

A History
OF THE
Disciples of Christ

BY

B. B. TYLER, D. D.

Pastor of the Church of Disciples, West Fifty-sixth Street, New York City.

Part of the
Jimmie Beller Memorial eLibrary

www.TheCobbSix.com

A History of the Disciples of Christ, by B.B. Tyler, originally appeared as part of volume XII of *The American Church History Series*, a multi-volume encyclopedia, subtitled “*Consisting of Denominational Histories Published under the Auspices of the American Society of Church History*,” edited by Philip Schaff.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction: The Moral And Spiritual Condition Of The People.

The following pages will be devoted to an account of the origin, principles, aims, and progress of the Disciples of Christ.

That the evolution of this communion may be understood in its genesis, purpose, and rapid growth, it is important to consider the moral and spiritual condition of the people of the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The moral and religious life of our fathers at the close of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries was very low. Unbelief in Jesus as the Son of God, and in the Bible as a book of supernatural origin and divine character, and in what are esteemed by evangelical believers generally as the fundamental facts and truths of the Christian religion, abounded. The greatest immoralities were permitted to exist almost without rebuke. The Lord's house was neglected. The Lord's day was habitually profaned. The gospel was disregarded. The message of divine love was scorned. The Bible was treated with contempt.

When Theodore Dwight became president of Yale College, in 1795, only four or five students were members of the church. The predominant thought was skeptical. In respect to the Christian faith, the students of the College of New Jersey (Princeton) were not superior to the young men in Yale. The College of William and Mary was a hot-bed of unbelief. Transylvania University, now Kentucky University, founded by Presbyterians, was in the hands of men who repudiated the evangelical faith. At Bowdoin College at one time in the early part of the nineteenth century only one student was willing to be known as a Christian. Bishop Meade has said that so late as the year 1810, in Virginia, he expected to find every educated young man whom he met a skeptic, if not an avowed unbeliever. Chancellor Kent, who died in 1847, said that in his younger days there were but few professional men who were not unbelievers. Lyman Beecher, in his autobiography, says, speaking of the early years of this century and the closing years of the last, that it was "the day of the Tom Paine school, when boys

who dressed flax in the barn read Tom Paine and believed him.” Mr. Beecher graduated from Yale in 1797, and he tells us that the members of the class of 1796 were known to one another as Voltaire, Rousseau, D’Alembert, etc. About this time also wild and undefined expectations were, in many places and by many persons, entertained of a new order of things and better, about to be ushered in. The Christian religion, it was thought, would soon be thrown to one side as obsolete. Illustrations of the bitter feeling which existed against the orthodox conception of the religion of Jesus are abundant.

It is said that in the year 1800 only one Congregational church in Boston remained loyal to the old faith. When Dr. E. D. Griffin became pastor of the Park Street Church, in 1811, the current of thought and feeling against orthodoxy was so decided and intense that men went to hear him in disguise. They could not endure the ridicule that they would certainly receive from their acquaintances if the fact became known that they had given attention to a sermon delivered by an evangelical minister.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1798 issued a general letter in which the following language was employed:

“Formidable innovations and convulsions in Europe threaten destruction to morals and religion. Scenes of devastation and bloodshed unexampled in the history of modern nations have convulsed the world, and our country is threatened with similar concomitants. We perceive with pain and fearful apprehension a general dereliction of religious principles and practice among our fellow-citizens; a visible and prevailing impiety and contempt for the laws and institutions of religion, and an abounding infidelity, which in many instances tends to atheism itself. The profligacy and corruption of the public morals have advanced with a progress proportionate to our declension in religion. Profaneness, pride, luxury, injustice, intemperance, lewdness, and every species of debauchery and loose indulgence greatly abound.”

Unbelief and immoral living were joined hand to hand. Intemperance prevailed to an alarming extent. To become stupidly drunk did not seriously injure a man's reputation. The decanter was in every home. Total abstinence had hardly been thought of. Temperance sermons were not preached; the pulpit was dumb on this evil. Members of Christian churches in regular standing drank to intoxication. The highest church officials often indulged immoderately in drink. When the physician visited a patient he was offered a stimulant. At marriages, at births, and at the burial of the dead, drinking was indulged in. A pastor in New York City, as late as 1820, has left on record the statement that it was difficult to make pastoral visits for a day without becoming, in a measure, intoxicated. Lyman Beecher has given an account of an ordination in which the participating ministers drank until they were in a state bordering on intoxication. Daniel Dorchester, D.D., quotes a minister of this period as saying that he could reckon up among his acquaintances forty ministers who were either drunkards or so far addicted to the use of strong drink that their usefulness was impaired. This man says that he was present at an ordination at which two aged ministers of the gospel were literally drunk.

Peter Cartwright, in his autobiography, gives a dark picture of the moral condition of the portion of Kentucky in which his youth was spent. He was born in 1785. He testifies that the state of society in southern Kentucky was desperate. Lawlessness prevailed. Such was the disregard for religion in this commonwealth at one time that the services of a chaplain in the State legislature were dispensed with.

As the movement of which I am in the following pages to give an account began in Kentucky and Tennessee, it may not be improper to say, in perfect harmony with well-attested facts, that in that portion of our country the moral tone of the people generally was exceptionally low. There was a general disregard of religion, and a contempt for religious institutions. In many places having a considerable population there was not a place of public worship. The Lord's day was distinguished from other days only by greater noise, more amusement, more profanity, and a more shameless dissipation. The predominating influence in Lexington, the capital of the far-famed Blue Grass region, was infidel.

How are we to account for this moral and spiritual desolation?

The people had but recently passed through a war of seven years' duration. Moral and spiritual deterioration is almost unavoidably the accompaniment and consequence of great wars. The Revolution in North America does not furnish an exception to the usual tendencies of war. The year 1783 marked the conclusion, in a sense, of this long and bloody conflict. The people had secured the liberty for which they had struggled with a heroism unsurpassed in the annals of the race. They were free from the rule of Great Britain, but were in a condition bordering on lawlessness. It is recorded in our Bible, in the Book of Judges, that at a certain period "there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." This is a pretty accurate description of the disorderly life of our people during the period intervening between the close of the Revolutionary War, the adoption of the present Constitution, and the formal inauguration of the system of government under which we so happily live. This time has been felicitously described by Mr. John Fiske as "the critical period in American history." So much had been spoken and written on the subject of liberty that multitudes were unwilling to be directed in their dealings with their fellow-men by the reasonable requirements of law.

The people, also, during this period of time were compelled to give much attention to political questions. A government of some kind must be established. The liberty which had been secured by an appeal to arms must be organized and transmitted. This required much anxious thought on the part of men who were leaders. Intense political thought and discussion are, as we all well know, not favorable to a high degree of moral and spiritual life.

Almost as soon as the new form of government had, with almost incredible difficulty, been settled, questions between the infant republic and the British monarchy came to the front, resulting in the War of 1812.

But most to be lamented, there was a famine of the Word of God. Before the War of Independence the mother-country would not permit the publication of the Bible within the limits of her dependencies on this side of the Atlantic. One of the first acts of

Congress after the war was an act ordering the purchase of a quantity of Bibles to be distributed freely among the people.

Dr. Dorchester, in "Christianity in the United States," says that "the most pious people in the beginning of the present century, in the United States, entertained a faith so unlike the present belief of evangelical Christians as to almost create the impression on our minds that their religion was not the same as the religion which we now have, and in which we believe."

President Wayland, in "Notes on the Principles and Practices of the Baptists," says that in the early part of his ministry he was settled in an intelligent community in the goodly commonwealth of Massachusetts. In his church was a gentleman reputed to be intelligent in the doctrines of the denomination, the son of a Baptist minister, who had an interesting family, but devoted to worldliness. Dr. Wayland expressed *to* the father a desire to speak to the young people on the subject of personal religion. To this the father objected! He assured his pastor that he wished no one to speak to his sons and daughters on the subject of personal piety: if they were of the elect, God would convert them in his own good time; and if they were of the non-elect, such conversation as Dr. Wayland suggested would probably make them hypocrites!

Regeneration, as usually presented, from the pulpit and in current theological literature, by the accredited teachers in the orthodox denominations, was regarded as a miracle. Every case of moral quickening was as much a miracle as was the resurrection of Lazarus. As the ministers taught, so the people believed.

The word of God in the Bible was popularly regarded as a dead letter. There was supposed to be no power in the preached gospel to produce saving faith. The faith by which men are saved was understood to be a direct gift from God. It was assumed that the gospel was impotent to produce spiritual life. The seed was thought to be dead.

Dr. Thomas Armitage, in his "History of the Baptists," gives an illustration of the condition of affairs among the Baptists. The Baltimore Association met at a place called Black Rock, in the State of Maryland. Those who opposed missions, Sunday-schools, and Bible societies under the pretense that they conflicted with the sovereignty of God in the kingdom of Christ were in a majority. They denounced these institutions as corruptions which were flowing in

like a flood. It was accordingly resolved that the Baltimore Association would not hold fellowship with such churches as united with these and other societies of a benevolent, religious, and philanthropic character. The names of congregations cooperating in mission work, in Sunday-school work, and in the distribution of the Word of God through the agency of Bible societies, etc., were erased from the minutes of this association. This was as late as 1836. What must have been the attitude of these churches before the new light began to spread!

Dr. Armitage says that the Sator church started with a keen zest against the Roman Catholic communion in what she called her "Solemn League and Covenant." The members of this church bound themselves to abhor and oppose Rome, the pope, and popery, with all their anti-Christian ways. This, adds the historian, was all well enough, but it would have been much better to have set up a strong defense against the antinomian and anti-mission pope who crippled so seriously the early Baptists in Maryland.

An excellent way in which to obtain a reasonably accurate and full view of the condition of the Church of God and of the community at large in the United States when the present century came in, is to eliminate from the church and society, as we now know them, the spiritual organizations and forces known to be at work in this present time.

The Sunday-school was not. More than a decade of the nineteenth century had passed when the American Bible Society began its beneficent career. Antislavery societies had not been organized. The crusade in behalf of total abstinence from the use of intoxicating beverages had not been inaugurated. The great missionary and other benevolent agencies, so full of blessing to the people, came into existence subsequent to the period of time here described. Eliminate these factors of human progress and blessing, and behold the moral and spiritual desert.

The material and spiritual in man are intimately associated. Extreme poverty is not favorable to a high degree of spiritual development—nor is extreme wealth. Man's physical surroundings and condition determine, to a degree, his moral and spiritual state. A description of the religious—or, more correctly, irreligious—lives of our ancestors is incomplete without a statement of their finan-

cial, social, and physical condition; but in this place there is no room for the proper presentation of this subject.

It is a fact that at the conclusion of our War of Independence the houses of the people were meaner, their food was coarser, their clothing was scantier, and their wages were lower than at the present time. The man who did unskilled labor was peculiarly fortunate if at the close of a week he could carry to his home four dollars. In this home there were no carpets; there was no glass on the table, no china in the cupboard, no pictures, not even cheap chromos, on the walls. His clothing was a pair of leather breeches, a flannel jacket, a rusty felt hat, shoes of neat's-skin, and a leather apron. The treatment of debtors shows beyond reasonable doubt that the generation that witnessed the War of the Revolution was less merciful than the generation that witnessed the War of 1861-65.

But from the revolting scenes in the prisons in which men and women were incarcerated for no other crime than debt it is a relief to turn. The theme treated so briefly and so very imperfectly is capable of indefinite expansion. But a better day approaches. Let us behold its dawning.

CHAPTER II.

The Great Revival.

It must not be thought, from the statement of facts on the preceding pages that the people of the United States were, without exception, destitute alike of saving faith and genuine piety during the period described. Some there were who had successfully resisted the tide of unbelief and immorality. In some of the institutions of learning where infidelity had reigned it is encouraging that there were indications of a practical interest in the spiritual verities of the Christian religion.

Dartmouth College, as an illustration, enjoyed a season of spiritual refreshing in 1781 and in 1788. There was a revival in Yale in 1783- The membership of the college church, as a result, became larger than at any previous period. A season, however, of spiritual declension followed. In 1795, as has already been related, twelve years after this revival, not more than four or five students in Yale College professed to be Christians. For three years during the Revolutionary War Princeton College was closed. For a period of forty years, or from 1770 to 1810, there was no such interest in the gospel as could properly be called a revival. There were but two professors of religion among the students in 1782. As the eighteenth century came to a close there were a few religious revivals in different parts of the country. There are in existence accounts of spiritual awakenings in portions of the State of New Jersey, in parts of Pennsylvania, in western New York, in Georgia, in the Carolinas, and in portions of Connecticut and Massachusetts.

During these seasons of special interest in these widely separated localities, some young men who were destined to exert a great influence for good in coming years turned to the Lord.

Barton Warren Stone (born in 1772, died in 1844) was such a person. In 1790 he entered an academy in Guilford, N. C., then in the midst of a revival. Here he found the peace that passeth understanding.

But almost the whole of New England was exempt from special religious interest from the year 1745, the close of the revival under Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield, which began in 1743, until long after the beginning of the present century. The

same conditions, in general, existed in the churches located in eastern New York and in the Middle States.

It becomes now my pleasant task to give some account of the radical moral and spiritual change which came over many thousands of our people.

Dr. Heman Humphrey, in a volume written by himself, entitled "Revival Sketches," expresses the opinion' that "the revival period at the close of the last century and the beginning of the present furnishes ample material for a long and glorious chapter in the history of redemption." This revival had its origin in the northern part of Tennessee and the southern portion of Kentucky.

The first indications of a quickened spiritual interest were manifested in settlements on what was then the frontier, where the greatest hardships were experienced, and where the people of God realized more fully the spiritual desolation, and where also they called on him with the most intense faith and fervor.

As a beginning, Christians entered into a solemn covenant with one another and the Lord to spend specified portions of time in prayer for a revival. In some places the time designated was a half-hour at sunset every Saturday and a half-hour at sunrise every Lord's day.

The Christian population in this spiritually desolate frontier region belonged generally to the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist churches. The people had been attracted from Virginia and the Carolinas to what was then familiarly known as "the Cumberland country," by the great beauty of the scenery and the extraordinary fertility of the soil.

In the latter part of 1799 two brothers named McGee—brothers in the flesh and in the Lord—William, a Presbyterian minister, and John, a minister of the Methodist Church, preached in special meetings in parts of Tennessee and Kentucky—in some communities with remarkable results. As they proceeded on their evangelizing tour, their reputation spread, and the great good that the Lord was doing through them was told. They so preached the Word that many believed and turned to the Lord. Many families came to their meetings from great distances, and encamped in the woods for days. These meetings were conducted in the open air. This seems to have been the origin of camp-meetings. It is probable that the

first meeting of the kind was held in July, 1800, in Logan County, Ky. James McGready of the Presbyterian Church was the preacher.

People came to this meeting from a radius of sixty miles. Young men, young women, aged persons of both sexes, white and black, dissolute and moral, were alike stirred by the preaching of the gospel. E. B. Crisman, in his "History of the Cumberland Church," says that, as to the character of the preaching, "the ministers dwelt, with great power, continually on the necessity of repentance and faith, the fullness of the gospel for all, and the necessity of the new birth. They eloquently and earnestly presented the purity and justice of God's law, the odious and destructive consequences of sin, and the freeness and sufficiency of pardon for all." A work of grace was thus inaugurated, the extent and blessings of which the cycles of eternity alone will be able fully to reveal.

Let us note, with some degree of leisure and care, the extension of this special interest in the things relating to the spiritual welfare and eternal destiny of men generated in "the Cumberland country," and see how, from the southern portion of Kentucky and the adjoining districts of the State of Tennessee, it was carried to the central part of the first-named State, and thence to every part of the land.

Barton Warren Stone, whose conversion to Christ is mentioned above, became an accredited minister in the Presbyterian Church. In the year 1800 he lived in Bourbon County, Ky., where he served, in the pastoral office, two churches—the congregations at Concord and Cane Ridge. When he was more than seventy years of age he gave a full and minute account of the kindling of this great revival fire among his people. The story in full is of surpassing interest. Only a part of it can be given in this place. The following is Mr. Stone's account of the revival at Cane Ridge in August, 1801.

"Things moved on quietly in my congregations," says Mr. Stone, "and in the country generally. Apathy in religious society appeared everywhere to an alarming degree. Not only the power of religion had disappeared, but also the very form of it was waning fast away, and continued so to the beginning of the present century. Having heard of the remarkable religious excitement in the south of

Kentucky and Tennessee, under the labors of James McGready and other Presbyterian ministers, I was very anxious to be among them, and early in the spring of 1801 went to the scene of this remarkable religious excitement to attend a camp-meeting. There, on the edge of a prairie in Logan County, Ky., the multitudes came together and continued a number of days and nights, encamped on the ground, during which time worship was carried on in some part of the encampment. The scene was new to me, and passing strange. It baffled description. Many, very many, fell down as men slain in battle, and continued for hours together in an apparently breathless and motionless state, sometimes for a few moments reviving and exhibiting symptoms of life by a deep groan, or piercing shriek, or by a prayer for mercy fervently uttered. After lying there for hours they obtained deliverance. The gloomy cloud which had covered their faces seemed gradually and visibly to disappear, and hope, in smiles, brightened into joy. They would rise, shouting deliverance, and then would address the surrounding multitude in language truly eloquent and impressive. With astonishment did I hear men, women, and children declaring the wonderful works of God and the glorious mysteries of the gospel. Their appeals were solemn, heart-penetrating, bold, and free. Under such circumstances many others would fall down into the same state from which the speakers had just been delivered.

“Two or three of my particular acquaintances from a distance were struck down. I sat patiently by one of them, whom I knew to be a careless sinner, for hours, and observed with critical attention everything that passed from the beginning to the end. I noticed the momentary revivings, as from death, the humble confession of sins, the fervent prayer, and the ultimate deliverance; then the solemn thanks and praise to God, and affectionate exhortation to

companions and to the people around to repent and come to Jesus. I was astonished at the knowledge of gospel truth displayed in the address. The effect was that several sank down into the same appearance of death. After attending to many such cases my conviction was complete that it was a good work—the work of God; nor has my mind wavered since on the subject. Much did I see then, and much have I seen since, that I consider to be fanaticism, but this should not condemn the work. The devil has always tried to ape the works of God, to bring them into disrepute, but that cannot be a satanic work which brings men to humble confession, to forsaking of sin, to prayer, fervent praise and thanksgiving, and a sincere and affectionate exhortation to sinners to repent and come to Jesus the Saviour.

“The meeting being closed, I returned with ardent spirits to my congregations. I reached my appointment at Cane Ridge on the Lord’s day. Multitudes had collected, anxious to hear the religious news of the meeting I had attended in Logan. I ascended the pulpit, and gave a relation of what I had seen and heard; then opened my Bible, and preached from these words: ‘Go ye 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.’ On the universality of the gospel and faith as the condition of salvation I particularly dwelt, and urged the sinner to believe in it and be saved. I labored to remove their pleas and obligations; nor was it labor in vain. The congregation was affected with awful solemnity, and many returned home weeping. Having left appointments to preach in the congregation within a few days, I hurried over to Concord to preach at night.

“At our night meeting at Concord two little girls were struck down under the preaching of the Word, and in every respect were exercised as those were in

the south of Kentucky, as already described. Their addresses made deep impressions on the congregations.... On the next day I returned to Cane Ridge.... I soon heard of the good effects of the meeting on Sunday. Many were solemnly engaged in seeking salvation, and some had found the Lord and were rejoicing in Him....

“A memorable meeting was held at Cane Ridge in August, 1801. The roads were crowded with wagons, carriages, horses, and footmen, moving to the solemn camp. It was judged by military men on the ground that between twenty and thirty thousand persons were assembled. Four or five preachers spoke at the same time in different parts of the encampment without confusion. The Methodist and Baptist preachers aided in the work, and all appeared cordially united in it. They were of one mind and soul. The salvation of sinners was the one object. We all engaged in singing the same songs, all united in prayer, all preached the same things.... The numbers converted will be known only in eternity. Many things transpired in the meeting which were so much like miracles that they had the same effect as miracles on unbelievers. By them many were convinced that Jesus was the Christ, and were persuaded to submit to him. This meeting continued six or seven days and nights, and would have continued longer, but food for the sustenance of such a multitude failed.

“To this meeting many had come from Ohio and other distant parts. These returned home and diffused the same spirit in their respective neighborhoods. Similar results followed. So low had religion sunk, and such carelessness had universally prevailed, that I have thought that nothing common could have arrested and held the attention of the people.”

It would be interesting to describe the singular manner in which multitudes were physically affected during this revival, but there is not space to do so.

What were some of the good results of the revival of religion which began in 1800?

The permanent effects, from every point of view, were extensive, abiding, and in the highest degree salutary. The low plane of morals previously occupied by the people was abandoned. Infidelity received a permanent check. A distinctly religious phase of life was entered upon by entire communities. In all the churches formalism gave way to spiritual life and fervor.

George A. Baxter, D.D., who visited Kentucky soon after the revival above described, in a letter to Dr. Archibald Alexander says:

“On my way I was informed by settlers on the road that the character of Kentucky travelers was entirely changed, and that they were as remarkable for sobriety as they had formerly been for dissoluteness and immorality; and, indeed, I found Kentucky to appearances the most moral place I had ever seen. A profane expression was hardly ever heard. A religious awe seemed to pervade the country. Upon the whole, I think the revival in Kentucky the most extraordinary that has ever visited the Church of Christ, and, all things considered, it was peculiarly adapted to the circumstances of the country into which it came. Infidelity was triumphant, and religion was on the point of expiring. Something extraordinary seemed necessary to arrest the attention of a giddy people who were ready to conclude that Christianity was a fable and futurity a delusion. This revival has done it. It has confounded infidelity, and brought numbers beyond calculation under serious impressions.”

Similar testimonies were given by a committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church appointed to investigate the character of the revival.

Dr. Heman Humphrey, whose "Revival Sketches" were quoted in the preceding chapter, says:

"Looking back fifty years and more, the great revival of that period strikes me in its thoroughness, in its depth, in its freedom from animal and unhealthy excitement, and in its far-reaching influence on subsequent revivals, as having been decidedly in advance of any that had preceded it. It was the opening of a new revival epoch, which has lasted now more than half a century, with but short and partial interruptions; and, blessed be God, the end is not yet. The glorious cause of religion and philanthropy has advanced until it would require space that cannot be afforded in this sketch, so much as to name the Christian and humane societies which have sprung up all over the land within the last forty years. How much we at home and the world abroad are indebted for these organizations, so rich in blessing, to the revival of 1800 it is impossible to say, though much every way, more than enough to magnify the grace of God in the instruments employed, in the immediate fruits of their labors, and the subsequent harvests sprung from the good seed which was sown by the men whom God delighted thus to honor. It cannot be denied that modern missions sprang out of these revivals. The immediate connection between them, as cause and effect, was remarkably clear in the organization of the first societies which have since accomplished so much, and the impulse which they gave to the churches to extend the blessings which they were diffusing by forming the later affiliated societies of like aims and character is scarcely less obvious."

The great evangelizing agencies with which we are today so familiar came as a result of this mighty spiritual revolution, as Dr. Humphrey claims. Note the following facts:

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was organized in 1810. The American Bible Society was organized

in 1816. The New England Tract Society was organized in 1814, and changed its name in 1823 to American Tract Society. The New York Methodist Tract Society, now the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was organized in 1817. While the American Baptist Missionary Union did not receive its present name until 1846, it was established as early as 1814. In 1819 the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church organized the Protestant Episcopal Board of Missions in 1820. The Baptist Religious Tract Society, now the American Baptist Publication Society, was organized in 1824.

To this period belongs also the introduction of the reform in the use of intoxicating liquors.

In 1802 a total abstinence society was organized in Saratoga, N. Y. It was in the same year that Lyman Beecher delivered his first temperance discourse. Seventeen years later he delivered his famous six sermons on temperance. In 1812 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church urged the ministers of that denomination to preach on the subject, warning their hearers not only against actual intemperance, but against all those habits and indulgences which have a tendency to produce intemperance. The same year the General Association of the Congregational churches in Connecticut recommended entire abstinence from the use of distilled liquors as beverages. The Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance was formed in 1813. In 1810 the father of ex-United States Senator William M. Evarts, of New York, directed public attention to the great evils of intemperance by printed arguments. In 1811 Nathaniel S. Prime, father of the late Irenaeus Prime, D.D., of the "New York Observer," delivered a pungent discourse against intemperance before the Presbytery of Long Island. It is clear from almost countless facts that the consciences of Christian men were aroused to see clearly and to feel keenly the evils of the drinking customs of the people.

