

2020

Footnotes to Disciples History

Rice Haggard

John M. Imbler

J. T. M'Vay

William A. Gerrard

Alexander Campbell

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/acu_library_books



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Haggard, Rice; Imbler, John M.; M'Vay, J. T.; Gerrard, William A.; Campbell, Alexander; Wrather, Eva Jean; and Gresham, Perry E., "Footnotes to Disciples History" (2020). *ACU Brown Library Monograph Series*. . https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/acu_library_books/14

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ACU Brown Library Monograph Series by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

Authors

Rice Haggard, John M. Imbler, J. T. M'Vay, William A. Gerrard, Alexander Campbell, Eva Jean Wrathner, and Perry E. Gresham

*Footnotes to Disciples
History Series*



DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

**AN ADDRESS
TO THE DIFFERENT RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES
ON THE SACRED IMPORT OF THE
CHRISTIAN NAME**

Rice Haggard

**FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY
NUMBER FOUR**

**AN
ADDRESS
TO THE
DIFFERENT RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES,
ON THE
SACRED IMPORT
OF THE
CHRISTIAN NAME**

by

Rice Haggard

With a Preface by John W. Neth, Jr.

**FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY
Number Four**

**THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Nashville, Tennessee
1954**

**LIBRARY
ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
ABILENE, TEXAS**

Copyright 1954
by
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society

INTRODUCTION

This is the fourth in a series of pamphlet publications issued by The Disciples of Christ Historical Society under the title, *Footnotes to Disciple History*. Individual numbers in the series deal with specialized subjects in the field of Disciple history. Occasionally original documents such as this will be reprinted.

The term Disciple history is used in its broadest sense as being representative of all the groups whose beginnings date back to the restoration and reform movements inaugurated by James O'Kelly, Elias Smith, Abner Jones, Barton W. Stone, Alexander and Thomas Campbell, and others. These groups are variously known today as Christian Churches, Churches of Christ, and Disciples of Christ.

The opinions expressed and the interpretations made in each *Footnote* are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Society.

An Address to the Different Religious Societies on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name by Rice Haggard was a "lost" pamphlet for generations of Disciples. Not until 1953 was the content of a series in *The Herald of Gospel Liberty* fully authenticated as being a reprint of the long-looked-for Haggard pamphlet.

Then, later in 1953, a copy of the original pamphlet was secured by exchange from The Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio. *Footnote* number four is a reprinting in modern type of that pamphlet. The spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of the original pamphlet have been exactly reproduced.

John W. Neth, Jr., the discoverer of the Haggard reprint in *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, has written a preface in which he tells the story of his efforts to authenticate his find, and at the same time gives new information about Rice Haggard.

CLAUDE E. SPENCER, Curator
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
February 3, 1954

About the Author of the Preface

John W. Neth, Jr., is librarian and professor at Milligan College, Tennessee, and minister of the Hopwood Memorial Church located adjacent to the Milligan College campus.

Mr. Neth was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and was reared in western Pennsylvania. He spent seven and a half years in the U. S. Army, serving in the Philippine Islands prior to World War II and at the chapel of the Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, Virginia. During the war he was in the European theater and spent two years in Northern Ireland, England and Scotland, and one year in France, Belgium and Holland.

He holds the following degrees: B.S., Bethany College, 1938; M.A. and B.D., Butler University School of Religion, 1950 and 1951; and M.A. (major in Library Science), George Peabody College for Teachers, 1953. His M.A. thesis is "An Investigation and Analysis of the Doctrine of Walter Scott" and his B.D. thesis is "An Introduction to George Forrester."

Pastorates held by Mr. Neth have been: Hazelwood, Cyntheanne, Macedonia, Chesterfield and Madison, Indiana; and Nortonville and Oakland, Kentucky.

He is a member of the American Church History Society, the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, and the Tennessee Library Association.

PREFACE

by

John W. Neth, Jr.

The year 1954 will witness the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the famous decision at Cane Ridge, Bourbon County, Kentucky, by a few resolute, God-fearing men. They agreed to renounce all party divisions and assume the name "Christian" as descriptive of their relationship to Jesus Christ. Among their number were some whose names are not well remembered, such as Dunlavy, Thompson, Purviance, Marshall, and McNemar. But the name of Barton Warren Stone is well remembered and takes its place with those of Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott.

But there was another man present at this meeting which proved so momentous in the Restoration movement. His name is nearly unknown and at best is remembered only by the person interested in the details of the history of the early Restoration Movement in America. Yet he was at Cane Ridge and influenced the actions of that great day. Rice Haggard might have been passed by completely and forgotten if Barton Stone in his autobiography had not mentioned his name and given an indication of the part he played. The discoveries of which we write in this preface lead us to the conclusion that Haggard was one of the *chief* men sitting at Cane Ridge in that early summer of 1804. Since his name does not appear as the author of the pamphlet discovered, its first identification comes through the words of Stone when he writes: "With the man-made creeds we threw it overboard and took the name, *Christian*—the name given to the disciples by divine appointment first at Antioch. We published a pamphlet on this name written by Elder Rice Haggard, who had lately united with us."¹ After these many years in which every restoration historian has longed to find this pamphlet, it has been located. Because it was published anonymously the task of discovering it was doubly hard. There is another factor which clouded the issue. The pamphlet has been spoken of by nearly every historian of note under the title or subtitle of "The union of all the followers of Christ in one Church." With this name given and the pamphlet published without author's name, it is small wonder that in a few years it was lost and referred to only by inference. Now that it has been found, it ranks with the *Last Will and Testament* published in the same year, and with the *Declaration and Address* published about five years later, as a basic statement of the Restoration movement.

The publication of which we write is entitled: *An Address to the Different Religious Societies, on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name*, published anonymously in Lexington, Kentucky, in 1804 by Joseph Charless. It does not bear the name of Rice Haggard, but on the verso of the title page we read: "Some may, perhaps, be anxious

¹Rogers, John. *The Biography of Eld. Barton Warren Stone, Written by Himself: With Additions and Reflections.* (Cincinnati: Published for the Author by J. A. & U. P. James, 1847), p. 50.

to know who the author of the following pages is, his name, and to what denomination he belongs. Let it suffice to say, that he considers himself connected with no party, nor wishes to be known by the name of any—he feels himself united to that *one body* of which *Christ is the head*, and all his people fellow members.” The pamphlet consists of 31 pages and has a heading at the beginning of the contents, “Acts XI. 26. *The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.*”

In addition to the statement of Stone mentioned above, which is only verification of the fact that Rice Haggard wrote a work on the name Christian, we have this positive identification. On page 198 of Davidson’s *History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky*, published in 1847, we read these words concerning the group of men who met at Cane Ridge:

Filled with the pleasing dream of an approaching universal Kingdom, which was to embrace the whole earth, they proposed to establish a grand communion, which should agree to unite upon the simplest fundamental principles according to a plan drawn up by Rice Haggard, such as worshiping one God, acknowledging Jesus Christ as the Saviour, taking the Bible for the sole confession of faith, and organizing on the New Testament model. To this union of all the disciples of Christ, they gave the name of “The Christian Church” and would recognize no sectarian appellation. Their views were communicated to the world in the promised, “Observations on Church Government” and An Address to the Different Religious Societies on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name.

This is further verified by the internal evidence found on pages 21 and 22 of the subject pamphlet where a plan is given for the reuniting of the shattered parts of Christ in 9 points, of which the first four are abbreviated as: (1) Then, we are to worship one God; (2) Acknowledge one Savior, Jesus Christ; (3) Have one confession of faith, and let that be the Bible; (4) Let us have one form of discipline and government and let this be the New Testament. This would seem to indicate that the Haggard Plan was prior to the *Last Will and Testament*, or the basis on which it was written.

Putting together the statement of Barton Stone, the place and date of publication, and the complete agreement of the evidence from Davidson’s *History*, and the work itself, there can be final agreement that we have at last on the eve of the 150th anniversary of Cane Ridge, found the document so much hunted and whose influence is yet to be determined.

The question asked me most frequently is, “How did you find this pamphlet?” It is not an easy nor a lucrative thing to search for lost documents unless perhaps they be treasure maps. Here is the story behind the finding of the Haggard pamphlet:

In the summer of 1950 while finishing my thesis for the Master of Arts degree at Butler University School of Religion, a decision was made concerning the subject of my Bachelor of Divinity thesis which was to be a study of the life of George Forrester, about whom nearly nothing was known up to that time. Fortunately, on a visit to Pitts-

burgh, Pennsylvania, where Forrester immersed Scott, I was able to unearth the naturalization papers of George Forrester in the Allegheny County Court House. Information in these sent me in the direction of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, which was Forrester's port of entry into the United States late in 1810. The journey proved profitable. In newspaper files we found the desired information about Forrester. One of the valuable friends we made was Dorothy Vaughan, the librarian of the Portsmouth Public Library, who gave us the name and address of an elderly book dealer, Robert W. Lull, of Newburyport, Massachusetts. We drove to that city and found him to be a veritable story-book character. He allowed us to prowl among his great stock of old books in one of his storerooms. Though we found nothing, he agreed that if any books "came to the top," he would send them to us.

Several months later I received a package of about 45 numbers of the first and second year of the *Herald of Gospel Liberty* published in 1808 and 1809, and edited by Elias Smith. It is considered the first religious newspaper in the world. The charge was \$3.00. I gladly sent the money—then began a study of the papers in my spare time. I was still hard at work on the Forrester thesis. Sometime in 1951 during my reading I was suddenly smitten with the thought that one of the articles might possibly be a reprint of the lost Haggard pamphlet. Dr. Dean E. Walker, former head of the Department of Church History at Butler School of Religion (now President of Milligan College) and my first teacher of the Restoration Movement, had instilled into the minds of his students that this pamphlet would be one of the greatest "finds" of our historical materials. I recall that on a day back in 1946, I turned to my nearest classmate and said, "I'm going to find that pamphlet."

So much was this on my mind during the years of my ministry at the First Christian Church, Madison, Indiana, that while studying the *Herald of Gospel Liberty*, the very thought that this article might be the Haggard document fired my zeal to prove it. Persons to whom I showed the article would smile and say, "This may be the Haggard document, but you will have to do some real verification before it can be accepted as such." For two years I searched by means of letters to libraries and historians, through history books, and at last in the late summer of 1953 verification was made in Davidson's History, as stated above.

From the beginning of my researches, the curator of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Claude E. Spencer, was a sympathetic party—doing his best to assist with available materials. In the spring of 1953 after the Society was settled in Nashville and I was enrolled in the Library School of Peabody College for Teachers, we made a more intensive effort to verify the author of the subject pamphlet and locate an original copy. The Curator was responsible for borrowing several books in addition to those available in the Society library for my use in research. It was in one of these books, procured at my request, that final verification of the Haggard pamphlet was made. All my research information was made available to the Society, thus enabling the Curator to locate an original copy of this valuable work.

This copy is now on file in the Society's library. Early verification of this reprint was made possible largely through discussion with and the cooperation of the Historical Society and its staff.

Rice Haggard was born about the year 1769 in Virginia. At the age of 22, he was ordained by Bishop Francis Asbury as a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1793 he is listed as having withdrawn from this ministry. Jesse Lee, a fellow-preacher of both O'Kelly and Haggard, writing his short history of Methodism in 1810, says that Rice Haggard was the only travelling preacher that went off with O'Kelly and continued to travel and preach. This means that Rice Haggard and James O'Kelly stood alone as the two who rebelled against the organization of the newly created Methodist Church. On August 4, 1794, almost a year after this group had assumed the name of Republican Methodists, Rice Haggard stood in the conference meeting at Old Lebanon, Surry County, Virginia, with a copy of the New Testament in his hand and said, "Brethren, this is a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and by it we are told that the disciples were called Christians, and I move that henceforth and forever the followers of Christ be known as Christians simply."² This was unanimously adopted by the group present. It was here that the first "Christian Church" in America was restored and this done at the hand of Rice Haggard.

Just ten years later, while making another tour of Kentucky, Rice Haggard sat again in a meeting of men who were struggling to find the basis for true worship of God through Jesus Christ. Again he stood boldly for his return to first principles, and in the document of which we write he said:

Let it first be firmly believed, that there are real and great evils, and I am persuaded every honest man will be willing to listen to any plan that promises their removal. We have departed in some measure (I believe greatly) from primitive christianity; if we can find by what means we shall get back, doubtless it will remedy the evils, which have arisen from our departure. I will mention a simple method, which I am willing to try till some abler hand suggest a better. And it is the following. "Let all christians worship one God—Acknowledge one Saviour—Have one Confession of faith—One form of government—Be members one of another—Members of one church—Profess one religion—Let none be received but living members"—And finally, "let none be expelled but for a breach of the divine law."

Here is a plan, and a simple one too, which is designed as "a healer of the breach, a restorer of paths to dwell in," to bring back those, who have gone astray; those, who by fraud, force, or otherwise, have been led off from the original christian plan.³

²MacClenny, W. E. *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly* (Raleigh, N. C.: Edwards & Broughton Printing Co., 1910), p. 116.

³Haggard, Rice. *An Address to the Different Religious Societies on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name* (Lexington, Ky.: Joseph Charless, 1804), p. 22.

Barton W. Stone and those with him accepted this plan even as James O'Kelly and his associates had done ten years before. And all this took place many years before the *Declaration and Address* was penned by a Presbyterian minister named Thomas Campbell, who had but two years before that writing left Ireland for America.

After this great meeting at Cane Ridge in 1804, Rice Haggard returned to his home near Norfolk, Virginia. It was here that he lived when the reprint of his pamphlet, which we found, appeared in the newspaper of Elias Smith in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. He was, in fact, "one of our Brethren in Virginia."

Rice Haggard died while on a tour in Champaign County, Ohio, in 1819. His will was written on the 31st day of May and proven after his death in the August term of court, beginning August 13, 1819. Neither the exact date of death, nor the place of burial have been accurately determined.

It is evident from Stone's own admission that Haggard was regarded as one of the leaders at this time. It is also evident that they accepted the plan of Haggard, verified by Davidson, as their platform for this new "Christian Church." The role played by Rice Haggard in this Restoration movement must be re-evaluated, and it is possible that he will, as some historians already intimate, rate in a class with the so-called four great men of this movement: Stone, the Campbells (father and son), and Walter Scott.

E. E. Snoddy makes this statement relative to Barton W. Stone:

To Stone belongs priority of time, priority in American experience, priority in the ideal of unity, priority in evangelism, priority in the independency of his movement . . . and . . . priority in sacrificial devotion to his cause.⁴

We feel that this will bear restudy and further consideration since Rice Haggard definitely has precedence from point of time, statement of principles, and establishment of Christian churches on the New Testament plan.

⁴Ware, Charles Crossfield. *Barton Warren Stone, Pathfinder of Christian Union* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1932), p. xi.

AN
A D D R E S S
TO THE
Different Religious Societies,
ON THE
SACRED IMPORT
OF THE
Christian Name.

BEHOLD HOW GOOD, AND HOW PLEASANT IT IS, FOR BRE-
THREN TO DWELL TOGETHER IN UNITY.
DAVID.

LEXINGTON:
PRINTED BY JOSEPH CHARLES,

1804.

Some may, perhaps, be anxious to know who the author of the following pages is, his name, and to what denomination he belongs. Let it suffice to say, that he considers himself connected with no party, nor wishes to be known by the name of any—he feels himself united to that *one body* of which *Christ is the head*, and all his people fellow members.

ACTS XI. 26.

The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.

A disciple is a scholar, or learner; such were the followers of Christ—students under him their Lord, and Master. During the times of his ministry on earth, he taught them the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven; and though he taught them diligently, yet they remained only learners, until the Holy Ghost came, took of his, showed it unto them, and anointed them. John 16. 14. 1 John 2. 20. They were then enabled to comprehend the sum of that holy science now contained in the new Testament. This being the case, it was proper they should no longer be called *disciples*, but *Christians*; because the latter name was best expressive of their character, and because Christ was, from that place, about to spread his kingdom, and collect out of different nations subjects of his grace and government. It was therefore necessary, that those peculiar people should have a name incontestably proper, significant, cementing, common, and agreeable to all; that those of different name, and education, as Jew and Gentile, collected to form one holy nation, might not be *barbarians* to each other, but united as one family.

Hence they were called Christians; and the original (chreematizoo, according to the best critics, see Schrevelius, Dod. Guyse, &c.) strongly intimates, that they were called so by *divine appointment*. For it generally signifies an *oracular nomination*, or *declaration from the mouth of the Lord*, as used in other parts of the New Testament. See Matt. 2. 22. . . . *notwithstanding, being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee.* Luke 2. 26. *And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ.* Acts 10. 22. . . . *Cornelius the centurion, a just man, and one that feareth God, and of good report among all the nation of the Jews, was warned from God by an holy angel to send for thee into his house to hear words of thee.* Heb. 8. 5. *as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle, &c.* Chap. 11.7. *By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, &c. and 12.25. For if they escaped not, who refused him that spake on earth, &c.* From the foregoing passages therefore it is highly probable, nay to me it appears manifest, the simple meaning of the text is, *that the disciples were, by divine appointment, first called Christians in Antioch.*

In this view the promise of Jehovah is fulfilled to his church; Isai. 62. 2. *thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name.* 65. 15. *for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name.* 56. 5. *I will give them an everlasting name which shall not be cut off.* Acts. 15. 7. *That the residue of men might seek after the Lord; and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.*

Though the name *christian*, is now nearly eighteen hundred years old, & almost lost in party names, and distinctions, yet it may be worth while to consider farther its original import, as a happy mean to recover not only the name, but also the thing.

This *name* should stand as a distinction between the followers of Christ and the world, out of which he has chosen them. It may properly be considered a patronymick name, a badge of relation to Christ, as his servants, his bride, &c. and as intimating their *unction* by the Holy Ghost: for as Christ was anointed to prepare him for his work, so, for the same purpose are his followers.

It is a *catholic name*, intended to bury all party denominations. The name *Jew* was odious to the Gentiles, and *Gentiles*, to the Jews. But the name *christian* swallows up all other names in one common and agreeable appellation. He who *broke down the middle wall of partition*, has taken away partition names, and united all his followers in his own name, as one common denomination. And it is but a due honor to the Lord Jesus Christ, the founder of Christianity, that they who profess his religion, should wear his name. Those, therefore, who take their denomination from his subordinate ministers, pay an extravagant, and almost an idolatrous compliment to them.

The Roman catholics, having corrupted and lost the thing, acted consistently enough in laying aside the *name*. But what excuse should we plead for protestants, who profess to act upon the original plan; and yet are divided, each pointing a different way, saying *lo, here is Christ*; or, *lo, he is there*? In these days it is not enough to be christians, but we must be something more. . . . rigned bigots to some party, and the whimsies entertained by that party.

I believe some things, which great and good men have believed and taught; but I believe them not on their authority, but solely on the authority of Jesus Christ. It would, therefore be iniquity in me to rob him, in order to compliment them.

The subject may be reduced to two general propositions.

I. The requisites to constitute a Christian. And

II. Why the followers of Christ should be called Christians, and nothing else.

I. The requisites to constitute a Christian.

A *Christian*, in a good degree, imitates the character of Jesus Christ, who was *holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners; in whose mouth there was no guile*. Therefore,

Reformation is strictly necessary, seeing the lives and characters of the unconverted do not, even remotely resemble the spotless character of Jesus Christ.

Faith is equally, or rather superlatively necessary: for without this *it is impossible to please God, or come to him*. Heb. 11. 6. By faith, mountains may be removed, and virtue drawn from the fountain of life. By it sinners may lay hold on eternal life, and trust there all upon the truth of God's promise.

Repentance is also necessary, and therefore strictly enjoined from Heaven, in the most positive manner. Matt. 3. 2. *Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*. Luke 13. 3. *except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish*. Acts 3. 19. *Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, &c.*

Adoption is also necessary to constitute a christian: for by nature we are strangers, and *foreigners, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*. But through Christ we are adopted into the family of God, brought into the state, spirit, and privilege of his sons. *For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.* Rom. 8. 15. Gal. 4. 5. Eph. 1. 5, 13.

Many more arguments might be deduced to substantiate these points; but as the principal subjects of investigation lie yet before us, we come to consider,

II. Why the followers of Christ, should be called christians, and nothing else.

1. Because the name is significant, the interpretation being *anointed ones*: for the word *Christ* signifies *anointed*. Is. 61. 1. *The Lord hath anointed me, &c.* Psal. 105. 15. *Touch not mine anointed, that is, mine anointed people.*

2. Because the scriptures favor that as the name most proper for the church. It was given by divine authority, as has been already shown; and who will dispute the reason, and propriety of it? Paul almost persuaded Agrippa, as himself acknowledged, to become a christian. Acts 26. 28. *Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a christian.* Paul was desirous, not only that the King should become a christian, but all who heard him; *would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds, v. 29.* Peter calls the followers of Jesus by the same name. 1 Pet. 4. 16. This appears to be the name alluded to in Eph. 3. 15. the name by *which the whole family in Heaven, and earth is named.*

3. The Church of Christ is *one body*, and one name is enough for the same body. He that changes his name has generally a design in it. Paul was pointedly opposed to the appellation of any other name to the church. See his first Epistle to the church at Corinth, chapter first and third. The Corinthians were not satisfied to be called *christians*, and nothing else; but some wished to be called Paulites, after Paul; some Apollosites, after Apollos; and some Cephasites, after Cephas. As in these days some are vain enough to profess themselves Calvinists, after Calvin; Lutherans, after Luther—Arminians, after Arminius &c.* This is improper, unless their religion, be human, not divine—springing from men, not from God. Had Paul encouraged such a spirit among the Corinthians, and others where he preached, there might soon have been as many parties among them as there were ministers; and he being the greatest, might have triumphed over the rest; as many are now attempting to do. But his noble soul, abhorring the idea, endeavored to nip the poisonous weed in the bud, by telling them they were *carnal*; and urging these pungent questions, *Is Christ*

*We hear, indeed some of the controversial writers apologize for the use they make of these names, that it is only to prevent circumlocution. But it is easy to see, that they are often used as terms of reproach. Thus to the Arminians, the name Calvinists' and to the Calvinists, the name Arminian, is a name of reproach. And to the sticklers for partyism, these terms, while they exist, will be esteemed a sufficient proof of error.

divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptised in the name of Paul? Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed?

4. Because unscriptural names, are spurious things, being destitute of divine authority; and not only so, but they are *divergent*, having a tendency to disunite the body of Christ, scatter its sacred members, and cause them to *bite, devour, and be consumed one of another.*

5. Because Christ and his church are often in scripture designated under the endearing relation of husband and wife. And there is a real propriety in a woman being called by the name of her husband, seeing they are *no more two, but one flesh.* Gen. 2. 24. Mark 10. 9, &c. The Lord says to the church *I am married unto thee.* Jerem. 3. 14. He complains of her as a treacherous wife. v. 20. *Then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband; for then it was better with me than now.* Hos. 2. 7. *And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shall call me Ishi, that is, my husband.* v. 16. *And I will betroth thee unto me forever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness.* v. 19. *I will betroth thee unto me in faithfulness.* v. 20. *ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, to him who is raised from the dead,* &c. Rom. 7. 4. *I have espoused you to one husband.* 2 Cor. 11. 2. See also Psal. 60. 5. Cant. 4. 12. Eph. 1. 23. and 5. 23. Rev. 21. 9, &c. and 22. 17. would it not be a matter of jealousy for a woman to refuse to be called by the name of her husband, or wish to be known by another name, especially if that person whose name she preferred should be a base character. What would any man think of his wife, if, in word, she acknowledged her lawful marriage to him, but would be called by the name of some of his male domestics? Or she would carry the name of the domestic in her *forehead*, that is, *publicly*, by which she might be known; and the name of her husband in her *hand*, that is, *privately*, would he not suppose she was insane? or conclude she loved his servant better than himself? He would undoubtedly consider himself robbed of his due honor, as her head and husband. Now God says he is a *jealous God*, and his glory will he not give to another. Exod. 20. 5. Isai. 48. 11. Zech. 8. 2. Let professors of religion, who choose to be called by so many names, which the mouth of the Lord hath not named; and who glory in their names, make the application; it is easy, and natural; the similitude answereth as face to face in a glass.

6. The church of Christ is built of lively stones, a spiritual house. 1 Pet. 2. 4,5. Knowing that a house divided against itself cannot stand, and to cut off all excuse for division, he broke down the partition wall, and *abolished in his flesh the enmity, to make in himself of twain* (Jews and Gentiles) *one new man, a holy and united church.* The Lord has justly made a difference between the righteous, and the wicked. Exod. 11. 7. Mal. 3. 18. but between the righteous we are more than three times told there is no difference. Acts. 10. 34. 35, *of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, &c. and 15. 8, 9. Rom. 3. 22. and 10. 12. These things I have in a figure trans-*

ferred to myself and Apollos, for your sakes; that ye might learn in us, not to think of man above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another. For who maketh thee to differ from another? 1 Cor. 4. 6, 7. In chap. 11. 3. he lets them know, that the head of every man is Christ, as the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. In chap. 12. 12. he would have us remember, that though there be different gifts it is for the perfecting of the same body. For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, v. 13. and have been all made to drink into one spirit, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free. To the Gallatians he says, there is neither Jew, nor Greek, there is neither bond, nor free there is neither male, nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. Chap. 3. 28. See also Eph. 2. 18—22, and 4. 1—6. Col. 3.11.—15. Just before our Lord left the world, he fervently prayed to the Father, that they, the church, might be one, even as we are one. John, 17: 11, 21, 22, 23. He plainly saw, that nothing short of the unity of his people, would stop the mouths of gainsayers, and crush infidelity. He knew it would be in vain to persuade, and impossible to prevail on the world to believe, that he was sent of the Father, while his followers were falling out by the way.

Having sufficiently shown, that the name *christian*, is the ancient and proper name for the church, the question will naturally arise, whence came other names? I answer. They had lost the spirit of the christian religion, and departed from the simplicity of the gospel.

At first they sought the honor of the Redeemer, and the advancement of his kingdom; but after they descended from these noble ends, *self* took the lead, and directed them to make honor, and empire, power and profit, their chief objects. The church of Rome, foremost in pride, avarice, and ambition, made the first struggle; and to accomplish her end gave herself names unknown before; such as *the Mother church, the holy Roman Catholic church, &c.* Here the christian name was lost. In process of time, other enormities arose, and grew to an amazing size, which more or less infected all her members. New rites and ceremonies were almost continually introduced, until they became too intolerable for a pious mind to bear. At length some, who could no longer support under the galling yoke of her superstitious deviations from the original plan, and her unscriptural invasions of their religious rights, entered their *protest* against her capital errors, and withdrew from her jurisdiction. Their first object was *reformation*, which, with much labor, and through many sufferings, they effected in a good degree, and in many respects.

But as they were not themselves entirely cured of the old infection, they propagated, in some measure, the same disorder in the doctrines they taught, and the government under which they placed the *reformed*. This disorder, like noxious vapors, soon infected the atmosphere of the church; or as noxious weeds, although not planted in the same soil, soon grew up and infected the ground.

It is remarkable from the history of those times, that the reformers themselves soon began to act in the same manner the church had done from which they separated; and to practice the same things against which they had protested in others.

The church of Rome had introduced several things as articles of faith, and rules of government beside those contained in the word of God; against these the reformers protested as *human*; alleging, that the *Holy Scriptures contained all things necessary for Salvation, and were the only sure Rule of faith and conduct*: and upon this ground they began to carry on the reformation.

But when they began to wax great, to be well known in the world, and to receive honor of men, they began to contend for the mastery, and to strive who should be the greatest. Here pride, passion, &c. so hateful in the followers of Jesus, soon found incentives. One could not obtain exclusive honor, but at the expense of another. Hence each began to explode the opinions of others, in order to extol his own; and that too in non essentials, in things merely circumstantial. For these were the trifles, about which only they could contend; because their religion being substantially, the same, they had no wherewithal to begin. But they did not end here. For, astonishing to relate with respect to these non essentials, those worthy reformers parted. And the difference of opinion being then agitated, as it still is to this day, the consequence was that the breach was increased. Each had his advocates, and followers; and it became *like priest, like people*; the people caught the spirit of their respective leaders. Each party liked the other so little, they were not content to be known by the same name. Hence it came to pass, that each espoused the name, by which they chose to be distinguished from the rest.

Thus arose the denomination Calvinist, Lutheran, Arminian &c. and in this way we may account for the many parties, and party names, which have arisen and swallowed up the church of Christ to the present day. Similar causes will produce similar effects.

After the example of the old church, from which they had departed, they began to introduce human Laws, Rules, Rites, Ceremonies, Creeds, Confessions, Standards, Helps, Forms of Government, Discipline, &c. &c. to make laws to bind both soul, and body, and cast them to the tormentors, until they should repent, and submit to their authority.

The native consequences of these things, were what might be expected. Like confining fire and powder in a bombshell, the consequence is a violent explosion. These ingredients burst off the reformers and the reformed from the church of Rome; then burst them asunder from each other. And it would take a very accurate historian to tell into how many pieces this combustible matter has rent the body of Christ. One thing I know, that wherever non essentials are made terms of communion, it will never fail to have a tendency to disunite and scatter the church of Christ. It is certainly making the door of the church narrower than the gate of Heaven, and casting away those whom Jesus has received.

It is indeed not a little surprising, that things, which will be granted not essential to the salvation of the soul, should so long have been made terms of communion; so that while it will be granted a man continues essentially *in the faith*, and his moral, and religious character unexceptionable, yet he cannot be admitted into the church; or if

he is in it, he may be excommunicated, (that is delivered over to satan) as though the God of Heaven had rejected him.

It is also matter of astonishment, that a person, whose experience of grace they receive as valid, and whose life is confessedly devout and pious, they will refuse to admit to the privileges of the Lord's house, and drive him from his table, as they would even a dog, or a wretch unworthy of a crumb!

And what excuse will be plead for such conduct? He has not complied with all the punctilious of our party. But there is an enquiry far more important, and that is, Is he one of Christs flock? Let truth, and candor now answer. Why he tells us indeed, (and we cannot deny it) a beautiful story about the great deep of his heart being broken up—his sensibly feeling the sinfulness of sin—his sore distress on account of it—his seeking to the Lord Jesus, and being healed—one thing he affirms, that whereas he was blind he now seeth—that he has chosen God for his portion, that he loves his ways, his people, and his laws—that sin has ever since appeared to him exceeding sinful, &c. As to his moral conduct we have no objection against it. And if he could only see with us, as to church order, and some other things of a doctrinal nature, we would rejoice to give him the right hand of fellowship, and see him at our table, enjoying all the privileges of the Lord's house with us. For as to practical, and experimental religion we are satisfied with him; in a word we believe he is a christian, Poor man! we pity him: may the Lord give him to see right!

How will such shepherds answer him who said unto them *Feed my lambs?* John 21. 16—when he calls them to give an account of the stewardship committed to their trust Luke 16. 2. 1. Pet. 4. 5.—when he demands of them, where are such and such whom I sent hungry to you to be fed? You have lorded it over their consciences, and driven them from my board—you would not allow them one crumb of my bread, nor one drop of my wine.

Methinks I hear them say, "Lord I hoped they would become *orthodox*"; that is, change their sentiments respecting external things, "come over to our side, and then I would have fed them."

Am I mistaken: or do I really hear the Judge reply, "Were you wiser, or better than I? Did I not tell you, there were *other sheep, which were not of this fold, them I would bring; and there should be one fold, and one shepherd?*" John 10. 16. "Did I not also tell you, *I was no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feared me, and wrought righteousness was accepted with me?*" Acts 10. 34. 35. See also 2. Chron. 19. 7. Rom. 2. 11. Eph. 6. 9. Col. 3. 25. 1. Pet. 1. 17. "why then have ye beaten my people to pieces?" Isai. 3. 15. I sent you not to divide my flock, to sever, and judge them" Matt. 7. 1. Rom. 14. 4. 10. James 4. 12. but to feed them: What I require of my stewards is, that they be faithful. Luke 12. 42. 1. Cor. 4. 1. 2. Tit. 1. 7. that they take care of all that is mine. Heb. 13. 17. Will any party attachment avail before the Judge. Will any frivolous arguments be heard? Can wilful ignorance stand fourth and plead their excuse? If it cannot, *it had been better for them that a millstone had*

been hanged about their necks, and that they had been drowned in the depth of the Sea. Matt. 18. 6.

Take a fair view of partyism, and you will find the following things.

1. It has a tendency to immortalise the name of him, who first brought it in to being; and to give the minds of its members an unhappy bias, or prepossession in favor of one against another: and thus they become bigots—for they are led to conclude, that although others may be partly right, they themselves are altogether so. This tends natively to prompt the pride of the human heart, and to verify that saying of the hypocritical Jews, who were more afraid of ceremonial than of moral uncleanness, *stand by thyself, and come not near me; for I am holier than thou.* Habits are soon formed, which lead them to have exalted ideas of themselves, and consequently contemptible ones of others, who differ from them. They soon begin to boast of their party, to tell wherein they excel their neighbors. The opposite party is exercised in the same way. Hence arise disputes, which interest all the passions of the human mind, and hurry them oftentimes into the most unwarrantable extremes. And, like Milton's war with the devils, it is *finite against finite*, policy against policy, orator against orator, argument against argument, passion against passion, *gendering* strife—the contest is never ended; but the war waxes hotter, and hotter; and each party is zealous to enlist soldiers into their cause, and to compass sea and land to make one prosylite. But should *one* gain the ascendancy over the *other*, what is the result? Pride avarice, ambition, &c. being the moving springs in the contest; honor, greatness and addition are the reward.

2. When the followers of Christ are divided into different parties, and choose to be called by different names, a great deal of the preachers time and studies is spent in inventing and vending arguments to draw persons over to their respective parties. Hence the holy scriptures must be bent and twisted in support of them: to which purpose those divine materials will never submit. For who does not know, that if the Scriptures are consistent, they never can support so many parties, and those too so widely different? Nay, so far are they from supporting *any* that they forbid *all*, and sap the very foundation of them, as has been already shown.

