has already been referred to as both a distinguished preacher and a forcible writer. His articles in the *Millennial Harbinger* and in other papers clearly indicated that he had the literary gifts equal, if not superior, to those belonging to any other man of that period. At any rate, it was the opinion of many
of his brethren that his viewpoint of the movement was just what should be advocated, and, consequently, he was urged to start a paper that would represent his conception of the needs of the hour. Accordingly, in 1866, the first issue of the *Christian Standard* was published from Cleveland, Ohio, in which an obituary notice of Mr. Campbell appeared from the pen of Mr. Errett, who had been elected by the company as the editor-in-chief. The directors of the company were J. A. Garfield, W. S. Streator, J. P. Robison, T. W. Phillips, C. M. Phillips, G. W. N. Yost, and W. J. Ford. In the prospectus of the *Standard* it was declared that it would be "Scriptural in aim, catholic in spirit, bold and uncompromising, but courteous in tone; would seek to rally the hosts of spiritual Israel around the Bible for the defence of truly Christian interests against the assumptions of popery, the mischiefs of sectarianism, the sophistries of infidelity, and the pride and corruptions of the world."

The position which Mr. Errett now occupied gave him a new prominence among his brethren. His superior ability was recognised everywhere, and as he now had control of a medium through which he could advocate a genuine forward movement of the Disciples, he called to his assistance an able staff and began what proved to be the great work of his life. In view of the importance of his subsequent relation to the Disciple movement, it is believed that there is justification for publishing the following address, which was delivered January 24, 1909, at Ionia, Mich., during the fiftieth anniversary of the church at that place, of which Isaac Errett was the first pastor, and from which have been sent out such distinguished workers as Herbert L. Willett, Fred Arthur, Arthur Willett, Leslie Willett, Bert Salmon, Errett Gates, Clarence Daniels, Will Ward, Frank Taylor, and the Missionaries, Royal and Eva Dye. Another reason for publishing the address is that it contains much matter that will throw light upon the Disciple movement which is under consideration in this volume. The address is as follows:

**ISAAC ERRETT; THE MAN AND HIS WORK**

*By W. T. Moore*

Biography is the highest reach of historical writing. To describe wars, battlefields, governments, empires, etc.,
may be very interesting, and even instructive; but these have no real meaning until we come to personality. Things were made to serve men, but men were made to serve God. A world without personality would be as a body without life—a mere framework without potentiality. Personality must, therefore, be regarded as the sublime end in view in the creation of the whole universe, and character is the end of personality.

Next to the greatest personality in the universe is a real man. In the ascending scale of creation he stands next to God. We may not be able to measure the distance between them, but we know that no other being intervenes. The Scriptures are content with telling us that "man was made a little lower than God," and that is all we know about the matter. Exactly what the phrase "a little lower" may imply perhaps no one can tell. Nevertheless, this phrase forcibly suggests the highest position which man occupies, and it also augments our conception of this position when we realise the fact that no man is able to measure himself: His capabilities are no doubt largely finite, yet, after all, they are measureless; and this, for practical purposes, places man within the reach of the infinite. It has been truly said that "man is the highest product of his own history. The discoverer finds nothing so grand or tall as himself, nothing so valuable to him. The greatest star is that at the little end of the telescope—the star that is looking, not looked after, nor looked at." It has been again said that "man was sent into the world to be a growing and exhaustless force. The world was spread out around him to be seized and conquered. Realms of infinite truth burst open above him, inviting him to tread those shining coasts along which Newton dropped his plummet, and Herschel sailed—a Columbus of the skies."

But I have used the phrase "a real man" advisedly. There are men and men. Some are not real, and this is true of them, no matter from what standpoint we may look at them. They are simply of the masculine gender, but are not men; the most we can say of them is that they are big babies. They may not cry as a baby does. It would be all the better for them if they did. Tears would compensate to some extent for the want of manly character. A real man presupposes normal development
—genuine, intellectual, moral, and religious culture. This is what makes a real man, and finally shows itself in that magnificent term we call manhood. But manhood does not always necessarily belong to masculinity. Manhood implies certain characteristics which cannot be predicated of any one who is not a real man.

Isaac Errett was a real man. He possessed the quality and attributes of a genuine manhood. Indeed, this was so much the case that no mistake will be made if he is called a noble man; for in many respects he was truly noble. In this statement it is not implied that he had no faults. He would not have been a man at all if we could in truth say that he possessed no weakness. In some things he was like the rest of us, and most of us, at least, will plead guilty to some weak places in our characters. Nevertheless, Mr. Errett's towering manhood commanded the admiration of all who knew him intimately, while his genuine manliness won the affection of many who did not always agree with him in everything he taught or did.

I cannot at present enter into the facts of his early history. This is not needful on an occasion like this. Still it is interesting to know that the conditions of his early life did much to make the character which he possessed during the days of his most mature manhood. Carlisle was right when he said substantially that Dante could not have written as he did had he not passed through the experience which practically gave him a vision of Hell. He was right, also, when he said, "experience does take dreadfully high school wages, but it teaches like no other." God's great men have all passed through the fiery furnace, but all the time he was saying to them:

"The flame shall not hurt you, I only design
Your dross to consume and your gold to refine."

Isaac Errett's early character was forged out of the white heat which always separates the pure gold from the dross. He had not the advantages of a university education, and yet he was a thoroughly educated man. However, this statement needs some explanation. I distinguish sharply between education and learning. A man may be scholarly and yet not educated in any true sense. No one is a better friend than I am to our colleges and
universities. Still, it is possible to make too much of these. In my judgment, we are just now suffering from a want of preachers to supply our pulpits, largely because it is coming to be understood that unless a man has a college or university education, he is practically unfit to be a minister of the Gospel at all. Now, this is an extreme view of the matter, and as it is deterring young men from entering the ministry, it ought to be severely denounced, and I take this occasion to enter my protest against the prevalence of such an idea. Some of the greatest preachers in all the history of the Church never spent a day in a college or university. But these men were all highly educated, nevertheless, and educated especially with respect to the matters of their high and holy callings. Of course, I believe in a college or university education for our preachers whenever this is possible, but I protest against creating the impression that young men must have this high academic training before they can be useful as preachers at all. My own conviction is that there are hundreds of young men, worthy of earnest encouragement, who are deterred from entering the ministry simply because they are unable to secure a degree from some college or university. I will go even further than this, and affirm without the fear of successful contradiction, that not a few of those who have obtained academic degrees give less promise in the ministry than would those young men who are kept out of the ministry chiefly because they feel that they must necessarily take a subordinate place, even if they obtain any place at all, on account of their inferior scholastic attainments. It is really not needful that all ministers shall be scholarly in the technical understanding of that term. Of course, a certain amount of academic training may be regarded as necessary in order to secure the highest usefulness in the ministerial calling. But the education of toil and experience in the world of struggle, of temptation and trial, of suffering and rejoicing, will be worth more to many men, for real service, than even ten thousand degrees from colleges or universities.

Isaac Errett was in many respects what we call a self-made man, and yet he was not self-made. I prefer the phrase "God-made." He was very much the result of forces which may be properly attributed to Providence.
God had special use for him, and throughout his early career, God was leading him to the development of that character which subsequently became such a great power for good.

In a brief address, such as this must necessarily be, it is impossible to do more than sketch a few important phases of the man and his work. We have already seen that he was a real man, but it may be well to look a little more minutely into some of his leading characteristics.

(1.) He was a man illustrating Paul's triad of graces—faith, hope, and love. Perhaps no higher compliment could be paid him than this statement. In the first place, the men who have moved the world have been men of faith. Intellectual attainments should not be despised. Undoubtedly, all other things being equal, a man of brains will always outstrip his less intellectual competitors. Nevertheless, brains are not everything; they are, indeed, not even the chief thing in a successful career. Not only is it impossible to please God without faith, but it is equally impossible to be strong in the elements of a true manhood unless we heartily believe in the principles by which we profess to be guided. It is our faith that overcomes the world. Some men never believe in anything. They are professional doubters; and yet these men are generally credulous to a degree that is simply painful to contemplate. They find fault with those who honestly believe something, and yet at the same time they themselves cannot move a single step without exercising the very faith which they assume to criticise.

Truly it has been said—

"Fault-finders are a dismal set,
Negations are their life and food,
Their words are nearly always rude,
And with them faith's an epithet.

All honest doubt affirms its 'nay,'
Just as the Christian does his 'yes,'
Yet doubters seldom will confess
That in this thing they go astray.

We must, therefore, be bold to speak,
And put agnostics in the place
Where, when we meet them face to face,
Their logic will appear quite weak.
This seems an easy thing to do,
   If men are fair with good and right,
And know the nature of the fight,
   Between what's true and what's untrue."

Isaac Errett was a man of unwavering faith. He not only had faith in God, in Christ, and in the right; but he also believed firmly and constantly that these would ultimately triumph over all opposition. But he was also a man of Hope. Just here we touch a most important element in the formation of character. No one can be strong who does not believe in the success of the cause which he represents. Dean Stanley, after he returned from America to England, stated that one of the most characteristic features of American life was the faith of the people in the almost infinite possibilities of their country. He said he heard no whisper anywhere which had in it the most remote sign of pessimism. Every one seemed to believe heartily that America must necessarily continue to grow, and become greater and greater in all that relates to both material and spiritual development. Doubtless this optimistic view by the American people has had much to do in strengthening the present forces of our material life. Pessimism is essentially sickly. It invites inroads of evil because it always leaves a gate open at the strongest citadel of defence. It is a philosophy without hope; and yet the apostle, in his letter to the Romans, was evidently right when he said "we are saved by hope." It is readily conceded that there is much in pessimism to attract certain abnormal souls. Nothing marks the difference between Tennyson and Browning more emphatically than the peculiar tinge which characterises their respective writings. There is nearly always a sombre background in Tennyson's poems, while here and there are dark lines which may generally be regarded as the keys with which to unlock the meaning. It is true that his plaintive notes are the sweetest. Perhaps this is because these notes strike a common chord in humanity. In most of these there is a feeling, sometimes at least, that coquettes with the sunshine. We look for the sombre cloud, and although we realise that behind the cloud the sun is still shining, at the same time we know that in spite of it all some days must be dark and dreary. However, Tennyson dwells too much upon this sombre side,
and his poetry, therefore, is often enervating rather than strengthening.

It is quite different with Browning. He is the poet of brightness. He always sings in the sunshine. Or to put it in another form, he makes the sunshine sing in him. His optimism is vigorous, and the atmosphere he creates is positively health-giving and inspiring. Tennyson often leaves you in dreamy sadness. He chides you for having failed to reach his ideals. He lashes the slave because he is not free, and scolds the weakling because he is not strong. Not so Browning. He helps every struggling heart into hope, and stands sponsor for every soul that looks up to higher things. While reading the former, we are constantly sorrowful that men are so weak; while reading the latter, we are constantly glad that men are so strong.

Isaac Errett had the spirit of Browning. His overmastering faith made him hopeful. He always fought for a winning cause. He never doubted the ultimate result when he knew he was in the right. Perhaps his great conviction of truth had much to do in developing this prominent characteristic. He knew in whom he believed; and not only saw, but he had a very comprehensive understanding of the environment in which he lived. He was able to read the signs of the times in the light of a burning faith, and this fact gave him great advantage as an educator, counsellor, and man of affairs. He had not a particle of pessimism in his whole nature, though he was sometimes led to conclusions which made others think he was losing heart. But he did not lose heart. He saw a rainbow in every cloud, and heard a joy-note in every cry of distress.

He not only illustrated faith and hope in the apostles' triad of graces, but he also illustrated the one which is greatest, namely, love. Love is always enterprising. It seeks channels for expending energy. It does not wait for something to turn up, but it enters the field of contest, and struggles for the mastery. But in doing this, it is a model of discretion. "It beareth all thing, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." This was eminently characteristic of Mr. Errett. I knew him intimately. Perhaps more intimately, for several years at least, than any other man of that period. I saw him
tried with respect to bearing, believing, hoping, and enduring; and in all these things he was conqueror, and more than conqueror, through Him that loved us and gave Himself for us.

(2.) He was a man of great moral courage. The Apostle Peter exhorts to add to faith, courage, as the first step in that ascending scale which he builds from faith up to love. It is true that the authorised version uses the word *virtue* instead of courage, but it is well known that the original is a military term, and means courage. It is easy to see how this addition is necessary. The Christian life is a constant conflict. It has to be developed in a state where no element for good generalship is more needed than a high moral courage. The coward has nearly always the worst of it in battle. The most destructive hour of an engagement is when a rout begins. It is just then that the retreating army is sure to lose most lives. The place of real safety is at the front. It is better to be on the firing line than to be a skulking coward. It is not always true that—

"He who fights and runs away
Will live to fight another day."

Indeed, it is more probable that—

"He who fights and runs away
Will lose his life on that same day."

But no matter how this may be, it cannot be doubted that courage is a great factor in every strong character. Many lives are failures simply because they have not the courage to meet opposing forces, and yet it is by opposing forces that all worthy progress is achieved. Life itself is held in that strange equilibrium which is produced by what Coleridge calls "sustaining opposites." The words *victory, triumph, success*, etc., all clearly indicate that every worthy achievement is through struggle, and without courage there can be no patient endurance to the end.

"We cannot even walk unless our feet
The solid earth and they do somewhere meet;
Each step opposed, the next one helps to take,
And thus opposing forces really make
What we call progress, and a reason give
Why nearly all great men and women live
Within that narrow belt of earth where life
And all the seasons are at endless strife."

To meet these opposing forces in the battle of life, next to faith a true moral courage is of supreme importance. Isaac Errett was certainly endowed with this courage. When there were battles to fight, he was always at the front. At such a time he was an implacable Radical. But when the battle was over, and the victory won, he was among the first to treat with clemency his conquered foes. When the time for organization and development came, he was eminently conservative. In many conditions it takes as much courage to say "no" as to say "yes." Indeed, the most courageous man is not unfrequently the one who refuses to follow the wild cry of unrestrained radicalism.

We mistake entirely the real facts of the case when we attribute more courage to the martyrs, who have been burned at the stake, than to those who have stood fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, and have earnestly contended for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, in the face of a frowning world, and the opposition of an apostate Church. Isaac Errett could have easily stepped into one of the most popular and remunerative pulpits of the land had he chosen to do so. As a public speaker he had few equals and scarcely any superior. He was simply matchless in the pulpit; and his chaste, impressive style would have secured for him almost any position which he might have desired to obtain. But he had the moral courage to say no to all the whisperings of avarice, and the blandishments of popular applause. Like Moses, he chose to suffer with the people of God, rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.

It is easier, in my judgment at least, to give up life itself at the stake, in one supreme sacrifice, than to live on from day to day in a constant contact with elements where all that tests a true moral heroism is brought into play. The mother that watches, with ceaseless vigilance, over her darling child exhibits quite as much fortitude, or courage, as he who dies in attestation of his faith. What we call "little things" are sometimes more trying, especially
when they are a constant irritation, than the big thing which may be disposed of in a moment.

Time and again I had occasion to notice this high quality in the subject of this address. He was always very considerate of the feelings of his brethren. He was very fond of them, and nothing gave him more pleasure than to have their undisturbed friendship. Nevertheless, when duty called him to take a course of action contrary to those he loved best, he did not hesitate to take the step that was needed. In a controversy wherein your present speaker was involved, and where very intimate personal relations were likewise involved, Isaac Errett did not hesitate to contend for the right, and though I was at that time living in a foreign country, no one could have done more valiant service in my defence than did the subject of this address. Knowing him as I did, it was just what I expected, but all the same I was none the less grateful for his magnificent defence, and especially when he uttered that memorable sentiment in one of his editorials, wherein he declared that he would as soon suspect himself of being untrue to the Gospel as to suspect your humble speaker.

This characteristic rarely ever failed him. He was necessarily much involved in a conflict with not only the world, the flesh, and the devil, but with opposing religious influences and religious men; the latter being unable to appreciate the lofty position which he occupied in contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints; and some of these were his own brethren. Notwithstanding he was frequently misrepresented, and occasionally assailed with bitterness of spirit, his courtesy and kindness never failed him. To even those who most stubbornly opposed him he was the very embodiment of a noble charity. He constantly illustrated in his relation to these the prayer of our Divine Lord, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do,"

(3.) He was a lover of men, as well as of God. This gave his ministry, both with tongue and pen, a humanitarian aspect, which greatly enlarged his usefulness. He recognised the fact that religion is a compound of at least two ingredients, namely, Divinity and Humanity. Jesus Christ Himself is "God with us"—the Theanthropos. His belief in this fact showed itself in all he said
and did. His theology recognised fully both the divine side and the human side in the plan of salvation. He had no "alones" and "onlys" in his religious system. With him God and man must co-operate in all the affairs of the present life, and in this fact he found the chief glory of God, as well as the dignity of man.

No man loved his friends with a more ardent affection than did Isaac Errett. Indeed, this was so much the case, that it was difficult to make him believe that any of his friends could go wrong. Nevertheless, this characteristic was a most valuable asset in his public ministry. A man cannot in a personal way help his fellow man, as he ought to help him, unless he is himself in deep sympathy with him and his personal needs. We can usually find a way to help those we love, and there is never any easy way to help those we do not love. Altruism may not be the best word with which to express the idea I am now seeking to enforce, but this word may give us a sort of working basis from which we may rise to higher things.

Isaac Errett's love for his fellow men was not a mere sentimental, perfunctory matter; it carried with it a genuine heart-beat and a helping hand, and even a vigorous defence, though the latter might cost him practically everything he possessed. He was no summer friend. His friendship stood the winter storms, and his generous treatment, of even his enemies, manifested itself in silence with respect to their wrong doing, even when he did not illustrate the Saviour's teaching with regard to them, by praying for them when they despitefully used him.

(4.) He had an open mind to every truth in the universe. He realised that the time is past when the highways of truth may be blockaded by the interposition of fossilized methods or creeds. He at once recognised that his age was one that invited free investigation. His innate love of liberty accentuated this open-mindedness. What he claimed for himself he freely granted to others. He wrote no "ne plus ultra" across the pathway of his own progress, and he did not, therefore, limit the possibilities of others. As he claimed perfect freedom for himself, he left every other man free to seek truth and to find it wherever and in whatever way he might think best. He was himself a truth lover. He was always ready to sacrifice everything, if needs be, for this precious good. He could have been
rich if he had sold the truth; he could have been famous if he had compromised it; but he chose the better part, namely to buy truth, and not to dispose of it at any price, and also to refuse all overtures to change the truth so that it might be more acceptable to those who could not endure its demands without adulteration. He was always ready for a clearer revelation of the truth, or for more truth than that which he possessed. He believed that no one had a monopoly of the truth, and that no age had been able to comprehend its whole area in its latitude and longitude. He had no patience with those who contend that there is an irreconcilable conflict between nature and revelation, or science and the Bible. He heartily believed that, when these are both understood, they will speak the same voice in praise of Him who is the author of both. He recognised that our present imperfect knowledge of the Bible, as well as the physical universe, must be taken into account in all our reasoning, and that there is, therefore, no place for dogmatism with respect to any conflict unless it be a conflict on account of our ignorance. But in any case, he was willing to wait with an open mind, believing with an unfaltering faith that no truth in the universe is to be feared by any one except where his prejudices are more sacred than the truth itself.

(5.) He was non-professional and non-conventional in all that he did. He had a supreme contempt for stilted manners, or even a stilted style in literary composition. Few men have written with more grace, and none have excelled him in simplicity. I do not believe that there was a writer or speaker of the times in which he lived who used the genuine Anglo-Saxon terms more copiously than he did. His vocabulary was largely limited to the simplest terms, and this fact serves to illustrate, not only the clearness of his literary work, but also emphasizes his non-conventional habits in reference to everything.

With respect to this characteristic, he had a striking example for a pattern in our Divine Lord. *He* was the impersonification of simplicity and genuineness in all that He did. He came to do His Father's will, and His whole earthly mission constantly represented the relation of a child to its parent. He knew nothing of a stereotyped formality. He knew only the needs of men, and He constantly sought to minister to these needs. He often
shocked the professional and conventional Pharisees of His day by His disregard of formal, traditional etiquette. He even dared to eat with publicans and sinners, and showed scant respect for anything that stood in the way of His helping hand for the poor and needy.

Isaac Errett's sense of humour was inimitable. This of itself would have kept him from being a pessimist. He saw sunshine in everything, and his humour was a perennial stream, watering the dry land where the sunshine had become too intense. I trust that some one will one of these days give us a volume illustrating this side of his nature. I, myself, could furnish many incidents and anecdotes that would make many a soul that is weary and sad in the struggle of life take heart again.

His humour, however, was never coarse. He had no respect for a class of anecdotes, sometimes indulged in by even preachers, wherein the Word of God is used to inculcate frivolity, and wherein coarseness is the only thing that gives the anecdote any special point. It has been said that "humour is a quality which dwells in the same character with pathos, and is always mingled with sensibility, being the offspring of a sympathising fancy." Undoubtedly Mr. Errett possessed both of these in a high degree. He was capable of very deep feeling, and in some of his addresses his pathos was over-mastering on his hearers. But these qualities helped him to be non-conventional. He was spontaneous. While he was an omnivorous reader, he often depended upon the inspiration of an occasion for some of his greatest speeches. Indeed, it is my opinion that most of his greatest pulpit efforts, as well as other addresses, have been practically lost to the world, because they were spontaneous utterances on a great occasion, and no record was made of them.

His non-conventional habits held such a mastery over him that in the social circle, where Lord Chesterfield reigns, he was generally awkward, and scarcely ever did himself justice, though in conversation he was always bright and interesting. His love of freedom was too great for him to allow himself to be trammelled with conventional rules and regulations by which society, as it is called, is supposed to be governed. He was Nature's own child, though he had improved on nature by the severe training he had imposed upon himself, as the artist im-
proves upon nature when he puts into the picture some touches that are not in the landscape he is painting.

(6.) He possessed a humble, child-like spirit. Christianity is full of paradoxes. One of the most striking of these is that the way to go up in it is to go down. "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." In order to enter the kingdom of God, we must become as little children—we must possess the child-like spirit. This was eminently characteristic of Mr. Errett. And this fine quality made him an easy prey of certain parasites which hung about him and derived their chief importance from the recognition which he gave them. He was not pre-eminently a judge of character. If he trusted at all, it was without reservation. If he was a friend, he was a friend indeed. His own spirit was guileless and wholly unaffected. The simplicity of a child was in his every action.

This characteristic lent a peculiar charm to his manners and added an indefinable sweetness to all his friendly overtures. As has already been intimated, he was the embodiment of courtesy towards even his enemies, though when aroused he could use the lex talionis with considerable force, if there was occasion for it. There were those who felt his heavy blows, as well as those who received his gracious smiles.

It was his child-like spirit which bound him to me so closely. He was an elder of the Central Christian Church of Cincinnati, for several years, and during all these years he was one of the most tolerant of all my hearers, while no one gave me a heartier support than did he. He seemed to delight in holding up my hands and making my pastorate an eminent success. Never did I see in him the slightest tinge of jealousy. He seemed always pleased when I was honoured. In all this he had a noble yoke-fellow in the person of Father Challen. These two men were both elders of the Central Church during the greater part of my ministry there, and I can truly say that no two men could have been more unselfish helpers.

I have referred to this matter not only because it illustrates the point I am making, as regards the character of Mr. Errett, but also for the lesson which it teaches with respect to the position which preachers, who have no pastorates, should occupy in the churches where they
hold their membership. Sometimes there are two or three of these preachers in the same church, and it not infrequently happens that these men, instead of being a blessing to the church, and a help to the pastor in charge, are actually a disadvantage to both. They make themselves officious, meddlesome, and not seldom aggressive in faultfinding, ungenerous criticism and invidious comparison. In short, they show themselves to be little men with smaller souls, while they create an atmosphere which is surcharged with the whisperings of envy or the maledictions of hate. This is no exaggerated picture. I fear it is too often literally illustrated in some of our churches. Isaac Errett was the freest man I ever saw from this ugly spirit. He was the very opposite of the picture I have drawn. He was a brother to the regular preacher in the truest and noblest sense, and this made my association with him in the church a perpetual delight.

(7.) He was a man of insight and vision. Perhaps nothing characterised him more than this, and it is certain that nothing contributed to his great manhood more than this. Most people can see the surface of things. But to go down underneath the surface and see what is invisible is altogether another matter; and yet we can scarcely claim to be men unless we can stand the test with respect to at least three things: We must see the invisible, know the unknowable, and do the impossible. Almost any one can accomplish the ordinary; but only a magnificent character can accomplish the extraordinary. It is precisely at this point where true greatness is separated from mediocrity.

Isaac Errett stood this test well. He was especially gifted with respect to insight and vision. He was almost a prophet in his ability to interpret the facts of the day in which he lived. He saw at a glance the needs of the religious movement with which he had become identified, and he at once set for himself the task of providing for these needs.

What do I mean by seeing the invisible? First of all, I mean the insight, or sight that looks within, or sees down beneath the mere glamour of the outside, that penetrates to the causes of things, that perceives the relation of things; that leads noble souls into spiritual environments; that "looks not to the things that are seen, but
to the things that are unseen, for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are unseen are eternal." I mean by vision the power to do this. The power to leave the mere things of sight and catch glimpses of the spiritual world. No man can be a true minister of the Gospel, or even a power in the world for good, whose vision never goes beyond the sensuous. He must sometimes be practically translated, as Paul was, into the third heaven, where he may see things that are unlawful to mention. The one fault of our twentieth century ministry is, perhaps, the lack of this quality. Our preachers are so absorbed in the questions of economics, social life, articles of faith, and addition and subtraction, that their vision is largely limited to these transient matters. Oh, for a ministry that is endowed with the faculty of insight and vision, for when this ministry dawns upon this grey old earth it will then be ready to be truly the footstool of God, while the firmament above it will be full of stars in preparation for the final inheritance of the saints in light.

It would be most agreeable to me, and would no doubt be agreeable to you, if I should continue to dwell upon other characteristics which were prominently manifested in the man we are considering. But as there are other things to be said along the line of his work, and as these will supply some of the details in his character, which have been necessarily omitted, I must at once proceed to the consideration of the work which he was specially called to do, and which, after all, speaks for him more eloquently than anything I, or anyone else, could say with respect to his character.

As regards the religious movement in which he was engaged, he occupied a unique position. Coming into active service exactly at the time he was needed, it is impossible not to believe that he had been raised up, under the guidance of Providence, for the very work which he accomplished. At present we can notice only a few of the special things which he emphasised, and in which he led the forces of the Reformation to a higher and better position than had been occupied before his advent.

(1.) He did much to deliver the Disciple movement from a despotism which was evidently settling upon it at the time he began his public advocacy. There is nothing clearer to the mind of a sound, logical thinker than that
there is an irreconcilable antagonism between fixed theological definitions and individual Christian liberty. Nature abhors a duplicate as much as she does a vacuum. Hence, there are no two things exactly alike in the world of either matter or mind. Intellects differ as much as physical appearances; and this difference in intellects is the parent of different conceptions of any given fact or truth.

Just here we touch a most vital matter, and it is just at this point that Mr. Errett's influence upon the religious movement with which he was identified was most powerful for good. The "Declaration and Address" of the Campbells plead for individual liberty, and was as clearly a declaration of independence for the soul as the "Declaration" by Thomas Jefferson was for the body. But soon after this "Declaration and Address" was made the Campbells changed very materially their own attitude toward the movement they had inaugurated. Several things were practically covered up in the "Declaration and Address" by "glittering generalities," and when these were differentiated and made practical elements in the plea which was advocated, they became sources of antagonism at some of the points where individual liberty had been proclaimed in the beginning.

To illustrate what I mean, it is only necessary to refer to the change of ground which the Campbells made with respect to baptism. At first neither the subject, action, nor design of baptism was considered. The plea which they made was mainly against the usurpation of opinionism in producing divisions among the people of God, and right valiantly did they contend for a demolition of speculative theology, because of its divisive tendency.

However, it was not long until it was found that, if they followed the dictum "where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent," they must necessarily discard some of the things they had inherited, however sacred these things may have seemed to be in view of their associations. Among these things, infant baptism and affusion for baptism could no longer be tolerated. Hence the Campbells put into practice just what their teaching clearly implied. We are compelled to admire their honesty, and also the courage of their convictions which carried them forward into practice.
what they announced in theory. At the same time it must be confessed that, when they attempted to impress this radical change upon the religious world, they were met with a stern refusal on the part of many who would perhaps have accepted nearly every position advocated in the "Declaration and Address." Of course the Campbells themselves, and those immediately associated with them, had no desire to impinge in any way upon individual liberty, for it was this very thing, most of all, that permeated from beginning to end the great paper which they had given to the world. But the men who subsequently came into the movement soon began to narrow its dimensions by a dogmatic interpretation which came nigh drifting the movement into a sectarianism equally as bad, if not worse, than that from which the movement had sprung. Perhaps this is only another illustration of that atavism which seems to prevail everywhere, and which in this case showed itself in a tendency to recur to the ancestral type of sectarianism out of which the movement sprang. We must not forget that progress has always been in zigzag courses. Sometimes to the right, sometimes to the left. Sometimes forward and sometimes backward. The Carnpbellian religious movement went forward at first, it then went to the right, then to the left, and finally began to go backward, recurring to the sectarian type which had cursed the world before the movement was inaugurated.

It was just here that Mr. Errett's work was most effective. Without going into details, it is sufficient to say that his advocacy did much to put the movement on the right basis, and to deliver it from a narrowness with which it was characterised when it reached the organic period where introspection began to take the place of aggressive evangelism for the conversion of the world.

It is only fair to say, in this connection, that this sectarian tendency was both augmented and accelerated by the ugly opposition which the movement received. Like produces like is a law of grace, as well as nature. Ugliness begets ugliness, and this was especially true with regard to the Disciples during the middle of the first half of the last century. They were persecuted by their religious neighbours, and this persecution often drove them into extreme positions which they would not have occupied had it not been for the ugly spirit with which
they were persecuted. Everything produces after its kind.

I do not stop now to discuss the probable consequence of this unseemly opposition, if it had not been arrested. Doubtless it was unavoidable at the time when it so distinctly prevailed. It may have been the best thing that could have happened at that particular time. Evil sometimes may be an important factor on the way to an unmistakable good. Lord Macaulay says there was a time in the history of England when the Roman Catholic Church was practically the salvation of the people, though he himself was a strong Nonconformist, and consequently was bitterly opposed to Roman Catholicism. It is easy for us to find fault with the grand men who fought the battles of the early days, but it is doubtful if a different type of advocacy would have succeeded. I believe the movement has been guided by Providence all the way through, and consequently I am inclined to the opinion that the very thing that now looks ugly in the advocacy of those days was just what saved the movement from collapse. I cannot at present show the reasons for this conclusion, but I believe there are reasons of a most convincing character with respect to this very matter.

However, at the crucial time, a new leader came to the front, whose mission was to lift the movement into a broader plain, and to a more comprehensive view. This leader was Isaac Errett, and right valiantly did he perform this work.

It is certainly true that, theoretically at least, the Campbells struck at every form of religious despotism. Every line of the "Declaration and Address" throbs with the spirit of freedom. They were especially hostile to human creeds, because they regarded these creeds as not only unscriptural, but as also fraught with danger to religious liberty. But one of the difficulties which met the movement was that many of the men associated with the Campbells did not seem to understand what religious liberty meant. Alexander Campbell was the very embodiment of hostility to theological dogmas, and hence he waged a relentless war upon everything like speculative theology. It would be untrue to say that he at least did not understand the true conception of the liberty for which he contended. In my judgment, hie, celebrated
reply to a lady from Lunenburg makes it evident that he had a very clear vision as to the spirit
which should characterise the movement of which he was the most prominent leader. But for
this very reply he was severely criticised by some of the men associated with him. Indeed,
their opposition to his liberal views was so pronounced that at one time it looked as if there
would be a conflict between Mr. Campbell and his legalistic friends. It must not be forgotten
that some very illiberal elements came into the movement at the very beginning, and these
elements had much to do with bringing about the reaction toward sectarianism. The whole
movement was influenced by elements from at least three different sources: First, the
Campbells themselves; second, the Christians, under the leadership of B. W. Stone; and third,
the Scotch Baptists, who more or less became associated with nearly all the more important
churches of the early days, of the movement. These Scotch Baptists had much to do with
giving the movement the narrow caste it had at the time Mr. Errett began his definite work.

Mr. Campbell's plea for the Bible and the Bible alone, as a sufficient rule of faith and
practice, was well enough when legitimately construed; but with many it meant that there
must be practically no interpretation of the Bible at all. To quote the language of those days, it
was declared that "the Bible said what it meant and meant what it said." This summary
method was supposed to be conclusive against every one who claimed to follow some
interpretation of the Bible, whether that interpretation was in a confession of faith or
anywhere else.

Mr. Errett was not slow to see that this kind of an argument, though fatal to human creeds,
was a dangerous boomerang. While it might be conclusive against authoritative confessions of
faith it was equally conclusive against individual liberty. He saw that every man must follow
the Bible as he understands it, or else he must blindly accept the interpretations made for him
by others.

I do not say that Mr. Errett discovered this important fact, but I do say that he called
attention to it, and showed its consequences upon the religious movement, as no one else did.
Really it is somewhat remarkable that this important matter did not leap to the first place at the
very
beginning of the Campbellian reformation. It ought to be evident to every tyro in logical analysis that there are at least two Bibles in every man's house. First, the Bible as it really is; and second, the Bible as each man sees it or understands it. Practically the same may be said of Christ. There is undoubtedly a Christ who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; but each man's conception of Christ is, after all, the Christ which he follows. The general conception is what we may not inappropriately call the composite Christ, and it is an interesting inquiry as to the aggregate conception of Christ at the beginning of this twentieth century. If we could get the aggregate of all the conceptions of what the Christ really is in each individual case, we would have the composite Christ, or an accurate photograph embodying all the varied views of Him entertained by different persons. This picture would be a curious compound. Nevertheless, this is precisely the vision of our great Redeemer which is needed in order to understand His present position in the world. His universality is conceded, but it must not be forgotten that each individual has his own picture of Christ, and that this differs from every other individual picture. Practically, therefore, there are as many Christs as there are individuals who have formed a conception of Him. What we would like to see clearly drawn is the composite result of the combination of all these pictures. Perhaps to obtain this is impossible, but an approximation to it is certainly within the range of human effort. We might reduce the individuals into several classes, and by combining these classes we might reach an approximation of the ideal we have before us. A mention of a few of these will help you to understand my meaning. The following groups will at least be suggestive: The Theological Christ, or the Christ in the Creeds; the Pictorial Christ, or the Christ in Art; the Emotional Christ, or the Christ in devotional service; The Ritualistic Christ, or the Christ in liturgy; the Conventional Christ, or the Christ in social intercourse; the Commercial Christ, or the Christ in business affairs; the Political Christ, or the Christ in human government. This list might be extended much further, but the enumeration is sufficient to indicate my meaning. Even the Christs I have mentioned would make a curious composite picture, but I must leave my hearers
to work out the results as best they can. My object has been to indicate the diversity of conceptions, even as regards the very foundation of our faith.

From the foregoing considerations it is evident that the creed question is not so easily disposed of as some have thought. While the reformers, with whom Mr. Errett was associated, did not write a creed, they came very near adopting an unwritten creed which would have been destructive to individual liberty. Mr. Errett did as much, if not more, than any other man to stay this tendency, and he thereby helped to free the religious movement from the spirit of dogmatism which at one time began to show itself in several quarters.

(2.) Mr. Errett did much to inculcate a better conception of Christian Union than that which threatened to fasten itself upon the movement sometime after it was started. I have already referred to the tendency of religious movements to revert to the very things against which they at first protested. The Campbellian movement was not an exception to this rule. At the beginning it was characterised by a generous catholic spirit, and its great plea for Christian Union was perhaps its noblest and most effective commendation. But following the course of what seems to be the law of evolution, the point was finally reached where the plea for Christian Union did not mean much more than the subjugation of religious parties, and their absorption into the organization represented by the Disciples of Christ. This was the theory of the Union of the Anaconda and the Rabbits. If the denominational Rabbits were willing to be swallowed by the young, vigorous, and rapidly growing Anaconda, then the latter was quite prepared to have Christian Union on those terms. But this plan did not suit the Rabbits, and so Christian Union did not seem to make much progress from the Disciple point of view, notwithstanding their earnest pleading for it, and the Scriptural ground of much of their contention. It is true that the Disciple leaders tried to make their plea consistent. In any case they were able, in the main, to demonstrate that it was at least Scriptural. But it did not take into consideration all the facts of the case. It expected too much to be accomplished at once. It failed to recognise the fact that the apostasy was a gradual development, and that conse-
quently the return from this apostasy must necessarily be gradual.

Mr. Errett soon saw that his brethren had not considered sufficiently the genesis of denominationalism; that, at least, many of them came to regard it as all bad; as, indeed, without anything to commend it whatever. Mr. Errett took a different view. He perceived that denominationalism was the result of an effort of earnest souls to restore the Christianity which had been lost during the apostasy, and which apostasy had "begun to work" even in the days of the apostles. He saw that gradually the Church went down into Babylon. It was not a sudden lapse. Step by step the downward road was traveled, until at last the sombre nightshade of religious despotism hung over the prostrate form of the Christian Church. With Wyclif, Luther, and their associates a reaction began. This was also gradual. Two or three important things were restored by each successive movement, until the Reformation inaugurated by the Campbells was reached. Mr. Errett recognised that the latter movement would have been impossible without those which had preceded it, and he therefore felt that a great deal was due to such men as Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Knox, and others, who had been pioneers in bringing the Church out of the apostasy. He did not believe that they had accomplished everything that was needed to be done, but he was quite prepared to give them full credit for having done a great deal. The respective movements which they represented had crystallised into denominations, but these even held to much of the truth for which he and his associates contended. He made these points of agreement the starting point for Christian Union, rather than a sharp discussion of differences which could only tend to separate him and his brethren more widely from the denominations into which Christendom was divided. He held strongly to the notion that the union movement, with which he was identified, could be advanced more easily and certainly by emphasising points of agreement, than by emphasising points of difference. He did not believe that the denominations occupied the best ground, or advocated the best Scriptural views of the Church or its government. Still, he believed that the best way to secure Christian Union was by recognising all the good that was
in these denominations, and then trust to "sweetness and light" for a fuller vision of the whole truth. He furthermore believed that Christian Union could not be attained except by gradual approaches, and consequently he advocated co-operation with all the Christian forces as far as this could be done, without sacrificing principle, as a preliminary step to a better understanding, and to reach finally the one foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone. In short, he did not believe that Christian Union could be accomplished by a sort of tomahawk system of advocacy. His notion was to contend for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, but to recognise this truth whenever it was found, even though it might be associated with much that was not true.

He saw clearly the fact that the denominations already existed. They were in possession of the field. They held much in common with the faith of the Disciples, though in some things they occupied a very different position. Nevertheless these denominations had to be reckoned with and could not be remanded to the mother of harlots without doing them great injustice, and at the same time proclaiming his own brethren as a narrow proscriptive sect. He believed, therefore, that it was wiser and better to recognise these denominations as partial growths of the true Church out of the apostasy which had so universally obtained during the Middle Ages. He did not regard this concession as justifying denominational organisations; it only suggested the toleration of these until all could see their way to accept the higher ground to which the Campbellian movement invited them. In the meantime, he believed that to cultivate a friendly spirit with respect to these denominations, and to co-operate with them in every possible way, would hasten to their absorption into the one family of the living God where all are brethren.

Undoubtedly this was a somewhat new point of view from which to consider the question of Christian Union. It evidently recognised the doctrine of evolution, though it is possible that Mr. Errett and those associated with him did not perceive this fact; nor did they for a moment recognise the legitimacy of denominationalism; at any rate they certainly did not recognise the continued legiti-
macy of a divided Christendom. They did, however, admit that the position of the religious movements, to which reference has been made, were well enough when first taken. It was then perhaps impossible to do any better; but Mr. Errett contended that it was worse than folly to rest in this partial development whenever it was possible to reach a higher position where the Apostolic Church could be restored in its faith, doctrine, and life. He argued that these denominations were only justifiable, if justifiable at all, just as long as it was impossible to reach any higher ground; but he believed also that the ground which had been reached should be used honestly as a basis from which to reach the higher ground of the ideal Church, or the Church distinctly portrayed in the New Testament Scriptures. He claimed for the movement with which he was identified that it aimed to represent this higher position, and consequently he felt the time had come when denominationalism ought to be given up, and when all who love our Divine Lord in sincerity and truth should stand together and contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

Surely this great plea which he made for truth in the love of it, for union in the reasonableness of it, and for the conversion of the world as the result of it, was worth all it cost to advocate it. This position I believe is impregnable. It will stand against all assaults. Furthermore, I believe that the time has now come when denominationalism should be given up. However justifiable it may have been for a time, there is no good reason why it should be continued, and there are many good and excellent reasons why it should be abandoned. There are also many signs that indicate that this is the feeling of the best men and women to be found in all of these religious parties.

In view of this fact, why should the Protestant churches still occupy the low ground of sectarianism when it is now possible for them to step up higher? As well might an army refuse to march forward after a number of battles have gained for it the best strategic position.

Suppose a general is commanded to capture a strongly fortified citadel. He goes up near enough to make an observation, and finds that he cannot storm it. He at once begins a series of what military men call "parallel
approaches." He plants some guns in the most favourable position that can be obtained, and opens fire upon the fortress. His guns do some execution, but not a great deal. But he "keeps the enemy employed," and is thereby enabled to secure for his men a more favourable place from which to operate.

He now pulls his guns up higher and closer, and begins to fire from the advanced position with decidedly better effect than before. Still he does not capture the stronghold. But with the advantages he now possesses, he is soon able to gain a platform from which he can almost command the works of the enemy. He immediately pulls up his guns to this higher ground, and, under their cover, is enabled to gain a point where he is thoroughly master of the situation. Now what would you say of him if he were to keep his guns and men at the first, second or third positions? I think you would say he would act very unwisely; and so he certainly would. But like a competent general, that he is, he brings all his forces up to the highest and best point from which to operate, and from this commanding position makes short work of the business before him.

Now this illustrates the relative value of what has been accomplished by the religious movements of the past. The Protestant organisations have fought through many terrific battles, and gained some splendid victories; and these victories have generally secured more advantageous religious positions—positions which enabled the hosts of God to come nearer and nearer the Divine platform, and to more thoroughly command the enemy's works. And now, just as the highest and most favourable point is within reach, from which it will be possible to demolish the very citadel of sin itself, and proclaim union and peace to our present divided and troubled Zion, is it not worse than folly to continue in the old denominational positions where little more can be accomplished than has already been done?

If such a position, as that indicated, is attainable, surely all who love the Lord Jesus Christ should heartily work for it, for this alone will bring us to the "unity of the faith," and give the answer to the Saviour's earnest prayer, when He said: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word;
that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

(3.) Mr. Errett's work contributed largely to a better conception of the Church and its responsibilities. During the years preceding his advocacy the reformers had been mainly concerned in preaching the Gospel and converting the people. At first the movement was distinctly and emphatically evangelistic. It was a proclamation of good news to the people, not only with respect to religious freedom, but with respect also to freedom from sin. The early advocates who led the movement gave little attention to the Church in its organization and work. Of course this part of the movement was not entirely neglected, but it did not receive the consideration which was necessary in order to hold the ground that was gained. Even when Church matters came under discussion, very little progress was made, for the reason that it was difficult to lift the discussion up to a high plane. Very few of the men, who had been so fully absorbed in what was called "first principles," were able to move forward to "second principles," without involving themselves with impracticable definitions which stood right in the way of Christian progress. The whole movement of the Disciples involved at least three things:

(a.) A movement back to the personal Christ; or, as I prefer to state the case, a movement forward to Him, as contra-distinguished from the theological Christ. It was believed that this would give to the world again the true faith.

(b.) A movement back to the inspired Apostles, who were regarded as Christ's vice-gerents on earth, and through whom the Holy Spirit carried on and further developed the work which Christ "began both to do and teach" while He was on earth in the flesh. It was believed that this would give the world again the true Gospel, in its facts, commands, and promises.

(c.) A movement back to the New Testament Church, the Divine ideal Church, not the Church of ecclesiastical history. It was believed that this would solve all the questions of our social environment, and would ultimately result in the conversion of the world to Christ.

It was the last of these movements which enlisted much
of the attention of Mr. Errett. He saw that this was the weak point in the Reformation to which he was devoting his energies. He saw, furthermore, that this was precisely the point which was most difficult to strengthen.

Men are not usually very sensitive when the wrongs of others are being corrected, but when their own wrongs are under consideration, then it is that they begin to show signs of restlessness, if not stubbornness. While labouring for the restoration of the primitive faith and the primitive Gospel, the Disciples found themselves practically of the same mind in regard to one another, and whatever conflict they had was with the denominations and the world; consequently there was little or no friction among the brethren in the earlier days of the Reformation. But by and by it became necessary to turn the light of the Bible and experience upon the churches themselves, and this at once revealed the fact that much remained to be done before these could be regarded as in harmony with New Testament teaching.

But this was not all. There were many things constantly coming up concerning which there was no specific direction in the Bible. These had to be decided by referring them to general principles, and what was called the "law of expediency." It is just here that some sharp and vigorous discussion was precipitated among the Disciples themselves. Mr. Errett led the forces of progress. He advocated a forward movement all along the line. He felt that the churches had been so long and so constantly engaged in a conflict with the denominations, concerning the first two points included in the reformatory movement, that they had largely neglected their own development, and especially had they failed to provide ways and means for both spiritual culture and an aggressive attack upon the heathen world.

Not a few of the brethren were extremely sensitive to any change in the established order of things, with respect to their church life. Some of them resisted the demand for a forward movement, and persistently called for a "thus saith the Lord" in order to justify the most trivial changes in the practice of the churches. So vehement were some of these in denouncing what they were pleased to call "innovations" that they practically made progress an epithet and efficiency a crime.
There is nothing so easy as to float with the current, but sometimes our floating with the current is wholly owing to an illusion. The eye is easily deceived, and hence the old Latin proverb—*ne crede colori*—has in it a very suggestive truth. We certainly should not trust too much to appearances. I was once standing on the Thames embankment, looking over the stone wall which bounds the walk along the river. The ice was breaking up in the river, and was moving at a rapid rate with the tide. By an optical illusion it seemed that the ice was not moving at all, while I was moving swiftly in the very opposite direction. Nothing could have been more complete than this illusion, and I had to remove my point of view before the spell was broken. So it is with respect to many things in our present environment. The direction we are going is determined wholly by the standpoint which we occupy. When we have the courage to move our standpoints we then, for the first time, realise that we have been labouring under an illusion.

The traditionalists who opposed Mr. Errett imagined that they were moving right along in the line of true progress, and that every one else was standing still, or else going back to sectarianism. It probably never occurred to these earnest souls that they were standing still and the progress which they noticed was wholly owing to the motion of those whom they opposed. This often happens in our experience. Some men never move except when they are carried along by others. In any case it cannot be denied that a change of standpoint has brought many of the "super-sound" men to entirely reverse their former understanding of things; and no one perhaps was more influential in bringing about this change than the subject of this sketch.

But I must now conclude this already extended notice of our distinguished brother, whose life and work wrought so mightily upon the religious movement with which he was identified. Isaac Errett is no longer with us in flesh, but his work remains as a monument to his foresight and devotion to the principles which he advocated. Like all great men, he thought in advance of his age. He saw much and felt much that he did not even advocate. He knew that his brethren could not bear all that he had in his heart to say to them. He was too conservative on
one side to allow the expression of some things of his highest conception. Nevertheless, the seed-truths which he planted are already bearing abundant fruit in education, missionary work, spiritual development, etc., among the brethren whom he so ardently loved.

In closing this address, I should like to indulge in some personal reminiscences, but I fear this would consume too much time, for I have already trespassed upon your patience; but I cannot see how I could have said less, and at the same time done justice to this occasion. Many of the people who are gathered here now knew him intimately; but perhaps few, if any one, knew him as I did. He was an elder in the church for many years where I was pastor. I had the honour to succeed him in Detroit, and was also intimately associated with him in literary work. In all these relations he was more than a brother to me. I was with him during his visit to the Orient, and was a personal witness of the accident which doubtless cost him his life. He was always a hero, never complaining, even when he had great cause for complaint. He bore the ugly criticisms of even his brethren without retaliation. Like his Divine Master, when he was reviled, he reviled not again. Let us be thankful that such a man lived and wrought in this great world of ours, and that his influence will continue to be a perpetual help in carrying on the great principles of the Reformation to which he devoted his life.

In the language of Matthew Arnold, we can truly say:

“No, No! The energy of life may be
Kept on after the grave, but not begun;
And he who flagg'd not in the earthly strife,
From strength to strength advancing—only he,
His soul well-knit, and all his battles won,
Mounts, and that hardly, to eternal life."
CHAPTER XXI

NEW PAPERS AND NEW PLANS

PRIOR to the death of Mr. Campbell the enemies of the Disciple movement constantly predicted that it would go to pieces when he ceased to be its leader. They contended that his strong personality and distinguished leadership made the movement a success during his lifetime, but that it would utterly fail as soon as this directing force ceased to exist.

But these critics all proved to be false prophets. The very opposite of what they predicted actually happened. When the Disciples realised that their great leader had fallen, instead of becoming utterly disorganised, they immediately began to come closer together, and to prepare for such a definite organization and co-operation as would compensate largely for the loss they had sustained. From this time forward they did not seek for the leadership of any man. Mr. Campbell's mantle fell on no one. Indeed, there was no one who could take his place. Truly it has been said that "Atlas had gone to the Hesperides, and there was no one left to hold up the skies. Ulysses had departed on his wanderings, and there was none strong enough at Ithaca to bend his matchless bow." No one assumed to take Mr. Campbell's place, for no one felt that he could wear Mr. Campbell's armour. Nevertheless, there were a few men to whom the brethren looked for special help in their time of need. Isaac Errett was one of these; Benjamin Franklin was another; there were also others, but the two mentioned were editors of the two leading journals devoted to the advocacy of the Disciple plea, and consequently they occupied an influential position which no one else held at this time. The Millennial Harbinger was still continued with Professor C. L. Loos as co-editor, but owing to the rising power of the two religious weeklies, viz., Christian Standard and American Christian Review, the Harbinger, being a monthly magazine, decreased in its circulation, and ceased to be the influential...
power it once was. However, it was conducted with great ability and in a noble spirit by its distinguished editors.

In addition to the older men, both of the first and second generations, a number of strong, earnest, and influential workers among the younger men had now to be reckoned with. Some of these were preachers, some educators, and others editors, and not a few business men who furnished the sinews of war. Only a few of these can be mentioned now, and some of them had already been prominently identified with the movement for several years. However, it is well to include them among the most prominent men connected with the movement during the latter part of the sixth decade of the nineteenth century:


It will be seen by this list of noble men (some of whom may be almost classed with the pioneers, but whose names are repeated here because they were at this time still actively engaged in their respective fields of labour), that the Disciples had at this time a very strong force of distinguished advocates, and as these were mainly working
together harmoniously, and as most of them had a clear vision of the new day upon which the movement had entered, it is not surprising that the movement began to take on new life and to go forward with rapid strides.

It is true that there were some drawbacks. The ghost of the organ question kept coming up, and even the right of missionary societies to exist became a prominent question for discussion during this period. Of course this only shows, what has already been mentioned, and what is distinctly indicated in all history, viz., that progress is never in straight lines. Sometimes it is backward, and in the present case the reactionary movements which took place were, in the long run, advantageous to final progress. These served to clear the atmosphere; to fix definitely the real principles, and to define clearly the methods that were best for effective work. The discussions were generally very able, and when this period was passed there was never much encouragement to raise these questions again. Where united action could not be secured, no particular effort was made, after this, to convince those who still held out against what most of the Disciples believed legitimate progress. But there were those who believed that the whole success of the Disciple movement depended upon some of the issues that were raised during these controversies. In fact, it was a time when some were disposed to quote Paul's remark that "without controversy great is the mystery of godliness," with special emphasis on the word "controversy," as meaning discussion without end.

Sometime before this it was thought generally that the question of organs and missionary societies was practically settled, but the belligerent spirit of the war seemed to have been transferred to the religious sphere, and for a few years after the war closed the organ question, especially, held a prominent place.

Meantime, in 1869, a new journal was started, entitled the *Apostolic Times*, with the following statement in the prospectus: "To the primitive faith, and the primitive practice, without enlargement or diminution, without innovation or modification, the editors here and now commit their paper and themselves with a will and purpose, inflexible as the cause in whose interest they propose to write." Five editors were announced, viz., Moses E. Lard,
Robert Graham, Winthrop H. Hopson, Lanceford B. Wilkes, and John W. McGarvey. This was truly a formidable array of talent. These men were unquestionably devoted to the cause. They were every way worthy to carry out the proposal in their prospectus. The only difficulty was that of determining just what the primitive faith and primitive practice were. These men thought they knew exactly just what they were aiming to do, and the paper became itself almost as belligerent as the Civil War had been which had recently closed.

The following incident will illustrate the faith that these men had that their paper would have a very wide circulation, and would neutralise the liberal tendencies of the Christian Standard, edited by Isaac Errett. Just before the first issue of the Times appeared, one of these editors remarked to an experienced journalist that a paper, with five such names as the Times would display as editors, could not possibly fail. He continued (without including himself) it was safe to say that no paper in all the land could boast of such an array of talent in its management, and furthermore, the personal influence of these men would itself secure a very large subscription list. The journalist shook his head, and then asked the embryo editor how many copies of the paper he supposed would be taken by his own personal friends simply because he was one of the editors. The editor hesitated for a moment and then replied: "Of course I do not know, certainly, but I should say at least several thousand." "Well," said the journalist, "you sit down and count up the friends that you can be sure will take it on account of your personal relations to it, and when you have counted all you can remember, I will venture the prediction that you cannot find a hundred. Indeed, it is doubtful if fifty will take it from personal considerations. Probably twenty-five would be a safe guess with respect to this matter. Then after the first year these twenty-five will not take it unless the paper pleases them. People do not take a paper to please the editor, or because they are special friends of the editor. They take a paper because it pleases them, and when it ceases to do this, they immediately drop the paper. You have five editors. The most you can claim for this phalanx of personal power is a few people will take the paper from personal con-
siderations, but the number will not exceed 500, and that is, in my judgment, entirely too liberal an estimate. Still, I will grant that 500 subscribers will take the paper the first year in deference to the personal esteem which they have for the editors. At the end of that year, nearly all of these will feel they have discharged their personal obligation, and will immediately discontinue the paper, unless it is a paper they want on account of its intrinsic value."

It is needless to say that the editor regarded this journalist's estimate of the matter as wholly wrong, but the subsequent history of the paper really demonstrated that he was entirely right. The paper was conducted with much ability, considering its number of editors. What the editor just quoted regarded as its strong point was really its weak point. The paper turned out to be nearly all editor. It was made up chiefly of editorials on controversial questions, and was virtually killed by the weight of its own talent. It lacked variety and scope, and above all adaptation to the wants of hungry souls. The result was it had to struggle for an existence, and finally changed hands, and kept on changing hands and title until at last it died the death of the righteous. It was good, but too good. It was straight from the shoulder, but it was not in touch with the demands of the age, and while its hewing to the line made the chips fly, most of these flew in the face of the editors themselves.

Meantime *Lard's Quarterly*, to which reference has already been made, ran its course and its editor was transferred to the *Apostolic Times*. This *Quarterly* contained some very able articles, but for some reason it did not appeal to a large class of readers. Its spirit was very much the same as that which soon possessed the *Apostolic Times*.

But now another quarterly, viz., the *Christian Quarterly*, was launched, which was of a different type. The first number of this was issued in January, 1869. Its spirit was somewhat different from that which had characterised *Lard's Quarterly*. In its advocacy it covered a wide field, but its main contention was for a liberal interpretation of the Disciple movement and a support of all worthy enterprises in the interests of that movement. However, it was not specially controversial. Indeed, it
refused to admit distinctly controversial articles, especially when they were in reply to other articles that had appeared in its pages. It was not a forum, but a broad, liberal platform where the best talent could say the things that were supposed to be needed.

In referring to this quarterly, Dr. Frederick D. Power says:

“From 1869 to 1876 W. T. Moore edited at Cincinnati this excellent journal. It is safe to say that for wise editorial management, for the ability and learning of its contributors, for the timeliness and vigour of its articles, for the thoroughness and usefulness of its book reviews, for general intellectual and mechanical make-up and widespread literary and religious influence, it was superior to anything of the kind ever issued by the Disciples. Lard's Quarterly is remembered, the Quarterly Review, the New Christian Quarterly, and other ventures, but the Christian Quarterly for dignity, efficiency, and quarterliness, has not been surpassed. During its whole career Mr. Pendleton was associated with Mr. Moore in its editorial management and contributed to its columns some of his best work.” *

The Christian Quarterly undoubtedly did produce a favourable impression from the very first issue. The press everywhere gave it the highest praise. The New York Independent, which was then at the acme of its fame and influence, stated frequently that the literary reviews of the Quarterly were better than those in any other periodical of the country. The Quarterly was also noticed favourably in Europe; one German paper, published in Leipsic, declared that it was the only American magazine worthy of notice in its columns.

These facts are stated because they suggest very important matter. It certainly must be regarded as remarkable that a periodical, representing so young a religious people, historically considered, as the Disciples were at that time, and also a people who had given very little special attention to literature, should produce a quarterly magazine which was regarded, during the whole time of its existence, as superior to any other magazine of its kind published in America. This can be accounted for only on the ground that the plea which the Disciples make is fresh and free, and contains the possibilities of a literature wholly untrammelled by the traditions of the

past, and in perfect sympathy with the needs of the present and the hopes of the future. It was not on account of any superior ability in the articles it contained, but rather in their newness, and freeness, and adaptation to the religious, social, and civic tendencies of the age. It was practically a revelation to many of the best minds of the country, and it is believed it did a worthy work in bringing the plea it advocated before these minds.

There were other papers about this time which came into existence. The Gospel Echo, edited by the young and rising advocate of the Disciple plea, J. H. Garrison, was full of missionary zeal, and at once became a stalwart helper in the missionary cause. Another paper, entitled The Christian, was under the management of T. P. Haley, G. W. Longan, Alexander Proctor, A. B. Jones, B. H. Smith, and George Plattenburg. These two papers were shortly united, and the union paper was issued from St. Louis. A monthly, entitled the Evangelist, was issued in Iowa, which also supported earnestly the missionary societies.

But with all the help derived from these sources, as well as from other sources not mentioned, the American Christian Missionary Society seemed to be losing ground, and was very inadequately supported. Mr. Franklin, with his paper behind him, threw himself practically in opposition to the Society, and in this he was supported by other men and papers of less note. Finally it was decided to make some changes in the constitution of the Society, where had been pointed out the most objectionable features. But these changes did not seem to satisfy the opponents. It was strongly contended that all societies, such as the American Christian Missionary Society, were simply human institutions, for which there is no authority in the Word of God. This plea was easily made popular. It at once exempted Disciples from any obligation to contribute funds to the support of the Society, and it was not difficult to persuade many that in withholding their funds from the Society they were doing God's service. An appeal to selfishness usually smothers all reason, and at any rate it helps to interpret the Bible so that every man's money can stay at home. Truly has Tennyson said:

"The jingle of the guinea helps the hurt that honour feels."
This was undoubtedly a crucial time in the history of the movement. The stoutest, bravest, and most faithful almost lost heart. But it was the darkest hour just before day. It simply illustrates one of those backward tendencies which are sure to manifest themselves here and there in every progressive movement. It was a time of testing; but it was a time also of clearing the atmosphere of certain disturbing elements which were all the time threatening cyclones.

In 1869 a reaction from this state of things definitely began. The course of the American Christian Missionary Society is here followed because it was the only organization at that time through which the Disciples, in a general way, made history. This Society held a semiannual meeting in May of the year mentioned, and during this meeting it became evident to those in attendance that something definite ought to be done to relieve the anxiety of the situation, and bring a hearty support in contributions to the Society's funds.

Just here it is well to quote from a historical address delivered by President W. K. Pendleton with respect to the origin and final passage of what has been called "The Louisville Plan." President Pendleton says:

This plan, as we so well remember, was adopted at Louisville, in October, 1869. It grew out of the wear and tear of a protracted prejudice against the organization of the society. Bro. Franklin's assurance in 1857, when he was Corresponding Secretary, that this prejudice had considerably abated under his counteracting labours, justified a prophecy that the Society would soon rise above its influence altogether, at least with all who did not plead objections as a cloak for their covetousness. But this prophecy had proved false. The prejudice still murmured against us. "The organization is not Scriptural; it is not founded upon the Churches. It is in no organic sense representative of the Churches." These objections and inferences from them, were conscientiously urged by some, and with much severity and denunciation by others. In May, 1869, the Society held a semi-annual meeting in the city of St. Louis, Missouri, and here the effects of disagreement on this great subject were painfully felt by many of the truest friends to missions in the convention. And so it came to pass that at a recess in the sessions for dinner, W. T. Moore proposed to your speaker, that we should take a walk and talk the matter over. The result was a motion before the Convention, offered by Bro. Moore, to refer this whole matter to a committee. The
resolution read: "That a Committee of twenty be appointed to take into consideration the whole question of evangelisation, and report, if possible, a Scriptural plan for raising money and spreading the Gospel; said committee to report at the Louisville meeting in October next." This resolution was adopted by the Society. In order to secure the largest measure of harmony and the fullest representation of the entire brotherhood, the members of this committee were chosen with the most careful consideration, and from all States that had been active in their interest in the cause of missions. In addition to this, the State Missionary Conventions were requested to send delegates to act with this committee in preparing the plan sought for.

The members of the committee of twenty, appointed at St. Louis, were W. T. Moore, Ohio; W. K. Pendleton, West Virginia; Alex. Proctor, Missouri; W. A. Belding, New York; R. R. Sloan, Ohio; Enos Campbell, Illinois; T. W. Caskey, Mississippi; Isaac Errett, Ohio; J. C. Reynolds, Illinois; J. S. Sweeney, Illinois; Joseph King, Pennsylvania; Robert Graham, Kentucky; G. W. Longan, Missouri; Benjamin Franklin, Indiana; W. D. Carnes, Tennessee; C. L. Loos, West Virginia; J. S. Lamar, Georgia; and A. I. Hobbs, Iowa.

The delegates appointed by State Missionary Conventions to act with this committee were A. E. Myers, West Virginia; D. R. Dungan, Nebraska; Winthrop H. Hopson, Kentucky; C. G. Bartholomew, Indiana; A. B. Jones, Missouri; W. L. Hayden, New York; Edwin A. Lodge, Michigan; O. Ebert, Michigan; N. A. Walker, Indiana; I. B. Grubbs, Kentucky; S. E. Shepherd, Ohio; P. Blaisdell, Massachusetts, and J. W. Butler, Illinois.

This movement was made in the most sincere and trustful spirit of compromise. It was a sacrifice on the part of many to the feelings and judgment of others in the desire to satisfy their theoretical objections and to conciliate their prejudices. The Committee met in Louisville and spent some days in preparation of the report, after having had the matter for months before under personal consideration and advisement. They were a body of the ablest men among us. I felt strong in the strength of our chiefs, when I stood among them in council. I think we realised the situation and felt both its responsibility and its difficulty. But we went at the work prayerfully, hopefully, and courageously. The whole theory of the plan was clearly grasped, and every detail was analysed, criticised, and adjusted, till the whole stood before us clear, consistent, Scriptural, and satisfactory. It was an earnest and a careful work. I shall never forget the labours of the night which you, Bros. Errett, and Moore, and Munnell, and myself, spent on it. We had talked it all over and agreed about the substance of it in committee of the whole, when it was referred to us to put into proper shape and order and expression. We had only a
night in which to do it. We met in an upper room of the hospitable home of Winthrop H. Hopson, and there wrestled all night for the inspiration and the wisdom and the wit which we needed. Morning came and with its light the end of our toil and counsel. We were satisfied and bore our work back to the committee—and so it went to that convention, the grandest we have ever had.