The national conscience also began to be quickened to the enormous evils of human slavery. The antislavery crusade was a religious enterprise. The moral sense of the people, having been aroused, was offended by the presence of human slavery. B. W. Stone, whose connection with the great revival in Kentucky has been mentioned, emancipated his slaves. When William Lloyd

Garrison was moved to begin his life-work in behalf of freedom, he was a devout worshiper in Lyman Beecher's church in Boston. During the exciting days in the experience of Wendell Phillips, he met a company of believers in a private house in Boston, where on every Lord's day they read the Scriptures, sang and prayed, uttered words of exhortation, and partook of the Lord's Supper. Mr. Phillips testifies that the strength gained in these meetings gave him ability to go on with his work. The antislavery crusade, in the beginning, was inspired by the spirit of Christ.

The increase in the membership of the churches was large. From the year 1800 to 1803 the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church increased from 64,870 to 104,070. This, however, was only the period of beginning. From 1800 to 1830 the increase in the membership of the Presbyterian Church was from 40,000 to 173,229, or more than fourfold. The number of communicants in the Congregational churches increased during the same period from 75,000 to 140,000, or almost twofold. The membership of the Baptist churches grew during these thirty years from 100,000 to 313,138, or a little more than threefold. At the same time the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church increased more than sevenfold, or from 64,000 to 476,153.

It will be seen from this condensed statement of visible and known results that the revival of 1800 was no local nor temporary excitement. The entire country was almost simultaneously wrought upon by a mighty spiritual force, reforming, regenerating, and lifting such multitudes into a life of faith as to change the moral and religious character of the American people.

CHAPTER III.

Contention And Division.

Let us return to Kentucky and see the progress of the work in that particular region.

As might have been predicted without a special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, this new and profound interest in spiritual things encountered bitter opposition from the unbelieving, the profane, the immoral.

The work, as we have seen, was good. By it men were made better. It would, therefore, have been surpassingly strange had Satan permitted it to proceed without hindrance. But opposition was met from characters altogether unlike those here named.

The general character of the preaching in the revival in Tennessee and Kentucky has been shown by a quotation from E. B. Crisman, D.D., author of "Origin and Doctrines of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church." A quotation from the "Autobiography of B. W. Stone" is here given:

"The distinguishing doctrine preached by us was that God loved the world—the whole world—and sent his Son to save men, on condition that they would believe in him; that the gospel was the means of salvation; that this means would never be effectual to this end until believed and obeyed; that God required us to believe in his Son, and had given sufficient evidence in his Word to produce faith, if attended to by us; that sinners are capable of understanding and believing this testimony, and of acting upon it by coming to the Saviour and obeying him; that from him may be obtained salvation and the Holy Spirit. We urged upon sinners to believe now and receive salvation; that in vain they looked for the Spirit to be given them while they remained in unbelief; that they must believe before the Spirit or salvation would be given; 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 war-

rant 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 began first to preach these things the people appeared as just awakening from a 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.”

Such preaching at the present time would not excite opposition in any evangelical church. Good men, however, in Kentucky and other places, then thought that such sermons were calculated to seriously injure the church. They loved the church, and the truth as they understood it. Loyalty to Christ’s holy church and fidelity to the gospel, as they saw it, required them to enter an earnest protest against the course of the revival preachers in their treatment of some doctrines usually regarded as orthodox.

There were five ministers in the Presbyterian Church, living in Ohio and Kentucky, who were active in the promotion of what they believed to be the work of God in the great meeting held at Cane Ridge in August, 1801. Their names were Richard McNemar, John Thompson, John Dunlavy, Robert Marshall, and Barton Warren Stone. McNemar, Thompson, and Dunlavy lived in Ohio; Marshall and Stone, in Kentucky. David Purviance, whose name will appear further on in this history, was a candidate for the ministry, and was in sympathy with the then new theology and the new theologians.

Charges were preferred against McNemar in the Presbytery, and he was cited for trial. He was condemned for preaching doctrines contrary to the Confession of Faith. The case came before the Synod. Marshall, Dunlavy, Stone, and Thompson understood that McNemar’s was a test case, and that if he were condemned for heresy they also were under a ban. When it was seen that the decision would be against them, and before the judgment of the court was announced, the five accused brethren withdrew to a garden, where, in prayer, they sought divine direction. Having prayed, they drew up a protest against the proceedings of the Synod in McNemar’s case, a declaration of independence, and a withdrawal from the jurisdiction of this tribunal, but not from the Presbyterian Church.

The public reading of this document created a sensation. A committee was at once appointed to confer with the protesting brethren, and induce them, if possible, to reconsider their decision. This committee was prompt and faithful in the discharge of its duty, but was compelled to report to the Synod that the accused brethren remained firm. An aged gentleman named Rice—David Rice—familiarly and lovingly known as “Father Rice,” was the most important member of this committee. He maintained, in his interviews with the young brethren, that every departure from Calvinism was a step toward atheism! The steps named by him were: from Calvinism to Arminianism, from Arminianism to Pelagianism, from Pelagianism to deism, from deism to atheism!

Since the effort of the committee to reclaim the erring brethren was unsuccessful, they were, according to the forms of law recognized in the Presbyterian denomination, adjudged guilty of departing from the standards in their public teaching, and were therefore suspended from the ministry.

A result of the position of these brethren and the action of Synod was contention in the churches and division.

The decision of the Synod still more turned the minds of Messrs. Marshall, Dunlavy, McNemar, Stone, and Thompson against all human authoritative creeds. They blamed their creed for the strife in their beloved church, and for the consequent division, but not yet had the suspended ministers a serious thought of leaving the fellowship of the Presbyterian denomination.

Immediately, therefore, after their withdrawal from Synod, they organized the Springfield Presbytery. A letter was addressed by the excommunicated ministers to their congregations, in which they informed them of what had transpired—the prayers in the garden, the protest, the declaration of independence, the withdrawal, the excommunication—promising soon to give a full account of their conception of the gospel, and reasons for their conduct. This promise was in due time redeemed. Their objections to the Confession of Faith were given at length. They assailed all authoritative creeds formed by fallible men. They declared their abandonment of all such creeds as tests of Christian fellowship. They affirmed their devotion to the Bible alone as containing a sufficient, and the only infallible, standard of faith and rule of life. They maintained that it alone was “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for

instruction in righteousness,” and that by the Bible and the Bible alone “the man of God may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” This volume bore the title, “The Apology of Springfield Presbytery.”

The conduct of the deposed brethren was not such as to calm the troubled waters. Pamphlets were published against them; pulpits engaged in the controversy; almost of necessity there was more or less of misunderstanding, misrepresentation, and consequent injustice and ill-feeling. To claim that the suspended ministers and their adherents were in no respect to blame would be to claim for them more wisdom and forbearance and self-control than belongs to our frail human nature. By the zeal of friends and enemies alike the views of the condemned ministers spread rapidly.

Under the name of the “Springfield Presbytery” the five men mentioned above went forward preaching and organizing churches. During this time also David Purviance, spoken of already as a candidate for the ministry, united with this Presbytery. After about a year they saw, or thought they saw, that the name and organization of the “Springfield Presbytery” was not in harmony with their publicly expressed devotion to the Bible alone as a sufficient standard of faith and guide of life. The thought came into their minds that the name “Christian” was given to the disciples of Christ by divine authority. Converts to the new views were rapidly made. Churches were organized, and preachers multiplied. But the consciences of these good men could not long remain in such a state of tension. Their words and deeds alike must harmonize with their convictions of truth and duty.

Consequently, at the next annual meeting of the newly organized Presbytery, held in the month of June, in the year 1804, it was determined by the organizers and other members to bring the existence of the body to an end. This they did with entire unanimity by the adoption of a singular paper entitled “The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery.”

This document, drawn in the form of a will, and signed by the deposed ministers, was followed by a statement called

“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 professed Christians, principally owing to the adoption of human creeds and forms of government. While they were united under the name of a Presbytery they endeavored 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 the Christian church government stripped of all 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 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 a 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 counsel when required, assist in ordaining elders or pastors, seek the divine blessing, unite with all Christians, commune together, and strengthen each other's 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.”

John Allen Gano, one of the earliest disciples of B. W. Stone, and a lifelong personal friend, in a memorial discourse on the occasion of Mr. Stone's death, delivered in the Cane Ridge Meeting-house, June 22, 1845, said:

“The first churches planted and organized since the grand apostasy, with the Bible as the only creed, or church book, and the name ‘Christian’ as the only family name, were organized in Kentucky in the year 1804. Of these Cane Ridge was the first.”

It was at this place that, on the twenty-eighth day of June, 1804, “The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery,” as we have seen, was drawn up and signed by Marshall, Dunlavy, McNemar, Stone, Thompson, and Purviance, in which they declared to the church and the world that they were determined to take from that day forward the Bible as containing the standard of faith and rule of life to the exclusion of all human authoritative creeds, and the name “Christian,” which they believed to have been given to the disciples of Christ by divine authority, to the exclusion of all sectarian and denominational designations. They sought peace with men, and union with all who believe in Jesus.

Other similar movements—similar in aim and method—arose at about the same time in remote parts of the United States.

James O’Kelly was a member of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1792. He made an ineffectual effort to secure a modification of the power of the bishops in the appointment of preachers. The next morning after his failure he and a number who were in sympathy with him addressed a letter to the conference announcing their withdrawal from that body. An effort was made to bring about a reconciliation, but in vain. The separation was final and irrevocable. This event is known in the history of the Methodist Church as “the O’Kelly Secession.” The seceders at first took the name of “Republican Methodists”; but later this name was repudiated, and the name “Christian” was taken as a sufficient designation. At the same time it was declared that no other headship than that of the Christ would be recognized, and that no other book of authority than the Bible would be received.

Abner Jones was a member of the Regular Baptist Church in Hartland, Vt. “He had a peculiar travail of mind in regard to sectarian names and human creeds.” In the year 1800 he gathered a church of twenty-five members in the town of Lyndon in the State of Vermont. In 1802 a church was organized in Bradford, same

State, on the Bible alone, and in 1803 another came into existence in Piermont, N. H. Through the influence of Elias Smith, a Baptist pastor in Portsmouth, N. H., his church adopted the views of Mr. Jones on the subject of creeds and denominational names. Several other ministers among the Regular Baptists, and also from the Free Baptists, soon rallied to this standard, and labored with great zeal and success, securing an acceptance of their views through many parts of New England and in the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Thus it will be seen that in distant parts of the country there were movements of similar aim, spirit, and methods to that inaugurated in Kentucky by the dissolution of the "Springfield Presbytery." Their authors in their inception were unknown to one another. After a few years they obtained some knowledge of each other, and were surprised and pleased to find that they had embraced and were advocating essentially the same principles. The result was a union on the agreement "that the name 'Christian' is the only name of distinction which we take, and by which we as a denomination desire to be known, and the Bible is our only rule of faith and practice."

This movement proved to be so popular that in 1844 there were said to be 1500 preachers, as many churches, and 325,000 communicants. About this time, however, their numbers were much reduced by the prevalence of Mr. Miller's views of the second coming of Christ, and the millennial reign.

Let us now return to Kentucky, and note particularly the progress of the work inaugurated by the members of the late "Springfield Presbytery."

There were stormy seas ahead. Their plan of peace was rather a tocsin of war. A resolution of those in authority in the Presbyterian denomination forbade the people of that communion to associate with the heretics in worship, on pain of censure, and, in certain cases, of exclusion from their fellowship.

But what became of the men whose names are attached to "The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery" as witnesses?

Marshall became so fully convinced of the correctness of the Baptist teaching on the subject of baptism that he gave up the practice of infant baptism, and it was thought by his friends that he

would unite with the Baptist denomination. Mr. Stone wrote a letter to him on the subject of baptism in which he endeavored to convince him of the error into which he had fallen. Marshall replied with such force that Stone's mind was unsettled to such a degree that *he* gave up the baptism of infants, and began to immerse believers who desired to be baptized in that way. After a season Marshall returned to the Presbyterians. He was required by his Presbytery to visit the churches where he had preached his errors, renounce publicly the false doctrines, and proclaim to the people pure doctrine as set forth in the Westminster Standards. And this he did.

McNemar and Dunlavy joined the Shakers. Dunlavy lived long enough to see and lament his folly, and McNemar was expelled from the society. It is said that he too was convinced of his error.

Stone and Purviance remained true to the cause of union on the Bible. Thompson returned to the Presbyterians.

Having mentioned the letters which passed between Messrs. Marshall and Stone on the subject of baptism, it may be well at this point to set forth the manner in which immersion gained acceptance and became the practice of those who had agreed to be guided in their Christian life by no other book than the Bible. The following is Mr. Stone's account of the matter:

“The brethren, elders, and deacons came together on the 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 conviction of right, and that we should cultivate the long-neglected grace of forbearance toward one another; they who should be immersed should not despise those who were not, and *vice versa*. Now the question arose, Who will baptize 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 authorized to preach we were also authorized to baptize.

The work then commenced: the preachers baptized one another, and crowds came and were baptized. My congregations very generally submitted to it, and it soon obtained generally; and yet the pulpit was silent on the subject.”

In tracing the origin, aim, and progress of the Disciples, we must now cross the Atlantic and study the genesis and nature of an influence destined in time to affect very powerfully this movement in the United States in behalf of peace and unity among Christians, by a return in belief and in practice to the religion of Jesus as described in the New Testament.

CHAPTER IV.

Preparatory Events In Europe.

Thomas Campbell was born February 1, 1763, in County Down, Ireland. His father, Archibald Campbell, was in early life a Roman Catholic, but this representation of the Christian religion he rejected as being out of harmony with the teaching of the Bible. He became a member of the Episcopal Church. His grandfather Campbell, whose name also was Thomas, was a member of the Roman Catholic Church. The formality of the worship in the Church of England, of which his father was a member, and the apparent want of piety in that church, led Thomas Campbell to the fellowship of the Covenanter and seceded branches of the Presbyterian Church. He became a man of marked piety. The consecration of Thomas Campbell to the service of God is thus described by Dr. Robert Richardson in the first volume of his "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell":

"In his early youth he became the subject of deep religious impressions, and acquired a most sincere and earnest love for the Scriptures. The cold formality of the Episcopal ritual and the apparent want of vital piety in the church to which his father belonged led him to prefer the society of the more rigid and devotional Covenanters and Seceders, and to attend their religious meetings. As he advanced in years his religious impressions deepened. He began to experience great concern for his salvation, and the various doubts and misgivings usually presenting themselves when the sense of sin is deep and the conscience tender pressed very heavily upon his mind. For a long time his distress seemed to continually increase. By earnest and diligent prayer, and the constant use of all the means prescribed by sympathizing and pious friends, he sought, apparently in vain, for those assurances of acceptance and those tokens of forgiveness which were regarded as necessary accompaniments of a true faith, and evidence of 'effectual calling.' While in this state, and when his mental distress had reached its highest

point, he was one day walking alone in the fields, when, in the midst of his prayerful anxieties and longings, he felt a divine peace suddenly diffuse itself throughout his soul, and the love of God seemed to be shed abroad in his heart as he had never before realized it. His doubts, anxieties, and fears were at once dissipated as if by enchantment. He was enabled to see and to trust in the merits of a crucified Christ, and to enjoy a divine sense of reconciliation that filled him with rapture and seemed to determine his destiny forever. From this moment he recognized himself as consecrated to God, and thought only how he might best appropriate his time and his abilities to his service.”

All men are to a considerable extent creatures of circumstances. The influences about us in early life contribute in no small degree to the formation of the characters that belong to us in the high noon and evening of life. It is important, therefore, in any attempt to understand the Campbells, Thomas and Alexander, father and son, who were destined to so greatly affect religious society in the New World, especially the movement in behalf of Christian union, whose genesis has been given on the foregoing pages, to look briefly at the condition of men as regards the subject of religion in the portions of the world in which their characters, during the pliant period of their lives, received, we may assume, the most permanent impressions.

Thomas Campbell was born, as has been said, in the year 1763; Alexander, his son, was born also in Ireland, September 12, 1788.

In 1729 four young men, students at Oxford, began to spend some evenings together, reading chiefly the New Testament in Greek. The band increased so that in 1735 the number of names together was fourteen. All the members of this society were staunch churchmen. They scrupulously observed all the sacred days and appointed fasts of the church. They partook of the Lord's Supper every first day of the week. They spent on themselves only so much money as was needful for their subsistence. They exercised the most severe self-denial. They gave in charity as much as they could spare. They visited the sick and the poor in their homes,

and prisoners in their places of confinement. They paid for the education of some poor children, and educated others themselves. The consecrated young men thus united and working together were called, in derision, "The Holy Club," "Bible Bigots," "Bible Moths," "Sacramentarians," "Supererogation Men," and "Methodists." In the writings and sermons of John Wesley from this early and small beginning to the close of his incomparably busy and useful life, he refers again and again to what he calls the primitive church. The idea of restoring primitive Christianity in faith and life dominated him from the year 1729 until he terminated his earthly career and entered into glory in 1791. This was the charm which the Moravians possessed for him. He thought their faith and manner of life were more like the belief and conduct of primitive Christians than anything he had seen elsewhere.

John Wesley's work, as an itinerant, began in 1738, and continued more than fifty years. The mere figures which represent his labors are almost enough to take one's breath away. For a man to commence at the age of thirty-six, and to travel 225,000 miles in the slow manner of the eighteenth century, preaching more than 40,000 sermons, some of them to congregations of 20,000 people, is an experience in the Christian ministry which probably stands without a parallel in the annals of the Church of Christ.

What was the immediate visible result? No pen can place on paper a complete answer to this question. It is easy enough to say that Mr. Wesley left a well-trained itinerant ministry 550 strong, a local ministry of thousands of hardly less effective workmen, and more than 140,000 members of his societies—for it must ever be borne in mind that to the very last he adhered to the idea that his organizations did not constitute churches, nor in the aggregate the church, but that they were simply societies in the church, the Church of England. The people of England, Ireland, and Scotland were profoundly moved by the ministry of John Wesley and his co-workers.

Mr. Wesley first visited Ireland in 1747, and he crossed the Irish Channel forty-two times. At Dublin there were more Methodists than in any other place except London. Some of his most efficient helpers came from Ireland. He loved the Irish, and the Irish were fond of him. His farewell to Ireland, when he was long past eighty years of age, was quite an ovation.

At this time Thomas Campbell was a young man—a young man of ardent piety. This mighty movement was gathering force and momentum before his eyes. Was he ignorant of it? Was he uninfluenced by it? Had it nothing to do with making him the man that he became in later years?

The condition of Mr. Campbell's own denomination in Scotland and Ireland must also be taken into account. He was a member of the Seceder branch of the Presbyterian Church. This denomination was the first great schism in the Church of Scotland—the schism of 1733. There were Presbyterians not a few in the north of Ireland who were affected more or less by the condition of the church in Scotland. Ministerial aid was sent in 1742 by the Scotch Seceders to those of the Presbyterian faith in Ireland who sympathized with them. Five years later the Seceder Church “divided into two parties upon the question whether certain oaths required by the burgesses of towns, binding them to support ‘the religion presently professed within the realm,’ did not sanction the very abuses in the National Church against which the Seceders had constantly protested. Both divisions of the Synod claimed to be the true church. Those who considered the oath unlawful came to be called Anti-Burghers, the other party being termed Burghers. This division spread at once through the churches in Scotland and Ireland, and the controversy was maintained with considerable bitterness for many years.

“These two parties of Seceders continued for more than half a century to maintain each its separate ‘testimony’ and its distinct organization. They were distinguished for the tenacity and zeal with which they maintained the ground they had respectively assumed, for the strictness of their religious life, and for the rigidity of their discipline. That hatred of prelacy which prevailed among them in common with all Presbyterian parties was at first intense, ... but it became gradually softened down, and after the lapse of thirty or forty years gave place to the milder spirit of toleration. But the disposition to confound matters of opinion and questions of expediency with the things of faith and conscience

still continued to display its power; and in 1795 a question arose among the Burghers as to the power of civil magistrates in religion, as asserted in the thirty-third chapter of the Westminster Confession, and also in regard to the perpetual obligation of the 'Solemn League and Covenant.' This controversy had the usual effect to subdivide them into two parties, distinguished from each other as the 'Original' or 'Old Light Burghers,' and the 'New Light Burghers.' About the same period this controversy prevailed also among the Anti-Burghers, the 'Old Light' party being headed by Archibald Bruce, Thomas Campbell's former teacher of theology, who, with some other ministers, organized, in August, 1806, a new Presbytery, called the Constitutional Associate Presbytery.

"There were thus at this time no less than four different bodies of Seceders, each adhering to its own 'testimony, but all professing to adopt the Westminster Confession. In addition, there were not wanting various minor defections of those who, during the heated discussions of Synods and Assemblies, flew off like sparks from the iron heated in the forge.

"Schooled amidst such schisms in his own denomination, and harassed by the triviality of the differences by which they were maintained, it is natural to suppose that one of so catholic a spirit as Thomas Campbell conceived the greatest antipathy to party spirit in all its workings and manifestations."

The same and other similar influences were at work on Alexander Campbell to cause him to become a zealous advocate for the union of such as believe in the Lord Jesus.

When he was in the seventeenth year of his age he saw the futile effort of his father to bring about a union between the Burghers and Anti-Burghers in Ireland. In 1804 a report with propositions for union was prepared by Thomas Campbell and presented to the

Synod at Belfast. In March, 1805, a meeting of representatives of the two parties was held with an apparently unanimous desire for union. The General Associate Synod of Scotland, however, dissented, and the measure failed. Of this Alexander Campbell was cognizant. In 1806 an application was made by the Provincial Synod of Ireland to the Synod of Scotland, requesting them to consider the expediency of permitting the Presbyterians in Ireland to transact their business without subordination to the Scottish Synod. Thomas Campbell was delegated to bring this subject to the attention of the General Associate Synod of Scotland. Thomas Campbell presented the case to the Synod, which met in Glasgow. In this movement in behalf of union Alexander Campbell was in thorough sympathy with his father. The failure produced on his mind a deep and lasting impression.

When Alexander was a student in Glasgow, in 1808-09, a gentleman said to him:

“I listened to your father in our General Assembly in this city, pleading for a union between the Burghers and Anti-Burghers. But, sir, while in my opinion he out-argued them, they outvoted him.”

The influences to which Alexander Campbell was subject during his youth were such as naturally and almost of necessity to increase his reverence for the Bible as the only infallibly correct guide in all matters affecting the life of the soul, to weaken the force of inherited prejudices, if he had any, and to deepen his conviction that the existence of organized and antagonistic parties in the Church of Christ was one of the most serious hindrances to the conversion of the world.

Thomas Campbell's health became so impaired that his physician enjoined a sea-voyage. He arrived in the United States about the 1st of June, 1807. He was so pleased with the country that he determined to remain in the New World. His family, under the care of Alexander, sailed from Londonderry for their new home the first day of October, 1808. After about a week, during which the vessel made but little progress, a violent storm came up, during the prevalence of which she was dashed against a sunken rock. The escape of the passengers was almost miraculous. They were cast on the island named Islay, one of the Hebrides. This wreck seemed at first

to involve an entire failure of the well-matured plans of the Campbell family. But this apparent misfortune became, under God, an important means of still further preparing Alexander for the work before him. The voyage must, it was seen, for the present be postponed. It was soon determined during the period of waiting to go to Glasgow, where Alexander could employ the time profitably with studies in the University, in which his father had received his scholastic training. Three hundred days were spent in Scotland—days of great importance in fitting Alexander Campbell for the work in which with tireless zeal and a holy enthusiasm he continued until the infirmities of age rendered him incapable of using his eloquent tongue and facile pen.