3. Different parties have established different forms of government, and discipline in their different churches, to which members of other societies have either no access, or before which they are not willing to appear. Hence it comes to pass, that acts of immorality, to the great dishonor of religion, and promotion of infidelity, much oftener escape the just censures of the church than they would do, if all were of one name, and felt themselves bound by the same common bond of unity. Thus, for instance, if I, being a member of one denomination, know a person, who is a member of another, guilty of drunkenness, lying, profane swearing, or any crime whatsoever, I have neither part, nor lot in his party; he may, therefore, continue the practice, and remain a member, till the day of his death; unless some of his own church overtake him in the fault. *This is a lamentation, and*

shall be for a lamentation. For I believe it is a grievance for which there never will be found sufficient redress, while different parties exist.

4. While different parties exist, there is nothing more certain than that each will endeavour to support that one to which he belongs, in consequence of which he will endeavor to weaken the rest; to prevent their influence; and that is in effect, as far as he can, forbidding them to do good. We have this exemplified in one of Christ's disciples, Mark 9. 38. *Master we saw one casting out devils—a glorious work indeed! and surely all men ought to be encouraged, who are engaged in it—casting them out too in thy name—and that is the only name under heaven in which it could be done—and he followeth not with us—and what of that? we forbade him—for what?—because he followeth not with us—a poor pitiful reason indeed! But Jesus said, forbid him not; for there is no man that shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me.* Verse 39. Glory, to his name for this rebuke! But if he was now on the earth, he would not only have one to rebuke, but the parties *altogether.*

5. Partyism is calculated to fill the mouths of gainsayers with arguments against us. For we preach, that the religion we recommend to the world is a religion of love; is a spirit of amity and concord—that it is *pure, peaceable, and easy to be intreated*—it is that spirit of charity which *suffereth long, and is kind—envieth not, vaunteth not itself—is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly—seeketh not her own—is not easily provoked—thinketh no evil—rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth—beareth all things, believeth all things; hopeth all things, endureth all things.* . . . and finally that *it never faileth.* 1 Cor. 13. 4. 8. That is, in other words, that it is of God, and is perfect like 'its author. And we stand up and solemnly profess, that this is our religion. But does our conduct towards each other manifest it? It does not. The men of the world say (and there is too much truth in it) "They are not what they pretend to be. . . they put on the habiliments of sanctity, and make long prayers; but interest is at the bottom of all their plans." And indeed facts are so plain against us as nearly to prove the truth of what they assert.

6. Partyism always tend to grieve, and dispirit, the hearts of those who are for peace. They desire to learn, and to know nothing among men, but *Jesus Christ, and him crucified—to live peaceably with all men—not to render evil for evil, nor railing for railing, to love the brotherhood*—and, like their divine Master, to behold with equal eye all, in every nation, that fear God, and work righteousness. Hence, when they go up to the house of God, it is with design and desire to worship God in spirit and in truth; to get their souls nourished with the sincere milk of the word; to renew their spiritual strength. . . that they may be enabled to withstand the wiles of the devil, and combat his temptations. . . that they may renounce the allurements of the world, and mortify their members which are upon the earth. . . that, *looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of faith,* they may run with patience the race that is set before them. . . forgetting the things that are behind, and reaching forward to the things that are before,

they may press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Therefore they desire, not to be always learning the first principles of the doctrines of Christ, but to go on towards perfection. But when they arrive at the place, which is called by the name of God, how much are their souls grieved, and disappointed? Are they there taught to disdain, in comparison, all other knowledge but that of Jesus crucified for the sins of a guilty world? to imitate that love that led him to Calvary and the Cross? to breathe, in the midst of persecution and reproach, of suffering and death, that prayer of Love, *Father forgive them?* No, this is not the spirit that is inculcated; this is not the religion that is taught them from the sacred desk. The preacher rises and exhibits a few things respecting the first principles of religion, which most of them have long since learned by rote. . . Then instead of turning to the right, and leading them into the marrow and fatness of the Gospel, *into green pastures by the still waters*; causing them to lay down, and rest in God; like a warrior he rouses them to arms, wheels to the left, and teaches them to fight not indeed the battles of the Lord, but imaginary ones. . . He sets their notions and whims in battle array against the notions, and whims of their brethren of other parties. . . instructs them accurately in the arts of war, furnishes them with weapons which *are carnal, not mighty through God to the pulling down the strong holds* of satan and of sin. . . weapons, not prepared to fight and overcome their foes, but to wound, and destroy their friends. Here they are not taught to fight the *good fight of faith*. . . *to put on the whole armour of God*, &c. But they are taught to think lightly of other christians, perhaps better than themselves, and to beware of them as dangerous. Thus, by these strategems of the devil (for they deserve no better name) the minds of their hearers are turned from the love of the brethren to hate them, and, view them often as outcasts from God.

7. Another evil that arises out of *partyism* is, that frequently, in the same neighbourhood, and at the same time, there are several worshipping assemblies in opposition to one another; when the whole might conveniently constitute one assembly only. Each of these parties, in their own opinion have God engaged on their side, and in opposition to the others. Let christians blush and be ashamed, at the recollection! Does not this look too like ancient heathenism, when each nation had their God, who took part with them against the rest, both in times of war and peace? These different divisions, and subdivisions, have their different houses of worship built, and dedicated according to the pattern of their own mind. Their holy domes are the sacred property of the party; and generally one of the stiffest of the sect carries the keys. When, therefore, a stronger passes along, though in pursuit of the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and though he may have clean hands, and a pure heart; may have forsaken father, and mother for sake of Christ, and the Gospel; yet he cannot be admitted to preach, nor to teach, unless he be something more than a christian. His name therefore, and surname must be delivered up; the name of his sect, the articles of his creed, &c. Should it happen, that he was not called by the name of their leader, or if

he did not wish himself to be known by the name of any particular party, he must pass on, though the people were dying in their sins, and destitute of stated preaching. He comes to another temple, rotting to the ground, unoccupied. . . the hinges of the doors rusting with idleness, and the people around perishing for lack of knowledge; but unless he can embrace that *manism*, which has distinguished them as a party, he cannot be admitted there.

He goes on, and comes to another, they bid him enter in and preach. . . But should he advance anything, which does not tend to strengthen their party, they will either oppose him to his face, or go away, and revile him behind his back. Or though he should preach the things they approve, and would extol in one of their own name; yet, in him they will account for it, on other principles. "Yes," say they, "he knows where he is; if he were at such a place, he would preach other doctrine. Thus men often make void the commandments of God, through their own traditions. Under these distressing circumstances, frequently those whom God has sent to preach the everlasting Gospel, have to turn out into the hedges, and high ways, exposed to wind and weather; and call, to the Gospel feast, those who are not too full of pride, or prejudice to hear them.

We have long been crying out against the church of Rome for her superstitious, and unscriptural inventions; while we have neither suspected, nor examined our own;* as though the world did not see and many of our acquaintances know, that we neither have, nor even pretend to have, a *thus saith the Lord* for many things we both *do* and *teach*. Alas for us! the children of this world are to this day wiser in their generations than the children of light. They have long since learned that short, though important lesson, *united we stand, divided we fall*: But we will divide, and rend in pieces, and yet expect to stand.

To remove the cause of division, that the effect may cease, is a work, which should engage the attention of every good man. In order to this we should certainly *judge righteous judgment*. We should let truth have its due weight, and ascribe the effect to its proper cause. Now where shall we find an instance of a lasting separation having taken place in the church of Christ by a close and strict adherence to the word of God on each side? It is a fact confirmed, by history and observation, that the more closely any body of christians adhere to the word of God, as the only standard of faith and practice, the more firm, and lasting will their union be, And, on the contrary, the farther they depart from the simplicity of the word, by the introduction of human inventions, the more certainly and speedily do corruption, schism, and desolation follow.

*It is sufficiently proven by protestant Expositors, that the *Mother of Harlots*, spoken of by John in the Revel. is the Roman church. Now if a woman in the marriage state becomes a *harlot*, it is by departing from the law of her husband, and following her own carnal inclinations—If she becomes a *mother*, it is by having children—And if she have *children*, they must be *distinct persons*—If they become *harlots*, it is by following the example of their *mother*, by partaking of her spirit, and drinking of the *wine of her fornication*. Query. If the church of Rome be the *mother* of harlots, who are her daughters?

That schism does exist in the christian church is a lamentable truth; and that human inventions are the cause of it is too evident to be denied: therefore, let that man, or set of men, who have introduced, or are the supporters of them be regarded as the true schismatics. And let such inventions be forever excluded from the church; and then, and not till then, will the unity of the spirit, and bond of peace be restored.

8. Another evil tendency of partyism is, that it always gives the common enemy of souls an advantage over the church: For while each party is engaged in internal broils, and factions, they are all off their guard; as to other enemies. Their eyes are fixed on each other, and removed from the great adversary of souls. Hence he is left at liberty to make inroads at pleasure, to stir up passions within, strengthen prejudices, foment quarrels, wound the weak, overturn the wavering, and confirm the wicked in their wickedness. And the strength of each party is so far exhausted in struggling against one another, that they have neither time, nor strength to oppose the arch-enemy, nor his emissaries. And therefore, many fall an easy prey. It is astonishing, that the friends of religion have not, at least more policy, if not more goodness, than to assist this enemy, when he concert schemes to impede the work of salvation, and destroy the souls of men.

To me it appears, that if the wisdom and subtility of all the devils in hell had been engaged in ceaseless counsels from eternity, they could not have devised a more complete plan to advance their kingdom than to divide the members of Christ's body. And yet his ministers, through pride, ambition, the love of domination, &c. will aid in this horribly tragical scene; and that too, for sake of some new found forms and ceremonies; or to gratify their honor, or profit, which may, perhaps, in the end, prove less to them than "thirty picies of silver" did to Judas.

These, and innumerable other evils which cannot be named, result from the various divisions, which have taken place, and do still exist in the church of Christ.

But while it will be readily acknowledged by serious, and unprejudiced minds, that these are great evils, attended with incalculable bad consequences; yet, in the present existing state of things, it is much easier to lament than remove them. I will grant there are great difficulties in the way; but, I trust, they are not insuperable.—

Let it first be firmly believed, that there are real and great evils, and I am persuaded every honest man will be willing to listen to any plan that promises their removal. We have departed in some measure (I believe greatly) from primitive christianity: if we can find by what means we shall get back, doubtless it will remedy the evils, which have arisen from our departure. I will mention a simple method, which I am willing to try, till some abler hand suggest a better. And it is the following. "Let all Christians worship one God. . . Acknowledge one Savior. . . Have one Confession of faith. . . One form of government. . . Be members one of another. . . Members of one church. . . Profess one religion. . . Let none be received but

living members. . ." And finally "let none be expelled but for a breach of the divine law."

Here is a plan, and a simple one too, which is designed as "a healer of the breach, a restorer of paths to dwell in," to bring back those, who have gone astray; those, who by fraud, force, or otherwise, have been led off from the original christian plan.

Come now, my christian brethren, let us all agree that the mischiefs already done by partyism are sufficient, and more than sufficient; and let us begin to enquire "for the good old paths, and walk therein, and we shall find rest."

Let us now a little review and examine the plan.

1. Then, we are to worship one God; because he that does more is an idolater.

2. Acknowledge one Savior, Jesus Christ. For he is the only Savior, besides him there is none else; and his name is the only name under heaven by which we can be saved.

3. Have one Confession of faith, and let that be the Bible. This is so generally and yet so particular a rule, that we shall never be able to find a man or set of men, in the world who can mend it; and we are pointedly forbid either to add to it, or diminish from it; and this prohibition is enforced with a fearful, but just threatening, in the very conclusion of this Book, Revel. 22. 18. 19. "For I testify unto every man, that heareth the words of the prophesy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

A vast body of divines, both in Europe and America, have confessed the holy scriptures to be the only and sufficient Rule of faith and practice. Now if they be the only rule, there can be no other; and if they be sufficient, there is no need of any other. Some indeed have asserted the contrary; but they were such as wished to Legislate for the Church. Indeed it appears that too many have viewed the Bible, as the statesman does the Constitution, that upon which they are to frame laws; and it often happens, through the ignorance, or the intrigues of designing men, that the laws are anticonstitutional. The pride, ignorance, and designs of the priesthood, have, in this way, introduced innumerable evils into the church. . . They have not only legislated for the existing generation, but have bound up the consciences of their unborn race.

It is not a little degrading to the supreme God, to suppose, that he himself should institute a religion, and convey it to his rational creatures, by means of supernatural revelation, on the observance of which their happiness, in the present and future world depends; and yet that this revelation should be so vague, that we must have the assistance of men, no more inspired than ourselves, to perfect that which is lacking in the work, of a God? That it must be modeled by political heads; that it needs the labor of Synods, General Assemblies,

Councils of fathers, &c. &c. to systematise, and arrange it, before we can adopt it as a rule? This is a thought, that has sunk the credibility of the Scriptures, and being brought out to view, has shook the faith of thousands.

4. Let us have one form of discipline, and government, and let this be the New Testament. The Old Testament is necessary as a guide to our faith: for by it we are led to those things we find accomplished in the new, and which we are to believe. But for the constitution of a christian church; its conduct when constituted; the reception of its members and upon what principles; the manner of expelling and for what, we have a sufficient guide in the New Testament, independent of every other Book, in the world.

When I read, and observe how exceedingly particular Jesus Christ has been in building his church, and the order of it, as to all her members—that he gave his life for her—that his love to her is unchangeable—that she is “his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all”—that for wisdom, goodness, &c. there never was one on earth equal to him—I have a higher opinion of his wisdom, goodness and love, than to imagine he would give her a guide, or a rule, which, in the state he left it, was inadequate in some, or in many respects—and yet that he should appoint, and authorise nobody to make up the deficiency.

5. Let all christians consider themselves members one of another: because in the estimation of scripture they are so indeed. This is illustrated and proved from Christ himself being the foundation, and his church the house, or superstructure built upon that foundation—he is the vine, they are the branches—he is the head, and they are the members of his one body, knit together by joints and bands. And therefore they are members one of another in particular. Hence it follows,

6. That all christians ought to be members of one church. Because we find but one foundation for a church, and that is Christ; “and other foundation can no man lay.” All therefore that is built upon that foundation, is one superstructure, or one body in Christ. This is his mystical body, and no other. And the name of this body originates from its head, which makes it the christian church, or church of Christ. Therefore,

7. Let all profess one religion. And Let all be more solicitous about the possession, than the profession of this one religion, as that which will make every one happy in God, in himself, and with his brethren. But if a man has religion at all, it will be known, and it must be called something. If our religion be the religion of Jesus Christ, both justice and propriety demand, that it should be called by his name. Otherwise, he will be the author of a good, and another will have the honor of it.

8. Let none be received as members of the church, but such as are made alive in Christ. For the Lord’s temple is “built of lively stones, a spiritual house.” But let awakened persons now, as of old, be taken under the care of the church, as “prosytes of the gate,” to be instructed, watched over, prayed for, &c. But why should they be

considered as part of a body, of which they know, and sensibly feel, they are not members. And let children be taken under the care, and inspection of the church, by baptism, or otherwise, as each society, or individual member of it shall judge best. But let not brother contend with, or condemn brother for practising, or omitting the rite of infant baptism, or the mode in which it shall be administered, or received. If the spirit and love of Christ in his members will not preserve his people from this, I am sure no laws of human invention can do it.

6. Let none be excommunicated from the church, but for a breach of the divine law. As each member is engrafted into the true vine by faith; and nothing but sin can separate between God and the soul; why should any thing else separate members from the visible church? Where is the man, or set of men, who hold a divine charter to forbid communion, or cut off from the church militant, those who hold communion with God, and are fit candidates for the church triumphant?

But there are objections offered against a general union of christians under one name. I shall answer some of them.

1. It is objected, that controversies would then cease, and all being alike would slide into a dull and careless state, seeing they would have nothing to stir them up to examine whether they were right or wrong. Ans. Let me ask, what good has ever been done by controversy? Where can the person be found, who by controversy was convinced of his lost state, and forced to cry out, "What shall I do to "be saved?" Or who found peace with God in this exercise? Where is the christian, who had his love to God and man increased, while he warmly contended to establish the distinguishing opinions of his own party, at the expence of all others? He cannot be found. But on the contrary, how much mischief have we seen done by it? How many glorious revivals of religion have been extinguished by it, as fire upon which mighty waters have been dashed? Has not the heavenly *dove* fled before the bigots rage? Nay, has not the world been drenched in blood in consequence of it? Let the history of the church vouch for the truth of what I say. Partyism has been the destruction of multitudes of the human race, even without the use of fire and sword. To the careless part of mankind, every party bears the appearance of a religion different from the rest; and each arrogates to itself the honor of being right; of course it condemns all others as being wrong. The natural conclusion, therefore, of those, who are not skilled in theological criticisms, and care as little about them, is, that as there are so many religions (for they denominate each a different religion) they cannot tell which is right. And as there is but one God, and one religion, if any, they conclude all are wrong. Hence they commence infidels, concluding that each party is a cheat, the Bible priestcraft, and its advocates a set of designing men. Upon this ground, therefore, they cast away all religion, and give up the reins to every lust.

2. It is objected, that God has permitted division in the course of his providence, and, therefore it must be for good.

Ans. If by *permission* you mean God has *allowed* it, it is not only *for good*, but it is good in itself. For God, who is infinitely perfect, cannot allow any thing but what is good. To suppose otherwise, is to destroy the divine nature. But if by permission you mean, that he has not put physical obstacles in your way—made you cease to be rational creatures—moral, or free agents—that is, that he has not overturned the laws of creation, or struck the world out of existence, in order to prevent divisions and controversies among men. If this be what you mean, I grant God has permitted division, controversy, murder, drunkenness, uncleanness, and all other sins, which have existed, or ever will exist. But it is very strange, that it should be applied to God in this sense, when his word, so far from saying he permits, expressly prohibits all sin. For, as I have already shewn, he has forbidden division, and consequently that strife and contention which spring from it.

3. If christians were all thus united, there would be so many to attend the same place of worship, that we could not find houses sufficient to contain them; they would be incommoded for want of shelter, shades, seats, &c. And the preachers would be greatly injured by speaking so loud as to make the multitude hear.

Ans. This objection has the honor of coming through very influential hands; and I verily believe it to be as forcible a one as I ever heard advanced against a general Union. But it is so far from being an evil, that I am persuaded all christians would rejoice to see it.

4. We are commanded to “contend earnestly for “the faith once delivered to the saints.”

Ans. “Wisdom is justified of her children.” We should contend earnestly, not rashly, for the essential truths of the Bible. And who will oppose them? Not christians surely, but atheists, deists, heathens, and the licentious croud; who are not of the church, but of the world. But are we to take the liberty, to fall out by the way, and brother to smite his brother, when both are agreed as to every thing that is essential to their salvation? God forbid!

5. We are not agreed as to inward principles, how then can we walk together?

Ans. I query whether this is true with respect to any two christians in the world—We all agree, that man is a fallen creature—that faith, repentance, and an holy life are necessary to salvation. And who can, or will condemn those, who are possessed of them? Not Jesus Christ; for they are members of his body; nor a righteous man, for they are the delight of his heart—We also agree, that true religion is one; that the experience of every christian is substantially the same; that no man can get to heaven except he be a christian; and that no man, who lives, and dies a christian, will miss heaven, &c.

About what, then, have we to dispute? Why says one, such a person is an Arminian, he denies absolute predestination; he holds that a christian can fall from grace; he is a free willer; or he is a calvinist, a rigid predestinarian, nay, I think, a fatalist—or he is a bap-

tist, &c. &c. and I cannot fellowship him. That excuse will not bear telling, for it is notoriously known, that there are of these descriptions interspersed through the various denominations, and in communion with them, while they hold these sentiments. And being real christians, it makes little or no odds, provided they are called by the same name.

I believe every objection, which can be raised against a general union of christians, arises from unbelief, pride, prejudice, a party spirit, &c. and the spirit of Jesus living in his members will destroy them. Let christians then possess more of this blessed spirit, and it cannot be doubted, but they will soon form an union with one another.

The conclusion of the whole matter is; that the various denominations shall give up their several distinctions, and be consolidated into one body. And why not, since their various names are no more than newfound, spurious things, for which there is no use in the church of Christ? I say newfound, because they are not contained in the New Testament; and spurious, because they have no divine original. And I know of none that claims any for them, but the baptists. They claim it from John, the harbinger of Christ—he was called Baptist, which was truly applicable to him, as an Officer; because it was expressive of his office. But why should we call every lay-man, and old woman a baptist, who never baptized any body in their lives, and never will?

Brethren, we are just at the door of a gracious providence, and are invited in. We may now constitute a church upon the true basis, free from the conflicting principles of partyism; from whence alone we may expect to see her pure, benevolent, and divine principles exalted for the happiness of all people. Would to God, that those distinctions, which have so long abounded, and troubled the christian church, were vanished away, never to return! and that union, and church communion, were every where established upon the original simple principles of the gospel!

Could the friends of Jesus Christ be once persuaded of the importance, and utility of this duty, and arrange themselves under his banner; we should soon see them abandon vain jangling, and strife of words to no profit, but to the perverting of the soul; and united in the bonds of faith and love. Happy should we then be! Then thy king, O Zion, should reign in the midst of thee!

To promote this great end, and bring about this desirable event, must be the duty of every religious person—Now the Lord has set before us an opportunity, and is graciously inviting us to embrace it.

It is much to be lamented, that the zealous reformers, when they burst asunder the cords of popish tyranny, ever departed from the scripture plan. But alas! instead of following the plain rules of their divine Master, as laid down by the Holy Ghost, they framed ones of their own, as the means to preserve union. But the effects were fatal—They have nursed the demon of intolerance which, when aided by civil power, has led martyrs to the stake. It is a truth self evident to the christian, that nothing is a sin but what the scrip-

tures forbid, and nothing a duty but what they enjoin. If therefore, they have gone as extensively as sin, and duty, nothing more can be necessary. And to suppose they have not, is to reflect dishonor on them, and through them, on their author, who is God. We may be sure Christ never intended any other summary, as a standard of faith and practice for his church, but the gospel itself. And if the intrigues of designing men can be set aside, we may, upon the fair principles of the gospel, and simply as christians, form an union, whose order is divine, founded on universal charity. May heaven bless the hand, which shall aid in the consummation of a plan so essential to human happiness, as uniting the precious, and bringing back the children of God to primitive christianity. What is a christian church, but a voluntary society, stipulating to walk by the rules of the gospel? And to every such society, when cramped by a man-made summary of faith and practice, searching the scriptures, to know their duty, is rendered in a great measure useless. Human compositions imposed upon thousands, not only undervalue the scriptures; but attack every man's judgment, who stands with the minority: and to all intents, and purposes, aims at the annihilation of private judgment altogether. Verily they are destructive of an union founded on truth: because they impregnate the pure waters of the sanctuary with the impure conceits of men. Some, indeed, say, that the scriptures are not well understood, and therefore rules, and creeds are necessary. But it is very easy to see that they are expressed with all that clearness, with which God intended to reveal them. And we may be sure this is sufficient. Any other help, therefore, to make them plainer, and to set that up as a standard of orthodoxy, and a term of christian communion in any society, is to involve the church in error.

Our fathers erred, or why a reformation? Their descendants will err; nor shall we see christianity in its native beauty, until it appears in the white garments of the Gospel alone, stript of all the filthy rags of Human Invention.

It is pretended that human standards help to keep evil men out of the church, But it is far more certain from what has been already said, that they help to keep out the good, when they are out, and to put them out, when they are in. He who is wicked enough to wish for a place in the church, in order to gratify his lust of honor, power, or wealth, will be base enough to bend to the times, and suit himself to the sentiments of the day. Who, then, will be the most likely, to suffer expulsion, and to feel the iron hand of ecclesiastical tyranny? Men of stubborn virtue, of principle, and of conscience—men of that rigid, tough integrity, which cannot be bent and twisted to comply with the systems which are in fashion—who will not prefer the dictates of fallible mortals, to the infallible word of God.

It is easy to see, that every rule enacted by man, as a rule of faith, is from its very nature void, or else the laws of Christ are void.

Some have urged, that a church has a right to prescribe to itself terms of communion, provided they be agreeable to the word of God. This would be true, if the terms were not prescribed there already, and no man, nor combination of men has any authority derived from

scripture, to alter them. The precepts therefore, and practice of Christ, and his Apostles, recorded in the New Testament, have been, are, and ever will be, the only proper terms of church communion. And these are so plain, that no honest man need mistake them. But supposing it were granted, that the church has this right, who shall be the judge? How shall each member be assured, that this, and that should be a term? or that such and such things should be terms, and such others should not? Or is private judgment to be annihilated? The difference of sentiments among those, who have prescribed their different and opposite terms, prove that infallibility is not with us. Truth, like the Eternal, is one! Where shall we find it? He who would find truth, pure, and unmixed, must search for it in the Scriptures alone.

Brethren, we are expecting happier times than the church has ever yet seen; when she shall "come up out of the wilderness, leaning upon her beloved;" when she shall "look forth" as the morning, fair as the moon, "clear as the fun, and terrible as an army with banners." There are perhaps, few professed christians in the world, who are not looking, and longing for these glorious days; when there shall be "one Lord, and his name one." When the church shall be one. But it is to be lamented that every party confident they are right, and all the rest wrong, are waiting to swallow them up. You will find no denomination, who are not possessed of this vanity more or less. And hence they are struggling, and have long struggled to bring about that event. But has not each hitherto stood its ground, and the harder the struggle, the less the success. And this is what has been chiefly done heretofore to promote a general union. But it has so long been tried in vain, as is sufficient, I think, to convince every discerning and honest mind, that each party has set out upon wrong principles.

Take the prophet's rule, and measure the foundation upon which each party has built, and you will find it narrower than the rock of ages, and not sufficient to bear the whole body of Christ. But measure the foundation of the christian plan, and you will find it broad as the stone, which God has laid in Zion, able to bear every christian in the world at once. How pleasing the anticipation, but how much more delightful will the enjoyment of that time be, when the different denominations, which have long been at variance, shall join hands in an everlasting peace! Then shall the wide world bow the knee, and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father—Then, and not till then, shall bold transgressors cease, and iniquity ashamed, stop her mouth—Then, when Zion travels she shall bring forth her children—the earth shall bring forth at once, and a nation shall be born in a day. For all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest; and the earth shall be full of his glory.

Are you not all praying, brethren, "Lord, hasten the approach of that day?" The day has already begun to dawn among some. Let a spirit of union and love (which is the fruit of the spirit of God,) prevail among you, and you will find, that this is day in the moral

world—The more you cultivate this spirit, the more will the Lord bless you, until “your peace shall become like a river, and your righteousness as the waves of the Sea. Nation shall cease to lift up weapon against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.



FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

- No. 1 *Alexander Campbell and His Relevance For Today*, by Eva Jean Wrather.
- No. 2 *The Lunenburg Letter With Attendant Comments*, by Alexander Campbell
- No. 3 *Barton Warren Stone and Christian Unity*, by William Garrett West.
- No. 4 *An Address to the Different Religious Societies on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name*, by Rice Haggard.
- No. 5 *Report of the Proceedings of a General Meeting of Messengers, From Thirteen Congregations, Held in Wellsburg, Va. on Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834*, by J. T. M'Vay and Alexander Campbell.

Footnotes No's. 1, 2, 3, and 5 are 25 cents each

Footnote No. 4 is 35 cents

Complete set of 5 FOOTNOTES—special price \$1.20

Special prices are made for larger quantity orders

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

1101 19th Avenue, South

Nashville 12, Tennessee

**BEYOND BUFFALO:
ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY**

by Dr. John M. Imbler

**FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY
NUMBER EIGHT**

**BEYOND BUFFALO:
ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON
EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY**

by
John M. Imbler
St. Louis, Missouri

**FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY
Number Eight**

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
1101 19th Avenue, South
Nashville, Tennessee 37212-2196

1992

**Copyright © 1992 Disciples of Christ Historical Society
All rights reserved. No part of this Footnotes may be
reproduced without the publishers written permission.**

Address:

**Disciples of Christ Historical Society
1101 19th Avenue, South
Nashville, Tennessee 37212-2196.
(615) 327-1444**

INTRODUCTION

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society is pleased to publish the eighth in a series of *Footnotes to Disciple History*. The term Disciple History in these footnotes is used in its broadest sense as representative of the three groups which grew out of the Campbell-Stone Movement. These groups are variously known as Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Christian Churches, and Churches of Christ.

This *Footnote* seeks to examine the place of ministerial education in the developing educational system of America. It then looks at Campbell's philosophy about education. This philosophy was colored by his concepts and thoughts about Christian Unity, the restoration of the New Testament, professional ministry, and the laity. This philosophy of education was developed also around a number of general themes. Those themes were the wholeness of person, moral formation of character, biblical studies, non-sectarianism, the perfectibility of the individual, life-long learning and the fact that education is international. The author then puts this philosophy in context as he examines Campbell's thought about the church. This paper demonstrates meaningfully why and how Campbell's thought concerning education for ministry changed through the years.

The author, John M. Imbler, is Vice President of the Division of Higher Education for the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Inc. He is a graduate of Butler University and Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis, Indiana, and has done additional post graduate studies at Christian Theological Seminary. He is an ordained minister in the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

The Historical Society is happy to present this writing in the interest of historical preservation and research as a *Footnote to Disciple History*.

James M. Seale, President
Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
February, 1992

BEYOND BUFFALO: ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY

During the mid 1860s, the nation and American religion were in transition. The end of the Civil War brought the northern and southern states into an uneasy union with much left unresolved. Churches were similarly affected; some divided immediately, some lived with their tensions only to have those tensions reemerge at later times, often over unrelated issues. This era, too, heard the noise of a great western expansion as individuals and families alike sought to stake their claims on the American frontier. Numerous territories were being settled and moving toward statehood. As the population in the West grew, the need to establish churches and schools was of constant interest among all major church bodies.

Simultaneous with the nation's transition was the transition of the Disciples. The year 1865 is important to Disciples for it marks the ascendancy of another generation of leadership which made contributions to theological education through the establishment of The College of the Bible in Kentucky, the Disciples first "seminary." This essay introduces the warp and woof of attitudes toward clergy and ministerial education through the early history of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). A brief description of the progress of ministerial preparation from Colonial America into the 1800s sets the context from which to understand Alexander Campbell's views on the subject.

I. The First Era of American Ministerial Education

The establishment of formal theological education institutions in America is tentatively set at 1800, but specifically at 1807-08. The tentative date is only a landmark for on both sides of it important, creative experiments took place on which the structure of modern day seminaries and divinity schools are patterned. From the mid 1600s, colleges such as Harvard were founded to provide general education with the influence of religious studies. Orville Wake observes: "Popular thought is, therefore, likely to regard America's first colleges as modified seminaries, giving most of their energies to instruction in religion."¹ Either Wake or popular thought overstate the case. Within the context of educational preparation for any profession, Wake goes on to say: "apparently the image of the college at that

time [1600s] was constructed on the twin axes of faith and learning."² While the early colleges were dedicated to teaching law, medicine, and the classics infused with large doses of religious instruction, this hardly made them modified seminaries in the modern definition of the word. Institutions of higher learning in colonial America did not regard the liberal education concept with which we are familiar today as either necessary or relevant.

It must not be assumed that colleges were the primary means of ministerial education. The academy was one of two predominant models, apprenticeship being the other, although there were variations on these based upon geography and denominational disposition. The more historic of the two is that of apprenticeship or "reading divinity" which is rooted in the Patristic period. The prospective pastor learned ministry under the tutelage of an experienced cleric by studying the Bible and classic literature and languages, to the extent the teacher was competent in these disciplines, and by on-the-job experience. This often took the form of a live-in arrangement whereby the student was in constant relationship with the mentor. The candidate was instructed through a carefully prepared sequence of readings coupled with practical exposure to pastoral functions and immersed in a specific theological orientation. This method concentrated learning over such a time span as the mentor deemed appropriate, which could last from a few months to three or four years. The widespread practice of apprenticeships began to fade in late sixteenth century America as colleges proliferated and denominations demanded a clergy corps of "gentlemen-scholars." One disadvantage of "reading divinity" was the intellectual isolation the apprentice experienced.

Structured classes and textbooks offered a more in-depth approach to the discipline of theological study. No longer was the student bound to a mentor, most of whose ideas were adopted and mannerisms were emulated. Rather, the college offered a broader environment for learning which encouraged critical interpretation and the development of social skills befitting the preferred status of the clergy. A drawback to the classroom was that such a heavy concentration on academics displaced the experience of pastoral field work so the actual practice of ministry gave way to elitism. Because of the secular courses that were required in conjunction with the study of theology, there was dissatisfaction with the curriculums by many church bodies calling the academy model of training into question.

While this new style of ministerial education in early American colleges gained popularity among the teachers and administrators, by the mid 1700s a return to apprenticeships was desired by the students.

During and following the excitement attendant upon the Great Awakening, largely because of the increasing prominence of certain pastors unconnected with colleges, as well as because of antipathy on the part of Harvard and Yale toward the revival movement, there seemed to arise among those aspiring to the ministry an eagerness to sit at the feet of the great revival preachers and to learn the secrets of their stirring success.³

Religious leaders in America were caught in conflict between personal ambitions and public witness. "Presbyterians and Congregationalists, the strongest denominations at the end of the Revolution, interpreted their churches as the 'soul' or 'conscience' of the new nation."⁴ Those who felt called to proclaim the gospel sometimes saw the revival as a means to achieve self-gratification and notoriety. There was uncertainty among ministerial candidates about the most effective means to establish authority and competency which would be personally, socially, and ecclesiastically acceptable. However, the denominations were quite prepared to press their positions on ministerial education: "The first theological schools were established by those who shared a vision of a Christian republic, heir of the richness of western civilization."⁵

The late 1700s saw the emergence of "professors of divinity" at Colonial colleges. Functioning primarily as undergraduate instructors, these professors taught in a manner that evolved into graduate departments of theology. These departments offered the strength of institutional instruction under the direct supervision of a mentor who was responsible also for maintaining institutional standards.⁶ This educational system has been described by Franklin Littell:

For many generations the Protestant seminary functioned as a monastery, a retreat center where for a period of years single men charged their batteries for a long run of service in the church's ministry. The chief symbols of the bachelors' community were the chapel for common worship, the refectory for the common meal, the dormitory for the common life, the library for

the study of the common heritage. At the highest point this monastery also preserved the role of the professor as a spiritual director as well as an academic instructor.⁷

The prototype of graduate study in theology was the creation of a seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church at New Brunswick, New Jersey in 1784, with the appointment of an independent professor of divinity.⁸ That professor's teaching responsibility was not to be confused with the more general undergraduate curriculum. Designated courses in theology were designed to enhance the undergraduate program.