As this plan occupies a prominent place in the history of the Disciples, it is thought well to quote the whole plan, as it was passed by the Convention:

As a basis for any acceptable and efficient system of cooperation, there must be assumed some well defined and generally accepted facts and principles. We therefore submit, first of all, the following propositions of this class as the basis of the plan which we recommend.

1. The conversion of sinners, while it is the work of God, is at the same time a work ordained to be accomplished through human instrumentality.

2. The accomplishment of all the philanthropic purposes contemplated in the religion of Jesus—the realisation of all its benevolent designs—is likewise to be sought through human instrumentality.

3. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. Rom. i: 16.

4. This Gospel must be preached since it "pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." I. Cor. i:21.

5. The work of preaching the Gospel is committed to Christians—the disciples were to be taught to observe all things that the apostles should deliver to them. Individually they were to shine as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life (Phil. ii:16), but especially in their united capacity, as the Church of the living God were they to be the pillar and ground of the truth (I. Tim. iii:16), and to exhibit such a divine unity and harmonious co-operation as would lead the world to believe in Jesus. John xvii: 21.

6. The obligation to preach the gospel being thus laid upon every disciple, he is sacredly bound, in honour to the charge committed to him, to make known the unspeakable riches of Christ.

7. The way in which this is to be done must depend much on circumstances. In the New Testament we have:—


(b) Single churches sending out preachers, as the Church at Jerusalem sending Barnabas—Antioch sending Barnabas and Paul. Acts xi: 22, xiii: 1-3.

(c) Churches uniting to recommend a young man for missionary work. Acts xvi: 1-4.
8. While there is no record of associations of churches or of representatives of churches to exercise dominion over the faith of any, there are examples of representative action and co-operation of churches in works of benevolence, requiring combination of resources; and hence, there were messengers of the churches, to whom this work was delegated. I. Cor. xvi: 1. II. Cor. viii: 18-24.

9. The extent and manner of this co-operation were governed by the emergency—two churches joining to send out a missionary—all the churches in a province entering into hearty co-operation to provide for the poor saints in a land of famine. It is, therefore, Scriptural that the churches of a district, state, or nation should unite in such co-operation, whenever the circumstances render it advisable.

A wise economy, a proper regard to harmony, a due respect to the business experience of all workers in the line of religious and benevolent enterprise leads to the conclusion that in a great country like ours, with Christian brotherhood numbering, it is thought, more than half a million, and spread over immense territories without the possibility of developing their resources, except by some general system of co-operation clearly defined and generally accepted, it is highly desirable that such a plan should be adopted, not as a bond of fellowship, but as a voluntary and hearty combination of means by which the strong may assist the weak, and all possible resources be drawn out to further the philanthropic designs of the Gospel of the grace of God. And since well known complications in our missionary work have existed for years, arising from our three-fold system of general State and District Societies having separate financial systems, independent of each other, and often conflicting in their operations, we, therefore, recommend:

1. That there be one uniform financial system to secure the means for missions both at home and abroad.

2. That to render this efficient there be: (a) A General Board and Corresponding Secretary, (b) A Board and Corresponding Secretary for each state to co-operate with the General Board, (c) District Boards in each state and a Secretary in each district, whose duty shall be to visit all the churches in his district and induce them to accept the missionary work as a part of their religious duty.

3. There shall be an annual convention in each district, the business of which shall be transacted by messengers appointed by the churches; an annual convention in each state, the business of which shall be conducted by messengers sent by the churches of the state, it being understood, however, that two or more churches, or all the churches of a district, may be represented by messengers mutually agreed upon; and an annual General Convention, the business of which shall be conducted by messengers from the state conventions.

4. The General Convention shall annually appoint nine
brethren, who, together with the corresponding secretaries of the states and the presidents of the state boards, shall constitute a General Board, who shall meet annually to transact the general missionary business and appoint a committee of five to superintend the work in the intervals between their annual meeting.

5. It shall be the duty of the General Board and corresponding secretary to provide for and superintend missionary operations in destitute places not actually in state and district organisations, and not to promote the harmonious co-operation of all the state and district boards and conventions.

6. There shall be also a State Board and corresponding secretary in each of the states, elected annually by the messengers sent to the State Convention, and that it shall be the duty of said boards and secretaries to manage the missionary interests in their respective states in harmony with the system of general co-operation.

7. Each state shall be divided into districts of suitable limits by the State Board; the messengers from the churches of each district shall elect, at their annual conventions, a board and a secretary; and the business of each secretary shall be to visit all the churches in his district, and in co-operation with their own officers induce them to contribute and send to the district treasury money for the support of missions.

8. As our whole financial system is based upon a general cooperation of the churches, we recommend that each church, over and above the sums it may contribute for missionary work under its immediate control, give a pledge to pay annually to its district treasurer a definite sum for other missionary work, and that one-half of such contributions may be under the control of the district boards for missionary work in the districts, the other half to be sent to the state boards, to be divided equally between it and the General Board for their respective works; but this recommendation is not to be considered as precluding a different disposition of funds when the church contributing shall so decide.

9. The churches shall send reports to the District Boards in time for the District Conventions; the districts shall send reports to the State Boards in time for the State Conventions; and the State Boards shall send up reports to the General Board in time for the General Convention, so that a report of all our missionary operations may appear in the minutes of our General Convention.

10. Each State Convention shall be entitled to two delegates in the General Convention, and to one additional delegate for every five thousand Disciples in the state.

This was signed by the following, as these were all the members of the two committees present at the Convention: W. T. Moore, Ohio; W. K. Pendleton, West Virginia;
This plan was submitted to the annual convention held in Louisville in October, 1869. Benjamin Franklin, who was one of the opponents of the Society, was present, and after reading the whole plan before the Convention, the chairman asked Mr. Franklin if he was willing to endorse it, and when the answer was "yes," a murmur of satisfaction and even delight ran through the whole audience. He afterwards wrote in the columns of his paper, as follows:

"In our estimation, it is the most simple, natural, and wise arrangement ever made, and that it will commend itself to all who desire to do anything beyond their own immediate vicinities for the spread of the Gospel. We have never seen anything proposed that came near meeting with the same approbation in a convention. Nor have we seen anything that we could give such an unequivocal approval. We hope now that every friend of evangelising will put his hand to the work and push the work, and let us hear no more about plans and societies, but work. We can work and live, or refuse to work and die. . . . We need nothing now but work, true and honest work, with determination, faith, and love. The Lord put it into the heart of the brethren to work while it is called to-day; and may his richest blessings attend all our efforts!"

For a time, at least, it looked as if the "Louisville Plan" had produced harmony, if not efficiency. But even in this the friends of the Society were soon disappointed. Mr. Franklin very shortly became disaffected again, and the whole weight of his paper was thrown practically against the Society. It was not long, therefore, until a new crisis arose. It was evident, from the start, to many friends of the Society, and even to most of the Committee who had recommended the plan, that it was like the Dutchman's perpetual motion—it would "run only mit a crank," and yet the unanimity with which it passed (there
being only two dissenting votes) seemed to assure better results than what followed. The
difficulty was not altogether on account of the absence of a "crank," but mainly because there
were a great many "cranks," and of a kind, too, which were of no advantage, but rather a
disadvantage to the machine. The following liberal extract from an article in the Christian
Quarterly, written by the chairman of the Committee of Twenty, and who reported the
"Louisville Plan" to the Convention, will give an inside view to the whole situation at this
particular period of the Disciple movement. The article is from the October number of 1874,
and is as follows:

I. The plan has met with a persistent opposition from a number of brethren, who declare it
to be wanting in Scriptural authority, and entirely opposed to the principles of the religious
movement in which they are engaged. These objections have been urged with more or less
ability, through several papers of considerable circulation, while a number of preachers have
been outspoken in their opposition on the same grounds. Many of the churches have been
ready listeners to these special pleaders; and the result is, that only a portion of the Disciples
have given the plan their hearty support. It is never very difficult to convince people that they
ought not to do anything. Opposition is a force so easily engendered that we need not be
surprised if we sometimes find that our most cherished projects have been roughly treated.
Some men seem to have been born in the objective case, and it is quite useless to expect of
such that they will ever be favourable to anything. They seem to be living chiefly for the
purpose of illustrating the meaning of the word *protest*.

The plan for co-operation adopted at Louisville gave all this class of men a fine
opportunity to come to the front. And they were by no means slow in making their
appearance, and have been busily engaged ever since in trying to show what the plan is *not*. They
tell us it is *not* the "Lord's plan," that it is *not* in harmony with the "original principles of
the Reformation," etc. Now, it may be said that this class should have little influence on
the movement proposed. But these men are generally the most active and busy opponents any
worthy movement has to meet, and *activity on the side of established custom is more than a
thousand good arguments in favour of change*.

But there were some excellent brethren among the Disciples who heartily opposed the
new co-operative system. They felt that it was virtually giving up the whole plea which the
Disciples had made—a surrender of the principles for which they had so earnestly contended.
With this class we confess to have had considerable sympathy. We know upon what
specious reasoning they have been fed. Failing to distinguish between principles and methods, they supposed that a change of methods involved a change of principles. In other words, when it was proposed to change the manner of working, they supposed the work itself must necessarily be a different thing. Just here is the fallacy upon which rests that "harp of a thousand strings" whereon so many advocates of the "ancient order of things" have been playing for the last five or six years. These distinguished brethren have failed to see that the churches have changed their methods in almost everything but missionary work. In the beginning, none of the churches had pastors, or, if you prefer, stationed salaried preachers; now, this is regarded as quite the thing in almost every part of the land. In the beginning, the houses of worship, the hymn-books, the Sunday-School interest, the educational interest, and in fact, almost everything connected with church life and church development, were as different from what we find these things to be now as the old stage-coach is different from the steam-car. Have the churches of the present surrendered the principles of the past? We think not. We go farther. We believe it would be impossible to find an advocate of the general missionary plan who does not accept heartily every principle contained in the "Declaration and Address" issued in 1809. Why, then, is the cry of "unsoundness," "departure from the ancient order of things," "going over to the sects," etc., raised in reference to those who plead for more unity of action and more effectiveness in work? It has never been proved yet, so far as we have seen, that the "progressionists," as they are called, are less devoted to the principles of the Christian Church than those who style them thus in derision. If there is any falling away, we think it would not be difficult to show that this apostasy is chiefly confined to those who are insisting that questions of expediency shall be made tests of Christian fellowship.

In order to have a proper conception of this whole matter, it ought to be remembered that, in the earlier days of the movement, the brethren were not much concerned about methods, and consequently gave very little attention to the manner of doing things. They stood little upon the order of working, but worked. They were especially interested in the principles which they had announced; and their chief effort was to get these before the world. Hence, some of the questions of order and co-operation that are now agitated among the Disciples were not even thought of in the beginning of their movement. There was no need to discuss these questions then. There was no emergency which called them up. Now they cannot be ignored. To shut them out of the present would be just equal to going back fifty or sixty years. And this would be little less than an entire surrender of the plea which has been so earnestly made within the last half-century. It is doubtful whether Mr. Campbell himself ever thought very seriously of
many problems connected with Church organization and government. It is certain that at first he accepted, with slight modifications, the Haldane system. In later years he was evidently in favour of a much closer organization than that which had grown up in the Scotch-Baptist mould. Still, his mind was chiefly occupied with other things. He was discussing great principles, gathering materials which were afterward to be brought to bear upon the world through organised effort. The men of his day had their special work to do; and now we have ours to do. They sought for the truth, and found it. It is our duty now to take this truth, and, through the most efficient instrumentalities, bring it to bear upon the world. We cannot repeat their work. In fact, there is no need of this. But we can begin where they left off, and carry forward the work which they committed to our hands. They brought the work through its formative period; we must now give it organization, and carry it forward to final triumphs. There is certainly no ground for opposition here. But this is the very ground upon which many have refused to co-operate under the present plan. True, this opposition has now largely spent its force. But the mischief has already been done. It is too late to rejoice over a fallen foe when we ourselves are mortally wounded. The opposition has largely died out, but the plan itself does not seem to be gathering much strength.

II. Another reason why the plan has not been successful is, the preachers and officers of the churches have, for the most part, failed to do what was expected of them. Section 6, Article II., reads as follows:

“Each State shall be divided into districts of suitable limits by the State Board; the messengers from the churches of each district shall elect at their annual conventions a board and a secretary; and the business of each secretary shall be to visit all the churches in his district, and, in co-operation with their own officers, induce them to contribute and send to the district treasurer money for the support of missions.”

The object of the whole plan is, of course, to reach the churches, and it was thought that this could be accomplished in no way so well as through their own officers. Hence, each district secretary is required "to visit all the churches in his district, and, in co-operation with their own officers, induce them to contribute," etc. It will be seen by this provision, that the officers stand between the district secretaries and the churches; and just here is where the practical difficulty is developed. The districts have been formed, and generally well organised; but the district secretaries have been unable, in a majority of cases, to secure the active cooperation of the church officials. These officers do not keep the matter before the churches; and, as the churches do not act without this
prompting, it necessarily follows that comparatively little can be accomplished.

We think that, with reference to this failure, the preachers are largely to blame. It is useless to deny the fact that the preachers can generally carry their churches with them in any worthy religious movement; but the difficulty is, in the present case, they will not do it. We do not mean to say that they will always find their churches willing. We understand the selfishness of human nature too well to hope for any large benevolence from even Christian men who have been taught to believe, so far as missionary work is concerned, that charity begins at home, and even ends there. Still, we think that any faithful preacher may, in time, induce his church to contribute regularly to the cause of missions.

We are not unmindful of the difficulties that lie in the way of preachers. Some of these are very serious, and may just as well be understood. Chief among these difficulties is the uncertain official status of a majority of the preachers among the Disciples. A few of those who are called pastors are elected elders in the churches where they labour; but by far the greater portion are called from year to year, and have no official relations whatever. There is another class of preachers who have no local charge, but have a sort of roving commission to do itinerant work. These have no official relations anywhere, and are, consequently, powerless everywhere to act for anybody but themselves. A curious problem it is to determine the exact status of these two classes of men. They are called "preachers," "pastors," and "evangelists;" but they are in fact, officially, nondescripts—a sort of form of officer without official power.

It is not altogether strange that men, situated as these are, should be somewhat timid in urging upon the churches the duty of a large benevolence. Each man feels that his own relations to his Church are of such a character as that he cannot, or ought not, to be active in committing the Church to any movement where money is an important factor. Then, he has heard a thousand times that every church is in itself a missionary society. This is a very convenient corner in which to hide whenever he is hard pressed concerning the duty of co-operative work. He will tell you that his Church is already doing as much as it can do; that it has to look after local interests, and has nothing to give to the support of unscriptural officials called "secretaries." We are sorry to believe that frequently, with these men, "local interests" mean their own interests. They are afraid that money taken away from the Church is so much taken away from them. We do not say that this feeling is to be severely condemned. It grows naturally out of the selfish system of things in which the preacher has been educated. Nevertheless, it is certainly not a very desirable state of things, and must be remedied before any very effective general co-operation can be secured.
Let us now pass from the preachers to the elders and deacons. From these we have a right to expect better things. Their official relations are not doubtful. Their positions are not subject to the same conditions as the preachers. They have official authority to do what the preachers can do only by arguments and motives. But these are frequently less inclined to co-operate with the district secretaries than the preachers are. And if they refuse, the only thing left for the secretary to do is to obtain such individual help as he may readily command. But this is a work that has to be done over and over again, and does not amount to much even when it is accomplished.

It may be said that the churches would not give anyway. Doubtless, in a few instances, this is true; But what are leaders for unless they can lead? Why should men have the oversight of a church when they do not direct anything? We believe that, generally, the churches would come up bravely to the work, if the officers would only do their duty.

If it should be said there is no remedy for this, then the whole plan of Church co-operation had as well be given up. It is useless to talk about any general missionary work to be supported by the churches, if the churches cannot be reached. And, as they cannot be successfully reached, except through their officiary, it necessarily follows that if this officiary cannot be actively enlisted, it is simply certain that no plan, however perfect it may be in itself, can possibly succeed.

III. Another cause of failure is an obvious weakness in the plan itself. In the foregoing discussion we have assumed all the time that the plan is all right. But we can no longer conceal the fact that it contains one feature which, we were satisfied from the very first, would prove fatal to the whole system. Section 7, of Article II., reads as follows:

“Each Church, over and above the sums it may contribute for missionary work under its immediate control, shall give a pledge to pay annually, to its district treasurer, a definite sum for other missionary work; and one-half of such contributions may be under the control of the district boards for missionary work in the districts, the other half to be sent to the state board, to be divided equally between it and the general board for their respective works; but this recommendation is not to be considered as precluding a different distribution of funds when the Church contributing shall so decide."

It will be seen that this section virtually leaves the distribution of all the money raised in the hands of those who contribute it; and the result so far has been that very little goes to the State Boards. Hence, these Boards are powerless to meet the pressing calls for help which come up from all quarters. And, to make matters still worse, the State Boards can send but little or nothing to the general board; and, as this is
dependent entirely upon an equal division of funds with the state boards, it is easy to see that the general board will not be blessed with a superabundance of means. All this difficulty came from trying to satisfy some extreme congregational tendencies. Several members of the committee, that framed the section, were strongly opposed to it as it now stands; but their judgment was overruled, while experience has shown that the objections which they then urged were well grounded.

A little reflection ought to convince the most ardent advocate of extreme Congregationalism that we cannot make a distributing agent of a general fund out of every one who contributes to it. This at once defeats the objects of such a fund. The whole philosophy of co-operation is in gathering the small contributions, and putting them together, until the aggregate amount is sufficient to accomplish a work that could not be done by a single contribution. Hence, the very moment the respective churches, or even the districts, retain at home all the money raised for missionary purposes, that moment does co-operation cease to be possible. Hence, anything like a general system, with this feature in it, is simply out of the question.

This very difficulty has been in the way of the Disciples ever since they began to talk about co-operation. It is generally the straw that breaks the camel's back, because it is precisely the turning point between extreme Congregationalism and such an organization of churches as will enable them to work effectively together. Fear of ecclesiasticism has too long been the flaming sword to guard against a re-entrance of God's people into the Eden which they lost through the apostasy of the Church. Ecclesiastical despotism is certainly a thing to be dreaded; but it is doubtful whether this is any worse than violent independency that makes progress an epithet and efficiency a crime.

Having now looked at some of the causes that have operated against the success of the general plan of co-operation, we come to ask the question, What must be done? We feel sure that no more important question than this has ever been propounded for the consideration of that body of religious people known as the Disciples of Christ. They have had, in many respects, a worthy history. Their past is full of glorious deeds, and the memory of a host of noble heroes, who once stood in the foremost of the battle, but have now gone to their reward, come up to cheer us as we contemplate the present and the future. But what has 'been is of little value, unless what is shall be made secure. The Disciples have now reached a crisis; and it is worse than madness for them to shut their eyes to this fact. They cannot remain long in the position that they now occupy. They must either go forward or backward, and the sooner they decide which they will do, the better it will be for them and the cause which they represent. That they cannot succeed in the position in which they now stand is simply
certain. It would be far better to give up all attempts at systematic co-operation than try to press a system that is wholly impracticable. They have already gone too far to work on the old plan without going back, and yet they *have not gone far enough* to make the new successful. We will try to illustrate what we mean. The time was when the churches made considerable progress without the aid of regular preaching. Now, the churches that depend on the old plan are rapidly dying out. The reason of this is obvious to any reflecting mind. The two plans are largely antagonistic, because they introduce unfavourable contrasts; and it is, therefore, better to adopt either one or the other. While we do not believe in the old system, a contingency might arise in which it would be better to go back to this, than to have only about half the churches adopt the new. We know that it may be said that this half, working on the new plan, would do more than all together would on the old. This may be true, and we are inclined to think it is true; but it is because this new plan has in it the unmistakable elements of success. But suppose it was no more successful than the other, then would it not be better to go back? Now this is just what we mean by going back to the old plan of missionary work. If the new plan was unmistakably a success, then we would say, Hold on to it; but as it is, unless something can be done, we prefer to go back where every church worked in its own way, as best it could. We do not say that going backward is a thing to be seriously thought of; we present it only as an alternative. It is certainly not desirable; but it is better than to stand still: for this is certain death.

But should any one seriously think of accepting the alternative we have presented, it may be well for him to consider what is involved in it. In our view, it means to give up the struggle for a glorious triumph of the principles announced in the beginning of the movement. Every day has its peculiar work to be done. Hence, while principles remain the same, methods must ever be changing. Just now Providence is opening up great opportunities for pushing forward the plea which the Disciples are making. But this work cannot be successfully performed by the old methods. The country has changed, society has changed, and even physical things have changed; and, in view of all this, can any one hope to succeed with the methods of fifty years ago? Formerly the churches could not have rapid intercommunication. They were largely isolated from each other, and this fact made it necessary for them to rely chiefly on independent action. Now things are very different; and with the different circumstances comes the necessity for a change in the plans of working.

But even allowing that to go backward is desirable, it may be seriously asked, Is it possible? We doubt whether very many have considered this question; and yet it is of primary importance in the present discussion. We cannot go back
into the past for methods *without accepting all that is there*. There are certain things associated with every epoch of history, and these cannot be dissociated without extreme violence. For instance, we cannot go back and assume the habits of the aborigines of this country without placing ourselves in their position. But this is impossible; hence to assume their habits is impossible. Can the Disciples again place themselves in the position of the pioneers of their movement? Can they go back to the old meeting-houses, old hymn-books, uneducated and unpaid ministry, and a thousand other things that were prominent in their past history? No man, in his senses, will believe such a thing; and yet all this must be done if they go back to their old methods of working. Change in one place involves change in another. This is the law of progress, and it cannot be violated without dangerous consequences.

The only thing left, then, for the Disciples to do is to go *forward*. And this is precisely what they ought to do. They have already progressed beyond the possibility of working on the plans of the past, and yet they have too much of the past in the present to make their work effective. What is needed now is to cut entirely loose from obsolete things, and adopt such measures as will meet the exigencies of the present hour.

But it may be asked, What shall these measures be? This brings us to the vital point; and just here several answers are suggested:

1. Throw aside all the plans that have been tried, and at once form such an organization of the churches and ministry as will be strong enough to do whatever is needful to be done. This is suggested by the many resolutions of the past that have been *great on paper*, but could never be executed. Men get tired of being responsible for a work when they have no authority by which they can possibly make it a success.

2. It might help matters very much if such an organization of the preachers only was effected as would bring them frequently together in counsel, and solemnly pledge them to the support of whatever measures are needful for the success of missionary work. This would overcome one of the difficulties that has been prominent in the way of the present plan. We think that such an organization of the preachers would be beneficial in many ways, but it would not sufficiently meet the case before us.

3. We will now briefly present what we believe to be the true idea. We do not propose any different plan from the one on trial. We believe that this is all that is needed, at least for the present. This, we think, would succeed, with the following modifications and suggestions.

First. Let Section 7. of Article II., be changed so as to require that all money raised for missionary purposes shall be sent to the respective State Boards, instead of allowing it to be disbursed according to the notion of the contributor. This
will enable the boards to establish missions in the most important places, and at the same time leave them something to send to the general board. The general board can then have the means to establish foreign missions—a work that ought to be at once energetically begun, if the Disciples would lay any claim to being a missionary people.

The change proposed would remedy the weak point in the plan which we have already noticed. It would entirely do away with the idea that every contributor can be his own missionary society; and it would, at the same time, greatly strengthen the hands of those who have been appointed to superintend the work. Every contribution would be subject to the unembarrassed direction of the respective boards. This is precisely what should be, and would scarcely fail to give greater efficiency to the plan.

To assist in solving this difficulty, it might be well to do away with the district boards entirely. Many reasons could be given why this is desirable; but we cannot state them now. It is sufficient to say that the state boards ought to have direct connection with the churches. But whether the districts should be abolished or not, it is certain that the money should be disbursed by the state boards. We understand well enough how this proposition will be received in certain quarters. We know that some brethren will regard it as a fearful sin against the freedom of the churches to deny them the privilege of saying where their money shall be used. But to listen to these men any longer is to compromise success with the unreasonable demands of those who have already too long illustrated the fable of the "dog in the manger," by not eating themselves, nor letting any one else eat.

Second. Let the plan, as thus modified, be formally presented to all the churches for their adoption, with the distinct understanding that such adoption fully commits the churches to its hearty support, and binds them to a faithful observance of all its provisions. Let it be understood, also, that every church coming into the co-operation shall be held responsible to do its full share in bearing the burdens, whatever they may be, and let only such churches as will do this have representation in the conventions.

This is the only way in which the churches can be committed to the work. Heretofore they have not felt much responsibility in the matter. They have sent delegates or not, money or not, to the conventions, just as they felt inclined. Having assumed no responsibility, they have generally acted with great indifference. It is useless to say that the plan was adopted by the respective state conventions, and therefore the churches are committed to it, when perhaps not more than one-third of the churches were represented in these conventions; and even those that were represented did not feel bound by the action of their delegates. What is needed is to bring the matter before each church, and have it decided by a vote.
as to whether the church will co-operate or not. An affirmative action will place the church in the co-operation, entitle it to representation, and commit it to the action of the conventions. Churches voting in the negative must remain out, and work as best they can in their own way, until they shall reverse their decision. This, we think, is fair to all. It gives every one the right of choice, but thoroughly binds those to the provisions of the plan who formally agree to work under it. In this way unity and strength are secured; the churches are reached without any difficulty, while the various boards and officers will have power to carry out the resolutions of the conventions.

Third, and finally. So soon as these changes are made, let discussions about plans cease, and let earnest work begin. The Disciples have spent twenty-five years in considering the plan of general co-operation. This consideration was doubtless necessary; but it has, in some respects, greatly retarded their work. The time has come when they ought to have something settled with regard to this matter, and if they cannot settle anything, they had better stop the discussion at once, and give up the whole case as hopeless. Organization is certainly the normal state of the Church, but active work is essential to its life. Almost anything is better than the present uncertainty. What is needed is a little brave doing. There has been brave talk long enough. If the days of babyhood are passed, let the Disciples put away their playthings, and assume the responsibilities of a true manhood. We think the time for decisive action has come. No matter what the result may be, something must be done. True, there may be danger ahead. There is danger in everything. But the worst danger is now to hesitate. To go backward is impossible; to stand still is eternal disgrace; to go forward has at least the promise of victory, with all the inspirations of a glorious contest. Let every faithful disciple of Christ at once determine as to where the future shall find him.

This extract not only shows the weakness of the plan, but distinctly adumbrates a new forward movement, which would practically ignore the factious opposition which had heretofore stifled every effort at worthy co-operation.

Thomas Munnell, one of the bravest and brainiest men among the Disciples, was Corresponding Secretary of the Society at this time, and he was in hearty sympathy with the best ideals of the Disciple leaders who were now in front of the battle. It has been represented that he was the author of the "Louisville plan," but this is not true. If there is any credit to be placed to any one with regard to this plan, he is only entitled to share it with others, and if there is any blame he is not to be blamed.
more than others. Surely the chairman of the Committee knows how the plan originated and who were its responsible authors. It was really the result of the concrete wisdom of the Committee. In fact, some features of the plan were not heartily approved by Mr. Munnell, and this can be said also of other members of the Committee. The plan was a compromise, both with regard to the members of the Committee and also those that were opposed to missionary societies. It was a tub to the whale, and as such it perhaps deserved the fate which it finally received. Nevertheless, as a historical document, it deserves the consideration we have given it, but we must now put it behind us and step out upon a new platform, which was already foreshadowed in the few years' experimenting with this somewhat famous plan.

It has been mentioned that only two of the delegates present at Louisville voted against the plan. These were Dr. L. L. Pinkerton and John Shackleford, both devoted Christians, and deeply interested in the progress of the Disciple cause, but they did not believe that the plan was workable and so voted against it.

Dr. Pinkerton was one of the great men of his period. He was, however, somewhat eccentric when looked at from the usual point of view. The same year the plan was adopted, viz., 1869, he and Shackleford started a magazine, entitled the Independent Monthly. This proved to be the stormy petrel of those somewhat turbulent days. It was ably conducted, but it is probable its influence would have been greater had it been less prolific in its use of personalities. In one of its numbers this very course of the magazine was strongly defended by Dr. Pinkerton. Nevertheless, the brethren generally began to feel that it was a sort of Ishmaelite magazine, and consequently its influence was largely circumscribed. It is safe to say that what it stood for was very much needed at this particular time, and doubtless it had a certain value as representing the extreme left wing of the Disciples, by holding in check somewhat the extreme right wing. As a sample of its advocacy, the following incident will serve to illustrate. The Apostolic Times, with its five editors, apparently labouring under the impression that the whole Restoration movement depended upon its direction, very gravely announced that "it had its eye on
the unsound men," and consequently in due time they would be brought to judgment. The Independent Monthly took this matter up and gave the Times such a hauling over as evidently turned its eye in some other direction.

Dr. Pinkerton was a great preacher. It is doubtful whether he had an equal among the preachers of that day, and it is very certain he had no superior. He was equally gifted as a writer. He had also a very correct view of the Christian religion. It was perhaps his anti-legalism which made him the inveterate enemy of every movement among the Disciples that seemed to limit individual liberty. During the war he took actively the side of the union, and as he lived in Kentucky, he lost favour, to some extent, with many of his brethren who sympathised with the South. At the same time, no one admired his talent and his fine Christian character more than the men who were opposed to him on the issues of the war. As a specimen of his writing, and also of his religious point of view, we give the following from a sermon of his, published in the "Living Pulpit of the Christian Church":

A knowledge of religion, as a science, is not more necessary to salvation than is a knowledge of geology, mineralogy, botany, physiology, and chemistry to farming and gardening. As men manage, by a knowledge of simple facts, to cause the earth to yield her increase, and as they live without any knowledge of the processes of digestion and assimilation, even so may the poor and the uneducated hear, believe, and obey "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God," and rejoice in the "great salvation," without having heard anything whatever on the subject of Total Hereditary Depravity, Imputed Righteousness, Effectual Calling, the mode in which the Holy Spirit operates in conversion, the "doctrine" of the Trinity, or its opposite, or, indeed, of any other of the vexed questions that have originated and that perpetuate religious parties. Do we mistake utterly? If not, then is it true that an overwhelming majority of all who are brought to God by the preaching of the Gospel, even in the most enlightened communities, know only that they are sinners; that they ought to be holy in heart and life; that they are helpless; that they are disquieted, and fearful, and miserable.

They believed that God has pitied and loved them; that Jesus died for their sins; that God will forgive them for Christ's sake; that he will comfort and sustain them through life; and that he will take them to a glorious home in heaven finally, if they live and die in Jesus. And these, we may add, remain the chief articles of their creed through life; these and similar
simple truths, apprehended with a clearness and force, varied by difference in temperament and culture.

To pursue the train of thought we are in yet a little further. Let any one competent to do so set himself to ascertain the amount and kind of "doctrinal" knowledge possessed by any congregation of Christians of average general intelligence and of average piety. Beginning with the creation, let him pass leisurely over the four thousand years of Old Testament history and prophecy. He will see what the merchants, farmers, mechanics, their wives and children, the clerks, shop boys, and the women of the various handicrafts know about "Cosmogony," the Science of the Deluge; what ideas are entertained of the wonderful and astounding providences of God, as displayed in his dealings with the Patriarchs, with the Egyptians, with Israel during their journey to Canaan, with the same people under their judges and their kings, and with the idolatrous nations with which the people of Israel came into conflict. The examiner will, doubtless, find faith enough in all that is written, so far as the record has been read and remembered; but he will find, also, that to the vast majority, the things revealed have but a shadowy, misty existence, and that, except in rare instances, generalisation has not been even so much as thought of; in no instance quite satisfactorily accomplished. Let the same course be pursued with New Testament revelations, the object being to determine with exactness the "views" entertained by the masses on the subjects of debate among Protestant Christians. He will find beautiful, all-conquering faith, triumphant hope, and love and joy that pass understanding, but very little "Theology"—none, in fact. Decided partisans will have at hand a few "proof texts," which they will quote at random, and often incorrectly; a few will remember definitions and doctrines which they learned from catechisms in childhood, and of which they understood as much at ten years of age as they now understand at thirty. Ah, well, sinners are saved by grace, through faith, and this faith has for its objects persons and facts, not "doctrines," not dogmas, not scientific formulas.

The knowledge absolutely essential to salvation takes its range far within the limits of the whole revelation of God, and yet we believe he has not spoken one word in vain. So we believe he has not made anything in vain, although the wisest naturalist fails to apprehend the uses of thousands of objects that offer themselves to his contemplation.*

CHAPTER XXII

MANY TESTS, SOME FAILURES, AND SOME VICTORIES

THE failure of the Louisville plan to bring funds to the American Christian Missionary Society seemed to give special license to the anti-Society men to renew their opposition. The course adopted by these men is almost incredible when looked at from the point of view of the present day. But it must be remembered that the whole movement of the Disciples had to hew its way through a forest of difficulties. Most of the ground along its historic course was a wilderness, and it is unfair to the men who opposed Societies to charge them with want of devotion to the main principles advocated by the Disciples. They were as loyal to these principles as the most ardent advocates of co-operation of the Societies. The difference was simply a difference in methods; and the accentuation of this difficulty was chiefly where the cleavage began. The anti-Society men made too much of methods; they exalted them into principles, and thereby practically antagonised one of the cardinal principles of the Disciple movement. Nevertheless, these men were thoroughly conscientious, and it yet remains to be demonstrated that their influence upon the whole was not salutary. There is always danger in progress. Of course, there is more danger in anti-progress; indeed, there is danger in everything that has life. There is not much danger in a graveyard except for scary people, who may imagine that they see ghosts in such a place.

These were the days when great, earnest souls were feeling their way to the true position with respect to taking the world for Christ. Every man of the men belonging to this period was conscientiously working for the solution of the problem of co-operation. All felt that something was needed to bring the brethren together in a great co-operative movement for the salvation of the world. It was also a question of how that should be done.
Just here a new man came to the front. Robert Milligan was now President of Kentucky University at Lexington, Ky. He was a man of unexceptional character; indeed, one of the best men of the age in which he lived. He was quiet and unobtrusive, scholarly and gracious. He was a man of peace; a soul big enough to come into sympathetic touch with the whole human race, and he had not a particle of captious criticism in his nature.

In the *Harbinger* for 1867 he offered an eirenicon on the subject of Missionary Societies. The following were its main points:

I. Jesus Christ is God's supreme evangelical missionary to our entire race. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." I. John iv: 14.

II. Every Disciple or follower of Christ is, therefore, by his profession a missionary of the Cross. "Let him that heareth say come." Rev. xxii: 17.

III. Every Disciple is, therefore, to the full extent of his ability and opportunities, responsible for the conversion and salvation of the world. Gal. vi: 10. To convert and save men from their sins is certainly to bestow on them the chief good. Matt, xvi: 26.

IV. A Church, or congregation, is but an association of Christians united together, for the purpose of doing what they could not so well do by each one's acting in his own separate and individual capacity. Rom. xii: 4, 8, and I. Cor. xii: 4, 27. And hence every congregation of disciples is a missionary society, divinely ordained and organised for the salvation of the world. And to her, therefore, it belongs to send out missionaries, whenever she has the means and the opportunity to do so. Acts xiii: 1, 3.

V. There is no Scriptural limit to the extent of this cooperation for the salvation of the world. Whether the organization shall consist of all the disciples within the limits of a village, or a city, or a county, or a state, or a nation, or a continent, or the world, is a matter of mere expediency. For be it remembered, that after we shall have made all the divisions and subdivisions that may be thought necessary, there is, nevertheless, still but *one body*. Eph. iv: 4, and that *it* has been divinely constituted the pillar and ground of the truth. I. Tim. iii: 15.

VI. And hence it follows that the whole Church is a missionary society, composed of an indefinite number of congregations, united together for the purpose of doing what they could not so well do by acting separately and independently. Eph. iv: 11, 16, and Isa. lxii, etc.

VII. Whether the whole Church should ever actually meet together, and co-operate together, either personally, or through
her representatives, is, therefore, a question of expediency, that must in every case be
determined by the nature and force of circumstances. The right to do so and, I may add, the
obligation to do so, whenever either her own interests or the interests of the world require it, is
clearly implied in the aforesaid unity.

VIII. But it is not in harmony with either reason or revelation to complicate any scheme of
organization and co-operation beyond what is necessary. It is not wise to form a society for
the purpose of doing what might as well be done by individuals, in their own proper and
separate capacity. Nor is it wise to form an association of churches for the purpose of doing
what they could as well do separately. So teaches all human experience, as well as the Living
Oracles.

IX. And hence it follows that church discipline and other purely local matters should, in
all cases, be left to the wisdom and discretion of each congregation; and that other matters of
general interest may be referred to State or National Associations.

X. As the representative system is the only one that is practicable in such cases, every
such association, whether it be State or National, should be composed of delegates chosen by
the churches, on account of their superior wisdom, piety, and zeal for the missionary cause.
The number of delegates sent might be made to depend on the number of persons represented;
and their expenses should, in all cases, be defrayed by their respective churches.

XI. In such an association no principle or line of policy should be adopted that is
inconsistent with the Scriptural rights and privileges of the churches. The delegates who
compose it are but the representatives of their respective congregations; and they have,
therefore, no right to legislate on matters of faith, or piety, or morality, or anything else on
which their congregations might not legitimately legislate. Their deliberations and
proceedings should all be confined to such practical matters as serve to promote the
edification of the Church and the salvation of the world. And hence it follows, that the
discussion of purely secular questions, and all attempts to raise money by selling life
memberships and life directorships, are wholly out of place, and utterly unwarranted in every
Scripturally organised missionary society.

XII. The advantages of such associations, properly organised and properly conducted,
would be very great; e.g.:

1. They would serve to cultivate a spirit of unity, and harmony, and love, and co-operation
among all the churches. This is proved and sufficiently illustrated by the good effects of the
three Jewish Festivals.

2. They would create a missionary zeal in our churches hitherto unknown; and would,
therefore, very greatly serve to promote the missionary cause.

3. They would serve to promote order in the several congregations represented; and also,
to some extent, in the whole body.
XIII. I will only add, that the state societies might be composed of delegates chosen by the churches; and the national society of delegates chosen and appointed by the several state societies, if the brethren prefer it. There is certainly nothing in the Scriptures that is opposed to such an organization; provided that it can be made to work harmoniously. But all organisations without the spirit of Christ are worse than useless. "Let all things be done decently and in order." I. Cor. xiv:40.*

To this very just and reasonable presentation of the case Mr. Franklin replied in very much the same spirit, though evidently feeling considerable difficulty as to what should be done. He says:

I. The Lord requires us to spread the gospel to the extent of our ability.

II. To do this work successfully, there should be united, systematic and harmonious co-operation of individuals and churches.

III. This work has nothing to do with churches set in order, by way of arranging and furnishing preaching for them, but is intended exclusively for the assistance of weak churches, needing assistance from abroad, members residing remote from churches, and districts of country where there are no churches or brethren.

IV. The law of God, as found in the Bible, is complete, thoroughly furnishing the man of God for all good works; still, in carrying out the law and executing the Divine will, in the propagation of the Gospel, there is an important province for man's judgment, wisdom, and discretion, as well as for his labour, involving great responsibility, and without the exercise of this judgment, wisdom and discretion the work cannot go on at all. Men must be selected to preach the Gospel, means must be raised and sent to them, for their support; fields must be selected in which for the evangelists to labour, the time must be set for commencing, etc., etc., all of which matters, and many more similar, are left to the judgment, wisdom, and discretion, of the people of God.

V. The Divine authority for doing the work is vested in the Church, and she is responsible to the great head of the body for the faithful performance of the work.

VI. The book of God knows nothing of any confederation of churches in an ecclesiastical system, culminating in an earthly head, for governmental or any other purpose.

We have all the time since our first efforts in the work of the Lord felt some scruples about Missionary Societies, formed after sectarian models, but for years tried to be satisfied that,

if they were confined exclusively to missionary work, they might be employed without objection. But, after writing more to reconcile the brethren to them, and give them efficiency than any other man among us, we were forced to the conclusion that there was no possibility of confining them exclusively to missionary work; that they opened the way for dangerous and mischievous elements to be thrown in, spreading contention in every direction; that such confederations were wrong in themselves; that their constitutions were nothing but annoyances, opening the way for amendments, modifications, or changes of some sort, distracting our meetings, and were not only useless, but injurious. Having been compelled to this conclusion some four years ago, we have been unable to make any defence of these Societies deserving the name, or to advocate them in any effective manner since. If the time has come when we can agree on something, free from objection, so that we can, without scruple, advocate it with our whole heart, we shall be truly rejoiced.

Sectarians have no wisdom for us and their schemes are all nothing to us. We go not to them for light or example in anything. We are, therefore, ready to propose a thorough change in our entire mode of operation in missionary work, abolishing all "our societies," with their constitutions and names, and trying for a simpler, more efficient and effective method of doing the same work. We hope, too, that this may be brought about without any cessation of work in any district, state, or nation. We may not be able to suggest the best method of bringing it about, nor is it material whether it shall be accomplished in all cases in the same way. We suggest the following:

I. We need an evangelistic committee and a financial agent, who shall do the work now done by the board and corresponding secretary of the General Missionary Society located at a central place in the nation.

II. We need an evangelistic committee and financial agent, who shall do the same work now done by the board and corresponding secretary of each State Missionary Society.

III. We need a similar evangelistic committee in all the districts where we now have district societies.

IV. Churches and individuals could make their contributions to the district committee, designating what portion of their funds shall go to the district, what portion to the state, and what portion to the National Committee.

V. We might, instead of our present business meetings, have one rousing National, one State, and one District Annual Meeting, at some suitable place in the nation, in each state, and in each district, for speeches, exhortations, and forming acquaintances. These meetings might be changed from place to place for the good of the different sections. How is this to be brought about? We suggest as follows:

1. That each Society push on its work till its next annual
meeting when it can appoint its evangelistic committee and financial agent to serve for the term of one year and then abolish the constitution and society.

2. At the expiration of one year, each church send one messenger to the place where the evangelistic committee for the District meets to make the necessary changes in the committee and agent to serve for the term of one year, and let the churches thus continue annually to send messengers for the purpose of making whatever changes may be necessary in the committee and agent.

3. Each district committee in a state send one messenger to the place where the state committee meets to make whatever changes may be demanded and establish a committee and agency for another year, and thus continue to reappoint a committee and agency annually.

4. Each state committee send one messenger to the place where the national committee meets, to make the necessary changes in the committee and agency for the next year, and thus continue to send messengers from the state committees to reappoint a national committee and agent annually.*

President Pendleton remarks, as follows:

We lay the two preceding articles before our readers with great pleasure. They are thrown out as peace offerings by two of our brethren, who are both friendly to missionary work. Brother Milligan is an active minister of the Gospel, and more than this, an earnest and able educator of ministers; while Brother Franklin is one of the most industrious and successful missionaries among us. They are both prompted to write by a desire, not to hinder, but to promote missionary work. They have both been long and anxiously exercised on the subject on which they write, and when wise men and of large experience write on subjects that deeply concern them, and which they have long studied, we always read their utterances, with the profoundest respect. In this spirit we have read and re-read these communications, and in this spirit we propose to speak of them.

It is evident that both of these articles have the same aim, and that is, to propose something that will be free from objection; but it appears but too evident that both of these earnest brethren have fallen into the mistake of supposing, that the disposition to object exhausts itself on "Societies, life-memberships and life-directorships," for these are the objections which their plans are projected to avoid. We think there is a fatal assumption here. The objections made against our present mode of operation, it is true, are directed specifically against these features, but the principle of the objections is much wider, and covers everything for which there is not a

* Harbinger, 1867, pp. 13-16.
"Thus saith the Lord," either in precept or in precedent. Hence, even should Brother Milligan present a plan which would preclude the "discussion of purely secular questions, and all attempts to raise money by selling life-memberships and life-directorships, as wholly out of place," yet while he confesses that "the Bible does not contain a fully developed scheme for missionary operations," he will be met by new objections to new features, that have taken the place of the old, but which are yet not in the Bible—and therefore, without the required "Thus saith the Lord."

So with Bro. Franklin's scheme. Of course he does not set it forth as in the language of Scripture. "Executive Committees" and "financial agents" are functionaries utterly unknown by these names in the Scriptures. Whilst his scheme, therefore, as the suggested improvement of a wise and good man, is worthy of our highest respect, it can be worth nothing as a silencer of objections, which proceed from a principle that is violated by every feature of it. For District, State, and National Committees, and financial agents, there can be found no "Thus saith the Lord"—and therefore, says the objector, "Away with them."

We are for peace and harmony and efficient missionary cooperation, and will gladly accept any improvement or modification of our present organization that will more certainly and generally promote these great ends. We are not so wedded to the means as to sacrifice or in any degree hinder for them the divine ends for which we labour. If we do not at once and readily accept these proposed changes, it is because we cannot see that they will be any improvement. Still if, in the opinion of the brethren generally, it should appear, upon a fuller examination, better to make the trial, I shall not be at all hard to persuade to go in with them and help to make the experiment a success.

I do not propose, now, to present any analysis of these plans—further than to notice their radical defect as silencers of objectors. Already they have called out criticism on the ground I have mentioned, and Brother Lipscomb, of the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., which is the present champion on that side, heads his critique of them, "A Humiliating Confession." This is just as I anticipated. The advance is met with reproach, and, instead of promoting harmony, is instantly treated as a further illustration of the unscriptural nature of all such schemes. What will these brethren say? We will not anticipate them. Meantime let the friends of missions "push all together," as Bro. Franklin says, and work by the plan we have, till we agree upon another. Wide fields are opening for us. If any brother wants to give a hundred dollars to the Society, and does not want to become a life-director, there is no compulsion. Let him give his money and decline the honour. We know men who give their one hundred dollars almost annually, and never think of the honour of
SOME FAILURES AND SOME VICTORIES

A man who is purchasing honours can get them at a cheaper rate in other markets. I trust we are aiming at higher things. For my part, could I hinder the proclamation of the Gospel by my opposition to this Society, to the loss of a single soul that might else have been saved, I should expect and with trembling await to give account for it in the day of judgment. Let us beware how we throw stumbling blocks in the way of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*

We have given these liberal extracts in order to set before the reader the representative views with respect to the Society question, for this question was entering upon practically its last stage of discussion. The majority of the Disciples were becoming restive under the discussion, while nothing, or next to nothing, was being done. The Society men regarded the opposition as altogether unreasonable, and in many cases wholly the result of ignorance; and doubtless ignorance was an important element in creating an anti-Society sentiment. As an illustration of this fact, the following incident is to the point: In Indiana the anti-Society men put up one of their advocates to make a speech on the question. He took for a text I. Cor. xii: 25, where the Apostle, after saying that "God both tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked," continues by saying "that there should be no schism in the body." The preacher called the word "schism" scheme, and went on to say that here was a warning against "schemes." "Now," said he, "you have your missionary scheme, and the Apostle says there must not be any scheme in the body," and he continued to repeat the word "scheme" until at last an old brother on the front seat put on his spectacles, opened his New Testament, and after looking at the word for some time, interrupted the speaker by saying, "Brother, it is not 'scheme.'" "Well," said the preacher, "what is it then?" "Why," said the good brother, "its 'skism.'"

But after all, some of the strongest men among the Disciples, such as Jacob Creath, Benjamin Franklin, David Lipscomb, and many others that might be mentioned, continued their opposition, notwithstanding the apparent unreasonableness of it to those who favoured these Societies.

* Harbinger, 1867, pp. 18-20.
The communion question also came to the front again. This was caused, no doubt, by a series of nine letters written by David King, of Birmingham, England, who, after the death of Mr. Wallace, had succeeded him as editor of the British Millennial Harbinger. These letters were not only published in the Harbinger for 1868 and 1869, but were also published in several American papers. At the annual meeting of the churches of Great Britain and Ireland, a committee of four, consisting of King, Tickle, Lynn, and McDougall, was appointed to write these letters. The ostensible occasion of the letters was certain tendencies of the Americans which were greatly disturbing the English churches. These churches had reached the conclusion that the American brethren were practically "open communionists," and the object of appointing this committee was to make a protest by the English churches against what the latter believed was a departure from the New Testament teaching.

For some reason three of this committee did not sign the letters, the only one to sign being David King.

The letters were far from what they ought to have been, in either matter or spirit. They were egotistical, legalistic, unreasonable, and contained misrepresentation of facts. They did not help the cause on either side of the Atlantic, but served to widen the breach which had already begun to appear between the American and English brethren. There never had been any substantial identity in several respects between the Disciples in these two countries. But Mr. King was a very different man from Mr. Wallace, whom he succeeded as editor of the leading journal of the Disciples in Europe. Though an able man, he was dogmatic, intolerant, and had little or no tact. The influence of his journal from that time on till his death was in the interests of division, rather than union.

Up to this time the movement in Great Britain and Ireland had made very slow progress, and these letters of Mr. King did not help matters in any respect whatever. The letters were commended by some of the American brethren, but in the main they were severely condemned. The Christian Standard, by its distinguished editor, did much to counteract the influence of these letters in the American churches. But in doing this he precipitated again the communion controversy, though it was now
fought out to a finish, with the victory on the side of those who held to the practice of "neither inviting nor rejecting Pedo-Baptists" with respect to partaking of the Lord's Supper. Since the close of that discussion there has been little said concerning the communion question, though the practice of the churches has undoubtedly become less and less restricted with regard to even not inviting Pedo-Baptists to participate at the communion table. It can scarcely be truthfully denied that many of the ministers of the present day, while not perhaps formally inviting these Pedo-Baptists, do certainly make it plain enough that they are heartily welcome when they choose to partake of the emblems of the Lord's death. In stating this fact, it must be remembered that we are writing history, not giving an opinion as to what is right or wrong in the case.

During the year 1866 a conference was held between the Baptists and Disciples at Richmond, Va., with the view of reaching a better understanding between the two bodies, and to determine, if possible, whether the time for proposing a union between them had come. It has already been remarked that the war settled several things. Among the things it strongly emphasised was the fact that divisions among the people of God were not only abnormal, but are really unnecessary, and probably very generally because the denominations do not understand one another. This was made very evident by the Sanitary Commission, which was such a potent factor in relieving the sick and wounded soldiers during the war. This commission was supported by many of the religious denominations, and in the various conferences which took place, during its operations, leading members of the respective denominations represented came in close contact with one another. In this way they found that the differences among the denominations are often more imaginary than real, and where there are real differences these are not of a character that ought to interfere with good fellowship.

When it became evident that the union of the states would be preserved, men began to ask questions about the union of God's people; and one question was, if a union of the states is important, is not a union of the churches of even greater importance? The result of this inquiry, as well as other inquiries that were made, moved Dr. W.
P. Broaddus to invite a conference of Baptists and Disciples to meet at Richmond to consider the question of union between the two bodies. This conference was represented by some of the ablest men on each side. Among the Baptists was Dr. Jeremiah B. Jeter, whose book entitled, "Campbellism Examined," had given him a not very enviable reputation among the Disciples. It is certainly somewhat remarkable that he should be among those who were seeking a union between the two bodies. But it is a pleasure to state the fact that Dr. Jeter, during the latter years of his life, became deeply interested in bringing about a union between the Baptists and Disciples, and as editor of the *Religious Herald*, published at Richmond, he became a conspicuous advocate for such a union, though he constantly recognised the difficulties that were still in the way of its being accomplished. The following article, written by Dr. Jeter, giving an account of the conference, is copied, as indicating not only his spirit, but also as giving a clear, unbiased statement with respect to the spirit and purpose of the conference itself:

This body met, as was stated in our last issue, on the 24th ult., and continued in session until the 27th. Its meetings were strictly private. As it was not a representative body, but a voluntary assemblage for the purpose of conferring as to the propriety of recommending union between the Baptists and Disciples, and as the opening of the doors would have led to the gathering of a curious and anxious crowd, whose presence would have been unfavourable to calm discussion, it was deemed best to sit with closed doors. At the close of the Convention it was resolved, at least for the present, not to publish its minutes. We deem it no breach of propriety to say that the editor of the *Herald*, connected with the body, dissented from this decision. We thought that the full publication of its proceedings would most contribute to the object for which it was assembled; but others were of opinion that their publication might give rise to discussion, strife, and alienation. Our judgment was overruled, and we cheerfully submit. Instead of printing the minutes of the Convention, Dr. W. F. Broaddus and Elder J. W. Goss were requested to prepare and publish, over their own signature, a brief address to the Baptists and Disciples of Virginia, setting forth the results of the conference. This address we hope to receive in time to insert it in the present issue.

While we cannot comply with our promise in the paper of last week to furnish a full account of the proceedings of the Convention, we will give such a statement of them as the limitations imposed by the body may seem to permit.
The meeting was conducted in a courteous, dignified, and kind manner. Not a single unkind word was uttered on either side. We have sat in many bodies for religious conference, but never in one freer from excitement. The intercourse was frank, free, and faithful. The conference developed that on some points, on which we were supposed to differ, we were in agreement; that on other points, on which we differed, the differences were not so great as had generally been supposed; and that while our differences were such as to prevent ecclesiastical union and intercommunion, they are not such as to call for denunciations, or to forbid the hope that time, kindness, the study of the Scriptures, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit will efface them.

The desirableness of the union all must concede. We are agreed on certain important points in which we differ from the rest of the world. We believe that only immersion is Christian baptism; that only believers are entitled to the ordinance; and that churches are constituted only of immersed believers. Our views, too, of the great, vital evangelical duties, repentance and faith, as disclosed by the conference, are identical. On various points we differ; but some of these differences relate to terminology; some to matters of comparatively little moment and some may yet be the offspring of misconception; but still there are differences between us, the most serious of which, perhaps, concerns the design of baptism. It would be a bright day for the principles which we hold in common if these differences could be removed or overcome, so that their advocates, instead of wasting their time and energies in fruitless controversies, could heartily combine all their influence and efforts for their wider diffusion. It is our plain solemn duty to pray, not merely for the union of all Christians, but especially for the union of those Christians whose approximation to each other affords ground to hope for their harmony.

But what we pray for we are bound to seek, if it lies within the sphere of our influence; and we are able to do something to promote the union of Baptists and Disciples. What, then, should we do to secure this object? We certainly should not sacrifice our principles. Union that is not based on a common discernment and love of truth is not worth seeking. There should be no compromise of essential truth, however yielding we may be in matters of indifference or expediency. Calm, candid, fair, discriminating discussion may do something to promote the object; but it must be admitted that there is but little of such discussion, and that its influence is usually very feeble. Certainly strife, denunciation, and bitterness do not promote union. It must be gained, if gained at all, by kind intercourse, reasonable concessions, and gradual assimilation.

We found to-day a striking confirmation of this view. A highly-esteemed minister was in our office who was formerly a Disciple, and who, some years ago, became a Baptist. He stated that he was led into the Baptist Church by ministers
who treated him fraternally, solved his doubts, shed light on his path, and gradually convinced him of the soundness of their views. What occurred in his case may occur in the cases of others. Nor is it wise for fallible beings, like ourselves, to assume that our own views cannot, by the study of the Scriptures, fraternal intercourse with enlightened Christians, a wider observation of others, a deeper experience of the tendencies of our own hearts, and earnest prayer for Divine instruction, be modified or enlarged.

We are hopeful that the conference will be the means of advancing the interests of truth and of promoting harmony.

We desire that our remarks should be understood as having exclusive reference to the Disciples in Virginia, or such Disciples as those who participated in the conference. It is said, and we presume correctly, that there is a wide difference between the Disciples of Virginia and of the West. Of the nature and extent of this difference we are not accurately informed. Our brethren in different sections of the country should, and no doubt will, deal with the subject as they find it. If under the name of the Reformation, or the "Ancient Gospel," or any other title, they discover a tendency to Rationalism, or the rejection of a spiritual Christianity, let them oppose it with an earnestness proportionate to the value of the soul and the preciousness of salvation. Our course in Virginia can be no guide to those who are encompassed by errors which do not trouble us. Even if an ecclesiastical union had been formed between the Baptists and Disciples of this state, and properly formed, too, that would be no reason for the formation of such a union in states, if such there be, in which the Disciples hold anti-evangelical sentiments. There are certain great principles, or articles of belief, which we have inherited from our fathers and hold in common with most Protestant Christian sects, which should never be abandoned or concealed. Among these we may mention the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures—the Tri-unity of God—the Divinity of Christ—the efficacy of his sacrifice in the expiation of sins—the agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners and the sanctification of believers—the justification of a sinner by faith in Christ without the merit of any good works—and we might mention other facts and truths. These are essential to the vitality and efficacy of the Gospel, and are to be held with unyielding tenacity. But we owe it to ourselves, the cause of truth and piety, the harmony of sincere Christians, and the glory of our Master, that we should judge of the views of those who differ from us carefully, ingenuously and in the fear of God—seeking not to widen but to narrow the breach between us—not to divide and alienate but to win and harmonise. It is one of the saddest exhibitions of human infirmity, not to say, depravity, to see men, fallible and ignorant, as all must be, contending for what they deem the doctrine of the "meek and lowly" Jesus with fierceness and denunciation. Can the wrath of man work
the righteousness of God? Does the cause of truth and of Christ need our anger, bitterness, and strife for its support?

As it was thought not desirable to publish the minutes of the conference, two brethren, W. F. Broaddus, representing the Baptist, and J. W. Goss, representing the Disciples, were appointed to prepare an address to both Baptists and Disciples with respect to the whole matter. The following is the address:

Address of the Convention of Baptists and Disciples, held in Richmond, April 24, 25, 26, and 27th, 1866, to the churches of these two bodies in the State of Virginia.

DEAR BRETHREN:—We have met in this Convention, not as delegates appointed to transact business for you; but as a voluntary convention of professed Christian men, earnestly desirous to promote the cause of Bible truth, and to bring nearer to each other the divided forces of our Lord's great army.

It had been hoped by many that the influence of time, and the more thorough study of the Divine Word, had brought us so near to each other in mind and heart, and in the interpretation of the Scriptures, as to make it manifest that we could jointly recommend to our churches in Virginia a more intimate ecclesiastical co-operation than has heretofore existed—hoping that fraternal, mutual courtesies would sooner or later lead to a cordial ecclesiastical union of the two bodies.

With a view fully to ascertain each other's views of the teaching of the Bible, we have for four days met for conversation and kind discussion of the questions deemed necessary to be discussed on the occasion. We have frequently united in appealing to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, chat he would by the Holy Spirit lead us to right conclusions in the premises. During our entire session, there has prevailed as much of Christian courtesy and brotherly kindness as we have ever seen manifested in a body of thirty men engaged in the discussion of questions involving Christian fellowship. But, after all, we have reached the conclusion deliberately, however reluctantly, that the time has not yet come when the Baptists and Disciples are, on both sides, prepared, with a prospect of perfect harmony, to commit themselves to any degree of co-operation beyond such courtesies and personal Christian kindesses as members of churches of different denominations may individually choose to engage in.

We would express, however, with much gratitude to our common Father, the gratification we have felt and still feel in having developed by this interview an agreement of views as to the great facts and truths and duties of the Gospel, far more extensive and practically identical, than many of our brethren had supposed to exist; and we would earnestly recom-
mead to the brethren of the two bodies in the State of Virginia, to cultivate the spirit of fraternal kindness and Christian courtesy towards each other—to keep in mind the prayer of our Lord, that all his people might be one; and while they cultivate the spirit of peace, to refrain, as far as possible, from everything that would tend to alienate from each other those who, in regard to so many precious and important truths taught in the Word of God, give the same interpretation and, in regard to so many Christian practices, are of one mind. Signed by direction of the Convention.

W. F. BROADDUS,
J. W. GOSS.

However, as it is believed that so much of the minutes as relate to the faith of each body will be interesting, the following is copied:

DECLARATION OF BELIEF SUBMITTED BY BAPTISTS

We utterly repudiate all creeds or confessions of faith as of binding force upon the consciences or conduct of men; yet we deem it essential that churches should, in some form, state distinctly and unequivocally their understanding of the fundamental doctrines and duties taught in the Word of God, in order to union among themselves, and that they may be understood by others. We therefore offer to the Convention the following as such a statement of the views of the Baptist denomination regarding the subjects embraced therein:

Article 1. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and are the only sufficient, certain, and authoritative rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience.

Art. 2. Agreement in the belief of the fundamental facts and doctrines of the New Testament is essential to Christian union.

Art. 3. There is one God, the Maker, Preserver, and Ruler of all things, having in and of himself all perfection, and being infinite in them all. He is revealed to us as the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each with distinct personal attributes, but without division of nature, essence, or being.

Art. 4. God originally created man in his own image, free from sin, but, through the temptation of Satan, he transgressed the commandment of God and fell from his original holiness and righteousness, whereby his posterity inherit a nature corrupt and wholly opposed to God and his law, are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors.

Art. 5. Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is the divinely appointed and only Mediator between God and man. He perfectly fulfilled the law; suffered and died upon the cross for the salvation of sinners; was buried, and rose again the
third day, and ascended to his Father; at whose right hand he ever liveth to make intercession for his people.

Art. 6. Regeneration is a change of heart, wrought through the truth by the Holy Spirit, who quickeneth the dead in trespasses and sins, enlightening their minds spiritually to understand, and savingly to believe the Word of God, so that they love and practise holiness.

Art. 7. Repentance is that change of mind and heart in which the sinner, being made sensible of the evil and pollution of sin, turns from it with godly sorrow and abhorrence.

Art. 8. Faith is a sincere belief of the Gospel, in the exercise of which we heartily receive and rest upon the Lord Jesus Christ alone for salvation.

Art. 9. Justification is that act of God in which he pardons and accepts the believer as righteous, through faith in the atonement of Christ, and not on account of the performance of any duty.

Art. 10. Those who have been regenerated are also sanctified by God's Word and Spirit dwelling in them. This sanctification is progressive, and is carried forward through the supply of divine strength unto eternal life.

Art. 11. A visible Church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers associated in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel, subject only to the authority of Christ, governed by his laws, and observing his ordinances with the officers of his appointment, to wit: the pastors, or bishops, or elders anddeacons.

Art. 12. Ministers of the Gospel are called of God and set apart by the churches to their office. It is their duty to labour to secure a continual increase of knowledge and fitness for their work, and to devote themselves earnestly to it, and it is the duty of the churches to support them while thus engaged.

Art. 13. Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem his faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, and the remission of sins through that faith. It is a prerequisite to Church membership, and to a participation of the Lord's Supper. To this ordinance it is the duty of every believer to submit.

Art. 14. The Lord's Supper is an institution of Jesus Christ, in which, by partaking of bread and wine as emblems of his body and blood, we commemorate his dying love; and only members of the Church in good standing are entitled to receive it.

Art. 15. The first day of the week is the Lord's Day, and it is to be kept sacred to religious purposes by abstaining from all secular labour and recreation, by the assembling of the churches for worship, and by diligence in the exercises of private devotion. Art 16. It is the duty of Christians and Christian churches
to labour for the propagation of the Gospel throughout the world, and in doing so, they may unite in missionary and other associations, provided that such associations shall have no ecclesiastical authority.