Aside from the impressions made on him by the faculty of the University of Glasgow must be reckoned the influences of certain friends outside with whom he came in contact. Dr. Richardson, Alexander Campbell's chosen biographer, says that "Mr. Campbell received his first impulse as a reformer" during his sojourn in Glasgow, and as a result of personal association with the gentlemen to whom allusion is here made.

The first man, it seems, with whom he met was Greville Ewing, a cultivated, liberal-minded Christian gentleman, who introduced the young man to the professors, and at whose house he was a frequent and always welcome guest. Mr. Ewing was highly esteemed by the brothers Robert and James Alexander Haldane. The Haldanes were men of wealth and social position, destined for the East India trade; but becoming much interested in the Christian religion, they gave themselves, their fortunes, their social position, everything, with a consuming zeal, to the dissemination of its truths and principles.

Mr. Robert Haldane was in sympathy with William Carey, "the consecrated cobbler," in his missionary work in India. James was in this, as in all things relating to the extension of the Messiah's reign, in full accord with Robert. It was their purpose to inaugurate a permanent and far-reaching work in Bengal. Robert Haldane proposed to go out to the work in person, carrying with him three ministerial coadjutors—David Bogue, Greville Ewing, and William Innes. A printer was also engaged, and it was the purpose of Mr. Haldane to support a well-equipped printing establishment, so that the Word would be proclaimed to the millions in India, espe-

cially in Bengal, by the press as well as by the voice. Others were also to have gone out—such was the plan— as catechists, city missionaries, and school-teachers. But this comprehensive scheme came to nothing by reason of the determined opposition of the East India Company. Mr. Robert Haldane proposed to assume the entire financial responsibility of this great missionary enterprise. After its failure Mr. Haldane turned his attention to the evangelization of Scotland with such zeal and liberality that before Alexander Campbell went to Glasgow he had expended almost \$300,000 in home evangelization. He also thought to evangelize Africa, by having boys and girls of promise brought from the Dark Continent to be intellectually trained, to be educated also in the faith of the gospel, and in the *good* customs of our civilization; after which they were to be sent back to their native land to educate and Christianize others. Mr. Haldane pledged seven thousand pounds sterling for this purpose. He educated about three hundred young men for the ministry, and erected large buildings for public worship in the principal cities of Scotland. He also organized a theological seminary in Paris. At the beginning of their benevolent career the Haldanes were members of the Church of Scotland, but they left that communion and became independent, attempting to conform, alone, always, and in all things, to the teaching of the New Testament. They afterward identified themselves pretty fully with the great Baptist family, agreeing with the Baptists particularly as to the subjects and form of baptism, and the independency of the individual churches. James Alexander Haldane became pastor of an independent church in the city of Edinburgh in 1799, in which office he continued, without salary, more than fifty years. There can be no doubt that Alexander Campbell was influenced by these men during his sojourn in Scotland. He himself said, in a letter, in 1835:

“I am greatly indebted to all the Reformers, from Martin Luther down to John Wesley. I could not enumerate or particularize the individuals, living and dead, who have assisted in forming my mind. I am in some way indebted to some person or other for every idea I have on every subject. When I begin to think of my debt of thought, I see an immense crowd of claimants....

“If all the Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Persian, French, English, Irish, Scotch, and American teachers and authors were to demand their own from me, I do not know that I would have two mites to buy incense to offer upon the altar of my genius of originality for the honors vouchsafed to me.”

CHAPTER V. The Campbells In America.

Immediately on the arrival of Thomas Campbell in the United States, he was cordially received by his Presbyterian brethren, and found employment, as a Christian minister, in the Presbytery of Chartiers in western Pennsylvania. The country in which he wrought was sparsely settled, and it was therefore but seldom that ministerial services and public worship were enjoyed by the representatives of the various denominations which, having floated off from the Old World upon the tide of emigration, had been thrown together in these new settlements in this western world. As a communion season approached, Mr. Campbell's sympathies were aroused by the spiritually destitute condition of some in the vicinity of his labors who belonged to other branches of the Presbyterian family, and who had not for a long time enjoyed an opportunity of partaking of the Lord's Supper, so that he felt it to be his duty, in his preparation sermon, to lament the existing divisions, and to suggest that all his pious hearers who felt disposed and duly prepared should, without reference to denominational differences, enjoy the approaching communion. This furnished a basis for formal charges against Thomas Campbell before the Presbytery of which he was a member. When the trial came on the accused did not fail to reiterate his oft-expressed convictions as to the manifold evils of sectarianism, and to bear testimony in favor of a more fraternal and Christ-like spirit. His appeal was to the Bible. He maintained that his conduct was in accord with the teaching and spirit of the One Book, which contains all things necessary to salvation. But his earnest lament and tender words in behalf of Christian liberty and fraternity were in vain. The court found him so far guilty as to deserve censure. From this decision an appeal was made to the Associate Synod of North America. When the case was called before this superior court Mr. Campbell delivered the following address:

“Honored brethren: Before you come to a final issue in the present business, let me entreat you to pause a moment and seriously consider the following things:

“To refuse any one his just privilege, is it not to oppress and injure? In proportion to the magnitude

and importance of the privilege withheld, is not the injustice done in withholding it to be estimated? If so, how great the injustice, 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 his ministering servants, and to be received and observed by all his people! Or have I, in any instance, proposed to say or do otherwise? If I have I shall be heartily thankful to any brother that shall point it out, and upon his so doing shall as heartily and thankfully relinquish it. Let none think that by so saying I entertain the vain presumption of being infallible. So far am I from this that I dare not venture to trust my own understanding so far as to take upon me to teach anything as a matter of faith or duty but what is already expressly taught and enjoined by divine authority; and 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 it is to be in all things conformed to the original Standard. It is therefore because I have no confidence, either 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. Is it, 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-laborer in that blessed work? I sincerely rejoice with them in what they have done in that way; but still, all is not done; and surely they can have no objection to go further. Nor do I presume to

dictate to them, nor to others, as to 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 such pure 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.

“And all this without any intention on my part to judge or despise my Christian brethren who may not see with my eyes in these things, which to me appear indispensably necessary to promote- and secure the unity, peace, and purity of the church. Say, brethren, what is my offense, that I should be thrust out from the heritage of the Lord, or from serving him in that good work to which he has been graciously pleased to call me? For what error or immorality ought I to be rejected, except it be that I refuse to acknowledge as obligatory upon myself, or to impose upon others, anything as of divine obligation for which I cannot produce as ‘thus saith the Lord’? This I am sure I can do while I keep by his own Word; but not quite so sure when I substitute my own meaning or opinion or that of others instead thereof.

“Surely, brethren, from my steadfast adherence to the divine Standard; my absolute and entire rejection of human authority in matters of religion; my professed and sincere willingness to walk in all good understanding, communion, and fellowship with sincere and humble Christian brethren who may not see with me in these things; and, permit me to add, my sincere desire to unite with you in carrying forward that blessed work in which you have set out, and from which you take your name—you will

do me the justice to believe that if I did not sincerely desire a union with you I would not have once and again made application for that purpose. A union not merely nominal, but hearty and confidential, founded upon certain and established principles; and this, if I mistake not, is firmly laid on both sides. Your Standard informs me of your views of truth and duty, and my declarations give you precisely the same advantage. You are willing to be tried in all matters by your Standard, according to your printed declaration; I am willing to be tried in all matters by *my* Standard, according to my written declaration. You can labor under no difficulty about my preaching and practicing whatever is expressly enjoined in the divine Standard, as generally defined in my 'Declaration,' and although I have not the same clearness about everything contained in your Standard, yet where I cannot see, believing you to be sincere and conscientious servants of the same great and gracious Master who freely pardons his willing and obedient servants their ten thousand talents of shortcomings, I am, therefore, through his grace, ready to forbear with you; at the same time hoping that you possess the same gracious spirit, and therefore will not reject me for the lack of those fifty forms which might probably bring me up to your measure, and to which, if necessary, I also through grace may yet attain, for I have not set myself down as perfect"

After the reading of this paper and the hearing of the case by the Synod, it was decided that there were such informalities in the proceedings of the Presbytery as to afford sufficient reason to the Synod to set aside their judgment and decision, and to release Mr. Campbell from censure. (Richardson's "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," vol. 1:, pp. 222-229.)

It is evident that Thomas Campbell had no desire to separate himself from the fellowship of this church. For many of the ministers, and for the people generally, he cherished sentiments of

Christian affection; but more and more it became apparent that an amicable adjustment of the differences between him and his brethren was impossible, and that a separation was inevitable. The feeling against Mr. Campbell on account of his liberal spirit and principles was greater than he was able to resist. He accordingly presented to the Synod a formal renunciation of its authority, announcing that he abandoned all ministerial connection with it, and would thenceforth hold himself utterly unaffected by its decisions.

These proceedings and this step antedated the arrival of his son Alexander and the family in the early autumn of 1809. Alexander, when he heard the story, was in entire accord with his father, and greatly rejoiced when his father told him that for some time he had been preaching to audiences made up of individuals entertaining different conceptions of the gospel—men who were willing to give attention to overtures for Christian union on the basis of the Bible alone.

In due time these persons were united in an organization called “The Christian Association of Washington, Pa.”

That all might understand its purpose and method, this association published an elaborate “Declaration and Address.” This document is too verbose to find a place in full in this story. It was a carefully prepared and most significant paper. It contained the seeds of coming fruit, nor is the end yet. This paper, prepared by Thomas Campbell, as time goes on is seen to contain a far-reaching wisdom of which its scholarly and pious author had no adequate conception. This was the second document which was given to the public in the beginning of the communion known as Disciples of Christ. The first was the publication made by Stone and his friends in Kentucky, five or six years before. We can only pause, at this point in our progress, to read the following propositions, containing the substance of the “Declaration and Address”:

“Proposition I. 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 truly and properly be called Christians.

“Proposition II. 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.

“Proposition III. 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.

“Proposition IV. That although the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are irreparably 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.

“Proposition V. 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 be made a term of communion among Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament.

“Proposition VI. That although inferences and deductions from Scripture promises, 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 further 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.

“Proposition VII. That although doctrinal exhibitions of the great system of divine truths and defensive testimonies in opposition to the 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 the 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.

“Proposition VIII. That 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.

“Proposition IX. 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.

“Proposition X. That division among 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 antiscriptural, as being strictly prohibited by his sovereign authority; a direct violation of his express command. It is antinatural, as it excites Christians to contemn, to hate, and oppose one another, who are bound by the highest and most endearing obliga-

tions to love each other as brethren, even as Christ loved them. In a word, it is productive of confusion and of every evil work.

“Proposition XI. 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.

“Proposition XII. 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 temper 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, without any additions whatsoever of human opinions or inventions of men.

“Proposition XIII. Lastly, that if any circumstances 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 pretense 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.”

This document in full, from beginning to end, exhibits a beautiful spirit. It is an earnest appeal to evangelical believers to come together in aggressive Christian work, by a return in faith, in ordinance, and in life to the religion of Christ as described on the pages of the New Testament. The closing paragraph of the “Declaration and Address” reads as follows:

“May the Lord soon open the eyes of his people to see things in their true light, and excite them to come out of their wilderness condition, out of this Babel of confusion, leaning upon their Beloved, and embracing each other in him, holding fast ‘the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.’ This gracious unity and unanimity in Jesus would afford the best external evidence of their union with him, and of their joint interest in the Father’s love. ‘By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples,’ says he, ‘if you have love one to another.’ And, ‘This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you.’ And again, ‘Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are,’ even ‘all that shall believe in me; 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. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast loved me.’ May the Lord hasten it in his time. Farewell.

“Peace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.”

The spirit manifested in the above quotations, a spirit of tenderness, gentleness, and affection, is exhaled by the entire document from beginning to end.

To guard against misunderstandings and consequent misrepresentations, the “Declaration and Address” was followed by an explanation called an “Appendix.” In the “Appendix” the following language is employed:

“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 favor us to make inroads upon such; or by endeavoring to erect churches out of churches, to distract and divide congregations.” They express, however, a “desire to be instrumental in erecting as many churches as possible throughout *the desolate places* of God’s heritage,” on the one divine foundation, “being well persuaded that every such erection will not only in the issue prove an accession to the general cause” of Christian union on New Testament principles, “but will also, in the meantime, be a step toward” this grand consummation, “and, of course, will reap the first-fruits of that blissful harvest that will fill the face of the world with fruit.”

Alexander Campbell said, in 1861, of this “Declaration and Address” that it “contains what may be called the embryo, or the rudiments, of a great and rapidly increasing community. It virtually contains the elements of a great movement of vital interest to every citizen of Christ’s kingdom. The author of it, and those who concurred with him in the views and propositions developed in it, did not, indeed could not, comprehend all its influence and bearings upon the nominal and formal profession of what is grossly called ‘Protestant Christendom.’”

One of the first practical questions that came up as a result of the adoption by the Washington Association of the “Declaration and Address” related to the Scriptural subject of Christian baptism. Alexander Campbell says that on reading the proof-sheets of this now historic document immediately after his arrival in Washington, Pa., in the autumn of 1809, he remarked to its author:

“Then, sir, you must abandon and give up infant baptism and some other practices for which, it seems to me, you cannot produce an express precept or an express example in any book of the Christian Scriptures.”

To which Thomas Campbell, after a pause, replied:

“To the law and to the testimony we make our appeal. If not found therein we must, of course, abandon it. But,” he added, “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.”

CHAPTER VI.

Connection With The Baptists.

So large an amount of space has been given to the Christian Association of Washington, Pa., to the "Declaration and Address," and to the "Appendix," because of their importance in coming to a correct understanding as to the origin and aim of the Disciples of Christ. There is no other single document in existence which states so fully, so clearly, and so authoritatively the *intention* of the Disciples in the very beginning of their existence as the "Declaration and Address" with the accompanying "Appendix."

After two or three years Thomas Campbell became dissatisfied because the work for which the Christian Association had been organized did not progress as rapidly as he desired. His proposition looking toward a union of evangelical believers seemed in a large degree to have fallen on dull ears. The favorable responses to his kindly overtures were few. No societies were organized auxiliary to the society in Washington, as was contemplated. The association itself was gradually assuming a character different from that which was in the minds of its organizers. It was expressly stipulated in the "Declaration and Address" that "this society by no means considers itself a church, nor does at all assume to itself the power 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 of church reformation." But under the ministry of himself and of his son Alexander, the Christian Association of Washington seemed to be gradually taking the position of a distinct ecclesiastical body. With this tendency they were displeased. The thought that they should be the agents in bringing into existence another denomination was most abhorrent to their minds. There were already too many religious denominations. Their purpose was the ultimate destruction of denominationalism in the Church of Christ. To avoid what now began to seem to be almost inevitable, the Campbells were willing to adopt any measures which were consistent with the clearly defined principles of the New Testament. It was at this juncture that the principal in this movement was invited by ministers and members to identify himself and the association with the Presbyterian Church. This, how-

ever, was not practical. The Association had no thought of surrendering its identity or its aims. It only desired to continue its labors as a society for the promotion of Christian union under the auspices and with the approval of the Presbyterian Church, and thus avoid the organization of a new denomination.

Dr. Richardson says (“Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” vol. 1:, p. 330) that:

“the society must obtain admission into some regularly organized religious body, or be itself compelled to change its attitude and resolve itself into an independent church—an alternative which Thomas Campbell particularly desired to avoid. It was this very dread of the ultimate formation of a new religious body that caused him to overlook the absurdity of expecting that any sect would receive him and the society he represented on the terms proposed. For a party to have admitted into its bosom those who were avowedly bent on the destruction of partyism would, of course, have been perfectly suicidal.”

The origin of the Disciples of Christ is represented in this narrative as a Christian union movement, as a movement in the interest of love and peace among believers; but there is a general opinion, or seems to be, that the characteristics of the Disciples are in direct opposition, so far as their relation to other Christians is concerned, to this pleasant and altogether fascinating representation. What is the explanation?

The Synod of Pittsburg, to which Thomas Campbell applied for admission with his Christian Association, by its action in the case initiated a most unpleasant controversy, which continued, almost without interruption, for a sufficient length of time to give the Disciples the reputation here named. It is easy to see, from the records of the Synod, that the position and aim of Thomas Campbell were greatly misunderstood, and consequently misrepresented. The very thing that he was doing his utmost to avoid was one of the things charged upon him and the Christian Association of Washington—the promotion of division among the people of God. The work in which he was engaged was characterized as “baleful” and “de-

structive”—not pleasant epithets, it must be confessed. He was even accused of “declaring that the administration of baptism to infants is not authorized by Scriptural precept or example, and is a matter of indifference.” Mr. Campbell at once “denied having said that infant baptism was a matter of indifference.” The advocates of reformation and union were compelled, by misrepresentations, for the time to stand before the world in the attitude of belligerents.

As to the peaceable purposes of the Campbells, the chosen biographer of the younger, Dr. Robert Richardson, says that “among the numerous discourses which Alexander Campbell delivered during the early years of his ministry, and of which he preserved skeletons and notes sufficient to make an interesting volume, none are to be found of a partisan or disputatious character, and none of them are directed against existing denominations.”

Many years afterward, in the “Millennial Harbinger,” of which he was editor, Alexander Campbell counseled preachers of the gospel to avoid controversy in the pulpit. He himself became a polemic from necessity, not as a matter of choice; and as long as he lived and was able to preach, his selection of topics and the general character of his discourses was in harmony with the beginning of his ministry.

Circumstances, such as have been here in brief placed before the reader, at length compelled the members of the Christian Association to organize themselves into an independent Church of Christ “in order to carry out for themselves the duties and obligations enjoined on them in the Scriptures.” The time of this organization was May 4, 1810. The Lord’s Supper was duly observed on the following day. From almost the beginning of the organization the Lord’s table was spread every Lord’s day. Weekly communion was seen to have the sanction of the New Testament Scriptures, by these reformers, before they understood that the same writings require in the administration of the ordinance of baptism the immersion in water, in the name of the Lord, of believing, penitent souls. Gradually they saw this teaching, which, when they saw, they practiced. They started out to follow as closely as possible the teaching of the Holy Spirit in the sacred writings, and this they did with a steadfast devotion nothing below the sublime.

The congregation organized by the Campbells and their associates, May 4, 1810, was called “The First Church of the Christian

Association of Washington, meeting at Cross Roads and Brush Run, Washington County, Pa.”

A most important and altogether unexpected change was just before this little congregation of devoted men and women. The members had committed themselves wholly to the teachings of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. They were determined to believe and do all things enjoined on men under the gracious administration of the Lord Jesus in his own book.

When reading the “Declaration and Address” in 1809, Alexander Campbell called the attention of his father to the fact that the principles therein announced required the abandonment of infant baptism, since there could not be found in the Christian Scriptures “an express precept or an example” authorizing the baptism of babes. A little later he engaged in a friendly private discussion with Mr. Riddle, a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, in regard to the principles of the “Declaration and Address,” in which Mr. Riddle admitted that there is no direct authority in sacred Scripture for infant baptism. This admission led Alexander Campbell to determine that he would make an effort to settle in his own mind and for at least his own satisfaction the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. Up to the time of entering on this investigation *de novo*, Mr. Campbell occupied a position on the whole question of baptism well expressed in his own way in the following words:

“As I am sure that it is unscriptural to make this matter a term of communion, I let it *slip*. I wish to think and let think on these matters.” (“Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” by Richardson, vol. 1:, p. 392.)

But he now determined to abandon all uninspired authorities and apply himself diligently and prayerfully to a careful study of Jesus and his apostles, that he might learn *from them alone* what baptism is, and for whom. Thomas Campbell had already immersed three members of the Christian Association. There seems to have been no doubt in the minds of the Campbells and their associates that an immersion of believers in the name of the Lord Jesus was a legitimate form of Christian baptism. The question began to be, *Can we innocently omit the baptism of believers?* The im-

mediate result of the investigation was that on the twelfth day of June, 1812, Alexander Campbell and his wife, Thomas Campbell and his wife, Miss Dorothea Campbell, and Mr. and Mrs. James Hanen were immersed by Elder Mathias Luce, of the Baptist denomination. Thomas Campbell, before going into the water, delivered a lengthy address, in which he set forth in detail the steps by which he had reached a position in favor of the immersion of believers as alone the act of Christian baptism. Alexander delivered an elaborate address on the same subject. The services continued through seven hours! At the next meeting of the church thirteen other members expressed a desire to be immersed. They were, therefore, baptized on a simple confession of faith in Jesus as the Son of God.

By faith in Christ was meant such a reception of the testimony concerning the Messianic claims of the Son of Mary as led to the belief that he is *the* Son of God, and the Saviour of lost men; and this again to a simple, unreserved, hearty trust in him as willing to save sinners. Paul said, "I know him whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to guard that which I have committed to him against that day." This is saving faith. "The faith that saves is a believing *on* or *into* Christ; a receiving Christ himself; a trusting in Christ, in all the grandeur of his personal character, and in all the glory of his official relations as Prophet, Priest, and King." "The question, therefore, in regard to faith was not in the beginning" of the Christian religion, "*What* do you believe? but, *in whom* do you believe?" "It was the question addressed by Christ himself to one who sought to know the truth: 'Dost thou believe on the Son of God?' And the answer was, '*Who* is he, Lord, that I may believe on him?'" Alexander Campbell, in a discourse delivered in the early part of the year 1811, took the position that the faith by which the soul is saved is a "trusting in Christ," a "hearty reliance on him for salvation." Thomas Campbell about the time of his immersion said:

"It is not a theory, but a believing experience of the power of the truth in our own hearts, that will qualify us either to live or preach the gospel of a free, unconditional salvation through faith; and we may as well look to the north in December for the

warming breeze to dissolve the wintry ice as to extract this believing experience of the power of the truth out of the most refined and exquisite theory about the nature and properties of faith, or of justification, or of any other point of the divine testimony, abstracted from the testimony itself, as exhibited and addressed to us in the Scriptures. Let us once for all be convinced by this, that we may addict ourselves to study, believe, and preach our Bibles, and then shall we study and live and preach to profit.”

Thomas Campbell had no thought in the beginning of his great movement in behalf of Christian union by a return in faith and in life to the religion of our Lord as described in the New Testament that he would abandon the practice of baptizing unbelievers; nor that he would be led to administer the ordinance only to such as would believe in and confess Christ; nor that sprinkling would be given up for immersion. Far from his mind were such radical changes as these; but he had determined to follow the Christ, and this solemn and fixed determination produced the change in his belief and practice here recorded.

The fact that the immersion of penitent believers on a confession of faith in Jesus as the Son of God and the Saviour of men had been accepted by the Campbells and their cooperants in the work of reform as *the* one baptism taught in the New Testament, at once destroyed the feeble bond of sympathy which yet remained between them and the Pedobaptists. Nor did this change at once place the reformers in living sympathy with the Baptists as Baptists *then* taught and practiced. To all who desired to be baptized, the reformers, in harmony with their openly avowed principles, could only say, “If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.” (Acts 8: 37.) But this simple method was not at all pleasing to the Baptists of that time in that place. The little Brush Run church, therefore, was, apparently at least, more entirely out of fellowship with Christian believers than at any previous period. The acceptance of believers’ baptism—and immersion—caused some disturbance also among those who had been beautifully united in the sentiments expressed in the “Declaration and Address,” and in the work of union which had been begun. Immersion, instead of being

a bond of union, was an occasion of separation between some who had previously been joined together in a loving fellowship. But while the changed position of the Brush Run church as to baptism did not identify it altogether with the churches of the Baptist denomination, there was, on the part of some Baptists, a feeling of brotherly kindness toward the Campbells and their little flock which led to invitations “from every quarter” to Alexander Campbell “to visit their churches, and, though not a member, to preach for them.” “He often,” therefore, “spoke to the Baptist congregations for sixty miles around.” “They all pressed” the Brush Run church “to join their Redstone Association.” There were, however, from the point of view occupied by the Campbells, some objections to such a union.

In the first place, and chiefly, “the churches composing the association had adopted the Confession of Faith set forth by a Baptist association at Philadelphia, September 25, 1747, and which contained a fair proportion of the unscriptural theories and speculations usually found in such standards.” And in the second place, as has been said, “immersion itself was not to the church at Brush Run precisely what it was to the Baptist Church. To the latter it was *merely a commandment*—a sort of front door by which regularity and good order required people to enter the church. With the former it was a *discovery* which had the effect of readjusting all their ideas of the Christian institution. It was to them the primitive confession of Christ, and a gracious token of salvation.” (“Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” vol. 1:, p. 437.)