The evangelical emphasis was prominent along the Eastern Seaboard, and its influence was being carried westward rapidly. Because of the political repercussions over the appointment of Unitarian Samuel Webber as the President of Harvard in 1806, acting President Eliphalet Pearson, a moderate, resigned from the faculty.⁹ Evangelical representatives immediately called Pearson to Andover to join with them in response to the Unitarian influence by establishing a clergy training institute in conjunction with Phillips Academy.¹⁰ Support for Pearson's position, both financial and spiritual, was broader than expected. This protest was so popular that an innovative theological education institution opened its doors. The establishment of Andover Theological Seminary in 1807 was the first of its kind.¹¹

Jedidiah Morse, editor of the magazine *Panoplist* and one of the founding fathers, was apparently the first to understand the potential distinctiveness of its mission. In response to a fear voiced by Nathaniel Emmons that ministers from a theological college would not command as much respect as those with university degrees, Morse wrote, "Call not the Institution a College but a Theological Seminary. The idea is to admit young men into this school who have received education at one of our Colleges." Andover would not compete with Harvard at the baccalaureate level there would be enough trusted colleges to do that but would rather provide post-baccalaureate for those entering the ministry. Morse's letter represents the first known use of the term *theological seminary* among American Protestants to denote theological schooling at this level.¹²

Seminary is derived from the Latin *seminarium* meaning "seed plot" or "nursery." Long used by the Roman Catholic

Church to identify a preparatory school, American Protestants appropriated the term seminary to denote a place of higher learning. Seminary founders strove to require a baccalaureate degree as a prerequisite for admission. Colleges and seminaries were viewed as separate types of institutions with distinct missions.

The creation of Andover as a graduate school with multiple faculty members was an effort to preserve the evangelical faith, and it presents yet a third model of education to prepare ministers competent to fulfill the functions of pastoring established churches and organizing new churches on the frontier. The creation of Andover by the Congregationalists spurred other church bodies to experiment with new models of theological education as a means of maintaining high standards of orthodoxy while preparing for the westward evangelistic emphasis. "The Great Awakening of New England," said Ralph H. Gabriel, "was a backyard bonfire in comparison with the religious conflagration lighted by the Revival of 1800. Extraordinary excitement and emotional upheaval marked this Second Awakening or Great Revival of the West."¹³

The success of graduate theological education generated by Andover gave rise to a proliferation of similar institutions. Designing a theological curriculum consistent with three years extended study at the university level for honors or master's status, Princeton came to life in 1812 followed by Bangor, 1816; the theological school at Harvard, 1819; Auburn, 1821; the theological department at Yale, 1822; Newton, 1825; and Union in 1836.¹⁴

Each had a different ethos and mission, dependent on the direction of its founders and the administration of its president. Yet all were created to educate quality ministers for the revivalist movement through faculties of divinity. The denominational presence was to be felt in many circles from the liberal Congregationalists to the conservative Presbyterians. As the Lynn study reports: "One can approach the history of the seminary as a way of understanding the fundamental course of American theological education."¹⁵ This is reflected in the character of clergy training, lay education and leadership, and the acknowledged continuation of pastoral apprenticeships. "Or one can seize upon this opportunity as providing a new vantage point for viewing the unfolding drama of American higher education."¹⁶

The opening of Buffalo Seminary by Alexander Campbell in 1818 was also designed to prepare young men for their roles in

evangelizing of the frontier. Having separated himself from formal denominational ties by this time, Campbell's institution was worthy of note for its intention if not its longevity. The paradox Campbell felt in the Buffalo experiment was only one important reason for its closure. Early on he had insisted that theological schools did not promote unity but encouraged sectarianism. Campbell regarded these newly formed seminaries as centers which created a narrow-minded and indoctrinated clergy intent on serving themselves rather than the church.

It was not the institution *per se* that needed critique but the abuses within the institution. No matter what the charter of an institution, education was influenced by the biases of those teaching. The professors of theology, in Campbell's mind, professed not the Christianity of the New Testament but the tenets of their denominationalism. His Buffalo Seminary, and later Bethany College, took on what he determined was a non-sectarian, non-denominational position. And while it may be difficult for historians to precisely define the distinction between Buffalo and say Princeton, it was certainly clear in Campbell's mind.

Being a New Testament Restorationist, he fought against doctrinal teaching which he saw as the major impediment to Christian cooperation. He held contempt on attempts to standardize and finance theological education such as that found in the new American Education Society (AES) established by the Congregationalists and Presbyterians shortly after the founding of Andover and Princeton.¹⁷

The AES was created as an agency to undergird those two seminaries as well as to support seminary students financially. Campbell regarded this as the most crass of enterprises, particularly in light of his attitudes on societies in general and the stipendiary support of ministerial students. Coupled with this was his disaffection with the Presbyterian penchant towards authority. Theological education for Campbell, or more precisely, education for ministry, was to take the form of learning for the sake of human growth: morally, intellectually, and spiritually. Campbell's resistance to being called a theologian himself was consistent with his resistance to formalized theological education. Experience and disciplined study of the Bible were all that were needed to prepare one sufficiently as a preacher.

To replicate the American Education Society was to invite disaster by mass producing clergy who had no grasp of the

biblical faith nor the skills necessary to function effectively as preachers and teachers. Even more, Campbell's considered judgment was that to pay students for this kind of training was ludicrous. An early editorial in *The Christian Baptist* illustrates the intensity of his feelings.

The Pittsburgh Recorder, of November 6th (1823), informs us that fifty-four Presbyteries of the General Assembly, reported, at last meeting, *One Hundred and Thirty-Two Beneficiaries*; that is poor pious youth of talents, educated, or assisted in obtaining an education, by alms of the munificent devotees of the church. It also informs us that the Philadelphia Education Society, organized in 1818 has since that time aided forty-four beneficiaries. It adds that the Presbyterian Education Society, which holds its annual meeting in the city of New York, existing for five years, is the most powerful institution of the kind in the United States excepting the American Education Society. Now the *Luminary* of last July informs us, that at the fifth anniversary of this society one hundred and three young men were reported on its list of beneficiaries. The aggregates of the poor pious beneficiaries is TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY NINE! TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY NINE YOUNG PRIESTS COME! Yes, they come, meek and lowly, riding upon the alms of the people, the colt of the asses of Judah. Yes, and TWO HUNDRED MORE MIGHTY MEN, riding in chariots, come to thine aid! - O Zion! Thy Mammon is thy glory!!!¹⁸

So strong were his feelings on preachers working for pay that much of his writing in *The Christian Baptist* conveyed messages against the evils of a "kept" clergy. From a student receiving the alms of the people graduates a minister who will seek alms for the entire course of his ministry. This indebtedness encouraged laziness, for in this indebtedness there is no responsibility; no responsibility to teach the Bible as it ought to be taught, no responsibility to evangelize, no responsibility to minister. Campbell was clear that the commitment to Christian faith incurred both the privilege and obligation of preaching the gospel apart from financial gain. Campbell was so insistent on this issue that Granville Walker interpreted the founding of *The Christian Baptist* by saying:

If the date of July 4 was chosen deliberately, it is of a piece with the fact that *The Christian Baptist*, consistently with much of Campbell's entire career,

was devoted to the effort of freeing the Christian layman from the yoke of clerical oppression.¹⁹

This interpretation of Campbell's position relates specifically to his attitude toward theological education. Walker further illustrates Campbell's attacks on seminaries and the domination of the clergy:

The seminary was itself the medium of perpetuating the reign of the clergy over the people,^a and Campbell characterized it as the "grand device" for keeping the laity in ignorance and bondage, "a scheme, by means of which the people have been shrewdly taught to put out their own eyes, to fetter their own feet, and to bind the yoke upon their own necks."^{b20}

Had Campbell been active when men like Pearson were constructing their educational reforms, his perspectives might have been different. It is conceivable that Campbell could have served as a pioneer for a new design rather than as a critic of that which emerged. Charles Pyatt addresses the proposition in an essay on "Theological Education Among Disciples."

Four influences led to the establishment in America of institutions designed solely for the training of ministers. One was the growing feeling on the part of the colleges that the provisions they had made for the training of ministers by the appointment of single professors to care for the graduate students in theology was insufficient to meet the need. The second was the desire felt by the particular denominations, such as the Dutch Reformed Church, to perpetuate on American soil the kind of control exercised by the home church over the education of its ministers. A third was the growing fear of the liberal movement in theology which was one of the effects of the deistic movement on the Continent. A fourth was the desire to supply ministers for the growing missionary work of the church at home and abroad and to furnish them with a more practical training than that offered in the older institutions.²¹

II. Campbell's Educational Philosophy

The first half of the 1830s marked a significant period of growth for the Disciples. In 1832 Stone's Christians and Campbell's Disciples entered into union in Lexington, Kentucky which brought the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) into being.

Alexander Campbell matured from the sardonic critic who edited *The Christian Baptist* to the more socially responsive individual who edited the *Millennial Harbinger*. He participated in the general welfare of society by being elected a delegate to the 1829 Virginia Constitutional Convention.²² In this time also, his public appearances became more frequent, his sharp tongue tempered, and his theology developed precision resulting in his publication of the *Christian System* (1835). This is not to infer, however, that he lost his energy or was unwilling to enter spirited dialogue to defend his positions or press his point.

Although he was often reluctant to relinquish his previous opinions, Campbell was able to set them in a new context and refine them. His stands on Christian unity, the restoration of the New Testament, professional ministry, and the laity, while modified through the years, remained central to his understanding of the Christian church. And it is precisely these principles that inform his educational philosophy.

In 1808, one year after Andover opened, Campbell matriculated in the University of Glasgow.²³ While there, he came under the influence of Thomas Reid who, although deceased by that time, left a great legacy of philosophical discipline. Additionally, readings in Locke's empiricism and Hume's rationalism gave Campbell enough stimulation to design a course of studies which later formed the base for the curriculum at Bethany College. While not considered a disciple of Locke, he was attracted to Locke's notions of sensory and experiential learning. Locke's conclusions on empiricism caused Campbell to outline his own philosophy by listing four powers of attaining knowledge—instinct, sensation, reason, and faith.²⁴ These formed the assumptions from which he debated and from which he developed his philosophy of education. The impetus for his educational philosophy is summed up by Perry Gresham:

A bright and creative mind, responsive to the best thought of his age, interacting with the mood of the American frontier with renaissance interest and versatility, all these elements issued in the educational philosophy of Alexander Campbell.²⁵

Disciples scholars have evaluated the propositions of Campbell's educational philosophy arriving at no clear consensus on the language or order of each point. There is, however, agreement on the general themes. Duane Cummins offers the most compelling schema in his book, *The Disciples Colleges: A History*.²⁶

To describe the *Wholeness of Person* is to consider that education is for everyone. This universal applicability of education stands in opposition to Locke's aristocracy. And, it must be mentioned that this view also includes public schools for Campbell's idea of participatory democracy depended on a well-informed electorate. In his address "On Common Schools" to the Virginia Legislature in 1841, Campbell asserted that the state was responsible for the eradication of illiteracy through free and accessible schools and even suggested that education should be a qualification for voting.²⁷ Furthermore education should be both liberal and vocational in order to prepare individuals, regardless of their talents and abilities, to be productive citizens.

His emphasis on the institutional or corporate nature of education also reflects the second point, the *Moral Formation of Character*, and was not Campbell's alone. The flurry of college starts among the Disciples during the nineteenth century, beginning with Walter Scott's Bacon College in 1836, was exemplary among the denominations which moved along the frontier. Colleges not only expanded the mind but built character as well. Study in the academic community enabled people to function more efficiently in the social community and be more responsible in the church community.

In the *Christian System* Campbell summarizes his position on the impact of the Bible on moral formation:

The searching, examining, comparing, and ruminating upon the Holy Scriptures in private, in the family, in the congregation cannot fail to make us learned in the knowledge of God and in the knowledge of man. The Bible contains more real learning than all the volumes of men. It instructs us all in our natural, moral, political, and religious relations. Though it teaches us not astronomy, medicine, chemistry, mathematics, architectures, it gives us all that knowledge which adorns and dignifies our moral nature and fits us for happiness. Happy the person who meditates upon it day and night.²⁸

The third characteristic which closely follows the second is the value of *Biblical Studies*. The Bible is an essential textbook for all schools and colleges. The theme of biblical responsibility informs his whole approach to education by encompassing a value system beyond human experience. The other six propositions are subject to this one. Indeed, even Campbell's attitude

towards theological schools was colored by this principle. The issue here is the locus of both religious and social beliefs. Without appreciation of the cultural, historical, and political foundations of the Bible, particularly the New Testament, neither the will, the spirit, nor the nature of God could be understood. Creeds, doctrines, and tenets are false responses to an active God who must be apprehended in primary form. This proposition reflects the influence of his father as well as the development of his own thinking from Glasgow. Campbell expresses himself unequivocally in the *Millennial Harbinger*.

Bethany College is the only College known to us in the civilized world founded upon the Bible. It is not a theological school founded upon human theology, nor a school of divinity, founded upon the Bible; but a literary and scientific institution, founded upon the Bible as the basis of all true science and true learning. . . .

Those destined for the ministry of the Word, are thus furnished with all the ground materials of their future profession; and those assigned to other professions in life, are prepared to enjoy themselves in the richest of all possessions—a mind enlightened with the hands of the greatest masters that ever spoke or wrote.²⁹

The fourth point of Campbell's educational philosophy is *NonSectarianism*. Perhaps one of Campbell's most cogent arguments, which he consistently proposed, is that sectarian education is a contradiction in terms. This message was so central to his thinking that he fought to ensure that sectarianism would not creep into Bethany College nor into the other institutions which he supported or in which he became involved. He extended this notion also to public schools arguing that sectarianism was provincial and had no place in a free educational system. The state was obliged to provide the best offerings in order to adequately prepare its people for their roles in progressive society.

The Perfectibility of the Individual as seen in the ability to improve the human condition by means of education, may be Campbell's weakest argument. His understanding of psychology and human dynamics is based more on hope than reality, even though he addresses innate frailty in the *Christian System*: "The stream of humanity, thus contaminated at its fountain, cannot in this world ever rise of itself to its primitive purity and excellence. We all inherit a frail constitution physically, intellectually, but especially morally frail and imbecile."³⁰ Whether Campbell

assumed that education, even education based on the Bible, could accomplish that “rising” is debatable.

The perfectibility of the individual is more subjective than the other points and, if Morris Eames is correct in his interpretation of Campbell’s philosophy of education, it takes away the creative edge necessary to promote personal and social improvement.³¹

The sixth proposition of *Lifelong Learning* closely follows the first. Along with its universality, education must also be comprehensive. Moving from infancy through adulthood four requisites are identified: physical education, intellectual education, moral acculturation, and religious development.³² Corporate learning through the classroom is preferable, but individual learning through a self-initiated, disciplined program of study is also viable, as witnessed by Campbell’s personal regimen.

A seventh point is not listed by Cummins but is found in other sources and is worthy of mention. Education is International. The current parlance of the globalization of education must not be confused with Campbell’s more limited world view. An eclectic man with a temperament towards rationalism, *belles lettres*, and democratic ideals, he was nonetheless a product of his Scots-Irish heritage and defined internationalization from that perspective. His appropriation of citizenship demanded a relationship to community, state, nation, and world, yet his position has more relevance today that it did in the mid 1800s.

Having described Campbell’s philosophy and the premises on which that philosophy was based, the next step is to consider how that philosophy was translated into action. He was not merely a writer, publisher, and preacher but extended his activities to the construction of educational facilities and the development of church organizations. While he responded negatively to the contents and products of theological schools, he positively addressed the values of biblically-based education for the total person, all people. But this does not complete the picture of Campbell.

III. Campbell and the Church

Alexander Campbell was not the only forebear of the Restoration Movement, but, during this period of Disciples history, he was the dominant figure. His opinions on certain subjects may not have been as open as Stone’s or Scott’s, but he was more

prolific through pen and voice and more visible in the public arena. His critiques on theological seminaries and ecclesiastical organizations reflect his disposition on the ancient order of things.

Campbell's biographer, Robert Richardson, presents Campbell's ideological position:

His dissatisfaction with the divided and distracted condition of religious society, and with the aversion manifested by the clergy to much-needed reforms had, indeed, heretofore, created dubiety in his mind as to his possible future relations to any existing party. Now, however, that a complete and radical reformation was proposed, and by one, too, whose judgment and piety it had become almost his nature to reverse, all the difficulties of his position disappeared. A new and unexpected field of action was opened before him, precisely suited to his bold and independent spirit, and in perfect harmony with his convictions of religious duty. The paramount claims of the Bible were to be asserted and defended; the intolerant bigotry of sectarianism was to be exposed; the people of God were to be delivered from the yoke of clerical denomination, and primitive Christianity, in all its original purity and perfection, was to be restored to the world. His efforts to prepare himself for the work before him received hence a fresh and powerful impulse, and he devoted himself, with renewed assiduity, to the appropriate course of reading and investigation, suggested by his father or approved by his own judgment.³³

The Christian unity Campbell espoused was a unity based on the New Testament. Divisions into denominations represented non-biblical interpretations of the faith and self-serving assumptions of church leaders. His attacks on the distortions of basic Christian principles were directed both toward Protestants and Roman Catholics. One of those distortions that divided the church was hierarchy. Campbell recognized the prudence of a hierarchy within the democratic state conceding that the state could not govern effectively without constitutional structure. Yet the issue of organization became problematic for Campbell as the Restoration Movement expanded. While he stressed unity within an independent congregational system, the rapid success of the Movement necessitated some type of organizational form. Growth results in complexity: complexity demands order. Campbell acknowledged this reality but continued to struggle with ways in which it could be manifested faithfully to the New Testament.

Denominations and churches fed the egos of those who had power, but oppressed those over whom the power was extended. Thomas Campbell was quite influential in shaping his son's thought here but he, too, had difficulty convincing others of the distinction between good and bad organizations. In his *Declaration and Address* he had to carefully define his assertions.

I. That we form ourselves into a religious association under the denomination of the Christian Association of Washington, for the sole purpose of promoting simple evangelical Christianity, free from all mixture of human opinions and inventions of men.³⁴

Furthermore:

IV. That this Society by no means consider itself a Church, nor does it at all assume to itself the powers peculiar to such a society; nor do the members, as such, consider themselves as standing connected in that relation; nor at all associated for the peculiar purposes of Church association; but merely as voluntary advocates for Church reformation; and as possessing the powers common to all individuals, who may please to associate in a peaceable and orderly manner, for any lawful purpose, namely, the disposal of their time, counsel, and property, as they may see cause.³⁵

This issue is one of power and authority, and how that power and authority are used. The point is one of voluntary association, or what modern Disciples would call covenant.

Organizations and associations pressed their insistence on controlling the membership they sought to protect. One example was the Presbyterian Church's effort to establish an order of ministry which took the forms of requiring oaths of allegiance from ministers, indoctrination of seminarians, and regionally controlled hierarchies. In the 1830s there was also resistance by Disciples to Baptist organizations which were seen as exercising arbitrary power over both clergy and laity.³⁶ Traditionally, associations functioned more as guardians of orthodoxy than as alliances for church support. From Alexander Campbell's perspective, organizational order was an invitation to cooperation rather than a mandate to participation. Connections were to be loose. Associations were for the mutual benefit of the various local churches.

As situations changed, Campbell changed. By the 1850s the Movement had grown to more than 150,000 followers. This large number, spread across the southeast and mid-west, made the

means for cooperation more difficult to achieve. His changing opinion presented a stumbling block for adherents to the Restoration Movement as some clung to Campbell's earlier position while others traveled the new path with him. This dispute caused tensions later in the Movement's life over acceptable responses to missions, schools, seminaries, and general operational structures. It is unfortunate that the very principles of unity he advocated eventually became sources of division. To secret associations he was consistently opposed, but with open cooperative associations he increasingly developed amity.³⁷

Given that the restoration of New Testament Christianity was the motive behind his reform efforts, this is seen no more definitively than in his philosophy of education, for its seven propositions directly impact the nature of the church and its general ministry. It must also be reemphasized that for Alexander Campbell the Bible was the basis of all scholarship for in it is contained the moral admonitions of good living, the excellence of literature, and the revelation of an active God who creates and saves. The Bible is nonsectarian and very public.

The Bible is to the intellect and moral world of man what the sun is to the planets in our system—the fountain and source of light and life, spiritual and eternal. There is not a spiritual idea in the whole human race that is not drawn from the Bible. As soon will the philosopher find an independent sunbeam in nature, as the theologian a ritual conception in man, independent of THE ONE BEST BOOK.³⁸

Campbell was so convinced of the Bible as the model of intellectual and moral activity that he lectured to the entire student body at Bethany College on the Holy Scriptures. These lectures occurred each morning at 6:30 and attendance was compulsory. The centrality of the Scriptures remained unchanged from his earliest editorials in *The Christian Baptist* to his later articles in the *Millennial Harbinger*. In this regard Campbell was not a theologian. The openness and practicality of the New Testament rendered speculative theologies unnecessary and therefore useless. Time could be better invested in enterprises other than with the abstract exercises on the faith. Campbell was not a biblical literalist. He approached the Scriptures with a faith led by the Holy Spirit and a mind conditioned by reason. He held to I John 4, which requires a testing of the spirits for appropriateness and validity.³⁹

Not only did the New Testament direct his perception of Christianity, it specifically informed his notion of clergy and of the appropriated distinction between clergy and laity. Again he spoke only of those things to which the New Testament spoke. He derived his positions on clerical arrogance from the stories of Jesus being confronted by the Pharisees and Sadducees. What orders of ministry he approved were described in the Epistles rather than by the traditions of the historic church.

Campbell's resistance to the professional clergy was complex, and he has been accused of being anti-clerical. "It must be stressed, however, that Campbell's opposition to the clergy at no time extended to what he understood to be the rightly authorized ministry of the church."⁴⁰ His bias was reinforced by the order and propriety of Presbyterianism. Stone was unable to disassociate himself from his Presbyterian roots as cleanly as Campbell and this proved to be a minor point of contention in the 1832 union of Disciples and Christians.⁴¹ But was Campbell alone in his disdain of clericalism? Thomas Campbell, Walter Scott, and Barton Stone also saw the clergy as responsible for the divisiveness and arbitrariness which obscured primitive Christianity. The clergy accentuated the problems by their aloofness and superior attitudes which not only created impediments to unity but also widened the gap between them and the laity. Campbell was incensed even more in that the clergy were paid for their "services." In an 1824 number of *The Christian Baptist*, Campbell received a letter from "A Layman" who challenged him to respond to seven points regarding the Christian ministry.⁴² He obliged willingly, and his responses are informative.

First, That the clergyman can subsist without either eating or drinking. They subsist, Campbell responds, on the good graces of the lay folk they serve. To test their authorization from Heaven, they should be unfed for seven years to determine their worth. Campbell proposed this experiment would show their true value. His contention was that to preach was honorable, but to receive compensation for doing the Lord's work was not.

Secondly, That the clergymen who provide for their own households are worse than infidels. To live off the well being of the laity is a denial of the true faith because ministers have no real honest profession. Honest professions, he argues, are any one of a number of secular jobs, e.g., farmer.

Thirdly, That clergymen should not receive a liberal education. Campbell responds by pursuing his point of strength. If the

clergy have a liberal education so should the laity. The more liberal the education the clergy enjoy, the more, too, should be the education of the laity. It is, he argues, more difficult to understand the clergy than the Bible. Campbell's typical position was to provide a good education for all people so they could read, interpret, and decide for themselves. The question, couched as it was, caused him to again reproach clerical haughtiness.

Fourthly, That clergymen should not study divinity. Naturally his answer held the sting of sectarianism for he said those most proficient in understanding and expounding divinity were among the most ignorant in matters biblical. If one is to teach Episcopalian divinity for example, the minister should know Episcopalian divinity well, but then, of what real value is that for it begs the study of Christianity.

Fifthly, That if clergymen can preach without compensation, you can publish your "Christian Baptist" without compensation. Campbell's response was purely business. All the clergy sell is "breath," while ink, paper, and postage are expendable goods. He characterizes himself as a publisher which is an honest profession. In the tradition established in Scotland under the leanings of the Haldanes, he never did receive fees for his preaching.

Sixthly, That you are the only pious clergyman on the face of the earth. The answer is simply stated in that he did not consider himself a clergyman. In a touch of sarcasm, he said he had been one once but renounced the position when he realized the evil of his ways.

Seventhly and lastly, That you are the only clergyman since the days of the apostles that has taught the genuine and undefiled doctrines of the gospel of Christ. From the spirit and zeal with which you labor to establish truth and espouse error, I have no doubt but that you will cheerfully and promptly prove the above stated points. And when you shall have proved them, I will then willingly become a member of your church. I will, in conclusion of this note, assure you that I am no clergyman; that I am neither jealous nor envious of great talents, or of your unexampld piety; but that I am merely A LAYMAN. Campbell declined the challenge saying it did not affect him for when he was a clergyman, he did not teach the genuine gospel.

Campbell's relentless fight against the hold of the clergy was a lifetime struggle to empower the laity. Remembering his

earlier articles in *The Christian Baptist*, this thesis remained consistent until his death. Wise enough to understand the changing society and the growth of the Restoration Movement, he altered his thinking to accommodate the church rather than because he felt a change was ideologically sound. It was just this stand that caused Campbell to receive his greatest criticism.

A shift in his position is illustrated in a statement presented in the *Christian System*:

XXI. The Christian system demands for its perpetuity and for its prosperity at home and abroad, bishops, deacons, and evangelists. Its bishops teach, preside, and execute the laws of Christ in all its convocations. The deacons, a large and diverse class of functionaries composed of stewards, treasurers, almoners, doorkeepers, & c., as the case may require, wait continually upon its various services. Its evangelists possessed of proper qualifications, ordained and consecrated to the work of the Lord in converting sinners and planting churches, by a presbytery, or a board of seniors competent to the prudent discharge of this duty are constantly engaged in multiplying its members.⁴³

This movement toward organizational structure was presented by Campbell as quite scriptural based on passages such as those found I Timothy. Satirically, he prints "The Third Epistle of Peter" in *The Christian Baptist* to point out the excesses found in the professional ministry which sets up its officers as grand leaders who are to be revered with praise and great rewards.⁴⁴ In actuality the bishop's role was one of servanthood and manifested itself in presiding, organizing, overseeing, and teaching. Bishops rise from the will of the congregation in recognition of their talents and skills. The work is freely given, for the cause of the church is worthy of such service. It is an honorable position, yet not one to be honored. No amount of education or special training will qualify one to become a bishop for these gifts are of the Spirit. Education, however, will better prepare a bishop in the knowledge of the Bible and will sharpen those inherent skills enabling greater competency. Campbell contends this leader selected by the congregation stands in contrast to the hiring clergy who claims an inward call, is qualified by formal institutional preparation, and actively seeks a congregation. Without a congregation to oversee, the bishop would have no function.

Campbell argues that bishops should be paid because of the administrative nature of the job. In a later issue of *The Christian Baptist*, he sets up a telling comparison.

The bishop of a Christian congregation will find much to do that never enters into the idea of a modern preacher or "minister." The duties he is to discharge to Christ's flock in the capacity of teacher and president will engross much of his time and attention. Therefore the idea of remuneration for his services was attached to the office from its first institution. This was indisputably plain, not only from the positive commands delivered to the congregations, but from the hints uttered with a reference to the office itself.⁴⁵

Conversely:

A hireling is one who prepares himself for the office of a "preacher" or "minister," as a mechanic learns a trade, and who obtains [seeks?] a license from a congregation, convention, presbytery, pope, or diocesan bishop, as a preacher or minister, and agrees by the day, sermon, month or year, for a stipulated reward. . . . He intends to make his living in whole, or in part, by making sermons and prayers; and he sets himself up to the highest bidder.⁴⁶

Deacons, too, arise from within the congregation by election or assent. And while not charged by scriptural authority to teach or preach, deacons are those members of the church charged with keeping order. The concept of servant is most clearly established in the role of the deacon for that is where the care for the property and prosperity of the congregation is lodged. Again, no education or specialized training will make one a deacon. However, broad classical understanding of history and the Bible will enhance the deacon's ability to care for the church. If the bishops are to teach the purity of the faith, the deacons are to manage its order *vis-a-vis* the building in which that faith is exercised, the money which is contributed, and the elements which are consumed. The deacon's job is not to evangelize or convert but to sustain those who have been converted. The office of deacon is biblical and finds its authority in the Gospels through such servant figures as Mary, Martha, and Lazarus.

To the evangelists fall the tasks of preaching, converting, and organizing new congregations. Like bishops and deacons, they too rise from the ranks of congregation and are confirmed by

those who call them. Campbell states they must be “possessed of proper qualification” which he does not intend to be formal training and self-presentation. The qualifications are authenticated by the act of common selection; “they are not consecrated by imposition of hands, but approved by letters from the community.”⁴⁷ There is no apostolic succession nor apostolic mandate which confirms the role of evangelist for it is a gift as defined in I Corinthians 12. Ordination and consecration is not meant to confer a special authority but to confer a recognition by the congregation of a preexisting authority. In the third chapter of II Corinthians, Paul contended with this same problem of qualifications and recognition. It is no coincidence that Campbell would come out on the side of recognition of talents. The call to the evangelist was to extend the church by building new ones and to fill them with committed people. The evangelist was never to assume duties beyond those which the congregation defined. Brashness and loftiness were the unfortunate consequences of presuming more than the call required.

The “Christian System,” which was the restoration of the ancient order of things, did have order. That order, while New Testament based, also was influenced by Presbyterianism. Even given the abuses he encountered with this denomination, he saw it as the simplest and most orthodox form of Christianity. The influences which brought Campbell to ancient order were the nature of unity through the one Christ derived from the model of Christ’s ministry. Congregational governance was the appropriate form of Christian management, and the rationalist Campbell embraced the principles, if not the practice, of the evangelist Stone as powerfully on this point as on any other.

*Item. We will, that the church of Christ resume her native right of internal government—try her candidates for the ministry, as to their soundness in the faith, acquaintance with experimental religion, gravity and aptness to teach; and admit no other proof of their authority but Christ speaking in them. We will, that the church of Christ look up to the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into his harvest; and that she resume her primitive right of trying those *who say they are apostles, and are not.*⁴⁸ (emphasis BWS.)*

Originally influenced in the value of participatory Christianity by the Haldanes and Greville Ewing in Glasgow, Campbell was a reformer in the tradition of Martin Luther. Luther’s

concept of the “priesthood of all believers,” the notion of the ministry of the people, was apparent in Campbell’s philosophy. The order of bishops, deacons, and evangelists was the glue which held the church together and prompted new church starts. It was specifically the laity who both received God’s grace and were directly responsible to God. Revelation was beyond the purview of the clergy.

Carrying his Scottish influences to America where Alexander was reunited with Thomas, he found himself in agreement with many of his father’s newly formed ideas. Among those was one of the most succinct principles expressed by Alexander in an 1810 address to the Christian Association where he expounded the third point of their unanimity: “They considered ‘lay preaching’ as authorized and denied any distinction between clergy and laity.”⁴⁹ Even prior to this, James O’Kelly, a Methodist lay-preacher, deviated from his own communion’s tradition to establish what he called the “Five Cardinal Principles of the Christian Church,” the third of which stated: “Ministers and laypeople alike were to enjoy the fullest liberty in interpreting Scripture.”⁵⁰

Richardson capsulized Campbell’s continuing pleasure in regard to the laity:

His lofty ideas of God led him to take noble views of man, who was made in his image, while the unspeakable mysteries of the atonement and of man’s redemption through the triumph of the Son of God ever filled him with adoring wonder. “There is more value,” he used to say, “in one human being than there is in a million worlds such as we inhabit.” Hence his love of a government where all enjoyed equal rights, and his dislike to clerical domination. “The true clergy,” he would say, “are the Lord’s lot or people. God made men, the priests make laymen. Man is the creature of God, a layman is the creature of priests.”⁵¹

The clergy-lay distinction is a human invention by Campbell’s standards, not one initiated by God nor found in the Scriptures. This theme runs deeply throughout his thought and the polity which subsequently developed. Although three distinct denominations trace their beginnings to the Restoration Movement, empowerment of the laity is a constant among all three. There now exists, however, the recognition of a professional ministry within the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, and the Church of Christ.

IV. A New Era of Education

Ronald Osborn comments:

In order to produce informed and thinking Christians, capable of reading the Bible with understanding and applying its precepts to their lives, the Disciples pioneers founded colleges across the land. These were liberal arts schools for teaching students to think and become responsible persons in society rather than seminaries for training a professional clergy. Here students were prepared to pursue careers as educators, doctors, lawyers, editors, and entrepreneurs while they were also being equipped intellectually to serve as elders, deacons, and teachers in the church.⁵²

Total biblically-based education for the laity was a cornerstone of Campbell's philosophy of education. Both Campbell and Scott pursued some college education, while Stone was an educated man in his own right having studied at David Caldwell's academy in North Carolina. None of the three were specifically trained as ministers in schools such as those which were beginning to emerge in the latter part of the eighteenth century.