Art. 17. There will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust.

Art. 18. God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world by Jesus Christ, when every one shall receive, according to his deed; the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, the righteous into life eternal.

RESPONSE BY THE DISCIPLES

PREAMBLE

We agree in utter repudiation of creeds. But we dissent from the position that churches state their understanding of fundamental doctrines, etc., in order to union among themselves, etc.

Article 1. Agreed.


Art. 3. Substitute: "The Holy Scriptures reveal the divinity, and personality, and unity, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

Art. 4. Substitute: "That sin having entered into the world by one man, in whom all have sinned, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, man is therefore by nature sinful, and by transgression a sinner, and thus, dead in trespasses and sins."

Art. 5. Agreed.

Art. 6. Regeneration, as used in the Scriptures, is a process which includes a change of heart, wrought by the Holy Spirit, through the truth, and a birth of water in an immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Art. 7. Agreed.

Art. 8. Agreed.

Art. 9. Substitute: "Justification is an act of God pardoning the sinner and treating him as righteous, through faith in the atonement of Christ."

Art. 10. Substitute: "Sanctification is a separation to the service of God, in which the children of God perfect holiness, through the Word and Spirit dwelling in them."

Art. 11. Agreed, with "immersed" for "baptized," and erase "visible."

Art. 12. Accept, with the omission of "called of God," because equivocal, and as a very incomplete statement of duties, etc.

Art. 13. Substitute: Christian baptism is the immersion in water of a penitent believer, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins;
and is a prerequisite to Church membership, and to a participation of the Lord's Supper.


Art. 15. Altered. The first day of the week is the Lord's Day, and should be sacredly devoted to religious culture, in assembling the churches for celebrating the Lord's Supper, and in other acts of public worship, and in diligence in private devotion.

Art. 16. Agreed.
Art. 17. Agreed.
Art. 18. Agreed.

BAPTIST REJOINER

Article 1. Adhered to; adding "written or unwritten" after "form."
Article 2. Accept "truths" for "doctrines"; but adhere to "New Testament."
Art. 3. We prefer ours.
Art. 4. Adhered to.
Art. 6. Adhered to.
Art. 9. Substitute for our article and yours: Justification is that act of God in which he pardons and accepts as righteous every man immediately upon the exercise of faith in the atonement of Christ.
Art. 10. Adhered to.
Art. 11. Accept your amendments.
Art. 12. We propose, "moved by the Spirit," or "called of God."
Art. 13. Adhered to; inserting (after your example), "penitent" before "believer."
Art. 15. Adhered to; with explanation by the president, that "we would not bar churches from weekly communion."

While this conference did not effect a union between the two bodies, it was evidently a move in the right direction, and its influence was salutary in creating a better spirit than had prevailed between the Baptists and Disciples. It is also worth while to state the fact that this conference found the practical difficulties in the way of a union more weighty than any theological difficulties. There were differences of the latter kind, but these were not insuperable, and it was believed by the representatives of both bodies that "sweetness and light" would soon overcome these difficulties if the practical difficulties could be adjusted, such as deeds of trust, bequests, missionary, and other organisations. It was, however, believed that time and patience and the cultivation of a brotherly spirit would finally solve every problem, so that the two bodies
might ultimately come together under the banner which they both endorsed, viz., "One Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism."

While the Disciples had been passing through a most turbulent period, they had at the same time continued their evangelistic efforts, and their churches had multiplied and their membership grown until it had now reached somewhere not far from 600,000 communicants. All of these were not in the United States. Canada had felt the force of the movement, and already churches had been organised in that country. In the line of progress Westward from the United States, Australia had received the Primitive Gospel, and the work there had begun to progress with rapid strides. H. S. Earle, an American evangelist, began to preach to crowds in various cities, and he was soon followed by another American evangelist, and through their instrumentality the cause in Australia became not only finally established, but it soon became a most influential religious factor in that country. A fuller notice of the work outside of the United States will be given in a subsequent chapter.

About this time some of the old pioneers were closing their labours. The death of Joseph Bryant, in the eightieth year of his age, took place in 1867. His name deserves to be mentioned mainly for the reason that he was the first to be baptized after the formation of the "Christian Association." He died on the 20th of May, 1867. When the "Christian Association" was founded, in 1808, he became a member of it, and when the question of baptism was under consideration, not having been sprinkled in his infancy, and having always regarded baptism as immersion, he and two others, the only individuals in the Association who had not been sprinkled in infancy, were, on profession of their faith, immersed in Buffalo Creek. This was before Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, and others were immersed. In fact, he was the first to be immersed after the organization of the Association. When the Brush Run Church was organised he became a member of it and continued with the Disciples to the end of his life. He was a most exemplary member, and deserves the recognition given him here in this history of the movement.

Another one of the pioneers passed to his everlasting
rest during this year, viz., D. S. Burnett, whose name has already been frequently mentioned. He died at Baltimore, Md., on the 8th of July, just as he had completed his preparations for removal to Louisville, Ky. He died in the full hope of a glorious immortality. He had just preached his farewell sermon to the church of which he had been pastor for some time, and where he had perhaps been more successful as a pastor than at any other place.

As a pulpit orator, he had few, if any, equals among the Disciples. But this was not his most distinguishing characteristic. He was an organiser, and to him the Disciples are indebted more than to any other man for the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society, as well as for the advocacy of a proper organization of the churches and other important societies connected with the Disciple movement. He was a true leader, and though dead, like Abel, he yet speaketh.

James Henshall also passed into rest, September 7, 1867, at Germantown, Ky. He was a native of England, and came to this country in the year 1834, and at once took an active part in the advocacy of the Gospel among the churches in eastern Virginia. In 1850 he left Virginia and moved to Kentucky, and for a while preached for the church at Lexington. Subsequently he located at May's Lick, Ky., and then at Lexington, Mo. At his own request he was buried at May's Lick beside his first wife, who died during his residence there. In 1847 he accompanied Mr. Campbell during his visit to England. He frequently contributed articles to the Harbinger and other religious periodicals published by the Disciples. He was a strong, earnest, and helpful writer and preacher.

During the next year, 1868, we have to record the death of John Smith, which took place on the 28th of February, at the residence of his son-in-law in Mexico, Mo. On the 9th of February, against the protests of his friends, he delivered a discourse. However, this discourse was regarded by those who heard it as one of the best he had ever delivered. He had been subjected to an exposure during a very cold spell of weather, and finally succumbed to an attack of pneumonia, or inflammation of the lungs, which followed. His last hours were spent in bearing testimony to the faith he had so long preached.

Smith was one of God's noblemen, without any human
dressing or culture. He was genuine gold in the rough, though long before he died he had passed through the crucible, and though still bearing marks of his early associations and the disadvantages under which he laboured, during the formative period of his manhood, his spiritual nature was refined, and his soul-life indicated the supreme influence which the Christian religion had exerted in the development of his real character. When the whole history of the Disciple movement shall be unrolled in that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," it is probable that John Smith's name will occupy a very high place on the scroll of the immortals who were the chief leaders of the Disciple movement during its pioneer period.

About this time the fate of the Christian Standard was in the balance, with a strong tendency to fail. The company which had financed the Standard, having spent all their money in establishing the paper, finally gave it over to Isaac Errett, the editor, as a present, with the hope that by removing it to Alliance, Ohio, where he had been elected President of Alliance College, the paper could be continued, as Mr. Errett would receive a salary from the college adequate for personal support without taxing the paper, as had been done for this purpose. Accordingly, the experiment was made, but owing to the fact that the editor's time was divided between the college and the paper, his work became oppressive, and the financial condition of the paper grew worse instead of better. At this crucial time Mr. Errett decided to make a visit to Cincinnati, with the hope that he could secure financial aid. A contributor to the July number of the New Christian Quarterly for 1896 states the facts of this case so fully and fairly that his account of the matter is given as follows:

In the year 1869 Mr. Errett visited Cincinnati, to see if something could not be done with the Standard, so that he could be relieved from its financial responsibilities. He was then publishing the paper from Alliance, Ohio, where he had been acting as president of Alliance College, while at the same time conducting the paper. During Mr. Errett's visit to Cincinnati, a meeting was called of several of the leading brethren to hear what he had to say and consider what might be done to give him relief. He stated frankly his embarrassment to the meeting. He made it evident that every issue of the paper was at considerable loss, and that he had already lost quite as
much as he was able to stand; consequently, he must have relief at once or else the paper would stop. The brethren, composing the meeting, seemed unwilling to assume the responsibility of its financial position unless it could be removed to Cincinnati, and in that case they could not agree to pay Mr. Errett sufficient salary to justify him in giving up his presidency at Alliance and removing it to the former city. He offered to surrender the paper to them without any compensation, and they agreed to accept it, provided I would agree to edit it. This I refused to do, as I was then already full handed with both literary work and a large pastorate. So the matter ended without arriving at any definite conclusion.

I shall never forget either Mr. Errett's looks or his words after the meeting closed. I walked with him part of the way as he was going to the railway station to return to Alliance. He said to me, "I shall issue only one more number of the paper. I will write my valedictory as soon as I reach home, and in this I shall propose to return the subscription money to all who have paid for the paper in advance. I see before me," he said, "a heavy loss, but this is nothing compared with my sorrow that the paper must stop. Nevertheless," he continued, "we must have the courage to meet defeat, if defeat must come, and I shall try to accept the whole situation with calmness, and act as becometh a man." He owned that he was badly disappointed in the failure of the meeting to offer any relief, but he had no reproaches for any one and would try to make the best of a bad case.

I was greatly touched by both the matter and manner of what he said. I told him that the disaster of stopping the *Standard* must in some way be averted, and if no one else would come to the rescue I would myself try to see what could be done. I secured a promise from him that he would not write his valedictory until he heard from me the next day, either by telegram or letter. I intimated to him that I had a friend in the publishing business whom I might interest in the matter, though in any case I was determined that the paper should not stop.

As soon as I parted from Mr. Errett, I called upon Mr. R. W. Carroll, the senior member of the firm of R. W. Carroll & Co., who were then leading publishers in Cincinnati, as well as publishers of the *Christian Quarterly*. I laid the whole matter of the position of the *Standard* before Mr. Carroll, and then made to him, substantially, the following proposition, namely, that the *Standard* and Mr. Errett should be removed to Cincinnati, Mr. Carroll to own the *Standard*, but to pay Mr. Errett a certain fixed salary which we agreed upon; and then if the paper paid, Messrs. Carroll & Co. were to have all the profits; but in case there was money lost on it during the first year, after its removal, I agreed to share that loss equally with the firm. Mr. Carroll at once regarded this proposal with favour, and after going to Alliance and looking into the busi-
ness condition of the *Standard*, decided to take over the paper and publish it from Cincinnati, with Mr. Errett as editor, on the conditions I had proposed.

This new turn of affairs saved the *Standard*, but it involved another exhibition of courage on the part of its editor. He had to give up his relations to the college at Alliance and move his family to Cincinnati, and that, too, without any very hopeful assurance that the *Standard* would ever be a financial success. But duty called him to take this step, and he at once gave himself up to what seemed to him the leading of that providence which had always guided his footsteps. However, the paper was a success. There was even a slight balance on the right side for the first year, so that I had no loss to make up.

Mr. Errett’s removal to Cincinnati was the beginning of a new era for the *Standard*, and also for a better outlook with respect to the Disciple movement. At this time the circulation of the *Standard* continued to grow, and it was soon not only free from financial embarrassment, but its power for good was largely increased. Being relieved from all business care with respect to the paper, Mr. Errett had time to devote his best energies to his editorial work, and this he performed with conspicuous ability. However, he was not allowed to pursue the even tenor of his way without friction. The *Apostolic Times* with its five distinguished editors had a duty to perform, and part of this duty at least was to “keep an eye” on the movements of the *Standard*, as the latter was not regarded, from the Lexington point of view, as entirely sound in the Apostolic faith.

The *Times*, in its discharge of a conscientious duty, was constantly on the lookout for heresy, and in one of its articles it sounded the alarm of apostasy, because “we have preachers in our ranks who grow furious and bluster much if even a hint is dropped as to their lack of soundness, yet ask them what they have to say on expediency, progress, organs, etc., and they reply: Oh, Why, Well, and end with a significant chuckle.” In the first issue of the *Standard* from Cincinnati, Mr. Errett replies to this in the following fashion:

Any attempt to introduce and enforce anything as a matter of faith or duty, which the Apostles did not enforce in the name of our Lord, would be a step in apostasy. And any attempt to compel uniformity in thinking or in practice, where the apostles have left us free, is virtual apostasy.
In the next week’s issue he continues the argument with respect to the matter of apostasy, and among other things, he says:

The germs of apostasy from Christ are found in the presumptuous spirit that seeks to dictate where Christ has not dictated. Division and its bitter fruits may come as readily through the attempt to forbid that which Christ has not forbidden, as through an attempt to impose that which Christ has not imposed. . . . Two things, it strikes me, must be carefully kept in mind, if we would legitimately work out the spiritual emancipation contemplated in the reformation which we plead.

1. The necessity for free and unembarrassed research with a view to grow in grace and knowledge. It is fatal to assume that we have certainly learned all that the Bible teaches. This has been the silly and baneful conceit of all that have gone before us. Shall we repeat the folly, and superinduce a necessity for another people to be raised up to sound a new battle-cry of reformation? Must every man be branded with heresy or apostasy whose ripe investigations lead him out of our ruts? Must free investigation be smothered by a timid conservatism or a presumptuous bigotry, that takes alarm at every step of progress? Grant that errors may sometimes be thrust upon us. Free and kind discussion will soon correct them. There is not a hundredth part of the danger from an occasional outcropping of error as the result of free investigation, that must accrue from the murderous stiflings of free thought and free speech. An attempt to preserve union on such conditions not only renders union worthless by the sacrifice of liberty, but will defeat its own purpose, and compel, in time, new revolutionary movements.

2. The absence of all right to control our brethren where Christ has left them free. Such freedom may sometimes alarm us. Creed-bound communities may lift their hands in holy horror at the ‘latitudinarianism’ that we allow. But it is not worth while to accept principles unless we are willing to follow them to their legitimate results; and we insist that Rom. xiv. allows a very large liberty, which we have no right to trench on except with the plea of the demands of Christian love.

Now it will be seen that the founder of the Christian Standard was not only opposed to magnifying opinions into matters of importance, but he carries the war into Africa and affirms that those who do magnify these opinions, or attempt to stifle the free and unembarrassed research with a view to growth in grace and knowledge, are the real apostates, and not those who favour such investigations,
In saying what Mr. Errett published in the Standard, he simply reiterated in his own words what had been a cardinal principle with the Disciple leaders ever since the issue of the great “Declaration and Address” by Thomas Campbell. Mr. Errett’s contention, however, had a special significance at this particular time. Those who were emphasising side issues as indicating an apostasy were claiming that the pioneers of the movement did not and would not countenance such things as were being practised by the “progressives.” Mr. Errett showed conclusively that these heresy hunters were the very men who were guilty of apostasy, at least so far as the Disciple movement was concerned. From time to time he showed conclusively that the pioneers did not magnify opinions in the question of fellowship or co-operation, and that while some of the questions which were under consideration at the beginning of the seventh decade had never troubled the pioneers of the movement, at the same time the principles by which these pioneers were guided were exactly the same as those by which he was guided in dealing with such matters as expediency, progress, missionary societies, organization, etc. Those who did not allow freedom with respect to such questions were the real heretics and had undoubtedly apostatised from the faith of the fathers.

It is well to emphasise this fact, as there are still some men who seem to be sighing for the flesh pots of Egypt, and some are even crying to go back to the bondage of those legalistic days when some of our leading men had the whiphand in guiding the Restoration movement.

John Augustus Williams had just finished writing the life of John Smith, a very remarkable biography of a still more remarkable man. The biography was entitled, “The Life of John Smith,” and Williams proved himself in its composition a second Boswell. Mr. Errett thought it would be a good thing, both for the Disciple plea and also for the circulation of the Standard, if he could secure the privilege of “funning this life through his paper before it was published in book form. An arrangement to do this was finally concluded with Mr. Williams, and accordingly, the first chapter of the life of John Smith appeared in the Christian Standard. Against this action the Apostolic Times entered a vigorous protest. The Times contended that the life of John Smith belonged to the brother-
hood, and could not, therefore, be used legitimately for exploiting the circulation of the Christian Standard, and the Times at once appealed to the brotherhood to frown upon this audacious innovation. Of course, the brotherhood soon saw through this flimsy veil of pious mortification. It was too evident to every one that the Times was disgruntled wholly because it had been out-generated in securing a privilege which the Times itself would have been more than willing to accept. In the blindness of this ridiculous opposition, the Times did not seem to apprehend the fact that however true it might be that the life of John Smith belonged to the brotherhood in a general sense, that this particular life of John Smith belonged to Augustus Williams, who had written it. However, a special point of objection was that the Times was a Kentucky paper, and John Smith was a Kentuckian, and naturally enough the Times supposed that a great many Kentuckians would take the Christian Standard in order to secure the privilege of reading about one of their great men whom they delighted to honour.

This incident is related in order to show the curious influence at work during these crucial days. The abnormal individualism which had characterised the Disciple movement from almost the very beginning did not fail to assist in the periodical rivalry of the period now under consideration. The Standard was really the only leading paper or magazine that supported definitely all-round, forward movements. The Apostolic Times supported the missionary societies, but was in other respects almost a hindrance to success, because of its extreme conservative and legalistic tendencies. The American Christian Review, edited by Mr. Franklin, while at first giving a sort of quasi-support to the Louisville plan, finally came out in open opposition to all missionary societies of every kind. Such was the actual situation with regard to the influence of the press at the close of the sixth decade.

At the end of the year 1870 the Millennial Harbinger was discontinued. The editor, President W. K. Pendleton, found that his duties as President of Bethany College, together with other important pressing obligations upon his time and strength, made it impossible for him to edit the Harbinger, or to be responsible for its business management. He gave it up with much reluctance, but with
the promise that he would continue to contribute liberally to other periodicals.

The *Harbinger*, since its initial number in 1830, had been a great magazine. In it may be found practically a history of the Disciple movement, through the forty-one years of its existence. It contained, from time to time, not only the remarkable contributions of its editor-in-chief, but also the very efficient help of the co-editors, such as W. K. Pendleton, Robert Richardson, A. W. Campbell, C. L. Loos, Robert Milligan, and Isaac Errett, together with a host of able contributors representing every phase of the Disciple movement, as well as every country where the plea had made progress. In short, its volumes are now a repository of literature which has not yet had its supreme influence. Much of what these grand thinkers and writers published in its pages was misunderstood at the time it appeared. But times change, and we change with them. Already the religious world is beginning to recognise the great value of the Disciple movement as a religious force, and it is not too much to anticipate that the time is not far distant when the leading articles of the *Millennial Harbinger* will become classic in the religious literature of the nineteenth century.

But all these changes, and conditions at the close of the sixth decade and beginning of the seventh, clearly indicate a new crisis in the Disciple movement, which will make it necessary for them to go either backward or forward—backward to the old, disorganised, and almost anarchical individualism, or forward to a co-operation, where the seeds of discord shall no longer be encouraged to grow by those who had so long hindered progress by making it an epithet rather than a great word with which to conjure.

Already the Disciple movement was beginning to attract very considerable attention among the religious denominations. Their phenomenal growth, notwithstanding the bitter opposition which they had very generally received, had begun to challenge those, who had unfavourably regarded their movement, to stop and think. The spirit of the movement had also become somewhat modified. As the violent opposition continued to grow less and less, the Disciples themselves became decidedly more charitably disposed in the treatment of their religious neighbours.
Concessions on both sides began to create a new atmosphere, and this became sufficiently predominant to produce a desire on the part of some of the denominations to cultivate very friendly relations with the Disciples, and in some cases this had in view a probable union with the Disciples.

In 1871 overtures were made of this kind by the Free Baptists, and committees representing the respective bodies were appointed to confer together with a view to the union of the two bodies. The chairman of the Disciple committee, W. T. Moore, visited the Free Baptist Convention that fall at Providence, R. I., and delivered an address before the Convention which was warmly received. The two committees also had a very friendly conference, and while it was apparent that no special doctrinal differences stood seriously in the way of union, there were still practical difficulties which could not be immediately overcome. However, the committees recommended exchange of pulpits, and the cultivation of fraternal relations, at the same time expressing the hope that the time was not far distant when all difficulties in the way of union would be overcome, and when the two bodies would become practically one.

It has already been stated that, with all its evils, the Civil War had produced some good. After the close of the war a union sentiment among the churches began to grow. It was felt that if a union of states is good, a union of Christians would be better. Furthermore, the Christians began to find out that divisions by mere shibboleths are unworthy of those who profess to be followers of Him who prayed that His disciples might all be one. We must, therefore, reckon that the seventh decade opened with a growing sentiment in favour of Christian union, and this sentiment among the Disciples was accentuated by the advocacy of the new journalism which was growing up among them. This new journalism was led by the Christian Standard, the efficiency of which was augmented by the addition of President W. K. Pendleton to its editorial staff.

In making his bow to the readers of the Standard, he uses the following great words:

We mean earnest, watchful, thoughtful work, honest as faith can make it, and true to the cherished purposes of the
many dead and living co-labourers with whom we have so long stood in harmonious struggles for the restoration of the New Testament doctrine and practice. We have discovered nothing in the Word of God, and can discern nothing in the signs of the times, to induce us to draw back, or aught to relent in the steadfast advocacy of our original plea. We may not, we think we do not, understand it in the sectarian narrowness in which it is held by a few. We can see neither the wisdom of the policy nor the warrant for the liberty which some are exercising in restricting the gospel of grace, in its divine catholicity and freedom, by the autocratic dogmatism of a creed spirit that is as narrow in its logic as it is cold in its charity. It is true now, as when Paul was yet with the Church, “We should be ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.” (II. Cor. iii:6.) Even under the Jewish dispensation this distinction between substance and form was true. Paul recognised it as an eternal law of the divine judgment. “He was not a Jew who was one outwardly, neither was that circumcision which was outward in the flesh; but he was a Jew who was one inwardly, and circumcision was that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.” (Rom. ii: 28, 29.)

But the form and substance are, both philosophically and Scripturally, united in every true life. The letter as law killeth, yet the letter as a revelation of grace leadeth to life. Paul does not use the word letter in the sense of the word of revelation. This is living and quickening through the spirit; but in isolation, taken as a mere intellectual light enforced or conformed to simply as a rule by which to escape punishment or secure advantage, it becomes mere letter, and profits nothing in the divine life. We may thus be led by it, as dumb cattle, submissive to the yoke and patient under the burden and obedient to the thunder of command, but heartless and lifeless in the service, as the ox under the goad. The letter pays tithes, but waits for the collector and grumbles at the rate. The spirit gives the heart, and anticipates the morning with its bounding gladness of service. The letter sits cautiously and gloomily in the corner, criticising its duties and shielding itself with a cunning network of “thus saiths”; the spirit goes abroad eager to find and prompt to do whatsoever is true and lovely. The letter is censorious; the spirit is charitable. The letter is a dead carcass, perfect and complete as it may be in its parts, but a lifeless anatomy; the spirit is a living form, beautiful in expression and restlessly active with the grace of divine life.

Evidently, the work that is needed is a restoration in form and power of the apostolic church, a New Testament ministry that takes the word of revelation for its guide, and the spirit of inspiration for its impulse. To separate these in theory or in practice is to break up the bond of Christian unity and reduce Christianity to a theory, a philosophy, a mere scheme of
salvation, without the power of life. The readers of the *Harbinger, to* whom now we especially speak, will recall the steady earnestness with which this essential characteristic of Christianity was ever insisted upon by its great editor. We remember with what earnestness he was wont to say, “I have no confidence in any instrumentality, ordinance, means, or observance, unless the heart is turned to God. This is the fundamental, the capital point; but with this every other divine ordinance is essential for the spiritual enlargement, conformation, and sanctification of the faithful.” On this grand position let us plant ourselves with renewed steadfastness, and labour to bring our movement on to still further perfection.*

The *Standard* had become a great power in guiding and developing the Disciple movement along wise and fruitful lines. Other journals were following this lead, and even the journals which had been least liberal began to relent somewhat in their violent opposition to progressive measures; and all this made the outlook for the new decade bright and hopeful.

CHAPTER XXIII

NEW MISSIONARY ENTERPRISES

THE year 1874 was a red-letter year for the Disciples of Christ. By this time it had become evident that the “Louisville plan,” from a financial point of view, was practically a failure. However, it is well to be careful about our wholesale condemnation of this plan, for undoubtedly it had a very important educational influence, though it did not immediately bring money into the treasury of the General Society. The following may be mentioned as some of the good results produced by this plan:

1. It convinced the Disciples that it was not according to the genius of their religious movement.

2. A people who had been fed on individualism could not be made to work in any hard-and-fast organization where this individualism was somewhat discounted.

3. It demonstrated, furthermore, that money is the most conservative thing in the world; that men will concede almost anything rather than the privilege to do as they please with their own finances.

4. It settled the question that co-operation of the churches must remain a voluntary matter, and that, therefore, any plan which had even the appearance of federating these churches in any organic way would be strongly resisted by very many of them, if not by all of them.

5. It also demonstrated that things sometimes have to get worse in order to get better. Experimenting with this plan brought the Disciple movement, in its missionary operations, to the point where it became clearly evident that something else must be done, or else their missionary operations, in any co-operative sense, would have to be abandoned.

6. It made very certain that the Disciples must either go back to the old system of life membership and life
directorship, and individual contributions, or else they must go forward to something better than had yet been tried in their history.

7. Finally, the “Louisville plan” had a certain positive influence in creating the sense of a united brotherhood among the Disciples. Some one has said that individualism had gone to seed at the time the “Louisville plan” was on trial, and that this plan, if it did nothing else, would teach the Disciples an important lesson by calling attention to the fact that they were dependent upon one another, and associated in a common brotherhood and fellowship, which demanded recognition in different cooperative acts, such as the “Louisville plan” provided for, and which it emphasised very strongly, though it failed to bring financial support to the General Society.

Thomas Munnell was corresponding secretary during the time that the plan was on trial. He was elected in 1868, and continued until 1877, when he was succeeded by F. M. Green, of Ohio. Munnell was a great secretary, though his greatness did not consist in his ability to secure contributions to the Society. During his administration the finances of the Society ran down to the lowest point that had ever been reached since 1853, but in other respects the influence of Munnell was very helpful. He was a spiritually-minded man, thoroughly in sympathy with the best ideals of the Disciple movement, and was much beloved by his brethren. He was also a gifted writer, and not the least influence which he exerted for good, during his administration, was by his pen. Some of his articles occupy a classic position in the literature of those days. To the first number of the Christian Quarterly he contributed an article, entitled, “Indifference to Things Indifferent,” which deserves to be written in letters of gold, and read by every Disciple of Christ, at least once a year, if not more frequently. It is a noble defence of liberty, and a most vigorous protest against magnifying matters of small importance into barriers in the way of legitimate progress. As there is so much of the true spirit of the real Disciple movement in this article, we feel justified in making a liberal quotation from it, which will give the reader not only a taste of the quality of the article itself, but will furnish him with the key to the principles and aims of the religious movement as it
was understood by the men who were governed by high ideals:

“There is a certain degree of spiritual development which only renders a man unhappy, morose, and unkind. It is that degree that has merely learned to hate sin, but that has not yet attained to the love of humanity. Such a Christian is always censorious, impatient of imperfection in others, and inclined to be very exacting about the ceremonial of religion. He understands the law better than the Gospel, he will have sacrifice rather than mercy, makes little allowance for circumstances, and has the narrow gate narrower than it really is. There may be a true work of grace begun in his heart, but then it is only begun. He lacks that malleable state of Christian sympathy that can become all things to all men, for the sake of winning them to Christ. Instead of leaving his theological moorings for awhile to associate himself with one who is out of the way, and, by gentle tractions, to lead him heavenward, he stands at a safe distance and yells his upbraidings and censures at him, scolding him back to God. Small departures from the truth in another he magnifies into mortal sins, and the narrowest dissensions are widened into impassable gulfs, while the constant contemplation of peccadilloes contracts his mind till there is no room for a large view of humanity, involved as it is in so many difficulties in the way of a perfect knowledge of God.

Not so with Paul. His sympathy for humanity, his love of souls, his knowledge of their weakness, his broad philosophy of spiritual growth, and, above all, the influence of the Holy Spirit, all lead him to make much allowance for men, to wait on their development, and to accommodate himself to their prejudice and ignorance, that he might win them to Christ. When he beheld a soul far from God, he ran to his side, linked his sympathies with his, identified himself with him, became whatever he was, and having securely bound that soul to his own, he tried to work his own way back to Christ with him. What was the eating of a little meat, or the not eating of it, to him, if he could save a soul thereby? Did he refuse to circumcise a man if that would give him access for Christ to their hearts? Did he stubbornly ‘stand up for the whole truth’ when he saw that many feeble souls could not bear it all? When he saw that his despising a ‘holy day’ would offend a weak brother, did he stiffly maintain his orthodoxy under pretense of ‘contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints’? And even if a quasi respect to the defunct ceremony of sacrifice was necessary to save what little faith they had in Christ, did he, on the plea of being sound refuse to become a Jew, for the time being, that he might save a Jew? Did he consider it a ‘retreating to the sects’—Pharisees and Sadducees—when he became all things to all men? The difference between Paul’s generous views of these things, and
those of small Pharisees of all ages, is just the difference between the divine and the human. With him everything transient, accidental, and merely ceremonial, was lost in the superlative importance of faith in Jesus, even if that faith should have to keep company awhile with a defunct ceremonial. He knew that the old leaves that fall not off in Autumn will surely fall at the swelling buds of opening Spring. No rational man ever wishes the darkness of night to break into sudden day without the help of twilight. God has put a green hull around every nut of the forest to protect its tenderness, and to convey its nourishment until the seed is fully matured. This hull gradually dries, withers, and falls off; when the seed no longer needs its aid; but it would be cruel to tear it from its place too soon, and leave the kernel to exposure and to death. Even so the Jewish religion for centuries contained, the Christian religion, and could not be torn from around it so soon, nor would the latter have thrived very well under such treatment.

How carefully ministers should deal with the souls of men may be seen from the fact patent to all—that truth is often, for a time supported even by error. Had the Jew been required to renounce Moses and the law at once, on the reception of the Gospel, few, if any, would ever have become the disciples of Christ. Even during his personal ministry they more than once left off following him on account of his hard sayings—that is, on account of his true sayings. But, being allowed to entertain much of their former religion, they received Christ, the Messiah, as a farther development of their own covenant. They received Christ, then, because they were allowed, for a time, to entertain some errors which they were not prepared to give up. How magnificent that spiritual understanding of the Apostle to the Gentiles, who, standing upon God’s observatory and seeing things as the Spirit sees them, defines the value of meats and drinks, new moons, Sabbath days, sacrifices, and circumcision; and taking up the last as a test-case for all the rest, declares that ‘circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing’—that ‘neither If we eat, are we the better; nor if we eat not, are we the worse’—that ‘one man esteemeth one day above another, another man esteemeth every day alike,’ and so indifferent is Paul to things indifferent that he allows each one to have it his own way, and be ‘fully persuaded in his own mind.’ Meanwhile he comprehends the several capacities of his infantile brethren, and gives milk or strong meat as the case will allow. He will give faith in the sacrifice of Christ time to absorb all the faith they now have in other sacrifices, will give the circumcision of the heart time to dismiss circumcision in the flesh, and keeps urging that ‘the kingdom of God is not meats and drinks, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.’

An altitude gained like this is so unlike the dwarfish attainments of his own, or even of modern times, that one is in
danger of being considered latitudinarian, unsafe, and ‘unsound,’ who even surveys the
ground on which Paul trod. However, in the ratio in which we can walk with him on these
highlands of God, we ought to be able to exercise the same forbearance toward those who fear
all this liberty of the Gospel. It cannot be denied that the distance between him who said
‘circumcision is nothing,’ and him who said ‘except ye be circumcised and keep the law of
Moses ye cannot be saved.’ is very great. Nor can it be denied that the distance is about the
same between him who could bear with such ignorance and error in the ancient Church and
him who breaks fellowship with a modern Church that has a small melodeon in their Sunday
School. Granting, as the writer does, that there are cogent and well founded objections to
instrumental music in public worship, this departure from the simplicity of the Gospel is
nevertheless animalcular compared to those tolerated by the apostles in the early Church—
tolerated, not that they approved them—but as the Greek general replied, when asked why he
was retreating so fast, ‘I am pursuing an advantage that lies behind,’ so, those wise men often
found advantages lying in concession to the weakness and ignorance of their brethren.

The ‘changeable’ and the ‘changeless,’ the ‘flexible’ and the ‘inflexible’ in religion, are
expressions exceedingly unsavoury to one who does not restrain his denunciations of their
authors long enough to understand what is meant by them. And yet it would be admitted that
while the command ‘give to him that asketh thee’ is as changeless as the word of God, the
manner of obeying the injunction may nowadays differ widely from, that which was common
in those days, and to which Jesus especially referred. We can now obey this order without
ever giving a cent to a street beggar, since our improved methods of taking care of the poor
prevent the necessity of it. The taxes and poor-houses far surpass any method ever known in
primitive times, and are so complete that city authorities forbid our giving to mendicants.
Evidently we are at liberty to feed the poor in a manner different from what the Saviour
alluded to, and this is what is meant by the ‘changeable’ and the ‘flexible’; and thus we must
adapt ourselves to ‘the varying conditions of society’ in obeying the commandments of God.

Now, while it is the duty of the censorious and fault-finding to imbibe more of the love of
God and less bitterness against those who either are, or are thought to be, in error, and so
preserve Christian regards, in spite of adventitious differences, it is also the duty of those who
are wrongfully represented and misunderstood to have compassion on those who do them
wrong. No one is ever intentionally misrepresented by good men. Besides, men’s intellectual
habits, often unconsciously to themselves, lead them into censoriousness and unfair methods
of debate. Public debates are sure to spoil the spirits of second
or third-rate abilities. A great man, like Alexander Campbell, can debate through many years without contracting those vicious habits of reasoning that so often overtake those of inferior capacity. The vicious and unmanly habits referred to are such as making false issues, where, in a true issue, triumph would not be so apparent; refusing to accept an explanation in the sense in which it was intended; taking no pains to honestly understand an opponent’s true position; merely asserting instead of arguing, where it is believed the populace are known to accept the former more greedily than the latter—these, and all the *ad captanda* intended to slap in the face an argument that cannot be fairly met, are weaknesses inherited from many disputings in public, and deserve commiseration on the part of those who have not been subjected to their influence. These are scars left upon the minds of those who have encountered the enemies of truth, and who have not been able to parry every stroke of the foe, nor to defeat him, without using his own mode of warfare, to some extent. Now, a proper love for humanity will not denounce these on account of their infirmities, although they may be very repulsive. For example—the narrowest-minded men are always the most confident of their own opinions, they are the most denunciatory, and always claim to be the standards of orthodoxy. The more you focalise the rays of heat, the more intense that heat becomes in its contracted circumference; the more general a man’s knowledge and sympathies, the more he is disposed, like the sun, to flood the world with his love and gentleness. The strongest focalisers are, of necessity, the most ignorant of men, and such should not always be condemned so much, as it is often their misfortune rather than their crime. Hence, the patience Paul manifested toward his Jewish brethren, who could not lift their eyes from the law, arose from his comprehensive view of the Christian religion, and of the gradual development of spiritual life in the soul; and when we say he was *indifferent to things indifferent* we do not mean that the errors tolerated were as good for men as the truth, but that none of the above-named were considered of sufficient consequence to warrant unkind upbraidings or even ill feelings. Why, then, do modern preachers treat so harshly any one who may not, in practice, but merely in theory, get out of the way a little? One believes in abstract operations of the Holy Spirit; another, that repentance precedes faith; another, that instrumental music belongs to the chapter of expediencies (or such like); another, that the title of ‘Reverend’ is innocent enough, and, lo, the dirty feet of harpies are upon them, as if they were outlaws against the Kingdom of God. Wherefore? Because the religious pulse is low in these theological constables, whose piety has all left the heart, producing a congestion of head religion, consisting in ‘clear views,’ critical acumen, sound theory, intolerance of mistakes, however small or however honest, and in denouncing
better men than ourselves. The gnats are not yet all strained out nor the camels all swallowed; nor are the ‘mint and anise and cumin all gone; the constant selection of things comparatively indifferent, instead of ‘judgment, mercy, and truth,’ is still the habit of poor little man.

Why the world always places the intellect above the affections, the head above the heart, might be a question for the philosopher. In our schools the premiums are given not to the best, but to the smartest boy. His mind, quick as a steel-trap, triumphs over the other’s conscience, sensitive as an angel’s. The blunted conscience of the covetous man remains in the Church, the whisky manufacturer and vender take high seats in the synagogue, and half-converted, prayerless souls of the most indifferent grace—if they only hold the doctrines ‘we teach’—can sit down at the communion table, while hearts the most subdued and mellow with the love of God, and that would die for Jesus’ sake, are thought to be unworthy, because of some honest head-mistake as to some theory of religion. In the day when God shall bring up the valleys and press down the hills; when he shall make the ‘last first and the first last,’ and ‘turn the world upside down,’ the heart will be found above the head, love above knowledge, and a godly life above a sound theory.

Too much attention to the ‘form of godliness’ draws religion from the inside to the outside, from the heart to the surface. The pushing of the lips toward God, while the errant heart is on an excursion somewhere else, is characteristic of those who object to the healing of a sick man on the Sabbath day. The Catholic and High Churchman give baptism the privilege of bringing the sinner to God without either faith or repentance, and all pedobaptists bring children into the Church by this rite alone. This is an election of the form without the substance, the husk without the ear, the shell without the seed. It is the antipode of transcendentalism that rejects all forms in religion, and seeks for direct communion with God, without the intervention of a Saviour, an ordinance, or a church. The one has a body and no soul, the other seeks to have a soul without a body. But as long as God shall have soul and body grow together, as complements of each other, so long will he give contradiction to both formalism and transcendentalism. As the substance of food is always obtained from the various forms of food, so is spiritual good found in the forms of religion, while forms alone, without the power of godliness, are like husks for the soul.”

The influence of this article was worth the whole cost of Munnell’s services during the period of his secretaryship. But this article was not the only one of value which he wrote. He was constantly urging through the

papers and magazines the importance of spiritual culture among the Disciples, and a proper
care of all the churches from that particular point of view. Indeed, his mission was practically
more to the churches than to any missionary field outside of the churches for which a
 corresponding secretary was expected to provide. He was not indifferent to evangelistic
operations in any or every direction, but he felt that the churches, first of all, should be
properly equipped and spiritually developed, if the Disciple plea should ever become effective
in results. In short, his special work seemed to be to help the churches, rather than to seek and
save the lost.

Of course his methods did not satisfy those Disciples who were constantly seeking a
pretext by which they could attack the missionary societies. But the financial results of
Munnell’s administration did not satisfy any one, and much less himself. Many felt that the
time had come when something better in missionary work should, at least, be attempted, as the
General Society had now only a name to live by, but was practically dead, so far as having
any ability to reach out for some noble achievement in the conversion of the world.

The churches were still actively engaged in evangelistic work, notwithstanding a
considerable amount of friction among them had been produced by the agitation of questions
with respect to organs, missionary societies, communion, and other things relating to the
growth of the Disciples in their church life. But up to 1874 very little effort had been made
through any organization to do missionary work in foreign lands. The mission that had been
established in Jerusalem was discontinued about the close of the war, and the one in Jamaica
was very poorly supported, and finally practically abandoned. There was a growing Reeling
that the time had come when the Disciples should begin a foreign missionary work in earnest,
as such a work would react upon the home churches, and would probably do more to stimulate
missionary activity at home, as well as abroad, than anything else that could be done.

In view of this feeling, earnest efforts were made during the Convention in October, 1874,
to secure the appointment of a foreign missionary to some inviting field, as a beginning in
what was believed to be an imperative necessity.
The importance of this movement was emphasised by a motion to instruct the General Board to take such action during the year as would open at least one foreign missionary station.

This proposal was urged upon the Convention very earnestly by two or three speakers, and to emphasise the importance of the matter, Joseph King, of Allegheny City, Pa., made one of the regular addresses of the Convention on “The Importance of Foreign Missions,” though he did not even suggest the propriety of starting a missionary society at that time. All who were in favor of establishing foreign missions looked to the General Society to do this, and consequently no one had any thought of establishing another society, until the motion to instruct the General Board to establish a foreign mission, during the year, was voted down, and in lieu of this, a half-hearted resolution was passed which left the whole matter discretionary with the Board, and this was regarded by the Mends of foreign missions as practically amounting to nothing at all, as such resolutions had been passed frequently without any results whatever.

For the sake of the truth of history, the following facts need to be stated just here. After it became apparent that the General Society did really nothing in providing for a foreign mission, and would do nothing, W. T. Moore left the audience room of the Richmond Street Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, where the Convention was in session, and retired to the basement of the church, where he spent some time in earnest thought and prayer over the whole situation. He then spoke to several brethren, whom he felt sure could be trusted to meet him at a certain hour in the basement of the church for conference. When the hour came, about twenty-five or thirty brethren assembled, where they had been invited. W. T. Moore then explained the object he had in view in calling the meeting. He stated that the time had come, in his judgment, when steps for the organization of a Foreign Missionary Society should be taken. In an earnest talk he urged immediate action, and then proposed that a committee should be appointed with power to prepare a Constitution, and also to arrange, if possible, with the General Society at its next year’s meeting, for a reasonable amount of time to make known the new soci-
ety’s plans and purposes. He made it clear that this society was in no way intended to antagonise the General Society, but to co-operate with that society and, therefore, to hold their respective conventions at the same time and place, and in all other cases to co-operate in the most friendly manner.

This proposal was heartily received and adopted by the conference, and a committee was appointed, with W. T. Moore as chairman, to prepare the whole plan of organization, and submit the same to a conference specially called to meet during the next convention of the General Society.

Among those who attended this conference in 1874 may be mentioned B. B. Tyler, Thomas Munnell, P. M. Green, J. B. Bowman, W. F. Black, J. C. Reynolds, Robert Moffett, J. S. Lamar, R. M. Bishop, W. S. Dickinson, Calvin S. Blackwell, L. Lane, John Shackleford, David Walk, J. T. Toof, and others whose names cannot now be recalled. Unfortunately the records of this meeting were lost, and consequently these facts are given as they are remembered by the one who called the meeting, and who presided during the conference. Even some of the names mentioned may not be correct. It must be remembered that others would have been present if they had not been engaged with the General Society, which was then in session in the main audience room of the church. Isaac Errett was then president of the General Society, and was presiding at the session of that society. However, when he learned what had been done, he gave his hearty consent at once, and served on the committee which had been appointed to prepare a constitution and plan of organization to be reported, as already stated. This committee met at Indianapolis during the Indiana State meeting, which was held the subsequent year, and had their report ready for the General Convention, which was held in October, at Louisville, Ky.

Meantime, Thomas Munnell, who was secretary of the General Society, was in hearty sympathy with the new organization, though, as there was some opposition to the proposed Foreign Society, he had to move cautiously with respect to his approval. But it is probably due to him that the friction, which threatened to become a stumbling block in the way of the new movement, was largely overcome before the General Society met in Louisville. With
his co-operation it was arranged that the new organization should have Wednesday night for its announcement, addresses, and such business as might be necessary. So that when the General Society convened at Louisville, October 21st, the committee of the proposed Foreign Society was ready to report. During the preceding year a circular had been sent out by the committee, explaining the whole matter as far as seemed needful, and calling for definite pledges to assist in the inauguration and sustenance of the Foreign Society.

At Louisville, October 22d, the friends of the new society were called together, and the following definite organization was effected: President, Isaac Errett; Vice-Presidents, W. T. Moore, J. S. Lamar, and Jacob Burnett; Corresponding Secretary, Robert Moffett; Recording Secretary, B. B. Tyler; and Treasurer, W. S. Dickinson. At this meeting the following constitution, reported by the committee, was adopted:

Art. I.—The name of this organization shall be, “The Foreign Christian Missionary Society.”

Art. II.—Its object shall be to make Disciples of all nations, and teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded.

Art. III.—This Society shall be composed of Life Directors, Life Members, and Annual Members.

Art. IV.—Its officers shall be a President, three Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be elected annually.

Art. V.—The officers of the Society shall constitute an Executive Committee who shall manage the affairs of the Society during the intervals of the Board meetings. A majority shall be competent to transact business.

Art. VI.—Any member of the Church of Christ may become a Life Director by the payment of $500.00, which may be paid in five annual installments; or a Life Member by the payment of $100.00, in five annual installments; or an Annual Member by the payment of $10.00.

Art. VII.—The officers of the Society and the Life Directors shall constitute a Board of Managers, who shall meet at least once a year for the transaction of business.

Art. VIII.—The Board of Managers shall have power to appoint its own meetings, elect its own Chairman and Secretary, enact its own by-laws and rules of order, provided always that they be not inconsistent with the Constitution of this Society, fill all vacancies which may occur in their own body during the year, and if deemed necessary by two-thirds of the members present, at a regular meeting, convene special meetings of
the Society. They shall establish such agencies as the interests of the Society may require, appoint missionaries, fix their compensation, direct their labours, make all appropriations to be paid out of the treasury, and present to the Society at each annual meeting a report of their proceedings during the past year. The action of the Board of Managers is subject to the revision of the Society.

Art. IX.—The Treasurer shall give bond in such amount as the Board of Managers shall think proper.

Art. X.—The annual meetings of this Society shall be held at the same time and place as those of the General Christian Missionary Convention (unless otherwise ordered by the Board of Managers) and its proceedings may be published as a part of the proceedings of that Convention.

Art. XI.—This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting of the Society, by a vote of two-thirds of all the members present, provided such amendment shall have been first recommended by the Board, or a year’s notice shall have been given.*

At the night session, which had been generously placed at the disposal of the new society, Isaac Errett made his presidential address, which was wholly extemporaneous, though very tender and effective. The first set address that evening was delivered by W. T. Moore, in which he gave an outline of the plan and purposes of the new society, even indicating some of the countries where the society would aim to establish missions within the near future. In the course of this address Mr. Moore answered some objections that had been raised against the new society. Among other things, he said:

You say we have tried Foreign Missions and failed. I beg pardon, but I really do not think we have tried very much. True, we sent a faithful missionary to Jerusalem and also one to Jamaica, but did we sustain them there? While we were discussing the propriety of having a missionary society with a moneyed basis, our missionaries were starved out and had to leave their work, which had only been fairly started, and come home. This is precisely the way we have tried the foreign missionary work. . . .

But away with all petty excuses that stand between the Disciples of Christ and the great work of converting the world. The time has come to end this discussion concerning the difference “twixt tweedledum and tweedledee.” It is work that is needed now, and not controversy. Then let the Macedonian cry, which comes up from all quarters of the globe, so completely drown the noise of our fruitless discussions, that all

along the army of the Lord nothing shall be heard but the stirring command of “Forward to the conquest of the nations.”

But if there are those who are unwilling to work in any way, I think we ought to say to all such that we cannot wait on them any longer. For the last twenty-five years we have been trying to get forward, but surely our progress has not been all that we could desire. And it seems to me part of our trouble has been that those among us who have had a true vision of our responsibilities, and who have always been willing to make real sacrifices in order to push on the work, have been largely spending their time in fruitless efforts to conciliate certain brethren who oppose all co-operative missionary labour. I say “fruitless efforts,” for there never was a more profitless controversy than that which has been going on between our missionary and anti-missionary men. If the difficulty with those who oppose us was only an intellectual aberration, then might we hope to correct it by discussion; but as long as it remains true that selfishness is at the bottom of all anti-missionary logic, it is worse than useless to try to overcome prejudice against us by an appeal to the reasonableness of our cause.

It ought to be evident by this time that if the work is ever done we must do it ourselves. We cannot hope for the cooperation of those who will not co-operate in anything, unless it be opposition to all that means success. Nor can we delay any longer in this matter, brethren. If we do not act now, God will give the work into other hands; for you may rest assured he will not leave himself without a faithful witness to the nations of the plea which we, to-day, represent.

At the close of this address the speaker indicated the true method that should be adopted in dealing with those who would be sure to find objections to the new movement. He told the story of two men starting to a certain village. A started an hour before B did, but they both arrived at the village at the same time. B interrogated A as to why he had been so long on the road. A replied that when he came to a certain place a number of dogs ran out and began barking at him, and that he had spent an hour in throwing stones at these dogs. B said the same dogs had barked at him, but he paid no attention to them whatever, and in this way he had caught up with A. “Now,” said Mr. Moore, “we should not spend our time in throwing stones at barking dogs.” This exercise would only delay progress, and would probably only irritate the dogs, and do no good whatever. The true spirit that should be manifested is to attend to the business in hand, and let the objections alone. He continued by saying,
that those who opposed missionary societies would have to be convinced, if convinced at all, by the work accomplished by these societies. Christ Himself did not argue with His bitterest opponents. He said, “If I do not the work of My Father, believe Me not; but if I do His work, then if you cannot believe in Me, believe the work.” This same method would, in the long run, win for every society that might be organised. If the society would do the work of preaching the Gospel to the lost, there would not be much difficulty in finally winning the approbation of all honest, earnest Christians.

It is worth while to state the fact that this policy has generally been adopted by the men of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society. They have turned neither to the right nor to the left, but have kept definitely to the main work which the society was organised to do, and the result has been a most triumphant vindication of the policy indicated in Mr. Moore’s address.

At the same meeting L. B. Wilkes delivered an able and pointed address, from which the following is an extract:

Does any one say, be careful how you form a co-operation, every detail of which is ‘not expressly provided for in the word of God? I reply, be careful that you fail not, nor refuse to do what is, in this case, manifestly the will of God. It is, as I understand the subject, the divine plan in such a case that the people of God should unite in such a co-operation as would be efficient. Opposition in such a case is not the teaching of the book. It is human, if it is not something worse. I am for the divine plan in every case, and against all human schemes. . . . We need to have our more prominent brethren, with tongue and pen, to speak out a little plainer. If there is anything settled in regard to our work, so that there is no reasonable doubt, let there be plain talk about it. ... It ought to be made odious to oppose all ways of co-operation for doing missionary work. A man may be respected who prefers one plan of co-operation to another. Such a one is not only willing to do something in co-operation with his brethren, but he manifests common sense candor to admit that some plan is needed to work by. But he who opposes all plans of cooperation, and, therefore, opposes all co-operation, is not religiously respectable. This plain, earnest talking ought to be done everywhere. Especially ought it to be done by every preacher in his pulpit, and as he goes in and out among his brethren.*

Such was the beginning of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society, which has undoubtedly proved to be the most effective organization for co-operative work that has ever existed among the Disciples. Soon after the society adjourned, Robert Moffett sent in his resignation as corresponding secretary, and W. T. Moore was appointed in his place, who served two years without salary, as he was at that time amply supported by the Central Christian Church, of Cincinnati, of which he was pastor. But Mr. Moore found it was impossible for him to do the work of corresponding secretary as it should be done, and consequently W. B. Ebbert was appointed corresponding secretary, who for four years did the clerical work of the office on a small salary, which supplemented the salary he was receiving from a business position which he held.

It will be seen by these facts that the society started out very modestly, and with the least possible expense. But it was soon found that something more effective should be done in order to secure the best results. Accordingly, A. McLean was elected corresponding secretary, and under his administration the society went on from victory to victory. The facts related will also show that the definite movement for the Foreign Missionary Society took place in 1874, rather than in 1875, as the record is usually made. It is true that the organization was not completed until 1875, but practically the society was formed and its organization provided for before the meeting in Louisville, 1875. This fact makes the beginning of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society synchronise with the beginning of the C. W. B. M., and justifies the statement made at the beginning of this chapter that the year 1874 was a red-letter year in the history of the Disciples.

In this necessarily brief sketch it is impossible to follow this society in detail through the thirty odd years of its history. But it will be interesting to the general reader to place before him a brief account of the work that has been accomplished. It has been stated that it was not the intention of the founders of the society to do missionary work in Europe. This is a mistake, but it has been iterated and reiterated until it has become classic in the history of the society. In the very address of Mr. Moore, to which reference has been made, he sketched in a brief outline the work which the society had in view. In this
comprehension he mentioned several European countries, and as a matter of fact, at this very meeting of the society, missionaries were actually appointed to several of these countries. Henry S. Earle was appointed to England, J. S. Lamar to Italy, Professor C. L. Loos was soon asked to go to Germany, and Dr. A. Hoick to Denmark.

It was evidently the intention, from the very beginning, to evangelise some of the countries of Europe, as well as countries in heathen lands; but it is freely conceded that heathen missions chiefly occupied the thought of those who were managing the society in its early days. Missions were established in England, France, Denmark, and Sweden. Both Mr. Lamar and Professor Loos felt it impossible for them to go to the countries to which they had been appointed.

Doubtless the mission in England was stimulated largely by two considerations. First of all, it was felt that the Restoration movement in England had been largely handicapped by a narrow, impracticable policy, and that this policy was growing worse and worse, owing to the kind of leadership which the movement in that country had.

Reference has already been made to the letters of David King, written to the American churches, in which he severely criticised these churches for practising what he called “open communion,” and other things which he regarded as extremely objectionable. It was believed, therefore, that if some American evangelist could visit England, a more liberal spirit of the brethren there might be the result.

This view of the matter was accentuated by the fact that a number of brethren in that country had been, and were still, calling for American evangelists to help them with their work there. In the spirit of real helpfulness American evangelists were sent, but it was soon found that Mr. King’s influence, through his magazine, made it next to impossible for these evangelists to have hearty co-operation with the brethren in England and Scotland. However, there were some who refused to be bound by Mr. King’s advice, and these formed a nucleus for the organization of churches that should be guided by a somewhat more liberal policy than that which had characterised the “old brethren,” as they were called. In
the churches which these evangelists organised the “police system” of the English brethren, in guarding the communion table and the contribution plate, was entirely abolished. As this was the main point of difficulty, the new churches were practically regarded by the English and Scotch churches as unworthy of their fellowship. It is furthermore doubtless true that the help which Timothy Coop, a wealthy member of the English churches, gave to the Foreign Christian Missionary Society had something to do with continuing the mission in England. Mr. Coop was for many years as narrow as any of the rest of his brethren, but a few visits to America had the effect of changing his views with respect to some things wherein the American brethren differed from those in England. Mr. Coop soon saw that one reason why the American churches had succeeded, while the British churches had made very slow progress, was owing to the fact that the American movement had not been loaded down with extremely narrow views and practices. He, therefore, plead earnestly with his brethren for a change in their policy. But they paid little or no attention to his appeals, and consequently he withdrew mainly his support from the British churches, and gave it heartily to the new movement, under the direction of American evangelists.

Mr. Coop was a very extraordinary man. He was perhaps the most generous giver among the Disciples during his day. Though not an exceedingly wealthy man, his gifts were munificent, and the more he gave the more he was prospered in his business, and the more he wanted to give to the cause which he loved so dearly. He fell asleep at Wichita, Kan., while on a visit to America, May 15, 1887, and was buried in Spring Grove Cemetery at Cincinnati, Ohio. His last hours are vividly sketched by Professor H. W. Everest, Chancellor of Garfield University, located at Wichita, in a funeral address, from which we make the following extract:

With such a life before us, concerning the death which was the end thereof, and which made it immortal in its beauty and power, we need say but little. The life is everything; the death is nothing; nothing, whether it come by the lightning stroke or by the slow approaches of a lingering disease; whether it break in upon the tranquillity of home, or bring
rest to a weary wanderer in a land of strangers. And yet, who would not like to know something concerning the last hours of this good man? About ten days ago he came into his own hired house, which stands in full view of the rising walls of Garfield University. By an almost special providence some of his family had crossed the sea and joined him there. Once more his wife and children were about him. He felt as though he could recover and would be permitted to carry out his plans, and yet to a friend he said: “I am almost done; almost through. If it is the Lord’s will that I should go, I do not want any one to pray that I may live—not even a week.” He expressed disappointment that he could not carry out his plans, but not a murmur indicated that he was not content. At first he could watch from his window the workmen at the University, speak of this and that element of architectural strength and beauty, and think, mayhap, of the portals and walls of the city of our God where the mansions are, and where he might soon find admission. Then he was unable to rise, and grew weaker day by day. For some hours he was a great sufferer; sleep brought him no refreshment, and he was tossed from side to side on the rough sea of death. At length nature’s opiate made him unconscious of pain, and then great quiet and peace seemed to have descended upon him. That room where this good man died, where the wife bent over his dying pillow, and where his children watched his slumber as he sank lower into the deep stillness of death, was a solemn place, a holy place, the vestibule of heaven. At four o’clock he opened his eyes as if to look once more at the faces that bent over him, and then gently closed them in the last long sleep of the grave. Gently he passed away, gently as if borne aloft by angel hands; as gently as the night yielded to the glories of another Lord’s Day. Then we remembered Him who brought life and immortality to light, and who said, “I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.” Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.*

To show how he was appreciated by the Foreign Christian Missionary Society, it is only necessary to give the following report of the Obituary Committee, made at the annual meeting of the society, held in October following his death:

Timothy Coop, the faithful soldier of Christ, the devoted friend of missions, has been called from a useful and consecrated life of toil on earth to the peace and joy of heaven. By his zeal in behalf of missions, and his large work through this Society, his name has become a household word in the

homes of the Disciples, both in America and England. His liberality was as great as the bounty which Providence poured into his bosom. “The liberal soul deviseth liberal things, and by liberal things shall stand.” The Lord made him to increase in wealth, and he was neither an unwise nor an unfaithful steward. Princely as were his benefactions, they were inadequate, because only material manifestations of his princely spirit. Manifold were his good words, but his labours through this Society abounded. In its feeble beginnings, his wise counsel and his liberal contributions to its funds inspired a host to renewed and hopeful toil for the salvation of the heathen.

We have had great preachers, great teachers, mighty leaders of God’s hosts; but Timothy Coop was pre-eminently the great practical friend of missions, and as such he will for years to come be known in America and England and in far distant lands.

Timothy Coop, thy liberal hand lies pulseless on thy bosom; thy generous heart has ceased to beat; thy pure, manly face is no more seen in the assemblies of thy brethren on earth. Thou didst follow thy Saviour in this stormy world—thou hast followed Him to the heavens. Is it too much to trust that when the loved of earth, who had passed before him, waited for him at the portals of the skies and gave him a glad welcome, the Redeemer welcomed him too, and said of him as of Nathaniel of old, “Behold an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile”?*

The following incident, related by his biographer, will serve to illustrate the practical character of his mind.

On one occasion he was having an earnest conversation with a Baptist minister in reference to the design of baptism. The conversation took somewhat the following form. Mr. Coop wished to know of the minister how he would treat an earnest enquirer who asked him the way of salvation. “Suppose,” said Mr. Coop, “such an enquirer were to come to you, and tell you that he had been hearing your preaching for some time, and was now anxious to be a Christian, what would you tell him to do?” The Baptist minister answered by saying that he would tell him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. “But,” said Mr. Coop, “suppose he says he does believe, would his answer be sufficient, and would you require nothing else?” The minister answered that he thought this would be quite sufficient, and opened his New Testament to that answer as recorded in Acts xvi: 31. “Then,” said Mr. Coop, “you would require nothing else?” “I certainly would not,” said the minister, “for the passage in question does not require anything else.” “But,” said Mr. Coop, “if we read a little fur-

ther you will see that something else was done, for the jailer was the same hour of the night baptized, he and all his straightway.” However, the minister insisted that the answer he had intimated was all that he was bound to give to the enquirer, since that is all the Apostles told the Philippian jailer to do. Mr. Coop insisted that in this his friend was mistaken, but waiving that point he turned to Acts ii:38, and quoted Peter’s answer to the Pentecostians, and then pointed out that faith was not mentioned there as a condition at all. “Now,” said he, “we have here practically the same question asked, and yet faith is not a condition at all.” “But,” said the minister, “that passage is not applicable to an enquirer in these days; it was all right for the Jews, but it would not do for an answer to a Gentile enquirer.” At that time Mr. Coop was using the minister’s own Bible, and deliberately taking his knife from his pocket, he opened it and began to cut the passage out, when the minister caught his hand and protested. “But,” said Mr. Coop, “if the passage is of no particular use why not cut it out? Let us get our Bible down to the exact dimensions needed, and then we will know precisely what we have to do and what we have not to do.”

But the minister persisted that he would not have his Bible mutilated. Then Mr. Coop turned to the reply of Ananias to Saul, and pointed out to the minister that in this neither faith nor repentance was mentioned, and if his rule of interpretation could be trusted, then it was absolutely certain that all those passages where faith is not mentioned cannot be regarded as in any way related to the salvation of the sinner. Mr. Coop then went on to explain that in all such cases the different circumstances must be taken into account, and when this is done, he contended that there can be no even apparent contradiction. What was necessary in every case was to consider the particular point of view from which the answer is given, and then the failure to mention any condition or conditions of the Gospel is easily understood. And when the reason for the omission is understood, it will at once be seen that the conditions not mentioned are nevertheless binding in every case. The Baptist minister hesitated to accept this apparently logical conclusion, but at the same time he admitted that Mr. Coop’s method had helped him to open his eyes to a view of the matter he had never before noticed.*

Early after the English mission was established, an association of the churches was formed, entitled “The Christian Association,” and this has continued to the present time. For a number of years this Association has managed the mission in England, though the Foreign Christian Missionary Society in America has contributed

a certain amount of funds to the work in England. This was thought to be good policy, both for the work there and also for the best interests of the Foreign Society. It gave the English brethren a sense of responsibility, which they could not otherwise have had, and at the same time it relieved the Foreign Board from the charge which was frequently made in the early days of the mission, that they were giving too much attention to missionary work that was not in heathen lands.

The mission in England has not gained any large accessions, but it has had, in many respects, a very good influence upon the Disciple movement. Some noble men in England have been gained to the cause. Such men as W. Durban, E. H. Spring, Eli Brearley, Joe and Frank Coop, and others that might be mentioned are worthy of any cause. The present membership of the churches there is 2,237. The pupils in the Sunday School number 2,432. The society owns property in England worth at least $100,000. Besides all this, eight missionaries have gone out from that country to India and China, and as many more to the West Indies. A number of strong men have also come to labour in the United States.

While the churches there have not increased rapidly in numbers, the mission has been worth very much more than it has cost, and its liberalising tendency upon the old churches that were there before the mission was established has been very considerable, and it is hoped that at no distant day all the forces in the United Kingdom will be working together in harmony with a view to reach the best ideals of the Disciple movement. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the establishing of the cause in England is, after all, geographically in the wrong direction. Progress is toward the West. Light comes from the East, strength and vigour from the North, courage and heart from the South, but development is very generally westward, if not always in that direction. In view of this fact, the work in England may be regarded as a splendid success, seeing that the stars in their courses do not fight with an eastward movement.

Before closing this brief notice of the work in England, justice demands that some reference should be made to M. D. Todd and his good wife. They followed Mr. Earle, and located in the city of Chester, where Mr. Todd’s preach-
ing of the simple Gospel soon attracted much attention, and in a short time he organised a church there, which continues to prosper to the present time. Todd was a great teacher of the Bible, as well as a most logical and impressive preacher. He and his wife practically gave their lives to the cause which they advocated. The English churches will long remember their untiring and sacrificing labours.