In 1848 Alexander Campbell said that at the time of his immersion, thirty-six years before, he “had no idea of uniting with the Baptists more than with the Moravians or the mere Independents. I had unfortunately formed a very unfavorable opinion of the Baptist preachers as then introduced to my acquaintance, as narrow, contracted, illiberal, and uneducated men.” (“Millennial Harbinger,” series 3:, vol. 5:, p. 344.)

The Brush Run church, however, having been invited to become a member of the Redstone Association of Baptist Churches, the matter was placed “before the 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 determinations on that subject. We did so in some eight or ten pages of large dimensions, exhibiting our remonstrance against all human creeds as bonds of communion or union amongst Christian churches, and expressing a willingness, upon certain conditions, to cooperate, or to unite with that association, provided always that we should be allowed to teach and preach whatever we learned from the Holy Scriptures regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom.... This proposition was discussed at the association, and, after much debate, was decided by a considerable majority in favor of our being received. Thus a union was formed” with the Baptists. (“Millennial Harbinger,” series 3:, vol. 5:, pp. 346, 347.)

Thomas Campbell warmly approved of the union of the Brush Run church with the Baptist denomination, since it removed from him and the little congregation the odium of forming a new religious body, and so adding to the lamentable divisions already existing in the church for which Jesus laid down his life. Peace with his brethren, not war, was his aim.

Of Baptists who were opposed to the reception of the Brush Run church was Elder Pritchard. In 1816 the association met with his church. When a desire was expressed that Alexander Campbell should deliver one of the discourses, Mr. Pritchard objected on the ground that Mr. Campbell lived so near to the place of meeting—only some ten miles distant—that those who wished to hear him could do so at any time. The real reason for the objection seems to have been jealousy. There was only one congregation of Baptists in the county (Brooke County, Va.), and Mr. Pritchard was its pastor. Mr. Campbell had been active in organizing another, and had collected a considerable sum of money with which to erect a house of worship. Mr. Pritchard felt that Mr. Campbell was pursuing a course calculated to materially reduce his influence in the county. This seems to be the true state of the case, and furnishes a satisfactory explanation of the intense hostility of Mr. Pritchard toward Mr. Campbell. At any rate, Mr. Pritchard was determined that Alexander Campbell should not deliver a discourse before the Redstone Association at its meeting in 1816. The name of a Mr. Stone was therefore put in the place of that of Alexander Campbell as the preacher at a given hour. But Stone was seized with a sudden illness, and Campbell was, after all, called on to preach. After much

persuasion he consented to deliver a discourse. Rumors were abroad concerning his orthodoxy, so that there was the greatest anxiety and the keenest interest not only to see him, but to hear every word that might fall from his lips. Mr. Campbell gives the following account of an impromptu discourse destined to become historic. He says:

“Not having a subject at 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 in the audience. I could not understand it. Finally, they got composed, and I proceeded. 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 afterward) the over-zealous 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 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.’”

And thus originated Alexander Campbell’s “Sermon on the Law.” The full text of the discourse is in the “Millennial Harbinger” for 1846; the text was Romans 8: 3: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.” The following is the outline:

“I. Endeavor to ascertain what ideas we are to attach to the phrase *the law*, in this and similar portions of the sacred Scriptures.

“II. Point out those things which *the law* could not accomplish.

“III. Demonstrate the reason why *the law* failed to accomplish those objects.

“IV. Illustrate how God has remedied those relative defects of *the law*.

“V. Deduce such conclusions from these premises as must obviously and necessarily present themselves to every unbiased and reflecting mind.”

Many years afterward, looking back on the incidents preceding, accompanying, and following the “Sermon on the Law,” Mr. Campbell said:

“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.”

It is more than probable that Alexander Campbell would have lived and died in the fellowship of the Baptist denomination but for the persecutions to which he was subjected on account of the sermon delivered before the Redstone Association in 1816. (“Millennial Harbinger,” 1846, p. 493.)

An effort was made to bring Mr. Campbell to a trial for heresy based on this discourse, but it was not successful.

Thomas Campbell at this meeting of the association presented an application for admission from a small congregation of immersed believers in Pittsburg. The application was rejected because it was not accompanied, as the constitution of the association required, by a formal statement of theological opinions.

At the same meeting Thomas Campbell read the annual circular letter which by appointment he had prepared. The item in the

minutes referring to this matter reads as follows: "The circular letter prepared by T. Campbell was read and accepted without amendment." The subject treated in this letter was the doctrine of the Trinity, and a most remarkable feature of the production is the fact that the word Trinity is not used in any part of it. Nevertheless, the "circular letter" on the Trinity, "prepared by Rev. T. Campbell, was read and accepted without amendment"! Mr. Campbell presented the nature of our Lord and the mysterious relations of Father, Son, and Spirit to one another, as near as possible, in the language of the Holy Scripture. He did it in such a spirit and manner as to be, so far as the records furnish evidence, altogether acceptable to the brethren present, notwithstanding their eagerness to discover heretical sentiments in the minds of the Campbells and their friends. When the suggestion was made that at the meeting of the association, to be held in 1817, with the church at Peter's Creek, Alexander Campbell should be proceeded against on the ground of entertaining and promulgating heretical opinions, he expressed a readiness to defend, at once, his position, as expressed in the offensive discourse, against any and all attacks from any person or persons whomsoever. The question of proceeding against Mr. Campbell for heresy was dismissed on the ground that the association had no jurisdiction in the case.

It is interesting to look back to the meeting of the Redstone Association of Baptist Churches in 1816, and note its composition as we study its effort to maintain the true and, in that part of the world, *orthodox* conception of the gospel of the Son of God. Thirty-three churches were represented in the association. The aggregate membership was eleven hundred and thirty-nine, an average of a little more than thirty-four members to a church. No church in the association had a hundred members. Look, too, at the names of some of them: Peter's Creek, George's Creek, Turkey Foot, Forks of Cheat, Little Redstone, Maple Creek, Big Redstone, Indian Creek, Head of Whitely, Ten Mile, Forks of Yough, Horseshoe, Sandy Creek, Plumb Run, King's Creek, Dunkird Creek, Cross Creek, Short Creek, Pigeon Creek, Wells Creek, Flat Run, and Salt Creek!

Comment as to the fitness of such an association to determine the orthodoxy of Alexander Campbell, or any other gentleman of liberal culture, is not needed.

The Campbells were never expelled from any Baptist church nor from any association of Baptist churches. In the course of time life in the Redstone Association became so unpleasant that they voluntarily entered the Mahoning Association. In 1827 this association adjourned, as such, *sine dine*, the majority believing that there is no warrant in Scripture for such organizations of churches. To this action Alexander Campbell was opposed. He thought that some such organization was needed, and that there was no reason why a specific “thus saith the Lord” should be required in a case of this character.

CHAPTER VII.

The Problem Of Christian Union.

ONE of the most natural things in the world was that the people who had been taught and influenced respectively by B. W. Stone and Alexander Campbell, principally in the States of Kentucky and Virginia, should come together on the simple, practical, evangelical platform suggested and advocated by each.

An interesting correspondence between Messrs. Campbell and Stone on the nature of Jesus, on the atonement for sin made by the Christ in his death, on the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion and sanctification, and on the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, resulted in such an agreement that a union was consummated in Lexington, Ky., in the early part of the year 1832.

A careful and impartial study of this happy event shows that it was not the result of an entire agreement in matters of exegesis, interpretation, theology, nor dogma, but there was an agreement in these things only in such a degree that the parties to the union were able to cooperate heartily in preaching the gospel to the unevangelized. There was no difficulty in coming to an agreement as to the fundamental facts, the great underlying truths, the commands, the promises, and the warnings of the gospel of the Son of God. There was an agreement to present these things to the people, urging them at the same time by an immediate and unconditional surrender of heart and life to the Christ to begin to live with reference to him. Accomplished men were employed to do the work of evangelists, going through the country in pairs, one a representative of those who had been taught by Stone, the other representing such as had received instruction from Campbell. The divine blessing attended the efforts of these men to such an extent that great numbers were turned to the Lord Jesus.

The friends of Campbell were currently known as Reformers, while those who were more especially under the influence of Stone were popularly designated as Christians. To increase and make more perfect and permanent the union, a joint editorial supervision was taken of the "Christian Messenger," a paper which had been established by and conducted in the interests of the Reformers.

There were many little differences to adjust between these communities, of which it is not necessary to speak further than to

say that the devotion of all to the Lord Jesus was so sincere and hearty that these matters, as time passed, gradually settled themselves in a satisfactory manner.

The name may, however, be mentioned as one of these topics. Mr. Stone favored the name Christian; Mr. Campbell preferred the name Disciple. Stone and his friends maintained that the name Christian was given, in the beginning, by divine authority. This Mr. Campbell and his friends denied. They also preferred, as less offensive to good people, and quite as Scriptural, to say the least, as the name Christian, the name Disciple. But these opinions were not permitted to disturb the fellowship of these children of God. And so it has come to pass that the people the story of whose genesis and growth is here given, are known sometimes as Christians, sometimes as Disciples of Christ, while their local organizations are known in some places as the Christian Church, and in others as Church of Disciples, or Disciples' Church. Usually, however, the legal title of any local church is simply the Church of Christ at such a place.

In this union there were mutual pledges to meet on the Bible as common ground, and to preach only, in the evangelization of men, the simple and obvious truths, facts, commands, promises, and warnings of the gospel. The friends of Stone did not join Alexander Campbell as their leader, nor did the brethren of Campbell join B. W. Stone, but, all having taken Jesus as their leader, became one body—not Stoneites, nor Campbellites, but simply and only Christians, Disciples of Christ, saints, brethren, children of God. And why may not similar results be brought about between other people?

As still further illustrating the spirit and character of this union, read the following address, delivered at the time of the consummation of the union by John Smith.

“God has,” said Mr. Smith, “but one people on 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 children should be united. To a 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 man’s 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 the 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 can do no 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 not robbery to be equal with God,’ I will not stop to speculate upon the consubstantial nature of the Father and the 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 that 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 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 conversation or social discussion to which there is a contrariety of opinion and sensitiveness of feeling, speak of them in the words of the Scriptures and no offense 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, in 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 other 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 the light we need.” (“Life of Elder John Smith,” by John Augustus Williams, pp. 452-454.)

At the close of this address B. W. Stone arose and said:

“I will not attempt to introduce any new topic, but will say a few things on the subjects already presented by my beloved brother.

“The controversies of the church sufficiently prove that Christians never can be one in their speculations upon these mysterious and sublime subjects, which, while they interest the Christian philosopher, cannot edify the church. After we had given up all creeds and had 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 once feasted my heart. I always felt a barrenness of soul afterward. I perfectly accord with Brother Smith that these 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.” (“Life of Smith,” by Williams, p. 455.)

It remains only to be said that this union was not a surrender of one party to the other. It was an agreement of such as already recognized and loved one another as brethren to henceforth worship and work together. It was a union of those who held alike the necessity of implicit faith and unreserved obedience; who accepted the facts, commands, and promises contained in the New Testament; who conceded the right of private judgment to all; who

taught that opinions are no part of the faith once for all delivered to the saints; and who now pledged to one another and to the world 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.

Throughout their entire history the Disciples have been deeply interested in the problem of union among the divided children of our common Father. They have given sympathetic attention to every proposition looking to the reunion of Christendom. Frequent conferences, more or less formal, looking to such an adjustment of differences between them and their Baptist brethren as will enable them to cooperate in giving the word of life to those who are dead in sins have been held. Nor is there reason to doubt that there is between Baptists and Disciples an increasing desire for such a union, with a growing probability that sooner or later such a result will be secured. This expectation is entertained, not because we are good enough or wise enough to bring it to pass, but because it is the will of God, and he will bring it to pass. And there will be a much more extensive union for this beneficent work, the preaching of the gospel to the whole creation. There is not a word in the New Testament on the subject of church union, but there is much about Christian union.

Believers are exhorted in the New Testament to “endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” (Eph. 4: 3.) Those who are called saints are told to “mark” those who “cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine of Christ,” and “avoid them.” (Rom. 16: 17-18.) Members of the Church of God are exhorted to speak the same things and to be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. (1 Cor. 1: 10.) Divisions among those who call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord are evidences of remaining among those who ought in all things to be led by the Spirit of God. (Rom. 8: 14; 1 Cor. 3: 1-4.) The Christ prayed that his personal friends and followers might be united as the Father and the Son are one. (John 17: 11.) And this prayer was answered, for we read that after the departure of our Lord for heaven his friends returned from the place of the ascension to an upper room in Jerusalem, where they “continued with one accord in prayer and supplication” (Acts 1: 14) until “the day

of Pentecost was fully come,” when “suddenly” “they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak,” in such a manner that “the multitude came together and were confounded,” becoming at length, as they heard of “the wonderful works of God,” “pricked in the heart” (Acts 2: 2, 4, 6, 37), exclaiming at length, “Men, brethren, what shall we do?”

The Christ also prayed for those who would believe on him through the testimony of those whom he ordained to be his witnesses, “both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth” (Acts 1: 8), that they might “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.” (John 17: 20, 21.) And this prayer also received an answer in the apostolic age, for we read that “the multitude” of those who “believed” on Jesus as the Messiah in Jerusalem “were of one heart and of one soul” (Acts 4: 32), and that as a result of this unity “a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.” (Acts 6: 7.) The Holy Spirit places sectarianism in a list with adultery, fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, contention, envy, murder, and drunkenness. (Gal. 5: 20.) All these things belong to the flesh and are opposed to the Spirit. On the contrary, “the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, and self-control.” (Gal. 5: 22, 23.)

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the desire of the Head of the Body, Jesus Christ our Lord, concerning the relation in which his disciples should stand toward him and toward one another.

Let us now consider the Disciples in their relation to the proposition made a few years ago by the Protestant Episcopal Church looking toward the reunion of Christendom. The facts are as follows:

In the year 1853 the bishops of the Episcopal Church appointed a commission to confer with the Christian bodies in the United States which were desirous of promoting union and concord among all who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth. This commission did formally set forth and advocate sundry suggestions and recommendations intended to accomplish the great end in view. In 1880 the bishops set forth a declaration to the effect that

in virtue of what they were pleased to characterize as “the solidarity of the Catholic Episcopate,” “it was the right and duty of the episcopates of all national churches holding the primitive faith and order to protect in the holding of that faith and the recovering of that order those who had been wrongfully deprived of both.” The special reference was to Christians in foreign countries who are struggling to set themselves free from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome. In view of these things, and also in view of the fact that “many of the faithful in Christ Jesus are praying with renewed and increasing earnestness that some measure may be adopted at this time for the reunion of the sundered parts of Christendom,” the following declaration was published to the world:

“The bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in council assembled, as bishops in the Church of God, do hereby solemnly declare to all whom it may concern, and especially to our fellow-Christians of the different communions in this land, who, in their several spheres, have contended for the religion of Christ:

“(1) Our earnest desire that the Saviour’s prayer ‘that we all may be one’ may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled.

“(2) That we believe that all who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost are members of the Holy Catholic Church.

“(3) That in all things of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own.

“(4) That this church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, cooperating with them on a basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world.

“But furthermore, we do affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired by the memorialists can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and his apostles to the church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.

“As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to wit:

“(1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God;

“(2) The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith;

“(3) The two sacraments, baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailling use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him;

“(4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his church.

“Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.”

By resolution a commission, consisting of five bishops, five clerical and five lay deputies, was appointed to communicate to the organized Christian bodies the declaration set forth by the bishops, above quoted, and to express a readiness to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the church.

This commission in 1887 communicated the foregoing facts and request to the General Convention of Disciples of Christ at its annual meeting held in Indianapolis in the month of October of the same year.

The following is taken from the minutes of the General Convention:

“REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
CHRISTIAN UNITY.

“The commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on Christian unity, having sent a communication to the General Christian Missionary Convention at Indianapolis, inviting a conference on this question, accompanying the invitation with a copy of the Declaration of the House of Bishops of said church on this subject, the General Christian Missionary Convention appointed a committee to consider the invitation and report on it, and the following report from the committee was adopted, enthusiastically, by a unanimous vote:

““Your committee, to whom was referred the communication of the secretary of the commission on Christian unity, appointed by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, October 27, 1886, beg leave to submit the following reply to said communication:

“““Rev. Herman C. Duncan, Secretary of Commission on Christian Unity of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

“““Dear sir: Your communication, addressed to the General Christian Missionary Convention through R. Moffitt, its corresponding secretary, was by him laid before our convention, at its annual

meeting in Indianapolis, October 20, 1887. After due consideration the following response was unanimously agreed to, which you will please present to your honorable commission, with assurances of our cordial approval of their noble aim:

““Having carefully, and with deep interest, considered the Declaration of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, adopted October 20, 1886, we respectfully and affectionately submit the result of our deliberations. In doing this it is proper to say that the General Christian Missionary Convention is possessed of no ecclesiastical authority. It is made up partly of delegates from our State and Territorial missionary conventions, and partly of annual members, life members, and life directors, and its objects are purely benevolent and philanthropic. It has no control over the faith or discipline of our churches.

““While there is a broad Christian fellowship of faith and love among all these churches, and organized cooperation alike of individuals and of churches, in districts, States, and nation, for missionary, educational, and other benevolent and charitable purposes, there is no central ecclesiastical organization having control of questions of doctrine and discipline, and no possibility, therefore, of an authoritative response to your Declaration. But, as this convention is composed of members from all the States and Territories in which we have churches, and of members of these churches, embracing a fair share of the intelligence, experience, and wisdom of their membership, this unanimous expression of sentiment on the part of this convention may be safely regarded as the most trustworthy utterance obtainable of the convictions of the entire brotherhood in the United States known as Christians, or Disciples of Christ. We have the fullest confidence that it will be generally approved.

“““Allow us, therefore, to say:

““I. You may infer with what lively interest and admiration we regard the Declaration of your House of Bishops when we state that, in so far as our religious movement is distinctive, its original differentiation from all other religious movements of the time was the condemnation of the sect spirit and of sectarian organizations as unscriptural, sinful, and fruitful of mischief, and the advocacy of a return to the unity, catholicity, simplicity, and spirituality of the faith and practice of the churches of apostolic times; a return, in other words, to New Testament teaching. This movement, which took on, in 1809, the public form of a voluntary Christian Association, finally developed into the organization of churches seeking to restore, as it was then expressed, ‘in letter and in spirit, in principle and in practice,’ the faith and discipline of apostolic times. They were known simply as ‘Churches of Christ.’ These organizations were formed not because those entering into them desired a separation from the ecclesiastical communions with which they had been associated, but because the narrow and bitter sectarian spirit then prevailing forbade all utterance of such antisectionarian sentiments and all promotion of such antisectionarian aims within their respective pales. These churches have increased until they now number, in the United States, about eight hundred thousand communicants, and to-day there sounds out from them all, with no diminution of earnestness or emphasis, the same condemnation of sectarian parties, sectarian creeds, sectarian names, sectarian aims, and the same entreaty for the return of all believers to the unity of faith and catholicity of spirit taught, fostered, and defended by the apostles of Jesus Christ. We cannot, therefore, do otherwise than hail with gladness the Declaration of your ‘desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bod-

ies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the church with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.’ We are especially glad that this overture comes from the Protestant Episcopal Church. Eminently conservative as that church is known to be, its leadership in such a movement is evidence that the religious sentiment of this country in behalf of Christian unity is deep and strong, while the cautious proceedings of thirty-three years, ripening into this Declaration and the appointment of this commission, give us unmistakably the result of mature deliberation and ripe conviction. While we do not accord with everything suggested in the Declaration as to what is ‘essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom,’ we do most heartily approve the proposal for ‘brotherly conference... with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which the desired unity may be brought to pass.’

““II. The frankness and candor with which you express your understanding of ‘the principles of unity’ is, in our view, as admirable as the kind spirit in which you invite us to brotherly conference. While it would be manifestly premature to enter, at present, on a discussion of these principles, we deem it altogether proper to imitate your frankness in simply *stating*, in the light of the investigations and experiences of three quarters of a century, what we deem essential to Christian unity.

““1. We heartily concur in your statement of the first essential to the restoration of unity—the recognition of ‘the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God.’ In the language of the Westminster Confession of Faith: ‘The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and *necessary* consequence may be

deduced from Scripture, unto which nothing is at any time to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men.' And 'though all things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves nor alike clear unto all, yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.'

““The Holy Scriptures are the only *catholic* rule of faith and discipline. On no other platform can the scattered hosts of spiritual Israel be restored to unity. The 'Historic Episcopate,' or 'the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church *during the first ages of its existence*; will not be accepted by the various 'divided branches of Christendom' as *essential* to Christian unity, or as binding on the conscience. Nothing less authoritative than a *thus saith the Lord* will be universally recognized as *essential* to Christian unity or as binding on the conscience. The history of the early Christian centuries may have a universally admitted value as illustrating or confirming Scripture; but as *essential* to union in Christ no historical teaching outside of the inspired books will be universally, or even generally, accepted by the divided branches of Christendom. For instance: if parochial or diocesan episcopacy, or an order of priesthood in the church other than that 'royal priesthood' which belongs to all believers, is set forth in the New Testament Scriptures as of divine authority, then *collateral* evidence of such forms of episcopal government and such order of priesthood may be brought from the history of 'the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence;' and such testimony of a 'Historic Episcopate' would doubtless be allowed to have its just weight. But a basis of union

involving anything as essential other than what is contained in the revealed Word of God we regard as utterly impracticable.

“““What we have said of the testimony of the early Christian centuries may also be said of what is styled the Apostles’ Creed, the Nicene Creed, and all other human creeds. Nothing less authoritative than God’s Word should be regarded as beyond the reach of ‘compromise or surrender.’ ‘Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me,’ said the inspired Paul to Timothy. No form of uninspired words, however admirable in the estimation of multitudes, can be insisted on as beyond ‘compromise or surrender,’ without placing an insuperable obstacle in the way of ‘the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom.’ If any ‘statement of the Christian faith’ should at any time be deemed necessary, not as a bond of fellowship, but for public information or to condemn prevalent errors, we respectfully submit that Christians of today can put such statement in a form much better suited to the people of this generation than the Nicene formula, which had birth out of the controversies of that time, and came into being under conditions which not only do not now exist, but which are not so much as known to the great majority of professed Christians of the present time.

“““2. The restoration of unity demands a return to New Testament teaching. We may not presume to improve on the ideas of unity and catholicity taught by inspiration. We ought to improve on the *practice* of the apostolic churches, being made wiser by their errors and by the apostolic rebukes which those errors called forth; but in our conceptions of spiritual unity and ecclesiastical union, of catholicity, and of all that is to be insisted on as essential to Christian fellowship and ‘incapable of compromise or surrender,’ we must be guided solely by the teaching of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

“““Coming, then, to the New Testament, to the ‘pure river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb,’ before it was contaminated by the muddy streams of human doctrine and tradition, what do we find?

“““(I) That the original, inspired creed—that and that alone which was required to be believed and confessed by all who sought membership in the Church of God—had but one article, viz., ‘JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING God.’ That which justified and saved, and held all the saved in one blessed fellowship, was not assent to a system of doctrines, a formulation of speculative opinions and theories, or a form of church government, but faith in Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God; faith in a divine person, love of a divine person, absolute and entire personal surrender and committal, in conscience, heart, and life, to a divine person—this was the requirement, the only requirement, laid on those who sought salvation and entrance into the fellowship of Christians. This is a *divine* creed, which can be neither compromised nor surrendered. Everything that is not legitimately involved in this one article of faith concerning the Christhood and divinity of Jesus, as a test of fitness, on the score of faith, for admission to membership in the church, not only may be, but ought to be, surrendered.