The laity, indeed, were becoming technically educated and biblically literate to the extent they were on a par with the bishops and evangelists who served them. This is philosophically and democratically sound, but practically teachers should be prepared in a different way from the students in order to challenge them. And, preachers must be prepared in a different way from members of the congregation in order to encourage them. These differences are not meant to be elitist or exclusive, but to provide leadership. The unsuccessful preacher or teacher is a reflection on the congregation who issued the call. Furthermore, at no point did Campbell denounce preachers who provided intellectual stimulation from the pulpit.

Intellectual sermons were not solely the province of Disciples either. Presbyterians experienced discomfort with the revivalistic spirit of the frontier because of uneducated, unordained preachers, and therefore in response, supported the educational advancements at Princeton in 1812. On the other hand, "the question of an educated ministry was most acute in southern Kentucky, where it became one of the grounds for the secession leading to the formation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church."⁵³ Many clergy in this revivalist age were willing to proceed on their inward call assuming the grace of God was all

that was needed to build new churches and count converts. The conflict arose when it came time to settle those new churches raising the question of how they would carry on their duties and under who's oversight.

Campbell's position on the education of preachers was often misunderstood or misinterpreted. Through a letter in the *Mil-lennial Harbinger*, Campbell issued a disclaimer to a critique by Jonathan Naylor that he changed opinions from those held in *The Christian Baptist*. Campbell contends:

Touching ministerial education, I am only more and more convinced of the necessity and importance of it, not so much in college training as in Bible training, and Biblical studies.

I did sternly oppose the education of unconverted men for the Christian Ministry, as it was practiced both in Great Britain and America, and is yet practiced in many cases and places in this country. I did also, and do still, oppose the training of young men for the Christian ministry in the great majority of our Theological Schools. But that I ever did oppose classical and scientific schools, colleges, and universities, or doubted the value and importance of such attainments, I have no recollection nor evidence whatever, either in print or out of it.⁵⁴

His Buffalo Seminary of 1818 was an attempt to address the needs of the churches by preparing young men for Christian ministry. Its demise was occasioned not only by Campbell's changing convictions, but because his students became increasingly interested in a general education. The seminary was not able to serve the purpose for which it was intended. While it did educate young men, they did not elect to pursue Christian ministry. It is difficult to assess the impact this experiment had on his concept of an "inward call," but surely it was influential.

Beyond Buffalo, the School of Preachers introduced a new format for ministerial preparation. As the rise of theological schools, with advanced courses and faculties of divinity in a collegial environment, represented a departure from apprenticeships and undergraduate programs, so the School of Preachers was an effort to nurture ministers apart from the confines of the theological seminary. The School of Preachers was introduced at the annual meeting in Newburg, Ohio, 1835, with the express purpose of enhancing preaching skills.⁵⁵ Not a center for theological reflection, it was, as its name implies, designed to promote

better practice in the art of preaching and teaching. Upon receiving an inquiry as to the differences between the School of Preachers and a theological seminary (the inquirer saw no distinction), Campbell published a lengthy response. In part he says:

Let me say, then, in direct reply to your inquiries, that the meetings called "schools for the preachers", are meetings to supply, in some measure, certain literary deficiencies under which some very useful brethren unavoidably labor at present. The manner, also in which some persons deliver themselves in their public discourses, is sometimes worthy of censure; but if pointed out to these brethren might easily be corrected: but for the want of some faithful monitor, these defects grow into habits as unconquerable as nature, and frequently prevent their usefulness to society.⁵⁶

Combining what was perceived as the best of both worlds, it provided the mentor experience within a collegial atmosphere. Fifteen were present for the first session and the textbook along with the Bible was Campbell's *Christian System*.⁵⁷ Described in the *Millennial Harbinger*, Campbell identified four specific elements of its purpose in order -

To remedy these imperfections [weak preaching], and more rationally and scripturally to qualify each other for public usefulness. . . we agree to meet occasionally at some central place. . . under the following regulations:

1) All the preaching itinerant brethren in a given district and those who teach in particular congregations are punctually to attend for one week . . . in such village or place as may be agreed upon by a majority of the brethren present.

2) At these meetings the proclaimers of the word shall each deliver one discourse, of one hour prepared in the best possible manner, before all who may please to attend.

3) These discourses shall be examined freely as to matter and manner, in committee of the whole, preaching and teaching brethren alone.

4) Some subject at each meeting shall be selected and agreed upon for the careful study of the brethren during the interval of these meetings. . . .⁵⁸

The curriculum for the School of Preachers was a much abbreviated combination of that found in theological seminaries and the individualized apprenticeships. But like Buffalo Seminary, it was short-lived closing down in 1839 when it was incorporated into the ongoing agenda of the yearly cooperative

ministerial meetings. The idea was good, but the changing times demanded more formal means of preparation for congregational leadership including greater degrees of ministerial sophistication. Disciples churches in the 1850s were feeling the same social demands the Congregationalists and Presbyterians experienced one-half century earlier.

Attuned to the principles of sound education, the first Disciples college was founded in Georgetown, Kentucky in 1836.⁵⁹ Chartered as Bacon College, Walter Scott was chosen as its first president. Although his tenure was short, he provided the impetus of the school's development by fund raising and by inculcating his long held views that education should embrace the whole range of culture. Due to declining enrollments, the school was moved to Harrodsburg, Kentucky in 1839 under President D.S. Burnet. In 1858 it was rechartered as Kentucky University, and in 1865 it joined a three-way merger in Lexington where it became part of Transylvania University.⁶⁰

The relationship between Walter Scott and Alexander Campbell was tenuous through the years. One reason for their disagreement was Scott's involvement with Bacon College. For some time Campbell had been considering opening a college. Bacon College beat him but also spurred him. While that institution received proper notice in the *Millennial Harbinger*, it was viewed with a jaundiced eye.⁶¹ To call Campbell envious may be too harsh, but he was not defeated. "In a series of articles on 'A New Institution' he developed his educational philosophy and in 1840 secured a charter for a 'Seminary of Learning' to be named Bethany College."⁶² The culmination of many years of thought and testing resulted in the opening of Bethany College to students in 1841. The term seminary as Campbell appropriated it for Bethany, as for Buffalo, was a place for learning and growth. It did not have the same connotation as it did for Andover.

Campbell was Bethany's first president and served in that capacity until shortly before his death in 1866. The college performed as that center of biblically-based liberal education Campbell had long professed. And as Osborn explained, it grounded its students in the understanding and application of Bible. Even though they were prepared for occupations other than ministry, they were capable of serving the church as informed elders, deacons, and teachers. Yet the number of preachers was recorded as no small part of those who provided significant leadership for the church.

An unexpected success of the college is recalled by Richardson:

The talented and educated preachers sent out from Bethany College were at this time (about 1852) giving a great impulse to the cause of the Reformation throughout the Western States. New Colleges, high schools and female seminaries were springing up under their influence to promote the cause of the primitive gospel, and the churches, sensible of their indebtedness to Mr. Campbell's energy and foresight in thus providing aids for want of which the cause had begun to languish, felt more and more disposed to complete the endowment of the institution.⁶³

Alliance to the institution grew as did the institution itself, the movement which spawned it, and the phenomenon of the western frontier. And what can be said of Bethany's early success? Certainly one factor was Campbell's business sense which provided an endowment sufficient to carry the immediate financial load as well as to secure its future. Another factor was the quality of the faculty which taught the philosophical and scientific subjects, coupling heavy doses of moral content with high intellectual expectations. A third was the proliferation of alumni who maintained strong institutional allegiance which was manifested both in recruitment and fund raising. A fourth factor was the uniqueness of the college based on its charter with the State of Virginia which made it distinctly non-sectarian. With due respect to the progress of Bacon College as a sister institution, Bethany's years were never interrupted by relocation, merger, and division.

Because of the success of Disciples church growth and the expanding economic base of America, Campbell saw a need for a full-time, compensated ministry. Not only were the number of churches increasing, so were the numbers within the churches. The preacher was called to a different service which demanded more time away from secular profit-making labors. The westward movement of the country called for a cadre of itinerant evangelists rendering employment apart from the ministry impossible. All this gave rise to the need for ministerial education as Campbell noted in his 1855 disclaimer to Jonathan Naylor.

In the days of *The Christian Baptist* Campbell's position was characterized by statements such as "In response to the question, Are we to have an educated or ignorant clergy? Campbell answered, 'Let us have no clergy at all, learned or un-

learned’.”⁶⁴ Although he adhered to his former position on the educated clergy as problematic, he was able to say later, “I have a little more faith in an educated than an uneducated ministry.”⁶⁵

ENDNOTES

- 1 Orville W. Wake, "The Emerging Image of the Church College," *Encounter* 22:4 (Autumn 1961) 445.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 As quoted from Mary Latimer Gambrell in *Why the Seminary* edited by Robert W. Lynn. This is part of the Auburn History Project, a study report of the Lilly Endowment Inc. of Indianapolis, Indiana, 1980 (page 8) which has been incorporated in *Piety and Intellect: The Aims and Purposes of Ante-Bellum Theological Education* by Glenn T. Miller, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).
- 4 Miller, p. 187.
- 5 *Ibid.*
- 6 *Ibid.*, pp. 9f.
- 7 Franklin H. Littell, "The Seminaries Commitment to the Dialogue," *Encounter* 25:3 (Summer 1964) 273.
- 8 Dates and descriptions on New Brunswick and subsequent seminary information are consistent from two sources: The study edited by Lynn and an excerpt from *Family Christian Almanac* (1840) reported by Alexander Campbell in the *Millennial Harbinger*, VIII (February 1849) 103-04.
- 9 Lynn, p. 11.
- 10 *Ibid.*
- 11 This is the only discrepancy from footnote 6. Lynn appropriates 1808 while Campbell records 1807. The year, however, is not as important as their agreement on the impact and visibility of this educational initiative.
- 12 Lynn, p. 12.
- 13 Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (sec. ed.) (New York: The Ronald Press, 1956), p. 35 as reported in *Journey in Faith* by Lester G. McAllister and William E. Tucker (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1975), p. 60.
- 14 *MH*, VI:II (February 1849) 103f. and Lynn, p. 21a.
- 15 Lynn, p. 1.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- 18 Campbell, *The Christian Baptist* I:5 (December 23, 1823) 98.
- 19 Granville T. Walker, *Preaching in the Thought of Alexander Campbell* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1954), p. 141.
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 147 Cf: ^a*CB*, 1:5 (Dec. 1, 1823) 29, ^b*CB*, I:2 (Sept. 1, 1823) 18.
- 21 Charles Lynn Pyatt "Theological Education Among Disci-

- ples", *College of the Bible Quarterly*, XVI:1 (January 1939) 4, extracted from *The Education of American Ministers* edited by William Brown Adams, Vol. 1. p. 74.
- 22 McAllister and Tucker, p. 129
 - 23 Lester G. McAllister (transcriber) "Juvenile Essays on Various Subjects by Alexander Campbell", *Encounter*, 32:1 (Winter 1971) 2f.
 - 24 S. Morris Eames, *The Philosophy of Alexander Campbell* (Bethany: Bethany College, 1966), p. 20.
 - 25 Perry E. Gresham, *Campbell and the Colleges* (Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1973), pp. 22-27.
 - 26 D. Duane Cummins, *The Disciples Colleges: A History* (St. Louis: CBP Press, 1987), pp. 32-35. In presenting the propositions of Campbell's educational philosophy, Cummins' specific terminology is in italics, the descriptions are mine.
 - 27 Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (St. Louis: John Burns, 1861), p. 256.
 - 28 Alexander Campbell, *The Christian System* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, n.d.), 303.
 - 29 Campbell editorial, *MH*, VII:V (May 1850) 291.
 - 30 *Christian System*, p. 29
 - 31 Morris Eames states: "According to Campbell, the human intellect has no creative power. This view has special philosophical meaning, and its complexities must be understood so that we can know what the human intellect can and what it cannot do." p. 35. This assertion limits the range of possibilities for human development by allowing a flow of knowledge to move in but not out of the mind. It would be good if Campbell were correct, but all people are not as responsive to intellectual stimulus as he was.
 - 32 *Ibid.*, "On Colleges", p. 296.
 - 33 Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1897), pp. i. 276f.
 - 34 Thomas Campbell, *Declaration and Address* and Barton W. Stone, et.al. *Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery* (St. Louis: Mission Messenger, 1978), p. 24.
 - 35 *Ibid.*
 - 36 Richardson, ii. p. 327.
 - 37 *Ibid.* ii. 45
 - 38 *Christian System*, p. 15.
 - 39 Richardson, ii. p. 153.
 - 40 D. Newell Williams, *Ministry Among Disciples: Past, Present, and Future* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1985), p. 12; for the Council on Christian Unity, "The Nature of the Church," Study Series 3.

- 41 *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- 42 *CB*, 1:10 (May 3, 1824) 178-181. The questions presented to Campbell are directly quoted from the article. His responses are not quotations but interpretations in order to make comments on his answers.
- 43 *Christian System*, p. 90.
- 44 *CB*, II:12 (July 4, 1825) 88-90.
- 45 *CB*, III:9 (April 3, 1826) 62.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 62f.
- 47 *Christian System*, p. 89.
- 48 T. Campbell and B.W. Stone, p. 18.
- 49 McAllister and Tucker, p. 117.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 55. At a conference in Surry County, Virginia, 1794, O'Kelly presented his "Principles" and declared the Bible as the only guide to Christianity. The new name of the dissident group was the Christian Church which ultimately joined with the Congregational Churches to form the Congregational Christian Churches in 1831.
- 51 Richardson, ii. p. 660.
- 52 Ronald E. Osborn, *The Faith We Affirm* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1979), p. 18.
- 53 Winifred E. Garrison and Alfred T. DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ: A History* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1948), p. 102.
- 54 *MH*, V:VI (June 1855) 343.
- 55 Garrison and DeGroot, p. 298.
- 56 *MH*, VII:VI (June 1836) 245.
- 57 *Ibid.*
- 58 *MH*, VI:X (October 1835) 479.
- 59 Cummins, p. 1.
- 60 *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- 61 McAllister and Tucker, p. 163.
- 62 *Ibid.*
- 63 Richardson, ii. p. 595.
- 64 Williams, p. 12.
- 65 Walker, p. 239.



REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF A GENERAL MEETING OF
MESSENGERS FROM
THIRTEEN CONGREGATIONS, 1834

J. T. M'Vay and Alexander Campbell

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY
NUMBER FIVE

REPORT
of the
PROCEEDINGS

of a

GENERAL MEETING OF MESSENGERS,
From Thirteen Congregations, Held in Wellsburg, Va.
On Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834

by

J. T. M'Vay and Alexander Campbell

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

Number Five

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Nashville, Tennessee

1957

INTRODUCTION

This is the fifth in a series of pamphlet publications issued by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society under the title, *Footnotes to Disciple History*. Individual numbers in the series deal with specialized subjects in the field of Disciple history.

The term "Disciple history" is used in its broadest sense as being representative of all groups whose beginnings date back to the restoration and reform movements inaugurated by James O'Kelly, Elias Smith, Abner Jones, Barton W. Stone, Alexander and Thomas Campbell, and others. These groups are variously known today as Christian Churches, Churches of Christ, and Disciples of Christ.

The opinions expressed and the interpretations made in each *Footnote* are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Society.

The *Report of the Proceedings of a General Meeting of Messengers, From Thirteen Congregations, Held in Wellsburg, Va. on Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834*, is a summary of the discussions of certain church problems and the conclusions reached during the Conference as reviewed by J. T. M'Vay and Alexander Campbell.

Only one copy of the original printing is known to be in existence. This is owned by H. E. Matheny of Akron, Ohio, who furnished the Society with a photostat of the document and gave his permission for its reproduction.

The pamphlet, possibly the earliest separate printed report of a cooperative meeting of churches of the brotherhood, probably was printed in Alexander Campbell's print shop in Bethany, although no imprint is given.

In the April issue, 1835, of *The Millennial Harbinger*, Alexander Campbell reprinted the body of the report as "containing an expose of our views on the subject of Co-operation." The report was reproduced complete in *The Harbinger and Discipliana* for June, 1957.

For wider distribution and more permanent form, it now appears in the *Footnote* series.

CLAUDE E. SPENCER, Curator
Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
September 16, 1957

REPORT
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF A
General Meeting of Messengers,
From Thirteen Congregations, held in Wellsburg, Va.
on Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834.

THE brethren in Wheeling, sensible that something was wanting among themselves to fill up the measure of their relative duties to the congregations in their immediate vicinity and to society at large; being also apprehensive that the congregations within their knowledge were, from similar circumstances, deficient in doing all that is enjoined on the citizens of Christ's kingdom, at one of their meetings in January last, addressed a letter to the brethren in Wellsburg, wishing them to take these matters into their consideration, and soliciting their aid and co-operation in the use of whatever means might, on mature deliberation, be thought wanting to finish the things begun, and to perfect what is wanting to the good order of the congregations and to their usefulness to the world. For this purpose letters were addressed to a number of congregations in the counties of Ohio and Brooke and the surrounding country, soliciting also their aid and co-operation. A meeting was finally agreed upon in Wellsburg, and messengers from the congregations were appointed to assemble there on the 12th of the present month, that the brethren might confer face to face upon these subjects. Messengers from thirteen congregations assembled on the day appointed; and, could the brethren in Wheeling have addressed a greater number of churches, doubtless the meeting would have been still larger.

The meeting was organized by appointing brother *John Brown*, President, and brethren *Isaac Hoge* and *J. T. M. Vay*, Secretaries. After social worship the object of the meeting was stated, and the matters to be examined were submitted in the form of three questions:

1st. In all the relations in which the congregations stand to themselves and to the world, is there any thing wanting to the full discharge of all that is enjoined upon them by the great King and Head of the Church?

This question being unanimously answered in the affirmative, the second question was, *What are the things wanting?*

On this question it was agreed that every brother present should, in answer to his name, state, from his own views of what pertained to the congregations, and from his own experience and observation, what, in his judgment, was wanting.

Some doubts were expressed whether such a meeting was in accordance with any precept, precedent, or principle suggested in the New Testament, and whether the things wanting could be set in order, or any means adopted by the brethren present to remedy any defects which should appear in the congregations, either with respect to their internal or external relations.

The discussion of this question was waved until the brethren should fully express their views of the things wanting; then it was alleged that it would be in order to consider whether, according to the letter or spirit of the Apostles' teaching, such a meeting, or any meeting for consultation, or any co-operation of congregations was either necessary or expedient, on any emergency, or in reference to any duties incumbent upon the congregations, either in reference to their internal or external relations.

The names of the brethren from each congregation were then called; and, in answer to their names, every brother present gave his views of the things wanting. The things wanting in order to fill up the views of all present on what is enjoined upon the congregations, both with respect to the internal and external relations of every congregation, are comprized in the following particulars:—

1. A systematic co-operation of the churches for the conversion of the world.

2. Proclaimers, of good moral character, and of suitable qualifications, to proclaim the word and teach the ordinances of Jesus Christ.

3. Better order in the congregations in their meetings on the Lord's day.

4. Overseers in the congregations to take the oversight and preside over them as the Apostles directed.

5. More general knowledge of the Scriptures, and marked attention to the teachings of the Holy Apostles.

The third and last question was next proposed, viz.—*How are the things wanting to be set in order?* In answering this question, the difficulty on the minds of one or two brethren present, respecting the ways and means by which the things wanting should be set in order, and concerning the propriety and expediency of such a meeting, either for consultation or co-operation, came fairly before the meeting. The difficulty was then fairly submitted, whether the Apostles authorized any such meetings, and whether the congregations in Christ were authorized to co-operate in any measures for the furtherance of the gospel, or for any object connected with the prosperity of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. For it was alleged that from such meetings, and from such efforts towards co-operation, sprang up, in process of time, all the councils and creeds, and intolerance which issued in the Roman Hierarchy, and in all the corruptions and tyrannies which were recorded on the pages of ecclesiastical history. It was argued

that the Reformation had progressed so far without such aids, and that it might endanger not only the independence of the particular congregations, but the very principles of reformation for which we contended. Moreover, there appeared to be neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament for any other meeting than that of a single congregation.

To this it was replied that no institution, human or divine, was free from abuse; that man was never placed in circumstances incompatible with a state of trial; that in Eden, and out of it, man was a responsible and accountable agent; and that as such, God could not institute any system which would interfere with a state of probation, and therefore the abuse of every institution and every blessing and privilege is possible. But the abuse of any institution or of any blessing never can be a reason or argument against the use of it. Were it otherwise, the gospel ought never to be preached—for nothing had been more abused than the gospel itself—and nothing more perverted than the preaching of it. Who would refuse to give alms to the poor, because charity had been abused? Or what disciple would withhold all his substance from works of benevolence, because the fruit of benevolence itself had been often misapplied?

That the Reformation had progressed so far without consultation, co-operation, or contribution, was assuming false premises; for it was by the liberal contributions of individuals—by the consultation and co-operation of members of different congregations—by the labors in word and teaching of individuals, who were sent out by different communities, acting in concert, that were the chief means of its advancement. Individuals, it is true, by the labor of the press, and by voluntary sacrifices in travelling and laboring in the word and teaching, had laid the foundation; but the conquests which were gained, either by these or by those, were the result of combined effort—of consultation and co-operation. And had there been more consultation, co-operation, and combined effort, there is every reason, in the nature of things, and in our own experience, to infer that the triumphs of truth would at this time have been much greater than they are.

But we are asked, What precept or precedent have we for the co-operation of congregations, or for consultative meetings; or what principle propounded in the New Testament authorizes any other meeting than that of a single congregation? If, indeed, the Apostles did, neither by precept, by precedent, nor by any general principle, inculcate or commend such measures, there is obviously no need for them, nor propriety in them. But on the hypothesis that Christianity refuses all co-operation beyond the limits of one congregation, then it has refused the most efficient of all the means which nature and society employ for every great and magnificent work. There is a co-operation among all the host of heaven: The sun, moon, and planets combine all their powers in producing the great effects of nature's laws. All the elements and distinct agents of our globe act in co-operation in all the products of the animal and vegetable kingdoms; and all the great achievements of humankind have been only the

effects of collected and concentrated effort. Moreover, when God instituted a social religion, he made it a national care and concern, and united all the families and tribes of Israel in one great system of co-operation. By consultation co-operation nations have been formed, cities and temples reared, monuments and towers erected, which have been the wonder of the world.

So very social and co-operative is Christianity in all its institutions, that the multitudes who first embraced it came together in one community—had all things common—and were one in all their prayers and efforts—daily in consultation and in co-operation for the promotion of its interests—and kept with one accord in one place, till a violent persecution drove them from the metropolis and scattered them over Judea and Samaria.

But if we are asked for an express command for congregations to co-operate, or for a consultative meeting to be held of any number of individuals or congregations, we can adduce none. Neither can we produce a command or a precedent for writing, publishing, or printing a line of the Holy Scriptures, nor for building a house for a Christian congregation to meet in. Shall we thence infer that the printing of the Scriptures, or the translation of them from a dead to a living language, or from one living language to another, is unchristian or unauthorized by the Apostles? If, then, the *principle* is clearly recognized, and the fact established, that the primitive Christian congregations did consult together, and co-operate in all affairs pertaining to the conversion of the world, and the prosperity, peace, and happiness of the kingdom of Jesus; then we have sufficient authority to proceed in devising ways and means to further the interests of our Saviour's cause, in every possible way, and by all lawful means.

Now as it derogates nothing from the divine authority for the consecration of the first day of every week, that we have no positive command addressed to any church, saying, that it ought to assemble on every first day for the observance of the social ordinances of the Redeemer, because we have an unequivocal precedent that the disciples assembled on that day for the keeping of the ordinances—so neither can it be an argument against consultative meetings or the co-operation of churches, that we have no positive command addressed to the congregations, calling upon them to meet for such purposes, provided we have clear and unequivocal precedents that the Christian congregations did even in the age of the Apostles co-operate. It need hardly be observed that if the fact be established that the congregations did co-operate, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that they did consult together on the ways and means of co-operation; for co-operation without consultation would be fortuitous, irrational, and unavailing.

We therefore proceed to show, that the congregations set in order by the Apostles themselves, did, while the Apostles yet lived, co-operate in matters and things of general concern. To say nothing at present of the consultative and co-operative meeting of the congregations in Jerusalem and Antioch, on a question which concerned all

the Gentile congregations,—(for whatever may be said of the authority of the Apostles to decide all questions of this sort, the meeting there was *consultative*; and the much debate and consultation among the elders and apostles preceding the decision, as narrated by Luke, shows that the meeting was fairly consultative,)—I say, passing over this celebrated meeting, we proceed to two very plain cases found in the 8th chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians.

In the 19th verse Paul mentions "*a brother who was chosen by the congregations their fellow-traveller.*" Wherever there is a choice made there must have been deliberation; and wherever there has been a choice by congregations, there must have preceded it a consultation of the congregations. This being very evident, we mention a second instance of the same sort, in the same chapter, verse 23. Paul introduces certain *brethren* whose names are not mentioned as (apostles) messengers of congregations. "If our brethren," says he, "be inquired of, they are apostles of congregations," (new version)—"messengers of congregations," (common version.) These messengers of congregations were doubtless chosen by the congregations whose messengers they were; and as they were acting in concert with Paul and Titus, it is obvious that the congregations whose messengers they were, at that time were co-operating in some matters of general concern. If it should be alleged that they were only co-operating in matters pertaining to the poor of the congregations, in the supply of their temporal wants, it only strengthens the argument in favor of the co-operation of congregations—by establishing the principle of co-operation in such matters as cannot be effected by a single congregation; and by exhibiting that concern for the welfare of the brethren in small matters, it furnishes a decisive argument for co-operation in the things pertaining to the greater wants and necessities of the brethren, in aid of their spiritual comfort and influence in the world.

But, indeed, the Acts of the Apostles throughout exhibit nothing more plainly in the history of primitive Christianity, than the spirit of co-operation. The church in Jerusalem co-operated with all the churches in Judea, and with the churches among the Gentiles as far their circumstances would allow; and the congregations of the Gentiles co-operated with them to the full extent of their opportunities. We find all the congregations alive to the prosperity of each other, and co-operating in aid of all the travelling brethren, selected and commended to the favor of God by the congregations. There was a continual going to and from Jerusalem, Samaria, Antioch, and other great places of resort.

At Antioch Paul chose Silas to accompany him, and the brethren commended them to the protection and patronage of the Lord. They went to Derbe. From Derbe Paul took Timothy; Gaius also of Derbe accompanied him. After some time Paul went to Corinth. Erastus, a convert of that city, was chosen to minister to Paul and travel with him. Sopater the Berean, and of the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus, and of the Asiatics Tychicus and Trophimus, besides Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy, were from these congre-

gations, all at one time co-operating with Paul in the work of the Lord. When Paul and his fellow-laborers came to Jerusalem, they lodged together at the house of Mnason a Cyprian, an old disciple, and were cordially received by the Jerusalemites. Luke himself at this time made one of the company. All the elders in Jerusalem were present at the meeting of Paul and James. Paul reported the progress of reform among the Gentiles, and when the Jerusalem elders heard it they glorified the Lord. Immediately a consultation was held concerning how the prejudices existing in the minds of the myriads of the converted Jews, against Paul, might be allayed, and certain measures were agreed upon. Paul acquiesced in the result of their consultation, and went to work accordingly. So prevailed the spirit of consultative co-operation in those primitive times.

Again—the Epistles are full of it. Besides the great congregation in Rome there were several smaller ones in that city and its environs. There was a congregation in the house of Priscilla and Aquila—one that assembled with Asyncritus and his companions—another that associated with Philologus and his companions. These congregations were commanded to co-operate with a deaconess of the church of Cenchrea, then at Rome, in whatever respects she might need assistance. Paul's companions, Timothy, Luke, Jason, Sosipater, Tertius, (Silas,) and Gaius saluted them in Rome; so did Erastus the Corinthian and Quartus of that city. Paul tells the Corinthians that all the congregations in Macedonia co-operated in making contributions for the saints in Judea, and that he wished them to co-operate also in that good work, and assured them that when they needed there would be a co-operation of churches in their behalf. He commanded the congregations in Galatia also to co-operate in this affair, and advised the brethren in Corinth to approve some persons by their letters, and he would send them to carry their gift to Jerusalem.

Indeed, all the catholic epistles—of which we have two from Paul; one to the congregations in Galatia—one to the Hebrews; one from James to the brethren in the dispersion; one from Peter to the sojourners in Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia, and Bythia: another to all the disciples, and one from John to the churches, imply a co-operation and conjoint interest in all the affairs of the “holy nation,” “chosen race,” and “royal priesthood” of Christ.

From all which we learn, that in those days there were consultations and co-operations in all things which transcended the knowledge and power of one congregation to effect. And this leads us now to take a more enlarged view than was expressed during our meeting, of all the relations in which the congregations stand to each other and to the world; and this with special reference to the abuses of this principle by the synods and councils to which we have so often alluded.

The Christian congregations, like so many families, have their internal and their external relations. All the children of one family stand in a special relation to each other, and the whole family stand related together. From these relations originate all the duties which they owe one another. But every family in one great community or

kingdom, stands related to all the families in that community, and owes to them duties growing out of those relations; and the whole of that community of families stand related to all other communities on earth; and, in consequence of that relation, owe to them a variety of duties: *for all duties spring from the relations in which we stand to God and one another.* Separate communities, which are the component parts of one great community, stand to the whole of that community as individuals in one family stand to one another. The kingdom of Jesus Christ consists of numerous communities, separate and distinct from each other; and all these communities owe as much to each other as the individual members of any one of them owe to all the individual members of that single community of which they are members. Every individual disciple is a particular member of that body (or congregation) with which he is united in Christian communion; and the whole of that community to which he belongs is but a member of that great body which is figuratively called "the body of Christ." He is the head of the whole body, or Christian congregation—not merely or specially of one community, but of all the separate communities as constituting one kingdom.

The kingdom of Jesus is now *in* the world, but not *of* the world. It stands related to the world by strong natural ties; and, from its relation to the world, owes it many duties. For here, as in all other parts of God's dominions, duty or obligation grows out of relation. The duties which the church or kingdom of Jesus Christ owes the world, numerous as they may be made, are all comprehended in one, viz.—its salvation. It is the duty of the church, having in it the oracles of God, to be *the light of the world*, and the *salt or salvation of the world*. The Head of the Church before he left the world died for it—erected one congregation, gave it the Oracles, the ordinances, and his spirit—and said on parting, OCCUPY TILL I COME. He has, then, by placing his kingdom in the world, and in such various relations to it, made it the duty of the whole kingdom to convert or save the world—the whole world. If, then, the whole world be not saved, it is not for lack of the sacrifice of Christ—for lack of the Spirit of God—for lack of oracles, or ordinances, or obligations; but for lack of an intelligent, holy, and harmonious co-operation of all the individuals and communities which constitute the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

We are so constituted that we cannot be prosperous or happy but as this work proceeds. Therefore, converting seasons are always refreshing seasons. In watering others, we are moistened and refreshed by the waters of life ourselves. When conversions cease, it is a dry time and a cold time. In the economy of salvation such is the arrangement, that no individual man can be happy but in doing his duty; and no congregation can be prosperous and happy, but as it exerts a converting influence and agency in the world. *The wisdom of the church is, then, a converting policy.* When the soldiers of the cross keep in the ranks of their respective companies, and the companies all march in solid columns, presenting one harmonious and unbroken front to the world, there is no standing before them, and there is in-

cessant joy and rejoicing in the camp. Union here is strength. If the church were now united and acting in holy co-operation, the world would fall before the blast of the gospel trumpet as the walls of Jericho by the blast of the ram's horns when encompassed with the armies of the living God. But to keep to the point: The external relations of the church, or the attitude in which she stands to the world, and the duties which she owes to it, now specially demand our attention.

All that is expected from the church in attempting the salvation of the world, is a full and faithful display of the word and the ordinances of Jesus Christ, sustained by a heavenly temper and a holy behaviour. This every Christian community is in duty bound to do. But there lie beyond its direct influence and example multitudes of brethren in Adam, to whom, in its congregated capacity, it cannot reach. Every Christian is a preacher, and a successful one as far as he has intelligence and character. But all cannot travel: for then there would be no church behind. Neither are all disciples equally qualified to convert sinners. If every church could send out one or more to labor in the word and teaching, then co-operation would not be necessary, so far as the means of providing and sustaining those laborers are concerned; yet still there would have to be co-operation and an understanding as to the route and course of proceeding, else they might travel in the same line and occupy the same field. Even Paul and Barnabas must consult and agree upon the route and order of proceeding. Acts xv. 36.

In the conversion of the world co-operation is necessary upon any hypothesis. But this co-operation of communities can extend no farther than a proper selection and application of the means ordained for the conversion of sinners. Co-operation in reference to the internal affairs of congregations, is wholly out of the question. This gave birth to popery, creeds, councils, and all the traditions of the Fathers. As every family regulates its own concerns, so every Christian congregation is to regulate its own individual concerns. It is in the affairs of Christ's kingdom as in the affairs of any well regulated kingdom of this world. Every family has its own relations, rights, obligations, and privileges; but all these families must co-operate in every thing that concerns the public good. Every family and every congregation in its individual character is independent of all others as far as the right of regulating its own internal concerns is considered. No one family has a right to interfere with the affairs of another. So in the neighborhood of churches, they are all independent communities; but neighborhood association and co-operation are necessary to the prosperity of all. But this is conceded. The only question is, *How far and in what manner ought congregations to co-operate?* The answer to the question *How far?* is short and easy—in every thing which is necessary to the salvation of the world, which they cannot effect at all, or so well in their individual capacity. The principles and examples laid down in the New Testament clearly teach this. And as to *the manner* in which this is to

be done, a general law could not be promulged, nor a general precedent laid down, more than for the manner of translating, printing, and publishing the Bible; or for erecting or hiring rooms and houses for church meetings. This must be a matter of expedience and convenience, as times, circumstances, and the exigencies of society require and suggest.