In the year 1876 Dr. A. Hoick, a Dane by birth, opened a mission in Copenhagen. The society has two churches in that city, and both of these are under the direction of one pastor, viz., Julius Cramer. The first church has a building worth $25,000.00. There are two churches in Sweden, and twenty churches in Norway, several of these churches being the fruit of Dr. Hoick’s labours and generosity.

Soon after Dr. Hoick located in Copenhagen he began the publication of a paper, which turned out to be remunerative, and brought him a considerable income. This he generously used in supporting his work. He was a fine specimen of a true Christian gentleman, well-educated, intellectually strong, and in heart consecrated. He was also generous to a high degree. He went to his reward in 1906. It was through his strong personality and vigorous advocacy that the cause was established firmly in Scandinavia.

In 1877 a mission was established in Paris, France, but it did not prove a very great success, and was finally abandoned. It was under the direction of Jules de Launay, a Frenchman, who had been educated for the Roman Catholic priesthood. His wife was an Englishwoman, and the two laboured earnestly, but owing to great difficulties the mission was discontinued in 1886.

G. N. Shishmanian, an Armenian, who became a Christian in Dallas, Tex., began work in Constantinople, Turkey, in 1879. In 1884 Dr. Garabed Kevorkian, another Armenian, became a missionary at Tokat, in Asiatic Turkey. He is still there, and under the society ministers to a group of churches in that part of the Empire. Shishmanian gave up the work in Constantinople in 1904.

The work in India was begun in 1882. The first group of missionaries consisted of G. L. Wharton, Albert Norton, and their families. The society now has four stations
and several out stations, viz., Harda, Bilaspur, Mungeli, Damoh, Hatta, and Jubbulpore. The work has five branches: The evangelistic, medical, educational, the literary, and the benevolent.

For seventeen years G. L. Wharton had charge of the evangelistic department. He was located at Harda, and preached and trained a class of preachers. He fell at his post, having given twenty years of his life to the work in India. He was, indeed, a model missionary. As a pioneer of the work in India, he will take a place in history in the days to come scarcely second to that of Carey. The influence of his life upon missions cannot well be overestimated. Everywhere his name is mentioned as the most heroic and splendid example yet furnished by the Disciples of Christ in missionary work.

Another devoted missionary, M. D. Adams, went to India in 1883, and located at Bilaspur. He also teaches and preaches, and is to-day the oldest missionary among the living Disciple representatives in India. Others occupy this field also. For the whole of India the converts number 852, the children in the Sunday Schools, 2,036; the children in the day schools, 1,383; the people treated in the hospitals and dispensaries, 57,879.

The converts in India have a mission of their own, which they maintain and manage. This is under the superintendency of Dr. John Panna. He preaches the Gospel, heals the sick, and teaches the young. This station is at Kota, some twenty miles distant from Bilaspur.

The Foreign Christian Missionary Society entered Japan in 1883. George T. Smith and C. E. Garst and their families were the first of the society’s missionaries to go to that country. At present the society has missionaries in Tokyo, Osaka, Sendai, and Akita. In addition to these four main stations, work is carried on at Fukushima, Innai, Arakawa, Shizuoka, Honjo, Gose, Akozu, and Shonai. The Gospel is preached regularly at forty-one places, and at a greater number irregularly. In the nineteen organised churches, there are 1,620 members; in the twenty-five Sunday Schools there are 1,620 pupils, and in the day schools 371. The Society owns eight chapels, nine homes, and three school buildings in Japan.

The first missionary sent out to China by the Foreign Society was Dr. W. E. Macklin. He first went to Japan,
but afterward chose China as a mission field. He is a Canadian by birth, and received his medical education in Toronto and New York City. Just as soon as he could speak the language sufficiently, he established himself in Nanking, and called for reinforcements. He was joined that year by two young men from London, Mr. A. F. H. Saw and E. P. Hearndon, and by E. T. Williams and F. E. Meigs and their wives from America. The principal places occupied in China are Nanking, Shanghai, Chu Cheo, Wuhu, Lu Cheo fu, Chao Hsien, and Nantungchow, with a number of out stations. F. E. Meigs is president of Union Christian College, where many young men are being prepared for lives of usefulness. A college also has been opened for young women. Miss Emma Lyon is president of the Woman’s College. Miss Edna Kurz is associated with her. James Ware, H. P. Shaw, W. R. Hunt, and their families have their homes in Shanghai. Ware has been in China over twenty-eight years, and Hunt is one of the most efficient speakers among the missionaries of that country, having very full command of the language which he uses. Dr. E. I. Osgood and D. E. Dannenberg and their families are at Chu Cheo. Dr. Osgood has a hospital and dispensary, and both he and Dr. Macklin are considered among the most successful physicians in that country.

Another great medical work is being done at Lu Cheo fu, by Dr. James Butchart. In the year 1908 he and his assistants treated over 33,000 patients. The number of church members in China in 1909 is 714; children in the Sunday Schools, 650; children in the day schools, 346. The Society has bought or built thirteen homes, five chapels, and four schools.

In March, 1897, the Society extended its work into Africa. Two missionaries, E. E. Faris, of Dallas, Tex., and Dr. H. N. Biddle, of Cincinnati, Ohio. After visiting several places, they finally settled at Bolenge. As a specimen of religious courtesy and brotherliness, it is worth stating that the Baptists agreed to vacate that part of the continent, and also sold their buildings to the new mission for less than half the original cost. A wonderful work is now being carried on at Bolenge under the superintendence of Dr. R. J. and Mrs. Dye, A. F. and Mrs. Hensey, Dr. W. C. Widowson, and Miss Katherine Blackburn.
Charles P. Hedges and E. R. and Mrs. Moon are recent additions. The work at this place seems almost miraculous. The Sunday School has 1,500 enrolled. The church has 561 members, and these members come from fifty towns and villages. The Endeavour Society has 900 members. Of the membership of this church, fifty-two are evangelists. Every nine members support the tenth as a missionary. These workers hazard their lives for the Lord Jesus. They go among the savages and cannibals with the Gospel message, and never know whether they shall return again in the flesh. The whole mission is a veritable beehive of activity. About 10,000 sick are treated by Dr. Dye and his staff each year. The schools that have been opened are well attended. A definite literature is being created. The four Gospels and some of the Epistles have been translated. A hymnbook and several schoolbooks have been prepared; and all this among a people who are simple, untutored savages. They have no written grammar. They have no words for “believe,” “repent,” “confess,” “virgin,” and many other important words that must be used in preaching the Gospel. From this fact will readily be seen what a difficult problem these missionaries have before them to solve, and yet the success of this mission is phenomenal, the present outlook being encouraging beyond all reasonable expectation.

The Society has also entered Cuba. In 1899 L. C. McPherson and Melvin Menges and their families located in Havana. The work there is successful, but the problem is a very different one from what it is in a heathen land. In Cuba they have to deal with an old, fossilised Catholicism, rather than the religions of heathendom.

A. E. Cory and wife were the first missionaries to enter Honolulu. They went there in 1900. C. C. Wilson and wife were in charge at one time. G. D. Edwards and wife were there for some time.

The work in the Philippines is very promising. W. H. Hanna and H. P. Williams and their families were sent there in 1903, and others have since followed. There are now about 3,000 members in the Philippines, and thirty-four churches. The evangelists number 171. The prospects of this mission are regarded by the Society as very hopeful. In 1903 Dr. Rijnhart and Dr. and Mrs. Shelton entered Tibet. They made their home in Ta Chien Lu.
Dr. Rijnhart soon afterwards married, and has since died. Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Ogden were also sent out. Dr. Z. S. Loftis joined the mission in 1909, and his death is reported while this book is in the press. This mission is still somewhat of an experiment.

In March, 1909, there were 167 missionaries and 594 native workers in the employment of the Society. They work at forty-eight stations and 128 out stations. The churches organised number 117, and the members 10,435. Many have died and moved away; some have gone back to the weak and beggarly elements which they once renounced. The children under instruction in the Sunday Schools number 7,289; in the day schools 3,194. Some of these are being taught and trained to assist in the work. Great numbers of tracts and gospels have been sold and distributed. The patients treated last year numbered about 127,882.

Taking all the countries occupied by the Society into account, the following list gives the names of those who have fallen in the conflict: Mr. M. D. Todd and wife, Mrs. Durban, Dr. A. Hoick, Jules Delaunay, Mrs. Mollie B. Moore, Miss Mary B. Moore, G. L. Wharton, Miss Sue Robinson, Miss Hattie Judson, Mrs. Josephine W. Smith, Charles E. Garst, Mrs. Carrie Loos Williams, E. P. Hearndon, Mrs. E. P. Hearndon, A. F. H. Saw, Dr. Harry N. Biddle, C. E. Molland, Miss Ella C. Ewing, Mrs. Rijnhart, and Dr. Loftis.

The Foreign Society is an international organization. The churches and Sunday Schools of Canada have contributed regularly and generously from the first. The women of Ontario and the Maritime Provinces support Miss Rioch in Japan. The Eudeavourers of Ontario have paid for a dispensary in China for Dr. Osgood. England supports Dr. McGavran in India, and has sent Miss Clark to be an associate, and sends large amounts each year for the general work. Australia supports Miss Thompson and three native helpers in India: Miss Rose L. Tonkin in China, and P. A. Davey in Japan. Considerable money has been sent to China from the brethren beneath the Southern Cross.

The income of the Society for the first year amounted to $1,706.35; for the past year to $274,324.39. The receipts, year by year, as are follows:
There has not only been a steady increase in contributions, but in the number of contributors. The first year twenty churches responded to the appeal for funds; last year, 3,457. One hundred and ten churches are now supporting their own missionaries on the field.

A feature in these contributions is what is given on Children’s Day. This day, which was observed first in 1881, originated in the home of Dr. J. H. Garrison, of St. Louis. That year 189 Sunday Schools responded. In 1909, 3,742 Sunday Schools responded. From the first to the present time the Sunday Schools have given $858,563.00. The whole amount received from the organization of the Society from all sources is $3,348,649.00. Of this amount, about $500,000.00 have been invested in property on the fields.

Not the least benefit of the Foreign Society has resulted from the reaction upon the home churches. These churches have been stimulated to religious consecration. Indeed, it is the general opinion that the Foreign Missionary Society has done more than perhaps any other agency to cultivate the spirit of unity as well as benevolence among the Disciples, and that it is through this Society largely that the brethren everywhere have been stimulated to reach the best ideals of the Christian life. There is no doubt about the fact that the formation of this society marks, indeed, a red-letter period in the history of the Disciple movement.

The Foreign Society has had only three presidents since

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>$1,706.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>2,174.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>8,766.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>8,287.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>12,144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>13,173.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>25,063.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>25,004.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>26,601.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>30,260.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>61,737.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>47,757.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>62,767.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>64,840.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>67,750.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>65,365.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>70,320.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>58,355.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>73,258.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>83,514.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>93,867.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>106,222.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>130,925.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>152,727.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>180,016.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>171,898.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>178,323.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>210,008.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>211,318.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>255,922.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>268,726.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>305,534.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>274,324.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
its organization. The first president, Isaac Errett, held his place until the time of his death, 1888. He was succeeded by Professor C. L. Loos, who continued in the office until 1900, when A. McLean was transferred from the corresponding secretaryship to the presidency. He still holds that place. The active corresponding secretaries have been as follows: W. T. Moore, W. B. Ebbert, A. McLean, and F. M. Rains. Four years ago Stephen J. Corey was added to the force, and another new secretary, E. W. Allen, has just been selected. The Society has been a success from the very beginning, though its early years, as has already been seen, were marked by rather small results, as the policy of the Society was to move cautiously and modestly, so as to make every step sure.

The Society held its Silver Jubilee Anniversary at Kansas City, Mo., October 17, 1900. This was an occasion of great rejoicing by the friends of the Society, as the results up to that time were very encouraging. Several inspiring addresses were delivered, and much enthusiasm was manifested in view of the past history of the Society. A Silver Jubilee Poem was also read, from which we extract the following lines, as they vividly set forth the task and aim which were had in view by those who organised the Society.

What was the task when first our work began?
What aim had we? and what our working plan?
Our task: the alien world for Christ to take;
Our aim: from lost and ruined souls to make
A new world saved, and full of hope and love,
A reflex picture of our home above;
Our plan: to work in every lawful way,
No matter what our foes might think or say.
We felt no method could be far from right
That helps lost souls to see and feel the light;
While any method must be sadly wrong
That keeps the world in darkness very long.
With these broad views we launched our little boat,
Not knowing whither it by chance might float;
But trusting fully in the guiding hand
Of him who gave to us the great command,
To preach the Gospel to the whole lost world;
We then and there our noble flag unfurled;
And now it waves o’er many heathen lands,
Placed there by trusted, consecrated hands.
CHAPTER XXIV
THE C. W. B. M. AND OTHER SOCIETIES

THE Disciple leaders have usually been wise in their generation. They have seldom made any serious mistakes in respect to the progress and development of their movement. This one fact does much to put the stamp of Providence on their past history. Many times, while passing through a certain stage of their development, they have been severely criticised by both friends and foes for apparent mistakes which they made. But a clearer vision of all the facts in the case usually demonstrated that these critics were born out of due time. God’s ways are not our ways. When He is leading the forces, the dark days are just as important as the bright days, and sometimes failure is a most important step in the line of progress.

In the earlier days of the movement the women took no very active part in it. It is true they went to church, even more than the men did, and they helped to sing during the public services on the Lord’s Day, and also at the prayer meetings. But they were not encouraged to take a public part in anything else, though their private contributions to the collection basket were gratefully received by the “keepers of the faith.” Most of the brethren always remembered vividly Paul’s exhortation to the women to keep silence in the churches, and some of the brethren interpreted this to apply to every department of life, so that for a number of years the women belonging to the great movement, though really and vitally connected with it, were not expected to give vocal expression to the faith that was in them.

This was perhaps a wise disposition of the sisters during the earlier days of the movement. It was perhaps providential that they did not seek, during this time, any prominent position in helping on the work. The movement had to pass through several important stages, and
it would have been unfortunate if, in addition to several other disturbing questions, the woman question, in relation to the position she might rightfully occupy in the churches, had come to the front before the time was ripe for her to do so. However, soon after the war her great services in the church began to be recognised. She had been eminently useful in ministering to the necessities of the soldiers during the fratricidal strife, and a recognition of her usefulness became crystallised in the public consciousness that she could be a much more important help in religious matters than she had been in the days that were past. The women themselves began to realise that they had been practically ciphers in the Disciple movement where they ought to have been emphatically powerful in organising and developing the great work which had to be done. This feeling took definite shape, and became almost spontaneously active in the formation of the Christian Woman’s Board of Missions, during the General Convention at Cincinnati in October, 1874.

There had been some preliminary symptoms with respect to the organization of the women for definite general work. J. H. Garrison was the editor of the Christian, and he was one of the first of the editors to emphasise the importance of enlisting the women actively and organically in the missionary work of the Disciples. He wrote editorials upon the subject, and urged this important matter enthusiastically. Isaac Errett also encouraged the same thing in the Christian Standard. A few of the women had also given expression to the necessity of a woman’s organization that should become an effective helper in carrying on the great Restoration movement. Among the women who first agitated the question may be mentioned Mrs. Caroline Pearre of Iowa City, la.; Mrs. J. K. Rogers of Missouri, Mrs. O. A. Burgess of Indiana, Mrs. Joseph King of Pennsylvania, Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin and Mrs. R. R. Sloan of Ohio, Mrs. E. J. Dickinson of Illinois, and Mrs. R. Milligan of Kentucky. Perhaps the one who is most entitled to credit for suggesting and agitating the matter is Mrs. Pearre, who had some conference with Thomas Munnell, who was the corresponding secretary of the American Christian Missionary Society, some time before the General Convention at Cincinnati, in 1874. In response to her appeal, Munnell said: “This is a flame
of the Lord’s kindling, and no man can extinguish it.” From that time he began to write letters
to different persons, urging that some definite steps should be taken towards forming a
woman’s society, which should cooperate with the General Society in doing missionary work.
The result of these preliminary intimations was that the women held some separate meetings
during the Convention, in 1874, and finally decided to organize what is now known as the C.
W. B. M.

The first officers elected were as follows; President, Mrs. Maria Jameson; recording
secretary, Mrs. William Wallace; corresponding secretary, Mrs. C. N. Pearre; treasurer, Mrs.
O. A. Burgess, all of Indianapolis, Mrs. Pearre having recently moved there. A vice-president,
a secretary, and one or more managers for each of the nine states which were included at this
time were also elected, and these, taken together, constituted the Executive Committee. The
management of the work was given to those in and near Indianapolis, though non-resident
members were allowed a proxy vote on all matters of importance.

As soon as the organization was completed, the officers who had just been elected were
introduced to the General Society, and were given a cordial greeting, the following resolution
being adopted: “Resolved, That this committee extends to the Christian Woman’s Board of
Missions recognition and hearty approval, assured that it opens a legitimate field of action and
usefulness in which Christian women may be active co-operants of ours in the great work of
sending the Gospel into all the world. We pledge ourselves to help these women who propose
to labour with us in the Gospel.”

These were the conditions under which the Christian Woman’s Board of Missions was
inaugurated, and it must be confessed that this organization came to the front at what seems to
have been exactly the right time. The spirit of missions in 1874 seems to have been practically
in the air. The desire to do something in world-wide missions had taken possession of the
Disciples in a very emphatic way. So much so, indeed, that the feeling that the time had
arrived to go distinctly, definitely, and enthusiastically forward was practically epidemic. Of
course there were objections to both this society and the Foreign Society, which had its
beginning at the same time, but these
objections had little or no influence beyond cautioning the advancing columns to be careful, and not to advance too rapidly, so as to endanger the organisations, for at this time the Disciples had little experience in working together in any general way for the salvation of the world.

Looking at the matter from the present-day point of view, it is clearly evident to him who can comprehend all the facts of the case that the opposition to the societies, during the seventh decade, was beneficial, in the long run, to the life and efficiency of these organisations. No great enterprise has ever finally succeeded that did not go through the wilderness period of hunger and temptation. The needy days and the trial days of the societies, initiated in 1874, were perhaps the most important days in all their history; and the very fact that they suffered both from want and persecution helped to make them what they have been, an eminent success. Of course some will doubt the philosophy of this optimistic view of the matter. But as long as it is written in the New Testament that “all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose,” even tribulations may be regarded as working “patience; patience, experience; and experience, hope,” and this being true, the dark days of the organisations under consideration may well be regarded as the days of preparation for their usefulness.

But however this may be, it cannot be doubted that the C. W. B. M. has won the right to be called a most useful and important auxiliary society in carrying on the great work of winning the world to Christ. The work that has already been accomplished by this society must be regarded as almost phenomenal, considering the quiet way in which the means have been accumulated, the plans perfected, and the missionary work conducted. Without friction, without noise, without the slightest ostentation, these godly women have come together and quietly talked over their work, while they have encouraged one another and wisely provided for great things; and great things in the name of the Master have already been accomplished through their efforts.

The following constitution and by-laws will give the reader a clear understanding of the purpose and scope of this very effective organization:
CONSTITUTION

These Articles of Association Witness:

That we, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together, for ourselves and our associates and successors, and have formed an association or corporation under the laws of the State of Indiana, United States of America.

ARTICLE I.

This Association shall be known as “The Christian Woman’s Board of Missions,” and under this name shall be fully established and shall have its legal location in the city of Indianapolis, county of Marion, State of Indiana; but it shall have power to meet and transact business at any place which shall be designated by the President.

ARTICLE II.

The object of this Association shall be to maintain preachers and teachers for religious instruction, to encourage and cultivate a missionary spirit and missionary effort in the Churches, to disseminate missionary intelligence and to secure systematic contributions for such purposes; also, to establish and maintain schools and institutions for the education of both males and females.

ARTICLE III.

Any person may become a member of this Association by contributing a sum of not less than five dollars a year to its funds. Any one may become a Life Member by the payment of twenty-five dollars within two years in not more than two installments, or by the payment of five dollars a year for five consecutive years.

ARTICLE IV.

The seal of this Association shall be a circular disk bearing on the outer margin thereof the words, “The Christian Woman’s Board of Missions—Seal,” and in the center a representation of an open Bible.

ARTICLE V.

The officers of the Christian Woman’s Board of Missions shall be a President, a Vice President, a Corresponding Secretary, a Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, a Superintendent of Children’s Work. These officers, together with five resident members, whose terms of service shall be co-extensive with that of the officers, and the State Presidents, and the State Corresponding Secretaries, shall constitute the National Board, five of whom shall be a quorum, provided it be a meeting regularly called, and provided not less than three of the five National officers be present, the absentee members being entitled to vote by proxy.
ARTICLE VI.

The business and prudential concerns of this Association shall be managed by an Executive Committee, consisting of the President, Vice President, Corresponding Secretary, Recording Secretary, Treasurer, Superintendent of Children’s Work, together with the five resident members of the Board. This committee shall have full power to do any and all things that are necessary to carry out the objects of the Association, including the employment of ministers, teachers, helpers, clerks, and agents, and the purchase and use of all appliances and instrumentalities needed in the execution of its plans. It shall have power to fill all vacancies occasioned by the death or resignation of any member. It shall meet regularly for the transaction of business twice in each month, and at such other times as may be deemed necessary by the President, who shall notify the members of a called meeting and of its object through the Corresponding Secretary.

ARTICLE VII.

The Executive Committee shall have power to create any fund or funds that may be deemed necessary or expedient to establish, and it may lawfully discontinue any such fund and close the account thereof: Provided, That all the stipulations, terms, and conditions are fully and strictly complied with according to the letter thereof, and according to the understanding thereof, upon which any and every donation or bequest shall have been made to any of the said funds.

ARTICLE VIII.

An annual meeting of the Association shall be held at some time and place designated by the Executive Committee, due notice of which shall be given, and the said Association shall, at such annual meeting, hear and take action upon the annual report of the Executive Committee, elect the officers and members of the Executive Committee and of the National Board, whose tenure of service shall be twelve months, or until their successors are duly elected. At the time of the annual meeting of the Association there shall be held a meeting or meetings of the National Board. The Executive Committee may at any time call for a vote of the National Board by correspondence. No measure whose effect would be to change radically the business methods or policy of the Association shall be enacted until it has been carefully considered by the National Board.

ARTICLE IX.

Any two or more persons may associate themselves together and form a local society, by adopting the Constitution and By-Laws provided for such societies by this Association; and every such society shall be auxiliary to this Association, and each and every such auxiliary shall be subordinate to the
Executive Committee, and shall be under the control and shall act under the direction of the said Executive Committee of this Association. Nevertheless, to facilitate the organization of such auxiliary societies and for the purpose of enlarging all the interests of the Association, State organisations may be formed under the direction of State Presidents and State Corresponding Secretaries. These organisations shall be subordinate to the National organization and shall act under the direction of the Executive Committee. Such State organisations may district their States and appoint a Manager for each such district, to direct the same work within the district: Provided, however, That the said Managers shall co-operate with the State Presidents and State Secretaries, who shall have the general oversight of this work of enlargement within their respective States.

ARTICLE X.

These articles may be altered or amended from time to time by the National Board, by a vote of two-thirds of the members, provided a notice of the proposed alterations or amendments has been filed with the Recording Secretary, and notice thereof has been given to all the members of said Board three months previous to the action; and such amendment shall go into effect when filed and recorded in the office of the Recorder in and for the county of Marion, State of Indiana.

BY-LAWS.

1. The Executive Committee shall meet for the transaction of business on or about the first and third Wednesdays in each month. State Presidents and State Corresponding Secretaries may attend these meetings.

2. The Executive Committee of the Association shall reside at or near headquarters.

3. The Executive Committee shall fix the salaries of all employed and officers, but it shall be lawful for the general officers to pay the same, to attend to remittances in payment of all bills or obligations created by the Executive Committee, and otherwise to give effect to what has been ordered by the said committee.

4. The President shall prepare programmes for, and take charge of, the meetings of the Board and of the Executive Committee; she shall countersign all obligatory documents of the same; and, with the concurrence of four or more other members of the committee, she may negotiate loans.

5. The Vice President, acting in the absence of the President, shall have full power to exercise all the functions appertaining to the office of President.

6. The Corresponding Secretary shall have charge of the office of the Association, and be responsible for the proper conduct of its business affairs; she shall there receive and attend
to all the official correspondence of the Association, including the receipt and acknowledgment of all moneys and the prompt deposit thereof to the credit of the Treasurer, and for the faithful performance of these duties she shall give a reasonable and sufficient bond; she shall file and preserve all letters and other papers of value in such manner that they shall be at all times accessible and intelligible to the members of the Executive Committee, make all notifications to officers and committees, and submit a monthly statement of receipt to the Executive Committee; she shall make an annual report to the Association of the general progress of its work, and in connection therewith lay before the annual meeting the recommendations of the Executive Committee. She may have such assistance in the performance of her duties as may be deemed necessary by the Executive Committee.

7. The editor of the official organ of the Association, the Missionary Tidings, shall be chosen by the Executive Committee.

8. The Recording Secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings of the Board and of the Executive Committee, and shall deposit the same in the office at headquarters; she shall prepare and sign all warrants upon which the money of the Board is paid out, and shall sign and affix the seal of the Association to all obligatory documents thereof; and she shall have the custody of all deeds, mortgages, instruments relating to bequests, contracts with employes, and such like indentures.

9. The Treasurer shall receive from the Corresponding Secretary all moneys contributed to the funds of the Association, for the custody of which she shall give bond, and shall disburse the same upon the order of the Executive Committee; she shall keep faithful accounts of the several funds of this Association, of which she shall make a report at each annual meeting. She shall also publish a quarterly statement thereof in the Missionary Tidings.

10. The Superintendent of Children’s Work shall have the general direction of the Young People’s and Children’s Bands, and she shall carry out in connection therewith the instructions of the Executive Committee. She shall make quarterly remittances of all moneys received by her, and shall report to the Corresponding Secretary quarterly the condition of the work committed to her supervision, and she shall also report to the Board at the annual meeting.

11. The State Presidents and State Corresponding Secretaries, in addition to their other duties as members of the National Board, shall have the immediate direction and oversight of the work of organization and development in their respective States; they shall take charge of State meetings, and may cause their States to be districted and Managers to be appointed for such districts, and, with the assistance of such Managers, direct the work of organisers. The State Secre-
taries shall report to the Corresponding Secretary quarterly the condition of the work in the several States.

12. It shall be the duty of Managers to co-operate with State Presidents and State Secretaries in the organization of new societies and the development of those already formed, and also to facilitate the work of employed organisers. The two officers for each State, acting with the Managers, shall be regarded and shall operate as an Organization Committee in connection with this Board.

13. In conducting annual elections a Nominating Committee shall be formed, consisting of one delegate for each State and Territory; each delegate may propose the names of those recommended for the offices of State President and State Secretary by her State, which, ordinarily, should be accepted by the Nominating Committee; and the said committee shall put before the annual meeting a full list of the Executive Committee, including the six official and the five unofficial members thereof.

14. All bequests and Life Memberships, unless otherwise ordered by the donors, shall be placed in the General Fund for immediate use. All money contributed in memory of deceased friends, unless otherwise directed, shall constitute a Memorial Fund, the principal of which shall be loaned upon good security, and the interest shall be used at the discretion of the Executive Committee in the home mission field.

15. These By-Laws may be altered or amended by the National Board at any regular or called meeting of the Board, provided such notice has been given to the members of the National Board as shall enable them to vote intelligently upon the proposed alterations or amendments.

The officers for 1909 are as follows, and the headquarters of the organization is at Downey and Ohmer Avenues, Indianapolis, Ind.

Officers:—MRS. ANNA R. ATWATER, President; MRS. IDA W. HARRISON, Vice-President; MRS. ANNIE B. GRAY, Recording Secretary; MRS. M. E. HARLAN, Corresponding Secretary; Miss MARY J. JUDSON, Treasurer; Miss MATTIB POUNDS, Supt. Young People’s Work; C. C. SMITH, Secretary of Negro Work; MRS. IDA W. HARRISON, Centennial Secretary.

Resident Members of Board:—MRS. EFFIE CUNNINGHAM, MRS. R. K. SYFERS, MRS. J. M. DUNCAN, MRS. FRANK WELLS, MRS. N. E. ATKINSON.

As a record of financial growth, the following figures, covering the whole period from the organization of the society to the present time, are surely very significant, and mark a growth which must be regarded as almost unparalleled in the history of woman’s work:
CONVENTION AND FINANCIAL RECORD

1874 Cincinnati: Collections during first Convention............... 1430.00

Receipts for
Year Ending
Sept. 30.

1875 Louisville......................................................................................... $770.35
1876 Indianapolis..................................................................................... 1,749.00
1877 St. Louis ......................................................................................... 2,033.77
1878 Cincinnati ....................................................................................... 2,919.42
1879 Bloomington .................................................................................. 3,551.24
1880 Louisville ....................................................................................... 5,050.96
1881 Indianapolis ................................................................................... 7,483.50
1882 Lexington ....................................................................................... 9,319.60
1883 Cincinnati ..................................................................................... 10,364.55
1884 St. Louis ....................................................................................... 14,418.55
1885 Cleveland ..................................................................................... 16,620.09
1886 Kansas City ................................................................................... 18,283.63
1887 Indianapolis .................................................................................. 26,226.01
1888 Springfield .................................................................................... 27,665.26
1889 Louisville ..................................................................................... 36,279.17
1890 Des Moines .................................................................................... 42,116.81
1891 Allegheny ..................................................................................... 40,973.87
1892 Nashville ....................................................................................... 48,222.68
1893 Chicago ....................................................................................... 51,232.06
1894 Richmond .................................................................................... 59,277.04
1895 Dallas ......................................................................................... 58,611.83
1896 Springfield ................................................................................... 57,622.20
1897 Indianapolis .................................................................................. 62,600.81
1898 Chattanooga ................................................................................ 68,185.87
1899 Cincinnati ................................................................................... 101,343.54
1900 Kansas City ................................................................................ 106,722.76
1901 Minneapolis ................................................................................ 135,441.58
1902 Omaha ....................................................................................... 139,034.00
1903 Detroit ....................................................................................... 147,086.85
1904 St. Louis ..................................................................................... 167,084.73
1905 San Francisco ............................................................................. 175,408.98
1906 Buffalo ....................................................................................... 206,553.12
1907 Norfolk ...................................................................................... 281,637.54
1908 New Orleans .............................................................................. 295,630.11

Total ....................................................................................................... $2,427,951.48

The Christian Woman’s Board of Missions is the only organised missionary work among
the women of the Church of Christ (Disciples of Christ). Naturally then their field is the
world. Home missions and foreign missions are alike to them the supreme object of their
existence.
“The love of Christ constraineth us” is the motto by which they are guided.

In this centennial year (1909) of existence of the Disciples as a religious people, the C. W. B. M. has in its auxiliary societies 60,000 women. It fosters the work of the Junior and Intermediate Christian Endeavour Societies and Mission Bands. It is true to the purpose of its existence,—“to cultivate a missionary spirit; to encourage missionary effort in the churches; to disseminate missionary intelligence, and to secure systematic contributions for missionary purposes.”

It has missions in Jamaica, India, Mexico, Porto Rico, South America, and a beginning work in Africa. At least half of its work is in the United States.

In Jamaica it has seven regular missionaries and fifteen other workers. Twenty-three churches, and a number of schools are under its care. In India there are twenty-nine missionaries, and a total of one hundred and seventy-two workers in churches, zenanas, schools, hospitals, Woman’s Home, and the four orphanages. In Mexico there are sixteen missionaries and a total of thirty-two workers in evangelistic and school work. Porto Rico has two orphanages, seven regular missionaries, and seven native workers in evangelistic, school, and orphanage work. Argentine Republic, South America, has two missionaries in evangelistic and school work. In Liberia, Africa, is one missionary with a school of forty-five pupils, and with evangelistic work.

The Christian Woman’s Board of Missions has evangelistic work in thirty-three states of our home land; university Bible work in the state universities of Michigan, Virginia, Kansas, and Texas; mountain schools at Hazel Green and Morehead, Ky., and Beckley, W. Va.; schools for negroes at Edwards, Miss.; Louisville, Ky.; Luna, Ala.; Martinsville, Va., and Jonesboro, Tenn. The oriental work on the Pacific coast consists of pastoral work and school for Chinese at Portland, Ore.; Japanese school at Berkeley, Cal.; Chinese hospital, school, and evangelistic work at San Francisco, Cal.; evangelistic work and a home for Japanese at Los Angeles, Cal.

In Indianapolis, Ind., the Sarah Davis Deterding Missionary Training School has just been erected. This is for the training of mission workers for the Church of
Christ, and is the first work of the kind to be undertaken by the Disciples outside of their regular college work. In this building are the headquarters of the national organization.

In concluding this brief sketch of this somewhat remarkable organization, it is only necessary to say that in all these fields where the C. W. B. M. has entered the work is progressing very satisfactorily. It ought also to be stated that in doing this work these consecrated women have fully justified their promise to work harmoniously with other organisations, which have for their object the salvation of the world. In several foreign fields this board has co-operated heartily with the Foreign Christian Missionary Society, and in some places their work is practically co-ordinated, so that they become mutually helpful in saving and educating the people. When the Recording Angel shall make up the estimate of work accomplished among the Disciples of Christ, not the least page will be ascribed to the Christian Woman’s Board of Missions.

It is impossible to record even the names of the noble women who have been prominent helpers of this society, and others who have been active in the Disciple movement even from the beginning. However, a few names must be mentioned. First of all, the name of Mrs. E. H. Tubman of Augusta, Ga., deserves recognition, who in the early years of the movement became identified with the Disciples, and continued to be a faithful helper to the close of her life. She possessed a large fortune, and was a most generous giver to nearly all of the benevolent enterprises of the Disciples. Such names as Mrs. Maria Jameson, Mrs. O. A. Burgess, Mrs. C. N. Pearre, Mrs. Sarah Wallace, Mrs. E. Shortridge, Mrs. Joseph King, Mrs. Elmira J. Dickinson, Mrs. Persis L. Christian, Mrs. N. E. Atkinson, Mrs. Louis White MacLeod, and Mrs. Helen E. Moses deserve a high place on the roll of honour among those who have contributed to the development of the C. W. B. M.

The last mentioned, Mrs. Helen E. Moses, was first corresponding secretary and then president until she died in 1908. Mrs. Moses was, in many respects, a remarkable woman. She impressed her personality upon all with whom she came in contact, and this personality was per-
vaded by a very influential spirituality. In a word, she possessed that indescribable charm which is always associated with close fellowship in the Christ. She lived in the constant companionship of Him who said: “I will be with you always, even to the end of the world.”

It would be a pleasure to record the names of a host of women who have been instrumental in helping on the great work of the C. W. B. M., but space forbids. However, their names are written in the Book of Life, and this is far better than to record them here.

During the latter part of the eighth decade of the nineteenth century the Board of Church Extension was created.

The Church Extension Fund was started in 1888 because of a great need. There were 1,628 homeless mission churches knocking at the doors of the National Convention, asking aid to build. There was one note that ran through all the appeals—“You have organised us into congregations through district, state, and national evangelists, but you have provided no plan by which we can get church homes in places where we cannot build except by some outside help.”

Secular loan companies would not loan money to help these churches build. They looked upon a mission church as a financial experiment. All Protestant religious bodies were found to have Church Building Funds. Hence the Disciple Church Extension Fund grew out of a necessity. In many cases where secular loan companies had loaned money to churches, foreclosure proceedings had been begun, and the mission churches were threatened with the loss of property worth three times the amount of the mortgage. Such cases proved the need of a Loan Fund in the hands of a board of brethren so that, when a struggling mission could not pay a mortgage, the property would not go out of the hands of the brotherhood.

The Church Extension movement primarily was a movement to establish congregations in the growing towns and cities of the West by helping churches to build at once. Therefore the National Convention of 1888, which launched this work, directed that the Board of Church Extension be located in Kansas City, Mo., because it was in the centre of the territory where most of the loans would be needed in helping missions to build suitable
church homes. There was need for the church builder to follow the evangelist and the church
organiser, while the waves of evangelism were sweeping over the middle West as the country
was developing. From Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Oklahoma, and Texas, and the new
Northwest, as well as from California, the appeals came thick and fast. At one time the
Disciples had over 2,300 homeless congregations.

Great demands also were coming from the growing cities which had hitherto been
neglected by the Disciples. At first the National Convention recommended that $500 be the
largest loan. But this was found to be inadequate. Then $1,000 was fixed as the largest amount
to be loaned on a property costing $5,000. But this kept the board from aiding cities, because
lots frequently cost $5,000 to $10,000. Then the board was recommended to loan as much as
$5,000 in cities, and finally the limit was taken off, and the board was instructed to use its
judgment in helping cities. The board has loaned $15,000 to help secure a $60,000 property on
169th Street, New York City; $12,000 to erect a $30,000 church in East Orange, N. J.;
$12,500 to rebuild the First Church in San Francisco, which was destroyed by the earthquake
and fire. By the help of the board splendid church property has been secured in Los Angeles,
Cal.; Seattle, Tacoma, and Spokane, Wash.; Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Toledo,
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Pittsburg, Boston, Baltimore, Washington City, Richmond, Columbia,
S. C.; Houston, Dallas, Oklahoma. City, Topeka, Kansas City, St. Louis, Omaha, Pueblo,
Denver, Salt Lake City, and a hundred other growing centres of population.

The Disciples are now in the building period in our cities, and the greatest demand is
being made upon the board to enter new wards in our growing cities. Our western frontier is
no more. The firing line is now in the city, and the frontier is the rapidly growing ward of the
city, and here Disciples believe they must enter while lots are cheap, and with their plea well
started shape the religious thought of these new communities. The smaller towns are not being
overlooked by the board, but the demand has been shifted to the long neglected cities, and
here the board must establish the cause or lose in the plea for Christian union.
Beginning in October, 1888, with $10,662.80, this fund has grown to over $715,000 on May 1, 1909, and 1,288 churches have been built, scattered through forty-five states and territories. These are the figures, but there is more in Church Extension than mere figures. By the encouragement of timely loans from this fund many a struggling church has been uplifted, better church houses have been erected, mission churches have received good titles to their lots in the beginning, they have been made more self-respecting by borrowing instead of receiving the money as a gift, and have been made self-reliant by paying the money back to go out and help other churches build.

In twenty years the board has loaned $1,516,500 to 1,228 congregations. These congregations raised two dollars for every dollar loaned by our board. They raised, therefore, about $3,000,000 for their own buildings and ground. They have done more than this. They have paid back on their loans $851,585.24, which has gone out again to help other missions build. In most cases they have supported pastors, and in twenty years these mission churches have given to all the missionary enterprises of the Disciples over one million dollars. These gifts were distributed well among all the missionary and benevolent enterprises.

For some time this Church Extension Board was an integral part of the General Christian Missionary Society, but recently it has become practically a separate organization, with headquarters at Kansas City. It was found to be inconvenient to the business of the board at home to send everything to Cincinnati for endorsement, and consequently the General Society granted the Church Extension Board the right to carry on its business, independent of the American Christian Missionary Society Board, though a certain nominal connection is still maintained, and the annual reports of the Church Extension Board will continue to be made to the Board of the American Christian Missionary Society.

It is now generally conceded that from the point of view of success this Church Extension Board is one of the most important organisations connected with the Disciple movement. From the foregoing showing it will be readily seen that the board is accomplishing a work which must in the long run tell wonderfully on the progress of the Disciple movement. Undoubtedly the building of perma-
nent places of worship is one of the most important matters connected with the movement. It is well known that had it not been for the Jewish synagogues, during the early days of Christianity, very little permanent progress could have been made during the first century of the Church. These synagogues furnished the basis for the early missionaries, and were evidently providentially provided for the very purpose for which they were used. They were of such striking help that it is almost impossible to believe that they could have come into existence, just at the time they did, without some Providential direction in the whole matter. But whether this be so or not, it is unmistakably true that these synagogues were most important factors in the propagation of Christianity during its early history. It is also true that any extension of Christianity which does not provide places where converts can come together for mutual edification and council will ultimately be of little value.

About the time of the organization of the Church Extension Board quite a revival in church building among the Disciples began to manifest itself in almost every part of the country. One of the first of the important church buildings was that of the Central Christian Church of Cincinnati, Ohio. This church was completed at the beginning of the seventh decade of the nineteenth century and cost, including lot, building, and furnishing, about $150,000. The audience room of this church is still regarded as one of the best to be found anywhere among Disciple churches. Other buildings soon followed this until it has come to pass that nearly all the old buildings, that were in existence before the Civil War, have now been replaced by beautiful modern structures. This revival in church building not only shows an improved taste among the Disciples, but it also accounts for some of their backwardness in giving to the public enterprises of the movement. In most cases these churches have been built at considerable sacrifice on the part of the local members, and in many cases a debt has been contracted which has had to be met by a sinking fund which has entailed upon the respective congregations heavy financial responsibilities for each year. It may be that these local financial responsibilities ought not to excuse the church members from meeting obligations in other directions, but
undoubtedly these church debts have stood very much in the way of supporting many of the general enterprises, such as missionary societies, colleges, and charitable institutions.

While the Disciples have numerically grown very rapidly, and have also increased even more rapidly in the accumulation of wealth, at the same time they have been much absorbed in developing the local churches, and especially the building of new church edifices. All of this has incurred heavy expenses at home, and has consequently hindered the giving for work away from home. Nevertheless, it is just through this very period of revival in church building that the Foreign Christian Missionary Society has had its phenomenal growth. This society seems to have been exempted from the excuse-making which the building of church edifices has made popular. However this may be, it is certain that the Disciple congregations are now fairly well equipped with good houses, wherever they have any substantial footing at all. It has already been remarked that they are rapidly extending their influence in the cities, and in doing so they are building permanent and often fine church edifices in which to house their people. Recently some of the most handsome church buildings to be found anywhere in the United States have been erected by Disciple congregations. The Union Avenue Church in St. Louis perhaps leads in this respect, though very elegant structures have been built in Kansas City, Mo., and Independence, Mo., while in many other cities very great advance has been made in the matter of church building.

The Disciples were somewhat late in attempting organised work not immediately connected with their special propaganda. It is easy to see why they kept close to the main principles of their plea, and especially with regard to what they have called “First Principles.” A large portion of their work has been the correction of misconceptions, wrong practices, and unworthy ideals. It was perhaps impossible for them to undertake every department of religious work during the first hundred years. Indeed, it is a surprising fact that they have accomplished so much in so many directions; and yet there is one department of very important service which they did not attempt in any organised way until 1886, at which time
the “National Benevolent Association of the Christian Church” was started. This Association was certainly not born out of due time. It was very much needed, and it came into existence in answer to this need. It is probable that this is the only way useful societies can find a place in history. Too many societies may become an evil. But the National Benevolent Association has already won its right to exist.

The fact that this Association was organised in the eighth decade of the nineteenth century is another evidence that the Disciple movement has always been equal to the demands of the period it has reached. It has seldom moved faster than was wise. It has generally been able to hold all the positions it has taken, and this for the reason that they were never taken until the opportune moment.

This is a new day for the Christian religion. It is rapidly leaving the doctrinal standards and centralising in Christ. It is practically ceasing to discuss the old questions, that once occupied the attention of theologians, and is now considering simply ways and means by which the teaching of Christ may be made practical in the affairs of our life. Helpfulness is now the watchword of every Christian body that is really making any worthy progress. Every religious organization which has not adopted this watchword is dying. The Civil War did much to turn the attention of Christians to the Christ-like spirit in helping the great struggling world in its most pressing needs, and in this respect the war illustrates what is often the case, that God brings good out of evil.

There can be no doubt of the fact that the time has come when the church or churches that succeed must become missionary, not only with respect to conversion, but also with respect to taking care of the converted, and especially taking care of those that are not able to take care of themselves. The primitive church was distinguished for this very thing. The disciples in many places had all things in common, and even sold their possessions and placed the money at the apostles’ feet, who provided for this money to be distributed as every one had need. The Disciples have not much more than reached the latter part of the second chapter of the Book of Acts. It has been said that, in their early days, they began at the wrong end of the commission, namely: preach-
ing the conditions of the Gospel before they took up the word *Go*, so as to provide for missions in all the world. But this is an unreasonable view of their history. At first, they had very few who could *go*, and for the most part these *went*, without money and without price, and preached the Gospel wherever they could get a hearing. When, however, they had men who could go, they provided for their going through the Foreign Missionary Society, and now their work in foreign fields is one of the most hopeful connected with any religious people.

However, they have at last come to the concluding part of the second chapter of Acts. This has been a favourite chapter with them from the beginning, as it is a clear revelation of how the kingdom of heaven was first set up, and the conditions of entering into that kingdom. It must be confessed they did not give much attention to the benevolent features of this chapter in the early days of the movement, except in individual cases. They could not organize for this work until the proper time had come. But the proper time has at last come, and now the proper association has been organised.

In 1887 the National Benevolent Association was chartered under the laws of the state of Missouri. Missionary work only was done in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and in Illinois during the first two or three years, while preparations were being made for the opening of the first home, which was ordered in January, 1889. This home was “for children only, until such time as knowledge of the association and its purposes, on the part of the brotherhood-at-large, should justify the enlargement of its work.”

The Christian Orphans’ Home was opened in February, 1889. At that time the officers of the association were Mrs. E. D. Hodgen, president; Mrs. J. H. Garrison, vice-president; Mrs. J. K. Hansbrough, corresponding secretary; Mrs. O. C. Shedd (now Mrs. T. K. Ayars), secretary; Mrs. L. A. Carlisle, treasurer, and Mrs. M. H. Younkin, missionary and general solicitor.

Two other improvements were made: It was found necessary to add a hospital department and the Babies’ Home, and in 1902 a staff of physicians and a corps of nurses were secured, and the name of the institution was changed to Babies’ Home and Hospital. The first Home for the Aged and Homeless Disciples was opened tem-
porarily in a small home near the Orphans’ Home, January, 1900, and in 1901 this home was transferred to Jacksonville, Ill., where a good-sized residence and two and one-half acres of ground had been purchased with a gift of $2,200.00 by Mrs. Nancy Henderson. The value of this property now is estimated at $19,892.38. A new and handsome building for the Christian Orphans’ Home has been erected, and this was made possible by a gift of $55,000.00 from Robert H. Stockton of St. Louis and the sale of the old property. The building was completed during the past year, and can now accommodate 200 children. This building, with the one already mentioned, namely, the Babies’ Home and Hospital, with the surrounding ten acres of ground, is estimated to be worth $130,000.00.

Havens’ Home for the Aged at East Aurora, N. Y., has been added to the Association’s list of institutions. This home was built by Mrs. Ursula Havens, and was deeded to the New York State Missionary Board, after her death, by her husband, Alonzo H. Havens, and was finally deeded to the National Benevolent Association in March, 1902.

In September, 1902, the Cleveland Christian Orphanage was established in Cleveland, Ohio. This property is worth $18,870.00. About seventy children can be comfortably cared for in it.

In 1904 two institutions were added to the Association property. Through the generous gift of Mr. and Mrs. Warren of Loveland, Col., 219 acres of fine land, supplemented by a gift of $500.00 from J. N. Cobb, together with $3,000.00 bequeathed by Mrs. Mary McMillan, the Association was enabled to erect the Memorial Cottage. This cottage was dedicated in 1904. After about three years it was decided, for the sake of the greater advantages and convenience which a large city can give in many ways, to move the home to Denver, where it is now caring for about twenty children in a rented house, while a commodious building is in process of erection on a ten-acre tract in the best suburbs of the city of Denver. The buildings of the Association for the Colorado home are worth $25,000.00. In July, 1904, the Julliaette Fowler Home, near Dallas, Tex., became a part of the National Association’s property. The estimated value of this home is $23,000.00.

The youngest of the Association’s family of orphan
homes is the Southeastern Christian Home at Baldwin, Ga. This is valued at $4,350.00. This home is to be moved to Atlanta.

In 1905 the board decided to purchase a hospital property in Valparaiso, Ind., which property is worth $13,000.00. The Home for the Aged at Eugene, Ore., was opened January 15, 1908. The Association has issued 166 annuity bonds for amounts ranging from $100.00 to $10,000.00. The holdings of the Association for its different institutions amount to $350,000.00, beside the monthly receipts for current expenses.

It will be seen by this brief history of the Association that it has already accomplished a great amount of good, and gives unmistakable promise of supplying a long-felt need in organised benevolent work among the Disciples. J. W. Perry is now the president, Lee W. Grant, the treasurer, and James H. Mohorter, general secretary. Mrs. Hansbrough, Mrs. Ayars, and Mrs. Mason, who have been with the Association from its inception, are still active in the work.
CHAPTER XXV

THE OLD EVANGELISM AND THE NEW

EVANGELISM, from the very beginning, has been a marked feature of the Disciple movement. This was altogether the most absorbing thought of the early pioneers. The new view of the Gospel which they received made the whole message very inspiring to the men who became identified with the movement before it reached the period of introspection. The first vision of the Disciple leaders was almost entirely outward. It was a vision of the world’s need, and they went forth into the world with a message of deliverance. The all-absorbing thought was to preach the Gospel in its simplicity and purity to the unredeemed masses. Later on the Disciples began the earnest work of introspection, and this compelled them to provide for self-preservation as well as evangelisation. But it is abundantly evident that for a number of years the preachers, and even churches, were engaged almost entirely in an effort to seek and save the lost. Doubtless this earnest spirit of evangelism was accentuated to some extent by the clear apprehension which the Disciples had of the Gospel message which they had to deliver. It was at this point, more than any other, where there was a striking difference between them and other religious people at that time.

It cannot be denied that the doctrine of conversion, as it was taught in those days by the denominations, was very obscure, if not almost in total darkness. The popular notion was that in conversion the sinner is wholly passive, and such passages of Scripture as the one which refers to the clay and the potter were constantly quoted, to show that no one could do anything of himself, but he was wholly in the hands of God, the potter, to be fashioned according to the Divine will. The usual evidence for conversion was the recital of some occult influence, either in dreams, feeling, sights, or sounds. But very rarely was
the Divine Word ever quoted correctly in support of any convert’s claim to acceptance with God.

In view of this state of things, it is not remarkable that the Disciples felt compelled to seek the deliverance of the world from this unreasonable theology. Their view of the Gospel was that it is a message adapted to man as he is; a message that man can understand, believe, and obey; and therein is his responsibility distinctly and emphatically emphasised. The Disciples claim that man is not responsible at all if he cannot act of his own free will, either accept or reject the Gospel message. They claim that in conversion the sinner, instead of being wholly passive, is wholly active; instead of conversion being something that is done for him, and in him, it is, as a matter of fact, something he does for himself, though he is influenced to take the step by the high considerations presented in the Gospel message. In short, this message is adapted to his needs, and pleads with him to be reconciled to God instead of his pleading for God to be reconciled to him.

This was practically a new revelation to the age, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century; and even at the present time there are some to whom this message is still a new revelation. But it is easy to see how it must have impressed the people in the early days of the Disciple movement, and also how it must have impressed the Disciple preachers, for it undoubtedly dignified their mission and accentuated their responsibility in a way that the old view could not do, no matter how earnestly the proclaimers of it may have preached to the world. But, however this may have been, the Disciples gave themselves up almost entirely, for nearly the first half of the nineteenth century, to evangelistic work; and in looking back over that period it is impossible not to admire the self-sacrificing spirit of the itinerant ministry of those days. Many of these men left their homes and families, and spent weeks, and even months, traveling from place to place, preaching in private houses, schoolhouses, courthouses, and even in the open air, under the forest trees, without money and without price, sometimes, indeed, without food enough to sustain their physical strength. Of course this was not true of all the evangelists at all times during this early period, but it was true of many of them, and it was
equally true of all of them that they were very scantily supported.

Considering the conditions under which they laboured their success was almost phenomenal. Of course they met with violent opposition. This was inevitable. Their message was a direct contradiction of the popular notions concerning the Gospel and the doctrine of conversion. It was practically turning things squarely around and beginning at the other end of the line. Those who did not accept the Disciple view of the matter felt bound to oppose it, and thus their preaching became a savour of life unto life or of death unto death. It either killed or cured. The issue was usually clearly defined at all places where the Disciples preached, and this one thing brought their preaching into collision with the leaders of many of the denominations. Their evangelism was consequently intensely aggressive, and could only succeed by overthrowing everything that stood in its way.

This fact will explain, as well as apologise for, much of the friction and opposition which the Disciples produced during the first half of the century in which they began their religious movement. Some have thought that these early preachers might have cultivated a less aggressive spirit, and consequently might have avoided much of the opposition and ill feeling which followed their preaching in the early days. But this conclusion is based upon a very imperfect knowledge of all the facts. Any compromise with respect to what the Gospel is, and man’s responsibility to accept it, would have been precisely equivalent to surrendering the Gibraltar of the Disciple plea. Undoubtedly, if their view of conversion, or, to put it in other words, their view of the sinner’s return to God, was not Scriptural and reasonable, then it followed that the most fundamental item in their advocacy was a broken reed, consequently their whole plea might well be regarded with suspicion. As the lawyers say, “A cause that is wrong in the beginning is wrong all the way through.” The Disciples felt that if their Gospel message was at fault then they could not be sure of anything else, since this message was the very foundation of everything for which they contended.

The method of this evangelism was very simple. Indeed, it is scarcely proper to say that it had any fixed method
at all. Every evangelist, in some respects, had a method of his own. Nevertheless, there were some things that were common with all the evangelists. After an expository sermon, in which the Gospel in its simplicity was declared, an earnest exhortation was made, urging believing penitents to come forward and confess their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, which faith was explained by the evangelist to comprehend a willingness to take this Christ as their Prophet, Priest, and King. A song was then sung, so as to give an opportunity to all who were disposed to come forward in order to make “the good confession,” and this confession was an affirmative answer to the following question propounded by the evangelist to each one that came forward: “Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God?” Nothing else was required in order to baptism, and consequently the baptism immediately, or soon thereafter, followed; and then, at the next meeting of the church, the hand of Christian fellowship was given to the new converts. This was usually done by the whole church coming forward, while an inspiring song was sung, and this service often presented a very happy scene to those who were simply witnesses. This same hand-shaking often took place when these penitent sinners came forward and made the confession. This, however, was explained to mean simply the hand of encouragement, a sort of assurance that the penitents were heartily welcome, while at the same time they were to be congratulated upon taking this important step in their return to God.

This simple procedure was a marked feature in the early evangelism of the Disciples. It will be seen that, so far as faith was concerned, all extraneous matters were eliminated. The simple proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, was the only thing presented to the candidate for baptism, but this must be accepted with all the heart.

As this was a radical departure from the usual requirements of the religious denominations, it was one of the points at which the Disciple propaganda was severely criticised. Sometimes it was claimed by the Disciple opponents that such a confession meant practically nothing, as everybody believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Disciples replied to this by saying that
the confession which they required went deeper than the mere admission of the truth as to the confession that might be made by many who felt no particular interest in trusting Christ for salvation. To believe in Christ with all the heart, so far as faith goes, is all that is needed by any one in order to salvation. But the Disciples also defended their confession on the ground that it ought to be simple, if it is intended for every creature, as the Gospel message evidently is, according to the commission which Jesus gave to His Apostles. They, furthermore, affirmed that nothing could be added to the confession which they required. They insisted that to add anything to Christ was like trying to add to the light of the sun at noonday with a “tallow candle,” and this “tallow candle” argument was usually quite sufficient to set aside all objections to the Disciple contention for the confession which Peter made, and on which Christ said He would build His Church.

Three things seem to have been very prominent in the preaching of the pioneers, and these have been more or less prominent in the preaching of the Disciples throughout their whole history, viz.:

(1.) Belief in a great person, Jesus the Christ, rather than the doctrines concerning Him, or any other kind of doctrines.

(2.) When men and women cried out, asking what they must do, they were told explicitly just what Peter told the Pentecostians, or in equivalent language, according to the circumstances of every individual case.

(3.) They were exhorted to accept the conditions prescribed without unnecessary delay, so that the same day, or same hour of the night, the whole matter was settled.

Of course it can easily be seen that preaching which eliminated all recondite philosophy and speculative theology, and that was concentrated in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, would be very effective with the masses. It was assumed by the Disciples that not one person in a thousand could be saved if the doctrines of the schools had to be understood before salvation could be secured. Then it was urged that nothing but a hearty faith in Jesus Christ is at all necessary, as He is the Saviour of men, and not doctrines or philosophies.

The people also were charmed with the idea that they
were strictly following the Word of God when they were told what to do in order to be saved. In the very language of the Scriptures all enquiries were answered. Of course the answers would vary somewhat as the circumstances were variable; but in every case a hearty faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, earnest repentance, a confession of this faith with the mouth, and then a burial and resurrection in the ordinance of baptism, comprehended the conditions of the Gospel as these were presented by all the evangelists attempting to preach the Gospel in the early days of the movement.

That this matter is stated correctly could be substantiated by innumerable quotations from the writings of the Disciples. But the following from Dr. J. H. Garrison, editor of the Christian Evangelist, not only furnishes the proof necessary, but is itself a sane and luminous statement of Scriptural evangelism, such as the Disciples have always claimed to advocate. After showing what the staple preaching was among the denominations in the early days of the Disciple movement, he says:

But leaving other religious bodies now to examine themselves, let us ask if we have attained to the New Testament ideal in the work of converting and saving men? None of us, we think, would make such a claim. Perhaps the chief lack is in depth of faith and religious experience. Preaching is such a strange blending of truth and personality that the higher the type of character which the preacher possesses, other things being equal, the greater will be the effect of the truth which he presents. The careful reader of the New Testament cannot fail to be profoundly impressed with the depth of sincerity, the unaffected piety, the entire self-forgetfulness, the directness and earnestness, which characterised the earliest preachers of the cross. They prayed for, expected, and received the guidance of the Holy Spirit in their work. They realised that it was not they but Christ working in them and through them that wrought the marvelous results which astonished men. They were not fanatics; they used their reason and common sense, but they lived and laboured in the presence of the unseen world, and its great verities were more real to them than the transitory things of this mortal life. We shall never fully restore apostolic evangelism until we restore men equally mighty in prayer, in the knowledge of the Scriptures, in the power of the Spirit, in the constraining love of Christ, and in the absorbing passion for the souls of men. We cannot overlook the potency of sanctified personality in the work of restoring New Testament evangelism.
There is constant danger of falling into a sort of perfunctory style of preaching which is void of life and of the power that moves men to action. The story becomes old to us and the tragedy of the cross loses its pathos and power over our own hearts. And then we are prone to fall into routine methods and stick to them with a pertinacity that impresses many with the thought that these methods are of divine origin and of perpetual obligation. It is a living gospel we preach to living men, and Christ, in making us free by His truth, expects us to use our freedom in applying this unchanging gospel to the ever-changing and varying conditions of humanity. We have fallen into a more stereotyped method of questioning candidates who come forward to signify their desire to be Christians than is warranted in the New Testament. The essential confession of Christ is presented to us in various forms, and we ought to exercise the same liberty to-day in adapting it to the needs of various classes—of children, of moral castaways who have been brought to repentance, and of religious people who come forward to render a more perfect obedience. The main thing is to be sure that the person making the confession is made to understand its import, and to commit himself to an unconditional surrender to Christ and to the duties and obligations of the Christian life. It can scarcely be doubted that the formal manner, in which the single question is sometimes put and answered, has created the impression on the minds of many religious people that there is something superficial, a lack of spiritual depth, in our manner of bringing people into the church.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid upon the importance of thoroughness in preaching. Men must be made to feel the awfulness of sin, the terribleness of its consequences, and then the way of escape should be pointed out, not in a mechanical way, but with all tenderness and love. Every semblance of legalism should be avoided. No man entering the church should be permitted to feel that, en condition of his doing certain specified things, God is placed under obligations to save him, so that there is an equal division of honour between himself and God, in the matter of his salvation. Every one should be made to feel that his salvation is a matter of grace, that what he is required to do is not by way of meriting salvation, but by way of appropriating the salvation which is offered freely, without money and without price.

Perhaps one of the chief errors in our evangelistic efforts has been the disproportionate emphasis we have laid upon the human side of salvation, that is, upon the things which are required of men in order to remission of sins, as compared with the divine side, or what God has done for us and must do in order to salvation. This is already being corrected. It came about in a natural way, since the human side needed the special emphasis at the beginning of our work. But conditions have changed, and a redistribution of emphasis is required. This
will add greatly to permanency of results in evangelistic work.

The great evangelists of the future, as of the past, must be men of profound religious convictions who know by actual personal experience the power of Christ to deliver from sin. He who knows this will not go far astray in presenting the claims of the gospel and in pointing out the way of salvation to sinners. Let us close by saying that there can be no restoration of New Testament evangelism without the recognition of our dependence upon God and His cooperation with us, of the value of prayer, and of the need of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the preacher. When these great facts are recognised we may expect, with our clear understanding of the message to be preached, which is Christ, and of the conditions of salvation through Him, that we shall raise up a mighty army of evangelists who will bring back to the Church the triumph and enthusiasm of the days of the apostles.*

It must be remembered that the Disciple movement aimed at restoring the ancient Gospel that had been lost, especially during the Dark Ages. It is not assumed that it was lost entirely. Some of the elements of the Gospel have been faithfully preached throughout the whole history of the Church. What the Disciples aimed to do was to restore the lost elements, and put them in their proper place. Looking carefully through the book of Acts, wherein are recorded the preaching and practice of the Apostles, the Disciples contended for what they conceived to be the simplicity and effectiveness of Apostolic evangelising. In the first place these Apostles evidently relied exclusively upon the preaching of the Gospel as the means by which to produce conviction in the sinner. They recognised that the Holy Spirit’s work in conversion is through the truth presented, and they therefore brought that truth to bear upon the conscience, so as to awaken the sinner and bring him into sympathy with their great message. Understanding the Gospel to be the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and having received a Divine commission to go into all the world and preach that Gospel to every creature, we find them in every place, and at all times, faithfully proclaiming the good news to all who would hear them. Disciples claim that we do not hear of any special meetings either for prayer or for anything else in order to make the Gospel message effective. They have never said that such meetings are wrong.

in themselves, but they have always contended that they are generally, if not always, misleading. Instead of trusting to the Gospel message, when faithfully preached, many modern evangelists seem to turn the mind away from the Gospel itself to something else, and consequently the Gospel message is practically nullified by expedients which are wholly human in their origin, and serve to weaken rather than strengthen the message which is delivered. Disciples have not objected seriously to modern enquiry rooms, when these rooms have been used legitimately; but they have contended that much of the instruction given in these rooms is crude, even at best, and is often a perversion of Scriptural teaching. When earnest souls are seeking the way of salvation, it is claimed that the answers often are vague and unsatisfactory. This is not the Apostolic style. When the Apostles preached the Gospel, and the people enquired what they must do, the answer was definite, in language which could not be mistaken. The enquirers were told precisely what the conditions of pardon and adoption were, so that when these conditions were heartily accepted there could be no reasonable doubt as to the position any one occupied. Every one could tell whether he had believed, repented, and been baptized, and when he was conscious that he had heartily done all these, he had then a right to claim with certainty the promises of remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, as well as the hope of eternal life.

Disciples have always claimed that much of the denominational teaching comes short of this. The enquirer is told to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and then, the remaining portion of the narrative, where this text is found, is apparently studiously suppressed, and the enquiring sinner is left with the understanding that a sort of sentimental belief in Jesus Christ is all that is needed, whereas, to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ with the whole heart is, not only to accept Him as the only Saviour, but to obey Him as the Divine Lord. The importance of this obedience is explained by the fact that the jailer took the Apostles the same hour of the night, washed their stripes, and was baptized, “he and all his straightway.”