“““(2) That all who confessed this faith in the Lord Jesus were admitted to Christian fellowship by an immersion in water into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. And only such were admitted. We would say, therefore, that those who thus accepted Jesus as their Lord and Saviour, and were thus immersed, were, in the apostolic age, members of the Church of God; or, to use the language of the Declaration, ‘members of the Holy Catholic Church.’ The church of apostolic times acknowledged ‘one Lord, one faith, one bap-

tism'; and these were among the *essentials* of Christian unity.

“(3) That those who were thus added to the church were continued in fellowships *long as they walked in the commandments of Jesus*. Obedience to the Lord Jesus— in other words, *Christian character*—was the test of fellowship in the church. If any one denied the Lord that bought him, or refused to honor him by obedience to his commandments, he was to be condemned as unworthy of Christian fellowship. But so long as one cherished faith in the Son of God and kept his commandments, he was entitled to a place among the children of God. If he was *right concerning Christ*, though he might be wrong about many things, it was presumed that Christ would bring him right about everything essential to spiritual life and enjoyment. And if he was not right as to his faith in and obedience to Christ, however free from error in other respects, his unbelief and disobedience formed an insurmountable barrier to the fellowship of Christians.

““It will be seen that this is *catholic* ground. ‘The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God’ is catholic. This cannot be said of any creed of human compilation.

““Faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, is catholic. It is the faith of all who accept the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God.

““The immersion of believers into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is catholic. No one disputes that the believer is a proper subject of baptism, while there is serious and widespread controversy over the admission of infants to that ordinance. All admit that the immersion of a proper subject is valid baptism, while there is endless controversy over sprinkling and pouring.

““Disciples of Christ, Christians, Church of God, Churches of Christ—these are catholic. All

evangelical parties claim these designations, and complain of any exclusive appropriation of them; while Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, etc., are party names which can never be universally approved.

“““Here, then, we stand on unsectarian ground, where, it seems, if anywhere, we find the *essential* principles of Christian unity, which cannot be compromised or surrendered.

“““III. Outside of that which is essential to Christian unity, there are many things pertaining to growth in knowledge, to methods of working, etc., in reference to which, for the sake of peace and for the preservation of unity, there should be a common agreement. There should, we think, be the largest liberty of opinion, of investigation, and of utterance on all questions arising out of the Scriptures, and no one who holds to Jesus as ‘God manifest in the flesh,’ and who keeps his commandments, should be disturbed in his church relations on account of his opinions, *provided* he does not attempt to force his opinions on others, or to make an acceptance of them a test of fellowship. Should he attempt this he becomes a factionist, to be rejected after the first and second admonition.

“““Many questions unprofitable for discussion in the pulpit may be profitably, or at least harmlessly, discussed in the schools, to which all speculative questions should be remanded.

“““Then there are practical questions—questions of method in carrying out the work of the church—which, being left to the discretion of Christians, to be answered according to times and circumstances, should never be made tests of fellowship or occasions of strife. In all questions of this class—as to what is *expedient*, and not as to what is of divine authority and obligation—Christians should learn to please each other, and study the things that make for peace and edification. We are pleased, therefore, to

read in the Declaration: 'That in all things of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own.' To refuse to forego preferences in all things of human ordering or human choice, or in things resting on merely traditional authority, and to allow such preferences to stand in the way of Christian union, would be to assume the tremendous responsibility of exalting the human to an equality with the divine. May we not say that it would be to make the Word of God of none effect by human traditions and usages? If 'the spirit of love and humility' prevail, this declaration of the Protestant Episcopal Church will receive unstinted approval from all who aim to 'keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' Yet it is just here that we fear. It is so easy to mistake attachment to mere usages for a conscientious adherence to God's will, that there is more danger of disagreement in things not taught in the Scriptures than in the things that are taught therein.

“““IV. There remains one item in the Declaration too important to be passed without notice: 'That this church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, cooperating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world.' As we understand it, this is a gratifying declaration. We do not regard it as looking toward a theological and ecclesiastical eclecticism or syncretism, by which the various denominational systems of doctrine and of church government shall be perpetuated in whole or in part, under some nebulous scheme or vague profession of Christian unity; but simply as a frank disavowal of selfish aims. This is alike manly and just. It exhibits

the only spirit in which it is possible to ‘discountenance schism and heal the wounds of the body of Christ.’ Not what will promote the interests of any denomination, but what will serve the purposes and promote the welfare of the ‘one body’ of Christ, is to be sought. All other communions should adopt this sentiment as their own, as a necessary preliminary to all successful efforts to heal divisions and make manifest that unity which is so prominent a characteristic of the Church of God.

“““In conclusion, permit us to say that we very cordially approve the gentle and loving spirit that breathes in your Declaration, and heartily coincide with your proposal to ‘enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the church with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.’

“““We respectfully submit this answer to your Declaration, with humble reliance on the Head of the church that we may be delivered from pride and prejudice, and be led into all the truth, so that all may speak the same things, and that there may be no divisions among us, but that we may be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment—thus realizing and fulfilling the prayer of our blessed Lord and Saviour in behalf of all who believe in him: ‘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.’me.

This report was signed by the members of the committee, as follows:

“Isaac Errett, editor of ‘Christian Standard,’
Cincinnati, O.

“J. W. McGARVEY, editor of ‘Apostolic Guide,’ and Professor of Sacred History and Evidences in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

“D. R. DUNGAN, Professor of Sacred Literature, Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.

“J. H. Garrison, editor ‘Christian Evangelist,’ St. Louis, Mo.

“B. J. Radford, formerly president of Eureka College, Eureka, Ill.

“C. L. LOOS, president of Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.

“A. R. Benton, president of Butler University, Irvington, Ind.”

A standing committee on Christian Union was appointed by the General Convention of Disciples in Des Moines, Ia., in 1890. This committee consisted of: B. B. Tyler, New York; F. D. Power, Washington, D.C.; C. L. Loos, Lexington, Ky.; T. P. Haley, Kansas City, Mo.; and R. Moffitt, Cleveland, O.

This committee made the following report to the General Convention meeting in Allegheny City, Pa., in 1891:

“I. There are on every hand indisputable indications of a steadily growing sentiment in favor of a more intimate spiritual unity and manifest union among those who believe on the Son of God to the saving of the soul. An exhaustive enumeration of evidences of this increasing desire is neither possible nor desirable at the present time. Such united efforts, however, as are made in the world-wide distribution of the sacred Scriptures, without note or comment, by the American Bible Society and other similar organizations on both sides of the Atlantic; the systematic instruction of the young in the fundamental truths and principles of the Bible, by the International System of Sunday-school work; the gratuitous distribution of evangelical literature, in which there is a Union of Evangelical Christians, without reference to theological peculiarities or denominational usages through the agency of the

American Tract Society and other kindred organizations; the lively and growing interest in the evangelization of all nations, leading to such conferences as the World's Missionary Congress, held in London in 1888, and to almost countless smaller assemblies of a like spirit in our own and other lands; the annual summer meetings for conference and Bible study in Northfield, Mass., under the direction of Mr. D. L. Moody, in which leaders of religious thought, representing almost all the great Protestant denominations, freely participate; the Evangelical Alliance of the United States, with its encouragement of cooperation in reaching the vast and rapidly increasing population of our land with the life-giving truths of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, making necessary, and bringing into existence, important conferences in Washington, Boston, and other great centers of influence, to prayerfully consider certain topics relating to the one end—ought certainly to be mentioned,' in this report, under the head of encouraging indications. And what shall we say when we come to speak of the meaning of almost two millions of people of both sexes, and all ages and conditions, banded together— 225,000 in Young Men's Christian Associations, 170,000 in the Women's Christian Temperance Union, 36,000 in Chautauqua Circles, 200,000 in King's Daughters' Bands, and 1,078,980 in more than sixteen thousand societies of Christian Endeavors—an aggregate of 1,639,980? What shall we say but that these are a few of the undoubted indications of a desire among those who profess and call themselves Christians for a more perfect union, and of the approaching answer in our day to the prayer of our divine Lord that all who would believe on him, through the words of his apostles, might be one as he and the Father are one? Not only is the sentiment in favor of unity and union seen in the above-named movements, but the same signs of promise can easi-

ly be discerned in public discourses delivered, in public prayers offered, in the official deliverances of powerful ecclesiastical bodies, in the publication of multitudinous essays and carefully prepared books, in which attention is called to the manifold evils of sectarianism, setting forth at the same time the pressing importance of such a union as will lead the world to believe in Jesus as the Son of God and the Saviour of the lost.

“II. There are four principal bases of union before the people for their acceptance or rejection, which may be characterized as 'submission,' 'confederation,' 'consolidation,' and "restoration."

“I. The first-named is the Roman Catholic plan of union. It is exceedingly simple. The scheme involves the unconditional surrender of all to one.

“2. The second plan of union has its principal advocates among our brethren of the Presbyterian faith. The scheme of confederation contemplates, for purposes of work in turning the world to Christ, the preservation of denominational organization and identity, each organized body of Christians standing on terms of equality with all other denominations, but all entering into formal counsel with the others in regard to all interests held in common. It may be sufficient to say by this plan in this connection that while it is complex and difficult to handle, it seems to us to be a step in the right direction.

“3. The third is the plan proposed by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in 1886, and indorsed by the Lambeth Conference, in London, in 1888. This quadrangular basis of union is placed before Christendom in the words following:

“(1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as “containing all things necessary to salvation,” and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith;

“(2) The Apostles’ Creed as being the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement, of the Christian faith;

“(3) The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself—baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by him;

“(4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his church.’

“An eloquent advocate of this plan, in speaking of it lately, used the word ‘consolidation’ as properly describing it. He explained that the scheme contemplates the consolidation under one self-consistent and well-understood system of polity and doctrine, with ample constitutional guarantees for a permitted diversity in the methods of worship and of work.

“It may be sufficient to say of this plan in passing that our divine Lord did not pray for a consolidation of denominations as such, nor for church union, but for a union of all who would believe on him through the ministry of his elect apostles.

“4. The fourth plan of union proposed contemplates a return in faith and in life, in doctrine and in spirit, to the religion of the Son of God as correctly and authoritatively outlined and placed before all men on the pages of the New Testament.

“The founder of the church was God, manifest in the flesh in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. He gave men in person, when he was on earth, and through his chosen apostles, whom he inspired by the Holy Spirit after his return to heaven, just such a religion as pleased him, and is best for man in all places and in all times.

“Protestantism affirms the infallibility of sacred Scripture. The fathers of the Reformation of the sixteenth century affirm that in religion there is no bet-

ter certainty than the teaching of the Bible. The Westminster Assembly of divines affirmed that ‘the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men.’

“The scheme of union now under consideration contemplates the practical as against the merely theoretical restoration of the religion of the Son of God as he gave it to man, ‘its doctrine, its ordinances, its fruits.’ Then Christ was infallible. His thought and speech and conduct were always right. His apostles spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. It is proposed, therefore, to unite the divided people of God on the following basis:

“1. The original creed of Christ’s church; 2. The ordinances of his appointment; 3. The life which has the sinless Son of man as its perfect exemplification.

“The creed of the church of which the Son of God was the builder is simply this: Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. When Simon Peter declared this truth in the presence of the Master, then Christ expressed himself as pleased with it, and said that on this basis he would build his church. With this creed he is doubtless pleased to-day. Why longer delay the visible union of the people of God by a search for a better creed than this, so emphatically approved by our blessed Lord?

“The ordinances of Christ’s appointment are baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Baptism is an immersion in water of penitent believers in the name of the Lord Jesus, and into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. That this is Christian baptism is denied by none. Its acceptance is universal. The region of controversy is

left by accepting this as the 'one baptism.' Affusion, as a mode of baptism, is in dispute; immersion, as baptism, is not in controversy. The way to peace at this point is clear.

"In the Lord's Supper the Christ appointed the use of bread and the fruit of the vine to symbolize to his disciples through the ages his body broken and his blood poured out for the sins of the whole world.

"The life of the Christian is to be lived with a continual reference to the man Christ Jesus. To be a Christian is to drink in his spirit of love and loyalty, reproducing in our associations with men, as far as possible, aided by divine grace, the life of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the standard of right living, both Godward and manward.

"This, in brief, is the basis on which we, who desire to be known as Disciples of Christ, or as simply Christians, believe that the church of the living God may be so visibly united as to move on compactly to the conquest of the world.

"There is a necessity for the exercise of a large charity toward all who profess and call themselves Christians, while maintaining an unswerving loyalty in all things to the Head of the body—Christ Jesus the Lord. In matters of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, we are ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of our own to secure the union for which the Son of God so fervently prayed.

"Finally, realizing, as we think we do, the hindrance to the successful evangelization of the nations in obedience to our Lord's final command, occasioned by our denominational divisions, we hereby declare our desire to enter into fraternal conference with our brethren from whom we are separated by denominational differences, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which a more

manifest union among the people of God may be brought about.

“And now may the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great and good Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make us perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.”

On motion, the report was adopted and the committee continued, Jabez Hall leading the convention in prayer for union.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Creed Question.

One of the earliest points discussed was the expediency of humanly devised creeds as tests of fellowship and bonds of union among Christians, the Disciples maintaining that such creeds as bonds of union and terms of communion are necessarily heretical and schismatical. This was one of Mr. Campbell's affirmations in his debate with Mr. Rice in Lexington, Ky., in the year 1843.

The word "authoritative" is an important word, and is to be borne continually in mind in any attempt to understand the position of the Disciples on the creed question. Their objection was and is to authoritative human creeds. That is to say, they object to creeds of this character as conditions of Christian and church fellowship. "By an authoritative creed is meant an abstract of human opinions concerning the supposed cardinal articles of Christian faith, which summary is made a bond of union or term of communion." ("Millennial Harbinger" for 1832, p. 344.)

The Disciples do not object to publishing what they understand to be the teaching of Holy Scripture on any subject of faith or duty as a matter of information. They protest only against using such statement as a condition of fellowship.

In an early period of the discussion attention was called to the fact that Unitarians, for example, warred against human creeds because those creeds supported Trinitarianism. Arminians too were hostile, it was said, to creeds because those creeds supported Calvinism. The controversy of the Disciples is to be distinguished from all previous controversies on this subject in that their opposition to creeds arose from the conviction that whether their contents were true or false they were hostile to the union, peace, harmony, and purity of Christians, and so were hindrances in the way of the conversion of the world to Christ. ("Christian System," p. 9.)

The principle which in the beginning was heartily accepted, and to which the Disciples have been and are devoted, may be expressed in the following words "Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to him as our Lawgiver and King, the only test of Christian character and the only bond of Christian union, communion, and cooperation irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments, and traditions of men." ("Christian System," p. 8.)

The constitutional principle in the organization of the Christian Association of Washington, Pa., is expressed in the following words: "That this society, formed for the purpose of promoting simple evangelical Christianity, shall to the utmost of its power countenance and support such ministers, and such only, as exhibit and manifest conformity to the original standard in conversation and doctrine, in zeal and diligence, only such as 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 matter of Christian faith or duty for which there cannot be produced a 'thus saith the Lord,' either in express terms or by approved precedent." ("Memoirs of Thomas Campbell," p. 28.)

Alexander Campbell declared that next to personal salvation two objects constituted the *summum bonum*, or supreme good: the first was the union, peace, purity, and harmonious cooperation of Christians, guided by an understanding enlightened by the Holy Scriptures; and second, the conversion of sinners to God. He said that his predilections and antipathies on all religious questions arose from and were controlled by these all-absorbing interests. From these commenced his campaign against creeds as above defined. He said that he was always willing to give a declaration of his faith and knowledge of the Christian system, but that he firmly protested against propounding dogmatically his own views or those of any fallible mortal as a condition or foundation of church union or cooperation. ("Christian System," p. 9.)

While he and the Disciples generally were and are entirely willing, either with the tongue or by the pen, to proclaim to the ends of the earth all that they know concerning the gospel and the religion of Jesus, they have always desired, and desire now, to have it distinctly understood that they take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion.

As to the readiness of the Disciples to make such a publication, attention is called to the fact that in 1846 (see "Millennial Harbinger" for 1846, p. 385) Mr. Campbell published the following eight propositions as embodying his theological beliefs:

“1. I believe that all Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for teaching, for conviction, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, and thoroughly accomplished for every good work.

“2. I believe in one God, as manifested in the person of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—who are, therefore, one in nature, power, and volition.

“3. I believe that every human being participates in all the consequences of the fall of Adam, and is born into the world frail and depraved in all his moral powers and capacities, so that without faith in Christ it is impossible for him, while in that state, to please God.

“4. I believe that the **WORD**, which from the beginning was *with God*, and which *was God*, became flesh, and dwelt among us as *Emmanuel*, or “*God manifest in the flesh*,” and did make an *expiation of sin* “by the sacrifice of himself,” which no being could have done that was not possessed of a superhuman, superangelic, and divine nature.

“5. I believe in the justification of a sinner by faith, without the deeds of law; and of a Christian, not by faith alone, but by the obedience of faith.

“6. I believe in the operation of the Holy Spirit through the Word, but not without it, in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

“7. I believe in ‘the right and duty of exercising our own judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.’”

“8. I believe in ‘the divine institution of the evangelical ministry; the authority and perpetuity of the institution of baptism and the Lord’s Supper.’”

In “Our Position,” a tract by Isaac Errett, which is extensively circulated by the Disciples as setting forth their position, the following thirteen items of evangelical belief are named:

“1. The divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

“2. The revelation of God, especially in the New Testament, in the tri-personality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

“3. The alone-sufficiency and all-sufficiency of the Bible, as a revelation of the divine character and will, and of the gospel of grace by which we are saved; and as a rule of faith and practice.

“4. The divine excellency and worthiness of Jesus as the Son of God; his perfect humanity as the Son of man; 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. We accept, therefore, in good faith, the supernatural religion presented to us in the New Testament, embracing in its revelations:

“(1) The incarnation of the Logos—the eternal Word of God—in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

“(2) The life and teachings of this divinely anointed Lord and Saviour, as the highest and completest unfolding of the divine character and purposes, as they relate to our sinful and perishing race, and as an end of controversy touching all questions of salvation, duty, and destiny.

“(3) The death of Jesus as a sin-offering, bringing us redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.

“(4) His resurrection from the dead, abolishing death and bringing life and immortality clearly to light.

“(5) His ascension to heaven and glorification in the heavens, where he ever liveth, the Mediator between God and men; our great High-priest to intercede for his people; and our King, to rule until his foes are all subdued and all the sublime purposes of his mediatorial reign are accomplished.

“(6) His supreme authority as Lord of all.

“5. The personal and perpetual mission of the Holy Spirit to convict the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, and to dwell in believers as their Comforter, Strengthener, and Sanctifier.

“6. The alienation of the race from God, and their entire dependence on the truth, mercy, and grace of God, as manifested in Jesus the Christ, and revealed and confirmed to us by the Holy Spirit in the gospel, for regeneration, sanctification, adoption, and life eternal.

“7. The necessity of faith and repentance in order to the enjoyment of salvation here, and of a life of obedience in order to the attainment of everlasting life.

“8. The perpetuity of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, as divine ordinances, through all ages, to the end of time.

“9. The obligation to observe the first day of the week as the Lord’s day, in commemoration of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, by acts of worship such as the New Testament teaches, and by spiritual culture such as befits this memorial day.

“ 10. The Church of Christ, a divine institution, composed of such as, by faith and baptism, have openly confessed the name of Christ; with its appointed rulers, ministers, and services, for the edification of Christians and the conversion of the world.

“11. The necessity of righteousness, benevolence, and holiness on the part of professed Christians, alike in view of their own final salvation and of their mission to turn the world to God.

“12. The fullness and freeness of the salvation offered in the gospel to all who accept it On the terms proposed.

“13. The final punishment of the ungodly by an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.”

A prominent writer among the Disciples has been quoted as saying: "We take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion." ("Christian System," preface to the second edition.)

It has also been said that the Disciples inscribed on their banner the following motto: "Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to him as our Lawgiver and King, the only test," etc.

If the question is as to the book by which a church is to be guided or ought to be guided, the language quoted can easily be defended. The Bible is the book. This was the doctrine of the Reformers of the sixteenth century. This is the true Protestant position. In the controversy with Rome at the time of the Reformation one chief issue was an infallible church or an infallible book—which? Romanists said an infallible church; Protestants, an infallible book. Chillingworth, a champion of the Protestant faith of the sixteenth century, is the author of the famous aphorism, "The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." When Chillingworth said that he was comparing the unity of the Bible teaching with the lack of unity in the doctrine of Bellarmine or Baronius, in the doctrine of the Sarbonne or of the Jesuits or Dominicans. He said that Rome furnished no safe guide since popes in faith and in doctrine were arrayed against popes, councils were against councils, fathers against fathers, and the church of one age against the church of another age. As the way out of this confusion the Protestants said that the Bible, and the Bible alone, contained their religion.

So when it is said by the Disciples, "The Bible is our creed," the statement is made with the various books of human and uninspired composition, written to aid in the preservation of faith and government of the church, in mind.

The Bible is the creed of the Disciples, not the Confession of Faith framed by the Westminster Assembly of divines.

The Bible is the creed of the Disciples, not the articles of religion of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Bible is the rule of faith of the Disciples, not the book of discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

This is the contrast and connection in which the Disciples desire to be understood as affirming that the Bible is their creed. As a

comparative statement it is true; as an absolute statement it is not altogether correct.

The Disciples maintain that the original creed of Christianity contained but a single article, namely, "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," and that all doctrinal tests but this must be abandoned. With them faith in Jesus as the divine Lord and Saviour is the one essential condition of baptism and church fellowship. Jesus said expressly that on this creed he would build his church. (Matt. 16: 18.)

This was the basis of the Church of Christ in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Corinth, in Philippi, in Thessalonica, in Berea, and in every place where the inspired apostles preached the gospel and planted churches. This creed was sufficient then—is sufficient now. Not the belief of theological dogmas, however true, but faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, is the faith that saves the soul. With the Disciples this statement concerning the nature and official character of the Son of man is not merely *an* article of Christian faith standing on a level with other articles of belief, but it is *the* article of the Christian faith, *the* creed of the church.

"Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" (John 9: 35.) "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest" (Acts 8: 37) be baptized, is the language of Philip the evangelist to the treasurer of Queen Candace. To every person, therefore, who applies for membership in a church of Disciples the questions are, "Do you believe in your heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God? Do you take him to be your Saviour? Do you desire to obey him?"

These exact words, it may be, are not always employed, but always and everywhere the candidate for baptism and church-membership is asked concerning his faith in and his purpose toward Jesus, and nothing else. "What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he?" (Matt. 22: 42) was our Lord's test of orthodoxy.

The Disciples do not object, as has been said, to the publication of statements of belief for information, but they do object to using such statements as tests of fellowship. Alexander Campbell, for instance, said: "While we are always willing to give a declaration of our faith and knowledge of the Christian system, we firmly protest against dogmatically propounding our own views or those of any fallible mortal as a condition or foundation of church union and cooperation." (Preface to the second edition of "The Christian

System.”) Their uniform custom is to follow without unnecessary delay this confession of faith in the Son of God with the administration of baptism and the hand of Christian fellowship.

The principal arguments which have been used against human creeds as conditions of fellowship are the following:

1. They are destitute of divine authority. God commanded no one to make them, no one to write them, no one to receive them. There is no “Thus saith the Lord” for any synopsis of faith, for any formula of belief such as has been in this connection described, nor is there any precedent containing the sanction of our Lord for anything of this character. Had the apostles placed such a statement at the close of the New Testament as is here contemplated, it would have been a sort of labor-saving device not at all designed by our Lord. It would have been a sort of acknowledgment that the writing in the book was not in some respects well adapted in the aggregate to the wants of society. For the good of man it was intended that to come to a knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord and of the way of salvation should involve much labor, reading, thinking, praying, searching, meditation, and inquiry. Our Father intended to keep the minds of his children much in company with himself by placing in their hands a book of principles which they might read and ponder upon for millenniums of years, and still find in it something new. A fortune left to a child is really a misfortune. This proposition is almost universally true. Whatever lifts the mind above the necessity of exertion robs one not only of employment but of enjoyment as well, and permits him to fall into *ennui*, uselessness, dissipation, and ruin. Hereditary orthodoxy is, however, if possible, a greater misfortune. It often ruins a man in his best interests, and always robs him of the pleasure of searching for the truth, of musing, reflecting, acting for himself.