Wages for labor in the word is spoken of in the New Testament; but no sum is stipulated, nor any kind of wages specified. Paul said he received *wages* from various congregations while laboring in Corinth, 1 Ep. viii. 8. He was no hireling. A hireling is one who works for the sake of the wages; therefore, every one who receives wages is not a hireling. The laborer is worthy of his *hire*, or wages. The wages may be either money, which represents property, or the things of which it is but the representative. Now as one congregation may not have the means of supporting one evangelist or proclaimer of the word all the time, however convinced that it is both necessary and expedient; and if one or two congregations with it are able jointly to obtain and employ one, why should they not? And if two or three congregations should all meet in one place, or send their messengers to confer upon the person most eligible, or the field of operation and the measure of his labors; what, in such a *manner* of proceeding, is detrimental to the conversion of the world, or ominous to the independence and liberty of the congregations?

There is no priesthood—no one cast of men in such an economy of expediency. There is no legislation for congregations, no compulsory enactments—no interference with the internal relations, duties, or privileges of a single congregation. It is not a body representative—it is not a mixture of clergy and laity on the principles of any sect in christendom. It is not a conference of priests—a synod of deacons and elders—an association of clergy and laity on the principles of a church representative—making laws for the internal affairs of congregations, passing decrees of exclusion on points of doctrine or matters of opinion; but a meeting of churches, by their messengers, or in person, with a reference to the faithful and full performances of those duties which grow out of the external relations of the church to the world. All now admit that co-operation is necessary, and for the purposes specified; and that no harm to the church is now likely to arise from it: but some may fear the abuse of it hereafter. Baptism and the Lord's supper have been abused, and the Lord knew that they not only *might*, but that they *would* actually be abused; yet he ordained them. He makes the grape to grow, and we may lawfully plant the vine, though some may make a bad use of its fruit. We are not responsible for posterity—we are responsible only for ourselves. Peter is not to be blamed for what his pretended successor has assumed; neither was the meeting, nor the consultations and decrees of the apostles, elders, and the whole congregation in Jerusalem to blame because of the proceedings of the Council of Trent. Nor are we, who, in conformity to the precedents and principles presented in the Living Oracles, co-operate in the full discharge of all our relative duties to the world, if hereafter others should abuse it to

interference in the internal affairs of the congregations. Of this we set them no example; and this is all that we have to guard against. We who think it our duty to co-operate with our brethren in the great work of regenerating the world, only ask our brethren who may disagree with us (if any there be) the privilege which they claim to themselves. If they conscientiously withhold their counsel and their property from the work of laboring in the word and teaching, we ask them to allow us the liberty to give our money and our advice in aid of a regular system of co-operation with all who are devoted to the great work of saving the world.

After a full expression of the preceding views (though they are here presented more in detail) the following resolutions were submitted, discussed, and all of them almost, if not altogether, unanimously adopted by the brethren present; and are now recommended to the congregations for their concurrence:—

Resolved, That in order to remedy one of the things wanting in the churches, it is the duty of the congregations to co-operate in the selection of proper persons to proclaim the word, and to give them directions in their labors, and to exercise a supervision over them.

Resolved, That there shall be a fund raised by voluntary subscription or contribution, in each congregation, for the support of those who labor in the word and teaching, and that this fund shall be forwarded quarterly to a Treasurer, who shall apply it under the direction of a committee to be appointed for that purpose.

Resolved, That this meeting nominate two persons to labor in the word and teaching, under the direction of a committee, and that they be recommended to the congregations for their concurrence.

Resolved, That brethren Robert H. Forrester, of Pittsburg—John Henry, William Haden, and Jonas Hartzil, of Ohio, be recommended to the congregations; and that whichever two of them can be first obtained, shall, with the concurrence of the brethren, be employed to labor in the word and teaching.

Resolved, That the following persons be appointed a committee to direct and superintend the labors of the brethren nominated in the 4th resolution—namely:—R. Richardson, of Wellsburg—J. T. M'Vay, of Bethany—John Hindman, of the Cove—Robt. Nichols, of Centre—Thomas Wier, of Steubenville—Absalom Titus, of Dutch Fork—J. Hoge, of Wheeling—Joel F. Martin, of Warren—Cyrus M'Neely, of Cadiz—James Hough, of West Liberty—Joshua Carlz, of Salt Run—William Cochrane, of Middletown, Ohio—Samuel Grafton, of King's Creek. And, of these, any three shall be a quorum, all of whom shall be notified by a Corresponding Secretary.

Resolved, That John Brown be appointed Treasurer, and J. T. M'Vay Corresponding Secretary of the congregations co-operating in these resolutions.

Resolved, That A. Campbell and J. T. M'Vay be appointed a committee to report the objects and proceedings of this meeting to the congregations here represented.

Resolved, That the congregations of disciples in this co-operation will not countenance or patronize any person as a public proclaimer of the word, who is not now known to the brethren, or who has not been appointed by some congregation, and has not testimonials of his good standing.

Resolved, That any of the congregations who may desire to co-operate with us on the basis of these resolutions, shall be received on application to the Corresponding Secretary, or at the next meeting.

Resolved, That this meeting now adjourn to meet again on the last Friday of September next, with the Cadiz church, five miles east of Cadiz, Ohio, and that a two days public meeting be there held on the seventh and first days following.

The brethren will perceive that these resolutions have respect only to the things wanting in reference to our external relations to the world, and that it is chiefly designed to ascertain how far the different congregations will co-operate in a regular systematic course of proceeding, for the purpose of keeping constantly in the field some competent and faithful laborers, who will devote themselves to the work of the Lord in converting the world. Before any steps can be taken, it will be necessary to ascertain, with tolerable accuracy, not only that the congregations are willing to co-operate in this work, but what they can do, before we present any inducement to competent brethren to come and labor in the bounds of these congregations. The first quarter commenced with the first of the present month (April,) and will expire on the first day of June, at which time it will be necessary that their contributions for the gospel be forwarded to the Treasurer elect.

A perfect unity of opinion (especially when many minds are concerned) in questions of expediency, is not to be expected in any matter—not even in the most common affairs of this life. In all these affairs the few must yield to the many. Paul and Barnabas could not agree in a matter of expediency; but this did not issue in a breach of brotherhood or Christian communion. But if the few will not yield to the many, schisms must occur on every question of business. Our brotherhood in Christ is on the basis of one faith, one Lord, one immersion, one God, one Spirit, one hope. These make one body. And in all other matters it is, "Receive one another cordially, without regard to differences in opinion."

It is our duty to co-operate, our duty to labor for the conversion of the world—to devote our time, our property, our talents to the Lord's work. This is our honor and our happiness. The ways and means may be better or they may be worse, in the estimation of the many or the few; but already we have the assurance of much unanimity in the ways and means of co-operating in reference to our present duties arising from our external relations.

One word, brethren, and we have done. The salvation of the world called for the best and richest and largest bounty of God in the gift of his Son. It cost the only begotten son of God a life of humiliation, mortification, poverty, and self-abasement, terminated by a painful and ignominious death. It cost the Apostles the sacrifice of their whole lives. The first Christians took joyfully the spoiling of their property, and gave up not only their substance, but their lives also in the propagation of the faith. In every age since, the true and faithful disciples of Christ have suffered much, sacrificed much, and labored much in the same good cause; and shall we withhold our hands, and refuse a little of that abundance and of those bounties which the Lord has bestowed on us, when in his word and in his providence he honors us by making a demand upon us as his stewards?

By order of the meeting—

J. T. M'VAY.
A. CAMPBELL.

It is expected that the Secretary, or Scribe, of every congregation, will inform brother *J. T. M'Vay*, as soon as possible, what may be expected from each congregation as a contribution to the fund—that measures may be taken in accordance with the preceding resolutions.

A LIST OF THE MESSENGERS AND BRETHREN

In attendance at this Meeting.

With the exception of one or two, they were all private members of the congregations to which they belong:—

Wellsburg—John Brown, R. Richardson, George Young, Leonard Hobbs, Louis Pinckerton.

Bethany—A. Campbell, James Parkinon, Alexander Mooney, J. T. M'Vay.

Cove—David Logan.

Centre—Thomas Donovan, Robert Nichols, John M'Ilroy.

Steubenville—Thomas Wier.

Dutch Fork—Absalom Titus, Samuel Cox.

Wheeling—Charles Encil, Thomas Wilson, Isaac Hoge.

Warren—James Hodgen, Elijah C. Foote, Joel F. Martin.

Cadiz—Samuel Paul, Cyrus M'Neely, William Harrah.

West Liberty—James Hough.

Salt Run—Joshua Carle.

Middletown, Ohio—James Garrett, William Cochran.

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

- No. 1 *Alexander Campbell and His Relevance for Today*, by Eva Jean Wrather
- No. 2 *The Lunenburg Letter with Attendant Comments*, by Alexander Campbell
- No. 3 *Barton Warren Stone and Christian Unity*, by William Garrett West
- No. 4 *An Address to the Different Religious Societies on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name*, by Rice Haggard
- No. 5 *Report of the Proceedings of a General Meeting of Messengers, From Thirteen Congregations, Held in Wellsburg, Va. on Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834*, by J. T. M'Vay and Alexander Campbell.

Footnotes No's. 1, 2, 3, and 5 are 25 cents each

Footnote No. 4 is 35 cents

Complete set of 5 FOOTNOTES—special price \$1.20

Special prices are made for larger quantity orders

Order from

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Room 109, Joint University Library Building

Nashville 5, Tennessee

For Your Library...

Barton Warren Stone: Early American Advocate of Christian Unity

by

William G. West

with an introduction by Luther A. Weigle

261 pages

Price \$4.00

NOTE: When order for the volume on Barton W. Stone is accompanied by a new or renewal membership in the Society (\$2.00), special price of \$3.00 per book is offered.

Save \$1.00—order your copy at special \$3.00 member's discount.
—include your dues payment 2.00

Total \$5.00

Order from

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Room 109, Joint University Library Building

Nashville 5, Tennessee



CHRISTIAN UNITY—OUR HERITAGE

by Dr. William A. Gerrard, III

286.6
GER

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY
NUMBER SEVEN

CHRISTIAN UNITY—OUR HERITAGE

by
Dr. William A. Gerrard, III

Presented at a retreat sponsored by the Christian Church (Disciples
of Christ) in Georgia, Epworth By The Sea,
St. Simons Island, Georgia

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY **Number Seven**

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Nashville, Tennessee 37212
1986

INTRODUCTION

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society is pleased to publish the seventh in a series of *Footnotes To Disciple History*. The term Disciple history in these Footnotes is used in its broadest sense as representative of the three groups which grew out of the Campbell-Stone Movement. These groups are variously known as Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Christian Churches, and Churches of Christ.

This Footnote seeks to analyze the place of church union in the life and ministry of some of the earliest leaders of the Movement. Giving a brief look at the thoughts and writings of Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott on union, the author provides a background on which they built and then seeks to provide an evaluation. The writer concludes: "Christian union is still an imperative, a polar star to guide the church. As the Christian Church takes this imperative with all seriousness, its rich heritage may guide its thinking in the endeavor to meet the challenges of the day."

William Austin Gerrard holds the Doctor of Philosophy degree from Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia. The subject of his doctoral dissertation was *Walter Scott: Frontier Disciples Evangelist*. He currently serves as minister of the Community Christian Church, Riverdale, Georgia. The material in this Footnote was delivered as a series of lectures given for a Ministers and Mates retreat in Georgia.

The Historical Society is happy to present this writing in the interest of historical preservation and research as a *Footnote To Disciple History*.

James M. Seale, President
Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
September 1986

CHRISTIAN UNITY—OUR HERITAGE

The question may be asked, "Why should the followers of the Campbell-Stone Movement be interested in the pursuit of Christian unity?" The answer, simply stated, is that this religious movement came into being principally to bring about Christian union among the churches. Since beginning in the early decades of the nineteenth century, efforts have continued to effect Christian union.¹ In this process, theological and practical issues have emerged for discussion concerning the nature of the church and its structuring, faith, worship, sacraments, mission, and ministry. The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) has been in pursuit of a unity that includes diversity on all of these issues.

I: Unity Efforts in the Nineteenth Century.

Where and how did the concern for the cause of Christian union begin? One needs to turn back the pages of time and history to the early decades of the nineteenth century and look briefly at the ideas of the four pioneer fathers of the movement: Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott. What was the cultural context in which they lived and worked, and what were the crucial issues of faith as they saw them? More particularly, one needs to assess critically their efforts and insights relating to the problem of unity and see what their legacy is for the present age. There was not an age devoid of efforts for union among the churches. In the early and mid-nineteenth century various ideas and plans were put forth by individuals and groups to effect Christian union. By viewing some of these, one may see in what ways the Christian Church represented a radical approach to the question.

Samuel S. Schmucker, a Lutheran, in his *Fraternal Appeal to the American Churches*,² in 1838, urged the churches to abandon their party names and unite to form the Apostolic Protestant Church. Schmucker's appeal for unity was based on a common confession of faith, consisting of twelve articles derived from the creeds of several churches and expressing the fundamental truths of the Christian faith. The churches should practice intercommunion and have an interchangeable ministry. Schmucker's plan allowed the denominations to keep their respective organizational structures, use their historic forms of worship, and utilize their own creeds if they desired, provided they accept the twelve articles of the Apostolic Protestant Church. If his plan had been accepted, the result would have been a federation of churches rather than a united church.³

Within the Protestant Episcopal Church proposals to unite the churches were put forth by Thomas Hubbard Vail and William Reed Huntington. One of the more celebrated endeavors for union was by William A. Muhlenberg, who inaugurated the Memorial Movement⁴ in 1853 in an effort to make the Protestant Episcopal Church an instrument for effecting Christian union in America. His plan for union was based on extending Episcopal ordination and a measure of pastoral oversight to sincere ministers of other denominations, provided they would abide

by certain liturgical, administrative, and doctrinal requirements of the church.

Nineteenth century Protestantism witnessed the formation of other movements that sought to achieve a type of unity in action. Basic to many of these was the idea that theological and ecclesiastical differences could be ignored or forgotten, and unity could be achieved through benevolent activity. In this "benevolent empire" individuals, but not established denominations, cooperated in various educational, missionary, and reform endeavors. Included in these enterprises were Methodists, Reformed, Congregationalists, Low Church Episcopalians, Baptists and Presbyterians. These persons believed that all Christians were one; by working together a spirit of unity could be achieved. Essentially, these endeavors were pragmatic in their thrust and represented not a reconciling but a concealing of theological issues through activism. Among these were the American Bible Society, the American Home Missionary Society, the American Tract Society, the American Sunday School Union, and the Evangelical Alliance.⁵

Numerous other endeavors for union and cooperation among the churches appeared on the horizon in nineteenth century America. The Plan of Union (1801) and the Accommodation Plan (1808) were developed by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the work of missions and evangelism on the frontier. The Evangelical Church of the Prussian Union was formed in 1817 by Frederick William III in Germany. Inspired by this union, many of the German Reformed and Lutherans in Pennsylvania engaged in cooperative efforts in worship and evangelism and looked forward to a union. Other voices were heard advocating church union, prominent among which were Phillip Schaff and John Williamson Nevin at the German Reformed seminary in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania.

Along with these endeavors for Christian union were those of Barton W. Stone (the Christians) and Thomas and Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott (the Reformers or Disciples). The steps they were proposing were radical in light of some of the currents of religious thought in early and mid-nineteenth century America and ran counter to the established churches that were steeped in their respective traditions, creeds, theologies, and patterns of worship. The basic plea of these founding fathers was for Christian union through a restoration of Primitive Christianity.⁶ By returning to the New Testament as sole guide to faith one can restore the Ancient Order and Ancient Gospel, thereby establishing the grounds for the union of all Christians. Basically, the Restoration Movement, as it was called, was anti-creedal, anti-ecclesiastical, and anti-clerical. By viewing the ideas of Stone, the Campbells, and Scott on Christian union, one can see both the differences in emphases and the large ground of agreement between them.

II: Barton W. Stone: A Plea for Christian Unity.

Barton W. Stone (1772-1884), the earliest pioneer of the movement, was a revival preacher in the New Light Presbyterian strain. Pastor of

churches at Cane Ridge and Concord, Stone was intimately involved in the Cane Ridge Revival on August 7-12, 1801, in the Bluegrass region of Kentucky outside of Paris.⁷

At this Revival, Stone witnessed the coming together of a vast number of people from different denominations — Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. Estimates of those attending ranged from 10,000 to 25,000. Originally intended as a “sacramental occasion” for Presbyterians, it became a great occasion for Christian unity. Preachers from all of the denominations were represented, and on occasion preached simultaneously to all who would listen to them. Stone was impressed that during these few days of intense revivalism all seemed to be united in the work of Christian love and in the salvation of lost souls. Especially significant for Stone was the fact that “party spirit” and sectarian narrowness, so rampant on the American frontier at this time, seemed to disappear in the great work being done there by the Holy Spirit. For Stone, there was a sense of spiritual unity among those in attendance. In the heat of the Revival, exercises and demonstrations of the Spirit, all of the sects seemed to be fused into one body of Christian people. The impression made upon Stone at Cane Ridge remained vivid and gave the prime thrust to what he wrote, preached, and practiced. It remained his ideal of Christian unity until his death in 1844.

Following the Cane Ridge Revival there was a train of events leading up to his separation from the Presbyterians. Then Stone, along with four others of like mind, formed the independent Springfield Presbytery on September 10, 1803. In less than a year after its formation, the Springfield Presbytery dissolved itself. Believing that it was a sectarian, unscriptural organization, Stone and his associates issued “The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery,”⁸ on June 28, 1804.

This brief document, which was a treatise on Christian unity and one of the most important in the history of the movement, opened with the resounding words:

We “will,” that this body die, be dissolved, and sink into union with the Body of Christ at large; for there is but one Body, and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling.⁹

In their plea to the churches for Christian unity and a return to the Holy Scriptures, these early reformers expressed their fundamental convictions, namely:

1. The Bible is primary over against all human creeds.
2. Christians have the right and duty to go directly to the Bible and interpret it for themselves. Individuals are to show a spirit of tolerance for the opinions of others.
3. The local congregation is an independent and autonomous body as against the authority of larger ecclesiastical bodies.
4. Unscriptural names are to be abandoned. In their place biblical names and ideas should be used in the church.
5. All Christian people belong to the one Body of Christ.

6. The Bible and the presence of the Holy Spirit should be the guide for all Christian people.

Stone's passionate concern was promoting the cause of Christian unity.¹⁰ Decrying divisions in the churches as sinful, Stone urged that one should go to the Bible for a true understanding of the church and Christian union. In his biblical restorationism, Stone believed that churches and individuals were not to go to the New Testament in order to formulate a rigid creed or model of church order as tests of Christian fellowship and unity. Rather, what he called for was a restoration of New Testament life. Central for him was one's personal commitment to Jesus Christ as Son of God and Lord and obedience to him. The Body of Christ was composed of those who were baptized by the one Spirit into one body, and all partook of the same spirit of love and obedience. The spirit of love that was present in Jesus Christ should exist among Christians, and this would bring about unity. Beyond this Stone would not dogmatize or put forth a precise formula to which churches or individuals must adhere for there to be unity.¹¹

In advocating a return to the Bible, Stone differentiated between facts and opinions. The Bible contained simple facts and rules of conduct that all could understand and obey.¹² Then, there were human opinions and interpretations of various doctrines. On the latter, according to Stone, it was not necessary to have theological agreement. One could have freedom of thought and hold one's own opinions and private thoughts, but these were not to be imposed on others.¹³ In Stone's view, there was room for diversities of opinions and biblical interpretations in one church where the spirit of love prevailed.¹⁴

From the beginning of the movement he spearheaded, Stone spoke of four kinds of union, namely:

1. Book union—union based on adherence to a creed or confession of faith.
2. Head union—union upon commonly agreed upon opinions. Certain individuals stated that the Bible was their creed. These individuals, in Stone's view, made union rest upon an acceptance of certain opinions as to what was taught in the Bible, some of which were not essential to salvation.
3. Water union—union founded upon immersion of believers in water.¹⁵
4. Union of fire or spirit—union founded upon faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and obedience to him and his commands. This was the kind of union for which Stone labored and prayed. In his thinking, only God could bring about union in the church, and this he did by bestowing the Spirit. Such a union of fire or spirit would lead individuals to love God and one another, and this was the only kind of union that would lead the world to believe in the gospel.¹⁶

In his understanding of the nature of Christian union, Stone stressed going to the New Testament to discover the kind of relationship

that exists between the Father and the Son (John 17). This is a prototype of the quality of relationship that should prevail among Christians in order for union to be effected.¹⁷ Stone found the relationship between the Father and Son to be a oneness in character and spirit of love; there exists between them a oneness of operation in creation, providence, and redemption.

In order for Christian union to be realized, Stone emphasized first that the individual must be personally united with Christ; a spiritual bond must exist between Christ and the person.¹⁸ Then individuals are to love one another as the Father and Son love each other. When this kind of relationship is present between people, the barriers separating them would break down. Stone preached repeatedly and urged that love, justice, mercy, and holiness of life would bring about the unity of God's people.¹⁹ Christians become co-workers with the Father and Son by preaching the gospel and working through love to effect unity. In this way they become participants in God's work of redeeming his people.²⁰

It was Stone's belief that Christian unity was a necessary step in God's plan to save the world and bring those who were lost to believe in his Son. Referring to the Gospel of John, Stone noted that Christ did not pray that sinners would believe, but that the church might be one so that sinners would believe. The gospel was to be preached in order to save the sinful, and the unity of God's people must be realized before Christ would reign supremely in the lives of people and in the world. Hence, the work of evangelism assumed a place of central importance in Stone's understanding of Christian unity.

Throughout his life, Stone was committed to effecting Christian unity; it was his "polar star."²¹ He looked forward to a national conference on Christian unity in America where the representatives of all denominations would be invited to attend and discuss the various issues regarding it.

Stone's strategy for bringing about Christian union underwent a gradual change.²² In the early years of his ministry Stone thought of union in terms of denominations and sects uniting. During these years he called upon the various denominations to abandon their creeds, party names, sectarian spirit, and unite on the basis of the Bible alone.²³

A union of the denominations of the day as Stone called for did not come about. Sectarian rivalry and creedalism were too strong to break the walls of denominational loyalty. Stone then ceased to think of union in terms of larger groups and began to conceive it as a relationship between individuals. For the remainder of his life this was the principal thrust of his preaching and personal endeavors. His plea was for individuals to abandon their party names, sectarian creeds and loyalties, and unite on the basis of the Bible. The kind of union Stone was calling for was a spiritual one where the spirit of love and peace existed between individuals. For Stone this was the only kind of union that would sustain itself, since he had become convinced that a large number of persons in the sects of the day were carnal and did not possess the Christian

spirit. Thus, Stone did not conceive union in terms of social groups or denominations merging to form a large church. He had little or nothing to say about a united church or what form it would take as an ecclesiastical structure.

III: Thomas and Alexander Campbell: Champions of Restorationism.

First in the stream of the Disciples roots of the movement was Thomas Campbell (1763-1854).²⁴ Born in County Down, Ireland, and educated at the University of Glasgow, Campbell was a minister in the Old Light, Antiburgher, Seceder Presbyterian Church. Having experienced the divisions and sectarianism prevalent in the church, Thomas Campbell made an effort to heal these divisions and effect unity, but in these endeavors he was frustrated.

Immigrating to America in 1807, Campbell settled in Pennsylvania and affiliated with the Associate Synod of North America, which represented the Seceder Presbyterians. Soon he came into conflict with his own church over the issues of creeds, the nature of faith, and who should partake of the Lord's Supper. Becoming dissatisfied with the church and embroiled in controversy, Thomas Campbell withdrew from the Presbyterian Synod, but continued to preach in the vicinity of Washington, Pennsylvania, as the occasion presented itself. The problem of a fragmented church loomed large in his mind at this time, leading to his becoming a staunch apostle of Christian union in America.

On August 17, 1809, Campbell took a bold step in organizing the Christian Association of Washington. The Association was composed of members of different denominations, although most were Presbyterians. Having an aversion to sectarianism and bondage to creeds as tests of fellowship, theirs was the desire for a united church. In their thinking, essential to the effectiveness of preaching the gospel in order to save the world was a church united. Proposing to work for reform and the unity of the church within the framework of existing denominations, the formation of a separate movement was no part of the original thinking of Thomas or Alexander Campbell. All who participated in the formation of the Christian Association of Washington²⁵ agreed that an appropriate motto would be: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

To express more fully the principles and objectives of the Christian Association of Washington, Thomas Campbell prepared a brief *Declaration* to which was added a more lengthy *Address*.²⁶ In essence the purpose of the Association and the *Declaration and Address* was to "restore unity, peace, and purity, to the whole Church of God."²⁷ In this brief *Declaration*²⁸ four fundamental principles were put forth:

1. The individual believer has a right to private judgment and freedom to interpret the Scriptures.
2. The Scriptures are infallible, the sole authority for the church, and binding upon all.
3. Party contention and a sectarian spirit are inherently evil.

4. Christian union may be attained by an exact conformity to the Scriptures and the precepts clearly expressed by Christ.

The assumption that underlay these formative principles in the *Declaration* was that one could define a "simple evangelical Christianity, free from all mixture of human opinions and inventions of men."²⁹ The New Testament was conceived as a blueprint for the doctrines, worship, discipline, and government of the church. Campbell, however, refused to be specific about what was essential or nonessential for the church. For him, essentials were simply the facts that were clearly written in Scripture. In these opening words Campbell made room for opinions and human interpretations, so long as these were not made binding on others. Campbell's assumption was that there could be a united church on fundamental principles, while preserving diversity of opinions. Hence, in this manifesto, Thomas Campbell was advocating a program of restoration of New Testament Christainity as a way to union.

The heart of the *Address* consists of thirteen propositions upon which Christian union should be based. Campbell intended in this document to stimulate thinking as to the common ground upon which to build a united church by returning to the New Testament. Four points in the *Address* stress the necessity of Christian unity. The opening proposition, which is among the most profound and far-reaching in the history of ecumenicity, states:

1. 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 . . .³⁰ From this basic premise all else that Campbell believed about the Church was developed. Referring to those of all other denominations who follow Christ as constituting the church, he was not proposing the formation of another sect. The Christian Association of Washington was working as a ferment in the church to bring about unity. The essence of the church is oneness by definition (essentially one). The church is "constitutionally" one in the sense that its unity is given by God and must be claimed. All who have faith in Christ belong to the church and need to be obedient to him in all things in Scripture. The church is "intentionally" one; it is not a matter of choice, indifference or accident.

Three other propositions express more fully the necessity of Christian union:

2. 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.
9. 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, . . .

10. Divisions 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 . . .³¹

To these Thomas Campbell included nine other propositions pointing out how the given unity of the church was to be realized in a practical way.³² There is some repetition in Campbell's proposals, so they may be summarized in a few points.

1. The Scriptures, and especially the New Testament, are authoritative in all matters of faith and church order. By restoring the primitive church as seen in the New Testament, Christian unity may be attained.
2. Creeds, theologies, and human opinions (interpretations) cannot be made tests of fellowship in the church.
3. All who love Jesus Christ and are obedient to him form an essential brotherhood. In this body a Christian spirit must be exhibited.
4. If human innovations were removed from the practices of the church, Christ's followers would be able to unite on a scriptural basis. No human authority has the power or right to impose any new commands that are not expressly stated in the New Testament.

Thomas' gifted son, Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), was born in Ballymena, County Antrim, Ireland. In his early years he received most of his education from his father and in an academy in Newry conducted by two of his father's brothers. Also, Alexander Campbell for a year was in charge of his father's academy at Rich Hill. One of the most rewarding experiences for the younger Campbell was the year spent at the University of Glasgow, where he broadened his education and was exposed to some of the currents of British intellectual life. At Glasgow he met and became acquainted with Greville Ewing, head of the Haldane seminary. Under his influence, Campbell studied the works of leaders of certain restoration movements. Most important of these were Glas, Sandeman, and the Haldanes. The experience in Glasgow was to make a lasting impression on him and turn his thoughts toward the idea of restoring the primitive church. Campbell had devoted himself to the ministry in the Seceder Presbyterian Church. Increasingly, however, he became dissatisfied with the church and finally broke with it in a symbolic way by walking out of a Communion service. Alexander and the family left Scotland in August 1809, and joined his father in America on October 19 of the same year.

Alexander Campbell read and heartily endorsed the *Declaration and Address* of his father. Soon becoming an enthusiastic advocate of union, he added definiteness and specificity to his father's manifesto and the restorationism expressed therein. Joining the newly formed movement

of his father, Alexander soon became its leader and carried forward the ideas of Christian union through the restoration of what he called the "Ancient Order."³³

Expressing himself in a summary way on his overall plan for the union of the churches, Campbell put forth his proposals to his readers:

"Let" the Bible "be substituted for all human creeds;" Facts, "for definitions;" Things, "for words;" Faith, "for speculation;" Unity of Faith, "for unity of opinion;" The Positive Commandments of God, "for human legislation and tradition;" Piety, "for ceremony;" Morality, "for partisan zeal;" The Practice of Religion, "for the mere profession of it:" and the work is done.³⁴

More particularly, Campbell pointed to a biblical restorationism, stating in propositional form what was essential for a strong and abiding union, in which the weaknesses of disunity could be overcome:

- 1st. "Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world but the union and co-operation of Christians."
- 2nd. "Nothing is essential to the union of Christians but the Apostles' teaching or testimony."³⁵

In his restorationism, Campbell made specific what were the conditions of salvation, and these were also requirements for church membership. Were the churches of the day to follow these, they would provide a formula by which a united church could be attained on a New Testament basis. In Campbell's words:

The Belief of One Fact . . . "is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation. The belief of this One Fact, and submission to One Institution expressive of it, is all that is required of Heaven to admission into the church." . . . The one fact is expressed in a single proposition — "that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah." . . . The "one institution" is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.³⁶

Campbell insisted on baptism by immersion as necessary for church membership and Christian union; however, he did not make baptism by immersion absolutely necessary for salvation.³⁷ In Campbell's thinking, immersion as the mode of baptism was a key point in the restoration of the Ancient Order and as a way to unite divided Christians. Both the immersed and the nonimmersed were Christians; nevertheless, the latter ought to be immersed as a means to union by submitting to the mode of baptism that all Christians should acknowledge as the universal New Testament practice.

In addition to faith in Jesus Christ and baptism, Campbell inquired as to what were the practices of the primitive church in the New Testament. His assumption was that what was practiced in one church was practiced in all of them during apostolic times. Especially in his earlier years when he edited *The Christian Baptist*, Campbell believed that the churches must conform their worship, order, and discipline to the letter

of the law in the New Testament so as to bring about union in the churches of his day; all unscriptural practices and organizations without a New Testament precedent needed to be abandoned.³⁸ Campbell made specific what he found to be the practices in the primitive church (the Ancient Order), all of which were indispensable in his own day for a united church. Included in these were:

1. The autonomy of the local congregation.
2. Deacons and elders being two classes of leaders in the church.
3. Demotion of the clergy from their "overlordship" and presumptuousness and rejection of clerical dignities and priestly functions.
4. No clear distinction between ministers and the laity. Elders were spiritual leaders and a minister was presiding elder of a congregation. Hence, Campbell advocated a form of the priesthood of all believers.
5. A nonliturgical worship service and weekly observance of the Lord's Supper.
6. Abandoning all creeds and unscriptural organizations.

In order to give a broader hearing to his plea for Christian union, in 1839 Campbell called for a unity conference to be convened and composed of delegates from all of the Protestant denominations. Also, Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox delegates were invited. As to the grounds for a union of the churches Campbell stated:

The rule of union shall be, that whatever in faith, in piety, and morality is catholic or universally admitted by all parties, shall be adopted as the basis of faith.³⁹

Even with this broadly based appeal, Campbell did interject in his plan his own ideas of restorationism. All of the churches attending the conference would be expected to discard all articles of faith, forms of worship, and church practices that did not have a New Testament mandate.

IV: Walter Scott: The Gospel Restored.

Along with Barton W. Stone and Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott (1796-1861)⁴⁰ was a leader in the Restoration Movement of the nineteenth century. Scott was born and raised in Scotland and studied for the ministry in the Presbyterian Church at the University of Edinburgh. Leaving Scotland in 1818, he immigrated to America, residing in New York for a short period of time, then moving to Pittsburg. There he met and became associated with the Haldanean minister. George Forrester. Under Forrester's influence, Scott began to think in terms of the restoration of the beliefs and practices of the primitive New Testament church.

In the winter of 1821-1822, Walter Scott met Alexander Campbell in Pittsburg. A congeniality and warm friendship developed between them that was to continue for the next forty years. At Campbell's request,

Scott attended a meeting of the Mahoning Baptist Association in August 1826. At their invitation, Scott became Evangelist for the Association in 1827 and continued in this capacity until the Association was dissolved in 1830.⁴¹ Throughout his life Scott was a tireless laborer in the Disciples movement as a writer, editor, evangelist, and educator.

Walter Scott accepted the basic ideas of Thomas and Alexander Campbell on the primacy of Scripture and the restoration of the Ancient Order of the church as necessary for Christian union.⁴² To Campbell's views on the Ancient Order Scott added a restoration of the "Ancient Gospel."⁴³ His primary thrust was on restoring to the church of his day "the Creed," by which he meant the proposition that Jesus Christ is the Messiah and Son of God (Matt. 16:16).⁴⁴ This truth, which Scott called "the Golden Oracle," was established on the basis of the scriptural evidences of miracles and prophecy fulfilled. The messiahship of Jesus was in Scott's thinking the basis of the church and salvation.⁴⁵ Hence, the Ancient Gospel entailed belief in Jesus Christ as the Messiah and the six steps in the process of salvation: faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, gift of the Holy Spirit, and the promise of eternal life.⁴⁶ It was Scott's view that this was the message of salvation that was preached universally in the early church.

The messiahship of Jesus Christ was not only the basis of the church and salvation, but it was also conceived as the foundation of Christian union. If the Protestant sects of the day would accept the messiahship of Jesus Christ (the Creed) and the principles derived from it, namely, the six steps in the process of salvation, Christian union would become a reality.⁴⁷ Thus, the union that Scott called for did not entail subscribing to creedal statements or doctrinal uniformity.