In order to comprehend the whole teaching of the Disciples on this subject, and also to realise why they are so earnest in contending for what has been stated as their
view of evangelism, it is important to indicate very clearly their point of view with respect to the teaching of the Scriptures, and this cannot be comprehensively understood without a full explanation from the Scriptural point of view.

As Pentecost furnishes us with the first Gospel sermon that was ever preached in the fulness of the Gospel, it may be well to look at the whole matter under consideration from this “beginning at Jerusalem.”

In all our reckonings a well-defined starting-point is all-important. There must be no uncertainty as to this. Whatever obscurity there may be in reference to other things, we must have a clear conception of the particular point at which we begin our calculations. Anything like uncertainty here is sure to beget uncertainty at the end.

In view of this, there is no wonder that our risen Lord gave very specific instructions to His Apostles concerning the time when and place where they were to enter upon their great mission of preaching the Gospel. They were distinctly told that they must “tarry at Jerusalem” until they were “endued with power from on high.” Jerusalem was then the place where the Gospel, in its fulness, should first be preached, while the time was to be determined by the “enduing power from on high.” They were to wait at Jerusalem until they received the “promise of the Father.” And all this was in harmony with prophecy, as well as the antecedent facts in the history of the case.

Turning now to the second chapter of Acts, we reach the fulfilment of the conditions necessary to the preaching of the Gospel under the commission which the Apostles had received. In vain do we look for this fulfilment anywhere else. Here we find the place is Jerusalem, the time is when they have received the promise of the Father,—“the enduing of the Holy Spirit.” And as if to make the occasion more emphatic, as regards the starting-point in the history of Apostolic preaching, Peter is the person who proclaims the joyful message, and announces the conditions of pardon to the enquiring Pentecostians. His Divine Master had promised as much to him by conferring upon him the privilege of the keys of the kingdom (see Matt. xvi:19).

Let us now take our reckoning from this starting-point. And if we will carefully note everything connected with
this “beginning at Jerusalem,” we shall be greatly helped to a right understanding of the Gospel of Christ, as well as of our own relations to that Gospel. But if we are indifferent to the wonderfully suggestive history of Pentecost, it is impossible for us to have any clear conception either as to what the Gospel is, or what our duties are in reference to it.

It may help us to appreciate the importance of this Pentecostal occasion if, in the order of time, we approach it somewhat gradually. Stepping back from Pentecost to the scene of the crucifixion, what are now the facts in the matter of human redemption, so far as they have transpired? Simply these. Christ had come, had spoken, as no one ever before spake, had fulfilled His personal ministry on earth—during which He made known the great principles of His coming reign—and had offered Himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world.

Now, whatever was said or done in reference to salvation prior to the death of Christ upon the cross must be interpreted in the light of an incomplete history of the case. Were conditions of pardon announced? These must be necessarily limited, to some extent at least, to the period antedating the death of Christ for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and cannot, therefore, be used now as a full statement of the conditions upon which salvation depends with those who live on this side of the time when Christ was crucified. Hence, all Scripture spoken before the blood of the new covenant was actually shed was more or less prospective in its bearing; and when such Scripture had special reference to the pardon of sins, or salvation, it must be understood as only a partial statement of what we, who live in a new dispensation, have received in fulness. This must necessarily be so, since the greatest facts in the history of salvation—the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ—had not at that time transpired.

Let us now step a little further in the direction of the dispensation under which we live. Let us stop just this side of the resurrection. From this point, looking back, we observe a great change has taken place. The veil of the temple has been rent; the middle wall of partition has been broken down between Jews and Gentiles; a propitiation has been made for the sins of the world; the sting of death has been taken away; the grave robbed of
its victory; all power in heaven and in earth has been given to the triumphant Conqueror; and now He tells His chosen Apostles to “go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.” Or, as recorded by Matthew, they were to go and “Disciple all nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

Standing in the light of this great commission, we dare not rest upon those statements of Scripture which belong essentially to the time of Christ’s personal ministry upon earth, and which do not take into account His death, burial, and resurrection. The great commission, however, is the full statement of the Gospel as we have it on this side of the resurrection of the Divine Redeemer.

But even at that time they were not permitted to enter upon the work for which they had been commissioned. As already stated, they were to “tarry at Jerusalem” until they were qualified for their work by the Divine Paraclete. As they had received a great commission, they must now make no mistake in carrying it out. They must be “filled with the Holy Spirit,” so that what they do will be binding for all time. Surely we ought to be profoundly thankful for all this care! How wisely every step is taken! How secure everything is made! How definite are all the instructions given! How specific as to time, place, person, and circumstance!

At last the day of Pentecost has “fully come.” The time has arrived. The place is Jerusalem. Peter is the person. The conditions are all fulfilled. And now the Holy Spirit descends, Peter is filled with it, and is at once ready to enter upon his ministry. He does not disappoint his Divine Master. Jesus has been constituted “both Lord and Christ,” and Peter does not hesitate to proclaim this fact as the crowning part of his wonderful sermon; and when the people heard this (that is, that this same Jesus, whom they, with wicked hands, had crucified, was now raised up, and was constituted both Lord and Christ), they cried out, “Men and brethren, what must we do?” The answer was, “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”

Who shall say that the Gospel which Peter preached on
the day of Pentecost has not been the Gospel of the New Institution since that time? And who
will say that the answer which he gave to enquirers then is not suitable to the same class now?
If we take our reckonings prior to the day of Pentecost, or subsequently from Rome, or
Augsburg, or Geneva, or Westminster, we may be sure that a different Gospel and different
conditions will seem to answer to our purpose. But if we begin with Jerusalem, at the time of
Pentecost, and receive the joyful message as delivered by the divinely-commissioned Peter,
then it is simply certain that we are following the specific directions of the Holy Spirit sent
down from Heaven; and that when we answer enquiries as the Apostle did, we are pursuing
the only course which will give infallible certainty to those who are seeking the way of life
everlasting.

It will be seen that in this, as well as in all other Apostolic examples, there was something
so straightforward, definite, and intelligible as to act, time, and place—something so
satisfactory to the people who were addressed—that the same day, or the same hour of the
night, many of those who heard believed, obeyed, and rejoiced in the salvation offered
through Christ. There was no delay in order to satisfy certain imaginary conditions—no
waiting for power to be added to the Gospel to make it effective. The Gospel itself was the
power, and whoever rejected it rejected the only means by which he could be saved. This view
made the issue definite and clear, and drew a distinct line between those who were in Christ
and those who were out of Him, those who were His Disciples and those who were not, and
those who were children of God and those who were children of wrath. In view of this
clearness of doctrine and practice it is not surprising that the Apostle Paul could write to the
Colossians, pointing back to the time when they had been buried with Christ, and had been
raised with Him to walk a new life; nor is it surprising that the force of the aorist tense in the
Greek always gives us a starting-point somewhere in the past history of every Disciple, from
which he is enabled to reckon with certainty precisely when and how he entered upon the
Divine life.

The aorist tense is so important a factor in reference to the matter under consideration that
it is worth while to quote a few passages of Scripture where it is used.
Quotations are made from the Revised Version. Romans vi: 2, “died;” 17, “became obedient;” I. Cor. vi: 11, “were washed;” “were sanctified;” “were justified;” II. Cor. i: 21, 22, “anointed,” “sealed,” “gave;” Gal. iii: 27, “were baptized,” “did put on;” Eph. ii: 1, 5, 6, “did he quicken,” “quickened,” “raised;” Col. ii: 6 “received;” 11, “were circumcised;” 12, “were raised;” 13, “did he quicken;” 20, “died;” iii: 1, “were raised;” 3, “ye died;” II. Tim. i: 9, “saved us.”

Now it will be seen that all these references point out distinctly certain facts in the past history of the persons addressed with which these persons must have been familiar, so that the Apostle could appeal to these facts as proof of the claims which Christ had upon their faithfulness. It ought to be possible to make the same appeal to-day in the case of every one who professes to be a follower of Christ. But it is to be feared that many of our modern Christians have no distinct consciousness of any such experiences in their past history as those referred to by the Apostle Paul. This ought not to be the case.

There is another difficulty in the way of Gospel progress. Even when the Gospel is faithfully preached in all its facts, commands, and promises, there is often no such result following as we have a right to expect, in view of the success which attended its proclamation in Apostolic days. Why is this? Undoubtedly one reason is because our modern preaching is really not preaching but teaching. We may not do too much for the head, but we certainly do too little for the heart. True preaching is telling the story of infinite love in which there is a strong appeal to the affections. Of course the “eyes of the understanding” must be enlightened, but after all these eyes belong to the heart, and if the heart is not reached, vain will be all our efforts to move the people to action. Mark Antony, speaking over the dead body of Julius Caesar, moved the people to action when he had touched their hearts. The success of the Wesleyan movement was as much owing to Charles Wesley’s songs as to John Wesley’s sermons. We, in these days, undervalue the true source of power; but the preaching of the Apostles was successful because they recognised what we do not. Many preachers now spend their time in discussing theological questions which lie entirely outside the area of human need, and
hence the partial failure of the modern pulpit, which ought to be the centre of the most potent influences to be found anywhere in the moral world. The preaching of the Apostles was simple, straightforward, direct, and to the heart. The modern pulpit is abstruse, often lacking frankness, full of circumlocution, and mainly to the head; and herein we find a reason why success in evangelising the world is not commensurate with the amount of means and energy expended. But this preaching to the heart must not be confounded with illicit appeals to the emotional nature, which may be also a great evil.

This brings me to notice what Disciples have always regarded as a very common fault in modern evangelistic methods, viz., the practice of preaching to the multitude, rather than to the individual. They do not wish to be misunderstood when they make this objection. They surely do not mean that we should dispense with preaching to large congregations, if they can be secured. The Apostles had much of their success in addressing great multitudes, and it is probable there will always be men who can succeed in this kind of work, and where such is the case much good can be accomplished in this way. But in the Apostolic days every member of the church was a preacher to the individual, and consequently when the Disciples were scattered abroad by persecution, “they went everywhere preaching the Word,” and doubtless much of this preaching was to single individuals.

Philip preached both to the multitude and to the individual. He preached to the people of Samaria and also to the Ethiopian eunuch. In both cases he was successful; and there are still persons who can succeed in both these ways; but a large majority of Christians will do best by, confining their labours to one person at a time. But this is the work which very few care to do, and the result is that very little of this kind of work is attempted. We trust to our popular evangelists, and the men who can “draw,” while individual effort is practically ignored by nine-tenths of those who ought to be personally labouring for the salvation of the world.

The great commission instructs us to go into all the world, but it does not say that we are to preach the Gospel unto all the world; but when we come to the preaching of it, it is at once individualised, addressed not to the multi-
tude as a whole, but to “every creature”; or, in other words, the message is personally applied to each individual, as if he were the only person in all the world. Our Divine Lord gave special prominence to the value of the individual man. He taught that there is joy in heaven with the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth. Earth’s joy does not rise very high until the converts are numbered by the hundreds, but one sinner, returning to God, sends all heaven into raptures. It is this personality and individuality about the Divine method of saving souls which give that method its distinct originality, and distinguish it from what is human. We go out after the multitudes, but the Divine plan is to save the one man. We find our enthusiasm in the hundreds and thousands, but the angels of God are thrilled with infinite delight when a single individual is made to realise his lost condition, and to seek for pardon in the Blood of the Lamb.

The great need of the present hour, as regards this matter, is undoubtedly an earnest and hearty acceptance of the New Testament doctrine of individual responsibility. This should manifest itself in two directions. Each individual Christian should become a missionary to each individual sinner. Where any one is capable of addressing effectively large audiences, let him not fail to do so, whether these audiences are gathered in churches, chapels, halls, in the streets, market places, or anywhere else out of doors. But let this not excuse those who may labour from house to house, and from individual to individual. Let each Christian be instrumental in saving his neighbour, without waiting for some one else to do it. And Disciples believe that whenever this method shall be honestly accepted and thoroughly worked, the problem of saving the world will be stripped of at least half of its difficulty. They do not undervalue associated work. All their societies are perhaps necessary; certainly they cannot do without their churches. But these ought to emphasise individual effort, rather than minimise it. And yet they may well fear that the more they organize co-operative work, the more individual labour will be practically discontinued. This ought not to be the case. But I am speaking of what actually is, and I believe that no one who understands the present condition of things will
attempt to deny my conclusion. At any rate, the fact stated is a crying evil, and stands in the
way of evangelistic success. Christians must seek to counteract this tendency; they must fully
accept the responsibility of individual work; each man must attempt to save some other man.
In this way every Christian will become an important factor in preaching the Gospel, and the
consequence will be the dawning of a new life and a new hope in all our efforts to evangelise
the world.

So far, under this division of the subject, the practice of the Christian world generally,
without specific reference to any particular denomination, has been considered. Doubtless the
Disciples of Christ will say that they can heartily endorse the contention made with respect to
evangelistic methods. But the Disciples are far from being entirely exempt from blame as
regards the indictments made against modern Christendom. It is perhaps quite true that, in the
earlier days of the Disciples, their evangelistic methods were not altogether objectionable.
Even now Disciples are not liable to all the charges that have been made. In some respects
they work upon lines which are distinctly Scriptural; and in most respects they are able to
prove, by an appeal to the facts of their success, that their methods are at least not obsolete.
Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that they are rapidly tending toward stereotyped formalities
and doubtful expedients. It is furthermore perfectly true that some of these formalities are
practically interwoven with every page of Disciple history. It is necessary at present to refer to
only a few of the most pronounced evils which their false methods have produced.

The first, and perhaps the most common, evil which needs to be considered is what may
be not inappropriately called hypnotic conversion. In the early days of their Reformation it
was the proud contention of the Disciples that they appealed mainly to the reason, rather than
the emotional nature, in seeking to bring sinners to Christ. But how has the mighty fallen! We
have come to times when the preaching of the regular pastor is not supposed to be sufficient to
turn men to God; consequently an evangelist with hypnotic powers must be sent for to
influence the hardened sinners who could not be reached through the regular ministrations of
the Word. When this evangelist
makes his appearance it is curious to study his methods. The main effort is pitched upon the plane of the emotions; and sad to tell, the exhortations sometimes fall to the low level of the auctioneer pleading for another bid on the article he is proposing to sell. As the success of these evangelists is measured mainly by the additions they are able to secure, it is not altogether strange that by hook or crook a respectable number must be added to the roll of church members. This is necessary to give the evangelist a favourable introduction to the next church in need of his help.

Now let no one misunderstand these statements. There can be no reasonable objection to additions to the church. By securing these a church is built up more readily and effectually than in any other way. What may be objected to is the manner in which these additions are made. Did any one ever stop to think about the solemn farce to which attention is called? Then did any one ever estimate the actual results of such a protracted meeting upon the religious growth of the community where it is held? Additions are made, not by the Gospel’s appeal to the whole man—spirit, soul, and body—but by the art of manipulation, or the trick of playing on the feelings, or what is worse still, by a skillful use of hypnotic power. We ought to end all this unworthy manipulation of illicit forces in the great work of saving souls. The Gospel is still the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; and when this is faithfully proclaimed the work of the evangelist is finished, so far as bringing the people to Christ is concerned.

It need scarcely be explained that all evangelists are not included in the category here indicated. Many will be glad that some one has spoken out so freely. These do not approve the unscriptural methods to which reference has been made. There are evangelists and evangelists. For the better class I have nothing but praise, but for those who practise the arts of manipulation I have nothing but contempt. If there is ever a time when a man needs to be honest and careful in the highest sense it is when he is dealing with immortal souls. Nothing can excuse the hypnotic evangelist. He plays with the will through the influence of a human power which practically ignores the Gospel, except so far as the Gospel
is used in order to give a solemn sanction to what he says. He uses heavenly wisdom with which to make successful his earthly tricks. Surely the time has come when this trafficker in human credulity should be remanded to a back seat in the work of converting the world.

Again, it is more than doubtful whether the old method among the Disciples of asking sinners to come forward to the front bench, in order to make the confession, is any longer the wisest that could be adopted. It is probable that some regard this method as divinely inspired, in view of the fact it has been so long and so generally practised. But every one ought to know that there is neither precept nor example for it in the New Testament.

It always did seem to smack of artificiality, and I am more and more satisfied that it has come to be largely a perfunctory performance. Disciples have railed against the “mourners’ bench,” but they have substituted for this what they call the “front bench,” only they manage differently, when they have got their sinner there.

Why not change all this? Why not ask for expressions from the congregation while the preacher is declaring his message? Or, if no one interrupts him while he is speaking, why not, at the conclusion of the discourse, ask the people to rise in their seats, or to indicate in any other way they wish their willingness to accept Christ and follow Him. Present methods are too stereotyped. The age demands something altogether more flexible.

Nor is it necessary to sing a song while decisions are being made. As a matter of fact the song is quite an addition to Apostolic practice; but it is doubtless an element in the atmosphere that will usually help hypnotic influence. Let no one think that this characterisation is irreverent. I solemnly protest against such construction of my words. I have the most profound regard for every legitimate effort to persuade men to turn away from sin and accept Christ as their Saviour; but I believe that this cannot be properly done through many of the methods that are used by even Disciple preachers, to say nothing of the remarkable expedients resorted to by some popular evangelists of other religious bodies. Surely a new reformation is needed with respect to the whole work of evangelising the world.

This old evangelism was doubtless just the thing for the
day when it was used. Nor is it certain that anything better has ever been invented that is now
called the “new evangelism.” Possibly the new conditions of society require some new
methods in preaching the old Gospel, but the old Gospel must still be preached if any
legitimate and permanent results can follow. For several years the evangelism of the Disciples
has been undergoing a change with respect to methods, the real value of which has not yet
been clearly demonstrated. Mr. Moody was perhaps the first who systematised the methods of
evangelism and showed the effectiveness of organization in preaching the Gospel, as well as
in other things. He has been followed in some of his methods by the great evangelists among
the Disciples. The present plan very generally adopted is to arrange beforehand with the
church or churches where the evangelistic services are to be held, one of the features of which
is to have ready a number of persons who will make confession at the very beginning of the
services. Often as many as fifty or more make the “good confession” at the first service held.
These are, for the most part, members of Sunday Schools, and are often rather small children,
though well instructed in the step they are taking. Many Disciples are not quite satisfied with
this apparently perfunctory way of making converts. They are not sure that there is much
conviction or even repentance possible in this method. Nevertheless, if we are to know the
tree by its fruits, this method has not been tried long enough to determine certainly just how
these converts will stand the wear and tear of the Christian life. However, as the parable of the
sower contains, perhaps unintentionally, a very suggestive prophecy, it may be well not to
prematurely judge the results of a protracted meeting which is conducted according to the
most approved methods of modern evangelism. Evidently only one-fourth of the people
reached by the Word were permanently benefitted by the seed sown. Only one-half of these
would be regarded as thoroughly converted by almost any evangelist of either the old or the
new school.

With the Disciples their new evangelism is still on trial, though in any case their
evangelism differs from any of the denominations. With such men as Charles Reign Scoville
(who properly stands at the head of the list), James Small, Brooks Brothers, W. E. Harlow,
Herbert Yeuell,
etc., etc., to lead the evangelistic forces, the new methods will undoubtedly have the very best chance of proving their efficiency that is at all possible. Some of the greatest evangelistic meetings that have ever been held in the history of Christianity have recently been held by Disciple evangelists. Still, it must be confessed that there are certain drawbacks which should be reckoned with before unlimited praise can be given to the modern methods. Perhaps one of the most serious objections is not usually considered at all. It is this: Many churches do not now attempt evangelistic work at all, unless they can secure the services of some of these remarkably successful evangelists. Ordinary preaching for the salvation of souls is very far below par, and evangelists who do not employ the modern methods are themselves not generally employed. They are not wanted by the churches, and consequently a great many of the smaller churches, where evangelistic work is most needed, but where these great evangelists will not come, for the reason that they cannot be supported, are practically left to take care of themselves, with a very feeble ministry frequently, and with a very dark outlook with respect to their future. Many country churches are dying simply because they cannot afford to have a protracted meeting according to the new methods, and consequently they have no protracted meeting at all, and some of them are giving up these meetings altogether.

In considering the evangelists of the present among the Disciples, it must be understood that those who advocate the new methods contend that these new methods must be followed, or else success cannot be assured. No doubt there is something in this contention. But there are those among the Disciples who refuse to accept this conclusion, and these are “progressive” men, consequently their opposition to the new methods cannot be ascribed to any unwillingness to keep up with what is called the “procession.” This protest was very emphatically voiced at a recent congress of the Disciples by Earle M. Todd. His paper was a masterly discussion of the whole question of evangelism from the New Testament point of view, and a very trenchant criticism upon the extreme new methods which have been adopted since the days of Mr. Moody. It is claimed by very many that Mr. Todd’s paper criticised a phase of things which does not prevail among
the Disciples at all, and was, therefore, a useless and extravagant presentation of evils which no one among the Disciples would for a moment advocate. Nevertheless, there are not a few who believe that Mr. Todd’s paper, while somewhat overdone at particular points, was, after all, a necessary protest in view of the tendencies of modern evangelism among the Disciples. Undoubtedly there are dangers to be avoided, but there are dangers in everything where there is life. Life itself is a signal to intimate that there are always breakers ahead.

But, however this may be, it is certain that the Disciples are an evangelistic people, and nothing short of a vigorous representation of this feature of their plea will satisfy the yearning of the churches for aggressive work. This has been from the beginning a distinct characteristic of the Disciple movement, and it will probably continue to be to the end, for their whole movement means to take the world for Christ, and this involves an aggressive warfare on everything that opposes His reign.

As an evidence of the prevalence of this evangelistic feature of the movement, the following list of evangelists is given. It is not claimed to be perfect, as these men are occasionally changing from the evangelistic work to pastoral work, and pastors are entering the evangelistic field, but it is believed to be practically correct for the present year.

**ALABAMA:** Clarkson, E. R.

**ARIZONA:** Conder, J. Perry.

**ARKANSAS:** McCarty, H. A.; Mason, W. B.; Meyers, W. H.; Taylor, J. J.


**CANADA:** Stevenson, R. W.; Wade, A. B.

**COLORADO:** Stout, Chas. G.

**GEORGIA:** Clarkson, E. R.; Shellnut, E. L.

**ILLINOIS:** Davis, H. A.; Monser, H. E.; Scoville, Chas. Reign; Snively, Geo. L.

**INDIANA:** Alford, W. H.; Brooks, W. T.; Bulgin, R. R.; Canfield, J. M.; Carpenter, L. L.; Chappie, William; Clark Family (A. K., Mrs. A. K., and Susie); Combs, J. V.; Crabb, A. W.; Legg, T. J.; Sellers, L. E.; Shearer, W. F.; Small, James; Snodgrass, R. E.; Trucksees, F. E.; Wilson, Allen.

**IOWA:** Burton, B. B.; Carney, Ira J.; Chambers, C. E.; Curless, Eugene; Fuller, John; Liverett, A. R.; Lockhart, W. J.; McKenzie, J. A.; Martin, A.; Maxey, R. Tibbs; Newland,
J. S.; Organ, C. L.; Stout, Chas. G.; Wright, Lawrence; Youtz, B. E.; Zenor, W. H.

MICHIGAN: Arthur, F. P.; Bellingham, T. W.; Ice, I. M.; Varney, Chas. E.


OHIO: Higgins, Frank A.; Nichols, Roland A.; Vawter, C. R. L.

OKLAHOMA: Beach and Beach; Cameron, I. W.; Chapman, G. J.; Garner, J. W.; Greenwade, J. B.; Haddock, J. L.; Ingold, Oscar; Kindred, W. H.; LeMay, W. M.; Mason, Mrs. M. W.; Minton, J. A.; Murphey, Chas. P.; Newby, H. W.; Reborn, W. S.; Reynolds, H. A.; Sexson, W. M.; Smith, M. G.; Thomas, Geo. T.; Trimble, C. F.; White, Dr. J. E.; Wolfe, Geo.

OREGON: Jackson, S. W.

TEXAS: Harrington, Vernon; Harrington, I. Estelle; Webb, Polk, C.; Stevens, John A.; Boggess, W. A.
CHAPTER XXVI

EDUCATION AND LITERATURE

THE Disciples have always been friends of education. The very essence of their plea demands this. “Let there be light” was Alexander Campbell’s great slogan throughout the whole of his public ministry. He constantly attributed much of the influence of sectarianism to the ignorance of the people, especially with respect to the teaching of the Word of God. The founding of Bethany College was with a view to overcome this ignorance as far as this one college could accomplish that end. The Bible was made one of the fundamental books in the curriculum of study, while every branch of education that could throw light on the Bible, and that could be made available, was co-ordinated with the study of the greatest of all books.

It was not long until other colleges were founded. The life of some of these was of short duration, but a few have survived the struggles of the past, and are to-day giving evidence of renewed vigour and permanent usefulness. Recently some new colleges have been organised, and these also give promise of helpfulness in the field of education.

Doubtless some mistakes have been made with respect to the matter of education among the Disciples. The supreme independency which controlled in the organization of churches controlled also in the organization of colleges. For the want of some central directing superintendency every one was at liberty to start a college where he might choose to do so, and often a college was started at a particular place largely for the local influence it was supposed to exert upon the development of the town where it was located. This was unfortunate in some respects, but perhaps it could not be helped. Indeed, it seems now to have been the only way a college could be started in the days when there was no practical cooperation among the churches. Looked at from the present point of view, it
is remarkable that any of these colleges have lived. Many of them have certainly lived at a half-dying rate. They have received no substantial endowment. However, the time has come when there is a better outlook for these educational institutions. Some of these have received already a substantial endowment, though much yet remains to be done before they can take their places among the colleges that are well equipped and securely made permanent for usefulness.

The following list, made for the year 1908, embraces most, if not all, the colleges that have any recognition among the Disciples:

Some of these colleges have recently come into existence, while other colleges, not enumerated in this list, but which once had considerable influence, have been discontinued. However, it is worth while to remark that most of the colleges inaugurated by the Disciples are still in evidence in their centennial year. Undoubtedly this speaks well for the educational spirit which has characterised the Disciples from the beginning of their movement. They are still criticised by not a few for their apparent indifference to the educational problems which confront them. But there are some good reasons why this indifference exists. Perhaps it is not correct to say that it is indifference in all respects. The seeming indifference doubtless comes from the fact that there has been no systematic general cooperation with respect to educational matters. Individualism has been a characteristic of the Disciple movement in all that they have undertaken to do. Their educational work has therefore been fragmentary, sometimes their methods have been wasteful. A college has been started mainly because of a local interest in it, and usually in such cases most of the money invested in it would soon be exhausted, and then the college would have to appeal for other help in order to keep it from at once failing. But these appeals, even when responded to liberally, would furnish the means for only a short duration of efficiency, for instead of using the interest, as in the case of well-endowed institutions, all the money contributed would be used in keeping the institution going.

It can be readily seen that this method must necessarily lead to ultimate failure, unless a permanent endowment fund is secured. This is the rock on which many of the
colleges have been wrecked, and it is still a great danger to those that are now in existence. People become tired of giving to an institution when they know that their contributions will be soon exhausted in meeting the running expenses. Perhaps this vicious method could not be well avoided in the past history of the Disciples. It proved to be a hand-to-mouth method, but nearly everything connected with the movement was somewhat of this character, for at least the first half century. In the later days this defective method is not used where it can possibly be avoided. Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly true that none of the colleges, ostensibly under the patronage of the Disciples, have been supported in a degree commensurate with the demands of these colleges. Some contend that they have too many colleges. But this is doubtful. It is not that there are too many colleges, but that only a few of these are at all adequately supported, and even the best support must be regarded as almost infinitesimal in view of the real needs to be supplied. But as has already been indicated, some of these colleges are reaching out hopefully for worthy endowments. Doubtless, all these must be subject to the inexorable law of progress. The survival of the fittest will ultimately determine which colleges shall live and which will die. It may be that the managers of these colleges will regard this law as an unworthy test. They may be right in this, but all the same the test will prevail, and will ultimately determine the place that each college shall occupy.

Those who have been most prominent as educators are as follows: Alexander Campbell, president of Bethany College; W. K. Pendleton, president of Bethany College; Walter Scott, who was a finely educated man, was connected with several educational institutions at different times of his life. James Shannon was president of Bacon College, Harrodsburg, Ky., also president of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., and was president of Christian University at Canton, Mo., when he died. Robert Milligan was president of Kentucky University as well as professor in several colleges; D. R. Dungan was president of Cotner University, and is at present a professor in the Biblical department of Drake University, Des Moines, la.; P. S. Fall, a finely educated gentleman, was president of a female college at Frankfort, Ky., and was also connected
with other educational institutions; John Augustus Williams was the first president of Christian Female College, Columbia, Mo., and then president of Daughters College, at Harrodsburg, Ky. He was a distinguished educator. J. K. Rogers was president of Christian College, Columbia, Mo., for about twenty years, and was one of the noted educators of his time. B. A. Hinsdale was president of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio, for several years, and afterwards a professor in Michigan University. He was not only an educator in the college, but also in literature. He wrote several works of much importance along educational lines. S. K. Hoshour was president of Butler College, Indianapolis, Ind., for a few years. Robert Graham was president of Kentucky University, and also for a time was president of Hamilton College, and the College of the Bible, all three of these located at Lexington, Ky. George T. Carpenter was president of Oskaloosa College, la. J. M. Atwater was president of Hiram College, and also served as professor in Eureka College, Illinois. H. W. Everest was president of Eureka College, and afterwards president of Butler College, and then dean of the College of the Bible in Drake University. C. L. Loos was president of Eureka College for a time and afterwards of Kentucky University, where he is still a professor, though he has reached an extreme old age. Mrs. W. T. Moore was president of Christian College, Columbia, Mo., for the past twelve years. Other presidents, now serving, are noted in the preceding list of colleges. Perhaps other names might be added to this list, but those mentioned include the most prominent among the educators of the Disciples.

It has already been intimated that some of the colleges mentioned are beginning to receive an encouraging endowment fund. An effort is now making to add to the endowment fund of Bethany, at least, $500,000.00 during this Centennial year. It is believed that this amount should be placed at the disposal of the trustees of the college as one of the Centennial offerings in recognition of the great service Bethany College has rendered to the Disciple movement. Butler College, at Indianapolis, has also received a substantial addition to its endowment fund, and is already one of the best colleges among the Disciples, and has perhaps the highest standing of any for thorough
college work. Drake University, at Des Moines, Ia., is making very commendable progress, while Hiram College, at Hiram, Ohio, has just added materially to its endowment fund. Furthermore, Eureka College, at Eureka, Ill., has also received a valuable addition to its endowment fund, while nearly all the other colleges are more or less beginning to receive help somewhat commensurate with their pressing needs. Indeed, it may be said truthfully that the day of small things, as regards the colleges of the Disciples, is passing away. Their ambition was very great at the beginning, so much so, indeed, that it sometimes became ridiculous, such as calling what was little more than a grammar school a university. But even that apparently absurd way of styling things must be regarded as an evidence of the hope which the founders of these institutions had with respect to the future. These men ought to be honoured for the very absurdities which they committed, for these were committed in the name of a great faith which they had in their brethren to build up and sustain their educational institutions. It is a great thing to believe in success, for this is practically success half won. After Dean Stanley had returned to England from a visit to this country, in stating his impression he declared that he did not meet a man or woman in America that did not believe in the almost infinite possibilities of this great land. This fact illustrates one of the fundamental things in the success of the American people. America can never fail while the people believe in America. After all, it is faith that overcomes the world, whether that faith be a religious faith or some other faith. Infidelity is a death-knell to any enterprise, and pessimism always raises the flag of failure all along the pathway of human progress, and this flag will bring failure to every soul who follows its lead. Disciples may congratulate themselves that their heroic educators have believed in success even where to believe seemed almost folly.

While perhaps the apology made for some of the eccentricities, in the educational methods of the Disciples, is entirely just, it ought to be stated that the truth of history compels the further statement that the Disciples as a whole do not seem to realise the importance of their colleges. The most fundamental thing in their plea is mainly education. Their appeal has always been to a sanctified intelli-
gence, and their movement has gained its greatest victories where this intelligence has been addressed. This is the day of colleges and universities. Whoever does not recognise this fact is surely out of touch with the great progressive movements of the age. Undoubtedly the future of the Disciple movement will depend largely upon the wise use made of present opportunities to make their colleges what they ought to be. This is the vision of the most far-seeing men among them, and it is an encouraging fact that even the indifference which seemed to prevail for a time is beginning to give way before the onward march of progress. It may be that some of the colleges that are still in existence will not be found among the fittest that will survive, but it seems practically certain that not a few of the colleges that have been struggling for an existence, through many years and many disappointments will soon be permanently established.

What some believe to be a great movement in the right direction is the establishment of Bible chairs and colleges in connection with the state universities. This has become a very prominent feature in the educational outlook of the Disciples. Several experiments of this kind have already been made in connection with some of the best state universities, such as Michigan, Virginia, California, Missouri, etc., etc. In connection with Missouri University, a Bible college has been inaugurated, and very suitable buildings erected. This college has received considerable endowment fund. The Bible chairs have been under the supervision of the C. W. B. M., and the experiment, though not altogether satisfactory, is making some progress, and may ultimately prove to be a valuable asset in the educational system of the Disciples. It is claimed by the friends of these Bible chairs that there is no good reason for endowing colleges to educate young men for the ministry in the academic departments, as this can be done by the universities much better than by a half-endowed college for that purpose. Hence, the location of these Bible chairs at these state universities is believed to be, partially at least, the solution of the problem for the better education of the Disciple ministry. There are, however, certain drawbacks to these Bible chairs and Bible colleges connected with these universities. One of these drawbacks is that the students in the university are usually
pressed very heavily with their academic work, and have no time to devote to studies lying outside of the university curriculum, and especially as they receive little or no credit for work done in these Bible chairs or Bible colleges. The result so far has been that the students very generally hesitate to take up the Bible work offered simply because it does not help them in their graduation from the university. Another drawback is found in the fact that the Disciples are the only religious people who have availed themselves of the opportunity offered in this respect, and consequently their presence at the state universities is regarded with some suspicion by the denominations, and in a few instances their presence at these universities has been opposed, if not openly, at least secretly. The consequence is that this whole system is yet on trial, and may or may not be such a success as will justify the existence of these Bible chairs and colleges. It is easy to see the advantages of this plan, but the difficulties in the way may, after all, make the plan practically inefficient as a satisfactory solution of the educational problem.

The Disciples have been rather slow in creating a literature. The reason for this is not far to seek. During their early history they had very little use for books of a general character. They were most concerned with the Book. They appealed everything to the Bible, and consequently they studied this book as they did no other, and when they were well acquainted with it they felt themselves fully equipped for the great work committed to their hands. Nor was much else necessary. The people very generally read few books in the early days of the movement. Cultivation was at a premium, and every Disciple preacher illustrated constantly the old exhortation to “beware of the man with one book.”

It has already been seen that several magazines and papers were started at different times; most of these had short lives, but frequently did good service while they were able to live. The real period of Disciple literature did not begin until after the war. A few books had been written mostly of a controversial character before the war, but not until about the year 1865 was there much attention paid to general literature. About this time a new hymn-book was published; and this was regarded as one of the best books of hymnody in the English language. It suc-
ceeded a book published by Mr. Campbell. His book was the only one used by the Disciples for a number of years. However, another book was published by B. F. Hall towards the close of the fifth decade of the nineteenth century. But this book had a very limited circulation, though it contained some of the splendid old hymns which are now almost entirely unknown.

The environment in which the Disciple literature had its birth is well sketched by a recent writer:

“Fortunately for us, we were launched at a favourable period. Not to speak of the religious agitation of the early part of the nineteenth century or of the tendency of the better religious people to examine their standing, New Testament in hand, we are to be congratulated on the fact that our literature was in process of formation prior to the setting in of that period of modern science which has so shaken the faith of the multitude. May I add that the same is true in respect to historical criticism, as it would have affected the American mind. In the first quarter of that century there were no new scientific ideas, whether applying to Nature or the Bible, to draw aside earnest minds. Biology and geology as now taught were yet in embryo, and the battle of Moses and the myths had not yet reached the western ear.

What might have transpired had our life begun half a century later, no one knows. I have heard it said that Alexander Campbell in his last days was asked whether, in the light of new facts, he was still satisfied with his conception of creation. That conception can be best understood by noting one feature of it. He held that by a fiat of Jehovah the trees instantly sprang into maturity. His answer betrayed doubt of this position, but he was too near the end of his earthly life to tackle the problems of modern science. We smile at so crude a thought. But he laughs best who laughs last. Had this prince in Israel attempted such a revision as the evolutionist of the ‘60s demanded, who knows but that even he might have been thrown out of balance, giving to the world merely an ambitious apology for a personal God, rather than his great demonstration of the Christ. Valuable as any true knowledge must be to the student of progressive life, does a person really need to know scientific truth to secure a correct understanding of the will of God? Is there not a clear and ample knowledge of God to be derived from his Word, and sufficient for a full salvation? If so, a leader such as Campbell would surely be on the safe side to adopt it, and thus steer clear of confusion. For this man had a purpose and he did not propose to mar it by devoting his energy to a field which did not belong to him, or by indulging in idiosyncrasies. Progress to him stood for naught unless it led one into the kingdom of heaven. Sciences might be true or false, that was not his question. If false, he
would profoundly regret it and pass them by. He never dabbled with them. The course of our modern Theists, Monists, and Theosophists would have been abominable in his eyes. He would have spurned such samples of progressive thought. Far wiser is he, as a builder, who has the instinct to reject unsuitable material, chooses the choice stones for his arch, drives the keystone home, and thus clenches the whole. That was the way of this man of God.

It was an age of the grossest ignorance respecting the Word of God. In the cities, those who occupied the pulpits usually chose half a dozen words of Scripture, beating out a finespun, ethical essay, till one wondered as to the principle of interpretation by which such a store of revelation could be educed. In country churches and at school houses where meetings were held no man was considered in good company who did not cry out loudly for the Holy Ghost. Thus the very virtue of Christianity was frustrated by those who professed to esteem it. Every expedient and pretext was resorted to to keep out an intelligent conception of the truth. Every corruption of practice was devised to make the terms and names of the popular religion designate and sanction the will of God. Some of these teachers were honest, and thought they were doing God’s service, but the pall of ignorance had spread, absolutely, over them. Ignorance had so become a fertile breeding ground that prejudice came forth as native offspring. This ignorance could not annihilate the principle of religion in the spirit of man, but in removing the exactions contained in the Saviour’s teaching it left that spirit to take its own wayward course. The unenlightened mind threw a fictitious authority into its own phantasms, and into whatever elements of dogma and worship were preferred. Much was said about depravity in those days, but how could such gross souls know the essential nature of perfect goodness? Much as they might have resented the imputation, the fact is there is no more riskful depravity than arises from the corruption of truth. Here, then, was the problem for our forefathers. All about them were people who had never learned to think. Beings who had hardly ever in their whole lives made a real effort to concentrate the action of their faculties on anything abstracted from the objects palpable to the senses. Whose entire attention had been engrossed with the fearful narrations and frenzied exclamations of backwoods preachers; or who were easily led astray by the wiles of pulpit demagogues. It took a keen eye to detect the perverse cast in the exposition of the Christian faith, distorting and cramping it, as a foot in a Chinese shoe, but our leaders were equal to the task, at all times, and the course they adopted was replete with wisdom. It was their duty to give the bewildered conscience a rational direction, and in order to achieve this they gave to the people the Scriptures in their purity.”

There is one thing that needs to be corrected in this statement. Mr. Campbell never said that “by a fiat of Jehovah the trees instantly sprang into maturity.” However, he did say that by a fiat of Jehovah he could make these trees instantly spring into maturity, but he was always careful not to affirm anything positively as to Jehovah’s method in doing things, unless this method was clearly defined in the Bible. Mr. Campbell’s position on this subject was well understood by those who heard him in his morning class lectures in Bethany College. He had the most supreme reverence for the Bible, and whatever it said he said. But he was never known to add to the Bible in all his teachings or his writings. It is perfectly true that he did not go into the history of creation according to geological science. Geology as a science was not quite fifty years old when Mr. Campbell had reached the highest point of his intellectual powers, and it was scarcely known at all when he began his public ministry. It would have been the supremest folly if he had attempted to interpret the Bible in the light of modern science, for no such light was then available.

But the liberal extract we have given serves well to illustrate the condition of the people as regards literature during the earlier days of the Disciple movement. Even at the beginning of the second half of the nineteenth century the Disciples had not made much progress in developing a literature worthy of the name. Their magazines were generally filled with strong articles, but these were mainly confined to special subjects bearing upon their religious movement. Everything was subordinated to the plea which they were making. They practically knew nothing but Christ and Him crucified, and such things as essentially belonged to this particular message. Everywhere the preachers burned this message into the souls of men, and most of them utterly refused to give attention to side issues.

It must not be understood by this that the men of that period did not read anything outside of the Bible and the magazines of the Church. Some of the men could claim a considerable knowledge of general literature. Mr. Campbell himself was a wide reader, but even he confined most of his reading to the particular matter which he had in hand. He was a controversialist from necessity, and
much of his reading was with a view to equip himself with the facts and arguments necessary to meet his opponents. He was leading a mission, whose object was to overturn or break down all influences that stood in the way of a return to New Testament Christianity in both its faith and practice. His writings show rather a remarkable acquaintance with general literature, notwithstanding the busy life which he lived in a somewhat circumscribed environment in view of the special plea which he was making.

Walter Scott was also a man of fine literary touch. The same can be said of Dr. Robert Richardson. W. K. Pendleton was a man of very wide reading and of high culture, though he was not a writer of books. It is really a pity he did not put into permanent form what he could have so well accomplished. P. S. Fall was another scholarly man, and yet he did not write anything in the way of literature of any special permanent value. Indeed, it may be said in truth that the Disciples are just beginning to make a literature somewhat outside of their special theological contentions. This literature shows itself in several directions, although nearly everywhere in the end the direction is turned toward the special plea which the Disciples are making. Several important works have appeared of a biographical character, such as Richardson’s “Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” Lamar’s “Life of Isaac Errett,” Williams’ “Life of John Smith,” and Shackelford’s “Life of Dr. Pinkerton,” and other books of a like character. Some histories have also appeared, but are all confined to the treatment of the life, character, and progress of the Disciple movement. These histories are referred to under the head of Bibliography.

Sermonic literature and essays began to have a prominent place soon after the war, and this tendency was focalised in a volume entitled “The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church.” Devotional books have had a wide sale among the Disciples, and this is a sign of spiritual development which needs to be recorded. “Communings in the Sanctuary,” by Dr. Robert Richardson, “Evenings with the Bible,” by Isaac Errett, “Alone with God,” “The Heavenly Way,” and “Half Hour Studies at the Cross,” all three by Dr. J. H. Garrison, have had a very healthful influence in developing the spiritual life of the Disciples.
“Alone with God” is said to have had a circulation of over 50,000 copies. It has been thought that the Disciples have not given enough attention to heart culture. It has been said of them that if their heads were cut off they would have no religion. Perhaps that is true. But it would be equally true of the men who have made this sage remark. However, what is meant by this remark is worth while for Disciples to consider, and they are considering it in these later days of their movement. They have passed the period where the theological tournament was the best for exercise of the religious function, and the consequence is they are turning their attention to the production of a literature somewhat general in its character, but always helpful in cultivating the heart life.

In reference to the future of Disciple literature, I crave the privilege of quoting again from Mr. Monser’s informative little book. He says:

Literature is the gangway between separate and otherwise unapproachable bodies. It is the medium between the known and the unknown; between what is sure and what is possible. Yes, it is more. Even as the great ships tremble under their vast cargoes, bearing them seaward, and at last placing them on the wharfs of the world’s distant markets, so it is the province of literature to convey foreign ideas into the most remote and indifferent minds. Thoughts which were once unwelcome become, through this medium, the common property of man. Week by week, and day by day, these thoughts come, dropping upon us like flakes of snow, until they eventually melt and pass into the heart and life of men. We have a noted instance of this in the plea for Federation. Nothing, at first, could have been more distasteful to us. Tutored as we were in our peculiar idea of Christian Union, it was difficult to see any place for provisional measures. With us it was all or nothing. We were too impatient for results and too jealous for the truth, as we saw it, to submit to any conciliation. It was difficult for us to see another group besides our own, equally anxious for unity, but puzzled as to how to accomplish it. Had they enjoyed such a training in union as we had, it might have been easier for both to get together. But they did not. Such as they were, they were at work, and the impartial, generous eye could easily behold them across the chasm building this way. It could also be seen that they, like us, had chosen the spot where the least construction was necessary, and that, as in building a bridge, they had chosen the narrowest part of the chasm and were placing their buttresses solidly in the bank. So there were two groups, but one work. Each could hear the sound of the other’s hammers.
But both were labouring against environments, rooted heredities, and persistent educational influences. To close up the spans, therefore, while a noble ideal, seemed still impractical. And yet, if Farrar could entertain an eternal hope for the incorrigible, surely there must be some value in looking forward to the ultimate unity of the Church. A few earnest spirits so feeling and believing formed themselves into a pioneer corps and persisted. For a while it seemed as though this had stopped the work of the bridge. Nothing of the sort. It is simply the temporary taking up of an auxiliary labour. Both sides are at present engaged in removing obstacles and in smoothing the way. The tide of destiny seems setting in, for the forces are daily increasing in numbers and in interest. How is the new move affecting us? Is it making our love for Christian Union grow cold? Surely not. On the contrary, that love is steadily increasing. We are catching such glimpses of the future Kingdom of God as promise us great fruition. Only, let us not weary in well-doing; nor in the midst of prosperity become arrogant. God is at the helm and he will guide the good ship Zion into the harbour. “It may not be my way, it may not be thy way, and yet in His own way, the Lord will provide.”

There is perhaps nothing more marked in the development of the Disciples than their interest in both education and literature. Most of their modern preachers have had a collegiate or university education, and these preachers are educators in the pulpit, and there is no other kind of education more helpful to the common people than that which unconsciously pervades an audience that is dominated by a speaker whose every utterance is an evidence of genuine culture. It is affirmed that association is a great power in moulding character. This is no doubt true. But the power of the pulpit to mould character has perhaps never been fully appreciated. When we think of this power we associate it almost entirely with religious influence. This is certainly its chief aim, and it should never be diverted from this aim. Still the message of the Gospel has an educational influence as well as a saving influence. There can be no doubt about the matter that the primary object of the Gospel is to save men, but a secondary object of the Gospel is to make these men worthy of being saved. Education is an essential condition to true spiritual manhood, and there is no teacher whose influence is more powerful to educate than the preacher who speaks to his people two or three times during every week. His very gestures will have either
a refining influence or the contrary. This being true, how important it is that the preacher’s mind should be well stored with the best literature, and his heart full of the grace of God in order that this literature may be seasoned and in every way prepared to work its influence upon the souls of those who hear the preacher.

It is surely an encouraging feature of the Disciple movement that at least some of the well-educated men are beginning to write books, and these books are, for the most part, gaining considerable recognition, not only for their high literary quality, but also for the stimulating message which they contain. There is generally a freshness and vigour about the writings of Disciple authors that commend their books to those who are tired of weary platitudes, such as are often in books written simply for the sake of making books rather than for the sake of delivering a live, earnest, and influential message to the world.
CHAPTER XXVII

GOVERNMENTS, NEWSPAPERS, SOCIETIES, AND FEDERATIONS

THE average man likes to be governed. He will probably not admit this. If told that he is governed, he will instantly resent it. Nevertheless, he enjoys the feeling of irresponsibility which the exercise of authority over him imparts. Even a man who is governed by his wife will not seriously admit it, though he knows well enough that her soft words, where all authority is melted into loving tenderness, are doing the work for him in bringing him into subjection, although in a very formal way; and with strong words of protest he will declare that he is the head of the family, and that all talk about his wife ruling him is simply nonsense. But, after all, he fairly revels in the thought that some way or other he is not responsible no matter how things may go; at least this is how he feels when authority is exercised over him by some one outside of the family. When things go wrong he likes to be able to say, “I told you so,” and then to hide behind the man in authority and say, “But it is not my fault, I am in no way responsible.” Pilate used this same argument when he washed his hands and declared himself irresponsible for the persecution of Jesus. It is a cowardly way to dispose of the most magnificent gift that God has conferred upon human beings, but it is sometimes very convenient to shift responsibility from our own shoulders and place it upon the shoulders of others. It is an unmanly way to dispose of personal obligation, with respect to looking after important matters; but it is a popular way, nevertheless. Despotism, where it does not persecute us, is the most agreeable form of human government, because it makes every one else behave himself, while we may do as we please. Give some men their regular porridge and mutton chops, and they do not care very much who runs the government.

In view of this fact, is it any wonder that government by a newspaper is a possibility? A well-established and
widely circulated journal is undoubtedly a great power. This position is not easily reached, but when it is reached it is an influence which can stand against the most determined opposition. To build up a newspaper to where it wields a decisive governmental influence is no very easy task, but when it is fully established it is equally a difficult task to break it down, or even to circumscribe its influence. The editor has the ear of his subscribers, and very generally these subscribers believe in him, and are therefore converts to the policy of the paper which he edits. He can, consequently, count upon their sympathy and support, even where there is strong opposition to his paper, by many who do not believe in what it advocates. These friends of the paper will be excited to work for its circulation by the very opposition which is manifested to it, and what the paper may lose in support, in any given case, will be more than made up by new subscribers secured by the old friends. This fact alone makes a newspaper a great power, and the editor a great despot, if he chooses to exercise the authority of his position.

For many years Mr. Campbell was recognised everywhere as the most prominent leader of the movement with which he was identified. But his influence would have been much circumscribed had he not been the editor of the leading magazines among the Disciples. In the days of the *Christian Baptist* that magazine had all the authority of an oracle with those who accepted the truth it advocated; but during those days the Disciple movement was still in chaos, and consequently the *Christian Baptist* was doing simply a pioneer work. But from 1830 to the death of Mr. Campbell, the *Millennial Harbinger* was the medium through which he mainly spoke to the religious people who had rallied around the standard of Reformation, and finally Restoration, as the years went on. Perhaps the influence of the *Harbinger*, as an oracle, was emphasised by the fact that there was no close organic co-operation among the Disciples by which official authority was conferred upon any one. By a sort of common consent the *Harbinger* was supposed to indicate what ought to be done and what ought not to be done in all cases that came up for consideration.

It has been said that a monarchy is the best government when the monarch is wise and good. This was evidently
demonstrated to be true in the case of the *Millennial Harbinger*. Its advocacy was always wise and its counsel always good. It was, however, a supreme governor, during the period of Mr. Campbell’s mature manhood. Perhaps this was the very best that could have been done under the circumstances. It would have been unfortunate, if a number of journals had attempted to do what the *Harbinger* was doing so well. As a matter of fact, there were a few magazines and newspapers started at different times, and some of these were evidently inclined to share with the *Harbinger* in directing the movement. Others heartily co-operated with it, and never gave any sign of jealousy with respect to the exercise of authority. But there can be no doubt about the fact that, from the beginning of the movement to the present time, the chief authority in regard to all important questions has been the Disciple press. For a time the *American Christian Review*, with Benjamin Franklin as its editor, spoke the oracles for the movement; but when this journal became somewhat oppressive in its decisions to very many who did not believe in Mr. Franklin’s advocacy, they cried out for another paper to counteract the influence of the *Review*. This cry led to the establishment of the *Christian Standard*, and with a view to the balance of power the *Apostolic Times* had its birth. Finally, when Mr. Errett died, in 1888, and the *Apostolic Times* died also, at least in influence, having changed to the *Guide*, the *Christian Evangelist* became the embodiment of Mr. Errett’s spirit and advocacy, and has practically held that place ever since. While Mr. Errett was living, the *Standard* and *Evangelist* worked heartily together, as they represented practically the same view of the Disciple movement. But after Mr. Errett’s death the *Standard* became the exponent of a somewhat reactionary policy, and it has ever since. At first Mr. B. W. Johnson was associated with Mr. Garrison in the editorship of the *Christian Evangelist*. He was a scholarly man and also a vigorous writer. Under their mutual editorship the *Evangelist* soon occupied an influential position, and became the exponent of a liberal-conservative representation of the Disciple movement, and this position it has held up to the present time. Mr. Johnson died in 1894, and since then it has been edited by Mr. Garrison, who has shown great wisdom in avoiding
extremes, while at the same time his advocacy of the Disciple plea has been earnest and vigorous.

Of course there have been other papers in the field, and some of these have been ably conducted. The Christian Century, published in Chicago, and now edited by C. C. Morrison and Herbert L. Willett, has had a rather checkered career, at times coming very near to failure, but recently apparently taking on new life and showing conspicuous ability in its advocacy. It has always occupied a rather extreme, radical position. However, no papers or magazines that have existed, or still exist, since Mr. Campbell’s death, have been as influential in directing the movement as the Christian Standard and the Christian Evangelist have been. These two papers occupy somewhat different points of view, and though sometimes the antagonism between these two views is emphasised out of proportion, it is, after all, possible that both of these papers are necessary, while government by journalism among the Disciples is conceded. It may be that this kind of government is all wrong; but if it is not, then it is probable that each viewpoint represented by these respective journals should in some way be recognised in the management of affairs. It is claimed that we must have two great political parties with respect to our civil government. It would seem also practically impossible to avoid the same thing with respect to any religious movement; and if the right spirit is manifested by all concerned, there need not be any special fear that this is a great danger. The centripetal and centrifugal forces in nature are necessary to the harmony of the universe, and there is no reason why the centripetal and centrifugal forces in the Disciple movement should not contribute to the harmony and progress of the cause they represent. The only trouble in this apparent antagonism comes out of a bad spirit which is sometimes manifested by the respective advocates of the different viewpoints. But, however this may be, it is certain that the influence of journalism in the Disciple movement has been very great, and it ought to continue to be great; but it needs to be understood, and at the same time held somewhat in check by the people themselves who are, after all, largely responsible for what the papers advocate. Of course any paper may be dangerous if it has influence. Influence is always dangerous, though
is the only thing that is helpful, and when legitimately used it should be honoured rather than condemned.

Personal journalism among the Disciples is, however, passing away. It will probably not be long until it will be simply a matter of history. People very generally these days take a paper because it pleases them, though they may not know even who the editor is. Perhaps the last paper among the Disciples that will be a power, partly because of the man who edits it, is the *Christian Evangelist*, and no one need fear that it will go seriously wrong while its present editor is at the helm. Dr. Garrison is perhaps more distinguished for *level-headedness*, to use an expression which is at least descriptive, than for anything else. He is a conservative-liberal; while always advocating every legitimately progressive movement among the Disciples, he is nevertheless always helping to conserve what has been gained. His paper never advocates any extreme radical view, though it is in the front of everything legitimately progressive.

Recently the Sunday Schools of the Disciples’ have received much attention in both the *Standard* and *Christian Evangelist*. The *Standard* has led a movement in advocating the importance of Sunday Schools and the preparation of teachers for Sunday School work, though the *Christian Evangelist* has given much attention to the same advocacy. The two papers have heartily co-operated in this splendid work, and the result has been a phenomenal success in reviving Sunday School interest. The two papers have always advocated very earnestly the Endeavour movement, and the Disciples are now leading all other religious people in the per cent, of their contributions to this remarkable movement among young Christians. These facts show conclusively that whatever may be the respective view-point of these journals, it cannot be doubted that when they work together for the same end their combined influence is very great in directing the movement and insuring success.

With respect to the missionary societies, the *Christian Evangelist* has never given any uncertain sound. However, before it was started, for a time at least, the *Christian Standard* was the only paper that advocated unflinchingly the cause of the society. Recently, however, the *Standard’s* advocacy has apparently been somewhat half-
hearted, and it certainly does not stand where it did when its distinguished founder was its editor.

This government by journalism has perhaps been unavoidable in view of the fact that the Disciples have never had any organization of the churches which could speak for the whole brotherhood. The American Christian Missionary Society has been regarded, from the beginning of its existence to the present time, as the only organization which, in a sense, represents the whole Disciple movement. But even this has its limitations, for it only represents such Disciples and churches as voluntarily become associated with it; and though it has become a powerful organization, it, after all, has no authoritative function in dealing with anything that has to do specially with the churches. Furthermore, as each individual congregation among the Disciples is independent of all other congregations, and is bound to these others only by a common faith and a common fellowship, it is easy to see how the journalistic element became a powerful factor in directing the Disciple movement, and how it must continue to be in a Church where there are no officials who represent the whole movement.

For a number of years the American Christian Missionary Society has been a sort of central organization through which the general tendencies of the movement have found expression. This society has grown both in the strength of its influence and in the scope of this influence. It is no longer the weakling it was when the Louisville Plan was given up. Under the efficient secretarship of Benjamin L. Smith the society gained steadily every year, and now, under the secretarship of W. J. Wright and his associates, the society is moving toward great results.

Not the least of the results, contemplated in its progress, is the cultivation of the spirit of Christian union which has always been a great feature of the Disciple movement. In Canada, where the Disciple churches have been making considerable progress under the leadership of strong and valiant men, these churches have been cultivating very hearty fraternal relations with the Baptist brethren. In some places a union between the local churches has been consummated, and a very general spirit of fraternity prevails between the two religious bodies.
There has been also correspondence with other religious bodies of a very fraternal character, but the most hopeful indication, with respect to union, is that which shows itself in the mutual approach of Disciples and Baptists. Nothing very definite has yet been accomplished, but there can be no doubt about the fact that the old antagonisms are rapidly giving way, and many Baptists, as well as many of the Disciples, are hoping for the day to speedily come when the two bodies shall be practically one. The American Christian Missionary Society is taking the lead in this union movement from the Disciple point of view.

In October, 1902, the convention was held at Omaha, Neb. Prior to this convention there had been considerable discussion in the Disciple periodicals with reference to federation, but no very definite steps had been taken with respect to co-operation with the Federation movement. As it is very desirable to state the facts connected with the action of the Omaha convention exactly as they occurred, the following letter from Dr. Garrison, who was the mover of the resolution at that convention expressing sympathy with the federation movement, is given just as he wrote it:

DR. W. T. MOORE,

Columbia, Mo.

DEAR BROTHER MOORE:

Responding to your request of the 1st inst., the following is a brief account of the acute stage of federation among us:

Just before the Omaha Convention in 1902, I had a call from Dr. E. B. Sanford at my office in St. Louis. He wished me to present the matter of federation to our forthcoming convention. I said to him, “Doctor, why not go up yourself and present the matter to our convention? I will see that you have opportunity of doing so.” After a little reflection he said he believed he would go. Accordingly, he came to the convention and dined with me at the hotel in the evening before going to the convention. He told me the substance of what he would report, and I wrote out a resolution, which I thought common courtesy required, as an expression of our sympathy with the purpose of federation, and handed it to him to read. He said that would be entirely satisfactory to him. After E. L. Powell’s address on “Christian Union,” by permission of the President, I introduced Dr. Sanford to the convention, who made the following statement of the general purpose of federation:

“The movement this federation seeks to aid and foster is at its heart a missionary movement, spiritual and evangelistic
in its spirit and purpose. It desires to bring believers of every name who recognise their oneness in Christ into such cooperative relations that along lines of practical service and counsel they will most effectively advance the kingdom of God. This movement contemplates a vital linking together of forces that hold to Christ as the head; forces that inscribe upon their banners these supreme convictions:

“First. That the gospel affords a remedy for all evil; furnishing as it does redemptive power that can save both the individual and the society.

“Second. The Church, of which Christ is the Head, composed of those who, in loyalty of purpose, trust, love, and serve him, is the chief instrumentality by and through which this gospel is to be brought in saving power into the life of men and the world.

“Holding these convictions, federation is the recognition on the part of those who enter into it, of the essential unity that underlies denominational and all other differences.”

Following this statement by Dr. Sanford I offered the following resolution:

“Resolved, That we, representatives of the Disciples of Christ, in convention assembled, having heard with pleasure the presentation of the claims of the Federation of Churches in the United States, as urged by the national secretary, Dr. E. B. Sanford, do hereby express our cordial approval of the effort to bring the Churches of this country into closer cooperation and to give truer expression to the degree of unity which already exists, as the best means of promoting that complete unity for which our Lord prayed, and we pledge our hearty co-operation with this and every other movement that has for its object the unification of believers, to the end that the world may be converted and the kingdom of righteousness established in the earth.”

A motion was made that it be adopted, and the motion was put and carried unanimously, as I remember. J. A. Lord, however, was on his feet to speak before the motion was put, but was not seen by the chairman, and remarked that he had desired to raise the question as to whether the resolution was not a recognition of denominationalism. Someone moved that the question be reconsidered with the view of giving Brother Lord a chance to express his objection. He did so in a short speech, and then the discussion was on. There were several speeches made, pro and con, and the motion was then put again, and was carried by a large majority, though there was a considerable minority vote. The discussion created a good deal of excitement, but kept within parliamentary lines. It was taken up, however, in our newspapers and continued to be discussed.

At the Congress held in Des Moines the following year, I was appointed to deliver an address on the subject, and M. M. Goode, of St. Joseph, was appointed to review it. I suppose
this discussion created as much interest as any topic that has ever been before one of our public assemblies. It ended, however, by our reaching practical unanimity, for when the brethren came to understand each other, the difference was, as Brother Briney expressed it, “chiefly about definitions.” The matter continued to be a theme of newspaper discussion, however, until the Norfolk Convention in 1907. At that convention at a special meeting called for the purpose, a committee, which had been appointed during a former meeting of our Congress, made its report recommending that the basis of federation adopted by the New York Conference be approved, and delegates appointed to the Philadelphia Council. After some discussion the report of the committee was adopted by an overwhelming majority, and delegates so appointed.

This, I believe, covers the essential facts. You understand the nature of the discussion. Perhaps for no other position I have ever taken have I received more abuse and misrepresentation than for my defence of federation, nor have I ever taken any position about the correctness of which I was, and am, more absolutely certain.

Very sincerely yours,

J. H. GARRISON.

This action of the convention was unfavourably criticised by some of the Disciple papers, especially the Christian Standard, on the ostensible ground that the Disciples cannot consistently enter into such a compact as the Federation Council involves. Following this action of the convention, a long and somewhat tedious controversy was precipitated. It was claimed by the opponents of federation that the whole idea is contrary to the Restoration movement, and also contrary to the teaching of the pioneers of this movement. On the other hand, the advocates of federation insisted upon the fact that the action of the convention was in perfect harmony with the spirit of the “Declaration and Address” by Thomas Campbell, and was also in harmony with the views propagated by Alexander Campbell himself. It was not claimed by these advocates that federation is a finality as regards Christian union, but that it is a step in the right direction, and perhaps a necessary step before Christian union can be attained. They claimed, furthermore, that it is in harmony with the spirit of toleration which has come to be a very marked feature of the Disciples. Emerging out of the controversies which were precipitated during the war period of their movement, they have come to look upon the question of Christian union from a somewhat different
angle of vision. During the time they were pleading specially for Restoration, and defending their movement on the ground of its entire Scripturalness, their leaders were engaged very largely in emphasising the difference between the Disciples and the denominations, and insisting upon exact conformity to the Disciple contention in order to Christian union. This view of the matter seemed to the denominations to be practically an invitation to all of them to come over and join the Disciples. This was not exactly what the Disciples meant. Their real meaning was that these denominations should give up the things that divided them into denominations, and unite upon a common platform which the Disciples claimed was all they required to Christian union. This platform may be stated in the following words:

A superficial view of the Disciple contention may seem to justify the point which the denominations have constantly made with respect to this matter, viz.: that the union proposed by the Disciples is not catholic. But a deeper and more comprehensive view will show that, after all, the Disciples are right, and for the reason that they are pleading, not for denominational union, but for Christian union. Their advocacy, when clearly understood, undoubtedly means that when all professing Christians shall be real Christians, the question of union will be at once greatly simplified; and whether a practical union can be effected or not, there must be a oneness of Christians before any kind of Christian union is at all possible.