2. Creeds have often operated, and their tendency has been, to cast out the good, the intelligent, the pure, and to retain those of contrary characteristics and character. They strain out the gnats and swallow the camels. They are in danger of racking off the pure wine and retaining the lees.

3. An examination of the history of the Christian church from almost the beginning will demonstrate that human authoritative creeds have generally been proscriptive and overbearing, and if proscriptive and overbearing, also heretical and schismatical in

their tendency. The truth of this proposition is copiously illustrated by incidents in the history of the church from the construction of the Nicene Creed to the present hour.

4. Their tendency has been to dethrone the Prophet, Priest, and King ordained of God to teach, to make intercession, and to rule over the children of men. Such a principle was not, of course, in the minds of their authors, but such a tendency certainly belongs to authoritative creedal statements. Men are commanded to hear Christ. (Matt. 17: 5.) He, and he alone, is Head of the body, which is the church. (Col. 1: 18.) He possesses all authority in heaven and on earth. (Matt. 28: 18.) He is the Author and Finisher of the faith. (Heb. 12: 2.) To substitute, even by implication, the teaching of any other for his doctrine is to displace infallible by fallible instruction.

5. It has been thought that creeds, as above defined, are prohibited by such precepts as the following: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which you have heard from me." (2 Tim. 1: 13.) "Contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." (Jude 1: 3.) "Hold fast the traditions which you have heard from us, whether by word or by our epistle." (2 Thess. 2: 15.) "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him." (Matt. 17: 5.) These and other similar passages clearly inhibit all rivals to the sacred writings, all substitutes, even by implication, for the New Testament teaching, all final and authoritative summaries of inspired doctrine. If men are commanded to hear Christ as the ultimate authority, it is certain that Christ forbids a rival Lord. It has been declared that it was the divine purpose that in all things he should be preeminent. (Col. 1: 18.)

6. In the protracted and sometimes heated discussions of the creed question great emphasis was placed on the fact that the interval of time from the death of the apostles to at least the year 200 of the Christian era was the purest, most harmonious, united, prosperous, and happy period of the church—the very time when there was no other statement of belief than that contained in the apostolic word and literature. It is admitted that there were declarations of faith made, especially at baptism and at other times, but there was nothing formal, nothing extended, nothing authoritative, except the apostolic writings. In the third century men began to frame doctrinal and metaphysical creeds. This was the beginning of controver-

sy about doctrines, ordinances, observances, etc., etc. The purest period of Christianity, and the most practical and useful, was when it had the one Book, and nothing else, in the way of writing as an authority.

7. It was said that creeds necessarily became the constitutional law of the churches, exceeding difficult, almost impossible to revise, and, as such, embodied and perpetuated the elements of schism from generation to generation. Illustrations of the exceeding difficulty and great peril involved in any attempt to revise and readapt a creed or confession of faith we have before our eyes to-day. A society built upon a religious controversy is a sort of commemorative institution, cherishing in the minds of those in succeeding ages ancient animosities, and encouraging men to love and to hate artificially, superficially, and irrationally.

8. If the foregoing points are well taken, then it follows that human authoritative creeds are unfavorable to that growth in Christian knowledge and that development of the social excellencies of our profession which in the apostolic age were presented by the spirit of inspiration as the paramount objects of Christian attainments. By attaching the mind to denominational shibboleths they detached it from a free and unrestrained consecration of itself to the whole truth as contained in the Bible. They confined the mind to a certain range of tenets and principles which have in various ways acquired an undue importance, giving thus to a definite number of points a factitious value, and in this way to a degree obliterating the proper distinctions between children, young men, and fathers in the Church of God. It must be apparent to every person that it is unreasonable to require children and men of undisciplined intellects to subscribe to statements of abstract themes carefully and laboriously prepared by trained thinkers as conditions of membership in Christ's holy church.

9. It was contended also that human creeds are obviously unfavorable to a large development of genuine spirituality. It was said that no one has ever been turned to Christ by a statement of theological dogmas. Such statements not only fail to turn sinners to Christ, but fail to promote sanctification on the part of those devoted to our Lord. They are at the best mere mummies of the life-inspiring truths of the Bible, which breathe with living efficacy and the warmth of divine love upon the soul. No one ever became en-

amored of a skeleton, however just its proportions or however perfect its organization, and no one can fall in love with the anatomical abstractions of a creed. They may excite the admiration of the intellect, but never the affections of the soul. This last, however, is essential to spirituality and sanctification.

10. Without at all intending to do so, they assume to be plainer and more intelligible in their statements of truth than the Bible. This is as derogatory to the honor of the Holy Spirit who is the author of these sacred writings as it is false. They are the veriest jargon of abstract terms compared with the clear, intelligible, and admirable simplicity and beauty of the divine writings. Take the word "election" or the phrase "Son of God" as explained in the creeds of human device and in the Bible, and, if possible, imagine a greater contrast in all that is plain, intelligible, and beautiful. Is not the Spirit of God the spirit of eloquence, of clear conceptions, and of appropriate, beautiful, and sublime language? An angel is not to be believed if he presumes to improve the diction of the apostles and prophets. (Gal. 1: 6-9.) The Spirit of the living God is the spirit of revelation, of all wisdom and utterance. Men are always infinitely more safe under his guidance than under that of any man, or company of men, however great, wise, or good.

11. Human creeds have been peculiarly hostile to the work of reformation in all ages by their tendency to eject godly and intelligent ministers of religion. All the great reformers of the world have been excommunicated persons. No eminent Christian reformer has ever been permitted to exercise his ministry in the church in which he commenced his work. Such men have always been cast out, rejected, condemned. For this excommunication, rejection, and condemnation the creeds are responsible, and ought, for this reason, themselves to be rejected and condemned.

12. Another argument was, that they are entirely superfluous and altogether redundant so far as their detection of either error or errorists is concerned. The greatest plea for them has always been their importance and utility in the detection and exposure of heretics and heresy. A ready reply to this, and one apparently satisfactory, is that heretics and heresy existed in the apostolic age, and under the ministry of those men made wise by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Jude, for instance, complained that ungodly men, turning the favor of God into lasciviousness and denying the one

God and our Lord Jesus Christ, had crept into the church unawares. (Jude 1: 4.) Paul echoes the same sentiment in reference to false brethren who “came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.” (Gal. 2: 4.) There were those who “went out from us because they were not of us,” and there was Demas, who “forsook” Paul in the hour of danger, “having loved this present world.” (1 John 2: 19; 2 Tim. 4: 10.)

Time fails to speak at length of Simon the sorcerer (Acts 8: 9-24), of Alexander the coppersmith (2 Tim. 4: 14), of Phygellus and Hermogenes (2 Tim. 1: 15), of Hymeneus and Alexander (1 Tim. 1: 20), whom Paul delivered over to Satan that they might learn not to blaspheme, and of many others who proved insincere in their confession and false to its obligations. Pharisees in Jerusalem crept in to spy out the liberty of the new covenant (Acts 15: 1-5), and bring the brethren back into bondage to the law, and there were Sadducees in the church in Corinth who denied the resurrection. (1 Cor. 15: 12.) There were philosophers, such as Hymeneus and Philetus, who concerning the faith erred, saying that the resurrection was past, and thus they overthrew the faith of some. (2 Tim. 2: 18.) There were transcendentalists who denied that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh, having speculated his bodily existence into the science of moonshine or something equally unreal. (1 John 4: 1—3.) James warned some against the worship of the heavenly bodies by assuring them that every good gift and every perfect boon comes down from the Father of lights and not from the lights themselves. (James 1: 17.) Paul fought a hard battle against the brethren who were disposed to openly countenance fornication, incest, and, the sacrificial banquets of heathen worship. (See 1 Cor.) Under the pressure of all this influx of falsehood and iniquity, why did not these inspired men see their mistake, and, discarding the simple confession of faith in Jesus as the Son of God, draw up a masterly catechism or skillfully arranged articles of religion which would shut out every error and guard the purity of the church? How sad the reflection that men so ingenious in other respects were so stupid in this, and how fortunate for us that the wiser heads of Nice, Rome, Geneva, Augsburg, and Westminster have supplied this deficiency in the work of the apostles!

Our Lord, in one of the epistles addressed to the seven churches in Asia, commends a body of believers because men claiming to be apostles, but who were not, had been put to the proof, and their true character detected. (Rev. 2: 2.) It is a fact that in that early period of the church's history pretenders of a most accomplished character were detected, condemned and repudiated, by churches possessing only parts of the New Testament, without the help of creeds; and who will say that we in these last days cannot try persons by the rule of faith presented in the Bible, detect their deviations from the good and the right way, and inflict on them proper punishment by the authority of Jesus Christ?

13. Another argument was that human creeds are formidable obstacles in the way of such a communion of believers as that for which the Master prayed. No man for even a moment seriously entertains the thought that Disciples of Christ will ever be induced to unite on any human statement of belief. No man thinks that the world will ever be converted to Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, or Methodism. These, and all other similar denominations, are results of serious efforts to return to the simple, spiritual Christianity of the New Testament. Christianity was before denominationalism, and it will survive all denominations. They are destined to perish. Take from each its peculiarities, and Christianity still remains. What they all hold in common as matters of faith may be regarded as Christianity. What is peculiar to each is not essential to the religion of Jesus. These peculiarities are of themselves inadequate to meet the deathless wants of humanity. Their utter incompetency to turn men to the Lord must be apparent. They are not permanently suited to the genius of human nature. They are but temporary expedients. They are mere incidents in the progress of Christ's holy church, and must, therefore, sooner or later, give place to a better order. Pure, uncorrupted, original Christianity in letter and in spirit as described on the pages of the New Testament, is, without doubt, superior to present-day denominationalism. Denominational institutions built chiefly upon phrenological and psychological developments of human nature must by and by inevitably yield to the whole genius of our common humanity. Men want a brighter, deeper, higher, purer, and more spiritual Christianity than any of them. The world longs for it, demands it, and the most spiritually-minded Christians pray for it.

Mr. Campbell said in his debate with Mr. Rice that: "Our Reformation began in the conviction of the inadequacy of the corrupted forms of religion in popular use to effect that thorough change of heart and life which the gospel contemplates as so essential to admission into heaven." ("Campbell and Rice Debate," p. 678.)

If Christians would sheathe forever their swords of strife, if they would make one grand *auto-da-fe* of all their creeds and shibboleths, if they would make one great burnt-offering of their schismatical constitutions, and cast forever to the moles and the bats their ancient apocryphal traditions, and then unite in the apostolic and divine institutions, the Christian religion might be sent to the ends of the earth in triumph in less than a single generation.

Protestant England and Protestant America have at their disposal all the means necessary to send the gospel from pole to pole and from the Thames to the ends of the earth. They have men enough, genius, learning, talent, ships, books, money, enterprise, and zeal adequate to such a splendid scheme if they would in Christian faith and purity unite in one holy effort on the plain teaching of the Book of God to humanize, civilize, and evangelize all the brotherhood of man in a comparatively short period of time. Too much of the artillery, intellectual, moral, and physical, is expended upon our little, scattering citadels, fortifications, and towers. This warfare among the professed followers of the Prince of Peace is uncivil, barbarous, savage. Unintentionally, of course, but nevertheless truly, it is a warfare against ourselves, against the common Saviour, and against the whole family of man.

For these and other reasons Disciples pray for the annihilation of partyism, and of everything that directly or indirectly tends to keep it up, and instead of human devices, instead of ordinances and traditions of men, they plead for the doctrine of the Bible, and nothing but the accredited teachings of the Bible, as the standard and rule of all personal duties, as the sufficient bond of union, as containing the only divinely authorized terms of Christian communion, and the sufficient director and formulator of our entire church relations, faith, discipline, and government.

It would seem to be proper before closing this chapter to make a more definite statement than has yet been presented of certain points in the teaching of the Disciples by which they are differenti-

ated from their brethren of the evangelical faith. Some years ago the late Isaac Errett made a statement of particulars in which Disciples differ from other Christians, and in which, consequently, their doctrinal peculiarities most strikingly appear. This statement is, so far as can be learned, universally acceptable to the Disciples of Christ. Mr. Errett said:

“1. While agreeing as to the divine *inspiration* of the Old and New Testaments, we differ on the question of their equal binding *authority* on Christians. In our view, the Old Testament was of authority with *Jews*, the New Testament *is now* of authority with *Christians*. We accept the Old Testament as true, and as essential to a proper understanding of the New, and as containing many invaluable lessons in righteousness and holiness which are of equal preciousness under all dispensations; but as a *book of authority* to teach *us* what *we* are to do, the New Testament alone, as embodying the teachings of Christ and his apostles, is our standard.

“2. While accepting fully and unequivocally the Scripture statements concerning what is usually called the trinity of persons in the Godhead, we repudiate alike the philosophical and theological speculations of Trinitarians and Unitarians, and all unauthorized forms of speech on a question which transcends human reason, and on which it becomes us to speak 'in words which the Holy Spirit teacheth.' Seeing how many needless and ruinous strifes have been kindled among sincere believers by attempts to define the indefinable, and to make tests of fellowship of human forms of speech, which lack divine authority, we have determined to eschew all such mischievous speculations and arbitrary terms of fellowship, and to insist only on the 'form of sound words' given to us in the Scriptures concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

“3. While agreeing that the Bible furnishes an all-sufficient revelation of the divine will and a per-

fect rule of faith and practice, we disagree practically in this: *We act consistently with this principle*, and repudiate all human *authoritative* creeds. We object not to publishing, for information, what we believe and practice, in whole or in part, as circumstances may demand, with the reasons therefor. But we stoutly refuse to accept of any such statement as authoritative, or as a test of fellowship, since Jesus Christ alone is Lord of the conscience, and his word alone can rightfully bind us. What he has revealed and enjoined, either personally or by his apostles, we acknowledge as binding; where he has not bound us, we are free; and we insist on standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, carefully guarding against all perversions of said liberty into means or occasions of strife.

“4. With us, the divinity and Christhood of Jesus is more than a mere item of doctrine—it is the central truth of the Christian system, and, in an important sense, the creed of Christianity. It is the one fundamental truth which we are jealously careful to guard against all compromise. To persuade men to trust and love and obey a divine Saviour is the one great end for which we labor in preaching the gospel; assured that if men are right about Christ, Christ will bring them right about everything else. We therefore preach Jesus Christ, and him crucified. We demand no other faith, in order to baptism and church-membership, than the faith of the heart in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God; nor have we any term or bond of fellowship but faith in this divine Redeemer and obedience to him. All who trust in the Son of God and obey him are our brethren, however wrong they may be about anything else; and those who do not trust in this divine Saviour for salvation, and obey his commandments, are not our brethren, however intelligent and excellent they may be in all beside. Faith in the unequivocal testimonies concerning Jesus—his incarnation,

life-teachings, sufferings, death for sin, resurrection, exaltation, and divine sovereignty and priesthood—and obedience to the plain commands he has given us, are with us, therefore, the basis and bond of Christian fellowship. In judgments merely inferential we reach conclusions as nearly unanimous as we can; and where we fail, exercise forbearance, in the confidence that God will lead us into final agreement. In matters of expediency, where we are left free to follow our own best judgment, we allow the majority to rule. In matters of opinion—that is, matters touching which the Bible is either silent or so obscure in its revelations as not to admit of definite conclusions—we allow the largest liberty, so long as none judges his brother, or insists on forcing his own opinions on others, or on making them an occasion of strife.

“5. While heartily recognizing the perpetual agency of the Holy Spirit in the work of conversion—or, to use a broader term, regeneration—we repudiate all theories of spiritual operations and all theories of the divine and human natures which logically rule out the Word of God as the instrument of regeneration and conversion; or which make the sinner passive and helpless, regarding regeneration as a miracle, and leading men to seek the evidence of acceptance with God in supernatural tokens or special revelations, rather than in the definite and unchangeable testimonies and promises of the gospel. We require assent to no *theory* of regeneration or of spiritual influence; but insist that men shall hear, believe, repent, and obey the gospel—assured that if we are faithful to God’s requirements on the *human* side of things, he will ever be true to himself and to us in accomplishing what is needful on the *divine* side. Our business is to preach the gospel and plead with sinners to be reconciled to God; asking God, while we plant and water, to give the increase. We care little for the logic of any theory of regener-

ation, if we may but persuade sinners to believe, repent, and obey.

“6. While agreeing with all the evangelical in the necessity of faith and repentance, we differ in this: We submit *no other tests* but faith and repentance, in admitting persons to baptism and church-membership. We present to them no articles of faith other than the one article concerning the divinity and Christhood of Jesus; we demand no narration of a religious experience other than is expressed in a voluntary confession of faith in Jesus; we demand no probation to determine their fitness to come into the church; but instantly, on their voluntary confession of the Christ and avowed desire to leave their sins and serve the Lord Christ, unless there are good reasons to doubt their sincerity, they are accepted and baptized, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *into* the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. They are thus wedded to *Christ*, and not to a set of doctrines or to a party.

“7. We not only acknowledge the perpetuity of baptism, but insist on its meaning, according to the divine testimonies: ‘He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved.*’ ‘Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins*, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.’ We therefore teach the believing penitent to seek, through baptism, the divine assurance of the forgiveness of sins, and that gift of the Holy Spirit which the Lord has promised to them that obey him. Thus, in a hearty and Scriptural surrender to the authority of the Lord Jesus, and not in dreams, visions, or revelations, are we to seek for that assurance of pardon and that evidence of sonship to which the gospel points us.

“The Lord’s Supper, too, holds a different place with us from that which is usually allowed to it. We invest it not with the awfulness of a sacrament, but regard it as a sweet and precious feast of holy mem-

ories, designed to quicken our love of Christ and cement the ties of our common brotherhood. We therefore observe it as part of our regular worship, every Lord's day, and hold it a solemn, but joyful and refreshing feast of love, in which all the disciples of our Lord should feel it to be a great privilege to unite. 'Sacred to the memory of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,' is written on this simple and solemn family feast in the Lord's house.

"8. The *Lord's* day—not the Jewish Sabbath—is a New Testament observance, which is not governed by statute, but by apostolic example and the devotion of loyal and loving hearts.

"9. *The Church of Christ*—not sects—is a divine institution. We do not recognize sects, with sectarian names and symbols and terms of fellowship, as *branches* of the Church of Christ, but as unscriptural and anti-scriptural, and therefore to be abandoned for the One Church of God which the New Testament reveals. That God has a people among these sects, we believe; we call on them to come out from all party organizations, to renounce all party names and party tests, and seek only for *Christian* union and fellowship according to apostolic teaching. Moreover, while we recognize the seeming necessity for various denominational movements in the past, in the confusions growing out of the Great Apostasy, we believe that the time has now fully come to expose the evils and mischiefs of the sect spirit and sect life, and to insist on the abandonment of sects and a return to the unity of spirit and the union and cooperation that marked the churches of the New Testament. We therefore urge the Word of God against human creeds; faith in Christ against faith in systems of theology; obedience to Christ rather than obedience to church authority; the Church of Christ in place of sects; the promises of the gospel instead of dreams, visions, and marvelous experiences as evidences of pardon;

Christian character, in place of orthodoxy in doctrine, as the bond of union; and associations for cooperation in good works instead of associations to settle questions of faith and discipline.

“It will thus be seen that our differential character is found not in the advocacy of new doctrines or practices, but in rejecting that which has been added to the original simple faith and practice of the Church of God. Could all return to this, it would not only end many unhappy strifes and unite forces now scattered and wasted, but would revive the spirituality and enthusiasm of the early church; as we should no longer need, as in the weakness of sectism, to cater to the world’s fashions and follies to maintain a precarious existence. Zion could again put on her beautiful garments and shine in the light of God, and go out in resistless strength to the conquest of the world. To this end, we are not asking any to cast away their confidence in Christ, or to part with aught that is divine; but to cast away that which is human, and be one in clinging to the divine. Is it not reasonable? Is it not just? Is it not absolutely necessary, to enable the people of God to do the work of God?” (“Our Position,” by Isaac Errett, pp. 6-11).

It seems appropriate to note in the conclusion of this chapter the fact that there is on the part of the Disciples agreement with the Baptists as to the proper form and subjects of baptism, but when the specific design of the ordinance is considered, Disciples and Baptists seem to part company. The former maintained that “regeneration must be so far accomplished before baptism that the subject is changed in heart, and in faith and penitence must have yielded up his heart to Christ; otherwise baptism is nothing but an empty form. But *forgiveness* is something distinct from *regeneration*; forgiveness is an act of the Sovereign; not a change of the sinner’s heart; and while it is extended in view of the sinner’s faith and repentance, it needs to be offered in a sensible and tangible form, such that the sinner can seize it and appropriate it with un-

mistakable definiteness. In baptism he *appropriates God's promise of forgiveness*, relying on the divine testimonies:

“‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’ ‘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.’ He thus lays hold of the promise of Christ and appropriates it as his own. He does not *merit* it, nor *procure* it, nor *earn* it, in being baptized; but he *appropriates* what the mercy of God has provided and offered in the gospel. We therefore teach all who are baptized that if they bring to their baptism a heart that renounces sin and implicitly trusts the power of Christ to save, they should rely on the Saviour’s own promise, ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’” (“Our Position,” pp. 12, 13.)

On the subject of church government Disciples are, in the main, in harmony with the Congregationalists and Baptists. For the sake of order and efficiency they have elders or bishops, deacons and evangelists, yet in the absence of these the members are taught to meet, to keep the ordinances, and encourage one another to love, to good works, and to administer baptism and partake of the Lord’s Supper, or do whatever needs to be done to promote their own growth and the salvation of sinners. Nevertheless, as soon as suitable gifts are developed persons are chosen to act as elders and deacons, and to serve in any other ministry the church may need. The position and authority of eldership in a congregation of Disciples is about the same as in a Presbyterian church.

They have no ecclesiastical courts, properly speaking, outside the individual churches, but it is becoming somewhat general to refer difficult cases to a committee mutually agreed on by the parties concerned, their decision to be final. (See “Our Position,” p. 14.)

Their position on the subject of union among believers for evangelistic work has been stated with a reasonable degree of fullness. While they make to their brethren of every name a distinct and definite proposition, which they believe to be thoroughly Scriptural also, looking to the reunion of believers, they rejoice in

every utterance which tends to break down sectarian barriers, and hail with gladness every step which condemns the folly and wickedness of denominationalism. They have, however, generally, no faith in the practicability of uniting denominations, as such, on any merely human basis, however liberal. The union cannot be Christian unless it is union in Christ, in those things which Christ enjoins, neither less nor more.

CHAPTER IX.

Literature And Education.

The Disciples have been fruitful in the production of literature, especially of a periodical and polemic character. Their movement was, as has been abundantly shown, in the interests of peace and union among the people of God. Theological reconstruction and contention were no part of the original program. A campaign of theological and ecclesiastical war was not so much as thought of by the pious men who were moved by the Spirit of God to undertake to lead the people back to Christianity according to Christ. It was certainly not the purpose of Thomas Campbell when he wrote the "Declaration and Address" for the Christian Association in 1809 to engage in controversy with his brethren, and no one who is at all acquainted with the gentle spirit of Barton Warren Stone can for a moment think of him as a polemic. He was prominently a man of peace.

Thomas Campbell especially, and Alexander, his son, entertained a natural aversion to everything which looked in the direction of theological pugilism. The former never conquered this aversion. The latter, however, did to such an extent that in the minds of many people he is thought of chiefly, if not altogether, as a theological polemic. Alexander Campbell's published debates, are with John Walker, a minister of the secession Presbyterian Church in 1820; with W. L. Maccalla, of the Presbyterian Church; with Robert Owen the Socialist; with Archbishop Purcell, of the Roman Catholic Church; and with N. L. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church. These were oral debates, which were published in book form.