Walter Scott believed that there was hope for Christian union by way of Protestantism and the Protestant sects. The work of Luther and Calvin in restoring the Scriptures to a position of authority and stressing justification by faith was especially significant. Scott and the nineteenth century Reformers accepted all of their positive achievements, as a result of which there had developed what he called the "Protestant consciousness."⁴⁹ Protestantism, however, was viewed by Scott as provisional and a stepping stone from the chaos of Roman Catholicism⁵⁰ to the work of the nineteenth century Reformers. Following the era of Roman Catholicism and the sixteenth century Reformation, the final stage in the recovery of the true church was being accomplished by the Restoration Movement of the nineteenth century.⁵¹

In their reconstruction of the church they believed they were overcoming the failings and shortcomings of Protestantism. Thomas Campbell had recovered the Bible to a place of central importance; Alexander Campbell had restored the Ancient Order of the church; and Scott himself had rediscovered the Ancient Gospel and restored it to the preaching of the church. The Protestant sects, in Scott's judgment, would dissolve in the light of the preaching of the true message of the New Testament by the Reformers, and Christian union would be realized.

As Moses' rod eat [sic] up the rods of the magicians, the true Creed will destroy all others, and the true principles of union consume all those of mere party origin. Reformers, having hitherto failed to select and appreciate the constitutional truth of the Christian system, their labors became schismatic, and they themselves the founders of sects. The aims and destinies of the holders of the true faith are higher. Their mission is Union — the annihilation of sects and parties, and the recovery of the church

. . . .
That will be the Creed, which, being proved true, proves all things else in the Gospel true; and that the church, which, being founded on the true Creed, shall bind in union, communion, and co-operation, all the individual assemblies of which she is composed.⁵²

Walter Scott was not advocating an organic union of all Protestants or a merger to form one large church. His conception was that the churches of his day have a union such as existed among the early Christians living in the same city or district⁵³. He described the kind of union that existed in the Apostolic church

These Churches being everywhere "constitutionally" the same . . . the members passed from one organization to another by letters of introduction and commendation, and when Churches co-operated it was by districts, and not by parties, as in Protestantism, or by the Pope, as in Romanism . . . This was a safe sort of union, because it secured the co-operation of the Churches, without endangering their liberties by the centralization of spiritual power in any individual. It was conservation both of the liberty and the strength of the Churches. It was God's plan of union.⁵⁴

This kind of union as a relationship among the churches and their members could, in Scott's thinking, become an actuality in the nineteenth century. Acceptance of the messiahship of Jesus Christ and the Ancient Gospel could bind all of the churches in a spirit of unity, co-operation, and commonality of belief. The churches would have in reality a common, interchangeable membership, and sectarian barriers would no longer exist.⁵⁵ In order to bring about the kind of Christian union he envisioned, Scott issued a plea for a great convocation among Protestants to discuss its possibility.⁵⁶

In the overall strategy of Scott and his associates in the Restoration Movement, there was a sequence of events that would follow the restoration of the Ancient Order and the preaching of the Ancient Gospel. The gospel would be spread throughout the land; sinners would be converted. With the dissolution of sectarianism, the churches would be reunited, and society would be transformed. These events would precede and usher in the millennial age. In this whole scheme of history, America was seen as a "messianic nation," God's chosen people and his instrument for spreading democratic government and Christian

civilization across the American continent and throughout the world.⁵⁷ Thus, America was the crucible in which the power of the gospel was operative in realizing the union of all the churches.

A sense of urgency and excitement was shared by Scott and the Reformers. They believed that they were part of a great drama and active participants in the work of uniting the churches and realizing the Kingdom of God. They were on the threshold of an event that would be the culmination of human progress, the fulfillment of the promises of God, and the result of God's providential guidance. It was this expectation of the millennium, coupled with the crucial significance of Christian union in the churches, that gave Scott's preaching of the Ancient Gospel such power. It accounted in great measure for his phenomenal success on the Western Reserve during the years 1827-1830 and in the succeeding years.

V: The Christians and Disciples Unite.

The emergence of the distinctive religious movement known as the Christian Church, Church of Christ, or Disciples of Christ came about in two steps: the dissolution of the Mahoning Baptist Association and the merger of the Christians and the Disciples in 1832.

Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott had labored together for several years in the Mahoning Baptist Association as a reforming element. The Reformers, however, reasoned that the Association was without the sanction of the Scriptures and should be disbanded. Thus, in August 1830, at its annual meeting in Austintown, Ohio, the Association voted itself out of existence.⁵⁸

This action represented the formal separation of the Reformers from their Baptist moorings. While within the confines of the Association, the Reformers were called "Campbellites" or "Scottites," whereas following the Austintown resolution they became distinguishable as "Disciples." The dissolution of the Mahoning Baptist Association represented one step, but a decisive one, in the emergence of what was to become a new American denomination. From this time on, the Disciples churches that advocated the reforming views of Campbell and Scott constituted an autonomous, identifiable group. The separation of the Reformers from the Baptists was not viewed by them as a step to further subdivide or fragment the church in America. To the contrary, it was a necessary step to advance the cause of Christian union. They had disbanded an unscriptural organization. After becoming a distinct body with a program of unity, they urged other groups to join them. The Disciples had a cause — the union of all the churches by restoring New Testament faith, practices, and terms of admission to the church.

Even before the Reformers separated from the Baptists, a movement was underway to unite the Christians led by Stone and the Disciples headed by Campbell and Scott. Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone first met in Kentucky in 1824, but serious discussions on a union of the two groups did not commence until 1826. Although there were

differences between Campbell and Stone on important issues of faith and practice, there was enough common ground for them to continue their discussions on a union.⁵⁹ Both the Disciples and Christians were interested in the possibility of a union, and the forces propelling the two groups toward a merger gained momentum between 1826 and 1831.

Two four-day conferences between the leaders and other members of the two groups were held.⁶⁰ The first one took place in Georgetown, Kentucky, on December 23-26, 1831; the final one was in Lexington, Kentucky, between December 30, 1831 and January 2, 1832. The climax of the two assemblies came at the memorable meeting at the Hill Street Christian Church in Lexington, Kentucky, on January 1, 1832. It was the unanimous sentiment of those in attendance that the two groups should unite. Barton W. Stone was chief spokesman for the Christians, John Smith for the Disciples. Both made concluding statements for their respective groups, shook hands, and the union was consummated.

What was to become a new American denomination, the Christian Church, began essentially with the agreement and approval of their most trusted leaders. Neither group had an administrative organization or agencies; everything in the initial years focused on the local congregation. Hence, the 1832 meeting was an event that initiated a process of uniting congregations in the same community and the recognition that the two groups, wherever they existed, were now one.

One of the first steps agreed upon by the leaders was the sending out of preachers in pairs — a Christian and a Disciple — to urge local congregations to unite. This was followed by the raising of a fund to support an evangelistic campaign, whose purpose it was to strengthen existing churches, establish new ones, and win converts to the cause. Their respective periodicals, *The Millennial Harbinger* and *Christian Messenger*, were circulated in churches across a line that no longer existed between them. As the preachers of one group were accepted by the other, free interchange of membership came about. There was a general feeling that as the process of uniting the separate churches continued, they were really one.

The Christians and Disciples firmly believed they were the only religious body that stood on a platform upon which a united church was possible. There was the optimistic belief among them that within the predictable future they would achieve both the conversion of the world and the unification of all Christians by bringing everyone into the new movement. The Christian Church has continued to the present day with a strong ecumenical thrust and a spirit of willingness to be open to other Christian groups and denominations in an attempt to heal and unite the fragmented Body of Christ.

VI: Concluding Evaluation.

The discussion thus far has centered on the views of Stone, the Campbells, and Scott on the nature of Christian union and how they proposed to effect it in their own day. As one considers their proposals

in retrospect, it can be seen that in many ways their approach to Christian union made them prophets ahead of their time. On the other hand, since they lived in a different era, one may question some of their assumptions and conclusions. It may be helpful, then, to offer a statement of evaluation concerning the endeavors of these early leaders and inquire as to what their legacy is for today. What can be learned from those pioneer spirits of the movement that has validity for today as the Christian Church seeks to bring about the unity of the whole church?

1. The Reformers and Christians alike endeavored first and foremost to overcome sectarianism and a divisive spirit and restore unity to the church. Theirs was the passion to propose a plan, engage in dialogue with others, and call for unity conferences. As has been shown, the Campbells and Scott approached the unity question on the basis of a catholic theology and a platform of doctrines from Scripture. Stone, on the other hand, was more concerned for unity in terms of personal relationships of trust and love. The important point is that the two forces, though different in backgrounds and approaches, did unite. Theirs was a union that maintained a creative tension between content and spirit, reason and emotion, theological understanding and a sense of the spiritual oneness of all of Christ's followers. As in the early nineteenth century so in the contemporary era, Christian union on the basis of certain fundamental biblical truths is possible. At the same time, the diversity and richness of those forming the union need to be preserved.

2. What began in 1832 as a handshake between the trusted leaders of the Christians and Disciples became effective at the grassroots level. For these early leaders Christian union concerned local congregations, a free interchange of members, and love manifested in personal relationships. Although they did not address the issues involved in institutional union, they did perceive and validly so that for unity to be lasting it must involve the individual churches primarily. If Christian union is to become a reality for the church, it must be claimed and appropriated by members of the local congregations.

3. The early leaders attempted to effect Christian union through restoration, and in this they viewed the New Testament as static and a blueprint. Their claim was that the only way to restore unity was through accepting the New Testament as sole authority in matters of faith and church order. Historical accretions to the faith and forms of church life must be abandoned as human additions and hence unnecessary. Since they overlooked the fact that the Holy Spirit was given to the church as a guide for differing times and varying conditions, they ignored the problems of historical development and the role of tradition in the ongoing life of the church. There was a finality about their views of the New Testament and revelation that needs to be seriously questioned. They were correct in their attempt to bring about unity by returning to the New Testament; however, their views of Scripture and what was to be restored need to be reformulated. Christian unity in the twentieth century needs to be biblically centered, the Holy Spirit guiding the church is an understanding of its given unity in Christ and the

form this unity is to take. In this endeavor, the church must be cognizant of the wisdom and insights gained through its tradition so as to encompass a breadth of understanding.

4. The founding fathers of the movement rejected creedal formulations as statements of the faith or conditions for church membership. In their view, creeds were divisive. Christian union could not be attained through subscribing to creedal statements (Schmucker) or adhering to prescribed theological formulations that were not based on Scripture. There was a valid insight at this point. However, they did not see the value of creeds or confessions of faith for liturgical purposes or as voicing what is accepted in common as the faith of the church. In this light, creeds and confessions of faith may serve a unifying function. The Restoration leaders, in their polemic against creeds, failed to see a valid place for such confessions in terms of remembering where the church has been, what it professes to the world today, and as a guide to the future direction of the church theologically.

5. Alexander Campbell's formulation of the Ancient Order of the church, as a statement of New Testament faith and practices, became a pattern for the church in his own day. Campbell was correct in seeking a scriptural basis for the faith of the church and its order. There was, however, a rigidity in that he and the Reformers demanded a consensus concerning the two ordinances (baptism and the Lord's Supper), forms of church life, government, ministry, and the name of the church. All of these were deemed as essentials in order to bring about union because they expressed, in his view, the will of God as revealed in Scripture. The weakness of this formula as a platform for union lay in the fact that the New Testament does not set forth a uniform plan of organization and practices for the church. They failed to see that the New Testament churches manifested a variety of organizational patterns and changing forms of church life, and what was practiced in one church was not necessarily practiced in all of the churches. Contemporary ecumenical thought and effort must continue to be guided by Scripture in its faith and church ordering. As in the early church, so in the present, the varieties of church life and expressions of faith must be preserved in a church united.

6. Both the Campbells and Stone in their proposals for Christian union stated that there was to be agreement on the essentials of the faith, the facts as they are clearly stated in Scripture. Beyond that one could exercise freedom to interpret Scripture and hold opinions on the varying doctrines of the faith. Thus, the early leaders were correct in attempting to maintain a balance between the fundamental tenets of the faith and human diversity. A difficulty with this is that not all persons agreed on what were the essentials and what were interpretations or opinions; these are not as clearly delineated in Scripture as the founding fathers supposed. What were essentials to them might not be essentials to another person or group.

7. Finally, and perhaps most important, the Disciples and Christians established a firm Christological basis for union. Jesus Christ as

Son of God and Lord is the fundamental truth of the faith — the basis of the church, salvation, and Christian union. Their insight here was sound and incisive and must guide the church in any age as it undertakes to fulfill its ecumenical task. The Campbells and Scott expressed their understanding of Jesus Christ as Messiah more in the form of a propositional truth, whereas Stone thought in terms of love and the Spirit of Christ manifested in the lives of people. Thus, in the union of the Campbell and Stone forces there was maintained a delicate interplay of doctrine and spirit. Scott's formulation of the Ancient Gospel was based on Jesus Christ as Son of God and Saviour (Matt. 16:16), and stemming from this were the six sequential steps in the process of salvation (Acts 2:38). As has been shown, Scott believed that this was the doctrine preached universally throughout the early church. Thus, he did not see that the New Testament witnesses to a variety of interpretations of the Person of Christ and the process of salvation. There was no one plan of salvation that was preached in the early church as Scott assumed. Even at this, Scott's preaching of the Ancient Gospel to bring about the union of all of Christ's followers and save the world gave to the Restoration Movement a strong evangelistic thrust that has characterized it throughout its history. It was a powerful message in Scott's day and can be appropriated today in the evangelistic witness of the church; however, how we understand it and the biblical texts upon which it is based need to be reformulated and made relevant to the contemporary scene. All who are in the Christian Church have been in fundamental agreement that strong evangelistic preaching, the conversion of persons, and Christian union are integrally related in the overall mission of the church.

The Campbells, Stone, and Scott expressed their convictions on Christian union in the categories and thought patterns of their own times. As one looks at their formulations and underlying principles, one can see that there is much truth that can be appropriated in this century of ecumenical witnessing and endeavor. Christian union is still an imperative, a polar star to guide the church. As the Christian Church takes this imperative with all seriousness, its rich heritage may guide its thinking in the endeavor to meet the challenges of the day. It may also point the way toward the future for the people of God who are on a quest for the unity of all of Christ's followers.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Winfred E. Garrison, *Christian Unity and Disciples of Christ* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1955), for a thorough historical review of the Disciples' ecumenical involvements.
2. Samuel Simon Schmucker, *Fraternal Appeal to the American Churches, with a Plan for Catholic Union on Apostolic Principles*, Edited and with an Introduction by Frederick K. Wentz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965).
3. Alexander Campbell, although not discussing the specific proposals made by Schmucker, approved of his endeavors. Campbell felt that Schmucker's plan was having an effect on church union by encouraging an open exchange of ideas and fostering a Christian spirit that was necessary for union to take place. See Alexander Campbell, "Union of Christians," *The Millennial Harbinger*, n.s. 3 (May 1839): 212.
4. See Anne Ayres, *The Life and Work of William Augustus Muhlenberg* (New York, 1880), pp. 263-267; and J. T. Addison, *The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931* (New York: Scribner, 1951), p. 178. The "Muhlenberg Memorial," which was presented to the House of Bishops in 1853, was his most significant contribution to the preservation of unity within his own denomination. Muhlenberg urged the low and high parties in the church to exist in harmony in one united church where a large measure of freedom was allowed in doctrine and liturgy. The Protestant Episcopal Church could be, in Muhlenberg's view, the basis for bringing about Christian unity with the other denominations in America.
5. The Evangelical Alliance was formed in London in 1846, and in 1867 a branch was established in America. It was a voluntary association of individuals working together in cooperative effort based on the spiritual union assumed to be existing among Christians. The Alliance was conservative theologically and had a nine-point creedal statement to which all participants gave assent. Alexander Campbell wrote a series of five articles in *The Millennial Harbinger* in 1847 concerning it. Although Campbell had some reservations about the Alliance, its creed, and basis for one's membership, he spoke favorably of it. He felt that the Alliance was a positive step towards the realization of Christian union in America and wanted to cooperate with them and other such associations as much as possible. See Paul A. Crow, Jr., "The Attorney of a Nineteenth-Century United Church," *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 18 (October 1983): 3-15, for a succinct overview of these endeavors for church union in the nineteenth century.
6. Ronald E. Osborn, *Experiment in Liberty: The Ideal of Freedom in the Experience of the Disciples of Christ*. The Forrest F. Reed Lectures for 1976. (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1978), has argued that there were actually three intertwining principles shaping the Disciples movement: restoration, unity, and freedom.
7. See "A Short History of the Life of Barton W. Stone, Written by Himself," in *Voices from Cane Ridge*, Comp. and ed. Rhodes Thompson (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1954), pp. 66-72.
8. Barton W. Stone and Others, *Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery*, With brief introduction by F.D. Kershner (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1960). The document was signed by Robert Marshall, John Dunlavy, Richard M'Nemar, Barton W. Stone, John Thompson, and David Purviance, who had recently joined the group. To the *Last Will and Testament* the signature added *The Witnesses' Address*, which further elaborated their views and called on others to join in the work of revival. This would result in the universal spread of the gospel and the unity of the church.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

10. See William Garrett West, *Barton Warren Stone: Early American Advocate of Christian Unity* (Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1954), pp. 110-131, for a concise, overall treatment of Stone's views on Christian unity.
11. Here, as will be pointed out in succeeding sections of this essay, Stone differed from Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott.
12. *CM IV* (1830):229.
13. *CM IV* (1830):163-164.
14. *CM I* (1827):112.
15. *CM IV* (1830):163ff.
16. *CM VII* (1833):314-316.
17. *CM XI* (1841):256-257.
18. *CM IV* (1844):40ff.
19. *CM VIII* (1834):68; *CM X* (1836): 30; *CM XII* (1841): 4; *CM XIV* (1844):131.
20. *CM XI* (1841):334.
21. *CM IX* (1841):330-331; *CM VI* (1832):266.
22. This change of emphasis in Stone's thought is treated succinctly by David Newell Williams, "The Theology of the Great Revival in the West as seen through the Life and Thought of Barton Warren Stone" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1979), pp. 168-169.
23. *CM XIII* (1843):138-140.
24. The classic study of the life and thought of Thomas Campbell is Lester G. McAllister, *Thomas Campbell: Man of the Book* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1954).
25. The Christian Association of Washington organized as an independent congregation, the Brush Run Church, on May 4, 1811. Theirs was the purpose of transcending denominational divisions and pointing the way to a united church. At first the Brush Run Church sought to affiliate with the Presbyterians, but these overtures were rejected. Still attempting to remain within a denominational structure, these independent Reformers discovered certain affinities with the Baptists on the issues of congregational independence and baptism by immersion. Applying for membership in the Redstone Baptist Association, they were accepted in 1813. Remaining in this relationship for a few years, Alexander Campbell broke with them and affiliated with the Mahoning Baptist Association until 1830.
26. Thomas Campbell, *Declaration and Address*, With an introduction by William Robinson (Birmingham, England: Berean Press, 1951).
27. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 15-17, Propositions 3,4,5,6,7,8,11,12, and 13.
33. See *The Christian Baptist*, ed. Alexander Campbell, rev. by D.S. Burnet, from the 2nd. ed., with Mr. Campbell's Last Corrections. 7 vols. in 1. (Cincinnati: published by D.S. Burnet, printed by James and Gazlay, 1835), for Campbell's earlier views on the restoration of the Ancient Order.
34. Alexander Campbell, *The Christian System: In Reference to the Union of Christians, and a Restoration of Primitive Christianity, As Pleaded in the Current Reformation* (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1964), p. 90.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
37. See Alexander Campbell, *The Lunenburg Letter, With Attendant Comments, Footnotes to Disciples History, No. 2* (Nashville: The Disciples of Christ His-

- torical Society, 1955), where Campbell distinguishes between perfect (immersed) and imperfect (nonimmersed) Christians. Thus, he does not make baptism by immersion essential for one to be a Christian.
38. Later, Campbell softened this somewhat for the purposes of expediency, believing that if certain things were not explicitly condemned, they might be used if practicable.
 39. *MH*, n.s.3 (May 1839):212.
 40. See Dwight E. Stevenson, *Walter Scott: Voice of the Golden Oracle: A Biography* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1946), for the most current biography of Scott and an overview of his thought.
 41. Scott's work as evangelist for the Mahoning Baptist Association is recounted by A. S. Hayden, *Early History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, Ohio; with Biographical Sketches of the Principal Agents in their Religious Movement* (Cincinnati: Chase & Hall, Publishers, 1875), pp. 54-296.
 42. Walter Scott, "Address: Given before the American Christian Missionary Society," Cincinnati: American Christian Publication Society, 1854, pp. 30-31.
 43. See Walter Scott, *The Gospel Restored* (Cincinnati: Ormsby H. Donogh, 1836), and *The Messiahship, or Great Demonstration* (Cincinnati: H.S. Bosworth, 1859), where Scott developed in greater detail his understanding of the Ancient Gospel.
 44. Walter Scott, *To Themelion: The Union of Christians, on Christian Principles* (Cincinnati: C.A. Morgan & Co., 1852), pp. 3-5.
 45. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
 46. Sometimes this formula was reduced to five—faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, in Scott's famous "five finger exercise."
 47. Scott, *To Themelion*, pp. 33, 42, 106-107.
 48. Scott's understanding of Christian union differed markedly from that of Samuel S. Schmucker at this point. Whereas Schmucker put forth twelve articles of faith as the basis of union, for Scott belief in the messiahship of Jesus Christ was the sole Creed of Christianity.
 49. Scott, *The Messiahship*, pp. 275-276, 290. The "Protestant consciousness" consisted of four leading principles — the supremacy of the Scriptures, the subordination of the church to Scripture, the subordination of the ministry to both the church and Scripture, and the doctrine of justification by faith.
 50. Scott, *The Messiahship*, pp. 118-141, and Scott, *To Themelion*, p. 42.
 51. Scott, "Address," pp. 32-33.
 52. Scott, *To Themelion*, pp. 46-47.
 53. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
 54. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
 55. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
 56. *Ibid.*, pp. 125-126.
 57. Scott, *The Messiahship*, pp. 297-298, 321-322, 334-335.
 58. William Baxter, *Life of Elder Walter Scott: With Sketches of his Fellow-Laborers, William Hayden, Adamson Bentley, John Henry, and Others* (Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase, & Hall Publishers, 1874), pp. 216-217.
 59. These differences and similarities between Campbell and Stone are discussed in detail by West, *Barton Warren Stone; Early American Advocate of Christian Unity*, pp. 137-175.
 60. The story of the converging of the Disciples and Christians during these years and the two conferences in Georgetown and Lexington is related and documented by Crow, "The Anatomy of a Nineteenth-Century United Church," pp. 24-39.



THE LUNENBURG LETTER

WITH

ATTENDANT COMMENTS

By Alexander Campbell

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

NUMBER TWO

THIRD PRINTING

**THE LUNENBURG LETTER
WITH ATTENDANT COMMENTS**

by

Alexander Campbell

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

Number Two

**THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY**

Nashville, Tennessee

1966

INTRODUCTION

This is the second of a series of pamphlet publications to be issued by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society under the title, *Footnotes to Disciple History*. Individual numbers of the series will deal with specialized subjects in the field of Disciple history. Occasionally original documents such as this will be reprinted.

The term Disciple history is used in its broadest sense as being representative of all the groups whose beginnings date back to the restoration and reformatory movements inaugurated by James O'Kelly, Elias Smith, Abner Jones, Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, and others. These groups are variously known as Christian Churches, Churches of Christ, and Disciples of Christ.

Each *Footnote to Disciple History* will have from eight to thirty-two pages. The opinions expressed and the interpretations made are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Society.

"Any Christians Among Protestant Parties," but more familiarly known as "The Lunenburg Letter" was published in *The Millennial Harbinger* for September 1837, and was followed with further comments by Mr. Campbell in the November and December issues of the same year.

"The Lunenburg Letter" has been much quoted through the years, but has not been easily available for general use. The later comments have usually been overlooked or ignored.

The Society believes that it is fulfilling one of its functions in the reprinting through photoduplication of these pages from *The Millennial Harbinger*.

CLAUDE E. SPENCER, Curator
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
December 2, 1953.

ANY CHRISTIANS AMONG PROTESTANT PARTIES.

“Lunenburg, July 8th, 1837.

“Dear brother Campbell—I WAS much surprised to-day, while reading the Harbinger, to see that you recognize the Protestant parties as Christian. You say, you ‘find in all Protestant parties Christians.’

“Dear brother, my surprize and ardent desire to do what is right, prompt me to write to you at this time. I feel well assured, from the estimate you place on the female character, that you will attend to my feeble questions in search of knowledge.

“Will you be so good as to let me know how any one becomes a Christian? What act of yours gave you the name of Christian? At what time had Paul the name of Christ called on him? At what time did Cornelius have Christ named on him? Is it not through this name we obtain eternal life? Does the name of Christ or Christian belong to *any* but those who believe the *gospel*, repent, and are buried by baptism into the death of Christ?”

In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the *everlasting* kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the *gates of hell have prevailed against his church!* This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects.

But who is a Christian? I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will. *A perfect man in Christ*, or a perfect Christian, is one thing; and “a babe in Christ,” a stripling in the faith, or an imperfect Christian, is another. The New Testament recognizes both the perfect man and the imperfect man in Christ. The former, indeed, implies the latter. Paul commands the imperfect Christians to “*be perfect*,” (2 Cor. iii. 11.) and says he wishes the perfection of Christians. “And this also we wish” for you *saints* in Corinth, “*even your perfection*,” and again he says, “We speak wisdom among the perfect,” (1 Cor. ii. 6.) and he commands them to be “perfect in understanding,” (1 Cor. xiv. 20.) and in many other places implies or speaks the same things. Now there is perfection of will, of temper, and of behaviour. There is a perfect state and a perfect character. And hence it is possible for Christians to be imperfect in some respects without an absolute forfeiture of the Christian state and character. Paul speaks of “*car-nal*” Christians, of “*weak*” and “*strong*” Christians; and the Lord

Jesus admits that some of the good and honest-hearted bring forth only thirty fold, while others bring forth sixty, and some a hundred fold increase of the fruits of righteousness.

But every one is wont to condemn others in that in which he is more intelligent than they; while, on the other hand, he is condemned for his Pharisaism or his immodesty and rash judgment of others, by those that excel in the things in which he is deficient. I cannot, therefore, make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even immersion into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their own knowledge and consent, as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven. "Salvation was of the Jews," acknowledged the Messiah; and yet he said of a foreigner, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, a Syro-Phenician, "I have not found so great faith—no, not in Israel."

Should I find a Pedobaptist more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually-minded and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians. Still I will be asked, How do I know that any one loves my Master but by his obedience to his commandments? I answer, *In no other way.* But mark, I do not substitute obedience to one commandment, for universal or even for general obedience. And should I see a sectarian Baptist or a Pedobaptist more spiritually-minded, more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, than one who precisely acquiesces with me in the theory or practice of immersion as I teach, doubtless the former rather than the latter, would have my cordial approbation and love as a Christian. So I judge, and so I feel. It is the image of Christ the Christian looks for and loves; and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known.

With me mistakes of the understanding and errors of the affections are not to be confounded. They are as distant as the poles. An angel may mistake the meaning of a commandment, but he will obey it in the sense in which he understands it. John Bunyan and John Newton were very different persons, and had very different views of baptism, and of some other things; yet they were both disposed to obey, and to the extent of their knowledge did obey the Lord in every thing.

There are mistakes with, and without depravity. There are wilful errors which all the world must condemn, and unavoidable mistakes which every one will pity. The Apostles mistook the Saviour when

he said concerning John, "What if I will that John tarry till I come;" but the Jews perverted his words when they alleged that Abraham had died, in proof that he spake falsely when he said, "If a man keep my word he shall never see death."

Many a good man has been mistaken. Mistakes are to be regarded as culpable and as declarative of a corrupt heart only when they proceed from a wilful neglect of the means of knowing what is commanded. Ignorance is always a crime when it is voluntary; and innocent when it is involuntary. Now, unless I could prove that all who neglect the positive institutions of Christ and have substituted for them something else of human authority, do it knowingly, or, if not knowingly, are voluntarily ignorant of what is written, I could not, I dare not say that their mistakes are such as unchristianize all their professions.

True, indeed, that it is always a misfortune to be ignorant of any thing in the Bible, and very generally it is criminal. But how many are there who cannot read; and of those who can read, how many are so deficient in education; and of those educated, how many are ruled by the authority of those whom they regard as superiors in knowledge and piety, that they never can escape out of the dust and smoke of their own chimney, where they happened to be born and educated! These all suffer many privations and many perplexities, from which the more intelligent are exempt.

The preachers of "*essentials*," as well as the preachers of "*non-essentials*," frequently err. The Essentialist may disparage the heart, while the Non-essentialist despises the institution. The latter makes void the institutions of Heaven, while the former appreciates not the mental bias on which God looketh most. My correspondent may belong to a class who think that we detract from the authority and value of an institution the moment we admit the bare possibility of any one being saved without it. But we choose rather to associate with those who think that they do not undervalue either seeing or hearing, by affirming that neither of them, nor both of them together, are essential to life. I would not sell one of my eyes for all the gold on earth; yet I could live without it.

There is no occasion, then, for making immersion, on a profession of the faith, absolutely essential to a Christian—though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort. My right hand and my right eye are greatly essential to my usefulness and happiness, but not to my life; and as I could not be a perfect man without them, so I cannot be a perfect Christian without a right understanding and a cordial reception of immersion in its true and scriptural meaning and design. But he that thence infers that none are Christians but the immersed, as

greatly errs as he who affirms that none are alive but those of clear and full vision.

I do not formally answer all the queries proposed, knowing the one point to which they all aim. To that point only I direct these remarks. And while I would unhesitatingly say, that I think that every man who despises any ordinance of Christ, or who is willingly ignorant of it, cannot be a Christian; still I should sin against my own convictions, should I teach any one to think that if he mistook the meaning of any institution, while in his soul he desired to know the whole will of God, he must perish forever. But to conclude for the present—he that claims for himself a license to neglect the least of all the commandments of Jesus, because it is possible for some to be saved, who, through insuperable ignorance or involuntary mistake, do neglect or transgress it; or he that wilfully neglects to ascertain the will of the Lord to the whole extent of his means and opportunities, because some who are defective in that knowledge may be Christians, is not possessed of the spirit of Christ, and cannot be registered among the Lord's people. So I reason; and I think in so reasoning I am sustained by all the Prophets and Apostles of both Testaments.

A. C.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS.

In an article on a query from Lunenburg, which appeared in the September number, certain sentences have been objected to by some two or three intelligent and much esteemed correspondents. We gave it as our *opinion* that there were Christians among the Protestant sects; an opinion, indeed, which we have always expressed when called upon. If I mistake not, it is distinctly avowed in our first Extra on Remission; yet it is now supposed by these brethren that I have conceded a point of which I have hitherto been tenacious, and that I have misapplied certain portions of scripture in supporting said opinion. In the article alluded to, we have said that we "cannot make any one duty the standard of Christian state or character, not even Christian immersion," &c. Again, we have said that "there is no occasion for making immersion on a profession of the faith absolutely essential to a Christian, though it may be greatly essential to his sanctification and comfort." These two sentences contain the pith and marrow of the objectionable portion of said article, to which we again refer the reader.

Much depends upon the known temper and views of a querist in shaping an answer to his questions. This was the case in this instance. We apprehended that the propounder of the queries that called for these remarks, was rather an ultraist on the subject

of Christian baptism; so far at least as not to allow that the name *Christian* is at all applicable to one unimmersed, or even to one immersed, without the true intent and meaning of baptism in his understanding previous to his burial in water. This we gathered from her epistle; and of course gave as bold an answer as we ever gave—perhaps more bold than on any former occasion, yet nothing differing from our former expressed views on that subject.

My high regard for these correspondents, however, calls for a few remarks on those sentences, as farther explanatory of our views. We cheerfully agree with them, as well as with our sister of Lunenburg, that the term *Christian* was given first to immersed believers and to none else; but we do not think that it was given to them because they were immersed, but because they had put on Christ; and therefore we presume to opine, that, like every other word in universal language, even this term may be used as Paul sometimes uses the words *saint* and *sinner*, *Jew* and *Gentile*—in a part of their signification.

We have, in Paul's style, the *inward* and the *outward* Jews; and may we not have the *inward* and the *outward* Christians? for true it is, that he is not always a Christian who is one outwardly: and one of my correspondents will say, 'Neither is he a Christian who is one inwardly.' But all agree that he is, in the full sense of the word, a Christian who is one inwardly and outwardly.

As the same Apostle reasons on circumcision, so we would reason on baptism:—"Circumcision," says the learned Apostle, "is not that which is outward in the flesh;" that is, as we apprehend the Apostle, it is not that which is outward in the flesh; but "circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter [only,] whose praise is of God, and not of man." So is baptism. It is not outward in the flesh only, but in the spirit also. We argue for the outward and the inward—the outward for men, including ourselves—the inward for God; but both the outward and the inward for the praise both of God and of men;

Now the nice point of opinion on which some brethren differ, is this: Can a person who simply, not perversely, *mistakes* the outward baptism, have the inward? We all agree that he who wilfully or negligently perverts the outward, cannot have the inward. But can he who, through a simple mistake, involving no perversity of mind, has misapprehended the outward baptism, yet submitting to it according to his view of it, have the inward baptism which changes his state and has praise of God, though not of all men? is the precise question. To which I answer, that, in my opinion, *it is possible*. Farther than this I do not affirm

My reasons for this opinion are various; two of which we have have only time and space to offer at this time. Of seven difficulties it is the least; two of these seven, which, on a contrary hypothesis would occur, are insuperable:—*The promises concerning an everlasting Christian church* have failed; and then it would follow that not a few of the brightest names on earth of the last three hundred years should have to be regarded as subjects of the kingdom of Satan!!