Neither have Disciples pleaded for what is called Church union or ecclesiastical union; but they have stuck closely to their original contention, that the first thing to be considered is not the union, but the unity; or, to put it in other words, the only starting point that promises anything like a worthy result must be determined by asking the question, Who are Christians? Hence, the Disciple contention for Christian union goes back to the question of obedience to the Gospel, for only a Scriptural obedience to the Gospel can give us the Christians who are necessary in order to have a practicable and permanent Christian union.

We are now prepared to ask, Does the Disciple plea furnish a common, reasonable, and workable ground for the union of Christians? Let us briefly consider this matter in the light of the facts of the case.

What the Disciples believe and teach may be summarised as follows:

(1) The Old and New Testaments reveal the divinely inspired will of God to men, and these Scriptures contain all that
is necessary for “doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” II. Timothy iii: 16, 17. But the New Testament is the source of authority in matters specially pertaining to the Gospel and the Church.

(2) The divine excellency and worthiness of Jesus, who is the Christ, the Son of the Living God; and his official authority and glory as the Christ—the Anointed Prophet, Priest and King, who is to instruct us in the way of life, redeem us from sin and death, and reign in and over us as the rightful sovereign of our being and disposer of our destiny.

(3) The personal and perpetual mission of the Holy Spirit, to convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; and to dwell in believers as their Comforter, Helper, and Sanctifier; but all speculative theories as to special operations, apart from the Word of God, are rejected.

(4) The Gospel as the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. This Gospel in its fulness embraces (a) Facts; (b) Commands; (c) Promises. The facts are to be believed, the commands obeyed, and the promises enjoyed.

(5) The Church of Christ, a divine institution, composed of such as have turned away from sin, openly confessed Christ with the mouth, and have been baptized, thereby expressing their loyalty to him as their sovereign Lord, and by an overt act entering into covenant relationship with him, by which act they definitely decide to take up their cross and follow him. Baptism (immersion) is, therefore, not a regenerative act, nor is it simply a bodily act. It properly follows such a change of mind and heart as is evidenced by “repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ,” and is the decisive step by which the penitent believer accepts Christ, and assumes the obligations of the Divine Government. It is, consequently, an act in which the whole man—body, soul, and spirit—moves up “toward God.” (See I. Peter iii: 21). This view makes neither too much nor too little of the ordinance. While on the one hand it repudiates “Baptismal Regeneration,” on the other it rescues baptism from the meaningless, formal ceremony into which it has fallen in some quarters.

(6) The fulness and freeness of the salvation offered in the Gospel to all who will accept it on the terms proposed.

(7) The necessity of righteousness, holiness, and benevolence, on the part of professed Christians, alike in view of their own final salvation and of their mission to turn the world to God.

From this statement it will be seen that, in the first place, the Disciple movement unquestionably furnishes a common ground, or a ground that is thoroughly catholic in every respect. A careful examination of the principles of the movement, to which attention has been called, will reveal the fact that there is nothing in these principles that may not be accepted by every evangelical denomination in Christendom. It may be, and no doubt is true, that these denominations con-
tend for some things that are not included in the Disciple contention, but these are things that are not absolutely necessary in order to either Christian state or character, though they may be of considerable importance to those who advocate them. But in order to have a common ground, or a position that is entirely catholic, it is necessary that everything should be thrown overboard that is not essential in the making of Christians, and in keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Let us now briefly indicate a few points where the catholicity of the Disciples may be clearly made evident.

(1) As already seen, they hold to the Scriptures as furnishing an infallible rule of faith and practice. Now this is common ground for all of those that are known as Evangelical denominations. These all claim to take the Scriptures as a sufficient guide for everything in religious matters, but they add to the Scriptures certain formulas of faith or human creeds. Now our troubles begin the moment these additions are made. We have no controversy with any of our religious neighbours as long as they are willing to take the Scriptures and the Scriptures alone as a sufficient rule of faith and practice. But the moment human creeds are added then divisions begin. Disciples say let all give up these creeds and immediately we are on the road to Christian union.

(2) Equally true is it that the Disciple position with respect to Christ is common ground upon which all can unite. While they heartily accept the Scriptural Creed, viz., Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God, they, at the same time, reject all speculative views concerning him, so far as these views may be regarded as tests of Christian fellowship. Men may speculate if they will, but they must not make their speculations barriers in the way of Christian union.

(3) A common ground is also maintained as regards the office and work of the Holy Spirit. The Disciples hold strongly the position that every conversion begins and ends with the Holy Spirit, but they decline to follow those who go beyond the statements of Scripture as to how the Spirit operates. They contend that as long as it is simply affirmed that the Spirit operates through the truth there is no need of controversy among Christians, but the moment we begin to speculate and declare that the Spirit operates independently, or apart from the truth, in the conversion of sinners, that moment do we open the way for divisions among the people of God. Nevertheless, Disciples do not make the extra views which others may hold a barrier to fellowship with them, provided they hold to the common ground that the Holy Spirit does operate through the truth.

(4) Disciples teach also a common ground upon which all Christians may unite in evangelising the world. They teach that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth and that, in order to believe, this Gospel must be carried into all the world and preached to every
creature. This practically unites them with all missionary people in sending the good news to
the nations.

(5) The same course of argument will at once eliminate all controversy with respect to the
baptisimal question. Practically there has never been any controversy about whether
immersion is baptism or not. With the exception of a few very small men it has always been
conceded by the whole of Christendom that immersion is valid baptism. But very many are
unwilling to concede that sprinkling and pouring can be baptism at all. Now as the
controversy is about the latter, Disciples say, why not give up what is not at all necessary, and
for the sake of union adopt that action of baptism which is practically universally admitted to
be both Scriptural and valid?

Following the same line of argument, we at once reach a common platform with respect to
the subject of baptism. Nobody questions that believer’s baptism is valid. Controversy among
professed Christians is impossible as long as we occupy the catholic ground of believer’s
baptism. It is only when we contend for infant baptism that alienation and strife take the place
of union and harmony.

The Disciple position, as regards the design of baptism, admits also an irenicon which
makes Christian union not only possible but very easily accomplished, if all will accept
substantially the main thing for which Disciples contend. They contend strongly for what they
believe the Scriptures teach as to the design of baptism; but as this question belongs properly
to the domain of philosophy rather than to the plain facts, Disciples do not make agreement
with them on this matter a necessary condition of fellowship. If the command to be baptized is
honestly obeyed, Disciples will not allow their views as to what baptism means to stand in the
way of Christian union.

(6) Equally true is the contention of the Disciples, when we test it by the name. They have
always been willing to be called by any Scriptural names, such as, “Christians,” “Disciples of
Christ,” “Children of God,” “Saints,” “Brethren,” etc., etc., but in refusing to be called by any
human name, or after any human leader, they have simply refused to abandon a catholic
platform for that which is narrow and exclusive. They say, why not exclude all names that are
divisive in their character and adopt only those that are Scriptural and that all can accept?

(7) The subject of Church government may also be settled by the same method of
contending for catholicity. Disciples occupy a position with respect to this matter which
practically covers the whole ground. They have bishops or presbyters in all the churches,
while these churches are nevertheless congregational in the best sense. They hold that while
the Church certainly occupies a very prominent place in the remedial system, nevertheless it is
not the first nor the most important
thing to be considered. It may be that too much emphasis has not been placed upon it, but unquestionably too little has been placed upon that which properly comes before it, and without which the Church is not worthy of consideration at all. The world has really nothing to do with the Church; it is Christ that the world must consider. Not only Christ, but “Christ and him crucified.”*  

But even so reasonable a platform as this seems to be could not be generally made practical in breaking down the walls of denominationalism, though in many respects its advocacy had the effect to diminish very largely the emphasis which had been placed upon the divisive elements which had separated Christendom into different denominational organisations.

From the year 1870 down to the present time there has been a growing feeling that Christian union cannot be realised by simply contending for a platform that requires an immediate conformity to all the conditions of Scriptural union; consequently the advocates of federation hold to the notion that this Scriptural platform must be approached by successive steps rather than by one step which will embrace everything that ought to be considered. These advocates claim that federation will bring the denominational leaders together, and that this is an important step in the right direction. In other words, many of the Disciple leaders at present believe in Mr. Campbell’s idea that “approaches are better than reproaches.” Carrying out these views, they think it is well to emphasise the points of agreement rather than the points of disagreement. They think that the points of disagreement will not be long in disappearing entirely if the points of agreement are sufficiently brought into view. Like the old leaves that stay on the tree during the winter, and are pushed off by the new buds of spring, so these differences will drop off as soon as the warm sun of love, shining upon the points of agreement, has its full force.

Now whether this view of the matter is correct or not, it is certain that this is all that the friends of Federation mean by entering into co-operation with the denominations. There are a great many things that can be done in common, and it is believed that while these things are being done, the various religious bodies will become acquainted

with one another, and will learn to love one another; and as love is greater than either faith or hope, this can ultimately conquer sectarianism and bring about the union of all God’s people.

Undoubtedly this is a somewhat different standpoint from that which the Disciples occupied after they entered fully upon the era of Restoration. They are still thoroughly committed to the Restoration principles; nor will they surrender these for any compromise which, in the slightest degree, discounts the great truths for which they have contended. But they have come to believe that Christian union can be effected more readily by working from the heart-life than from a purely intellectual point of view. As long as intellectual conceptions of Christianity are emphasised to the neglect of the heart, and those practical things which are, after all, the most important, Christian union, in any helpful sense, is little more than a dream never to be realised. Consequently, the present attitude of the most influential leaders of the Disciple movement is to recognise all that is good and common in the denominations, and by working together with them along the lines of practical co-operation to wait on “sweetness and light” to bring about the overthrow of sectarianism, and the union of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ more than religious partyism.

In this contention these Disciple leaders affirm that they occupy precisely the ground which was occupied by the pioneers of their movement, except that they are not willing to concede as much as the pioneers were ready to concede. In short, they contend that in entering the Federation movement they are not conceding to denominationalism as much as even Alexander Campbell was willing to concede during the early days of his advocacy. He declared, forty years after the beginning of his movement, that he never would have left the Presbyterians if they had allowed him to remain, and, at the same time, allowed him to be a free man. Nor would he ever have left the Baptists if he could have had the same privilege granted to him. Indeed, he claims that he stipulated for this privilege when he joined the Baptists, but it was afterwards denied to him, and that this was the reason why he did not remain in their fellowship.

It is evident that the Disciple leaders have changed
somewhat in taking up the position which we have ascribed to them. In these latter days they are relying more upon the logic of the heart than they did in about the middle of the century of their existence. As has already been intimated, they, at first, aimed chiefly to reform the denominations, and consequently the movement at that time was properly styled a Reformation. When they separated from the denominations it became a Restoration movement, and while that has not been given up, and probably will not be given up on any account whatever, at the same time for a number of years the movement has been much more tolerant toward the denominations than it was during the reconstruction period when it had to fight its way against all the denominations of Christendom. This toleration stage of the movement is finding organic expression in the Federation movement, and this movement is itself an emphatic endorsement of much for which the Disciples have always contended, and it will probably lead to a careful examination of their fundamental principles as they have never before been examined, and this of itself will be a very great gain in the direction of Christian union, the one great thing for which the Disciple movement has stood, and still stands.

Meantime, all the overtures for Christian union from any of the denominations are gratefully received by the Disciples, and when these overtures are made to the Disciples themselves they are most respectfully considered. It has not been long since a correspondence was held between representatives of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Disciples, and while there was nothing very practical that came out of this correspondence, it undoubtedly served to lessen the value placed upon denominational walls, and to increase the value set upon the spirit of unity which all Christians are enjoined to keep in the bond of peace. Indeed, the new day that has dawned upon the Christian world is perhaps largely due to the Disciples, especially with respect to the matter of the growing interest in favour of Christian union. This was from the beginning of the movement, throughout its whole history, the chief aim of the Disciple advocacy, and though this great ideal has been regarded from different points of view, during the past hundred years, it has always been in view and has been set among the high things for which
the Disciples have contended. While in these later days they are approaching the whole question of Christian union from the high summit of love, rather than as a mere matter of faith or doctrine, they are, at the same time, earnestly “contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints,” and are equally contending for the hope that is an anchor to the soul both sure and steadfast. But it has remained for these later days to demonstrate that love is greater than either faith or hope, and the trial of this remedy for the divisions of Christendom is the whole meaning of the Federation movement.

While this is true, and while the Federation movement evidently means just that much and no more, it is well for the Disciples who hold to this view of the matter not to judge too severely those who have not heartily joined with them on this high summit of vision. It must not be forgotten that the Disciples have their prejudices as well as other people. Many of them have been on the firing line during the days when debates about differences were nearly everywhere relied upon as the most important means by which to break down sectarianism and bring about the union of God’s people. The men who have been engaged in these debates, or who have been fed upon the food by which these debates were nourished, cannot be expected to suddenly leap over the whole boundary line of the differences between the Disciples and the denominations, and begin their work for Christian union in a movement from that love, which is greatest, back to hope and faith. Love must work in these Disciples before they will be ready to take up the new slogan and sound it forth without any cracks in the lute. The Disciples have had to discuss this matter among themselves. They have done so, and though sometimes in not the very best spirit, the discussion has practically ended with the victory on the side of progress. This has been the result of every discussion that has taken place among the Disciples. Every move to a higher point of view has been hindered for a time by obstructions put in its way by the extreme conservative wing. But in the long run these discussions have cleared the atmosphere and have made the position of the progressive brethren all the stronger by the opposition which had to be overcome. Victory over nothing is a victory where nothing remains. It is
a name to live by, but is dead. A victory over fierce opposition carries with it a strength which imparts new vigour to those who have gone forward. Climbing a mountain may be tedious and tiresome work, but when the top is once reached the next movement is easier, not only because of the new atmosphere that is breathed, but also because of the strength received in the very climbing itself.

For the last ten years the annual meetings of the American Christian Missionary Society have been remarkable for the number of people who have attended these meetings. In 1899 the jubilee of the society was held in Cincinnati, during the month of October. It was a great occasion. It was estimated that between fifteen and twenty thousand Disciples were in attendance. The communion service on the Lord’s Day was remarkable in both the spirit manifested and the great crowd that was present. Indeed, no one building was capable of seating the people who sought admission, so two or three of the largest buildings in the city were filled with earnest Christians seeking to participate in the Lord’s Supper. It was an occasion long to be remembered by those who were present.

But a duplicate of this occasion has been produced at every annual meeting of the convention since that time. Perhaps the largest communion service in one building that ever was held in the history of Christianity was held in St. Louis during the annual convention in October, 1904. It was estimated that not less than 12,000 Christians participated together in the communion service on the Lord’s Day during the convention. It was an inspiring sight to see all these Christians devoutly gathering for this great service. The silence which prevailed, the spirit of unity which pervaded every heart, and the profound earnestness which characterised all who were present, while partaking of the emblems of the Lord’s death and suffering, made an impression which can never be obliterated from those who were in attendance.

At all the annual conventions of the Disciples since then this communion service has been made a principal feature, and it has demonstrated the power of the Lord’s Supper to cement and hold together Christian hearts as nothing else can do. In fact, the Disciples regard this communion service as an effective means for the promotion
of Christian union, the very thing they have enthusiastically advocated from the beginning of their movement.

Notwithstanding that Christian union is a fundamental feature of the movement, there have always been some brethren associated with the Disciples who have contended for what are evidently divisive elements. This fact has shown itself in every step of progress that has been made. Recently it has made considerable demonstrations with respect to Biblical criticism. A few of the younger men have made statements with respect to the miracles of the Bible and other things involved along the lines of Biblical criticism that are not quite in harmony with the views generally held by the older men, and especially by the men of limited scholarship. It was immediately declared by the extreme right wing that these men ought not to have any place on the Centennial programme. Indeed, some of the super-sound Disciples went so far as to pronounce these “free thinkers” or infidels, and therefore unworthy of Christian fellowship. Justice to the majority of those who advocated the expulsion of these names from the Centennial programme requires that it should be clearly stated that their objections to these men were not against their Christian character, but against their representative character, and especially against their fitness to teach. However, the controversy with respect to this matter became somewhat acute at times; so much so, indeed, that there were those who feared that this controversy was the entering wedge to division among the Disciples. But those who had been with the movement for many years were not frightened at this “tempest in a teapot.” A movement that could pass through the Unitarian controversy, the baptismal controversy, the society controversy, the communion controversy, the war controversy, the organ controversy, and the federation controversy, cannot be wrecked by a question of Biblical criticism, especially as the question involved relates entirely to matters outside of the real conditions of fellowship which have always been acknowledged among the Disciples. The platform on which the Disciples rally is claimed to be wide enough for all shades of religious opinions, if these are not made questions of fellowship. This undoubtedly was the position held by Alexander
Campbell and his contemporary associates. If men were right in what was regarded as fundamental, it was claimed that no one should question their Christian character, no matter what peculiar opinions they might hold in respect to other things, provided always they did not push these “other things” into the front and make them practically take the place of the fundamentals concerning which all are agreed.

This matter is referred to here simply to indicate that, notwithstanding opinions have been repudiated from the beginning by the ablest Disciple leaders, these keep coming up and asserting themselves through their advocates right in the face of the most determined protest on the part of the real leaders of the movement. Perhaps no feature of the Disciple plea has been so difficult to manage as this one concerning the position which opinions must occupy. This difficulty has come from at least three sources. First of all, it is very difficult sometimes to determine the exact difference between faith and opinion. Second, when this difference is clearly defined it is equally difficult to keep a great many people from insisting upon their opinions as articles of faith; and in the third place, there is a constant tendency in human nature to be contentious and to divide over little things, and there are not a few people who find great delight in elevating their opinions into standards of faith. It would seem that their religious life depends mainly upon the things which ought to be regarded as of little consequence.

But, however this may be, it is certain that the very point where the Campbellian movement is most distinctive is just the place where it has been the most difficult of management. Nevertheless, owing to wise leadership, and above all, owing to a Providence which can scarcely be denied in the history of the movement, it has developed through all the stages of its past history without any serious break in the ranks of its adherents, no matter how hard the pressure may have been at times. Surely this fact alone is worth considering by the whole of Christendom. There must be something of great value in the principles held by the Disciples, or else they must have gone to pieces long before the Centennial celebration.

In this Centennial year of the Disciples, the American
Christian Missionary Society has reached a point of great usefulness. It has had a checkered history. It has literally come up through great tribulation, but has washed its robes and made them white in the blood of the conflict. The churches it has organised dot the map from ocean to ocean, and from Canada to Mexico. These churches are found in such centres as the following: Halifax, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Buffalo, Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, Norfolk, Charleston, Jacksonville, Tampa, Pensacola, Mobile, New Orleans, Galveston, Austin, San Antonio, Fort Worth, El Paso, Tacoma, Seattle, Spokane, Vancouver, Boise City, Winnipeg, Aberdeen, Sioux Falls, Watertown, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Milwaukee, Grand Rapids, Chicago, St. Louis, Des Moines, Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Oklahoma City, and Los Angeles.

There are churches in every state and all Canadian provinces. They include many of the greatest congregations in the communion of the Disciples, and in several Western states each strong church was organised and aided to self-support by the American Christian Missionary Society. To remove the congregations brought into organic existence by this society would be to cripple every society and college and paper in the brotherhood, and to divide the present membership by two.

Three thousand five hundred Disciple churches were organised by this society. Many others have been aided by supplies of tracts, meetings by one of the Disciple evangelists, a visit from one of the Disciple workers or secretaries during some crisis, or by the support of a minister, until they were able to sustain themselves. Perhaps sixty-five per cent, of all the churches have received aid in some form from the American Christian Missionary Society.

In addition to the special work of evangelising which this society has done, it has as auxiliaries the Board of Church Extension, Ministerial Relief, and Negro Education and Evangelisation. The last mentioned is practically under the direction of the society’s board, and is becoming a power for good in educating and Christianising the negroes of the South.

Nearly all of the Disciple societies and organisations had their origin through the American Christian Mis-
sionary Society. It has been the mother of them all. In 1899 the congress of the Disciples was organised and met for the first time in St. Louis. This congress has met every year since, save in 1909, and has discussed many of the great questions relating to theology, science, and sociology. It is believed that this congress has been useful in furnishing a platform to discuss the very questions which are felt to be important, but are not involved in the fellowship of the churches. It has been seen that the Disciple plea excludes a great many interesting and important matters from the sphere of faith, but all the same it recognises that these matters belong to the sphere of knowledge, and may be discussed by all Christians for the sake of a better understanding of the deep things of God, as well as man’s relation to these. The only difficulty in the case of the congress is that some are inclined to make the utterances of this congress a sort of test of the soundness of the men who speak these things. Others hold that nothing said in these meetings shall be made tests of fellowship or Christian character, while these utterances do not in any way attack the “faith once for all delivered to the saints.”

The organised work of ministerial relief among the Disciples of Christ is comparatively new, and is not yet well understood nor well supported. As a people they made three-quarters of a century of their splendid history before it occurred to them that they were neglecting one of the essential features of the Restoration movement.

Prior to the organization of the Board of Ministerial Relief, some little work had been done along the line of its purpose. Some money had been raised and expended in the support of a few needy preachers. The General Missionary Convention in 1895 undertook the organization of this work, and in that and the following year made some progress. The brethren of Missouri had been thinking of and doing something in this interest, and after the organization of this board, turned into its treasury $800 in cash and $200 in notes. In 1897 Mrs. Sarah H. Scott, of Detroit, Mich., left $2,000.00 to the General Christian Missionary Convention, as trustee, to be invested or loaned, the interest only to be used in the relief of needy preachers. Different brethren in different sections of the country had
begun the agitation of this ministry, so prominent in the early Church. An effort to constitute an “Old Preachers’ Home” had been claiming the attention of the brethren in Colorado, under the leadership of R. H. Sawyer, who had taken such an active interest, and so agitated the matter, that by action of their state convention in 1894 Mr. Sawyer was sent with a memorial to the general convention, held in Richmond, Va., that year. By action of the Richmond convention, the matter was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. This committee, through its chairman, W. F. Cowden, made the following report:

1. That this Convention heartily concurs in the sentiment expressed in this memorial, as to the importance and obligation of the church to make some wise provision for the adequate support of our faithful and worthy preachers who, in the decline of life, find themselves overtaken with misfortune and want.

2. That we recommend the appointment of a standing committee on Ministerial Belief to which this memorial and all other communications and matters pertaining to this department of work shall be referred, and that this committee report annually to this convention.

J. W. Allen, of Chicago, president of the convention, appointed the following committee on ministerial relief: W. S. Priest, A. M. Atkinson, W. F. Cowden, W. F. Richardson, N. S. Haynes.

During the year following this convention there was considerable agitation of the question, with A. M. Atkinson, of Wabash, Ind., as leader. In May, 1895, ex-Governor Ira J. Chase, one of Indiana’s greatly admired preachers, while engaged in a meeting with the church at Lubec, Me., suddenly sickened and died. Brother Atkinson’s experience, in providing support for Brother Chase’s family, caused him to be filled with anxiety for the welfare of aged and disabled ministers and their families. He talked and wrote much on the subject. The idea had taken possession of the man. Just before the general convention at Dallas, Tex., October, 1895, he issued a call through the Church papers for a conference of the preachers to be held at the Dallas convention to consider the organization of the work of ministerial relief. The result of this conference was that J. H. Hardin presented to the
convention the following preamble and resolution, which was adopted:

*Whereas,* There is necessity for some more adequate provision for our disabled preachers and the relief of the destitute widows and children of deceased preachers, and,

*Whereas,* The Lord has put it into the heart of Brother A. M. Atkinson to take steps to greatly enlarge our Ministerial Relief Fund; therefore, be it

*Resolved* That a committee of five be appointed to submit an amendment to our Constitution as the basis of such Curatorship, or Board of Control, as may be deemed necessary to the effectiveness of this important feature of our work.

The committee appointed was composed of B. L. Smith, chairman, A. P. Cobb, A. J. Bush, G. L. Brokaw, and F. D. Power. This committee made the following report:

1. That we recommend the organization of the Ministerial Relief Fund of the Christian Church as one of the departments of work of the General Christian Missionary Convention.
2. That we recommend the following change in the Constitution of the convention. Article IX. The convention shall elect annually nine brethren to serve as a Board of Ministerial Relief of the Christian Church, five of whom shall reside in or near Indianapolis, Indiana.

This Board shall have authority to raise and collect funds for the relief of destitute ministers and the dependent families of deceased ministers. They shall appoint their own meetings, make rules for their own government, elect their own officers, including a treasurer, who shall give bond, and report annually to the auditor and treasurer of this convention.

The Board of Ministerial Relief shall make a full report at each annual meeting of this convention.

3. The numbering of the remaining articles of the constitution be changed to provide for this Article IX.
4. The committee on nominations be hereby instructed to present to this convention the names of nine brethren to serve as a Board of Ministerial Relief.

This report was adopted, and in harmony therewith the committee on nominations, of which W. Chenault was chairman, reported the following named nine brethren as the first Board of Ministerial Relief:

A. M. Atkinson, Howard Cale, Amos Clifford, George W. Snyder, and Simeon Frazier, of Indiana; J. P. Torbitt, Kentucky; F. E. Udell, Missouri; F. M. Drake, Iowa; W. S. Dickinson, Ohio (see minutes of general convention, Dallas, Tex., 1895).

In the organization of this new board, Howard Cale
was elected president; W. S. Dickinson, vice-president; Amos Clifford, treasurer; Simeon Frazier, recording secretary. A. M. Atkinson was chosen corresponding secretary. Soon after the organization of the board, and for reasons necessary in its legal affairs, it was incorporated under the laws of the state of Indiana, with headquarters at 120 East Market Street, Indianapolis.

Mr. Atkinson served as corresponding secretary for four years. He was, however, unable, because of sickness, to do much work the year previous to his death, and the year following no secretary was chosen. At the beginning of the sixth year, A. L. Orcutt was chosen corresponding secretary, and served two years. In July, 1902, J. B. McCleary retired from the chaplaincy of the United States army and was called to the secretaryship. He served until March, 1903, when he died, and the board was again, without a corresponding secretary. Notwithstanding the working of death against the plans of the board, the Lord provided it with a guiding hand in the person of the president, Howard Cale, whose wisdom and devotion to its interests in personally directing its affairs, and bearing the burdens of the office of secretary, twice made vacant by death, made possible to many deserving, needy saints the blessings of this Christ-like, loving ministry.

Thus began the work of ministerial relief among the Disciples of Christ, and to A. M. Atkinson, more than to any other man, is due the permanent organization of this work. So completely did he give himself to the Lord in this work, that he virtually sacrificed his life upon the altar of this ministry. Of him also it may be truly said, “Though he be dead, yet he speaketh.” Through all the years of its history this board has ever held sacred the purpose to provide support for the aged and unfortunate in the ministry, and many thousand dollars have gone directly to those needing assistance.

The thirteenth annual financial statement of the board, made at the New Orleans convention, October, 1908, showed total receipts of $12,450, of which amount $2,000 was received into the permanent fund. While these receipts were not sufficient to meet the demands, they were, nevertheless, encouraging in that they showed thirty-five per cent, increase over the receipts of the previous year.

In the thirteen years of the history of this work the
general fund has received about $100,000. The permanent fund, the interest only on which is used, is in this Centennial year, $26,559. From sixty-five to seventy-five preachers and preachers’ widows, together with their dependents, compose the regular list of annuitants each year, which usually totals from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and forty persons.
CHAPTER XXVIII

SOME OF THE MEN INSTRUMENTAL IN MAKING THE MOVEMENT

THE man behind the gun is more important than the gun itself. In ordinary warfare this is a vital matter. However well an army may be equipped, or however noble and just its cause may be, if the men who are to do the fighting are not equal to the task it is impossible to assure success. We understand this fact when we are dealing with physical things, but we seem to lose sight of it entirely when we enter the moral or religious sphere, and yet in this sphere men are more important than anywhere else, for the reason that mind is the chief factor in all moral conflicts.

In the religious movement now under consideration there is something especially appropriate in calling attention to the men who have been instrumental in making the movement. The Disciples’ plea is founded upon a great personality. Jesus the Christ is the beginning and the end of all for which the Disciples contend. He is as much the centre of their religious system as the sun is the centre of the planetary system. They build not on theories, philosophies, or speculations of any kind, but upon a great, transcendent personality. From this point of view it is easy to see that personality must respond to personality. Only earnest, consecrated men, inspired by a great leader, such as Jesus the Christ is, could or can make the Disciples’ plea a permanent success. Consequently, the men who have lived and acted, preached and worked, suffered and rejoiced, struggled and triumphed, must be regarded as an integral part, and also an important part, of the forces which have produced the great results which are shown in the history of the Disciple movement. For this reason, as well as for others that might be mentioned, the Disciples will always do well ‘to give honour to the glorious names that make their history a shining light for all generations.
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It would be unreasonable to expect that all the names worthy of a place in this history can be mentioned. A whole host of other names, quite as worthy as those that may be mentioned, could be given; but space will not allow a larger list than that which is here presented.

CHRISTIAN STATESMEN

At the head of this list we place the name of James A. Garfield, not because he is entitled to more honour than many others, but because of his prominent position as a statesman and Christian, and of his tragic and heroic death.

Garfield was born November 19, 1831, in Orange, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, and was educated in the Eclectic Institute at Hiram, Ohio, and finally graduated with honour at Williams College, in August, 1856. He was principal, professor, and lecturer at Hiram from 1856 to 1866. He began to preach while he was a student at Hiram, and continued to preach until he entered Congress, in 1863. In 1859 he was elected state senator of Ohio, and entered the Union army in 1861, where he became distinguished, and was finally commissioned major-general, September 18, 1863. He was elected United States senator from Ohio in January, 1880. He was nominated for President of the United States, June 8, 1880, was elected in November, and inaugurated March 4, 1881. He was shot by an assassin July 2, 1881, and died at Elberon, N. J., September 19, 1881, at the age of forty-nine years and ten months. He was a man of unusual strength of character, with earnest religious convictions, and although at the time of his election to the presidency the Disciples were little known in the capital, he was faithful in his attendance at the church over which F. D. Power was and still is pastor.

Garfield’s death produced a profound sensation. For a long time his life hung in the balance, and every civilised country on the earth watched with intense interest its ebbing tide; and when he died a Paris paper headed an article on his life and character with these significant words, “The Globe in Mourning,” while the press everywhere repeated this sentiment in one form or other. But there was no country outside of the United States where
the public heart was more certainly touched and more profoundly impressed, or where the expressions of sympathy were more universal, than in England. As an illustration of this English sympathy it is only necessary to state that when the news of Ms death was flashed to that country a solemn memorial service was held in the church of St. Martin’s-in-the-Lane, where the Archbishop of Canterbury preached a sermon suitable to the occasion. The church was crowded in every part, and the particular factor emphasised by the Archbishop in the character of the deceased President was the simplicity of his religious faith. His religious character was highly eulogised, and nothing could have been more profound than the impression which was made upon the great audience in attendance.

But a still more striking illustration of the respect which England had for the stricken President took place in St. Paul’s churchyard immediately after the Archbishop’s sermon. Perhaps as many as five thousand Englishmen were gathered in and about that churchyard, listening to the great bell of the cathedral sounding out a requiem for the dead President, and this, too, for the first time that it had ever been tolled, except in the case of the death of royalty. But the impressive feature of this manifestation of sympathy was shown in the fact that in the great throng assembled around the cathedral every Englishman had his hat off, and was listening with bowed head, and in some cases with tearful eyes, during the whole time the bell was tolling. Not an audible word was spoken. Every heart seemed to be silently sending a tearful message of condolence to the people of the United States with every stroke of the bell which tolled out the mournful news of the death of the President. In this beautiful and touching assurance that the mother country fully appreciated and sympathised with the great loss that the United States had sustained, Englishmen testified, in a most impressive way, that, after all, blood is thicker than water, and that though they were separated from the people of the United States by the Atlantic Ocean, they were their near kinsmen both by blood and mutual interest in seeking the best ideals of Anglo-Saxon civilisation.

The next Sunday evening, after this great demonstra-
 tion, a discourse on the life and character of the deceased President was preached in the Kensington town hall, one of the largest halls in London. At this service the hall was crowded in every part, while many were turned away for want of room. At the close of the sermon Mr. W. H. Channing, who was chaplain of the House of Representatives in Washington, when Garfield was the leader of the Republican party in that house, arose and moved that the address just delivered should be published in pamphlet form, and scattered by the millions, as it was a perfect representation of the character of President Garfield. The following is a verbatim report of what Mr. Channing said, and also what Mr. Coop said, who seconded the motion for the publication of the address:

“FELLOW-CHRISTIANS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS:

My aim in requesting permission to address you, is to propose that, ‘by your vote, Mr. Moore should be invited to publish the heart-stirring ‘Memorial Discourse’ to which we have just listened. The deep emotions excited now, should not be allowed to exhale; but they should be preserved, and converted into life. Neither should they be confined to this crowded assembly. They should be diffused to tens of thousands, throughout this city and nation. In my conviction, among the good words which have been spoken and printed during the last ten weeks, in regard to the world-lamented President of the United States—no tribute to his memory has so deeply reached to the CENTRE OF JAMES GAEFIELD’S power and influence, as the one which has been addressed to us to-night. Our preacher has revealed to us, that the inner secret of this great man’s hold upon the hearts of his countrymen, upon the heart of this empire, upon the heart of Christendom, was his own CHRIST LIFE.

This is profoundly, strictly true, and the person who now appeals to you knows it to be true. You have known me more or less as, for fifteen years, a citizen of Kensington. But few of you know that during the Civil War of the United States, my duties—as son of our American Republic—called me to Washington, where Congress did me the honour to appoint me ‘Chaplain to the House of Representatives.’ And then it was, that it was my high privilege to know James A. Garfield,—when at Mr Lincoln’s urgent request, that brave young hero, fresh from the bloody fight of Chickamauga, resigned his higher generalship, and accepted his appointment as Representative from Ohio, in Congress. It is then, at once,—as your fellowcitizen, and as a fellow countryman of our friend who has so eloquently exhibited the claim of President Garfield to the earnest sympathies of all Christians of every communion,—
that I ask you to urge Mr. Moore to print his discourse. Let it be circulated far and wide, throughout all classes of this great nation. And may it aid a vast multitude to become humble and devoted followers of Christ, and to live for the glory of God as did our blessed brother, whom the Father has called to His heavenly home.”

Mr. T. Coop arose to heartily second the motion to publish the sermon, and stated that such was his interest in the matter, that he had come all the way from Carpenter’s “South Devon Health Resort,”—where he had been under treatment—about 200 miles, for the express purpose of being present at the Memorial Service. He said that General Garfield had been personally a special blessing to him. He (Mr. Coop) had been conscientious, but very narrow in his religious views. But some years ago, while on a visit to America, he had the pleasure of hearing General Garfield deliver an address before a Missionary Convention, and such was the breadth of his ideas, such the earnestness of his spirit, and such the eloquence of his appeal for generous missionary enterprise, that he (Mr. Coop) from that time, determined he would act upon the suggestion of the speaker; and, as a matter of fact, that occasion, as regards some very important things, was the turning point in his religious life.

At the conclusion of Mr. Coop’s remarks, the great audience (the large hall was crowded in every part) rose to their feet, lifting their hands, as an expression of their desire that the sermon should be published.

When it is stated that this address dealt chiefly with the religious principles which President Garfield professed and practised, it will be seen how these principles were received, even in England, by those who had become acquainted with them largely through their acquaintance with the life and character of the deceased President. It should be furthermore stated that the London Times sent a special reporter to take down this address, and a large portion of it was printed in the next morning’s edition of that paper, being the first time that so lengthy a report of a sermon had ever appeared in its columns.

It is difficult in so brief a notice as this sketch must be to do even meagre justice to a character such as that of General Garfield. But the following points may be noticed:

(1.) He was an honest man. This feature of his character manifested itself throughout his entire career; and
it was this perhaps more than anything else that swelled the tide of sympathy for him when the news of his assassination reached the people. His brave and manly fight against political intrigue, corruption, and what was known in America at that time as the machine politicians, and his evidently sincere efforts on behalf of political reform, at once challenged the respect of the better class of people in all countries. He was not able to accomplish all he wished, for, to use his own language, he could not break with his party without losing much of his power to do anything. He was compelled to hasten leisurely because of the evil influences which were strongly set against him. But he did accomplish something, even in the short time he was permitted to occupy the presidency. Nor is it probable that his example in this regard will be lost. Though dead, he yet speaketh. Unquestionably American politics still needs purification at the very point where General Garfield was labouring, but it must be admitted that since his time there has been a profoundly growing conviction among the people that the greater abuses, at least, must and shall be corrected.

(2.) He was also a brave man. Indeed his courage was of the highest quality—it was simply sublime. He was never rash, for true courage is always calm, prudent, and dignified. Boisterous self-assertion and inconsiderate haste sometimes pass for courage, but these are never associated with the genuine article. While General Garfield was not deficient in physical courage, as was frequently demonstrated on the battle-field, it was his magnificent moral courage which added so much strength to his splendid character. He could say Yes or No, and say it with a downward beat. He did not follow public opinion; he helped to make public opinion. He did not antagonise his opponents simply to illustrate that he was always in the objective case, but if necessary he could stand at the gate of any Thermopylae and die, Spartan-like, while beating back more than the millions of Xerxes. He himself drew a picture of his own moral courage when he said that he believed in the man who could “meet the Devil, look him in the face, and tell him that he was the Devil.” This is precisely what General Garfield himself did; it is precisely what he did many times
in his life. When he met Secession, under the plausible theory of State Rights, he drew the
cover from off this dangerous doctrine and looked at it straight in the face, fought it as a
deadly enemy to the integrity of the Union and the best interests of the people. When Lincoln
was assassinated he stood before the swaying crowd in Washington City and calmed their
turbulent spirits by declaring that the “Lord still reigned, and that therefore the country was
safe.”

(3.) His private life was also singularly pure. Only those who knew him intimately can
deal properly with this subject, but those know that nothing was more characteristic of him
than his beautiful private life. His tender sympathy for his own family was strikingly
illustrated when he was stricken down. His first thought was of his family, and especially of
her whom he called “the dear little woman,” who had shared all the sorrows and joys which
had gathered about his splendid manhood. This bit of home life touched the sympathy of the
whole world. From that moment he was at home with the world, for the world saw that his
heart was at home with his family. The kiss which he gave to his aged mother at the
inauguration ceremonies was not a piece of stage acting, but a genuine, heart-felt expression
of his undying devotion to her. Garfield was intensely human. It was this touch of nature that
made all the world akin to him, and it was in the electric battery, so to speak, of his own
household that the power was generated with which he electrified the hearts of millions.

(4.) The crowning feature in President Garfield’s life remains to be stated. He was a
Christian. That simple sentence tells the story of his great character. He was a Christian, too,
without the pretence of the tinselled display of ritualism; without the stiffness of formalism;
without the bigotry of sectarianism; and without the coldness of indifference. He was simply a
Christian, unaffected, hearty, liberal, earnest. His was an intelligent faith. Repudiating the
superstitions which too frequently supplant Divine teaching, he looked reverently to the Word
of God as the lamp to his feet and the light to his pathway. It was his rule of faith and practice.
Where it spoke he spoke, where it was silent he was silent also. This Word had been his
constant companion from his youth.
It dwelt in him richly and was as sweet to him as honey in the honeycomb.

He fully sympathised with the religious people with whom he stood identified. He was broader in his conceptions of both faith and duty undoubtedly than some of these were, but he never carried his breadth beyond the limits of a legitimate faith. Both his faith and practice were bounded by the Word of God when properly interpreted. He was a born leader and consequently his influence upon the Disciples themselves was very great, especially in Ohio, his native state. He was an eloquent preacher, and did not hesitate to occupy the pulpit whenever and wherever an opportunity offered itself.

His religious character never left him. It grew with his growth, and strengthened with his strength. Many persons who are religious when they are in comparative obscurity abandon their religion when they become famous. But Garfield was not one of these. If possible, he was a more devoted Christian as he rose higher and higher in the scale of honour and fame. One of his last acts before leaving his home in Mentor for Washington was to commemorate the Lord’s death in the church of which he was a member; and the next Lord’s Day, after entering upon his duties as President, he met with his brethren in Washington, and continued to do so to the end.

He was never a man of extremes, and this was especially true of him in his religious life. He was too honest to be a latitudinarian and too generous to be a sectarian. His reverence for the Bible held him strictly within the lines of evangelical truth, while his broad sympathies made it impossible for him to become a narrow-minded bigot. He was evangelical but not sectarian; Scriptural but not uncharitable; progressive but always true to Christian principles. Hence, while he earnestly contended for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, he was never unkind toward those with whom he might religiously differ. This fact was so abundantly evident that no one was ever driven away from him by any religious views which he held, and it was perhaps this very fact that gained much for him of the confidence and respect which were so universally accorded to him.

(5.) General Garfield’s character may be summed up in one word, namely: Manliness. But manliness in the
highest degree is not attainable without Christianity. To be like Christ is to be manly. One may have every other accomplishment, but without the grace which the religion of Christ confers, it is impossible to reach the best development of manliness. But President Garfield’s manliness was of the highest type. While it was polished by a generous culture, it was lit up and warmed by the spirit of the Divine Master. Notwithstanding it had the symmetry and comeliness which a wide experience and a constant contact with books and men of letters always bring with them, its strength and breadth, its real heart and life, its highest reaches of perfection, and its deepest sympathy with human need, all came from a supreme devotion to the Christian religion. It was his implicit faith in the Christ which gave General Garfield’s character that completeness which put him practically beyond the successful criticism of even his bitterest opponents.

In closing this brief notice of this distinguished Christian statesman it is only necessary to remark that, after all, his death was doubtless providentially overruled for good. This may sound strange to people who do not think below the surface. General Garfield occupied a peculiar position. From a religious point of view he represented a rising, vigorous, and influential body which had for both church and state a distinct and far-reaching message; and this was not only for the American people, but for the whole world. Garfield’s death drew very emphatic attention to the religious principles which entered into his remarkable character. This was strongly suggested in the sermon, already referred to, which was preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury. From that sermon, and through the reference to Garfield’s life and character in the journals of Europe, the principles and aims of the Disciples of Christ became widely known where they had never before been even heard of in any way which gave a true conception of what these were. It may seem almost sacrilegious to some to suggest that his death was much more powerful for good than his life could have been, even if it had continued for many years. Nevertheless, it is believed that this was true in his case. To use his own language, when another martyred President fell, the Lord still reigned, and the country was saved, even if Garfield died, and not only was this so, but the Church was
saved also, and a new force entered into it from Garfield’s death chamber when it was told everywhere that he died the death of a Christian, and that his Christianity consisted in a simple faith in, and obedience to, the Lord Jesus Christ, without any additions such as belong to the creeds of Christendom. At any rate, it is certain that through his death the plea of the Disciples was practically made known to the civilised world.

Another distinguished statesman associated with the Disciples was Jeremiah Sullivan Black, who was born in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, January 10, 1810. He was trained for the law, and soon became a distinguished advocate, having been appointed presiding judge of the sixteenth judicial district of Pennsylvania. In 1851 he was elected judge of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and when Mr. Buchanan was elected President in 1857, Judge Black, on account of his great ability and incorruptible integrity, was appointed attorney-general in Mr. Buchanan’s Cabinet. He soon became distinguished in this official position. At the age of fifty-one he returned to the practice of law, having maintained his character for incorruptibility throughout his official administration. He was a devout Christian and a very strong defender of the faith. At one time he began a controversy with Robert G. Ingersoll in the North American Review, but he soon found that Ingersoll was a man not at all worthy of his esteem, and the judge refused to continue the controversy on the ground that it was a waste of time to deal with a man whose shallow logic was not worthy even of a schoolboy. The articles which the judge wrote gave unmistakable evidence of his comprehensive grasp of the evidences of the Christian religion.

He died at his home on August 19, 1883. It is said that during his last illness, while he was unable to rise from his bed, he asked his wife to go to the window and look out on the beautiful landscape, and report to him how it looked, especially if the fields were green, and he always listened to her reports with the greatest apparent interest. Judge Black was a man characterised by unflinching integrity. He was acknowledged by all parties to be incorruptible, and doubtless this was largely owing to his strong faith in the Christian religion. He was a devoted member of the Disciples’ body, and always showed
a deep interest in the progressive movements of the Disciples from the time he entered the Church until his death.

Richard M. Bishop is another name that deserves a high place among the distinguished Christian statesmen who have been identified with the Disciples. He was born in Fleming County, Kentucky, and died in Jacksonville, Fla. He united with the Disciples early in life and remained a consistent, earnest member until he died. He removed to Cincinnati while quite a young man, and began the wholesale grocery business, in which he was very successful. He was mayor of Cincinnati at the time the Prince of Wales visited this country, and presided at the great meeting in Pike’s Music Hall, where the Prince of Wales was entertained. In 1877 he was elected governor of Ohio on the Democratic ticket, notwithstanding the state was overwhelmingly Republican at that time. Probably his election was owing largely to his popularity as a man as much as to his generous benefactions as a philanthropist, and to his hospitality in his home life. His house was for many years the home of the preachers of his Church, as well as of any other Church, for he was not a sectarian in any sense.

For ten years he was president of the American Christian Missionary Society, and was always influential in the councils of that organization. He was one of the elders of the Central Christian Church, and contributed very largely of his means in erecting the present splendid building of that church on Ninth Street in Cincinnati.

Owing to some financial reverses his fortune was greatly reduced during the latter years of his life, but his interest in his Church and in his brethren generally never flagged, no matter what his reverses may have been. His wife was also a devoted Christian, and her influence over him had much to do, no doubt, in forming and maintaining the high Christian character which he possessed. He had a judicial mind. He never went to extremes. His friends said of him that he asked the advice of everybody, then finally did just as he pleased. Undoubtedly he was careful to investigate all the facts before he gave a decision in any case. In all his official positions he was regarded as a very safe counsellor, incorruptible and cautious, and he was at one time spoken of freely as the possible candi-
date of the Democratic party for the presidency. He was eminently fit for an executive position.

Another distinguished governor was Francis Marion Drake. He was born in Rushville, Schuyler County, Illinois, December 30, 1830. In 1837 the family removed to Iowa, and ever afterward Drake remained identified with that state. He united with the Disciples in 1843. He grew up with the state which he had adopted, and accumulated a large fortune. He studied law and engaged in its practice for a while, but gave most of his time to the construction of railroads, in which business he was very successful. He assisted in founding Drake University at Des Moines, and was a large contributor to its building and endowment funds. In 1895 he received the unanimous nomination of the Iowa Republican State Convention for the governorship, and was elected by an overwhelming majority, having received the largest vote ever cast in the state for that office. He was, in 1885, elected president of the American Christian Missionary Society, and served for one year. He was a large contributor to all the missionary and benevolent enterprises of the Disciples.

Like Governor Bishop, he was a man of business, as well as a statesman. He left a very considerable fortune, some of which was bequeathed for the benefit of Drake University, to which he had already contributed generously. His memory is greatly revered in Iowa, and he can certainly be classed as one of the men who were influential in making the Disciple movement a success.

Another eminent statesman who has departed this life was ex-Senator Carmack of Tennessee, whose tragic death recently shocked the whole civilised world. Carmack was a man of remarkable characteristics. He was one of the finest orators of his time. In the Senate of the United States he was regarded as perhaps the superior of any other man in that body as a public speaker.

He was a man of great courage, and to this fact may be ascribed his untimely death. He was an uncompromising advocate of prohibition in his state, and it is believed that this fact had much to do with the violent opposition to him which finally ended in his being shot down in the street.

This characteristic of courage showed itself in his religious life. While he was in Washington, attending to
his official duties, he made up his mind to become a Christian; and, instead of uniting with one of the Christian churches in Washington, he immediately returned to his home in Tennessee and made a public confession of his faith in Christ, and was baptized and united with the little church, made up of his friends and neighbours. He was unwilling to take so important a step anywhere else. Ira I. Chase was at one time governor of Indiana. He was also a devoted Christian preacher.

A few of the representatives of the Disciples among Christian statesmen may be mentioned as follows: ex-Governor Benton McMillan of Tennessee, ex-Governor and Senator Alvin Saunders of Nebraska; “Private” John Allen, member of Congress, and H. D. Morely of Mississippi; Senator George T. Oliver, and Congressmen W. H. Graham, T. W. Phillips, and Russell Errett of Pennsylvania; A. M. Lay, Benjamin Franklin, Joshua Alexander, Thomas Hackney of Missouri; James D. Richardson, William C. Houston, C. E. Snodgrass of Tennessee; R. M. A. Hawk of Illinois; Honorable Albert T. Willis and John D. White of Kentucky; R. F. Armfield, J. D. New, Charles Cooper, and E. D. Crumpacker of Indiana; and also John C. New, United States treasurer, of the same state; J. A. Hughes of West Virginia, and Champ Clark of Missouri.

Most of these men have distinguished themselves in the positions which they have held. Champ Clark is now leader of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives.

PREACHERS AND EDUCATORS

One of the oldest of Indiana’s pioneer preachers was John Longley, born in New York City on the thirteenth of June, 1782. In 1790 with his family he emigrated West, finally settling in Kentucky, and was immersed in the Ohio River, in March, 1801. In 1804 he was married to Miss Francina Hendrickson of Fleming County, Kentucky. Some time after this he came under the influence of Barton W. Stone and those associated with him, and it was not long until he gave up all human creeds and became thoroughly identified with the Disciple movement. In 1826 he removed to Cincinnati, and in 1830 he finally settled in Rush County, Indiana. From that time until his
death he was a powerful factor in that state in advocating the cause of the Disciples.

Another pioneer preacher of Indiana was John Wright. He was born in Rowan County, North Carolina, December 12, 1785. He was largely instrumental in uniting a number of churches as early as 1819, 1820, and 1821. He was a man of strong religious convictions; generous, unselfish, and broad-minded, and was always an ardent advocate of Christian union on the Bible, and the Bible alone.

John B. New was another earnest advocate of the ancient order of things. The Disciples are much indebted to his influence for the success which they have had in the state of Indiana.

Beverly Vawter is another of the pioneers whose name deserves honourable mention.

Elijah Goodwin was for many years one of the leaders of the movement; and Samuel K. Hoshour, both as a preacher and educator, was highly respected and influential as a leader of the forces in the early history of the movement. Love H. Jameson was one of the sweet singers of Israel, as well as an earnest and effective preacher. He was identified with the pioneers in Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky, though, during the latter days of his life, he laboured chiefly in Indiana. Other pioneers may be mentioned, belonging to the same period, such as Jacob Wright, B. K. Smith, Joseph W. Wolfe, and Thomas J. Edmondson, the latter being somewhat given to poetry. One of his hymns has been very popular, commencing with the line, “Among the Mountain Trees.”

The name of Jacob Creath, Jr., has been mentioned in another part of this work, but he deserves to have a special place among those who have contributed most to the movement of the Disciples. He was born January 17, 1799, in Mecklenburg County, Virginia. Some notice has already been given of his uncle, Jacob Creath, Sr. The nephew became identified with the Baptists very early in life, but, having removed to Kentucky, and coming under the influence of the teaching of Alexander Campbell, he, with others, was excluded from the Baptists on account of what they regarded as his heretical views. He ever afterwards devoted himself to the promulgation of the principles set forth by the Disciples of Christ. In the later years of his life he laboured chiefly in Missouri, and was
a powerful factor in building up the cause in that state. In some respects he was perhaps the ablest man in the state, though on account of some peculiarities he may not have exerted as much influence as his superior abilities entitled him to wield. He was rather inclined to cultivate a dogmatic spirit, and his opposition to missionary societies and other progressive movements of the Disciples somewhat circumscribed his influence, although no one doubted his conscientiousness or his supreme devotion to the cause he had espoused.

Marcus P. Wills was a very influential preacher in the early days of the movement in Missouri. He came from southern Kentucky and settled on a farm in Boone County. He preached for the churches in Boone, Galloway, and Howard Counties, in schoolhouses, barns, and groves. The congregations at Red Top, Columbia, and Friendship were ministered to by him. He baptized great numbers in various parts of the state. He laboured entirely without any salary, depending on his farm for support. It is certainly worth while to mention here the fact that in these early days nearly all the preachers traveled and preached at their own expense, very seldom receiving anything by way of compensation for their services. Nearly all of these men were farmers, or were in some kind of business by which they could support their families. For many years the church in Columbia was served by preachers who received no stated salary whatever, such men as Wills, Thomas M. Allen, and others doing the preaching, while the elders attended to everything else.

Thomas McBride was another able preacher, who came from Madison County, Kentucky, and settled also in Boone County, Missouri, in 1816. He was perhaps the first advocate of primitive Christianity in the state of Missouri. His labours were chiefly confined to the counties of Galloway, Howard, Monroe, Randolph, Cooper, Saline, and Lafayette. His influence was very great among the churches, and to him the Disciples of Missouri are greatly indebted for his early advocacy of their cause.

Another Kentucky preacher, Allen Wright, was among the pioneers who advocated the Disciple movement in Missouri, and he did a splendid work at Lexington, Georgetown, and in other parts of the state.

Winthrop H. Hopson was born near Jacksonville, Ill.,
Hopson was one of the most gifted preachers among the Disciples of his day. He preached much in Missouri, and also in Kentucky, and was for a time pastor of a church in Richmond, Va. He held a great meeting in the Eighth and Walnut Street Church, Cincinnati, during which time he attracted the attention of the whole city as well as of the surrounding country. He was also an associate editor of the *Apostolic Times* when that paper was first started. He deserves to be gratefully remembered by his brethren.

A number of Iowa preachers have already been mentioned in other parts of this work. But one or two deserve mention here. George Thomas Carpenter was born March 4, 1834, in Nelson County, Kentucky. He was for a time connected with Oskaloosa College, Iowa, and also with the *Evangelist*, which at that time was the leading paper of the Disciples in the state of Iowa. He was a man of strong personal traits, energetic, and of fine executive ability. The cause in Iowa is much indebted to his advocacy.

N. A. McConnell was born in Columbia County, Ohio, January 23, 1824, and emigrated to Iowa in 1849, the same year that the American Christian Missionary Society was organised. He at once threw himself heartily into the Disciple movement, which was at that time making considerable headway in his adopted state. In these early days it was the habit to hold debates with those who opposed the Disciples, and McConnell became quite famous for his debates, though in many respects he was a man of exceedingly amiable disposition. He was closely associated with such men as Aaron Chatterton, Arthur Miller, Jonas Hartzell, and Levi Fleming, all of whom were able advocates of the Disciple movement.

Had we space, it would be a delight to give extended notices of such men as Harrison Jones (one of the most eloquent preachers of his time), B. A. Hinsdale (who was both an able preacher and educator), William Baxter (the biographer of Walter Scott), and many other distinguished advocates of the Disciple cause in Ohio, who have gone to their reward. But it is impossible to do more than simply mention the names of many of the preachers that have gone before, as well as those who
remain. However, there are two or three of the middle period pioneers who deserve a very prominent place in the history of the Disciple movement.

Alexander Proctor was the first college graduate who advocated the Disciple movement in Missouri. He was a great preacher, and even a greater thinker. He did much to liberalise the thought of the preachers of his state. He was a graduate of Bethany College, and for some time the pastor of the Olive Street Christian Church, St. Louis, Mo. But his most prominent ministry was in connection with the Christian Church in Independence, Mo., where his pastorate continued for many years. Perhaps no man exerted a wider influence in Missouri than did this great preacher. He was regarded by a few as somewhat eccentric, and his thinking was not always entirely accurate, but such a mind as his does not work by the ordinary rules, and hence he cannot be judged by the limitations of the usual standards. He lived much outside of the sphere occupied by smaller minds, and it is highly probable that many of these smaller minds did not understand him, and consequently misjudged him. However, no one ever even suspected him of being untrue to his convictions or untrue to the great cause which he advocated, though they may have differed from him as regards some particular views that he was known to hold. These views never interfered with his fellowship, and he himself did much to accentuate that peculiar feature of the Disciple movement which allows the largest liberty of opinion, provided men are true to the centre, which is the personal Christ.

Another splendid preacher was J. S. Lamar of Georgia. He was the biographer of Isaac Errett. He was a graceful writer, an eloquent preacher, and one of the most lovable of men. His writings were characterised by a subtle humour which made everything he wrote enjoyable reading. He was located for many years at Augusta, Ga., but his work extended to every part of the state. No man among the Disciples of his day was more respected.

One of the ablest, most trusted, and most useful men of the period under consideration was B. W. Johnson, first editor of the \textit{Evangelist} in Iowa, and afterward associated with J. H. Garrison in the editorship of the \textit{Christian Evangelist} at St. Louis, Mo. Johnson was a
graduate of Bethany College, taking the honours of his class, and was regarded by his contemporaries as one of the most scholarly men of his day among the Disciples. He was a very hard student, and probably to this cause may be attributed his ill health, during his later years, and finally his untimely death. He had just reached his most mature manhood when he fell, but he fell at his post. In addition to his preaching and editing the journals mentioned, he wrote a number of books, and these have become standards in the literature of the Disciples.

H. W. Everest was another able preacher and educator. He laboured chiefly in Illinois, and was connected for a time with Eureka College. His book on “Christian Evidences” is a text-book in a number of colleges, and from several points of view it is a very useful work. Its classification is especially good for the convenience of both teacher and pupil. However, it cannot be regarded as entirely up-to-date on the questions involved in modern skepticism.

Robert Graham was born in Liverpool, England, but came to this country early in life, and was a preacher of great power and influence. He was also an educator, being for some time president of the College of the Bible at Lexington, Ky., as well as connected with other institutions of learning. He was for a few years pastor of what is now the Central Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio. He was much beloved by all who knew him.

O. A. Burgess was another distinguished preacher of the class now under consideration. Most of his work was done in Indiana, and it was always done well. He served as a pastor of the Central Church in Indianapolis for many years, and the cause in Indianapolis owes much to him for its present position. He was a man of inflexible integrity, strong characteristics, and a forcible speaker.

The plan of this work does not allow any extended sketch of men who are now living, consequently only comparatively few of the living men will be sketched at all. Among those who are entitled to the exception is Professor Charles Louis Loos. He has been identified with the movement perhaps longer than any living preacher, and has been an active participant in nearly every department of its work.

He was born at Woerth, in the department of the lower
Rhine, France, December 22, 1823, but did not come to America until 1834. He is of both German and French origin—French on his father’s side and German on his mother’s side. In 1830, after the Revolution in Paris, the National Guard was organised, when Professor Loos’ father became an officer in the guard, and the younger Loos became a member of the Junior National Guard, and figured prominently under his father’s training, learning the lessons of republicanism and strong patriotism, by which the professor has always been characterised.

His French republicanism and that of his father brought them to the United States in 1832, the same year that the Reformers and Christians united in Kentucky. The young Alsatian had become an ardent lover of America before he reached this country, and he soon became identified with the most fervent adherents of republicanism in his adopted land. He began the study of English immediately after reaching Ohio, and the language was soon mastered, he having already a superior education which he had obtained in the schools of his native country. His people were Lutherans, but having heard some of the Disciple preachers, the plea which they make attracted his free spirit, and consequently he united with the Christian Church in 1838, and has been closely connected with their work ever since. He entered Bethany College, West Virginia, in 1842, and graduated in 1846. He was immediately appointed professor in the Primary Department, which position he held for three years. His career cannot be followed any further than to state that in 1880 he was elected president of Kentucky University, now Transylvania, and also professor of Greek. He served in this position seventeen years, and then resigned his presidency, retaining the chair of Greek until the present year, 1909. Professor Loos has been constantly engaged in teaching for over fifty years, and before his graduation he taught also for several years, making about sixty years in all that he has devoted himself to teaching. On this account he has been allowed the benefit of the Carnegie Fund upon his recent resignation from Transylvania University.

Another exception to the rule adopted may be made in the case of J. H. Garrison, the distinguished editor of the Christian Evangelist of St. Louis. Dr. Garrison is not only an able preacher, but has proved to be one of
the best editors ever connected with the Disciple movement. He was, in his early life, a Baptist, but while at college he became acquainted with some of the Disciple leaders, and was led to investigate their religious position. The result was that he united with one of their churches and soon became a warm advocate of their cause.

During the war, he went into the army and became distinguished for his courage and commanding ability. He was severely wounded at the battle of Pea Ridge. After the war he soon became identified with Disciple journalism. He was editor of the *Gospel Echo*, which later became the *Christian*, and this was finally united with the *Evangelist*, and the combined paper was called the *Christian Evangelist*, with B. W. Johnson and J. H. Garrison as editors. When Johnson died, Garrison became its editor-in-chief, and has recently celebrated his fortieth year as editor of that paper. During this whole time he has held the esteem of the entire brotherhood. He has never occupied an extreme position with respect to the questions which have come up for discussion during the time he has been a leader in the movement. He has usually occupied a middle-of-the-road position. While advocating every important forward movement he has, at the same time, held firmly to that which had already been gained. In other words, his idea of progress is that we must not destroy the platform on which the steps of progress are made. He therefore unites in his advocacy both stability and movement, and this makes him the safe leader that he is. As a writer he is always gentle in spirit, judicial in the statement of his arguments, and forcible in the presentation of his cause. He has written several books, the most widely circulated of which are those inculcating the spiritual life. One of his books, entitled “Alone with God,” has already reached a circulation of over 50,000 copies. He is now in the prime of his most mature manhood, and his influence upon the brotherhood with which he is associated was never greater.

John W. McGarvey is another preacher and educator who must be made an exception to the rule with respect to the sketches of living men. President McGarvey’s long and faithful service entitles him to a much more extended notice than can here be given. He was born in Hopkinsville, Ky., March 1, 1829. His father removed to the state
of Illinois when the son was only ten years old. From there he went to Bethany College to complete his education. He graduated in 1850, the family having meantime removed to Fayette, Mo., where he also went and taught a private school for two years. He finally decided to enter the ministry, and accordingly was ordained in 1853. He was pastor of a church at Dover, Mo., for nine years, and then went to Lexington, Ky., to succeed Dr. W. H. Hopson in what was at that time the Main Street Church; and after five years’ service in this pastorate he was elected to the professorship of Sacred History in the College of the Bible. He afterwards served the Broadway Church in Lexington for several years. In 1863 he published his “Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,” which at once received favourable recognition among Biblical scholars. In 1879 he made a tour of Egypt and Palestine, and afterward published “Lands of the Bible,” of which over 15,000 copies were sold almost immediately. Some time after this he published “The Text and Canon of the New Testament,” and also “A Commentary on Matthew and Mark,” “A Volume of Sermons,” etc., and finally a book entitled, “The Authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy.” On the resignation of President Graham of the College of the Bible in 1897, he was elected president of that college, having been a professor in it from its origin, in 1865.

He has been a prolific contributor to the periodical literature of the Disciples; for a time one of the editors of the *Apostolic Times*, and has for a number of years conducted a department in the *Christian Standard*, entitled “Biblical Criticism.” As a writer he is distinguished for clearness, incisiveness, and historical accuracy. He has always been a close student of the Bible, and there are few men more familiar with its facts. Some have thought that in his criticisms he has not always been as charitable as he might have been in his treatment of those from whose opinions he differs. It has been said of him that there are really two McGarveys. He is one of the most lovable men in the whole brotherhood of the Disciples in his social life, and is also one of the most hospitable in his home life. As a preacher his spirit is as gentle as that of a little child, but in the use of his pen he sometimes dips it in gall rather than in ink. However, he is now one of the grand old men of the
Restoration movement, and is still, both by tongue and pen, wielding a powerful influence for good. March the third, of this Centennial year, was his fifty-sixth anniversary in the ministry. On the eightieth anniversary of his birth he resigned the presidency of the College of the Bible, but the trustees refused to accept it.