The story of a change of view on the part of Alexander Campbell in regard to the subject of a public oral discussion of religious topics is not only interesting but necessary, in order to fully understand a portion of the history of the Disciples. The first public discussion was conducted in the town of Mount Pleasant, in the State of Ohio, a village about twenty-three miles distant from Mr. Campbell's residence in Brooke County, Va., in the month of June of the year 1820. The debate was with a gentleman named John Walker, a minister of the gospel in the seceder branch of the Presbyterian Church. This debate originated as follows:

John Birch, pastor of a Baptist church near Mount Pleasant, during the autumn of 1819 baptized an unusual number of believers. As a means of hindering the progress of Baptist principles and usages in the community Mr. Walker preached on infant baptism. Mr. Birch listened to one of his discourses. In the course of the sermon Mr. Walker quoted from a Dr. Baldwin. Mr. Birch thought the quotation was unfair, and at the conclusion of the address he asked Mr. Walker to what part of Dr. Baldwin's works he had referred. This gave rise to a short discussion as to the meaning of the quotation. During this interview Mr. Walker challenged Mr. Birch, or any regular Baptist minister of good moral character and of reputable standing intellectually, whom Mr. Birch might choose, to meet him in a joint, public, oral discussion on the general subject of baptism, but especially the baptism of infants. Mr. Birch at once accepted the challenge, and invited Alexander Campbell, as a champion of Baptist faith and practice in that part of the world, to represent the denomination in such a meeting. Three times Mr. Birch wrote to Mr. Campbell, inviting him to engage in a debate, before he succeeded in eliciting a reply.

In Mr. Birch's third letter to Mr. Campbell he told him that:

“It is the unanimous wish of the church to which I belong that you should be the disputant.” Writing of this discussion ten years later, Mr. Campbell said: “In the year 1820, when solicited to meet Mr. Walker on the subject of baptism I hesitated for about six months whether it was lawful thus to defend the truth. I was written to three times before I gained my own consent. I did not like controversy so well as many have since thought I did, and was doubtful of the effects it might have on society. These difficulties, however, were overcome, and we met. It was not until after I discovered the effects of that discussion that I began to hope that something might be done to arouse this generation from its supineness and spiritual lethargy.”

In his first address Mr. Campbell referred to the hesitancy with which he gave his consent to engage in a public discussion. He said:

“But why should I hesitate on the lawfulness of thus vindicating truth and opposing error? Did not the Apostle Paul publicly dispute with Jews and Greeks, with the leaders in philosophy and religion of his time? Yes, he publicly disputed with Epicureans and Stoics, the Jewish priests and the Roman orators, and openly refuted them. Nay, he disputed publicly in the school of one Tyrannus two entire years with all that came unto him. The Messiah himself publicly disputed with the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the priests and the rulers of the people; and by public discussion did Martin Luther, the celebrated Reformer, wage war with the whole learning and see of Rome. By these means he began and carried on the Reformation.... Heaven has stamped its *probatum est* upon this method of maintaining truth.”

From the above facts it will be seen that this initial debate was not sought by Mr. Campbell and his friends, but that the challenge which resulted in the discussion was issued by John Walker. Mr. Campbell was not connected with the controversy in any manner until after he had received a thrice-repeated invitation from Mr. Birch, at Mr. Walker’s request, to meet the latter in a public defense of Baptist principles. Mr. Campbell, in a preface to the debate which was published in 1822, tells with what hesitancy he consented to engage in the unpleasant and doubtful business. He says:

“I hesitated a little, but my devotion to the cause of truth, and my being unwilling even to appear, much more to feel, afraid or ashamed to defend the cause of truth, overcame my natural aversion to controversy, and finally determined me to agree to meet Mr. Walker.”

Let the fact also be noted that Mr. Campbell appeared in behalf of the Baptist cause, and as “a regular Baptist minister of good moral character and reputable standing.” During this debate he spoke as a Baptist. He said:

“On my side, or rather on the Baptist side, of the question there is nothing to be proved. The Pedobaptists themselves admit that the baptism which we practice is Christian baptism. They also maintain that infant sprinkling is Christian baptism. This we deny. A Baptist man can present in five minutes a divine warrant and express command authorizing his faith and practice, but a Pedobaptist requires days to prove his practice, and finally fails in the attempt.” (Preface to “Campbell and Walker Debate,” p. 6.)

At the close of this discussion Mr. Campbell’s scruples were so effectually overcome that he gave notice of his willingness to debate the same subject with any reputable and able minister in the Presbyterian Church, feeling, as he said, that Mr. Walker had not argued the Pedobaptist cause in such a manner as the Pedobaptists would generally abide by. A little later, through the agency of Mr. A. D. Keith, Alexander Campbell published the following:

“I this day publish to all present that I feel disposed to meet any Pedobaptist minister of any denomination, of good standing in his party, and I engage to prove in a debate with him, either *viva voce* or with the pen, that infant sprinkling is a human tradition, and injurious to the wellbeing of society, religious and political.”

Out of these expressions of readiness to engage in public discussion came Mr. Campbell’s second debate, that with W. L. Maccalla, in the year 1823. This gentleman was a minister in the Presbyterian denomination, and the general subject of discussion was the same as in the debate with Mr. Walker. Meantime Mr. Campbell experienced such a change of sentiment on the subject of public oral discussions of religious and theological questions that he was able to write the following:

“It is long since religious controversy began. The first quarrel that arose in the human family was about religion, and since the proclamation, ‘I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed,’ the con-

troversy has been carried on by different hands, by different means, and with various success. It is the duty of the Christian, and has ever been the duty of the saint, to contend for the truth revealed in opposition to error. From the days that Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses down to the present time every distinguished saint has been engaged in controversy. The ancient prophets, the Saviour of the world, and his holy apostles were all religious controversialists. The Saviour's life was one continued scene of controversy and debate with the scribes, the elders, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and with the established priesthood of his era. The apostles were noted disputants and the most successful controversialists that ever lived. Paul the Apostle was more famous in this department than Alexander the Great or Bonaparte in the field. Whether a Stoic or an Epicurean philosopher, a Roman orator, a Jewish high-priest, or Sadducean teacher encountered him, he came off victorious and triumphant. Never was he foiled in battle, never did he give back the sword which he wielded, and the arm which directed it proved resistless in the fight.

“There are not a few who deprecate religious controversy as an evil of no small magnitude [to this company Alexander Campbell himself belonged only a short time before], but these [he now says] are either ill-informed or themselves conscious that their principles will not bear investigation. So long as there is good and evil, truth and error, in this world, so long will there be opposition, for it is the nature of good and evil, of truth and error, to oppose each other. We cheerfully confess that it is much to be regretted that controversy among Christians should exist, but it is more to be regretted that error, the professed cause of it, should exist. Seeing, then, that controversy must exist, the only question is, How may it be managed to the best advantage? To the controversies recorded in the

New Testament we must appeal as furnishing an answer to this question. They were, in general, public, open, plain, and sometimes sharp and severe, but the disputants who embraced the truth in those controversies never lost the spirit of truth in the heat of conflict, but with all calmness, moderation, firmness, and benevolence they wielded the sword of the Spirit, and their controversies when recorded by impartial hands breathe a heavenly sweetness that so refreshes the intelligent reader that he often forgets the controversy in admiration of the majesty of truth, the benevolence and purity of their hearts.” (Preface to “Maccalla and Campbell Debate.”)

With the discussions here named and the beginning of the publication of the “Christian Baptist, August 1, 1823, the belligerent era among the Disciples was fairly inaugurated.

The prospectus of this paper was at once a declaration of independence and a proclamation of war. The end and objects of the proposed publication were candidly and clearly stated in the following words:

“The ‘Christian Baptist’ shall espouse the cause of no religious sect, excepting that ancient sect ‘called Christians first at Antioch.’ Its sole object shall be the eviction of truth and the exposing of error in doctrine and practice. The editor, acknowledging no standard of religious faith or works other than the Old and New Testaments, and the latter as the only standard of the religion of Jesus Christ, will, intentionally at least, oppose nothing which it contains and recommend nothing which it does not enjoin. Having no worldly interest at stake from the adoption or reprobation of any articles of faith or religious practice, having no gift nor religious emolument to blind his eyes or to pervert his judgment, he hopes to manifest that he is an impartial advocate of truth.” (“Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” vol. 2:, p. 50.)

The note of dedication prefixed to the original edition of the "Christian Baptist" reads as follows:

"To ALL those, without distinction, who acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be a Revelation from God; and the New Testament as containing the Religion of JESUS CHRIST:

"Who, willing to have all religious tenets and practices tried by the divine Word; and who, feeling themselves in duty bound to search the Scriptures for themselves, in all matters of religion, are disposed to reject all doctrines and commandments of men, and to obey the truth, holding fast the faith once delivered to the saints—this work is most respectfully and affectionately dedicated by

"The Editor."

The foregoing prospectus and dedication still express the spirit of what may be characterized as the belligerent era of the Disciples, and the facts here stated clearly show the manner in which they were drawn into a war theologic and ecclesiastic.

Mr. Campbell, in his preface to his published report of the Maccalla and Campbell debate, refers to the "calmness, moderation, benevolence, and heavenly sweetness" of the controversies reported in the New Testament, as examples to be imitated by all in modern times who engage in the discussion of ecclesiastical, theological, moral, and religious questions. But no one who has read or who now reads, if any do now read, the "Christian Baptist," has been impressed with the "calmness, moderation, benevolence, and heavenly sweetness" of those whose controversies have come down to us on its pages. No person, in reading the lines of this magazine, "often forgets the controversy in admiration of the majesty of truth, benevolence, and purity of their hearts"—the hearts of the controversialists.

Dr. Richardson, in his "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," says that expositions of primitive Christianity and of the corruptions in the church were "well calculated to startle the entire religious community," and that this was what Mr. Campbell "designed to do, for he conceived the people to be so completely under the do-

minion of the clergy at this time that nothing but bold and decisive measures could arouse them to proper inquiry.” (“Memoirs of Alexander Campbell,” vol. 2: p. 53.)

The name “Christian Baptist” was adopted with some hesitancy, since the word “Baptist” was a denominational designation, and the purpose of the Campbells was to free from denominationalism themselves and all whom they might be able to influence. It was, however, after conference, determined to give the name “Christian Baptist” to the magazine in order to avoid offending religious prejudice, as Dr. Richardson says, and to give greater currency to the principles which were to be presented. After conducting this magazine with remarkable success through seven years, Mr. Campbell began to fear that the advocates of the union of believers in Christ, by a return to the religion of the Son of man as set forth in the New Testament, would come to be known as Christian Baptists. For this reason in part he determined to change the name of his paper and also his style of writing, inasmuch as his trenchant and caustic style had accomplished the purpose which he had in view when he adopted it, that is, the awakening of a general public interest in the themes which to him possessed a very special interest.

But he had no thought of surrendering his position in order to avoid controversy. He would cultivate more assiduously the “calmness, moderation, benevolence, and heavenly sweetness” which he found in New Testament controversy and so much admired. That Alexander Campbell, in starting the new monthly magazine called “The Millennial Harbinger,” had no thought of ceasing to earnestly contend for what he believed to be the faith once for all delivered to the saints,” is evident from the following, taken from the first number of *The Millennial Harbinger*,” in January, 1830:

“Many will contend that religious controversy, oral or written, is incompatible with the pacific and contemplative character of the genuine Christian, and promotive of strifes, tumults, and factions in society, destructive of true piety toward God and of benevolence toward man. This is a prejudice arising from the abuses of controversy. Admit for a mo-

ment that it were so and what would be the consequence? It would unsaint and unchristianize every distinguished patriarch, Jew, and Christian enrolled in the sacred annals of the world. For who of the Bible's great and good men was not engaged in religious controversy? To go no farther back than the Jewish lawgiver, I ask, What was his character? I need not specify. Whenever it was necessary, all—yes, all—the renowned men of antiquity were religious controversialists. Moses long contended with the Egyptian magi; he overcame Jannes and Jambres too. Elijah encountered the prophets of Baal. Job long debated with the princes of Edom. The Jewish prophets and the idolatrous kings of Israel waged a long and arduous controversy. John the harbinger and the scribes and Pharisees met in conflict. Jesus and the rabbis and the priesthood long debated. The apostles and the Sanhedrim, the evangelists and the doctors of divinity, Paul and the skeptics, engaged in many a conflict, and even Michael fought in 'wordy debate' with the devil about the body of Moses. Yet who was more meek than Moses, more zealous for God than Elijah, more patient than Job, more devout than Paul, and more benevolent than John?...

“Religious controversy has enlightened the world. It gave new vigor to the mind, and the era of the Reformation was the era of the revival of literature. It has enlightened men on all subjects, in all the arts and sciences, in all things philosophic, literary, moral, and political. It was the tongue and pen of controversy which developed the true solar system, laid the foundation for the American Revolution, abolished the slave trade, and which has so far disenthralled the human mind from the shackles of superstition. Locke and Sydney, Milton and Newton, were all controversialists and reformers, philosophers, literary and political. Truth and liberty, both religious and political, are the first-fruits of

well-directed controversy. Peace and eternal bliss will be the harvest home. Let the opponents of controversy, or they who *controvert controversy*, remember that had there been no controversy neither the Jewish nor the Christian religion could ever have been established, nor, had it ceased, could the Reformation ever have been achieved. It has been the parent of almost all social blessings which we enjoy.”

In the year 1820 Robert Owen published in the secular press, first in the city of New Orleans and later throughout the United States, the following challenge to the clergy:

“Gentlemen: I have now finished a course of lectures in this city, the principles of which are in direct opposition to those which you have been taught it your duty to preach. It is of immense importance to the world that truth upon these momentous subjects should now be established upon a certain and sure foundation. You and I and all our fellow-men are deeply interested that there should be no further delay. With this view, without one hostile or unpleasant feeling on my part, I propose a friendly public discussion.

“I propose to prove, as I have already attempted to do in my lectures, that all the religions of the world have been founded on the ignorance of mankind; that they are directly opposed to the never-changing laws of our nature; that they have been and are the real source of vice, disunion, and misery of every description; that they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, of intelligence, of charity in its most extended sense, and of sincerity and kindness among the whole human family; and that they can be no longer maintained except through the ignorance of the mass of the people and the tyranny of the few over that mass.”

This was Mr. Owen's challenge, and Mr. Campbell took up the gauntlet thrown down by the defiant unbeliever, the immediate result of which is a published volume containing the arguments for and against the truth of the Christian religion, containing nearly five hundred pages.

It was in this debate that Mr. Campbell delivered an argument in behalf of the truth of the Christian religion, extending through twelve hours, with only such interruptions as were necessary for rest and refreshment. At the conclusion of the debate all persons in the assembly who believed in the Christian religion, or who felt such an interest in it as to wish to see it pervade the world, were asked to signify their belief, interest, and desire by standing up. The result was an apparently universal rising on the part of the great audience. Mr. Campbell then said that he wished all persons who were doubtful of the truth of the Christian religion, or who did not believe in it, or who were not friendly to its spread and prevalence over the world, to signify their doubts, their disbelief, and their unwillingness by rising to their feet. Only three persons arose.

Mr. Campbell's next public discussion was in the city of Cincinnati, in the month of January, 1837, with the then bishop, afterward Archbishop, Purcell. This discussion was the outgrowth of an address delivered in the same city at a meeting of the college of teachers, in which Mr. Campbell criticized the Roman Catholic Church. This criticism was resented by Bishop Purcell, and led to a public oral discussion. In this debate Mr. Campbell affirmed:

“1. The Roman Catholic Institution, sometimes called the ‘Holy, Apostolic, Catholic 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, holy, 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 antiscritural traditions rest-

ing 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.”

In 1843 a debate extending through eighteen days was conducted in the city of Lexington, Ky., between Alexander Campbell and Nathan L. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church, on the general subject of baptism, on the character of spiritual influence in conversion and sanctification, and on the expediency and tendency of human creeds as terms of union and communion.

Almost one thousand pages are occupied in recording the arguments urged by the distinguished gentlemen on this occasion. It is such a repertory of facts, arguments, and illustrations on the points of issue between Disciples and Pedobaptists as has left noth-

ing new to be said by those who have written and spoken in a controversial way on these topics during the last fifty years.

The "Christian Baptist" was continued through seven years, to be succeeded by a similar publication, entitled "The Millennial Harbinger," which continued forty years. An edition of the "Christian Baptist," revised, in one large volume, is still in print.

This magazine was intended to arouse the people, calling attention to the necessity not only of a reformation, but of a restoration of the religion of Jesus to the world in its doctrine, ordinances, and fruits. This fact will account for the style of much of the writing, especially of the articles by the editor. He intended to be cutting, caustic, and severe. Having succeeded in arresting attention, his style of writing changed with the beginning of "The Millennial Harbinger."

In 1826 Mr. Campbell published a translation of the New Testament, based on work previously done by George Campbell, James McKnight, and Philip Doddridge, with prefaces, various emendations, and an appendix. This book is still in print. The general preface contains valuable suggestions as to the manner in which the New Testament should be read in order to the fullest and most accurate understanding of its contents.

A fact worthy of mention at this point is the omission as spurious of the thirty-seventh verse of the eighth chapter of Acts of Apostles. It is believed that this is the first time in which this passage was omitted in the publication of an English edition of the New Testament, and what makes this omission the more remarkable is the fact that this text seemed to be of greatest value to Mr. Campbell and his friends in locating the confession of faith in Jesus, and its character and scope in the plan of salvation.

Partly because, probably, of the use of the word "immersion" instead of the word "baptism," and partly because of the style of English—a sort of Anglicized Latin—this book has never been popular, notwithstanding certain obvious merits which belong to it.

In 1864 a translation of the New Testament was made by H. T. Anderson. The English dress of this work is quite attractive. Mr. Anderson allowed himself certain liberties in his work which give to portions of it the character of a paraphrase rather than that of a close and accurate translation of the original text.

In the department of theology the principal books are: "The Christian System," by Alexander Campbell; "Reason and Revelation" and the "Scheme of Redemption," by President R. Milligan, of the College of the Bible, in Kentucky University; "The Evolution of a Shadow"; or, "The Bible Doctrine of Rest," by A. M. Weston, A.M.; "The Remedial System; or, Man and His Redeemer," by H. Christopher, A.M., M.D.; "The Gospel Restored," by Walter Scott (now out of print); "The Messiahship," by the same author; "The Divine Demonstration," by H. W. Everest; "A Vision of the Ages," by B. W. Johnson, being an exposition of the Apocalypse; "The Man in the Book," by Henry Schell Lobingier; "The Old Faith Restated," being a presentation of the fundamental truths and essential doctrines of Christianity as held and advocated by the Disciples of Christ in the light of experience and biblical research, edited by J. H. Garrison, A.M.; "The Gospel Plan of Salvation," by T. W. Brents; "Modern Phases of Skepticism," by President D. R. Dungan; "Evidences of Christianity," by J. W. McGarvey, A.M., Professor of Sacred History and Evidences in the College of the Bible, Kentucky University; "Christian Baptism with its Antecedents and Consequents," by Alexander Campbell; "The Form of Baptism: An Argument Designed to Prove Conclusively that Immersion is the Only Baptism Authorized by the Bible," by J. B. Briney; "The Genuineness and Authenticity of the Gospels," by B. A. Hinsdale, A.M., of the University of Michigan; "The Organon of Scripture; or, The Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation," by J. S. Lamar; "First Principles and Perfection; or, The Birth and Growth of a Christian," by the same author; "The Christian Preacher's Companion; or, The Gospel Facts Sustained by the Testimony of Unbelieving Jews and Pagans," by Alexander Campbell; "The Office of the Holy Spirit," by Robert Richardson; and "Encyclopaedia on the Evidences," by J. W. Monser.

The Disciples have done but little in the writing of commentaries. The earliest work of the kind is a "Commentary on Acts of Apostles," by Professor McGarvey, published in 1863, but recently revised and enlarged. Moses E. Lard wrote a "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," a work of merit. In 1876 the publication of a series of volumes, to be known as "The New Testament Commentary," was commenced. Of this series only the following volumes have appeared: One volume on Matthew and Mark, by J. W.

McGarvey; one volume on Luke, by J. S. Lamar; and one volume on Hebrews, by Robert Milligan. B. W. Johnson has written a "Commentary on the Gospel of John," and also a work for devotional reading on the entire New Testament.

Of books of sermons the following may be mentioned: "The Family Companion," by Elijah Goodwin; "The Pulpit of the Christian Church," by W. T. Moore; "Kinship to Christ," by J. Z. Tyler; "Serial Discourses," by B. K. Smith; "The Western Preacher," by J. M. Mathes; "The Gospel Preacher," by Benjamin Franklin, two volumes; "Practical and Doctrinal Discourses," by J. M. Tribble; "Fourteen Sermons," by J. S. Sweeney; "Evangelistic Sermons," by Robert T. Mathews; "Views of Life," by W. T. Moore; "Talks to Bereans," by Isaac Errett; "Lectures and Addresses," by Alexander Campbell; "The Iowa Pulpit," by J. H. Painter; "Lectures on the Pentateuch," by Alexander Campbell; and "The Old Path Pulpit," by F. G. Allen. Probably under this head ought also to be mentioned five volumes entitled "Missouri Christian Lectures," being some of the principal lectures delivered at the annual meetings of a summer school of theology in the State of Missouri.

In the department of history and biography, "The Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," by Robert Richardson, in two volumes, easily stands at the head. Mrs. Alexander Campbell has written also reminiscences of her husband. Books of historic value to those who would understand the genesis and aim of the Disciples are: "History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, Ohio, with Biographical Sketches," by A. S. Hayden; "Life of Walter Scott, with Sketches of His Fellow-Laborers," by William Baxter; "Life of John Smith," by John Augustus Williams; "Life of John T. Johnson," by John Rogers; "Life of L. L. Pinkerton," by John Shackelford; "Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin," by Joseph Franklin; "Life of Judge Jeremiah S. Black," by Mrs. Clayton; "Life of James A. Garfield," by F. M. Green; "Life of Knowles Shaw," by William Baxter; "Life of Jacob Creath," by P. Donan; "Origin of the Disciples of Christ," by G. W. Longan; "Dawn of the Reformation in Missouri," by T. P. Haley; "History of Reformatory Movements," by John F. Rowe; and "Autobiography of Barton Warren Stone," edited by John Rogers.

In 1850 the Disciples established a mission in the ancient city of Jerusalem. Dr. James T. Barclay was the missionary. This work

was sustained until the civil disturbances in our country interrupted it and Dr. Barclay and his family returned home. The chief result of the Jerusalem mission is a book of standard value from the pen of the missionary, entitled "The City of the Great King." Professor McGarvey has written a book of substantial merit containing more than six hundred pages, entitled "Lands of the Bible." This work contains a geographical and topographical description of Palestine, with letters of travel in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and Europe. "Under Ten Flags" is the title of an interesting book of travel by Z. T. Sweeney, late United States Consul to Turkey.

Of devotional books it is sufficient to name "Alone with God," by J. H. Garrison; "The Heavenward Way," by the same author; "Letters to a Young Christian," "Walks about Jerusalem," and "Evenings with the Bible," by Isaac Errett. A volume entitled "The Lord's Supper" has been published, edited by John L. Brandt.

Of periodical literature the most pretentious publication which has been attempted is "The Christian Quarterly," edited by W. T. Moore, at present editor of a weekly paper entitled "The Christian Commonwealth," London, England. Dr. Moore conducted "The Christian Quarterly" in Cincinnati from January, 1869, to October, 1875. In 1864 Moses E. Lard began the publication of "Lard's Quarterly," which continued until April, 1868. The successor of these publications is "The New Christian Quarterly," edited in St. Louis by J. H. Garrison and B. W. Johnson. The principal weekly papers are: "The Christian Standard," Cincinnati; "The Christian Evangelist," St. Louis; "The Christian Courier," Dallas, Tex.; "The Christian Oracle," Chicago; "The Christian Guide," Louisville; "The Christian Leader," Cincinnati; "The Harbinger," San Francisco; "The Gospel Advocate," Nashville, Tenn.; "The Christian Commonwealth," London, England; and "The Canadian Evangelist," Hamilton, Ont.

Sunday-school papers, lesson-leaves, and commentaries are also published by The Standard Publishing Co., Cincinnati, The Christian Publishing Co., St. Louis, The Christian Printing and Publishing Co., Louisville, Ky., and The Gospel Advocate Publishing Co., Nashville, Tenn.