None of our brethren regard baptism as only outward. They all believe that in the outward submersion of the body in the water, there is at the same time the inward submersion of the mind and heart into Christ. They do moreover suppose that the former may be without the latter. They have only to add that it is possible for the latter to be not without the former in some sense, but without it in the sense which Christ ordained.

Still my *opinion* is no rule of action to my brethren, nor would I offer it unsolicited to any man. But while we inculcate faith, repentance, and baptism upon all, as essential to their constitutional citizenship in the Messiah's kingdom, and to their sanctification and comfort as Christians, no person has a right to demand our opinions on all the differences of this generation, except for his private gratification. He is certainly safer who obeys from the heart "that mould of doctrine" delivered to us by the Apostles; and he only has praise of God and man, and of himself *as a Christian*, who believes, repents, is baptized, and keeps all the ordinances, positive and moral, as delivered to us by the holy Apostles.

The scriptures quoted in the essay complained of, are all applied to the Christian *character*, and not to the Christian *state*, as contemplated by one of our correspondents. They are therefore not misapplied. It is hoped these general remarks will be satisfactory on this point.

A C.

Ohio River, Sept. 28th, 1837.

ANY CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS?

JUDGING from numerous letters received at this office, my reply to the sister from Lunenburg has given some pain to our brethren, and some pleasure to our sectarian friends. The builders up of the parties tauntingly say to our brethren, "Then we are as safe as you," and "You are coming over to us, having now conceded the greatest of all points—viz. that immersion is not essential to a Christian." Some of our brethren seem to think that we have neutralized much that has been said on the importance of baptism for remission, and disarmed them of much of their artillery against the ignorance, error, and indifference of the times upon the whole subject of Christian duty and Christian privilege.

My views of Opinionism forbid me to dogmatize or to labor to establish my own opinion, and therefore I hope to be excused for not publishing a hundred letters for and against said opinion. Only one point of importance would be gained by publishing such a correspondence; and I almost regret that we have not a volume to spare for it. It would indeed fully open the eyes of the community to the fact that there are but few "Campbellites" in the country. Too many of my correspondents, however, seem to me to have written rather to show that they are not "Campbellites," than to show that my opinion is false and unfounded.

While, then, I have no wish to dogmatize, and feel no obligation to contend for the opinion itself, I judge myself in duty bound to attempt—

1st. To defend myself from the charge of inconsistency.

2d. To defend the opinion from the sectarian application of it.

3d. To offer some reasons for delivering such an opinion at this time.

I. With all despatch, then, I hasten to show that I have neither conceded nor surrendered any thing for which I ever contended; but that, on the contrary, the opinion now expressed, whether true or false, is one that I have always avowed.*

1. Let me ask, in the first place, what could mean all that we have written upon the union of Christians on apostolic grounds, had we taught that all Christians in the world were already united in our own community?

2. And in the second place, why should we so often have quoted and applied to apostate Christendom what the Spirit saith to saints in Babylon—"Come out of her, my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues"—had we imagined that the Lord had no people beyond the pale of our communion!

3. But let him that yet doubts, read the following passages from the Christian Baptist, April, 1825:—"I have no idea of seeing, nor wish to see, the sects unite in one grand army. This would be dangerous to our liberties and laws. For this the Saviour did not pray. It is only the disciples dispersed among them that reason and benevolence would call out of them," &c. &c. This looks very like our present opinion of Christians among the sects!!! 2d ed. Bethany, p. 85.

4. Again, speaking of purity of speech in order to the union of Christians, we say, "None of you [Christians] have ever yet attempted to show how Christians can be united on your principles. You have often showed how they may be divided, and how *each party may hold its own*; but while you *pray* for the visible unity of the disciples, and advocate their visible disunity, we cannot understand you." March, 1827, vol. 4.

5. Various essays and letters on "Christian union" from our correspondents, are given to our readers with our approbation; from one of which we quote these words:—"I suppose all agree that among Christians of every name there are disciples of Jesus Christ, accepted of God in him, real members of his body, branches in the true vine, and therefore all one in Christ." October, 1826, vol. 4, p. 53.

* It is with us as old as baptism for the remission of sins, and this is at least as old as the "Christian Baptist." Read the first two numbers of that work.

6. In a letter to Spencer Clack, August, 1826, I have said, "As to what you say concerning the evils of division among Christians, I have nothing to object. I sincerely deplore every division, and every sectarian feeling which now exists; and if I thought there was any man on this continent who would go farther than I to heal all divisions and to *unite all Christians* on constitutional grounds, I would travel on foot a hundred miles to see him and confess my faults to him" vol. 5, p. 15.

7. On the evening before my departure to debate with Mr. Owen, vol. 6, p. 239, April 6, 1829, in alluding to that crisis, I say—"I rejoice to know and feel that I have the good wishes, the prayers, and the hopes of myriads of Christians in all denominations." So speak the pages of the Christian Baptist on many occasions.*

8. The views of the Millennial Harbinger on this subject are condensed in a work called "Christianity Restored," or, as we have designated it, "A Connected View of the Principles," &c. "of the Foundation on which *all Christians may form one communion.*" (See its title-page!!)

9. In that volume there is a long article on *the foundation of Christian union*, showing how the Christians among the sects may be united. We refer to the whole of this article from page 101 to 128, as the most unequivocal proof of our views of Christians among the sects. Indeed we say (page 102) of our own community, that it is a *nucleus* around which may one day congregate all the children of God. In that article we wax bolder and bolder, and ask, (page 121,) "Will sects ever cease? Will a time ever come when all disciples will unite under one Lord, in one faith, in one immersion? Will divisions ever be healed? Will strife ever cease among the saints on earth?"

10. But in the last place, in the first Extra on Baptism for Remission of Sins, we exclude from the pale of Christianity of the Pedobaptists none but such of them as "wilfully *neglect* this salvation, and who, having the opportunity to be immersed for the remission of sins, wilfully neglect or refuse"—"of such," indeed, but of none others, we say, "We have as little hope for them as they have for all who refuse salvation on their own terms of the gospel." 1st Extra, 1st ed. p. 53.

With these ten evidences or arguments, I now put it to the candor of those who accuse us of inconsistency or change of views, whether they have not most evidently misrepresented us. Were it necessary we could easily swell these ten into a hundred.

11. We shall now attempt to defend this opinion from the sectarian application of it:—

1. It affords them too much joy for the consolation which it brings; because it imparts no certainty of pardon or salvation to any particular unbaptized person whatsoever.

In reference to this opinion, all the unimmersed are to be ranged in two classes;—those who neither know nor care for this opinion, and those who know it and rejoice in it. It will require but a moment's reflection to perceive that those who care nothing for this opinion will not rejoice in it nor abuse it; and that those who would, *for their own sake*, rejoice in it are not included in it. He that

* Let the curious reader consult the essays on *Christian Union in the Christian Baptist*, so far as I have approbated them, especially my replies to an Independent Baptist.

rejoices in such an opinion, for his own sake, has had the subject under consideration; and it is a thousand chances to one that he is obstinately or willingly in error on the subject; and, therefore, in the very terms of the opinion, he is precluded from any interest in it. His joy, indeed, is strong presumptive evidence against him; because it is proof that he is one-sided in his feelings, which no upright mind can be—at least such a mind as is contemplated in the opinion; for it respects only those who have not had any debate with themselves upon the subject, and have, without any examination or leaning, supposed themselves to have been baptized.

In no case, indeed, can there be the same certainty (all things else being equal) that he who was sprinkled, poured, or immersed on some other person's faith; or that he who was sprinkled or poured on his own faith, shall be saved, as there is that he that first believes and is then, on his own confession, immersed, shall be saved. In the former case, at best, we have only the fallible inference or opinion of man; while in the latter we have the sure and unerring promise of our Saviour and Judge. It cannot be too emphatically stated that he that rejoices *for his own sake*, that he may be accepted by the Lord on his infant or adult pouring or sprinkling, because of his dislike to, or prejudice against believer's immersion, gives unequivocal evidence of the want of that state of mind which is contemplated in the opinion expressed; and has proved himself to be a seeker of his own will and pleasure, rather than rejoicing in the will and pleasure of God; and for such persons we can have no favorable opinion

2. But that the aforesaid opinion does not disarm us of our arguments against ignorance, error, and indifference, is evident; because it assumes that the person in question is acting up to the full measure of his knowledge upon the subject, and that he has not been negligent, according to his opportunities, to ascertain the will of his Master; for in the very terms of the opinion he is not justified, but self-condemned, *who only doubts*, or is not fully persuaded that his baptism is apostolic and divine.

3. To admit that there may be Christians among the sects, does not derogate from the value or importance of baptism for the remission of sins, any more than it derogates from the superior value and excellency of the Christian Institution to admit that salvation was possible to the Jews and Patriarchs without the knowledge and experience of all the developments of the New Testament. For besides the Christian disposition, state, and character, there are the Christian privileges. Now, in our judgment, there is not on earth a person who can have as full an assurance of justification or of remission of sins, as the person who has believed, confessed his faith, and been intelligently buried and raised with the Lord; and therefore the present salvation never can be so fully enjoyed, all things else being equal, by the unimmersed as by the immersed.

4. Again, as every sect agrees, that a person immersed on a confession of his faith is truly baptized, and only a part of Christendom admits the possibility of any other action as baptism: for the sake of

union among Christians, it may be easily shown to be the duty of all believers to be immersed, if for no other reason than that of honoring the divine institution and opening a way for the union and co-operation of all Christians. Besides, immersion gives a constitutional right of citizenship in the universal kingdom of Jesus; whereas with our opponents, themselves being judges, their "baptism" gives the rights of citizenship only in some provinces of that kingdom. For as far as baptism is concerned, the Greek, the Roman, the English, the Lutheran, the Calvinian, the Arminian, the Baptist communities will receive the immersed; while only a part of Christendom will acknowledge the sprinkled or the poured. Therefore, our opinion militates not against the value of baptism in any sense.

5. In the last place, to be satisfied with any thing that will just do in religion, is neither the Christian disposition nor character; and not to desire to know and do the whole will of God, places the individual out of the latitude and longitude of the opinion which we have advanced. These things being so, then we ask, wherein does the avowal of such an opinion disarm us of arguments for professor or profane, on the value of the baptism in the Christian Institution; or the importance and necessity of separating one's self from all that will not keep the commandments of Jesus; and of submitting without delay to the requisitions of the illustrious Prophet whom the Almighty Father has commanded all men to obey?

III. In the third and last place, we offer some reasons for delivering such an opinion at this time:—

1. We were solicited by a sister to explain a saying quoted from the current volume of this work, concerning finding "Christians in all Protestant parties." She proposed a list of questions, involving, as she supposed, either insuperable difficulties or strong objections to that saying; and because she well knew what answers I would have given to all her queries, I answered them not: but attended to the difficulty which I imagined she felt in the aforesaid saying.

2. But we had still more urgent reasons than the difficulties of this sister to express such an opinion:—Some of our brethren were too much addicted to denouncing the sects and representing them *en masse* as wholly aliens from the possibility of salvation—as wholly antichristian and corrupt. Now as the Lord says of Babylon, "Come out of her, *my people*," I felt constrained to rebuke them over the shoulders of this inquisitive lady. These very zealous brethren gave countenance to the popular clamor that we make baptism a saviour, or a passport to heaven, disparaging all the private and social virtues of the professing public. Now as they were propounding opinions to others, I intended to bring them to the proper medium by propounding an opinion to them in terms as strong and as pungent as their own.

The case is this: When I see a person who would die for Christ; whose brotherly kindness, sympathy, and active benevolence know no bounds but his circumstances; whose seat in the Christian assembly is never empty; whose inward piety and devotion are attested by punctual obedience to every known duty; whose family is educated in the fear of the Lord; whose constant companion is the Bible: I say, when I see such a one ranked amongst heathen men and publicans, because he never happened to inquire, but always took it for granted that he had been

scripturally baptized; and that, too, by one greatly destitute of all these public and private virtues, whose chief or exclusive recommendation is that he has been immersed, and that he holds a scriptural theory of the gospel: I feel no disposition to flatter such a one; but rather to disabuse him of his error. And while I would not lead the most excellent professor in any sect to disparage the least of all the commandments of Jesus, I would say to my immersed brother as Paul said to his Jewish brother who gloried in a system which he did not adorn: 'Sir, will not his uncircumcision, or unbaptism, be counted to him for baptism? and will he not condemn you, who, though having the literal and true baptism, yet dost transgress or neglect the statutes of your King?'

3. We have a third reason: We have been always accused of aspiring to build up and head a party, while in truth we have always been forced to occupy the ground on which we now stand. I have for one or two years past labored to annul this impression, which I know is more secretly and generally bandied about than one in a hundred of our brethren may suspect. On this account I consented the more readily to defend Protestantism; and I have, in ways more than I shall now state, endeavored to show the Protestant public that it is with the greatest reluctance we are compelled to stand aloof from them—that they are the cause of this great "schism," as they call it, and not we.

Now, with this exposition in mind, let us examine the meaning of the alleged concession. And first let me ask, What could induce us to make it at this crisis? or, I should more correctly say, to *repeat* it so strongly?

No one will say our opponents have compelled us by force of argument to make it. Themselves being judges, we have lost nothing in argument. All agree that the "concession" was uncalled for—a perfect free-will offering.

Neither can they say that we envy their standing, or would wish to occupy their ground; because, to say nothing of our having the pure original gospel institutions among us, regarding us merely as a new sect like themselves, we have no reason to wish to be with them, inasmuch as we have the best proselyting system in Christendom. Faith, repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, with all the promises of the Christian adoption and the heavenly calling to those who thus put on Christ, is incomparably in advance of the sectarian altar and the straw—the mourning bench, the anxious seat, and all the other paraphernalia of modern proselytism. That it is so practically, as well as theoretically, appears from the fact of its unprecedented advances upon the most discerning and devout portions of the Protestant parties. No existing party in this or the father-lands has so steadily and rapidly advanced as that now advocating the religion of the New Testament. It has been successfully plead within a few years in almost every state and territory in this great confederacy, and even in foreign countries.

All agree, for a thousand experiments prove it, that all that is wanting is a competent number of intelligent and *consistent* proclaimers, to its general, if not universal triumph, over all opposing systems. We have lost much, indeed, by the folly, hypocrisy, and wickedness of many pretenders, and by the imprudence and precipitancy of some good brethren: yet from year to year it bears up and advances with increasing prosperity, as the present season very satisfactorily attests.

Do we, then, seek to make and lead a large exclusive sect or party? Have we not the means! Why then concede any thing—even the bare possibility of salvation in any other party, if actuated by such fleshly and selfish considerations? With all these facts and reasonings fresh in our view, I ask, Is not such a concession—such a free-will offering, at such a time, the most satisfactory and unanswerable refutation that could be given to the calumny that we seek the glory of building a new sect in religion? If, then, as some of our opponents say, we have made a *new* and an *unexpected concession* in their favor, we have done it at such a time, in such circumstances, and with such prospects before us, as ought (we think) henceforth to silence their imputations and reproaches on the ground of selfish or partizan views and feelings.

Some of our fellow-labourers seem to forget that *approaches* are more in the spirit and style of the Saviour, than *reproaches*. We have proved to our entire satisfaction, that having obtained a favorable hearing, a conciliatory, meek, and benevolent attitude is not only the most comely and Christian-like, but the most successful. Many of the Protestant teachers and their communities are much better disposed to us than formerly; and I calculate the day is not far distant when many of them will unite with us. They must certainly come over to us whenever they come to the Bible alone. Baptists and Pedobaptists are daily feeling more and more the need of reform, and our views are certainly imbuing the public mind more and more every year.

But to conclude, our brethren of Eastern Virginia have been the *occasion* at least of eliciting at this time so strong an expression of our opinion; and we have now many letters from that region for one from any other quarter on the aforesaid opinion. Had not some of them greatly and unreasonably abused the sects, or countenanced, aided, and abetted them that did so, and had not a few in some other regions made Christianity to turn more upon immersion than upon *universal holiness*, in all probability I would have answered the sister from Lunenburg in the following manner and style:—

The name *Christian* is now current in four significations:—

1. The ancient primitive and apostolic import simply indicates *follower of Christ*. With a strict regard to its original and scriptural meaning, my favorite and oft-repeated definition is, *A Christian is one that habitually believes all that Christ says, and habitually does all that he bids him*.

2. But its national and very popular sense implies no more than a *professor* of Christianity. Thus we have the Christian nations, as well as the Pagan and Mahometan nations; the Christian-sects as well as the sects political and philosophical.

3. But as soon as controversies arose about the ways and means of putting on Christ or of making a profession of his religion, in a new and special or appropriated sense, 'a Christian' means one who first believes that Jesus is the Christ, repents of his sins, is then immersed on confession into Christ's death, and thenceforth continues in the Christian faith and practice.

4. But there yet remains the sense in which I used the term in the obnoxious phrase first quoted by our sister of Lunenburg. As in the judgment of many, some make the profession right and live wrong; while others make the profession wrong, but live right; so they have

adopted this style—"I don't know what he believes, nor how he was baptized, but I know he is a *Christian*." Thus Adam Clarke quotes some poet—

"You different sects who all declare,
"Lo! Christ is here, and Christ is there!
"Your stronger proofs divinely give,
"And *show me where the Christians live!*"

Now in this acceptation of the word, I think there are many, in most Protestant parties, whose errors and mistakes I hope the Lord will forgive; and although they should not enter into all the blessings of the kingdom on earth, I do fondly expect they may participate in the resurrection of the just.

The words *Jew, Israel, circumcision, disciple*, are used in the same manner, even in the sacred writings: "They are not all Israel that are of Israel"—"An Israelite indeed"—"The true circumcision"—"A Jew inwardly and outwardly"—"Then are you my disciples indeed," &c.

I am glad to see our brethren so jealous of a correct style—so discriminating, and so independent. They are fast advancing to the habit of calling Bible things by Bible names. They only misunderstood me as using the term in its strictest biblical import, while in the case before us I used it in its best modern acceptation.

I could as easily at first as at last have given this reply to our sister's queries; but I thought the times required something else—and I was not mistaken. I have no doubt but it will yet appear to all that I have pursued in this the more useful and salutary course.

Our Eastern brethren were indeed, I opine, hasty and precipitate enough in expressing themselves—almost indeed before they had time to hear and consider the whole matter. I wish they had been as prompt on another occasion, and I should not have been addressed on this subject by the worthy sister so often named. But we are all learning and progressing towards perfection. If any of them, and not all, wish their communications to appear in this work, accompanied with a few pertinent remarks, I am in duty bound, according to my plan, to publish some of them.

I do not indeed blame them altogether for being prompt; for I had rather be an hour too soon as half an hour too late; yet I think some resolutions which I have received, were, upon the whole, rather premature. May the Lord bless all the holy brethren, and give them understanding in all things!

A. C.



ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

AND

HIS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY

Eva Jean Wrather

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

NUMBER ONE

Third Printing

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL
AND HIS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY

by

Eva Jean Wrather

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

Number One

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Nashville, Tennessee

1959

Copyright 1953
by
Eva Jean Wrather

INTRODUCTION

This is the first of a series of pamphlet publications to be issued by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society under the title, *Footnotes to Disciple History*. Written for popular reading, individual numbers of the series will deal with specialized subjects in the field of Disciple history.

The term Disciple history is used in its broadest sense as being representative of all the groups whose beginnings date back to the restoration and reformatory movements inaugurated by James O'Kelly, Elias Smith, Abner Jones, Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, and others. These groups are variously known as Christian Churches, Churches of Christ, and Disciples of Christ.

Each *Footnote to Disciple History* will have from eight to thirty-two pages. The opinions expressed and the interpretations made are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Society.

It is entirely proper that the first *Footnote* should be *Alexander Campbell and His Relevance for Today*, and that the author be Eva Jean Wrather, who has spent years in research into the life and thinking of Campbell. Truly, this is an advance footnote from Miss Wrather's tremendous 800,000 word manuscript that she is re-writing to be published in three separate and distinct volumes.

Alexander Campbell and His Relevance for Today was delivered as an address before the Tennessee Christian Ministers' Institute, Monday evening, January 12, 1953, and is here published, as recorded during delivery, with minor corrections by the author.

CLAUDE E. SPENCER, Curator
Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
June 2, 1953

In introducing Miss Wrather to the Tennessee Christian Ministers Institute, Mr. William J. Hadden, president of the Institute, said:

“Our speaker tonight does not look like the type of person we usually think of as an historian—she’s too happy all the time, too young—she doesn’t have the mildew and the musty appearance about her so many historians have, and yet she is one of the finest in our country, and I know, one of the top historians of the Disciples of Christ. Miss Eva Jean Wrather, our speaker tonight, was raised in our own Nashville. She attended Vanderbilt University where she received her A.B. degree. She spent a full summer abroad, shortly after finishing her college work, to study the backgrounds of Alexander Campbell, one of the great and noble leaders of our early movement. She is at the present time working on a three-volume life of Alexander Campbell, which will certainly be definitive in the field of our knowledge of Alexander Campbell. She is speaking tonight on the theme, *Alexander Campbell and His Relevance for Today*. Miss Wrather, it is with a great deal of pleasure that we listen to you at this moment on the life of Alexander Campbell.”

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND HIS RELEVANCE FOR TODAY

Thank you, Mr. Hadden. As for these "musty historians", perhaps I had better defend myself on at least one thing. Standing up here in this august pulpit, we won't speak of what Paul had to say about women in such places. And Campbell himself was no feminist either. But perhaps it would be well to explain that he did make one exception relative to women in public spheres: he did highly approve of female writers. So perhaps he won't turn over in his grave at thought of having his biography written by a woman.

Specifically, tonight, I want to talk about Campbell's relevance for today. But before I talk about his relevance, perhaps it wouldn't be amiss to mention two areas in which Campbell's example does *not* seem to be taken as very relevant to the modern ministry.

In the first place, he had fourteen children. And in the second place, he never spoke less than two hours, and quite often very much more. There was no connivance at all, I assure you, between Mr. Rose and myself tonight in his choice of a Scripture reading; yet 13th Corinthians was Campbell's favorite chapter of the entire Bible, and when he spoke from this text he always allotted one hour for faith, one hour for hope, and one hour for charity.

But we might well consider the significance of the fact that, in Campbell's day at least, the time apparently never seemed too long for his audience. In fact, Raccoon John Smith, that famed frontier wit and preacher, liked to tell the story of the first time that he himself heard Campbell preach. It was in Kentucky, and Smith describes how he sat entranced as he listened to Campbell because he was trying to find out, he said, to what "ism" this man belonged whose ideas, as he had read them, had already awakened so many new thoughts in his mind. But when Campbell finished, he had a complaint to make. He turned to his neighbor and said, "Isn't it a hard thing, Brother Vaughan, for a man to ride twenty miles horseback, as I have done, just to hear a man talk thirty minutes?" "Look at your watch, Brother Smith," said Mr. Vaughan. He did, Campbell had spoken *two hours* and thirty minutes.

* * * * *

But now, to speak of his relevance. And I think there's really no better time and place to talk on just such a subject.

For one thing, such meetings as these—ministers' associations, ministers' institutes, whatever they were called—Campbell always rejoiced in them. He went to his first one in 1821, on the Western Reserve, himself still a young preacher who hadn't yet "made much noise in the world." It was a "Ministers' Meeting", just started up there by the famous Baptist preacher Adamson Bentley, to provide each year, as Bentley put it, a school "for the mutual improvement of the preachers"; and I understand they had a practice that each

preacher would preach during this meeting, and then the rest of his brethren would criticize his sermon immediately thereafter. Well, after this first visit Campbell annually attended the meetings, "with much pleasure and profit," as he said.

Then, for another thing, this year, you know, really marks a milestone in Tennessee Disciple history. For now, for the first time, we have a national agency of our church here in Tennessee, with all of the challenge and enrichment that this means to our future.

Campbell and the Historical Society

And nothing could possibly have pleased Alexander Campbell better than to have walked across the way—as I hope you all will do before this meeting is over—to spend some time with the curator in this great collection of Disciple literature and also take a look at those building plans for the great archives, library and museum building which we hope to erect somewhere in this university area within a very short time. From 1833, in fact, Campbell himself started filing and making a collection of Disciple historical material, and he urged upon his churchmen their duty to preserve such a collection and keep it up—something unfortunately that was not done until some ten years ago with the founding of the Historical Society.

Campbell was in no sense a vain or conceited man, but he was a proud one, and an intelligent one, and he knew that there was a real challenge, a continuing challenge to the future, in this movement of which he was a part; and he would have heartily applauded a quotation that is often used by the Historical Society: "No people who are indifferent to their past can hope to make their future great."

I imagine that most of you read an article in the *Christian Century* a few months ago entitled "Recover Our Protestant Heritage!" by Richard C. Wolf, in which Arthur Cushman McGiffert is quoted as saying: "A major scandal in American theological education has been the inadequate attention given to the interpretation and understanding of our own immediate cultural background." And such neglect, I think, is particularly to be deplored in the face of a movement such as our Disciple movement, because of the very nature of it, because we are the one major Protestant reform movement which originated entirely on American soil, one peculiarly American in its origins, its impulse, and its spirit.

Campbell on Christian Liberty, and the Nature of Man

In fact, in writing the *Declaration and Address*, which really started our movement, Thomas Campbell was writing America's religious declaration of independence, a new charter of unity and liberty for the church. And quite consciously doing so.

For just as Thomas Jefferson, a few years before, had challenged the people of the new republic to a new adventure in self-government, so Thomas Campbell was challenging them to a like adventure in Christian thinking. As the American republic was established on a breakaway from the old political tyrannies of Europe by an appeal

to the "natural" and "inalienable" rights of man, so Thomas Campbell made a definite appeal to the citizens of the new world to work a like religious revolution by casting away the "stumbling blocks" of old priestly traditions and creeds—the ecclesiastical "rubbish of the ages", quoting John Locke—and by making an appeal, as he said, to the "first principles" and "fundamental truths" of the New Testament. In other words, to the unity and the liberty, the simplicity and the purity of the Apostolic church.

Alexander Campbell gave his life to implementing and amplifying these ideas. And his work is still far from done.

/ / /

Yet, Campbell never thought of himself as a man of religion alone. Rather, like Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, whom he so greatly admired, he was, in a sense, a Nineteenth Century embodiment of the Renaissance ideal of "the whole man", Shakespeare's "man of sovereign parts." A true "citizen of the world", he was equally at home in a frontier cabin or pulpit, or in the halls of Congress, or chatting with a queen's lady-in-waiting at the American embassy in London. Quite convinced that a free church could rise only on the firm foundation of a free society, from both lecture platforms and his editor's chair he turned his far-questing mind on every concern of man—political, economic, and social, as well as religious.

Henry Ward Beecher is reported to have once said that "Alexander Campbell lived a hundred years too soon." Well, it's very true that, imbued as he was with all the positive, exploratory spirit of the Enlightenment and the Revival of Learning—(it's an interesting fact that he was accustomed to remark that it's the great glory of Protestantism that the Reformation followed upon the Revival of Learning, and Protestantism's great tragedy that she so often forgot her high heritage and returned to an outworn medieval metaphysics)—and, with his own mind highly attuned to modern philosophical concepts and the scientific method, Campbell does seem in many respects more akin to our pragmatic Twentieth Century than to the romantic Nineteenth in which he lived. The age of Einstein and Roosevelt is perhaps better equipped to appreciate his full stature than the age of Byron and Victoria.

In fact, I rather believe that it is in Campbell's basic intellectual attitudes and in his philosophic assumptions about the nature of man that he perhaps has the most to say to our own frightened, harassed, confused generation, apparently about to drown itself in a sea of troubles.

For he looks both backward to Plato and Paul and Augustine, and forward to Toynbee and Barth and Ferré and Niebuhr. He was a Renaissance humanist; but he was also heir to a Scot's heritage of stern Calvinistic realism. In our Twentieth Century, he would perhaps not have joined the company of the existentialist philosophers, and yet he certainly would have understood their emphasis on man's indeterminate capacity for good and for evil—understood without yielding to either their despair or their cynicism.

Thus, having predicated a mature and complex view of the nature of man which denied both the dark medieval concept of total depravity and the bright Renaissance belief in man's infinite perfectibility by his own naked efforts, Campbell would see no cause to despair or for the scholar even to be surprised, for that matter, when in our generation the inexorable events of history should put an end to the facile optimism, at once naive and arrogant, of men's belief that our society can completely regenerate itself by its own agencies of technology and sociology. Rather, Campbell realized that actually man's only security lies in a conquest of the man within, what I believe Dr. Ferré calls "God security." His optimism was that stern realistic optimism of the man of faith, who rests secure in God's continuing purpose.

The English scholar, Stephen MacKenna, who has spent a lifetime, you know, in editing and translating the works of Plotinus, when asked why he gave so much time to him, was accustomed to remark that, "Plotinus is worth one lifetime." Well, such a man as Alexander Campbell, I believe, is certainly worth at least half a lifetime.

* * * * *

Campbell on Communism: the Owen Debate

If by odd chance we were suddenly to lose most everything, or even all, that Campbell ever said or did except just the events of one single year of his lifetime, we still would have a rich repository in which to study his relevance for today.

That year was 1829, when there occurred two of the most dramatic events of his entire life, crowded into a few short months.

In 1828 the English socialist, Robert Owen, was travelling through America, preaching his gospel of atheistic communism. Society would certainly be redeemed, he was saying, if we could just do away with three institutions of present society: that is, private property, marriage, and religion. And he was challenging the clergy of America to debate with him the proposition that all religions are based upon the ignorance of mankind, and that to religion is due all of the miseries, vice, and disunity of human society.

Campbell waited a suitable time for older and perhaps more famous ministers to take up this challenge. For in 1829 Campbell was barely beginning his career. He still was in the Baptist church, though resting rather uneasily there, it's true; and he had only been an editor for some six years, though his *Christian Baptist* was already beginning to be read throughout America and in Great Britain. But after he waited in vain for anyone else to answer Owen's challenge, Campbell himself took up the gauntlet.

That debate was held in the spring of 1829. It was widely heralded abroad, because of the reputation of Owen and the growing reputation of Campbell. In fact, even the *Edinburgh Scotsman* and the *London Times* made quite a to-do over it. So when the debate opened, it wasn't surprising that people were gathered from all over the country, from New York to Mississippi. They jammed the auditorium in Cincinnati where Campbell and Owen spoke every day, a hall seating

more than 1200; and, in fact, the occasion brought such a press of people that many could not get in and some even left the city in disgust because unable to hear the debate.

Of course, since he was, by nature, a mild and philanthropic man, Robert Owen may seem as little like Stalin as Paul like Genghis Khan. And yet the truth of the matter is that, deifying the state which he called the social system and insisting that man is utterly the creature of that social system, and believing that the complete regeneration of society could be worked out by following the twelve scientific "mathematical" laws he had evolved for bringing up mankind in his own image, Owen actually was preaching a thorough-going materialistic communism little less ruthless than that preached by the masters of the Kremlin today.

Campbell answered him, for eight days—and in one twelve hour speech, because by the sixth day of the debate Robert Owen had really said all he had to say about his twelve fundamental laws of human nature and society, and so suggested that Campbell take the rest of the time. So Campbell started to speak a half hour before the lunch intermission on Friday; he returned and spoke all Friday afternoon; he started speaking again Saturday morning, and spoke until evening; and then on Monday he resumed and spoke until 4 o'clock that afternoon. Surely that must be some sort of a record for marathon speaking.

Moreover, on the intervening Sunday he preached at the local Methodist church—which was the largest in the city. Robert Owen sat in one of the pews, and after the sermon he was heard to remark, "Never did I see as much fine talent so miserably misdirected."

But through these eight days of debate, Campbell answered him, with a telling admixture of wit and sarcasm, logic and eloquence. He tore asunder Owen's social system, which, he said, would reduce human society to the level of "a colony of bees" and degrade man to the status of "a stall fed ox." And, in opposition, Campbell lifted up his concept of the spiritual nature of man as a child of God and the democratic thesis of government that the state is something made for man, and not man for the state.

This debate, perhaps more than any other single thing, spread Campbell's fame abroad because, of course, he stood here, not as the exponent of any particular theory of religion, but as the great champion of all religion.

Today, I think our Voice of America, in sending its broadcasts abroad, could not do better than take some quotations from Mr. Campbell's debate with Owen. Upon this theme of democracy versus communism, democracy, I believe, has never had a better spokesman.

* * * * *

Campbell on Democracy: the Virginia Convention; War; and a Congress of Nations

Then he spoke again on the field of democracy that very fall. 1829 was a good year for democracy, of course, with Andrew Jackson in

the White House; and Virginians had taken courage to call a convention to rewrite their state constitution, which was indeed an oppressively autocratic constitution to be fouted upon any free people.

But this was no usual state convention. In it there sat America's great, because Virginia's great in 1829 was America's. Among others, there were, for example, two ex-presidents of the United States and another man who would be president: Madison, Monroe, and John Tyler. There was the great chief-justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall; and there was that perhaps most feared wit who has ever sat in the United States Congress, John Randolph of Roanoke. The debate was published—a voluminous volume and a rare one, of which we have a copy over in the Disciple archives, for those of you who may be curious to read further. And it is really a great volume. It ranks very high, as a matter of fact, in the history of constitutional law because of the very quality of the men who made those speeches in that parliamentary debate.

And I think no greater tribute has ever been paid to Alexander Campbell's genius than the fact that his people in western Virginia, those who agreed with his religious opinions and those who violently disagreed with them, alike united in insisting that Campbell should go to Richmond as their representative. And once there, in that vast assemblage of statesmanship, he was an outstanding speaker. There were 96 men there, as a matter of fact, and, of course, most of them simply signified their presence by their vote; so when I first read the volume, you can imagine with what concern and interest I read: Would Campbell just be recorded as saying "Aye" or "Nay"? Not by any means. When every great subject of the debate arose, he made a major address. Indeed, he stands out there as the most lusty voice of the Jacksonian "men of the western waters", raised in protest against the vested interest, special privilege, and aristocratic pretensions of the great planters on Tidewater.