The following pastors and educators are still living and have become distinguished in their fields of labour: T. P. Haley (the acknowledged dean of his brother ministers, and to whom his brethren in Missouri are more indebted than perhaps to any other man), B. B. Tyler (who has held several important pastorates and is still active in the ministry in Denver, Col.), W. F. Richardson, George H. Combs, Burris A. Jenkins, Herbert L. Willett, C. C. Morrison, I. J. Spencer, J. J. Haley, F. D. Power (who has held one pastorate in Washington City for thirty-five years, and who is well and favourably known.
MEN INSTRUMENTAL IN THE MOVEMENT


Now, if to these names are added those which have been prominently mentioned in other parts of this work, the sum total will give a very impressive illustration of the catholicity of the Disciple plea. A careful examination of the men selected in the list given, as well as those referred to in other parts of this volume, will abundantly prove that the Disciple platform is broad enough for all to stand upon who hold to the Lord Jesus Christ as the foundation of the Church and as the only object of the Christian faith. Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone differed very widely with respect to certain doctrinal and philosophical questions; John Smith and John Rogers also differed; Walter Scott held certain views with respect to the millennium and other speculative matters which were not even generally accepted by the Disciples during his time; Dr. R. Richardson differed from his brethren generally with respect to the baptism in Holy Spirit; while such men as Jacob Creath, Tolbert Fanning, and others of the pioneers differed from D. S. Burnett, James Challen, John T. Johnson, and others, with respect to missionary societies. Benjamin Franklin and Isaac Errett also differed in their opinions concerning some important matters; while the controversies with respect to the communion question, instrumental music in the churches, and many other things that might be mentioned, abundantly prove that the unity of the Disciples never did consist in a unity of opinion. Nevertheless, in all these primitive days the Disciples were firmly united together by the common tie of fellowship in Jesus the Christ.

The same is true, if we examine the men who are
in the movement during these later days. Let any one glance over the names of the preachers and educators given in the foregoing list and he will see very readily that there are men in this list who differ quite as widely as the pioneers differed among themselves. The questions now are not the same as they were in the early days of the movement. Some of the modern questions relate to Biblical criticism, and such men as Willett and Sweeney find themselves far apart in their interpretation of the Scriptures with respect to miracles and other important matters. Even men like Dr. Garrison and J. A. Lord, B. A. Jenkins and J. W. McGarvey, differ widely in their opinions concerning many things both of doctrine and policy; and yet, notwithstanding all these differences, these men heartily co-operate with one another, and all agree with respect to the cardinal facts of the faith, thereby illustrating the catholicity of the Disciple plea, as well as the sufficiency of the platform which they have adopted.

The list of men given is a sufficient proof that the plea of the Disciples is eminently catholic. Of course there has been friction at nearly all the points of difference, but no division of any consequence has ever followed, even where these differences have come prominently into view. Occasionally an ugly spirit has been manifested, and sometimes there have been threatenings of coming divisions, but these have never materialised to any extent. A few restless spirits, who determined at any cost to make their opinions absolutely vital, and who, at the same time, sought to propagate these opinions at the expense of the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, made slight breaches in the ranks of the Disciples; but all these divisive movements soon came to naught. The views held by such men as Jesse B. Ferguson, W. S. Russell, I. X. Carmen, and Dr. Thomas would never have disturbed the unity of the Disciples, had these men entertained the opinions they did without insisting upon them as matters of faith. Moses E. Lard held to some views with respect to the meaning of future punishment which were not at all in harmony with the generally accepted views of the Disciples, but he continued in the fellowship of the Church until his death, and he is now remembered by Disciples everywhere as one of the great men of the Restoration movement. But Lard never did make his
opinions, with respect to anything, fundamental in his religious life. He loved freedom and he was honest, and when he was persuaded that a thing was true he had the courage of his convictions to say so, but he had equal courage to allow his brethren to entertain a different view, if they were fully persuaded that his view was wrong.

Most of the living men whose names have been mentioned differ among themselves also as regards practical matters. Every man is doing his work in his own way. There is no iron-clad system among the Disciples for determining methods of working. There is the largest liberty allowed with respect to all these matters. At the same time it is unmistakably true that there is no great difference even in methods, and this is rather remarkable, since there has never been much attempt at uniformity, even where uniformity would seem to be almost necessary. Take the matter of the Communion service for example. For a long time the method of administering the Lord’s Supper was practically the same in nearly all the churches. However, the older members of the churches, now living, can remember when there was considerable controversy among the Disciples as to whether the Supper should be administered in the morning, afternoon, or night. Now, such a matter is treated with indifference. It is furthermore the privilege of any church to have the Communion before the preaching or after the preaching, as may suit the convenience and taste of the congregation. Many of the churches use individual Communion cups, and some of the churches return thanks for both the bread and the wine at the same time.

The time is also remembered by many when the same hymnbook was used in all the churches, and when it was thought advisable to publish a new hymnbook a committee was appointed by the American Christian Missionary Society for this purpose, and mainly for the reason that it was thought important that the one-hymn-book idea should be perpetuated. However, the churches have come to exercise great freedom, even with respect to this matter, which for a long time was regarded as very important. The hymnbook has been practically ruled out entirely, and in its place the churches are now using hymnals, and there is a great variety of these, so that every church can please itself as to what book is used.
This liberty may produce some confusion, and really does at times almost disturb a few of the older church members, who lived under a former dispensation. But in all this is illustrated the power of unity among the Disciples, notwithstanding the great respect there is for liberty in all that they say and do. Is not this the only platform that can insure Christian union? Is it possible to have union if all this variety has to be reduced to a minimum? Is it not far better to have a common centre, and then allow a planetary system to revolve around this, rather than to make a sun of every planet? Difference is the law of life, and difference, when it is in the right place, is the only way in which to have harmony. The Disciple platform proposes one central personality—Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God—and when the things which He has commanded are accepted, the largest liberty is allowed with respect to all matters of opinion, even as regards Biblical interpretation. This differentiates the catholic plea of the Disciples from all the denominations that have fenced in their churches by human creeds. The Disciples ring out in every part of the Christian world this glorious motto: “The right to differ, but no right to divide.”

BUSINESS MEN

It is one of the signs of the times that the Disciples are taking a business view of their responsibilities. The organization of the societies to which attention has already been called led up to a very decided recognition of what is understood as a “Lay Element,” or the business men element, in its relation to the whole movement. This recognition has finally led to the organization of the business men into a society called “The Brotherhood of the Disciples of Christ.” This organization aims to bring the business men into a closer relation with everything that is done, in order to forward the great enterprises of the churches. Evidently this is a movement in the right direction. And it is already assuming very definite and influential proportions. The following are the officers of this new organization:

Officers: R. A. LONG, President and Acting Treasurer, Long Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.; P. C. MACFARLANE, Secretary, Kansas City, Mo.; E. E. ELIOTT, Assistant Secretary.

But the interest of our business men is not confined to this organization. There is a general feeling among the brotherhood of the Disciples that the direction of affairs has been too much confined to the preachers. Perhaps this was unavoidable in the days of the past. Anyway, the preachers are not responsible for this state of things. They have always been more than anxious to have the business men participate in their councils, but for some reason these men have not become very active in any of the societies, though they have contributed liberally of their means to their support.

It is now felt that the time has come when the men who control the sinews of war must be brought into the councils of the brotherhood, and the society to which reference has been made will probably do much to stimulate the activities of the business men in this respect. This is a very encouraging outlook to the preachers themselves, who have long realised the need of the business experience which these business men will bring into the affairs of the Church.

At the General Convention in New Orleans, in 1908, steps were taken to organize a Ministerial Association for the better protection of the ministers themselves, in guarding against imposition from those who are not worthy to occupy the ministerial position, and also for general sympathy with and co-operation in all the work committed to their hands. While this, organization of the ministers will doubtless bring more efficiency to their own work, they have nevertheless been deeply impressed with the fact that there is a considerable amount of work for which they are not specially qualified, as their training has not been with reference to it; and this is precisely the work that the business men of the churches can and ought to do. It is hoped, therefore, by the Disciples that the new awakening, with respect to the importance of their business men, will do much in the future to forward their religious movement. These business men have always been a sort of silent force in the Disciple movement. Without them the movement would doubtless have failed, but they have received very slight recognition in any of the histories.
that have been written concerning the Disciples. It is believed, therefore, that some recognition ought to be made of this class of men in a history which assumes to embrace in its scope a somewhat comprehensive view of all the forces that have been engaged in the movement; and it is a pleasure, as well as a duty, to present some of the names of the business men who deserve to be mentioned for their active support of the Disciples in their effort to restore New Testament Christianity, in its faith, doctrine, and life.

In submitting a list of business and professional men it is possible to do little more than mention the name of each, as, to do justice to these men, a volume would be required. However, in a few instances, some facts are stated with reference to the life and character, and the reader will be able to see at once the reason for this. It is not even always possible to draw the line between the dead and the living; consequently, the name only can be perpetuated in this work.

Though one of the middle-aged men, the name of R. A. Long of Kansas City is placed at the head of this list. As he is the president of the Brotherhood Association, he is entitled to this place, though for other reasons he is eminently entitled to it. The Disciples have never had a man in their fellowship who was a more princely giver than R. A. Long. It would seem that there is practically no end to his contributions to all the enterprises of the church. Nor does he confine his gifts entirely to the Christian Church. He gives to many outside enterprises, and especially to those of a religious character.

Mr. Long is a deeply religious man, though he makes no exhibition of this in public. He is, of all men, the least obtrusive upon public attention. He shrinks from the publication of his benefactions. He was president of the American Christian Missionary Society for 1907-8. His gifts to colleges have been most liberal. Indeed, it would be almost impossible to mention any worthy enterprise among the Disciples to which he is not a liberal contributor. As he is still comparatively a young man, and as there seems to be no limit to the blessings which God is showering upon him, there seems also to be no end to the distributions which he is constantly making of his already ample fortune.
Timothy Coop of England is another name that deserves to be enshrined in history. He began his active manhood-life in almost extreme poverty, but through his indomitable energy and wise management he accumulated an ample fortune, and for the last ten or twelve years of his life he contributed each year to benevolent enterprises not less than $25,000.00. He was devoted to American institutions, and died while on a visit to this country, and was buried in the cemetery at Cincinnati.

T. W. Phillips of New Castle, Pa., has been a generous giver to the Disciples’ cause. Mr. Phillips has made large gifts to Bethany College, and has always been a liberal supporter of the missionary societies connected with the Disciple movement. It is understood that he is the author of a book entitled, “The Church of Christ, by a Layman.” This book has had a wide circulation, and is a plain, common-sense presentation of New Testament teaching concerning the Gospel and the Church.

Joseph I. Irwin, Columbus, Ind., is a business man who has accumulated a large fortune through his own industry. Recently he made a gift of $100,000.00 to Butler College, at Indianapolis, and he has also been a generous contributor to other organisations of the Disciples. He has now arrived at extreme old age, but is still in fairly good health. He is the father-in-law of Z. T. Sweeney, a distinguished preacher among the Disciples, and at one time consul-general at Constantinople.

W. S. Dickinson of Cincinnati has been associated with the Disciple movement from his early youth, and has been closely identified with the colleges, missionary societies, and benevolent organisations of the movement, since the organization of the American Christian Missionary Society in 1849, he being one of the few men, now living, who were present on that occasion. He was for many years treasurer of the Foreign Missionary Society, and at the present time holds several official positions in Church organisations.

A. M. Atkinson of Indiana is another man who will be held in memory as a consecrated business man. He was the real founder of the Board of Ministerial Relief, and fell dead at Cincinnati while pleading for the old heroes who needed the support of the brethren.

John B. Bowman of Kentucky deserves special mention.
He was profoundly interested in education, and gave his time, talent, and means to the building up of Kentucky University, at Lexington. He purchased the Ashland estate, owned by Henry Clay, and co-ordinated the Agricultural College with the university, and at the same time perfected plans by which, no doubt, one of the greatest universities in the country would have been developed had he been able to carry out these plans. But for reasons, which need not here be mentioned, he was hindered, and finally gave up the task some time before his death. But what he accomplished for the university will remain as a monument to his memory. He was one of the men present, in 1874, when the Foreign Christian Society practically had its birth.

Ovid Butler of Indiana was another great man among the men who have passed away. He was the founder of what is now known as Butler College, though the first name was Northwestern Christian University. Mr. Butler was a lawyer by profession and accumulated a considerable fortune, of which he contributed liberally to the building up of the institution which now bears his name. He was also a wise man in council, and was much esteemed by those who knew him.

Albert Allen was a Kentuckian who deserves to be gratefully remembered for his counsel and energetic efforts in the management of the business enterprises of the Church. He was state secretary under Governor Bishop of Ohio, and for a while lived at Bethany, W. Va., while he was financial agent for Bethany College. But most of his life was spent in his native state, where he was highly respected by all who knew him. He was regarded as a wise counsellor, and most efficient and energetic helper in the business affairs connected with the Disciple movement.

G. W. N. Yost, in his day, was a very generous giver. He was an inventor, and at times was very successful in business, though he was not careful in the management of his affairs, and consequently met with reverses which limited his power to help. However, during the times when he was successful his great heart prompted him to large benevolences.

C. H. Gould of Cincinnati was for many years closely allied with the central position of the Disciple propaganda.
He was a man of sterling integrity, and both in counsel and money he gave freely and wisely to the Disciple cause. He was for a time one of the stockholders of the Standard Publishing Company, and was for many years an honoured elder of the Central Christian Church of Cincinnati, the building of which he superintended during its erection.

B. F. Coulter of California deserves very special mention in connection with the business men who have been distinguished for their generous gifts to the Disciple cause. Mr. Coulter, like a great many Disciples, was born in Kentucky, and after living in Tennessee for several years, he removed to California in 1877. During nearly the whole of his Christian life he has united business with the preaching of the Gospel. In California he has held his membership in the Broadway Church of Los Angeles, the house for this congregation being built by Mr. Coulter himself. He has recently made over to this church property for the extension of its work, the worth of which is estimated at $150,000.00. He has also built at his own cost a comfortable building for a Japanese church-school, in connection with the Broadway Church. In addition to these benefactions he has contributed largely to many other enterprises of the Disciples. Recently there appeared an editorial in one of the Los Angeles papers, representing him as a “true successor of the Apostles.” The editorial mentioned says that Mr. Coulter is as unaffected as a little child, notwithstanding his munificent gifts and his large business, the latter of which enables him to make these gifts.

Charles C. Chapman was born in Macomb, Ill., in 1853. In 1894 he removed to Southern California, since which time he has been actively engaged in the culture of citrus fruits, and a recent issue of the National Fruit Trade Journal called him the “Orange King of the World,” and said he was “the most talked-of and successful grower of citrus fruits throughout the world.” He is not a rich man, as the present generation counts riches, but he has always been a generous giver according to his means. He is a trustee of Pomona College, and also of the Berkeley Bible Seminary. In counsel he is wise; in business, energetic; in his church life, faithful; and socially, he is one of the most agreeable of men.
J. H. Allen is a well-known cotton merchant of St. Louis. He is modest and somewhat retiring, but is forceful and energetic in business. He has contributed much to the Disciple cause in St. Louis, and has helped many struggling churches throughout the entire South and Southwest. He has also given to the Bible College at Columbia and other colleges of his Church. He is active in the Christian Brotherhood organization.

R. H. Stockton of St. Louis has already been mentioned, but his name deserves to be recorded on this page. His contributions to the Orphans’ Home of St. Louis, to several colleges, and for the erection of the new Hamilton Avenue Christian Church in St. Louis, place him among the most generous givers connected with the Disciples movement.

Claud L. Garth of Georgetown, Ky., gave during his lifetime $90,000.00 to the Educational Society of that state. John and Benjamin Thomas of Shelbyville, Ky., have given $80,000.00 for the endowment of the College of the Bible at Lexington. Dr. Gill of Danville, Ky., gave $15,000.00 to the same college.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE CENTENNIAL OUTLOOK

FOR several years the Disciples have had their faces turned toward Pittsburg, where their great Centennial celebration is to take place in October of the present year. As already stated in another chapter, this will probably be one of the greatest religious conventions ever held in the history of Christianity, at least so far as the number in attendance is concerned. Unless all signs fail, it is certain that there will be present during this convention not less than 50,000 Disciples, and probably many more. An extensive programme has been prepared, the object of which is to set forth in a popular way something of the history, principles, plans, and aims of the Disciple movement, and this volume would not be complete without giving some consideration to the Centennial year of the Disciple movement.

The place selected is believed to be appropriate. The movement, from the Campbellian side, began in Western Pennsylvania. The “Declaration and Address” was written in a house still standing, an illustration of which will be found in this volume. Thomas Campbell first settled in Western Pennsylvania, and Alexander, his son, lived there also until he married and moved to Bethany, W. Va.

But even Bethany is not far from Pittsburg and will doubtless be visited by many of the delegates who will attend the Centennial celebration. Walter Scott began his public ministry in Pittsburg, and other distinguished men, connected with the early days of the movement, lived there. Dr. Richardson was practising medicine in that city when he became acquainted with Walter Scott. It has been the home of some of the great preachers connected with the movement, as well as business men who have contributed of their means to the support of the cause. There are many associations connected with Pitts-
burg that make it a suitable place for holding this great convention of the Disciples.

It is not difficult to anticipate the enthusiasm of the delegates who will be present on this interesting occasion. The Centennial celebration will form a sort of promontory from which Disciples may contemplate the history of the past, the present outlook, and the future prospects of the great movement which has gained such widespread influence in the hundred years since it started.

In the preceding pages of this volume the movement has been considered in its past history. That history is undoubtedly a remarkable one. It cannot be accounted for on any other hypothesis than that it has been fostered by a kind Providence, which has watched over every step of its progress. However, this Providence has not always entirely shielded the movement from evil influences. There have been dark days as well as bright days; there have been drawbacks as well as incentives to go forward. But all this is in harmony with the general course of things. The method of the Divine government does not insure immunity from influences of evil, but it gives grace to resist these influences, which is far better than to suppress the influences themselves. Conflict is the law of progress. We are living in a world of lights and shadows, of sunshine and darkness, of joy and sorrow, of triumphs and trials, and no one ought to expect the most favoured religious movement to be entirely free from apparently unfriendly influences. But, after all, the very opposition which the Disciples have had to meet has been one of the best things that could have happened. This has made them vigilant, stimulated their activities, sharpened their intellectual perceptions, welded them together in the bond of a common faith, hope, and love, and has helped to make them a compact brotherhood, notwithstanding they have no human creed by which they are held together.

All is not entirely bright with them in this Centennial year. There are, here and there, indications of unrest, and in some places there are severe rumblings of a coming storm. They have fought through many hardly-contested battles, and have gained some conspicuous victories. But the final triumph of their principles has not yet been fully realised. Nor is the opposition confined to those who are outside the Disciple churches. Some of it is in
their own churches. There are always restless spirits who are seeking for new fields of enterprise. If these men are wisely guided, they are always important factors in any great movement. To stand still is death; to go forward is danger; but it is better to brave the danger of going forward than to stand still and die.

In this fact is much of the glory of the Disciples. In rejecting human creeds they utterly refused to tie themselves to the “dead hand.” These creeds are essentially unprogressive. They cannot move beyond the day they were adopted. They crystallised truth as men saw it when the creeds were made. Since that time they have not moved an inch, nor can they move, as they are practically the coffins in which the dead past is buried. Men who stand by these creeds must themselves become religiously unprogressive. They can go no farther than their creeds go, unless they break with them entirely, and this is equivalent to surrendering them, which is the very thing they ought to do in order that true religious progress may be made. But the Disciples have not only rejected these dead hands and religious sepulchers, but they have accepted a Leader who “was dead but is alive for evermore.” In accepting Jesus the Christ as their Great Leader, the Disciples practically pledge themselves to every forward movement which He commands. They follow Him, the living, personal representative of the religion which He came to this earth to establish; and, in following Him, they must necessarily always and everywhere be in the front of the battle where the contest against all evil influences is waged.

But this very fact of taking Jesus the Christ as their leader, and following Him wheresoever He goes, necessarily brings the Disciples into many antagonisms which might be avoided if they were satisfied to settle down with the achievements of the dead past and refuse to go forward as Jesus, their leader, goes to the conquest of the nations.

It may be that this progressive attitude of the Disciples will occasionally show itself in illegitimate tendencies, or in dangerous experiments. But even where this is the case, the situation is infinitely better than that extreme timidity which refuses to do anything, lest something should be done that is wrong. The first thing that the Apostle enjoins to be added to faith is courage, and that
courage should be carefully distinguished from rashness. At the same time, no progress can be made in this world without a good degree of willingness to take some risks, even in the most sacred religious things. Biblical criticism is not a thing to be despised. Alexander Campbell was the champion of a Bible, free from human glosses, and of a system of Hermeneutics that appeals to the educated reason; and he would be the last man in the ranks of the Disciples, if he were living to-day, to be unwilling to hear any one who has anything to say worth while concerning either the Bible or the rules by which it should be interpreted.

Freedom is always a precious boon to those who have felt its inspiring influence. But freedom has its dangers. Despotism is a mean thing, and is usually devoid of inspiration. But, after all, it has some good in it. It is good for order and for holding together. Where it reigns supreme there is not much danger of division. But Disciples, at least, have always preferred, and probably will always prefer, liberty with its evil to despotism with its good.

Recently there has been some discussion with regard to higher criticism tendencies among the Disciples. A few men have felt it to be their duty to urge upon the Disciples to bring up their movement so as to parallel it with the scholarship of the age. Of course these phrases are susceptible of different interpretations. The phrase, “scholarship of the age,” is itself open to serious criticism from the Disciples’ point of view. It has been the glory of the Disciples that they have always preached a Gospel which is simple and adapted to every creature. While they have advocated education, even to the highest that can be given in their colleges and universities, they have constantly urged that “the world by wisdom never knew God,” and cannot know Him in any such way. This view of the matter has made the Disciples careful, and even somewhat suspicious, with regard to mere intellectual attainments, where these come in conflict with the supremacy of the heart life. Unsanctified reason has often been found in conflict with the religion of the heart. Whoever is well acquainted with ecclesiastical history needs not be told that nearly all of the divisions that have come about in the history of Christianity have been produced by
this conflict between the head and the heart. At the same time it is unworthy of a plea which makes its appeal to the intelligence of men to ask them to surrender their reason simply because that reason may find itself in conflict with the “traditions of the fathers.”

The one thing which Disciples need to consider, during this Centennial year, is that this year is one hundred years later in the history of the world than when their movement had its beginning. One hundred years in these days make a very wide difference in the position which things occupy with respect to one another. The world has made immense progress since 1809. Christianity has itself made progress. There are means ready at hand, by which the Bible can be understood, which were not available when Mr. Campbell began his advocacy through the Christian Baptist. No one would think of reproducing many things that he said at that time, and hope to make them practical in the present day. He had his problems then and laboured earnestly and faithfully to solve them. Nor did he ever seem to have the fear of men before his eyes. While celebrating the inauguration of the great movement, which he did so much to make successful, will Disciples now tremble at the courage which he displayed? Surely they cannot honour His name if they refuse to follow wherever their Great Leader inspires them to go. Of course, they must be careful. Prudence is always closely allied with true courage. While the Disciples must still speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent, they need not always speak the whole truth as they see it, for the reason that there are many Disciples who cannot bear to hear the whole truth any more than the disciples of Jesus could bear it all when He told them He had many things to tell them, but they could not bear to hear them then. While the truth is progressive, and while we must be progressive with it, it is, after all, a very important thing to follow Longfellow’s advice, to “Learn to labour and to wait,” for inconsiderate haste in even saying things may sometimes lead to long delays when “hope deferred” must reign rather than “faith realised.”

In summing up the results of the century of the movement under consideration, Disciples may congratulate themselves upon the very great progress they have made
in nearly every department of their work. In educational matters they are coming to the front. They have been rather slow in this respect, for the reason that they have been unable to endow colleges; but some of these colleges are already taking high rank, and are receiving substantial gifts to their endowment funds. The day is auspicious for bright things, and it is believed that from this very year a new era will break forth with respect to the higher education.

The churches are still carrying on vigorous evangelistic work. The gains in numbers have been very decided within the past few decades. The most reliable statistics which can be obtained place the churches in round numbers at about 11,000, and the number of Disciples at about a million and a half. Of course it is not claimed that these figures are absolutely correct. The Disciples have never had any trustworthy system for numbering Israel. Indeed, they have been a little doubtful as to the propriety of this, in view of its prohibition under the Jewish system. Recently some earnest efforts have been made to secure trustworthy information with regard to the number of churches, preachers, and members, but this information is not yet equal to the giving of definite figures. However, it is believed that the estimates already mentioned are not far from the truth of the matter.

But, after all, numbers are not the things that count most. The progress which the Disciples have made in church-building, missionary operations, in contributions to the support of the work, and in spiritual growth, both at home and abroad, is certainly very encouraging in this Centennial year.

One thing that is often not counted in estimating progress may be regarded as almost the chief thing for which the Disciples should be thankful, namely, progress in the spiritual life. In enumerating the Centennial aims the first on the programme is prayer. Surely this speaks well for a religious people who are aiming to reproduce New Testament Christianity. Everything else would be a failure if the Disciples did not lean upon the Divine arm for strength. Indeed, it is one of the most hopeful things in this Centennial year that prayer should be the first consideration in the programme which has been published, indicating something of what is to be done at the Cen-
tennial celebration, as well as the kind of progress to be aimed at in the churches.

Undoubtedly the Disciples have great reason to rejoice in the present condition of their churches; especially is this true of their city churches, where for several years they have been making considerable progress. It has already been shown that in the early years of the movement very little attempt was made to evangelise the cities, and this for the reason that the time was not ripe for such an effort, in view of the fact that they had very few ministers properly equipped for this special work. However, for several years they have been making decided progress in the cities, and now, in this Centennial year, they can look with unaffected pride at what has been accomplished. It is only necessary to mention a few of the leading cities to illustrate the progress that has been made. The following are among the most striking examples: Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis, Mo.; St. Joe, Mo.; Anderson, Ind.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Crawfordsville, Ind.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Memphis, Tenn.; Birmingham, Ala.; Augusta, Ga.; Nashville, Tenn.; Lexington, Ky.; Frankfort, Ky.; Winchester, Ky.; Pittsburg, Pa.; Des Moines, Ia.; Los Angeles, Cal.; Denver, Col.; Richmond, Va.; Topeka, Kan.; Springfield, Mo.; Joplin, Mo.; Louisville, Ky.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Baltimore, Md.; Columbus, Ohio; Greenville, Tex.; Youngstown, Ohio; Warren, Ohio; Akron, Ohio; Bloomington, Ill.; Springfield, Ill.; Jacksonville, Ill. All these places are especially noticeable for good churches and good church buildings. Many other cities might be mentioned where the Disciples have gained a strong foothold, but those named are sufficient to illustrate the progress that has been made during the last few decades.

The American Christian Missionary Society has also been making very decided progress. Since this society was founded, in 1849, the Disciple movement has been very closely identified with it. In tracing the history of the Disciples this society has constantly been in evidence. It has been largely the central, directing force, so far as organization is concerned. Nearly all other societies connected with the Disciples have sprung from this mother society; and as the Disciples have never had any central, authoritative superintendency, such as is
common with Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, the American Christian Missionary Society, by general consent, has occupied an influential position in initiating and giving direction to very many important matters connected with the Disciple movement. At first the aim was to limit this society to simply missionary work. There were many misgivings when there was the slightest departure from this original comprehension of the society’s sphere of action. For some time after the society’s organization there was a growing sensitiveness with respect to any initiative which it undertook which had the slightest suspicion of departure from purely missionary work. It is evident, from the minutes of the first meeting, that this sensitiveness was not present at the time the society was organised, but it began to show itself very soon after the society was fairly launched.

However, in later years there has been a growing feeling that this society should be recognised as a sort of central organization which shall have a general superintendency with respect to many things which require such direction. So far, nothing of evil has come out of this centralising of authority; nor is it probable any evil will come out of it, if proper limitations are guarded in the management of affairs. Nevertheless, it is worth while for Disciples to remember some of the sweeping and incisive criticisms which Mr. Campbell made in the *Christian Baptist* on the abuse of societies, such as practically destroy the liberty of individual Christians and individual churches. Of course, in this matter, a very old question is involved. From another point of view this same question has entered into our national development. State rights and individual rights have been more or less at war with federal rights from the very beginning of the American Union. Hamiltonian federalism and Jeffersonian state rights have divided the American people, from the beginning, in politics. The Civil War grew out of this conflict more than out of anything else; but since the war there has been an unmistakable tendency toward centralising authority in the general government.

This tendency shows itself in nearly every department of American life. This life, as a whole, is characterised by bigness. No other word expresses so well just what American life is. Perhaps it is bigness *plus* exaggeration.
No doubt the bigness is exaggerated, and yet this strong persuasion, which seems to be an inheritance of every American citizen, has much to do with the greatness of the country. Dean Stanley was right when he said he did not find a single person in America who did not believe in the infinite possibilities of the American people.

The same tendency to bigness shows itself in commercial life. The little local shops and stores that once ministered to the needs of every neighbourhood are no longer in existence. They have been supplanted by the great department stores, where everything is supplied under practically the same cover. Corporations and trusts have their origin in the same tendency. We may protest against these, and certainly many of them need even more than protest, but they are supported, even against protest, by a tendency which is more powerful than any other dominating force. Whether we like these things or not, it is probable we shall have to put up with them until there is a decided reaction from the prevailing trend of our civilisation.

In view of these indications everywhere, it is probably certain that the Disciples will have, at least, to make the experiment of centralising their forces much more than has been the case during their past history. Indeed, it may be a reasonable conjecture that they have reached an era where such centralisation is absolutely necessary in order that they may achieve the triumphs that are awaiting them in the near future. But there is danger in breaking away from the traditions of the past, and especially with respect to this matter of centralising power. Undoubtedly there is great danger in this very thing, but there is always danger where life is at its best. As the Disciples have reached a stage of their progress where they are less belligerent than they were years ago, and where their own movement has become somewhat coordinated with the religious denominations around them, it is perhaps impossible to avoid entirely the somewhat doubtful expedient of centralising power in order to meet the exigencies of the times in which they now live. However, with prayerfulness and carefulness, and especially with personal unselfishness, there need be no extremes in the case, and consequently the American Christian Missionary Society may properly enough become a sort of
directing force for all the great agencies connected with the Disciple movement. From the Centennial outlook this seems to be a reasonable conclusion.

For the past two or three decades this Society has been making very commendable progress. It has constantly gained in both contributions and work accomplished. Since its organization it has received and disbursed $1,780,099.00. Its missionaries have baptized over 150,000 persons, organized about 3,500 churches, and gathered thousands of scattered Disciples together into working organizations. Every year has shown a gain in all of its departments of work, and the receipts for home missions have more than quadrupled in the past ten years.

But this is not all. Its missionaries have done much to build up the churches where they are weak, to develop spiritual life, and to increase general activity in religious work. Besides all this, considerable headway has been made in reference to Christian union. Recently several churches of the Baptists and Disciples have united in different parts of the country. This has been a marked feature of fraternal intercourse in Canada. As a matter of fact the Baptist churches and the Disciples in that country are practically one, and the spirit that has been manifested shows conclusively that the time is nearly ripe for a union between the two bodies. However, the course pursued is perhaps the best that can be devised. Individual churches have come together, and in a few places a larger comprehension has come into the union. Doubtless, this is the only way that union can be effected. Conventional union is likely to be conventional, and therefore not very real. The work must be accomplished, if accomplished at all, by beginning with the local churches and moving toward the larger comprehension. The American Christian Missionary Society has fostered this course in the union movement inaugurated in Canada. So far it has worked well.

The committees which have been appointed by this society, for the purpose of conferring with other religious bodies, have done something to cultivate the union sentiment, but to make union practical the work must begin with the local churches, as, after all, they must be consulted before any union can be made permanent.

Perhaps there is no department of the work of the Dis-
ciples more hopeful than their Sunday School work. This has become almost an enthusiasm. Not only have the Sunday Schools been largely increased in their attendance, but a much more efficient organization has been perfected throughout the whole country, and the teachers’ training classes have become great features in this Sunday School revival. This is as it should be. The weakness of Sunday School work has long been felt to be chiefly with respect to the character of teachers employed. Most of these needed training for service and were wholly unfit to train others. To some extent this evil has been corrected by the organization of teacher training classes, and where these have been under the direction of intelligent Bible students, many teachers have been equipped for their work who otherwise would have been wholly unfit for it.

It is undoubtedly true that the Disciples have also taken a very leading part in developing and disseminating Sunday School literature. Indeed they have among their number some veterans in this important field of labour. The one man who stands out more prominently than any other in this respect is W. W. Bowling of St. Louis, Mo. It is impossible to measure the influence of his work on the Disciple movement. To educate the children properly in Bible knowledge is to gain them in great numbers for Christ. Mr. Dowling has been associated with the Christian Publishing Company of St. Louis for one-third of a century, and previous to his removal to St. Louis he was a pioneer in Sunday School literature and Sunday School work at Indianapolis, Ind.; so that for about half of the century embraced in the Disciple movement he has led the Sunday School forces, especially in the literature department. His expositions of the Sunday School lessons have become almost a necessity in all the Sunday Schools of the Disciple churches.

The Standard Publishing Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, also issues a good class of Sunday School literature, much of which is under the editorship of Herbert Moninger.

The Sunday School revival is almost a phenomenon. And while in many respects the Disciples are leading in it, they are also leading in the Christian Endeavour work. Undoubtedly they are beginning to understand, more than ever before, that the young people must be instructed in the Word of God if that Word is to be made effective as a
guide in all religious matters. The Disciples honour their own plea when they seek to make the Bible an effective instrument in guiding the young in their religious life. A people who make “the Bible, and the Bible alone,” their rule of faith and practice can scarcely afford to miss any opportunity where the Bible can be properly used in bringing the young people of this age to a just apprehension of the meaning of the Christian religion. The Disciples have, therefore, done well in making the Sunday School work and the Christian Endeavour work very distinct features in their religious movement.

Reference has already been made to the active participation of the Disciples in Endeavour work. It is certainly somewhat remarkable that they should lead even the large denominations in organising and developing the young people of the churches. But a moment’s reflection will suggest the reason for this. The Disciples know that the success of their movement depends upon an intelligent understanding of the Scriptures by the rising generation. The Christian Endeavour movement offers an opportunity for educating the young, not only in the study of the Bible, but also in Christian service.

There are other points of view from which the Disciples may contemplate the work of the century and find much to encourage and stimulate their activities in the coming years, but enough has been said to indicate something of the progress that has been made and the advanced position which the Disciples at present occupy.

It only remains to give the following features of the Centennial programme. There may be some changes, but it is probable that none of these will be important. It will be seen that provision has been made for a great occasion, and no one doubts that much of what is anticipated will be practically realised.

It is believed that the importance of the occasion justifies the publishing of the entire programme in this volume, so that it may be permanently preserved for the benefit of future generations.

**CENTENNIAL PROGRAMME**

*Monday Evening, October 11th. Two Parallel Sessions.*

Addresses of Welcome, Responses, etc.

Tuesday, October 12th. Morning, Afternoon, and Evening.

Christian Woman’s Board of Missions in Three Parallel Sessions. Mrs. Atkinson, Mrs. Harrison, Mrs. Atwater, will be the presiding officers.

Reports will be presented by Mrs. M. E. Harlan, Mrs. Ida W. Harrison, Miss Mary J. Judson, Miss Mattie Pounds, and the President’s address by Mrs. Atwater. These reports will be repeated in all three meetings.

Addresses will be delivered by the following: Mrs. Alice Wickizer, Tulsa, Okla.; Mrs. Ella Humbert, Eugene, Ore.; Mrs. Reba Smith, Whittier, Cal.; Mrs. J. J. Zigler, New Orleans, La.; C. C. Smith, Cincinnati, Ohio; E. C. Davis, Maudha, India; Mrs. Bessie Farrar Madsen, Pendra Road, India; Miss Adelaide Gail Frost, Mahoba, India; Hugh McLellan, Richmond, Ky.

Afternoon and Evening.

One Auditorium Meeting, for men only, parallel with C. W. B. M. Sessions.


Evening.

Half an Hour in Each Hall.

Addresses on the Christian College: President T. C. Howe, Butler College; Professor F. O. Norton, Drake University; President E. V. Zollars, Oklahoma Christian University; President W. H. P. Faunce, Brown University.


Evening.

Half an Hour in Each Hall.


Reports. Messages from Home Missionaries.

Addresses: “The Contribution of the American Christian Missionary Society to the Century”—W. J. Wright, Cin-

*Evening.*

Half an Hour in Each Hall.


*Friday, October 15th.* Three Parallel Sessions.

*Morning.*


*First Hall.* FLETCHER COWHERD, Presiding.


*Second Hall.* W. F. RICHARDSON, Presiding.


11:35. Address by W. F. Richardson.

11:45. Report of Board.

12:00. Address by Finis Idleman. Subject, “Faith’s Tent Dwellers.”

*Third Hall.* J. C. HILL, Presiding.


11:35. Address by J. C. Hill.

11:45. Address by Randolph Cook. Subject, “Our Obligation to Church Extension in the Coming Century.”


*Afternoon.*

J. W. Perry, presiding. E. A. Long, presiding.
President’s Address. Chairman’s Address.
Secretary’s Report. Secretary’s Report.
Election.
Address, Geo. L. Snively. Address, J. H. O. Smith.
C. C. Chapman, presiding.
Chairman’s Address.
Secretary’s Report.
Treasurer’s Report.
Address, Mrs. T. R. Ayars.

Evening.
Christian Endeavour Night.
Chairman: A. W. Kokendoffer, W. F. Turner, and T. W. Pinkerton. Reports. Addresses by:

Saturday, October 16th.

SPECIAL CENTENNIAL DAY.
Morning, Afternoon, and Evening.
Five Parallel Sessions.

Chairmen: Dr. E. E. Montgomery, Philadelphia, Pa.; President H. B. Brown, Valparaiso, Ind.;
President Hill M. Bell, Des Moines, Iowa; T. W. Phillips, New Castle, Pa.; R. Lin Cave, Nashville,
Tenn.; C. C. Chapman, Fullerton, Cal.; W. F. Cowden, Tacoma, Wash.; President T. E. Cramblet,
Bethany, W. Va.; H. W. Elliott, Sulphur, Ky.; J. H. Garrison, St. Louis, Mo.; Prof. Jabez Hall,
Indianapolis, Ind.; W. L. Hayden, Indianapolis, Ind. Fraternal Addresses by representatives from
England, Australia, Japan, and from other religious bodies of this continent. Hon. Geo. T. Oliver,

Addresses.

Fla.; T. P. Haley, Kansas City, Mo.; J. H. MacNeil, Winchester, Ky.; F. D. Power, Washington,
D. C.

2. Thomas Campbell and the Principles He Promulgated: Mrs. Effie Cunningham,
Indianapolis, Ind.; C. M. Chilton, St. Joseph, Mo.; W. J. Loos, Owenton, Ky.; Pres. Clinton
Lockhart, Waco, Tex.; Prof. Herbert L. Willett, Chicago, Ill.

3. Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, and Walter Scott—Advocates of Liberty and
Union in the Truth: Hon. Champ Clark, Bowling Green, Mo.; Pres. J. W. Mcgarvey. Lexington,
Ky.; A. B. Philputt, Indianapolis, Ind.; W. H. Pinkerton, Gent, Ky.; A. C. Smither, Los Angeles,
Cal.


**Lord’s Day, October 17th.**

**Morning.**

Preaching in five hundred pulpits in Pittsburg District.

**Afternoon.**

Centennial Communion.

**Evening.**

Preaching everywhere in Greater Pittsburg.

The preaching of this day will be altogether different from the ordinary courtesy of “occupying all offered pulpits.” The men for this work are being chosen now and are coordinate with the other Centennial speakers. Each sermon will be the preacher’s life message of Christ.

For the Convention Hall sermons we are permitted to announce H. O. Breeden, San Francisco, Cal.; W. E. Crabtree, San Diego, Cal.; M. M. Davis, Dallas, Tex.; B. A. Jenkins, Kansas City, Mo.; J. M. Philpurt, St. Louis, Mo.; Z. T. Sweeney, Columbus, Ind.; I. N. McCash, Berkeley, Cal.; and S. M. Martin, Seattle, Wash.

**Monday, October 18th.**

**Bible School Day. Three Parallel Sessions.**

**Morning.**

Primary, Junior, and Intermediate Sections.

**Afternoon.**

Teacher-Training Sections.

**Section One.**

2:00. Service of Song.

2:40. Four ten-minute messages from those who have done things.
   1. “Methods of Working up a Teacher-training Class”—Clifford S. Weaver.
   3. “Training-class Work, a Revival of the Century-old Call, ‘To the Law and to the
      Testimony’”—B. S. Ferrall.


3:45. Class Contest: Youngstown, O., vs. Big Run, Pa.


4:35. Adjournment.

Section Two.

2:00. Service of Song.


2:25. Two ten-minute telling messages on methods:
   1. “Methods of Working up a Training-class”—Adam K. Adcock.
   2. “Methods of Teaching a Training-class”—Walter Mansell.

2:45. Four telling messages on what the Training-class work means:
   1. “Where the Training-class has Helped; or, Teacher-training the Panacea for the
      Church Ills”—H. A. Pearce.
   2. “Training-class Work, a Revival of the Century-old Call, ‘To the Law and to the
      Testimony’” Grant W. Spear.

3:25. Song.


3:50. Class Contest: Canton, Ohio, vs. Portsmouth, Ohio.


4:35. Adjournment.

Section Three.

2:00. Service of Song.

2:30. Introductory Word.

2:35. Ten-minute telling messages from those who have done things:
1. “Methods of Working up a Training-class”—G. O. Foster.
2. “Methods of Teaching a Training-class”—F. M. Rogers.
3. “Where the Training-classes help; or, Teacher-training the Panacea for Church Ills”—Homer W. Carpenter.
5. “Why make it Unanimous?”—Wm. Grant Smith.

3:25. Song.
3:45. Class Contest: Columbus, Ohio, vs. Wheeling, W. Va.
4:35. Adjournment.
Music—Prof. E. O. Excell and Chas. H. Gabriel, together with our own singing evangelists, will lead the music of this day.

**Evening.**

**Men’s Section.**

**Women’s Section.**
Song Service. Class Demonstration. Women’s Bible Class of Charleroi, Pa., under the leadership of Mrs. H. C. Boblitt, teacher.
Address: “The Woman’s Bible Class and the Home”—Mrs. T. W. Grafton, Anderson, Ind.
Address: “The Woman’s Bible Class and Evangelisation”—E. W. Thornton, Long Beach, Cal.

**For Representatives of Mixed Classes.**
Song Service. Class Demonstration. Bethany Bible Class, Pittsburg, Pa., under the direction of Fred M. Gordon, teacher.
Address: “The Social Life of the Adult Bible Class”—Marion Stevenson, St. Louis, Mo.
Address: “Methods of Building up an Adult Bible Class”—Herbert H. Moninger, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Tuesday, October 19th. Evangelistic Day.

Morning, Afternoon, and Evening.

Three Parallel Sessions.

Morning Session.

Afternoon Session.

Evening Session.
6:30 P.M. Street meetings by volunteer evangelists in different sections of downtown districts. Music at each place by volunteer singing evangelists.
Early morning conference on evangelistic problems for pastors and evangelists.
The Climax of a Century of Evangelism, and the Inauguration of a truly Pentecostal Era of Soul-Saving, under the auspices of the Permanent Committee on Evangelism, Charles Reign Scoville, Chairman.
IN closing this volume, it is worth while to take a glance backward over the century of progress which the Disciple movement has made. It will also be interesting to notice, with some degree of precision, just what the movement has contributed to religion during the century that has passed. There can be no doubt about the influence of the Disciples upon the religious progress of the one hundred years embraced in their history. In summing up a few of the facts of that history, and the relation of these facts to religious progress, we are confirmed in the belief that the whole movement was providential, and this of itself makes the study of these facts all the more important. Hence, the first thing to be considered, in a review of the history of the Disciples, is the point of view from which the movement must be regarded. It has already been stated with considerable emphasis that it is impossible to account for many things in the movement, without ascribing them to a providential oversight. The following may be regarded as some of the things that will at once arrest our attention:

(1.) *As regards the time the movement began.* It started at both the chronological and psychological moment. The preceding ages had been a preparation for it; though by this concession it must not be concluded that on this account the movement would necessarily succeed. Some of its forerunners had their day, and passed away. Their principles were crystallised in human creeds, and consequently it became impossible to co-ordinate these with the living things that made the progress of the ages. Indeed, the objection to human creeds was perhaps greater at this point than at any other. They necessarily limit progress. They make it impossible to even think beyond the expression of these creeds, without stepping over the boundary which they prescribe. Of course, there are men who will not be bound by them, and who make progress.
in spite of them, but they undoubtedly make the timid hesitate and the weak ones remain stationary. The movement of the Disciples came just when it was possible to break the influence of these creeds and turn the minds of the people to that Divine comprehension which, as regards faith, makes human definition unnecessary, and at the same time furnishes a platform broad enough, deep enough, and high enough for every human soul.

(2.) As to the place where the movement was started. This was exactly right also. If the movement, from its practical side, had started in Europe, it would, no doubt, have failed. Many of its principles may be traced back to European origin, and even some of its methods had exemplification in European countries before they were tried in America. But America was to be the real home of this great movement. It is geographically right on the line of progress in the conversion of the world. Christianity, having started in the East, has been traveling Westward ever since the beginning at Jerusalem. In the reconstruction of Protestantism, which had only been partially developed toward primitive Christianity in prior reformations, the United States at once presented congenial soil for the growth of the new movement which had for its object the complete restoration of New Testament Christianity, in its faith, doctrine, and life. It was in this new home that this new movement began the work of making ready for a great forward movement of all kindred religious people, in order to take the nations on the other side of the Pacific Ocean for the one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.

(3.) As to the persons who inaugurated the movement. This may be regarded also as providential. Thomas Campbell’s very education and environment, before he came to the United States, specially fitted him to write the “Declaration and Address,” the immortal document which gave the first great impulse which the movement received. The religious environment of B. W. Stone was equally conducive to the development of the special contribution which he made to the movement. The very fact that he began practically six years before the issuance of the Declaration and Address may also be regarded as Providential. His was the voice crying in the wilderness; but it was preparing the way, and making it straight for
the incoming of the great light which the “Declaration and Address” furnished, in the year 1809.

Alexander Campbell was also a man of Providence. There was work to be done which he alone seemed qualified to do. Walter Scott was an essential personality, in order to make the movement a success. The same may be said of Dr. R. Richardson, John Smith, and John T. Johnson. Thomas Campbell gave heart to the movement; Alexander Campbell gave strength to it; B. W. Stone gave toleration to it; Walter Scott gave to it evangelistic fervor; Dr. Richardson gave to it a certain literary flavor, and exegetical correctness; John Smith was the embodiment of common sense and practical wisdom; John T. Johnson gave to it energy and hopefulness; and John Rogers personified the sentiment of Christian Union, which everywhere, at the beginning, was predominant.

These eight men constituted the double quadrilateral personalities which carried on the movement for several year’s after it started, though it was not long until these men were multiplied by numerous additions, and consequently, when the movement reached its jubilee period, a great host of men and women had been gathered to it, distinguished alike for ability and faithfulness, so that the personality of the movement seems to have been under the direction of Providence, as well as the time and place selected for its inauguration.

It will now be instructive to ascertain what particular good the Disciples have contributed to religion, during the one hundred years of their history. Of course, it will be difficult to differentiate this good, so as to dissociate it entirely from the good other religious people have done during the same period; nor is this necessary. It is possible to clearly see some things which the Disciples have contributed to religious development, that may be regarded as their special contribution, though not entirely theirs, but sufficiently theirs to make it certain that they, more than other religious people, are responsible for the contribution. A few of these particular things have been already noticed in preceding chapters, and need not have any special mention now; nevertheless, even some of the greater things need particular emphasis in this recapitulatory survey.

(1.) First of all, it must be apparent to even the casual
reader of the history of the Disciples, that they have made a real contribution to religious
development, in the emphasis they have placed upon what has been called dispensational
truth. Mr. Campbell’s starlight age, moonlight age, and sunlight age have influenced all the
Disciple leaders in their study of the Scriptures, and their practical application of these
Scriptures to the development of the Christian life. The difference between the Law and the
Gospel was an early feature in the Disciple movement. It was for the emphasis of a proper
distinction between these that Alexander Campbell was first suspected of heresy by the Red
Stone Baptist Association. His celebrated sermon on the Law, delivered before that
association, in 1816, was the beginning of his troubles with the Baptist denomination. This
sermon set forth, in strong terms, a fact which is now conceded by all intelligent religious
thinkers, viz., that we are not under Moses, but under Christ; not under the Law, but under the
Gospel; not under the Jewish dispensation, but under the Christian dispensation.

It is not meant by the foregoing statements that the Disciples were the only religious
people who called attention to the distinction just referred to. But it is affirmed that they
emphasised this distinction much more vigorously, and showed its bearing upon a proper
understanding of the Christian religion with more clearness than any other religious people
did, before or during the one hundred years of history under consideration. Some time after
their movement was started, the Plymouth Brethren, in England, made considerable use of the
distinction between the dispensations, but in some respects these people made more of the
distinction than is justified by the facts, and often interpreted the Scriptures by a sort of
mechanical exactness which was never justified by the rules of legitimate criticism.

It is also true that some distinguished writers of the nineteenth century took precisely the
same view of this dispensational truth as that taken by Mr. Campbell and those associated
with him. Nevertheless, the Disciples made this matter of more consequence than any one
else, and their use of it gave practically a new meaning to many passages of Scripture, while
at the same time it gave to the Christian religion a comprehensive and spirit-
ual significance which nothing else could supply. Consequently, while not claiming for the Disciples everything as regards this matter, it will scarcely be doubted, by any one who is capable of judging, that the Disciples have done much for the religion of the past one hundred years, by emphasising the difference between the dispensations.

(2.) Another contribution almost equally important with the one already mentioned is the distinction which the Disciples made, and still make, between faith and opinion. This has not been altogether an easy task to make apparent to many people, and even where the distinction is clearly seen, it has been a still more difficult task to make the Disciple contention in this matter a practical force in the affairs of the religious life. Nevertheless, a review of the history of the Disciples must convince the intelligent reader that this difference between faith and opinion has been perhaps one of the most fundamental principles by which the Disciples have been guided. From the very beginning they have held that, for the most part, human creeds are made up of opinions, rather than Scriptural matters of faith. In other words, that these creeds are largely composed of philosophical speculations about facts, rather than the facts themselves. The Disciples have held that faith has to do with facts, and opinions have to do with the explanation of these facts; one rests on testimony, the other on philosophy.

The Disciples have always contended that philosophy is not necessarily opposed to true religion, nor have they hesitated to offer explanations of the facts of religion, even when these facts have been far removed from the sphere of conclusive investigation. Indeed, they have encouraged the most profound thinking, where men are capable of such thinking; but they have persistently and constantly urged that philosophy must not be made a test of fellowship, and that even doctrines, as they are commonly understood, should be rigidly eliminated from matters of faith.

In taking this position, they have felt justified by all Scripture teaching. It was at this very point where the dictum of Thomas Campbell became eminently serviceable, viz., “Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent.” It was contended by the Disciples that whatever is necessary to salvation is clearly
revealed, and consequently there need be no difficulty whatever in dealing with essential matters. They, furthermore, contended that if anything more were necessary, this would have been also revealed; consequently, any addition to the Word of God would not only be non-essential but might be regarded as impertinent, since it must be conceded by all that God would know just what revelation to make, as well as just how to make it.

It was, furthermore, contended that many things in nature fulfilled their appointed mission, though the philosophy of them is not understood by perhaps one person in a thousand. It is perhaps impossible for any one to know why the earth turns from West to East, or how it is that iron is attracted to the magnet. Indeed, what we call gravitation is in many respects as little understood to-day as it was in the days of Sir Isaac Newton; but no one hesitates to accept these things as facts, notwithstanding they cannot be explained satisfactorily to the human understanding. There are other things that can be explained to some people, but cannot be explained to all. In some cases, it is evidently unnecessary to explain to any, though a correct explanation may be valuable to him who can comprehend it.

Just so as regards the religion of Jesus Christ. Its facts may be established on satisfactory evidence; but the explanation of these facts may not always be conclusive to even the best informed people. Disciples held, and still hold, to the notion that, this being true, all philosophical speculations should be entirely ruled out as tests of fellowship, and only such matters as may be established upon credible testimony should be regarded as belonging to the sphere of faith. Opinions may be held, *ad libitum*, but these must be treated with indifference, with respect to Christian union, and as only admissible when we are exercising religious liberty.

A striking illustration of the particular point under consideration is furnished in the use of electricity as a motor. Perhaps there is not one person in a thousand who could explain how the electricity is applied in driving the car; and yet, millions of people ride on these electrical cars every day, without even seeking to understand the philosophy of their movement. Indeed, the very food which is taken into the system of multitudes of people
is eaten without question, while very few have any correct understanding of how this food is assimilated and made to contribute to the health and strength of the body. The same is true of nearly all the most familiar things that enter into the affairs of every-day life. No one thinks of trying to understand the philosophy of thousands of things upon which depends the very life we live. It is doubtless true that even in these material matters “we walk by faith and not by sight.”

Surely all of this ought to teach us the absurdity of seeking a philosophical explanation of the facts of religion before we can believe these facts and appropriate them as veritable realities. Perhaps there is nothing in which men show greater folly than in seeking to analyse the ways of God and to construct philosophical systems of religion through the knowledge which they are supposed to have acquired, forgetting the statement of the Apostle that “the world by wisdom never knew God.” We cannot understand how it is that our own bodies, souls, and spirits are related to each other, and yet we do not hesitate to tell all about the relation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in what is called the Trinity, or Godhead.

In view of these indisputable facts, the Disciples have always held that it is essentially wrong to make the explanation of the facts of religion a test of Christian fellowship. With them it is not because the Trinitarian theology is better than the Unitarian; or the Augustinian anthropology better than the Arminian; or again, the Calvinian soteriology better than the Wesleyan; but they reject all of these, whether true or false, simply because they are theories, about which men may have their opinions, ad libitum; but these opinions should not be made into iron bedsteads by which the faith of men must be measured. Except we become as little children, we cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. With the Disciples the child-like spirit and the unquestioned faith in the Lord Jesus Christ count for much more than theories concerning the Divine government.

It must not be understood by these statements of the position of the Disciples, that they are indifferent to the investigation of the deepest problems in the universe. They have always emphasised the importance of the highest possible education and the most perfect freedom in
thinking, and even in the expression of thought, when this is without divisive intention. It is not education, thinking, speaking, or writing, with respect to any legitimate things that the Disciples regard as contraband, but rather the use of any of these to mystify the faith or to debar Christian fellowship where the word of God has not debarred it; and in this respect they certainly emphasise a most important matter with respect to the Christian religion. Christianity can never be made a religion for the whole world if it must first be loaded down with philosophical speculations or recondite statements of truth, however valuable these may be to men who are capable of comprehending them. The great mass of mankind cannot and ought not to be expected to become philosophers before they become Christians. It is still true, as it was in the days of the Apostles, that not many wise, not many noble are called.

When discussing this difference between faith and opinion, Disciple writers and preachers were wont to refer to the history of religious dogmas as proof of their divisive tendency. This history shows that the bitterest controversies which have been waged by theologians have been concerning matters of opinion rather than matters of faith. These controversies have been around philosophical speculations, rather than the assured facts of religion; consequently, if these speculations are to be considered at all, then it is necessary to have at least two religions, viz., one for the intellectual class and the other for the common people, the latter being the very class that heard the Son of God gladly. That they did hear Him gladly is proof that He spoke to their comprehension, and this of itself is sufficient to convince reasonable people that only the things that He spoke are essential to the salvation of the soul.

As already intimated, there are many questions arising from the study of the Christian religion that are intensely interesting, and some of them highly instructive. The everlasting WHY will force itself into the whole region of facts. Philosophy is essentially obtrusive. It has not even the merit of courtesy. It wants to know. But this inquiring spirit must be carefully guarded. It was this that led to the disaster in Eden. God had said, and what He said ought to have been sufficient, but Satan sought
out an explanation, and our first parents became fascinated with this, rather than reverence for the Word of God. It is interesting to discuss many questions concerning the Incarnation, or to put it in modern style, the Virgin Birth of Jesus; but it is far better for nineteen-twentieths of the Christian world to accept simply the Scriptural statements concerning this matter, without going into any philosophical speculations concerning it.

Another reason why Disciples have earnestly contended for the difference between faith and opinion suggests the impossibility of securing Christian union on any ground other than the simple facts of the Christian religion. “No other foundation can any man lay than that which is laid,” viz., Jesus, the Christ. But it is an undeniable fact that nearly all the creeds are more or less burdened with explanations of these facts, rather than the facts themselves. Division has been the result. From the adjournment of the Nicaean Council down to the Vatican Council, the Christian world has been confusion worse confounded, rather than a representation of “keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” Disciples have always contended that the reason for this is not far to seek. A union that is founded upon certain doctrinal statements cannot possibly hold where counter-doctrinal statements are with equal earnestness affirmed. Archbishop Whately illustrates this whole matter in the following lucid paragraph:

Different theories, we know, have prevailed at different times, to account for the motions of the planets, and of the moon, and other heavenly bodies;—the tides, and various other subjects pertaining to natural philosophy. Several of these theories which supplanted one another have now become obsolete; and modern discoveries have established, on good grounds, explanations of most of these points. But the great mass of mankind cannot be expected to understand these explanations. There are, however, many points of daily practical use, which they can understand, and which it is needful for them to be informed upon. Accordingly there are printed Tables, showing the times of the sun’s rising and setting, at each period of the year;—the variations of the tides in different places, and the like. And all these are sufficiently intelligible, without any study of Astronomy, even to plain, unlearned men. The practical knowledge thus conveyed involves no astronomical theory, but may be equally reconciled with the Ptolemaic or the Copernican systems of the universe. It
is not the less possible, nor the less useful, for any one to know the times when the sun gives light to this earth, even though he should not know whether it is the sun that moves, or the earth.

Another very distinguished writer of the nineteenth century is equally strong in supporting the Disciples’ position on the subject under consideration. In his Bampton lectures on “The Limits of Religious Thought,” Dr. Mansell deposes as follows:

The testimony of Scripture, like that of our natural faculties, is plain and intelligible, when we are content to accept it as a fact intended for our practical guidance: it becomes incomprehensible, only when we attempt to explain it as a theory capable of speculative analysis. We are distinctly told that there is a mutual relation between God and man, as distinct agents;—that God influences man by His grace, visits him with rewards or punishments, regards him with love or anger;—that man, within his own limited sphere, is likewise capable of “prevailing with God”; that his prayers may obtain an answer, his conduct call down God’s favour or condemnation. There is nothing self-contradictory or even unintelligible in this, if we are content to believe that it is so, without striving to understand how it is so. But the instant we attempt to analyse the ideas of God as infinite and man as finite;—to resolve the scriptural statements into the higher principles on which their possibility apparently depends;—we are surrounded on every side by contradictions of our own raising; and, unable to comprehend how the Infinite and the Finite can exist in mutual relation, we are tempted to deny the fact of that relation altogether, and to seek a refuge, though it be but insecure and momentary, in Pantheism, which denies the existence of the Finite, or in Atheism, which rejects the Infinite. And here, again, the parallel between Religion and Philosophy holds: the same limits of thought are discernible in relation to both. The mutual intercourse of mind and matter has been explained away by rival theories of Idealism on the one side and Materialism on the other. The unity and plurality, which are combined in every object of thought, have been assailed, on this side by the Eleatic, who maintains that all things are one, and variety a delusion; on that side by the Sceptic, who tells us that there is no unity, but merely a mixture of differences; that nothing is, but all things are ever becoming; that mind and body, as substances, are mere philosophical fictions, invented for the support of isolated impressions and ideas. The mystery of Necessity and Liberty has its philosophical as well as its theological aspect: and a parallel may be found to both, in the counter-labyrinth of Continuity in Space, whose mazes are sufficiently bewildering to show that the perception of our bodily senses, however
certain as a fact, reposes, in its ultimate analysis, upon a mystery no less insoluble than that which envelops the free agency of man in its relation to the Divine Omniscience.

Action, and not knowledge, is man’s destiny and duty in this life; and his highest principles, both in philosophy and in religion, have reference to this end. But it does not follow, on that account, that our representations are untrue, because they are imperfect. To assert that a representation is untrue, because it is relative to the mind of the receiver, is to overlook the fact that truth itself is nothing more than a relation. Truth and falsehood are not properties of things in themselves, but of our conceptions, and are tested, not by the comparison of conceptions with things in themselves, but with things as they are given in some other relation. My conception of an object of sense is true, when it corresponds to the characteristics of the object as I perceive it; but the perception itself is equally a relation, and equally implies the co-operation of human faculties. Truth in relation to no intelligence is a contradiction in terms: our highest conception of absolute truth is that of truth in relation to all intelligences. But of the consciousness of intelligences different from our own we have no knowledge, and can make no application. Truth, therefore, in relation to man, admits of no other test than the harmonious consent of all human faculties; and, as no such faculty can take cognizance of the Absolute, it follows that correspondence with the Absolute can never be required as a test of truth. The utmost deficiency that can be charged against human faculties amounts only to this:—that we cannot say that we know God as God knows himself;—that the truth of which our finite minds are susceptible may, for aught we know, be but the passing shadow of some higher reality, which exists only in the Infinite Intelligence.

(3.) The Disciples have made an important religious contribution in their reasonable solution of the question of the Godhead, especially as it relates to Christ. The Disciples have never been troubled much about the Trinity, for they are neither practically Trinitarians nor Arians, in any divisive sense. Indeed, the term “Trinity” was classed by Alexander Campbell among his contraband phraseology, which he characterised as belonging to the language of Ashdod. He was himself a Trinitarian, as that term is understood in popular theology; but he did not hesitate to put the word in his catalogue of rejected terminology, simply on the ground that it has no place in the Scriptures.

Barton W. Stone was not an Arian; but he held to a somewhat modified view of the deity of Christ. He and Mr. Campbell differed in their definitions concerning
the Godhead; but they substantially agreed as to the essential facts. Mr. Campbell regarded Christ mainly from the point of view of His Godhood. Mr. Stone, while not denying His Godhood, laid special emphasis upon His manhood, giving particular attention to the Sonship of Christ. Mr. Campbell contemplated Him from the point of view of what He was and is; Mr. Stone from the point of view of what He did and does.

These two views have entered more or less into all the controversies concerning the character of Christ. Even to-day there are those who are advocating either one or the other of these conceptions.

Some are grounding their faith on the Christ, mainly, if not entirely, because of His relation to the Father, as divine as the Father, and equal with the Father, while others ground their faith upon Him as the Son of God, from which point of view they emphasise His obedience to the Father, seeking only to do the Father’s will, and thus setting an example to all of His followers.