The earliest institution of higher education established by the Disciples was Bacon College, which began its existence in Georgetown, Ky., in 1836. It was removed to Harrodsburg, in the

same State, in 1839. In 1850, because of a lack of financial support, the college was suspended. In 1857, through the agency of Mr. John B. Bowman, the college was revived with the idea of ultimately building up a great university. In 1858 the provisions of the charter were greatly extended by the legislature of Kentucky, and the name of the institution was changed to Kentucky University. Transylvania University was chartered by the legislature of Virginia in 1783, and after an existence of sixty-six years it became, by an act of the legislature, a part of Kentucky University. The city of Lexington became its home in 1865. The office of regent, created in 1865 and occupied by John B. Bowman, the founder of the university, was discontinued in 1878. Henry H. White became president, and filled that office until 1880. Charles Louis Loss is at present the chief executive officer of Kentucky University. The usual departments of such an institution are organized and in successful operation. The theological department is known as the College of the Bible, in which the Bible itself is used as a text-book. The number of students is about two hundred. The entire number of students in all branches of the university for the year 1892-93 was 1211.

The establishment of an institution of learning differing in some essential respects from any in existence had long been a favorite scheme with Alexander Campbell. When he was fifty years old he formulated and published the plan of an institution of higher learning. The teaching was to be essentially and permanently biblical. All science, all literature, all nature, all art, all attainments, were to be made tributary to the Bible and man's ultimate and eternal destiny. In this scheme education and moral character were identical. The blasphemer, the profane swearer, the liar, the calumniator, the peculator, are vulgar, barbarous, and uneducated persons. Mr. Campbell felt, moreover, the need of educated and consecrated men for every sphere of life—editors, teachers, physicians, lawyers, merchants, mechanics, farmers. He was impressed especially with the great need of an educated and efficient ministry to cooperate in the great work of restoring to the world the Christianity of Christ in its doctrine and life.

Bethany College, located at Bethany, W. Va., not far from Wheeling, is a result of Mr. Campbell's meditations and agitations. A charter for the institution was granted by the legislature of Vir-

ginia in 1840. Mr. Campbell became its first president, and held the office to the close of his life, in 1866. This work he regarded as the consummation and crown of all his earthly projects. After Mr. Campbell's death W. K. Pendleton became president, to be succeeded by W. H. Woolery, to be followed by Archibald McLean, in turn to be followed by Hugh McDiarmid.

The work of Bethany College has been of great value to the Disciples, especially in the training of men for the work of the ministry. The religious life of the college has from the beginning been most pronounced. Daily and weekly meetings for prayer and praise are held by the students. Evangelistic services are held every year. It is a rare thing for a student who is not a Christian to be graduated. Ninety-four per cent, of the students in 1891 were professed Christians. No particular pressure is brought to bear on the students to induce them to enter the ministry, but so common is it for students to decide to give themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the Word that it has been said there is something in the very air at Bethany which inclines men to preach. The evangelization of the world is kept continually before the minds of the students. A number of graduates are at work in heathen lands. The missionary spirit is fostered by correspondence with men working in the midst of heathenism. Weekly meetings are held in which fields are studied, information is disseminated, and prayers are offered for the conversion of the world. The attendance at Bethany has never been large. "Not quantity, but quality" has been the motto.

Eureka College is located in Woodford County,., eighteen miles east of the city of Peoria. In 1848 Walnut Grove Academy began its career under the superintendence of A. S. Fisher. A building was erected in 1850. A charter was granted in 1855, and the name was changed at the same time to Eureka College. Two hundred and thirteen students matriculated during the first session. William M. Brown was president one year. Charles Louis Loss succeeded to the office in 1856. In 1859 George Callender became president. He was followed by B. W. Johnson, who was succeeded by H. W. Everest. The first class graduated in 1860. From the year 1872 to the present time the chief executive officers of the college have been: A. M. Weston, three years; B. J. Radford, two years; H. W. Everest, again, four years; then J. M. Allen, six years. Carl Jo-

hann, who became president in 1888, occupies the position now. In the building up of this institution of learning the name of John Dorst, a consecrated business man, deserves to stand conspicuous. Although himself an uneducated man, his devotion to the cause of higher learning was so great that in one of the financial crises through which the institution has passed, when other friends, gentlemen of financial ability, lost heart, he pledged every dollar of property that he had on earth to save the institution. The buildings are of modern construction, and are adequate in size for the accommodation of six hundred students. For Burgess Memorial Hall, the latest building erected on the college campus, the friends of the institution are indebted to Mrs. O. A. Burgess, widow of O. A. Burgess, one of the early friends of the college. From the beginning the sexes have been admitted to the college on terms of perfect equality. The institution at the present time is in a high degree of prosperity.

Eminence College, Kentucky, is about forty miles from the city of Louisville. Its situation is all that can be desired for an institution of learning, being removed from the evil influences of city life. The college is situated in the midst of an intelligent and moral community. The first session of Eminence College began in September, 1857. In this school also the coeducation of the sexes obtains. W. Giltner has been president from the beginning. The last session is reported as having been one of marked prosperity and success. The institution is self-sustaining.

Oskaloosa College, located at the town of Oskaloosa, in Iowa, is a product of the churches of Christ in that commonwealth. In a convention of Disciples of Christ in 1855 it was resolved to establish a college in Iowa, the location to be decided at a later time. Oskaloosa was selected as the home of the new institution. In 1857 a charter was obtained, and the first session began in the autumn of 1858. Financial reverses and the Civil War, with other unpleasant occurrences, have conspired to make the course of the Oskaloosa College stormy and sometimes perilous, but since 1873 the life of the college has steadily improved. The tone of the institution is intensely earnest, practical, and Christian. John M. Atwater is president. Oskaloosa College, more than any other institution of learning among the Disciples, probably, maintains a close connection with the churches which gave it existence.

Hiram College is located about twenty miles from the city of Cleveland, and is an evolution from the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute, which began in 1850. The aims of the Eclectic Institute were:

- “1. To provide a sound scientific and literary education;
- “2. To temper and sweeten such education with moral and Scriptural knowledge;
- “3. To educate young men for the ministry.

One peculiar tenet of the religious movement in which it originated was impressed upon the Eclectic Institute at its organization. The Disciples believed that the Bible had been in a degree obscured by theological speculations and ecclesiastical systems. Hence, they proposed a revolt from the theology of the schools, and made an overture to men to come face to face with the Scriptures. They believed, also, that to the holy writings belonged a larger place in general culture than had yet been accorded to them. Accordingly, in all their educational institutions they have emphasized the Bible and its relative branches of knowledge. The charter of the Eclectic Institute therefore declared the purpose of the institution to be: “The instruction of youth of both sexes in the various branches of literature and science, especially of moral science, as based on the facts and precepts of the Holy Scriptures.” In 1867 the Western Reserve Eclectic Institute became Hiram College. It was in this institution that James A. Garfield was prepared for graduation at Williams College. Mr. Garfield became principal of the Hiram Eclectic Institute in 1857. His active connection with the school ceased in 1861, after he had secured wide popularity as a teacher, preacher, manager, and lecturer on religion and scientific topics. His name, however, as a sort of adviser, remained on the catalogue for three or four years after 1861. The commencement exercises of 1880 were of unusual interest, owing to the presence of General Garfield, who a few days before had been nominated for President of the United States. It was also the year for the regular meeting of the College Reunion Association. This meeting was held the day after commencement, and was presided over by General Garfield. On the 4th of February, 1881, he made his last visit to Hiram Hill, when he delivered a short but touching address to

the citizens and students in the college chapel. In 1886 the old college building was completely remodeled. Four years later two fine boarding-halls were erected, and these new facilities, together with the vigorous administration of President Zollars, have caused Hiram College to grow greatly in influence and importance. The endowment has been largely increased, the curriculum extended, and the teaching force greatly strengthened; but notwithstanding the changes made in the growth of the institution the original aims and spirit remain as in the beginning. The coeducation of the sexes obtains also in Hiram. The preparation of students for the work of the ministry is, and has been from the first, specially emphasized. During the session of 1892-93 ninety young men were candidates for the gospel ministry. Courses of study in law and medicine have recently been added to the curriculum. The number of students annually is in the neighborhood of five hundred.

Drake University, located at Des Moines, Ia., is one of the youngest and most prosperous of all the institutions of learning founded by the Disciples of Christ. The name was given on account of the deep interest taken in and liberal financial assistance rendered to the founding of the university in 1881 by General F. M. Drake. The first session began in September of that year. The institution in its beginning was veritably a school in the wild woods. The first session was held in buildings hastily erected. In the midst of shavings, plaster, fresh paint, etc., the professors taught and the students studied for nearly two years. These temporary buildings served the purposes of chapel, schoolroom, and boarding-house. The opening of the fall term of 1883 was made memorable by the dedication of the main portion of the magnificent buildings in which Drake University has its home. The prosperity of this institution from the very beginning has been marked. In 1889 B. O. Aylesworth became president of Drake University, and so efficient and satisfactory has been his administration of its affairs that every department is thoroughly organized and in successful operation, while the number of students annually reaches almost one thousand.

Cotner University is located in the vicinity of Lincoln, Neb. In the winter of 1887 an effort was made to build a Baptist college at this place. The people were to donate two hundred acres of land, and the church was expected to erect buildings and organize a

school. Matters, however, moved slowly, and the people began to feel that there was a lack of business energy. At this point the question was raised as to the propriety of the Disciples undertaking to carry forward the enterprise. They agreed to donate three hundred instead of two hundred acres of land. A few men in the city of Lincoln pledged their financial resources to insure the erection of suitable buildings. The institution began work in a private house in the autumn of 1889. The spring term began in the university building. The number of students was 137. The enrollment in 1890-91 reached 212. During the year 1893 nearly 400 students were enrolled. A considerable debt has been incurred, but the university is in possession of a large amount of real estate. There are thirty teachers and lecturers. Cotner announces that no man will ever receive credits in that institution which have not been earned, and no honorary titles will be granted, as a matter of favor to some good contributor who has no scholarship. It is claimed that the best buildings belonging to any institution of learning controlled by the Disciples are owned by Cotner University. The outlook is promising.

Carlton College is located at Bonham, Fannin County, Tex., and was founded in 1867 by Charles Carlton, who is still president. Mr. Carlton is a graduate of Bethany College. For fifteen years males and females were admitted to Carlton College on terms of perfect equality, but on account of the demand for a college for ladies alone the institution is now a female school. The buildings are well located, solidly constructed, and of sufficient capacity to accommodate four hundred students.

The twenty-first session of Add-Ran Christian University, located in the neighborhood of Fort Worth, Tex., began in the autumn of 1893. Add-Ran University is a distinctively Christian institution of learning. The number of students enrolled during the last session was 445. The coeducation of the sexes obtains here also.

The Southern Christian Institute, located at Edwards, Miss., is devoted to the education of colored people, and is under the direction of the General Christian Missionary Convention. J. B. Lehman, Ph.D., is president. The charter was granted by the legislature of Mississippi in 1875, and provided for the management of the institution by a joint-stock company. The minimum amount of

stock was subscribed and the organization effected in 1877, and a plantation of eight hundred acres, known as Mount Beulah, was purchased. Great sacrifices have been made by the men and women who have undertaken to carry forward this work, but the blessing of God has been upon them, so that their labor has not been in vain. The work is being energetically done by the Board of Negro Education and Evangelization, a department of the General Convention.

The Christian Bible College, located at Newcastle, Henry County, Ky., founded in 1884, is also devoted to the education of negroes. T. Augustus Reid is president, and professor of biblical literature and pedagogics.

This partial and imperfect enumeration of institutions of learning founded and controlled by Disciples of Christ is sufficient to show their practical interest in the cause of higher education. There is not space to mention other institutions of the same general character, whose existence and prosperity are a result of this appreciation of the value of learning. By their avowed principles and repeatedly published aims the Disciples must be keenly alive to the cause of education and literature, as well as to the great work of evangelizing the nations.

CHAPTER X.

Missions.

The first church organized with the Bible as the only creed or book of discipline and the name "Christian" as a sufficient designation was at Cane Ridge, Bourbon County, Ky., in the year 1804, under the direction of B. W. Stone. The purpose of this organization was evangelistic.

The Christian Association organized by the Campbells at Washington, Pa., in 1809, had as its avowed purpose the promotion of evangelical Christianity. Each member of the association was required to contribute a specified sum to be used in the support of the gospel ministry. The association at Washington regarded it as a duty to encourage the formation of other associations similar in character and aim. The constitution specified that the society was not a church, but merely an association of voluntary advocates for the reformation of the church. Its sole purpose, according to one of the articles, was to promote simple evangelical Christianity by giving support to such ministers as exhibit a manifest conformity to the original teaching of Christianity in behavior and doctrine, in zeal and diligence, 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. The last article of the constitution declared that the society held itself engaged to afford a competent support to such ministers as the Lord would dispose to assist in promoting a pure evangelical reformation by the simple preaching of the everlasting gospel, and the administration of its ordinances in conformity with the teaching of the New Testament. ("Memoirs of Elder Thomas Campbell," pp. 27-30.) In a word, the Christian Association of Washington, Pa., was a missionary society.

The arbitrary course of the Redstone and Beaver associations of Baptist churches with regard to churches and individuals who could not accept fully all that was embodied in creeds and articles of faith, caused the Campbells and their immediate friends to become members of the Mahoning Association. This association was composed of such churches as had been induced to lay aside all human standards of faith and practice as tests of fellowship, although still wearing the name "Baptist." At the meeting in 1829 it

was resolved: "That the Mahoning Association as an advisory council or an ecclesiastical tribunal should cease to exist." ("Life of Walter Scott," by William Baxter, pp. 216, 217.) This was in accordance with the general feeling, but Alexander Campbell, thinking the course proposed too precipitate, was on the point of rising to oppose the motion when Walter Scott, an able and eloquent assistant of Mr. Campbell, went to him, and placing a hand on each of his shoulders, begged him not to do so. Mr. Campbell yielded, the motion passed unanimously, and it was determined that in place of the association there should be an annual meeting for praise and worship, and to hear reports of the progress of the good work from laborers in the field. Walter Scott was selected, employed, and sent out to do the work of an evangelist by and under the direction of this, in effect, new missionary society.

The dissolution of the Mahoning Association at Austintown, O., in 1829, may be regarded as the formal separation of Disciples from the Baptists. Up to this time the association was a Baptist body and bore the Baptist name. After the dissolution those Baptists who had embraced the new views, together with the new converts made, were called Disciples.

At an early period in Alexander Campbell's life he wrote some caustic criticisms of missionary operations, which produced the impression in the minds of some that he was opposed to the work of organized world-wide evangelization. Such an inference, however, does Mr. Campbell injustice. A careful reading of what he published in the "Christian Baptist" on this subject, in the light of those times and his surroundings, will make apparent the fact that he only called in question the wisdom of the management of some of these associations. It seems also that he had in his mind a scheme for the propagation of Christianity in heathen lands closely akin to what are now called self-supporting missions. He thought that the Christian religion could be most effectively propagated by planting Christian colonies in the midst of heathenism, these colonies to be self-supporting and permanent settlements.

After much discussion the American Christian Missionary Society was organized in October, 1849, in Cincinnati. The call for this meeting was published in Mr. Campbell's paper, "The Millennial Harbinger" for that year. Article II. of the constitution adopted at that meeting declared that "the object of this society shall be to

promote the preaching of the gospel in this and other lands.” (“Christian Missions,” by F. M. Green, p. 114.) The first mission attempted was in the ancient city of Jerusalem, and the missionary was Dr. James T. Barclay. After a few years the effort was discontinued. An effort was also made to establish a work in Liberia. Soon after the arrival of the gentleman who had been selected to preach the gospel—Alexander Cross, a pious and devoted man—he fell a victim in death to the climate. A mission, which produced considerable fruit, was also established on the island of Jamaica in the West Indies. On account, however, of the disturbances occasioned by the Civil War in this country, all effort at work in foreign lands was for a number of years abandoned. The entire energies of the Disciples were devoted to evangelistic and educational work at home.

The foreign Christian Missionary Society was organized in 1875 in the city of Louisville, Ky. The object of this society is “to make disciples of all nations, and teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded.” (“Christian Missions,” by F. M. Green, p. 195.) The receipts, year by year from the first, are as follows:

| | | |
|------|---|------------|
| 1876 | – | \$1,706.00 |
| 1877 | – | 2,174.00 |
| 1878 | – | 8,766.00 |
| 1879 | – | 8,287.00 |
| 1880 | – | 12,144.00 |
| 1881 | – | 13,178.46 |
| 1882 | – | 20,063.94 |
| 1883 | – | 25,504.85 |
| 1884 | – | 26,501.84 |
| 1885 | – | 30,260.10 |
| 1886 | – | 64,556.06 |
| 1887 | – | 47,392.85 |
| 1888 | – | 57,997.19 |
| 1889 | – | 57,289.15 |
| 1890 | – | 63,109.49 |
| 1891 | – | 59,365.76 |
| 1892 | – | 70,320.84 |
| 1893 | – | 60,355.01 |

There are now 124 agents of this society at work in England, India, Japan, China, Turkey, and Scandinavia. Work began in England and Scandinavia in 1876; in Turkey, in 1879; in India, in 1882; in Japan, in 1883; and in China, in 1886.

The work in England was largely supported by Timothy Coop, of Southport, a successful and consecrated English tradesman. It was expected that the churches planted in England would be self-supporting in three or four years. This expectation has not been realized. At the last meeting of the Christian Association 13 churches were represented, only two of which were self-supporting. The aggregate membership is 1750; baptisms last year, 316.

In Scandinavia work is carried on in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Eight evangelists were employed last year. The aggregate number of Disciples is 779; Sunday-school pupils, 620. The number of conversions last year was 191.

In Turkey work is carried on at twelve points. According to the last report, there are 583 Disciples at these stations; Sunday-school pupils, 519; pupils in day-schools, 481. Thirteen persons are engaged in this work.

Twenty-three men and women and 6 native helpers are connected with the work of the Disciples in China. There are 5 stations, 4 out-stations, 9 day-schools, 2 boarding-schools, a hospital, and 2 dispensaries. Groups of Christians are gathered at 5 stations, one of which has formed itself into a self-supporting church. The number of converts is 70. Mankin is the central station. Not less than 10,000 patients are treated annually by the hospital force, and to each of these the gospel is personally presented.

In Japan penitents inquired of the missionaries the way of salvation before the latter understood the language sufficiently well to return intelligible answers. There are 12 stations, 25 out-stations, 23 native helpers, 334 converts, 403 pupils in the day-schools, and 588 in the Sunday-schools. The principal stations are Tokyo, Akita, and Shonai. The number of converts last year was 102.

The day of numerical results in India has not yet come, although about 150 converts have been baptized. Hurda, in the Central Provinces, is the center of work for the Disciples in the Indian Empire. Their principal stations are Bilaspur and Mungeli. Work is carried on at several out-stations. The missionaries preach every

day, conduct day-schools, Sunday-schools, orphanages, manage a Bible and tract depot, and carry on medical and zenana work. Recently a school for training evangelists has been opened.

The origin and progress of the Christian Woman's Board of Missions furnishes one of the brightest pages in the history of mission work among the Disciples of Christ. From the beginning woman has been treated with unusual consideration among the Disciples, and granted a rather remarkable degree of liberty in the departments of education and evangelical work. We have already seen that generally in the Disciples' institutions of learning there is one curriculum for men and women. Naturally, therefore, the time came when the women organized for the purpose of preaching the gospel to those who are in the region of death. The purpose of the Christian Woman's Board of Missions is expressed in Article II. of the constitution in the language following: "Its object shall be to cultivate a missionary spirit, to encourage missionary efforts in our churches, to disseminate missionary intelligence, and to secure systematic contributions for missionary purposes." ("Christian Missions," by F. M. Green, p. 382.) The Christian Woman's Board supports work in the western part of our country, in the South among the negroes, in India and in Japan. They also revived and are carrying forward the work on the island of Jamaica. They purchased ground and erected a house of worship in Ann Arbor, Mich., in 1891. They sustain a theological department in connection with Michigan University, which is remarkably popular and successful.

Their last annual report shows over eighteen hundred auxiliaries and bands. The receipts for the year aggregated \$52,327.93. The receipts for the first year after the organization in 1874 were \$1200, and the grand total for the eighteen years is \$370,000. This society has a small endowment fund of \$20,000.

The Christian Woman's Board of Missions is unique from the fact that the business of the society is managed entirely by women. The executive committee is composed altogether of women. Women select mission fields, employ missionaries, both male and female, and are in every way responsible for the conduct of the business. On the island of Jamaica 7 ministers are employed, caring for 18 stations and 1600 members. There are 10 day-schools and 17 Sunday-schools, with a total attendance of 1788. There are

5 workers at Bilaspur, India, 2 of whom are female physicians, 2 teachers, and 1 zenana worker. The buildings there are a bungalow, schoolhouse, orphanage, and hospital. These were erected under the direct supervision of women. The money for the buildings was raised by the children's missionary bands. Nearly 4000 patients were treated by the two physicians in 1893. A mission among the Chinese is supported at Portland, Ore. The missionary is a native of China. Papers published by the Christian Woman's Board are the "Missionary Tidings," and the "Little Builders at Work."

The General Christian Missionary Convention is the lineal and legal descendant of the American Christian Missionary Society, organized in 1849. The object of this organization is "the spread of the gospel in this and in other lands." ("Christian Missions," by F. M. Green, p. 376.) The actual work of the convention is, however, limited to the United States and Canada. Auxiliary to this are organizations in the States and Territories of the Union. About a million and a half dollars have been collected and expended from the beginning by this society and its auxiliaries. The annual collections and disbursements at the present time aggregate about \$50,000. Missionaries are employed in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Michigan, Minnesota, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Ontario. In connection with the General Convention are the Board of Negro Education and Evangelization and the Board of Church Extension.

There is an increasing interest among the Disciples in city mission work which promises in the near future to greatly augment their influence for good.

The offices of the General Convention and the Foreign Christian Missionary Society are in Cincinnati. Indianapolis is the headquarters of the Christian Woman's Board of Missions. The home of the Board of Negro Evangelization is Massillon, O. The office of the Board of Church Extension is in Kansas City, Mo.

For statistics concerning the number of organizations, church edifices, seating capacity of church buildings, value of church property, and number of communicants, see vol. 1: of "American Church History Series," pp. 125-128.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Dorchester, Daniel, *Christianity in the United States*. New York, Phillips & Hunt, 1888.

McMaster, John Bach, *History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War*. New York, Appleton & Co., vol. 1., 1883; vol. 2., 1885; vol. 3., 1892.

McDonnold, B. W., *History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*. Nashville, Cumberland Presbyterian Publication House, 1888.

Baxter, William, *Life of Elder Walter Scott*. Cincinnati, Chase & Hall, 1874.

Campbell, Alexander, “*The Christian Baptist*” (newspaper, 1823—29, Burnet edition), “*Millennial Harbinger*” (newspaper, 1830-70); *Debate with N. L. Rice*. Cincinnati, E. Morgan & Co., 1844; *Memoirs of Elder Thomas Campbell*. Cincinnati, H. S. Bosworth, 1861.

Crisman, E. B., *Origin and Doctrines of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*. Nashville, Cumberland Presbyterian Publication House, 1875.

Errett, Isaac, *Our Position* (a tract). Cincinnati, Standard Publishing Co., 1885.

Garrison, J. H., *The Old Faith Restated*. St. Louis, Christian Publishing Co., 1891.

Green, F. M., *Christian Missions Among the Disciples of Christ*. St. Louis, John Burns Publishing Co., 1884.

Hayden, A. S., *History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, Ohio*. Cincinnati, Chase & Hall, 1875.

Lamar, J. S., *Memoirs of Isaac Erret*. Cincinnati, Standard Publishing Co., 1894, 2 vols.

Longan, G. W., *The Origin of the Disciples of Christ*. St. Louis, Christian Publishing Co., 1889.

Richardson, Robert, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1868-70, 2 vols.; new edition, Cincinnati, Standard Publishing Co., 1888.

Rogers, John, *Biography of Barton Warren Stone*. Cincinnati, J. A. and U. J. James, 1847.

Williams, John Augustus, *Life of John Smith*. Cincinnati, R.
W. Carroll & Co., 1870.