Now, it can scarcely be regarded as an accident that both of these views came into the Disciple movement through the union which took place between the “Reformers” and “Christians,” in 1832. The “Reformers” mainly held to the former view, while the “Christians” held to the latter.

When the two bodies coalesced, or became united, the resultant was a somewhat modified view, which eliminated the extreme of each of the views mentioned. As two antagonistic substances, when united, will often result in a new substance, containing some of the elements of both of the old, so in this case. Without legislation, without even much discussion, the two bodies came together, and when they were fused by the principle of love, the resultant was a modified view of all extremes, and especially with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity.

It must be confessed that in the states where the “Reformers” and “Christians” were most numerous, the general tendency of thought was at first along the lines of the body which was most influential. This was especially true in Kentucky and Missouri, where the influence of the “Christians” was most pronounced. In these states the tendency, for a long time, was to reproduce, largely at least, the views of B. W. Stone, with respect to
the Godhead, though never making these views a test of fellowship. It must be remembered that in both Kentucky and Missouri the “Christians” had possession, and were strongly in evidence before the influence of Mr. Campbell was felt. However, when the graduates of Bethany College began to occupy the pulpits of these states, and to influence the literature of the Disciples, there was a perceptible and steady reaction from the views of B. W. Stone, concerning the Trinity, to those of Alexander Campbell; and while this reaction never did reach any extreme view of the Trinity, it certainly did settle down to a more satisfactory conclusion than that which was reached by the “Christians” at the time when the union between them and the “Reformers” took place. In short, it was this union of the two bodies which brought about a sort of consensus of opinion with respect to the Trinity, which is entirely acceptable to all concerned.

In this fact the Disciples are supported by some of the best thinkers of the present day. Among these may be mentioned Dr. James Denney, whose recent work on “Jesus and the Gospel” is one of the ablest of its kind that have appeared in the new century. Speaking concerning both these views of Christ and philosophical speculations in general, he uses the following very strong language, which is entirely in harmony with the teaching of the Disciples, from the beginning of their religious movement to the present time. Dr. Denney says:

It is faith which makes a Christian; and when the Christian attitude of the soul to Christ is found, it must be free to raise its own problems and to work out its own solutions. This is the point at which “broad” churchism is in the right against an evangelical Christianity which has not learned to distinguish between its faith, in which it is unassailable—and inherited forms of doctrine which have been unreflectingly identified with it. Natural as such identification may be, and painful as it may be to separate in thought things which have coalesced in strong and sacred feelings, there is nothing more certain than that the distinction must be recognised if evangelical Christians are to maintain their intellectual integrity, and preach the gospel in a world which is intellectually free. We are bound to Christ, and would see all men so bound; but we must leave it to Christ to establish His ascendancy over men in His own way—by the power of what He is and of what He has done—and not seek to secure it beforehand by the imposition of chains of our forging.
It is one of the most urgent needs of the Church at the present moment to have both these truths recognised in their full extent. There can be no Christianity to maintain if the evangelical truth is not asserted that Christ must have in the faith of men no less or lower place than He has had from the beginning, or than He Himself, as we have seen, deliberately assumed; but there can be no hope of appealing to the world in which we live to give Christ such a place in its faith if we identify doing so with the acceptance beforehand of the inherited theology or Christology of the Church. . . .

The problem is to find a way of securing the two things: unreserved recognition of the place which Christ has always held in evangelical faith, and entire intellectual freedom in thinking out what this implies.

It is this distinction between soundness in faith—a genuinely Christian attitude of the soul to Christ, in virtue of what Christ determines the spiritual life throughout—and soundness in doctrine—the acceptance of some established intellectual construction of faith, on which emphasis needs to be laid. Soundness in faith is that on which Christianity and the Church depend for their very being; but the construction of Christian doctrine is one of the tasks at which Christian intelligence must freely labour, respecting, no doubt, but never bound by, the efforts or attainments of the past. . . .

But though individual Christians, and not only those who listen to the Gospel, but those who preach it, are conscious of this distinction and accept its consequences, the Churches can hardly be said to have done so. They are Christian organisations, yet they seem to be based on doctrinal statements which most of their members have realised are not the actual or the proper basis of Christian life; and they not only find it difficult to conceive any other basis, but seem to suspect those who speak of another of striking at the very heart of the faith. This want of accord between the intellectual attitude of the Churches acting collectively, and that of their individual members is the cause not only of much discomfort and misunderstanding within, but of much scandal and reproach without. It seriously discredits the Church in the eyes of the world to which it wishes to appeal, and it is urgent to ask whether there is any remedy for it.

Nothing could be more suggestive than these luminous paragraphs. Neither Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, nor B. W. Stone ever wrote anything more strongly condemnatory of philosophical speculation concerning the Godhead, or, indeed, any religious matters, than is contained in these statements of Dr. Denney. Indeed, it is impossible to treat the religious movement of the Disciples with complete fairness without conceding that the Dis-
ciples have made this splendid contribution to religion during the century embraced in their history. In claiming this, it is not affirmed that no one else has contended for something like the same thing that has marked the pleading of the Disciples. Undoubtedly, many individuals have spoken out as strongly as need be, concerning the very matters to which the Disciples have called attention. But, as remarked by Dr. Denney, these individuals have simply represented themselves. No particular Church has led the way in treating philosophical speculations as have the Disciples. It is true the Methodists have always allowed considerable liberty with respect to such things, but they have never made their practice in this respect so fundamental as the Disciples have done. Nevertheless, it is only fair to this great religious body to accord to them a high place in the catalogue of those who reject philosophical speculations as a test of fellowship; and it is perhaps owing to this very fact that their progress has been so marked in the United States.

(4.) The Disciples have made an important contribution to theology in respect to the Atonement. It is generally acknowledged that this subject, in its finality, lies outside of the realm of human reason. Of course there have been efforts to explain it, but for the most part the explanations have failed to explain. Notwithstanding this fact, these explanations have been made tests of fellowship among Christians, and have almost universally produced discord instead of harmony. Indeed, this has been the result of all philosophising as regards the Christian religion. This ought to have been expected from a priori considerations. The human cannot comprehend the Divine without a revelation. Consequently no one ought to make speculations concerning things, not clearly revealed in the Scriptures, a test of Christian fellowship. The whole doctrine of the Atonement is extremely interesting, and it is a subject that has engaged the thoughtful attention and most profound meditation of some of the ablest men connected with the Christian Church during its entire history. Nor have the Disciples ever objected to any reverent consideration of the subject from such point of view as might be agreeable to those who are considering it. But they have always felt that it was not a subject which should be used, from its philosophical side, to divide
the people of God. They have, therefore, allowed the largest liberty in determining the rationale of the Atonement, so long as Christians are willing to accept the Scriptural statements concerning it. In this, as in other things, they have applied the Campbellian dictum, “Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent.”

In reference to this matter, as well as the Trinity (to which attention has already been called), the evolution of Disciple practice proceeded from the union that took place between the “Reformers” and the “Christians.” The “Reformers” very generally held to what is understood as the orthodox view of the Atonement, while the “Christians,” though not Unitarians in the modern sense, held strongly to a modified view of the Atonement, as they did also to a modified view of the Trinity. Both bodies received with unquestioning faith the statements of the Scriptures, and this was believed to meet all the conditions of Christian union.

Just here the rule which seems to have prevailed from the very beginning, namely, to eliminate everything but the essential facts of religion, was applied, and it worked admirably with respect to the union of the two bodies in 1832.

(5.) The Disciples made a splendid contribution to the religion of the nineteenth century by their insistence that the faith of the Gospel is not doctrinal but personal. It has already been seen that they eliminated all doctrinal matters that are purely philosophical from their basis of fellowship. This at once compelled them to find a basis that would be sufficient without the divisive elements which had so long dominated the Christian world. They found this basis in the personal Christ. They constantly insisted that He alone was the foundation of the Church, and that no other foundation could be laid; and, furthermore, that His great personality was all-sufficient to meet the conditions of every case. Of course, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ necessarily implied all that belongs to His personality, and consequently the great proposition which Disciples required every one to accept who sought admission into their churches was the confession which Peter made when he declared that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. This propo-
sition has always been regarded by the Disciples as sufficiently comprehensive; and, at the same time, sufficiently simple for the union of Christians, and consequently they have persistently contended that nothing else should be presented, so far as faith goes, for admission into the Church, and that all who are admitted into the Church should be regarded as Christians, and all Christians should be regarded as one in Christ Jesus, as He and the Father are one. They have also contended that this personal faith is the only kind that admits of legitimate progress. Dead creeds do not move, but a living leader goes forward, and those he leads can follow.

In this contention the Disciples, as a religious body, stood practically alone during the nineteenth century. There were individual Christians who saw the folly of philosophical statements, or even doctrinal statements, as bonds of union and communion, but the Disciples were the only religious body which, as a whole, made this contention for faith in the personal Christ as fundamental, both as regards the Christian life and Christian union.

It would be interesting to quote from some eminent theologians of the nineteenth century, giving their individual views concerning this matter, but space forbids us to do more than make one quotation from one of the celebrated German preachers, Dr. R. Rothe, who, after telling what belief in Jesus is, goes to the root of the matter in the following lucid paragraphs, which are translated from one of his sermons:

But if this is the character of belief in Jesus, how easy it is, my brethren, for this, which Jesus calls belief in him, to be wanting in one who has the most orthodox representation of him in his mind! And again: how easy for it to be present where there is no such representation at all! You can easily picture this to yourselves. Imagine for a moment that the Lord Jesus were to appear again to us now, in the midst of Christendom, but just in the same manner as he did of old, in the form of a servant, in complete incognito, without titles and honours, without official dress, and without the decorations of his Father in Heaven, so that we could see nothing of him, in word or deed, but his holy heart, completely filled with his Heavenly Father, full of pitying love and resplendent truth. What do you think? Who among the Christians of the present day would recognise him and cling to him, and who not? I do not wish to anticipate any one’s judgment, but, for my own part, I am thoroughly of the opinion that
very many of those who make orthodox confession of Christ with the greatest volubility would pass by without recognising him, and without feeling his Divine power of attraction, and this partly for the very reason that they would not discover in him those (for them) conclusive marks, which are given in their dogmatic treatises—as he would certainly seem to them far too worldly. And, on the other hand, how many of those who are unable to adopt the ecclesiastical confession of Christ as their own, would feel themselves drawn to him out of the deepest depths of their heart, would follow his every footstep, would fall in homage at his feet, and would not let him go, and would also inspire in him a corresponding attraction to them! O yes, how completely different would be then the grouping of human hearts, in their relation to Jesus, from what we should expect from the way in which they call themselves and others “believers” and “unbelievers.” And yet this would probably be the most certain test of belief in Jesus. For whoever is drawn to the real Jesus, not to the painted one of theological science, he is a believer in Jesus, and only he. He, the Lord Jesus himself, would certainly call these alone believers, for they alone really believe in him, himself; the rest merely believe in his titles and honours, in his high guardianship in heaven, and in the beautiful presents which he brings with him.

If, therefore, we only keep clearly in view the true nature of belief in Christ—and this is, moreover, indispensable to every one who wishes to guard against delusions as to his own belief—we shall easily find our position as to the inward conflict of which we speak. We shall say to our surprise that belief in Jesus is a much more simple matter than we have imagined. We have always thought, who knows how many intellectual operations, and hundreds of investigations of a scientific character, were indispensable to it? Now we see that the essence of the matter consists of nothing of the sort. To have confidence, but perfect confidence in the holy—in the literal sense of the word—Divine character, full of grace and truth, which beams on us so kindly serious from the Jesus of the Gospels, and which shines with ever-increasing clearness out of his whole historic work during these eighteen centuries—to have faith in this character, to resign one’s self to him in faithful obedience—that is it. And this is not a complicated task, for upright and simple souls not a difficult one. If you, my brethren, in whom belief in Jesus is struggling with unbelief, once perceive this clearly, you will soon take courage; for you will see that what you called your unbelief in Jesus is, for the most part, not that at all—that real unbelief in Jesus, with you, has its seat in far other places than where you have sought it. You will become conscious then of the real belief in Jesus, already present in you, which you have hitherto not recognised as such, because a false representation of him dazzled your vision—your hitherto un-
conscious Christianity will become conscious—you will now call by its right name whatever of true piety there is in you, namely, belief in Jesus Christ, and not as you have done, your own virtue and such like—for everything good and noble in you, you will give Jesus the glory, to whom alone it belongs. You will then no longer run the risk of denying what is to you in very deed the holiest and highest for the reason that you do not know its true name. You will then joyfully confess Jesus before all the world, because you can do it with complete inward truth, and extend the fraternal hand without reserve to those who have long openly confessed him. But especially will you, when you know what you possess in Jesus, and that what is truly good, whatever name it bear, can flourish within you only through the closest personal adhesion to him, cleave fast to him in confiding love and obedience, and, moreover, to the living, real Jesus and not to the mere profile of a scientific doctrine concerning him. Thus you will bring his holy image, in its very lineament, into ever more distinct relief until he stands in bodily form before your inward vision, and, eye and heart fixed continually upon it, you resign yourself like a child to all those influences which it will exercise upon you; you will comply with every demand which it excites in your conscience, and thus give proof to yourselves and the world that you really believe in Jesus, notwithstanding our language concerning him differs from what our forefathers transmitted to us. Thus your belief, your Christianity, will become integral, whole.

Yes, dear friends, this is what our time has need of. If this could only take place in a large number, if all the souls, of whom we have spoken, were to become conscious of their unconscious Christianity, then modern Christendom would be healed. This is its fundamental disease—that they have lost the consciousness of their actual Christianity. We have no idea that all our spiritual blessings, both those of the individual, and those common to all, are derived from Christ and from him alone; in purblind delusion we complacently regard that as the work of mankind which we possess only in virtue of the effects of that holy vivifying sun which rose upon us in Christ. Oh, if this almost universal delusion were dissipated, if our contemporaries could only become conscious of what they have of Christ, and how he is so very close to them in what they think their own most peculiar possession, how different, wholly different, and how much more beautiful it would be among us! This is the only way in which it can be brought about, and it will be brought about in this way, that the Lord Jesus Christ shall be again acknowledged and adored, and at large, too, in his Christendom. In this way let us joyfully hope that a common, many voiced, joyful, and cheerful confession of Christ will again be heard among us, be it when it may; and then again will all flock to our houses of worship, and, bowing the knee in grateful homage before him, give, as
out of one mouth, so also from a single heart, praise and thanks, and glory to him whose name they bear.

Many other extracts from distinguished writers of the nineteenth century could be given, strongly sustaining the Disciple view that a personal trust in Jesus Christ is all that ought to be required, so far as faith goes, in order to Christian fellowship. Of course this contention entirely eliminates human creeds as bonds of union and communion.

(6.) One of the most important contributions which the Disciples have made is a common ground for Christian union. From the very beginning Christian union has been a cardinal contention with the Disciples. No other subject was more prominently characteristic of the movement in its earlier days. Nor has their contention for this decreased in any respect whatever. Perhaps it is not so much the one thing for which they now contend as was formerly the case, as new conditions have arisen in religious society, and new questions have come to the front which have engaged their attention. Nevertheless, the movement to-day is a union movement, though from some points of view Disciples have been compelled to change their attitude towards the religious denominations. It must not be forgotten that about the year 1830 they were practically driven into a separate religious organization, and occupying that position, they had to fight in order to maintain their right to exist. From that time until the close of the Civil War their relation to other religious bodies was more or less antagonistic, and when they were pressed, as they frequently were, it is probable that the spirit manifested was not always the spirit of the “unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” It was sometimes a war spirit, and this could not always be justified. At the same time it is only fair to the Disciples to remember the character of their environment during their fighting period. Their contention was that denominationalism is wrong and ought to be abandoned; that sectarianism is even devilish and ought to be overthrown; that a divided Church is always and everywhere unnecessary and ought not to be perpetuated for a single day, for it is not only wrong in principle, but it must necessarily delay the conversion of the world, even if it does not make such a result absolutely impossible.
But it was not the reasoning of the Disciples which made their contention so valuable as an asset of religion. It was rather their practical demonstration of the fact that what they contended for could be thoroughly realised.

It is well, just here, to go over the ground somewhat of their efforts at Christian union. In 1810, before Indiana became a state, John Wright and his father, who were both Free-will Baptist preachers, organised a church of this order in Washington County, Indiana. In 1812, Peter Wright, a younger brother, began to preach. In a short time the three Wrights organised ten Free-will Baptist churches, and these churches constituted what was called the “Blue River Association.” The mother church was organised without any articles of faith, the church taking the Holy Scriptures as its rule of faith and practice, without any notes or comments. A few years later the name Baptist was dropped by all these churches, and the association was changed into what was called an Annual Meeting, which meeting was for mutual conference and edification. The members were called simply Christians, and the churches were called churches of Christ or churches of God.

About the same time, a little further northward, were fifteen churches of German Baptists or Dunkards. A crisis having arisen among these churches, with respect to trine immersion, the whole matter was referred to a committee, including John and Peter Wright, and the result was that the name “German Baptist” was changed to that of “Christian,” and this conference also was changed into an Annual Meeting.

Soon after this a conference of “New Lights,” known also by the name of Christians, dissolved their conference, and united with the churches already referred to, and thus a considerable number of churches were formed into a union where “the Bible and the Bible alone” was adopted as the rule of faith and practice. These churches were almost identical with the churches in Kentucky, Ohio, and Missouri that were associated with the movement of B. W. Stone and his co-labourers. It must be remembered that the movement of the Campbells did not begin until 1809, and the union between the “Reformers,” or the associates of the Campbells, and the “Christians,” the associates of B. W. Stone, did not occur until 1832.
There were individual churches and associations of churches in various parts of the country, occupying practically the same position as the two larger bodies did before they united. Indeed, the union of these believers in Christ began much earlier than that which took place at Lexington, Ky., at the beginning of the third decade of the nineteenth century. It is probable that no union would have taken place at all, if an attempt had been made in the usual way through church officials. The union began by the churches of the neighbourhood uniting, and these groups finally came into the larger comprehension. Perhaps it will be found out, after a while, that this is the only practicable way to solve the union question.

But the particular point which the Disciples have illustrated is the fact that Christians may come together into a practical union while, at the same time, they hold contrary opinions. Most of the Reformers were Calvinists, as the Campbells themselves were, while most of the Christians were Arminians, as B. W. Stone evidently was. But they did not even discuss these philosophical differences, when they came together to form a union; and, no doubt, it was providential that the two bodies held to these opposite views concerning the Divine government. When they coalesced the resultant was a composite view, differing somewhat from both Calvinism and Arminianism; and even this has never been insisted upon as a fundamental doctrine among the Disciples.

The same thing happened as regards the design of baptism. The doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins had its origin with Alexander Campbell and those associated with him. Walter Scott gave practical efficiency to this doctrine, but in the hands of uneducated men it was constantly liable to abuse, and, as a matter of fact, was sometimes abused by making it mean much more than was legitimately implied in the teaching of either Mr. Campbell or Mr. Scott. However, it was constantly exposed to the danger of making the religion of Christ a sort of mechanical matter, or a single rule-of-three statement of the case, namely, “As faith is to repentance, so is baptism to the remission of sins.”

The “Christians” associated with B. W. Stone and those scattered throughout Indiana, Ohio, and Missouri were slow to accept the design of baptism as contended for by
the “Reformers.” The consequence was that when the union took place the emphasis that had been put upon the new doctrine of baptism ceased to be so excessive.

At this point we see another indication of how the union modified the theological conceptions of the united Church; and looking at the whole matter from a careful review of the history of the case, it is impossible not to reach the conclusion that this union between the “Reformers” and “Christians” was necessary in order to keep the Disciple movement from a mechanical, if not a sectarian, development. The very things that would have hindered a union between many of the denominations were exactly the things that gave permanency and power to the union between the “Reformers” and “Christians.” Each body brought into the union (to use the language of chemistry) certain ingredients, which when fused made a union that was not only practical but also reasonable and Scriptural.

From that time to the present the Disciples have considered the matter of Christian union from at least two points of view: First, they have rejected all human creeds as necessarily schismatical in their tendency.

These objections may be summarised as follows:

1. They substitute philosophical speculations for the personal Christ, thereby usurping the sphere of faith with the things that belong to knowledge.
2. They are without any divine sanction, and consequently should not be made tests of Christian fellowship. We should certainly have a “thus saith the Lord” for everything that enters into the question of fellowship.
3. They are schismatical in their tendency. The history of the Church is a sad commentary on the influence of human dogmas upon the peace and harmony of the children of God.
4. No human creed can be perfect. Hence, even if it were right to formulate the things of knowledge and make them objects of faith, such formulas must of necessity exhibit many of the traces of human weakness. Men are short-sighted at best, and it ought to be expected therefore that their most careful work will lack the completeness which should characterise a creed for the Church of God.
5. No human creed can ever be adapted to every creature. The Infinite Mind can alone provide that which is suitable to such an infinite variety of circumstances and conditions as is everywhere found among men. The best that any number of men can do is to provide for those who are of like tastes, habits, etc., and in like circumstances with themselves. They
cannot reasonably hope to take into consideration the whole sphere of human thought and action, consequently the most perfect human creed possible must, after all, have only a limited application.

(6) Human creeds are not only limited in their reach, and unsatisfactory in their character, but they are not permanent. They are either changing or else passing away entirely. “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.”

(7) God has given to the Church a creed—a Divine creed—and it is disrespectful to our Heavenly Father, presumptuous and wicked to substitute anything for that which Divine wisdom has prepared.

On the other hand, they have contended for certain definite things which they have offered as a common ground upon which all Christians can unite:

(1.) The Bible, and the Bible alone, as a sufficient rule of faith and practice.

(2.) Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God, as the foundation of the Church.

A hearty belief in Him, not doctrine concerning Him, or anything else, as the only thing necessary, so far as faith goes, to salvation.

(3.) All believers should be baptized, and this baptism is an immersion into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

(4.) Those who are thus baptized may be properly called Christians or Disciples of Christ, or any other Scriptural name. The Church itself should be called the Church of Christ or the Church of God, or simply The Church, as these are all Scriptural designations.

(5.) The Lord’s Supper and the Lord’s Day should be observed as they were in the Apostolic churches.

(6.) The practical duties of the Christian life as enjoined in the Word of God must be inculcated in all churches.

(7.) Above all, and in all, and by all, must the Christian spirit or the Holy Spirit be manifested, as this is also enjoined in the Holy Scriptures.

It will be seen that not one of these things, for which the Disciples have contended, may not be accepted by all Christians. Even immersion as baptism is not a divisive contention, for all religious denominations admit that immersion is valid baptism, though they may practise sprin-
kling or pouring. Disciples have contended that where these fundamental facts and principles are accepted there need be no difficulty about Christian union, as division lines begin only after these facts and principles are departed from, or where something is added which is not necessarily involved in any of them. To illustrate this point it is only necessary to refer again to immersion. Disciples contend that division begins only when we require something different from immersion. All agree that immersion is valid baptism, and that being the case, there is no absolute need for any other form of baptism, even allowing that sprinkling and pouring may be valid also. Disciples contend that as sprinkling and pouring are not universally accepted as baptism they ought not to be practised, since they undoubtedly produce division among the followers of Christ.

With these wholesome views it is certainly somewhat remarkable that the Disciple movement did not at once receive the support of all earnest Christian people, and especially the intelligent part of every Christian community. It is perhaps not to be wondered at that the ignorant masses did not appreciate the supreme simplicity of the plea which the Disciples made. Ignorance loves mystery. It is fascinated with the very things it cannot understand. This is especially true in religious matters. A religion which is easily understood loses something of its attractiveness to the ordinary mind. Occultism is essential to some people’s piety. They cannot worship in an atmosphere where the vision is clear. Ritualism has its foundation in this very fact: a spectacular representation, which is intended to exhibit, to a certain extent, the unseen, is a powerful factor in gaining the attention of those who do not think. Perhaps the beginning of Christianity in miracles may be explained by the fact just stated. But whether this be so or not, it is certain that the popular mind is often more easily moved by occult influence than by any other, since nearly every one is to some extent inclined to be superstitious.

It is undoubtedly true that the Disciple movement, as a union movement, has not succeeded as the Disciples expected it would succeed, when they proposed the union and supported it on the simple ground of fellowship in Christ, without any additions of theological or philo-
sophical speculations, or human opinions, as distinguished from the faith that is in Christ. Indeed, it has been affirmed by some of their own writers that their contributions to Christian union have not been equal to those of the Episcopalians. However, nothing could be more unjust than this unworthy contrast. It is readily admitted that the Episcopal Church has advocated Christian union, and has done some good service in calling attention to the importance of oneness in Christ; but, at the same time, this advocacy has carried with it an impossible condition. The celebrated Lambeth proposals were not for Christian union at all, but they simply stated the terms on which the bishops were open to consider the question. The statements are also somewhat ambiguous, and therefore leave room for misunderstandings. The fourth article, whether intentionally so or not, certainly makes safe the position of the bishops themselves. In other words, the Episcopal Church is ready to have Christian union provided that Church and its clergy are to be properly cared for in the union, and are made perfectly safe in holding their present positions, no matter what else may happen. This is emphatically the union of the anaconda and rabbits. The anaconda is doubtless always willing, but the rabbits object to a union which swallows them bodily into the greedy stomach of the anaconda.

The Disciples have been charged with advocating a union somewhat similar to this. But this is not true. They have always been willing to throw the Bible down on a platform and call all religious people to come to it, and then if they (the Disciples) are not there themselves they declare that they will soon come and join with those who are honestly seeking for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. They do not ask that other religious people shall join them, but that all shall join the Christ, and then in Him all will be united and one, as He and the Father are one. It is an entire misapprehension of the Disciple position to affirm that they are seeking Christian union by having their own religious organization absorb all other religious organisations. Their movement means a larger comprehension than is now manifested by the Christian churches, or Disciples of Christ. They have been compelled, by force of circum-
stances, to organize their churches and work from a common centre on the religious world, and also on the unconverted masses; but they have always been willing to meet other religious people more than halfway in any effort to break down the walls of sectarianism and unite the people of God on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone. Indeed, nothing perhaps has characterised the Disciples more than their willingness to abide by the conclusions of their own logic. The Campbells were the first to show their faith in the principles they advocated, by submitting to the very conditions which they announced for the acceptance of others. It was a struggle, no doubt, for them to give up all antecedent religious associations and theological predilections, and submit to the simple tests which were comprehensively stated or implied in the grand “Declaration and Address.” But when they saw to what result their reasoning led, they willingly submitted to even immersion, and to the rejection of infant baptism, both of which antagonised their most sacred religious belief. And it must be remembered that, in taking this step, they had to cut themselves off from all former religious affiliations, and for a considerable time, at least, they were entirely isolated, and had the fellowship of only a few friends who formed with them the Christian Association, and finally two or three churches of little or no social influence. Whoever will contemplate the action of these holy men, from this point of view, cannot fail to see that they really practised what they preached. They were not seeking to have the religious world join them, as an organization, but to have the religious world reform their faith and practice until they should stand in the teaching of the Holy Scriptures.

This noble spirit may not always have been manifested by all the Disciples, during their hundred years of history. There have been, and are doubtless, still sectarianists among them. It is perhaps impossible for this to be otherwise. There were narrow-minded men among the Christians in the days of the Apostles. These men were a source of constant trouble to those who had the wider and higher outlook. But God has never made human progress an easy thing. It would be worth very little if it were always easy. Struggle is essential to strength, as well as to clear-
ness of vision, and these are always indispensable to the building of character, and God is
ing to make character through the Church. This is the Church’s object and aim. Even
Christian union cannot be attained until Christian character is the basis. It is, therefore, no
discouraging fact that the Disciples must still “learn to labour and to wait.” God is never in a
hurry. It took millions of years to prepare the earth for the abode of man. It may take millions
of more years before man, in his full growth, is prepared for that “house not made with hands,
eternal in the heavens.” God’s steps are across the centuries; but He makes these steps only
when the proper time has come for them. As a union movement, the Disciple plea has not
been a failure. It has leavened religious society; it has called attention to the only basis upon
which Christian union is possible or even desirable. Many have not yet responded. This ought
to have been expected, and is not, therefore, wholly a discouraging fact. Some have
responded. The movement itself has made phenomenal headway. It has undoubtedly reformed
the religious thinking of the age, as well as much of the practice. The high ideal set before it
has not yet been reached, but many important steps in that direction have been taken. The
Disciples are still climbing the hill, on the top of which all the dividing lines will be lost in the
comprehensive vision which Christians can have when they have reached the summit of love.
Faith and hope are important basic graces, but love covers everything and permeates
everything. It clears the atmosphere. It blends all the dividing lines, which are seen in the
lower views, into one holy vision where only Christ and His salvation fill the eyes of His
disciples.

(7.) The Disciples have demonstrated that a religious body can remain united without the
aid of a human creed. This is a very important contribution to religious progress. It is the very
thing that their enemies declared could not be. In the early days of their movement it was
constantly asserted that as a religious body they would soon go to pieces. It was declared that
their bond of union was a rope of sand; that they had among them all kinds of men, preaching
all kinds of doctrine, and that consequently there was no potent influence to hold them
together as one people.
But these prophecies have all failed. The Disciples have proved by their own history that human creeds are not necessary to the union of Christendom. They have made a practical demonstration of this fact, and this is worth vastly more than arguments. Their movement is now one hundred years old, and no serious defection has ever taken place among the Disciples, while division after division has followed among the denominations which have human creeds as the basis of union and communion.

It is doubtless true that the very thing that was supposed to be a weakness with the Disciples has been a great source of strength. The elimination of doctrinal philosophies and theological speculations, which more or less enter into all the human creeds of Christendom, has made the Disciples’ position not only broad enough for all religious people to stand upon, but strong enough to stand against all the foes that may assail it. To indicate more specifically the breadth and strength of the Disciples’ position it may be stated that they have brought into their fellowship not only all kinds of men preaching all kinds of doctrine, but these men have themselves contributed to the richness and fulness and glory of the Disciple fellowship. Men have been allowed to enjoy their own opinions with respect to all questions that may be regarded as legitimate for investigation, while these men remain true to the centre, namely, Jesus the Christ, the Son of the living God. Neither Trinitarianism nor Arianism; neither Calvinism nor Arminianism; neither pre-millennianism nor post-millennianism; nor have questions about the future life been made tests of fellowship with the Disciples. The one question which they ask, when persons are seeking fellowship, is with respect to the faith of the applicant in Jesus the Christ. If such applicant says he believes with all his heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, that, so far as faith goes, is all that is required. Surely nothing could be simpler than this, and yet nothing more comprehensive. It unites the head and the heart, and this is pre-eminently the glory of the Disciples’ plea. It is a constant protection against ignorance, in that it makes the Word of God a rule of faith and practice. It is also a constant protest against coldness or formality, in that it makes a hearty faith in Jesus
Christ fundamental in the case of every one who seeks fellowship in the Church. It is a reasonable plea; for it makes its appeal to the intellect. It is a social plea, for it addresses the affections. Uniting both head and heart, it lays hold of Christ, who satisfies both the intellect and the affections.

Standing at the close of this Centennial year and looking backward over the century that is past, it is impossible not to realise something of the coming glory which is beginning to shine upon the progress of the Christianity of Christ. It has already been indicated that America is the place where the forces of Christendom are preparing for the final attack upon the strongholds of heathendom, lying west of the Pacific Ocean. Even now, some of the advance guards have entered these unregenerated countries which lie on the road to the final consummation of the struggle for the conversion of the nations this side of Palestine, the country where Christianity first took up its march around the world. It may be that this preparation for the final attack on heathendom will be delayed longer than seems reasonable to the Disciples. No doubt they are impatient to effect Christian union, for the reason that they do not believe that the conversion of the world can be realised until Christian union is consummated. But this impatience should give place to the hopeful consideration that this Centennial year is itself almost a marvelous preparation for and a promise of the coming better days. The Disciples have already demonstrated their wonderful enthusiasm by the remarkable crowds which have assembled at their yearly conventions, during the past two decades, but the Centennial celebration at Pittsburg, during October of this year, will perhaps be the most noteworthy gathering of religious people that has ever assembled at one place in the history of Christianity. When the tens of thousands of Disciples stand together in a holy fellowship, on that occasion, it will be the pledge of a new courage and new consecration and new triumphs for the great cause for which the Disciples have always contended. It will also be an unmistakable proof that the new century of their history will not close until their great Leader, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, shall triumph over the opposition which has so long sought to hinder His stately steps of progress,
while leading the host of religious people in their march to the conquest of the nations.

From this high point of view I plainly see
A vision clear of what the world will be,
When all the nations shall the praises sing
Of him who is our Prophet, Priest, and King.
I see a time when bloody wars shall cease,
And in their stead reign universal peace,
When pruning hooks shall take the place of spears,
And Love in hearts shall reign instead of fears.
I see also in that great coming day,
That cold commercialism will not sway
The lives of men for filthy lucre’s sake;
But energy will then be used to make
And bless a free and noble brotherhood,
In which the aim of all is highest good,
Where selfishness, with ugly visage, dies
Beside the wreck of sordid, corp’rate lies,
Which have so long with hungry, selfish greed
Refused to listen to the cry of need,
Which comes from sad and weary souls oppressed;
Whose fearful struggle in this world for rest,
Should make the very stones cry out for shame
Against the men, who chiefly are to blame
For all the inequalities of life,
That gender and maintain a wicked strife.
But in my view this evil is no more,
The time at last has come when rich and poor
Are terms which have no longer any place
Within the sacred sphere of saving grace.
But just like Jew and Greek, and bond and free,
These terms are lost in Love’s great symphony.
This blessed vision is no idle dream,
The present throbs and glows with things that seem
To promise and to clearly indicate
The ush’ring in of that millennial state,
Where our sweet peace shall like the rivers be,
And all our righteousness like waves of sea.

Upon the dim and mystic borderland
Of nineteen Christian centuries now we stand;
A century new begins to faintly dawn,
To take the place of one already gone,
While echoes from the years of all the past
Are ringing down the ages, like a blast
From northern climes upon the dawning spring,
And hushing birds which had begun to sing.
These echoes flood the air with sad refrains
Of injuries done and vile, unrighteous gains;
Of wrongs committed and of rights betrayed,
Of broken promises and debts unpaid,
Of wasted opportunities and powers,
Of squandered priv’leges and murdered hours,
Of sad bereavements and of dismal blights,
Of waiting long throughout the weary nights;
Of storms and tempests on the raging seas,
Of deep despondency and fell disease,
Of hopes all shattered in the rushing tide
That sweeps t’ward death with fast and reckless stride.

But these sad echoes all are fully met
With songs of joy to brightest music set;
These drive back strife, which comes from days of yore,
And usher in an age, when never more
The discords of the past shall break or mar
Our Gospel music by a single jar;
An age in which we’ll tell, with one accord,
The glories of our royal, sovereign Lord,
And men shall own and everywhere maintain
The majesty of his imperial reign.
We wait with patience for that age to bring
These splendid honours to our Lord and King.
CHAPTER XXXI

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

IT was the aim of the publishers to have this volume ready before the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, which was specially intended to celebrate the centenary of their organization, should take place at Pittsburg, Pa., beginning October 11th and closing October 19th; but owing to unforeseen difficulties this was found to be impossible. When this became apparent it was decided to add a few pages of letterpress, as well as of illustrations, giving a vivid and sufficiently comprehensive account of the great Convention, which was perhaps the most unique and largely attended of any assembly of Christians, representing a single church, that has ever taken place in the history of Christianity. A conservative estimate of the number of delegates may be stated at 35,000, though many good judges are of the opinion that not less than 40,000 were in attendance. It was well understood by those who had means of knowing that more than one-fourth of the delegates did not register, and consequently no official figures can be given.

The programme of this Convention, which will be found in Chapter XXIX of this volume, was substantially carried out, only a few unimportant changes being made. What follows in this report deals only with the mountain-peaks of what actually took place.

The opening meeting was held in Carnegie Music Hall, Pittsburg, Pa., on Monday evening, October 11, 1909. The Disciple movement is usually reckoned chronologically from the issuance of the celebrated Declaration and Address of Thomas Campbell in 1809. The Disciples had been two years preparing for this occasion. It was with deep emotions that the leaders took their places on the platform to face an audience which filled every part of the great building where the initial meeting was held. J. H. Garrison of St. Louis, president of the Centennial Commission,
presided at this meeting, and after a stirring hymn was sung the great audience was led in prayer by W. T. Moore of Indianapolis. The welcome to the city of Pittsburg was by City Solicitor Charles A. O’Brien in an appropriate address. The response to this address was made by A. C. Rankine of Adelaide, Australia, and Wallace Tharp, pastor of the First Church, Northside, Pittsburg. Mr. Tharp’s response was particularly happy. After these introductory exercises the Convention sermon was preached by George H. Combs of Kansas City, taking for his text John xvii: 37. In the course of his sermon he said:

“What is our mission? It has been already oft-repeated—the unification of the churches of our Lord. Now, if our mission is to unite Christians, our message must be to Christians. If we were sent into the world with a message to Christians in all the communions of earth, we must somehow deliver that message. But are we? Before Almighty God, yes or no? Are we reaching the ear and heart of Christendom? Are we going as flaming messengers to the churches around us, beseeching them in Christ’s name to be one? Here in this great centennial convention is the place for our confessions. We are not accomplishing, as we ought, our sacred mission. And here with these faces of our fathers looking down upon us, let us reconsecrate ourselves to our proper work. For these sturdy pioneers delivered their message. They spoke to the churches. From every platform, whether city church or woodland temple, they preached to Christians of all communions, beseeching them to be one. We must follow them. Their mission is our mission. We must address the churches of our day just as Mr. Campbell addressed the churches of his day. Convincing them that we are not building up another denomination, but are pleading for the union of all believers in Christ. We must find our way into their pulpits; into their prayer meetings, their revivals, their conventions, with the one cry on our lips and in our hearts, ‘Brethren, we entreat you that there may be no divisions among you!’ We count ‘our plea’ familiar. Familiar, yes—to us, but strange as tongue of Arabic to the Christian world at large. It is ours to make it known, to see to it that every man who holds in his heart the face of Christ from humblest sexton of dissenting chapels to highest dignitary in historic churches, English, Greek, and Roman shall have heard our story.

This is a summons to a warfare and not to a battle. Victory will not come on the morrow. The consummation may be yet afar, but this we can do: We can give ourselves in passionate abandon to this notable mission. We can do our very all, and if the triumph come not in our own day, we can surrender
our task in confidence to those who come after, knowing that soon or late the day will come, and singing even while we die:

“King bells in unreared steeples,
To joy of unborn peoples,
Your triumphs are our own.”

The second day of the Convention was occupied with meetings under the auspices of the “Christian Woman’s Board of Missions” and the “Brotherhood of the Disciples of Christ.”

All the sessions of the “Christian Woman’s Board of Missions” were crowded with enthusiastic, consecrated women, who evidently came together, not so much for glorifying the past as for providing for the future. In this respect there was a striking contrast between the C.W.B.M. and all other organisations represented in the Centennial Convention. It was evident that the women were there for business as well as for enjoyment, and the former was the predominant note. They held numerous sessions where the time was chiefly occupied in hearing the reports from the field, and in considering ways and means by which their work could be extended and also made more efficient. As an indication of the national character of this organization it is only necessary to state that there were representatives present from Alabama, Arkansas, California—north and south—Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, New England, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia—east and west—Washington, Wisconsin. There were also present representatives from Africa, Australia, Canada, China, England, India, Japan, Mexico, the Philippines, and other foreign countries.

Five hundred and forty-five new Auxiliaries and Mission Circles were organised during the past year. For the second and third quarters there was an average of two new organisations daily. There are at present 73,608 members. Receipts for the last month of the Centennial period amounted to $119,427.00. Receipts for all purposes during the year $381,854.23. The original financial Centennial aim was exceeded by $130,766.21. For the four years of the Centennial period the total receipts amounted to
$1,165,675.00, and for the same period 29,876 women were added to the membership.

The meetings of the Brotherhood were among the most inspiring, as well as perhaps the most important of any that took place during the entire convention. The great pavilion in Luna Park was literally packed with men only, and the enthusiasm was a marked feature and clearly indicated the deep interest which Christian men, among the Disciples, are taking in the affairs of the churches. This was all the more noticeable because this is a somewhat new interest. The Conventions of the Disciples in the past history of the movement have been characterised by a conspicuous absence of the business men connected with their churches. For the most part the men delegates of the Conventions have been preachers, college professors, editors, etc. Very generally only comparatively a few business men have appeared in their councils. Evidently the new century of their movement begins with a new enthusiasm among the business men, and this fact is perhaps the most promising sign in the outlook for the future days.

It is worth while just here to note that this new enthusiasm of the men has been mainly produced by the active agency of one man, namely, R. A. Long of Kansas City, Mo., who is the first president of the Brotherhood of the Disciples of Christ. Mr. Long went about arranging for the meetings at this Convention in a decidedly business manner, bringing all the way from Kansas City a splendid band of music, as well as scores of prominent workers, while the speakers selected were men of a type well-fitted to address audiences such as were brought together during the sessions of this society. Everything bore the stamp of intense activity. The atmosphere created was not one in which drones could live. It was evident from the beginning that only men who were willing to make sacrifices for the cause of Christ and to actively engage in His service would feel at home where these inspiring leaders were holding forth.

Mr. Long’s presidential address sounded the keynote. He was followed by other speakers, namely, Senator George T. Oliver of Pittsburg, James H. Allen of St. Louis, T. W. Phillips of Pennsylvania, Charles C. Chapman, known as the Orange King of California; Secretary P. C. Macfarlane
of Kansas City, Thomas W. Grafton of Indiana, W. F. Richardson of Kansas City, and Arthur W. Holmes of Philadelphia. The speech of the last-named gentleman was one of the most remarkable made during the entire Convention. It was literally on fire from beginning to end, and produced a profound impression upon the great audience present.

The addresses at the evening session were also of a very stirring character and were made by the following gentlemen: Charles H. Watson of Boston, Stephen J. Corey of Cincinnati, and Robert Johnson, pastor of the American Presbyterian Church of Montreal.

Evidently this new organization promises well to become an important factor in the future progress of the Disciple movement. It was an inspiring sight which met the view in that great hall, filled with consecrated business men, apparently moved by a single purpose, namely, the taking of the world for the conquering Christ.

The next day was devoted to Foreign Missions. Several able addresses were delivered, but the most attractive feature was the introduction of missionaries who were at home on furlough. Most of these made short addresses and were heartily cheered by the great congregations present. Three parallel sessions were held during the day under the auspices of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society, where abstracts of the Annual Report were read. The financial receipts for the year 1908-1909 were $350,685.21. Increase over the preceding year $76,360.82. Very little business was done during these sessions. However, during the afternoon an interesting service was held at the James Rees & Sons Company plant, where the dedication and launching of the steamboat Oregon were witnessed by at least 5,000 delegates. This boat was built especially for mission work on the Congo River in Africa, and was constructed so that it can be taken apart and shipped to its destination. Six thousand dollars were raised in about six minutes to complete the payments on the little steamer. The outlook for this society was never more promising. The work of the past year has exceeded all expectations. An additional secretary has been appointed, E. W. Allen, Kansas City, Mo., and a resolution passed instructing the Executive Committee to provide still other secretaries should they be needed. Fifty thou-
sand dollars have been received for two new colleges: one in the Philippines and the other in Africa.

The next two days were occupied with sections of the American Christian Missionary Society, and organisations under the auspices of that society. At the first morning session, held in Carnegie Hall, the president of the society, Charles S. Medbury, delivered his annual address. This address dealt with the past, present, and future of the Disciple movement, and emphasised very specially the spiritual side of their plea, holding this to be an important factor in their future development. During the day a lively feature of the exercises was a discussion with respect to the next place where the Convention should be held. A cordial invitation was extended by the Baptists of Boston to bring the Convention to that city next October. This invitation was received with marked appreciation, but owing to apparently very conclusive reasons, the Convention was compelled, reluctantly, to choose another place. The contest at once became exciting between Des Moines, la., and Topeka, Kan., the latter finally winning out by a decided majority.

The president of the American Christian Missionary Society for the next year is Peter Ainslie of Baltimore, Md., and the two new secretaries are I. N. McCash of Berkeley, Cal., and Grant K. Lewis, Long Branch, Cal.

The reports of work done by this society were very generally encouraging, decided progress having been made in many directions during the past year. It is difficult to tabulate this work, as it is represented more or less in nearly all the organisations connected with the Disciple movement. The report of the year’s work by the Board of Church Extension was particularly gratifying. The total receipts for the year from all sources amounted to $197,252.24. The total now in Church Extension fund $757,621.39. Number of churches aided during twenty-one years, 1,261, and these are scattered over forty-three States, Canada, and Hawaii; these loans aggregating 11,314,361.69. The balance on hand September 30th, was $79,842.42. It was also stated that during these twenty-one years $922,324.49 have been returned on loans, and 708 congregations have paid their loans in full, while all this has been accomplished with an actual loss of only
$563. The total new receipts of the Church Extension Fund for the year are $99,885.41.

Several other organisations reported substantial progress. Interesting sessions were devoted to the National Benevolent Association, Christian Endeavour, Ministerial Association, American Temperance Board, and Board of Ministerial Relief. Running through all these reports there was an optimistic spirit which was characteristic of all the sessions of the Convention. Evidently the Disciples believe in success, and to believe in success is success half won. As an indication of progress the following facts and figures are very convincing: Eighteen years ago the annual convention of the Disciples of Christ met in Pittsburg. The First Church on the Northside contained all the sessions. Then the delegates were considerably less than 1,000. This convention’s delegates were numbered by tens of thousands. There are 11,714 churches, 8,752 Bible schools, 6,861 ministers, 1,327,559 communicants. There are 984,883 students enrolled in the Bible schools. The total church valuation is $29,742,244.

Ten years ago the Disciples had 1,121,826 members. The present membership is 1,327,559, a gain of 18 1/4 per cent.

During these ten years 1,000 churches, with a membership of possibly 100,000, that are opposed to organised effort are not included in present-day statistics.

During the afternoon and evening of October 15th, several colleges connected with the Disciples held banquets. Among the most prominent of these may be mentioned Transylvania, Butler, Hiram, Drake, and Bethany; the last named being attended by nearly 800 of the delegates, and presided over by United States Senator Oliver of Pittsburg. At this banquet about $6,000 were added to the proposed Endowment Fund of $125,000, to be raised and presented to the trustees as a Centennial offering, in recognition of the great influence Bethany College has exerted in carrying forward the Restoration movement of the Disciples.

Saturday, October 16th, was the special Centennial day. Three parallel sessions were held during that day and evening. These meetings crowded every part of the great buildings occupied. Indeed, in many of the places standing-room was at a premium, and some overflow meetings
were held in order to accommodate the great throngs that were eager to hear and to see. Perhaps the most distinctively characteristic meeting was that held in the afternoon in the First United Presbyterian Church, entitled “The Veterans’ Campfire.” At this meeting only those who were seventy years of age and upward participated. Of course all who were present were not veterans according to this rule, but those who were not had a special place assigned to them in the room, and occupied that place simply as spectators. The Veterans numbered about 250, and the meeting was presided over by L. L. Carpenter of Wabash, Ind. His address was listened to with profound attention by all and was heartily received. He was followed by J. W. McGarvey of Lexington, Ky., who had been appointed to make the special address of the occasion. President McGarvey was never better in both matter and manner. His address was simplicity itself, and in this consisted its chief charm. There was no effort at self-laudation, nor any eulogy of others. It was a plain statement of plain facts with the co-ordination of these facts into the rise, progress, and present status of the Disciple movement. The spirit of the address was beautiful, its sympathy was intense, its appropriateness above all praise. There was not a note in it that did not harmonise with the great occasion. Many tearful eyes were in the audience and often the speaker was cheered at the conclusion of some eloquent passage which went home to every heart.

A number of short addresses followed President McGarvey’s masterly effort. These addresses were chiefly concerned with personal reminiscences of the men and things in the past history of the Disciple movement. The old pioneers received a large share of attention, some of the speakers being personally familiar with nearly all the chief men who were instrumental in making the movement.

On the Lord’s Day following, most of the pulpits of the different denominations in and near by Pittsburg were filled by Disciple preachers, but the crowning meeting of the whole Convention was held in the afternoon of that day. This was a communion service in Forbes Field, where not less than 30,000 communicants assembled to partake of the Lord’s Supper. In addition to these there were probably 5,000 more present who came as spectators, and who had no very special interest in the Supper itself.
It is surely a great compliment to the Christian religion to be able to say that, notwithstanding this great throng, the order was complete, and the silence at times was deeply impressive. Never before in the history of Christianity had so many persons partaken of the Lord’s Supper at the same time and place, and never was a great assembly like this more conspicuous for the finest decorum. One hundred elders served at the tables, and five hundred deacons served the great congregation. The elders led the thanksgiving in concert and, it is said by those who were in position to hear, that their voices swelled up in perfect unison into a great chorus which could be heard at considerable distance. The movements of the elders and deacons were directed by Wallace Tharp of Pittsburg, from a central position commanding the entire audience. By means of a small flag he was enabled to indicate each step of the programme, and so completely was everything understood that not a single mistake was made from beginning to end.

The whole service occupied little more than an hour, though there were several inspiring songs sung, as well as appropriate Scriptures read. The following description from the Pittsburg Post gives a vivid picture of this great gathering, and is copied here because it was written by an entirely independent observer:

“The religious fervor of early comers was kept in check with difficulty as the audience gathered. Song broke forth involuntarily from lips here and there in the vast assemblage during the wait. Section by section, in each a greater number of persons seated than contained in any congregation, the air of some well-known, well-loved hymn spread until a mighty, united paean of praise reverberated through the stands.

No individual’s voice could have reached the confines of the audience. Communicants recited in unison the Lord’s Prayer, a Scripture reading, and the benediction. Two prayers were read similarly by 100 elders officiating at tables at intervals about the semi-circle.

Rev. Dr. Wallace Tharp, pastor of the First Christian Church, Northside, was in charge. He took his station well within the enclosure of the grandstand wings, the spot recently designated in baseball parlance as home plate. Behind him was a massed chorus of 200 voices. Announcements by megaphone were scarcely required, owing to careful explanations in the programme. Signals for the commencement of each part of the service were given with a flag.
Remarkable contrast of the gathering with the great crowds attending the world’s champion baseball games last week formed an impressive feature. In the number of persons within the gates the events were almost on a par, but yesterday’s songs and prayers replaced cheering. The sober expression and devout demeanour of worshippers were in startling opposition to the frenzied contortions and vociferous enthusiasm to which are accustomed those who have visited the scene in baseball season.

Less than fifteen minutes sufficed, so excellent were arrangements, for every member of the enormous crowd to be given an opportunity to partake of the bread. The passing of the wine took but little longer. No disorder marred the exercises and little discomfort was occasioned on entering and leaving the field.

A word, a mild request, was sufficient to secure absolute quiet. In spite of unusual surroundings, realisation was brought home of the hallowed nature of an event which alone permitted the 50,000 visitors within Pittsburgh gates to participate in an observance which is a necessary part of the denomination’s services each Sunday.

The gathering was of necessity spectacular in itself, but features of an unusual nature were carefully avoided. Following the service the glass goblets used in partaking of the wine were eagerly sought as cherished souvenirs.

As the mighty congregation rose and at a signal, led by the chorus and eight cornets, raised their voices in the words of a hymn known the world around, ‘Nearer My God to Thee,’ every seat in the grandstand and left field bleachers was occupied. Soon the overflow formed a wide-flung crescent, with its tips resting at the extremities of the grandstand wings and extending across the field some distance back of the chorus and leader.

‘Blest Be the Tie That Binds,’ sung in unison by 26,000 persons of all religious denominations and of nearly all the nations of the world, rising in one great swelling anthem, brought to a close the remarkable celebration.

There can be no doubt about the influence which this great gathering in commemoration of the Lord’s death and suffering must have had upon the people who witnessed it. One thought at least must have been predominant in every heart. Could anything else have brought so many devout people together and kept them in the reverential mood which characterised them, than the Cross of Christ? Surely it was a demonstration of the truth of that saying of the Master, “I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me.” Those who imagine that Christianity is dead, or dying, would have had an object lesson
had they been present at this celebration of the Lord’s Supper. It was the crowning feature of the whole Convention, the event around which everything else revolved.

It is worth while just here to re-state what has already been emphasised in the preceding chapters of this volume, that the celebration of the Lord’s Supper on the first day of every week has been a cardinal feature of the Disciple Church from the beginning of their movement to the present time. Nor has this feature lost any of its interest. It has rather grown in its interest, though in latter years, and in some churches, it is perhaps not allowed to occupy as much time and as prominent a place as it is entitled to in view of the relation it sustains to the Christian institution. However, for the most part the Disciples would give up any other portion of the Lord’s Day services before they would surrender the Lord’s Supper, and this fact itself is a strong proof of their faithfulness in maintaining the cardinal principles of their religious movement.

The echoes of the celebration at Pittsburg will go down the ages, and wherever these echoes are heard they will be exhortations to the Disciple hosts of the future to maintain faithfully the institution which keeps in memory the death of Christ, the fundamental fact of the Christian religion; and the Lord’s Supper, the most historic fact connected with the Disciple movement.

The two succeeding days were occupied chiefly with department programmes, but these cannot be described in detail. Perhaps the most important of these was the meeting on Thursday of the evangelists. The speakers at this meeting were among the most eminent evangelists connected with the Disciples of Christ. No other religious people excel the Disciples in evangelistic fervor, and none can claim greater success in evangelistic work. The men from the field gave very conclusive evidence as to the methods that must be employed in order to have the best success. There was perfect harmony pervading all their messages, though there was some difference with respect to certain features of their work. This, however, has always been regarded as the God-given right of every Disciple of Christ, namely, to differ but not to divide.

No department of the year’s work showed greater progress than that of the Bible School, usually termed Sunday-
school. All reports from this field were of a most encouraging character. Undoubtedly the Disciples are giving very special attention to the religious education of the young, and the training of teachers for this work has become a marked feature of nearly all the churches.

The great Convention closed on Tuesday evening, the 19th. Many of the delegates had already gone home, but enough remained to make the last meeting one of the memorable meetings of the Convention. So ends the first One Hundred years of a religious movement which has already impressed itself upon all the continents of the world, and in America the Disciples have become one of the most aggressive religious bodies of all the Protestant churches. What another century will bring forth of course no one can tell, but unless all signs fail it is certainly highly probable that the principles for which the Disciples contend will become more and more the battle cry of the Christian hosts who are to ultimately take this world for Christ.

The great Centennial Celebration was a distinct emphasis upon the fact which has been contended for all through this volume, namely, that the Disciple movement is necessary in order to unite the Christian forces and carry the Gospel successfully in the conquest of the nations. The spirit of the entire Convention was a constant recognition of a Providential guidance throughout the one hundred years of the Disciple movement. While, in all that was done, honour was given to the names of the heroes that had fallen in the conflict, at the same time supreme honours were accorded to Him who has always been recognised, not only as the foundation of the church, but also as the leader of the mighty hosts who have won the battles of the past. This predominant spirit is summed up in the following Centennial Hymn written for the occasion:

One hundred fruitful years have rolled away,  
Our faithful pioneers have gone to rest;  
And here on this memorial, happy day,  
We honour those who now are with the blest.

But while we honour all our sainted dead,  
We’ll praise him most who made their lives complete  
We’ll place the victor’s crown upon his head,  
While all assembled here bow at his feet.
Then, gracious Lord, accept the praise we bring,
‘Tis all on earth we have to offer thee;
Make glad our thankful hearts while now we sing
Thy praise on this our second jubilee.

And as we turn to meet the coming strife,
May thy strong arm uphold and keep us still,
Be to us yet the Way, the Truth, the Life,
And we will try to humbly do thy will.
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Pendleton, W. K.: elected vice-president of Bethany College and marries Mr. Campbell’s daughter Lavinia, 421; character sketch, 421-428; takes a backward look at the close of 1859, 484-487; review Russellism, 499; elected president of Bethany College and editor-in-chief of the Millennial Harbinger, 522; his remarks on President Milligan’s eirenicon, 585-586; appointed one of the editors of the Christian Standard, 607
Perfectness, wrong view of, 354-355
Personal element in the movement, 723
Pinkerton, Dr. L. L.: as an editor, 577; as a preacher, 578, 579
Pioneers in Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa, 340, 341
Plan of salvation and obedience to it, 210
Plea of the Disciples, 36; its Bibliology, 37, 38; its Theology, 39; its Christology, 44-55; its Pneumatology, 55-61; its Anthropology, 62-65; its Soteriology, 65-68; its Ecclesiology, 69-72; why its success, 72; its scripturality, 73; its reasonableness, 74; its simplicity, 74-77; its comprehensiveness, 78, 79; its unity, 79-80; its consistency, 80, 81; its practicality, 82, 83; its conservatism, 83, 84; its liberalism, 84-86; its progressiveness, 86, 87; the certainty it assures, 88, 89; its unsectarianism, 89-94
Progress nearly always westward, 25; never in straight lines, 26
Prominent preachers and educators, 735-746
Raines, Aylett: sketch of his life, 286-294; why special attention given to his case, 295
Reconstruction period: its beginning, 33, 34; the change providential, 34
Redstone Baptist Association: Disciples urged to join it, 152; plan to exclude Mr. Campbell, 163, 165
Reformation of the Nineteenth Century: its origin, 21; time inaugurated, 22; time propitious, 22; place appropriate, 23; antecedent movement, 30, 31; three periods, 31, 32; a movement rather than church or churches, 9; a mathematical formula, 9; need of reformation, Mr. Jeter’s view, 11; classification of stages, 12; why the term “Disciple” is used, 13; becomes more and more aggressive, 223; some of the churches early in the movement, 224-226
Reformers and Christians: differences between the two bodies, 251-253; some of the leaders, 252; the Christian Messenger helping the union between the two bodies, 253; definite steps taken for union, 253; what each brought into the union, 255; sketch of the union meeting in 1832, 255-260; John Smith and John Rogers sent out as evangelists, 261; John Smith’s address to his brethren. 261-265; John Roger’s account of the union, 266; B. W. Stone’s account of it, 267, 268; some of the Christians not immersed, 268, 269; some drawbacks of the union, 269; union finally consummated, 269; spirit of this union spread to other states, 274; Love, the dominating influence, 275
Religious outlook in 1838, 343, 344
Restoration Movement: compelled to change from Reformation to Restoration, 319-321; necessity for studying the Word of God, 329; fairly launched, 335, 336; progressing along the lines of emigration, 342; danger of running off the track, 345, 346; reaching the rising of the sun, 357; characterised by three things, viz., interest in education, multiplying churches, and growth or organization, 411, 412; origin in England, 432; difference between the movement in England and America, 433-435; want of success in England, 435; passing out of the chaotic period and a second generation of preachers, 464; rapid increase of numbers, 522; some of the men of the seventh decade, 555; the ghosts of some mistakes, 556; letters of David King to American churches, 588; spread of the movement to Australia, 598; a new crisis approaching, 606; three great things for which Disciples contended, 663; what the Disciples believe and teach, 706-709; Disciples changing somewhat their method of effect-
Christian union, 711; working at Christian union, 712; Disciple platform broad enough for all, 746-749; providential as regards time, place, and person, 778-780; its contribution to religion, 781-807

Richardson, Dr. Robert: character sketch, 280-282; view of opinionism, 496-498

Rogers, John, his view of the “Jerks,” 240-242

Rogers, Samuel, one of the earliest pioneers in Kentucky, 285

Roundheads and Cavaliers, 28

Russell, W. S., 495

Scott, Walter: character sketch, 178, 179; his generalisation of the scheme of redemption, 183, 184; the influence of his preaching, 185; his generalisation of the Gospel, 186, 187; men associated with him, 189; removes to Carthage, Ohio, 417; removes to Pittsburg and edits Protestant Unionist, 418; his death, 512; described as a preacher, 513-515

Sectarianism among the Disciples, 350-352

Shannon, James: president of Bacon College and Missouri State University, 358; inaugural address at Bacon College, 360-362; side issues must be avoided, 465

Smith, John: his death and character, 599, 600; his life by John Augustus Williams, in controversy, 604-605

Societies: American Christian Bible Society, its organization, constitution, and officers, 418-420; Mr. Campbell’s objection to it, 420; vote of confidence in it, 477; finally discontinued, 477

American Christian Missionary Society: first meeting, 440; its origin, constitution, and officers, 441, 442; report of first meeting, 443-445; great men in attendance, 445, 446; Mr. Campbell’s appreciative notice of the society, 446, 447; marks an important era in the history of the Disciples, 448; progress made, 768; beginning of State societies, 451-458; opposition to societies is of some value, 458-460; The Publication Society attacked by Mr. Pendleton, and defended by Mr. Franklin, 481; Kentucky Christian Education Society organized, 482; origin of the “Louisville Plan,” 561, 562; The Louisville Plan as passed by the Convention, 563-565; The Missionary Society discussed by the Christian Quarterly, 567-575; differences between society men and anti-society men, 580; anecdote illustrating ignorance of the Anti-Society opposition, 587; lessons of the “Louisville Plan,” 610; Foreign Christian Missionary Society, formation of, 618, 619; definite organization and constitution, 620; first set address delivered, 621; economy observed in management, 624; its aim at worldwide missions, 625, 626; annual income since organization, 636; silver jubilee anniversary, 637; Christian Woman’s Board of Missions, 638; organization and some of the prominent movers, 639; constitution and by-laws, 642-646; financial record, 647; the extent of the field occupied, 648; value of the society, 649; Church Extension Society: when started, 650; meeting a great need, 651; some of the work accomplished, 652; a revival of church building, 653; some of the great buildings erected, 654; National Benevolent Association, 655; noble work it has done, 656-658; great Missionary conventions, 714, 715; churches founded by the American Christian Missionary Society, 717; Ministerial Relief Society, 718-720; the Disciple Congress, 718; organization of the Brotherhood of the Disciples of Christ, 749, 750; ministerial association, 750

Springfield Presbytery: its formation, 242; last will and testament of, 243-245; reasons for dissolving the body, 245, 246; effect of publishing the last will and testament, 246, 247

Stockton, R. H.: his noble gift to the National Benevolent Association, 657

Stone, Barton W.: his birth and early education, 232; religious experiences, 233, 234; he visits Kentucky, commenced preaching at Cane Ridge and Concord, 234; describes religious exercises denominated “Jerks,” 235-238; meets with discouragements, 247, 248; watches with much interest the Campbellian movement, 249; meets Alexander Campbell for the first time, 250; assists in planting
some great churches, 250; removes to Jacksonville, Illinois, and edits the Christian Messenger, 33D; visits Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky, 389, 390; gives his impression concerning the movement and its needs, 391; continues his duties as editor of the Christian Messenger, 393; writes a letter of advice to a young man, 393, 394; starts on his last preaching tour, 394; his alleged unitarianism and his personal denial, 390-400; his loss to the restoration movement, 401; his influence, 402

Summing up the Century, 808, 809

Sunday Schools: great interest in them, 450; appointment of Committee on Sunday School Literature, 450; great revival in them, 769

Union of Christians: not denominational but Christian, 151; union with the Baptists, 157, 158

Union meeting at Lexington, Kentucky, 378-379

Wallace, James, starts Christian Messenger in England, 432

War Period: Disciples generally opposed to war, 490; moderation shown by the Disciples during the Civil War, 491; trouble in the American Christian Missionary Society, 492, 493; address to Missouri Disciples, 494, 495

Wellsburg Church: its organization, 163; articles of faith, 164

Year 1848 notable, 437 Yearly meetings and cooperation, 417

Thomas, Dr., his heresy, 389