A vivid historical drama, in fact, can be drawn from that convention, if we picture Alexander Campbell standing there in debate, day after day, and opposed to him, the striking figure of that relentless arch-conservative, John Randolph of Roanoke. Indeed, one of Virginia's leading historians has said that he considered it a significant proof of Campbell's genius to record that he not only dared cross swords in debate with such an apostle of wit, but that Alexander Campbell actually had the distinction of being the only man he ever heard of who had had the *last word* while crossing the sword of wit with Randolph of Roanoke.

On one occasion, Randolph in the course of a speech remarked that he "would not live under King Numbers", that he would flee such a terrible "mischief". Immediately Campbell was on his feet, and he cried back, "Well, Mr. Randolph, and where will you go? For beyond the dominion of King Numbers there is no other monarch save King Blood or King Purse." And concluded Campbell, "For my own part, I love King Numbers, I wish to live, and I hope to die, under the government of this majestic personage."

Finally, in the debate, Randolph became so extremely exasperated at what he considered Campbell's radical and unreasonable democratic proposals that—remembering that Campbell had published shortly before a new translation of the New Testament—he rose to his feet and shook his long fore-finger, that “javelin of rhetoric”, in Campbell's face and cried out, “That man is never satisfied! God Almighty could not satisfy him with the Bible which He gave, and Mr. Campbell had to go and write a new Bible of his own.”

But, actually, Randolph and other conservative gentlemen on Tidewater need not have feared Alexander Campbell. For in his passionate plea for social justice, in his indictment of any society, anywhere, which tends to make the “rich richer, and the poor poorer”, as he expressed it, he was giving voice to democracy's demand for human decency, which is the strongest bulwark we have against subversion of our freedom and our free enterprise. But this truth some gentlemen in 1829 were not any more prone to see than their counterparts today; and here Campbell might find an amusing and rather useful, if painful, parallel with some present day conditions. In 1829, of course, the great bogey of vested interests, the terror of gentlemen, was the French Revolution, so recently over. And so time after time during the convention they hurled at Campbell the epithet “Jacobin”—these Nineteenth Century counterparts of a certain class of arch conservative who today will recklessly hurl the epithet “communist” at any man who dares raise his voice for the world's dispossessed.

But the epithet did not concern Campbell. In truth, few men have been more sane, tolerant, balanced than he. His was the Greek spirit of the golden mean. In fact, he very often used the expression which almost became the motto of his life: “*Via media tutissima est.*” Moreover, of course, Campbell himself was a man of property, quite considerable property, in fact (and among the most interesting recent acquisitions of our Historical Society, may I remark, are the account books that Campbell kept throughout his life, the great part of them now on deposit with the Society).

But, in following his way of the golden mean, Campbell not only attacked the dangers to democracy that inhere in communism on the one side and in selfish vested interest on the other. He also saw equally clearly the dangers that beset democracy within its own gates. And so, time after time, he warned that a falsely sentimentalized equalitarianism could, if it triumphed, destroy liberty itself, and that no free state could hope to survive whose citizens were more concerned with their privileges than they were with their duties and their responsibilities.

/ / /

As we talk today of our deepest concern of war and problems of the United Nations, we might reread an address that Campbell delivered in 1848, an “Address on War”, in which he eloquently plead that man stop this stupidity by the formation of “a congress of nations and a high court of nations”; and his ideas there were considered so relevant to our present problems that, a few years ago, shortly before

the outbreak of World War II, a Missouri Congressman, as most of you know, had that address read entire into our Congressional Record.

And if today we become somewhat timid about America's role in international affairs, we might reread two great addresses of Campbell's—one on "The Destiny of Our Country", and the other on "The Anglo-Saxon Language"—in which he issued a clear challenge for the Anglo-Saxon nations to assume their destiny. With their great tradition and backgrounds of liberty, both civil and religious, in their hands, he said, lie the moral and political responsibility and duty to lead the world.

* * * * *

Campbell on Christian Unity

But, of course, first and last, Campbell was always quite convinced that the ultimate regeneration of society must wait upon the regeneration of the human soul. And if Christianity had not achieved its high purpose, it was, he thought, because of the scandal of a divided church—in Thomas Campbell's words, "the bitter jarrings and janglings of a party spirit" "mangling" the "mystical body" of Christ. It is here, perhaps, we would agree that Campbell is, after all, most relevant to our problems today.

There is a common fallacy, however, about Campbell. It is often said that there are really two Campbells. He's spoken of as if there was the destructive iconoclast of the *Christian Baptist*; then there was the other man, the conservative master-builder of the *Millennial Harbinger* years. A sort of a schizophrenic personality, apparently. But I think nothing is really further from truth. Rather, Campbell followed a consistent course. Actually, he never uttered wiser or stronger statements on unity and cooperation than he did when he was editor of the *Christian Baptist*. In fact, there is a letter there called a letter "To an Independent Baptist" which I think is a more splendid statement on cooperation and Christian love than the very famous "Lunenburg letter" which he wrote some eleven years later. For in this earlier letter, among many pertinent statements, he says this: "Dear Sir, this plan of making our own nest and fluttering over our own brood, and confining all goodness and grace to our noble selves and to the 'elect few' who are like us," this, he says, "is the quintessence of sublimated Pharisism."

But actually, if Campbell spoke so bitterly of the evils of the church, it was because he loved the church so much, and he saw this clearly; that if we were ever to build this new temple of a church purified and united, we would first have to bring to the ground the old temple of corruption and superstition and prejudice.

And I think that the Campbell of the *Christian Baptist* will cease to be relevant when, and only when, this new temple is raised, when the church can no longer say that it has no sin within. For example, there is that piece which I believe is the most brilliant satire Campbell ever wrote on the church, his "Third Epistle of Peter", subtitled "A Looking Glass for the Clergy." I wonder whether you have read it

lately? I sometimes think that we might do well to have it reprinted and framed and hung in the vestry of every church, lest we grow too much at ease in Zion.

Then there is another fallacy of interpretation: that Thomas Campbell is our great apostle of unity, and that Alexander—well, perhaps we'd be a little better off if he just hadn't come along at all. But I think that this is quite a mistake in interpretation. It's true that Thomas Campbell spoke beautiful, wonderful, marvelous words on Christian unity and love, but they are, when all is said and done, indefinite words, rather vague, it will have to be confessed, at times. But Alexander was more practical, more realistic. He had the courage to face the fact that, if there ever is a united church, then that church will have to be defined, and defined in terms of its faith, its ministry, its sacraments, its order of worship; and I believe that any of our present-day scholars who have struggled in the Committee on Faith and Order at Lausanne or Edinburgh or on the World Council to resolve these problems, I think they, too, will applaud the courage of Campbell's attempt.

And in that attempt he made two contributions, I'm convinced, of lasting importance to the church ecumenical.

The first one actually would give Disciples a unique and mediating position in the ecumenical church, if it were fully recognized—as it really has not been—though it has been ably argued by two of the outstanding scholars of our present Disciple generation; that is, Charles Clayton Morrison in America, and William Robinson in England. For, as both Robinson and Morrison point out, the Campbells themselves did not hold an entirely Protestant theology.

Now, of course, Ireland born, no men understood better than they the evils that reside in an absolutist Roman system. As a matter of fact, I think we might well put Campbell's own debate with the Roman Catholic Bishop Purcell along side *American Freedom and Catholic Power* and Dr. Garrison's *Protestant Manifesto* as another great document in study of this question today.

But the Campbells did suggest that Protestantism in running out of Rome had perhaps run so fast that at some points it had run past Jerusalem. And the fact that there are several high church elements in their theology is not at all odd, of course, since Thomas Campbell's father was a Roman Catholic at first, and he himself was brought up in the Church of England. Thus the Campbells came naturally to their deep appreciation of certain fundamental Catholic elements. They rejected entirely the Protestant doctrine of an invisible church, I think as you know; and also they held a very high doctrine of the nature of the church itself as the body of Christ, not simply a fellowship. They also held a high doctrine of the sacraments, not just as a test of obedience, or some memorial rite, but as real channels of grace. And I believe that here today, through this idea rightly explored and understood, we could make a unique contribution to the ecumenical church—as William Robinson, as a matter of fact, has done in the English Council of Churches—by holding a reconciling

and mediating position between the high and low groups within the church, which, of course, must come together if there ever is a united church.

Now, the second contribution offered by the Campbells is, of course, the familiar one: that we should unite the church by a "restoration of primitive Christianity." We don't use that term, however, so very much any more; and perhaps, for the obvious reason that by a few it has been degraded into a deadening legalism. But used as the Campbells used it, as a new challenge, a new basis of unity for the church, then it holds the one perhaps solid hope of the church ecumenical.

In agreement, there are two pertinent quotations from two present-day scholars which you may have already seen. Two internationally famous scholars, as a matter of fact. And I doubt really if either one of them has ever heard of Alexander Campbell; and yet the things they have said sound as if they've been lifted bodily from the *Declaration and Address* or the *Millennial Harbinger*. One is from an article by Will Durant in the *Saturday Evening Post*—and I believe this is quoted in an editorial in *The Christian-Evangelist* a few months ago—in which Durant said: "If Christianity would go back to its sources, cleanse itself resolutely from the silt of time, and take its stand with fresh sincerity upon the personality and ideals of its founder, who could resist it?"

The other is from the accomplished French scientist, Lecomte du Noüy, in *Human Destiny* (and in our day of cheap and easy popularity, isn't it consoling that such a book could actually get on the best-seller list of America?). You may remember that in this book he says: "The only salvation for mankind will be found" in "a return to the elemental teachings of the Gospel," to "the fundamental principles of Christianity" through a church "vitalized by its own primitive ideals."

Nevertheless, today, however Campbell would applaud certain aims and accomplishments of the National and the World Council of Churches, he still would not be satisfied that they have achieved this ideal of unity. Because, of course, Campbell said very flatly that he did not envision any "mere federation of sects"; and in the *Declaration and Address* it is stated positively that what is intended and desired is "constitutional", "Catholic", "organic" unity. And yet Alexander Campbell, as a very sane and practical man, was the first to realize that federation must, perhaps, precede any hope of unity; and so in his own day every interdenominational cooperative that was suggested had his enthusiastic voice and his support: whether it was the American Bible Society; or the Sunday School Union; or the Evangelical Alliance, which was formed in London in 1846 and, in some respects, I suppose, may be considered a legitimate forerunner of our World Council.

In 1839, in fact, only some nine years after the Disciples had been forced into a separate movement, Campbell himself wrote a series of articles called "Union of Christians" in which he made this very interesting proposal: "I propose that a Congress of all Protestant

parties be convened in some central place, to be composed of delegates from each Protestant party, chosen in ratio to their entire population; and when convened, these men shall take as their rule of union in faith, in piety, and in morality only what is catholic, that is," he said, "universally accepted by all the parties. That shall be the basis of union. And whatever is not universally accepted as of divine authority shall be considered as schismatical and human."

A few years later, in 1842, when the American Protestant Association was formed, Campbell also had some remarks to make in which I believe our World Council and National Council might perhaps find some consolation. For while Campbell pointed out that, of course, this Association was federation and not union, and, therefore, hadn't achieved the highest goal, yet he added these philosophic and pertinent remarks: "Half a loaf," he said, "is better than no loaf at all. So let Protestant parties come together, shake hands, look at each other's warts and wens, until they become familiar with their mutual deformities and feel the need of mutual condolence and sympathy." "It is good," he continued, "to come together in a friendly mood. To taste the sweets of one general meeting for one common end, may be a sort of prelibation of future union on principles more catholic than either Papist or Protestant can yet appreciate." And, he concluded, perhaps such a meeting may "tend a little to the cultivation of that Christian and catholic spirit which must precede any union of Christians."

* * * * *

Campbell on Bible Translations and Education

Well, we might mention just one other event of our present decade that would have brought great joy to the heart of Campbell, and that is the publication of the Revised Standard Version and the beginning of the issuance of the volumes of the *Interpreters' Bible*. For Campbell, as you know, was a pioneer in American publication of a New Testament translation with the edition which he brought out in 1826. Everything that Moses Stuart of Andover wrote he followed; he always kept abreast of every new advance in the critical scholarship of his own day. In fact, the last great scholarly work of his life was to make a new translation from the Greek of the *Acts of the Apostles*, which he did in 1855 for the American Bible Union.

And there is one sidelight here which again might cause Campbell to laugh a little ruefully in thinking how little is changed after all from his century to ours; because, reading in our daily papers about the burnings of the new Revised edition, Campbell could recall that immediately on the issuance of his own New Testament, there was a certain Baptist minister, Edmund Waller, who built a great bonfire and burned Campbell's translation because, as he said, the King James version, just as God gave it, was quite good enough for him. But he and we may perhaps be consoled a bit by the fact that just twenty-five years later the son of that Edmund Waller, John L. Waller, was president of the American Bible Union and worked with Campbell in bringing out the translation of the 1850's.

In his preface to his New Testament of 1826 Campbell made, I think, one of the most revealing statements of his life. He said this: "The whole scope and design of my labors is to see Christians intelligent, united, and happy."

He put the first emphasis on "intelligent". Of course, in a sense, he envisioned the whole work of his life as a work of education, of which the founding of Bethany College was only its most conspicuous flower. And if today our modern educators and educated alike seem sadly concerned that something has gone puzzlingly amiss with our late fond expectations of the panaceas of universal education, they might find much to read and ponder in Campbell's writing on education. He always wanted to do a book on education. He never found the time. But one could readily be compiled from his numerous lectures, articles and essays on education—and this is the sort of thing being placed on the agenda of our Historical Society. And it needs to be done, to bring together his ideas and ideals of education in a form in which they will be read, because over and over Campbell issued the pleas and warnings even more relevant to the situation of our than his own day. Repeatedly he elaborated the absolute necessity and importance, as he put it, "of uniting the moral with the intellectual culture of the mind;" and repeatedly he warned of the shambles that was sure to come from man's fragmentation, from failure to educate the "whole man."

Today, I think a sober America in a sober world, trying to sort out the true from the false gods and facing the grim alternatives of chaos or civilization, can find much of instruction and hope, of warning and challenge, in the life and works of this man, who never worshiped at the delusive shrine of self, and who seemed to comprehend so thoroughly both the dark recesses and the radiant possibilities of the human spirit.



FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

- No. 1 *Alexander Campbell and His Relevance for Today*, by Eva Jean Wrather
- No. 2 *The Lunenburg Letter with Attendant Comments*, by Alexander Campbell
- No. 3 *Barton Warren Stone and Christian Unity*, by William Garrett West
- No. 4 *An Address to the Different Religious Societies on the Sacred Import of the Christian Name*, by Rice Haggard
- No. 5 *Report of the Proceedings of a General Meeting of Messengers, From Thirteen Congregations, Held in Wellsburg, Va. on Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834*, by J. T. M'Vay and Alexander Campbell.

Footnotes No's. 1, 2, 3, and 5 are 25 cents each

Footnote No. 4 is 35 cents

Special prices are made for quantity orders

Order from

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South

Nashville 12, Tennessee

THE BRONCHO THAT
WOULD NOT BE BROKEN

By Dr. Perry E. Gresham

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLES HISTORY
NUMBER SIX

THE BRONCHO THAT WOULD NOT BE BROKEN

by

Dr. Perry E. Gresham

Presented by First Christian Church of Springfield, Illinois
in behalf of the Vachel Lindsay Association
Vachel Lindsay Home
603 South Fifth Street
Springfield, Illinois 62703

FOOTNOTES TO DISCIPLE HISTORY

Number Six

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Nashville, Tennessee 37212

1986

INTRODUCTION

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society is pleased to publish the sixth in a series of *Footnotes To Disciple History*. The last Footnote was published in 1957.

The term Disciple history in these Footnotes is used in its broadest sense as representative of the three groups which grew out of the Campbell-Stone Movement. These groups are variously known as Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, and Churches of Christ.

This Footnote highlights the life and some of the works of Nicholas Vachel Lindsay, born in Springfield, Illinois, November 10, 1879. He died on December 5, 1931. Encyclopaedia Britannica states that his ambition was to convert America to his vision of beauty. "If I put my soul and body without reserve into the hands of the Lord," he wrote in his diary, "my part will be done. Then let them lead or kill or cure me as they will." (Quoted by Edgar Lee Masters in *Vachel Lindsay: A Poet of America*, Charles Scribner's Sons.)

Artist, poet, minstrel, troubadore, Vachel Lindsay comes alive in the words of Dr. Perry Gresham, who presented his address on the occasion of the 106th anniversary of the birthdate of Lindsay. Dr. Gresham is an internationally known lecturer, world traveler and writer who has reconciled classical learning with the complexities of 20th century civilization. He is President Emeritus and Distinguished Professor of Humanities, Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia.

The Historical Society in cooperation with the Vachel Lindsay Association of Springfield, Illinois, is happy to present this address as a *Footnote To Disciple History*.

James M. Seale, President
Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Nashville, Tennessee
February 1986

THE BRONCHO THAT WOULD NOT BE BROKEN

No one could forget the dazzling inner world of Vachel Lindsay. One glimpse is enough to mystify and beget wonder. His description of his own birth marks him as not only different, but quite spectacular.

“In through the window a sea-mustang brought me,
(Smashing the window sash, breaking the law).

I was tied to his back — I do not know who caught me . . .”¹

The idea of an unusual birth is as old as history. Ancient mythologies are rich with such reference. Even Benjamin Franklin gave a humorous description of his own birth when he said he was born in Philadelphia at age 17!

The actual birth of Vachel Lindsay was rather different. He was born November 10, 1879 in Springfield, Illinois. His physician-father was in attendance and his remarkable mother commented on the fact that he was born with a prophet's caul over his face. He was not a vigorous baby, and had to be carried about on a pillow for a rather long time.

As he grew, he was quite spoiled by his mother. His own description, as he thought back from maturity, was, “It now becomes plain that I was pumped as full of ambition by this aggressive lady as my silly little hide could hold.” His mother, a strong and talented person who became a sort of celebrity in Springfield, was keen on her son becoming an artist. Lindsay's tribute to his mother, however, is a tender and beautiful recollection described in the poem, “The Hearth Eternal.”

“ . . . Thus has the widow conquered half the earth,
She who increased in faith, though all alone,
Who kept her empty house a magic place,
Has made the town a holy angel's throne.”²

His poem, “Dr. Mohawk”, was his tribute to his physician father.

“ . . . Doctor, and glorious Ancestral Protector,
Exhorter, reprover, corrector.

Then we swam to the sky through crystalline spaces,
The clouds closed behind us, all the long way,
And a rainbow-storm priesthood that hour blessed the bay,
Medicine men, in tremendous array,

While he spoke to me kindly and yet with fine scorning
For hunting for favors with rabbits or men. . .”³

There is little doubt, however, that Esther Catharine Frazee Lindsay entwined her genius-son with cords of love and ambition that kept him a virgin until his marriage at age 45.

My personal experience with Lindsay is limited to two fleeting moments at the close of his lectures. I was privileged to develop a warm friendship with Olive Lindsay Wakefield, his sister. I have been fasci-

nated with Lindsay's poetry since my college days in Texas, where our speech choir did "The Congo" and "General William Booth Enters Into Heaven". I have carefully read much of the biographical literature which sets forth his unusual and fascinating life history. After pondering his rich and varied life, I am making a daring attempt to outline some of the inner images reflected in the poems, the paintings and the journals of the poet. These will include "The Broncho That Would Not Be Broken", "The Lame Boy", "Spring Came On Forever", "The Utopian", "The Johnny Appleseed of Beauty", and "The Apostolic Disciple". I have called this lecture "The Broncho That Would Not Be Broken".

THE BRONCHO THAT WOULD NOT BE BROKEN

The place was Great Bend, Kansas. Lindsay was on one of his walks as an evangelist for beauty. He had no money, so was trying to trade "poems for bread". He would surprise a household by knocking at the door, asking for food and lodging, with an offer to read poems as payment. In later years he was charged by critics as being a beggar, which he sternly resented. His purpose was to show that beauty is worth more than bread. He explained his own beggary as a protest against commercialism.

"The reason my beggar days started talk was that each time I broke loose, and went on the road, in the spring, after a winter of Art lecturing, it was definitely an act of protest against the United States commercial standard, a protest against the type of life set forth for all time in two books of Sinclair Lewis: *Babbitt* and *Main Street*."⁴

Lindsay tried to live up to what was expected of him. As he tramped across Kansas, he was expected to lend a hand in the harvest. He began to work for some of the farmers who needed help. In one place he found some very religious people whose commitment did not include kindness to animals. He witnessed, to his horror, these men trying to "break" a lively colt. They lashed the colt with rawhide to stop his capering as they put the harness on him. The next day, the bruised and injured creature was hitched to the reaper with mules. With his high spirit, he pulled the whole load, stung with the whip and bitten by the mules. By mid-afternoon, he could stand no more and lunged into a frenzy. His heart broke and he died there on the field. The tender heart of Vachel Lindsay identified with the colt, and I quote in part his poem, "The Broncho That Would Not Be Broken".

“A little colt — broncho, loaned to the farm
To be broken in time without fury or harm,
Yet black crows flew past you, shouting alarm,
Calling ‘Beware,’ with lugubrious singing . . .
The butterflies there in the bush were romancing,
The smell of the grass caught your soul in a trance,
So why be a-fearing the spurs and the traces,
O broncho that would not be broken of dancing?

You were born with the pride of the lords great and olden
Who danced, through the ages, in corridors golden.
In all the wide farm-place the person most human.
You spoke out so plainly with squealing and capering,
With whinnying, snorting contorting and prancing,
As you dodged your pursuers, looking askance,
With Greek-footed figures, and Parthenon paces,
A broncho that would not be broken of dancing.

* * * * *

In that last afternoon your boyish heart broke.
The hot wind came down like a sledge-hammer stroke.
The blood-sucking flies to a rare feast awoke.
And they searched out your wounds, your death-warrant tracing.
And the merciful men, their religion enhancing,
Stopped the red reaper, to give you a chance.
Then you died on the prairie, and scorned all disgraces,
O broncho that would not be broken of dancing.”⁵

THE LAME BOY

The wide gap which the poet felt between his over-stimulated aspiration and his modest level of achievement led him to think of himself as “the lame boy”. He had tried to win his way in drawing and painting, and while he became an expert guide to the Metropolitan Museum, his drawings were squiggly and confused.

Many informed people differ in estimating the worth of Lindsay’s drawings and paintings. All agree that they are of major importance in terms of his self-expression. Some of the Lindsay scholars think very highly of the technical qualities, the line, the color and the content of his art work. Some effort is being made to renew interest in Lindsay, the artist. It is generally recognized, however, that Lindsay’s teachers and the poet himself came to the right conclusion when they pointed him in the direction of poetry.

Lindsay was unable to communicate the overwhelming feelings that possessed him. He tried to follow the classic definition of poetry as “great emotion reflected in tranquility” by writing a poem to the rhythm of Chopin’s “Berceuse” with the title “The Lame Boy and the Fairy”. The fairy kept the lame boy laughing and dancing, even though he was inclined to be somber and discouraged. This remarkable poem ends with the charm of perpetual childhood in which imagination takes wings. He wrote,

“ . . . A hundred years
And
A day,
There we will fly
And play
I-spy and cross-tag,
And meet on the highway,
And call to the game
Little Red Riding Hood,
Goldilocks, Santa Claus,
Every beloved
And heart-shaking name.’
And the lame child
And the fairy
Journeyed far, far
To the North Star.”⁶

These childhood games were dear to the boyish heart of Lindsay, even when he was at the height of his power and reciting his lectures to the wide world.

Janel Lundgren, President of the Vachel Lindsay Association, has called my attention to the fact that Lindsay read this moving poem at his home church on the occasion of his last public performance. The response of the congregation was electric, and the memory of Lindsay’s appealing child-like heart still lingers.

SPRING CAME ON FOREVER

His image of perpetual youth prompted him to think only of spring-time. He had the arrested development of childhood comparable to Peter Pan in Barrie’s celebrated play. He sensed the need for autumn and winter, even though he lacked an immediate awareness of it. He was enchanted by Edgar Allen Poe, who thought only in terms of sunset, autumn and winter — never in terms of springtime and dawning. Van Wyck Brooks noted the contrast between Lindsay’s fascination with youth and Poe’s obsession with the sunset. He wrote:

“There were no mornings in the world of Poe, there were only winter afternoons or dull dark soundless days in the autumn of the year, and one sometimes had glimpses of a river or a lake that was saffron or sickly in hue or sullen or livid in the light of a setting sun . . .”⁷

Preoccupation with springtime appears in Lindsay’s drawings, his journals and his verses. In many ways, the most famous of his poems is “The Chinese Nightingale”. This poem paints in rhythmic words a phantom of long ago in which a Chinese laundryman dreams while he irons, oblivious to the sounds and fortunes of San Francisco out his window. He dreams of the golden age of his past when he was a great emperor.

“ . . . And the lady, rosy-red,
Flourished her fan, her shimmering fan,
Stretched her hand toward Chang, and said:
‘Do you remember,
Ages after,
Our palace of heart-red stone?
Do you remember
The little doll-faced children
With their lanterns full of moon-fire,
That came from all the empire
Honoring the throne?’ . . .”⁸

His nightingale kept singing of the mighty deeds of long ago.

“ . . . I remember, I remember
There were ghostly veils and laces . . .
In the shadowy bowery places . . .
With lovers’ ardent faces
Bending to one another,
Speaking each his part.
They infinitely echo
In the red cave of my heart.
‘Sweetheart, sweetheart, sweetheart,
They said to one another.
They spoke, I think, of perils past.
They spoke, I think, of peace at last.
One thing I remember:
Spring came on forever,
Spring came on forever,’
Said the Chinese nightingale.”⁹

Lindsay, in his heart, agreed with the magic bird.

THE UTOPIAN

Those who write learned books of literary criticism call Lindsay a naturalist and place him at the heart of America. They have correctly identified him as a poet who had utopian dreams for Springfield, Illinois, and for a time a fond hope that Spokane, Washington, might become the "New Jerusalem".

Robert E. Spillers, offered the opinion that Lindsay had picked up the American beat with its strain of optimism and its high expectations as reflected in folk expression:

"Lindsay's gift to American literature was, like George Gershwin's to music, an awakened sensibility to the folk spirit as a living and continuing force in the creative life. Coming before the general revival of interest in folk ballad, tale, and song, which was to sweep the country in the thirties and forties, he helped more than any other poet to discover native and authentic strains of song. An intense love of the people rather than a political nationalism motivated all of his work, as it did also — in a curiously inverted way — the work of Edgar Lee Masters (1869-1948) . . .¹⁰

Vachel Lindsay was fortunate to have Edgar Lee Masters for his friend. Masters stood by Lindsay in life and wrote a comprehensive biography after his death with the title, *Vachel Lindsay — A Poet In America*. It is a strong biography full of poetic insight and rich with information gathered by study of the journals and letters, as well as with personal recollections and conversations with Lindsay's family.

The biography, however, is occasionally more about Masters than about Lindsay. "What Peter says about Paul says more about Peter than it says about Paul". Masters hated Abraham Lincoln, and he found it difficult to understand how his friend, Vachel, could so love and admire him.

Lindsay broke into fame in 1913 when that gracious girl, Harriet Monroe, published in her poetry magazine his "General William Booth Enters Into Heaven". Some friends of mine and friends of Willis Jones who told me of this episode, were with her on the evening before her magazine reached the stores. Among them was Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, Editor of *The Christian Century*. She confided to these scholarly men and women that she was about to publish a great new poet named Vachel Lindsay. This was in January. She was right. He became famous from the moment the magazine hit the stands.

Since 1913 was the year of Lindsay's wide recognition, and since he had started his career as an artist, it is curious that he took no notice of an event in the affairs of art that shook aesthetic America to its very foundations. This event was The Armory Exhibit that presented Marcel

Duchamp's, "The Nude Descending a Stair Case." This event was described by art critics as comparable to "an explosion in a shingle factory". Yet none of Lindsay's biographers makes reference to this considerable episode. Lindsay, who was a talented student of art history and a guide at the Metropolitan Museum, makes no mention of the clattering descent of this naked lady.

Lindsay became even more famous in England than in America. He was the sort of an American who fulfilled the norms of British expectation. His trousers were cut at the ankles instead of at the heel, just the way Americans were pictured in *Punch*. Whitman before him had captured the heart of Britain with his "barbaric yawp". Lindsay's poems had the content, in "The Ghosts of the Buffaloes", and similar verses which identified him with the English perception of young and undisciplined America. They thrilled to the rhythm of his verses and lost their cool by participating in his recitations with his suggested responses. Lindsay offered the opinion that his mother did not really accept him as a competent poet until she saw him honored at the great universities of England. Then she was very proud.

Eleanor Ruggles captured the moment when she wrote —

" . . . Vachel believed it was in this moment and not before — not till she saw him with Oxford at his feet — that his mother, accustomed to being first in her own world, realized his accomplishment. He was to look back on the occasion with mixed emotions, now crying out — this was after her death — that on at last perceiving he had done something worth while she immediately took credit for it, and again expressing his happiness at her share in his triumph as 'the sort of thing few men can bring to their mothers' . . ."¹¹

Lindsay had his own little pantheon of American heroes, which included such disparate persons as Jefferson and Jackson, Roosevelt and Wilson, Lincoln and that forgotten Governor of Illinois named John Peter Altgeld. Lindsay's poem, "The Eagle That Is Forgotten", is a tribute to Governor Altgeld, who was roundly beaten in Illinois, but won Lindsay's heart by pardoning the socialists of the Haymarket riot. Lindsay's tender words for this remarkable hero are among those touched with immortality.

" . . . Sleep softly, . . . eagle forgotten, . . . under the stone,
Time has its way with you there and the clay has its own.
Sleep on, O brave-hearted, O wise man, that kindled the flame

—
To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name,
To live in mankind, far, far more . . . than to live in a name."¹²

His real heart, however, was stirred with the tall gaunt figure of Abraham Lincoln. His grandfather Frazee was a Southern Democrat who had no regard for Lincoln. His grandfather Lindsay considered Abraham Lincoln to be a scoundrel and a thief who had plundered his land, driven off his horses and cattle, and robbed him of his slaves. Lindsay had said, "The Mason-Dixon Line runs through our house and through my heart. It runs all around the world." My scholarly colleague, Dr. Van Meter Ames, who is a celebrity in philosophy and literary criticism, wrote a charming essay on the poet called, "Vachel Lindsay — or, My Heart Is a Kicking Horse". This article quotes Lindsay's identity with the South and with the Democrats, but shows how the person and life of Abraham Lincoln captured his heart.¹³

As a little boy, Lindsay played mostly with Ruby Vachel, his cousin who lived next door to the Lincoln House. They made a Christmas tree of a lilac bush which flourished in the shadow of the Lincoln home, and kept it decorated all year round. Lindsay heard over and over again the stories of Lincoln's compassion. It is no wonder that when the First World War broke out, Lindsay wrote "Abraham Lincoln Walks At Midnight". It begins in the solemn tones —

"It is portentous, and a thing of state
That here at midnight, in our little town
A mourning figure walks, and will not rest,
Near the old court-house pacing up and down, . . ."

and ends—

". . . He cannot rest until a spirit-dawn
Shall come; — the shining hope of Europe free:
The league of sober folk, the Workers' Earth,
Bringing long peace to Cornland, Alp and Sea.
It breaks his heart that kings must murder still,
That all his hours of travail here for men
Seem yet in vain. And who will bring white peace
That he may sleep upon his hill again?"¹⁴

Lindsay's utopian thought is best understood as his vision of things that might be fair and beautiful about Springfield, Illinois. It was not a comprehensive utopia such as that produced by Thomas Moore or Voltaire. It differed widely from Bellamy's *Looking Backward*. It had no identity with the efforts at founding a utopian community such as that attempted in New Harmony, Indiana, by Robert Owen. His *Golden Book of Springfield* is somewhat involved and somewhat difficult to read. It is like some of his drawings — squiggly and confused, yet rich with insight and throbbing with feeling.

Few cities in the world could boast an articulate citizen equal to Lindsay. In his triad, "A Gospel of Beauty", he includes some stirring

lines under the title, "On The Building Of Springfield".

"Let not our town be large, remembering
That little Athens was the Muses home,
That Oxford rules the heart of London still,
That Florence gave the Renaissance to Rome."¹⁵

Lindsay moved from this expression of love for his native city to his vision of the future. In the Section VIII, "Home Town" of his *Collected Poems*, he writes of things to be, such poems as "The Dream of All the Springfield Writers", "The Town of American Visions", and "The Springfield of the Far Future".

"Some day our town will grow old.
'She is wicked and raw,' men say,
'Awkward and brash and profane.'
But the years of God are like bread,
Balm of Gilead and sweet.
And the soul of this little town
Our Father will make complete."¹⁶

As I mentioned earlier, late in his life he was inclined to move his ideal city from Springfield to Spokane, Washington, where he made his home for several years in that famous old Davenport Hotel. This place had the fabulous practice of giving change in silver dollars. Many times I have walked out listing to port with a pocket-full of silver! There came a time, however, when Lindsay grew disenchanted with Spokane and felt that the citizens were trying to "break" him. He thought they wanted him to write poems like Eddie Guest, and pay his bills like anybody else! Lindsay could never quite accept the fact that people are expected to earn money, save money, plan ahead and meet obligations.

When he married Elizabeth Connor, daughter of the manse, Spokane resident, and teacher of English and Latin, the marriage took place within the confining flower-papered walls of Lindsay's room at the Davenport. Elizabeth tried to bring him to budget, but he was baffled rather than outraged. He earned substantial fees for his lecturing and writing, but he spent lavishly and gave away anything that was left over. He actually found happiness in being penniless!

Lindsay had strong views about social issues, but was gifted with a sense of humor which prevented him from charging through the Alpine village shouting, "Excelsior!" In one of his brilliant aphorisms he observed, "There are no masses, classes, or asses among immortal souls". He would have felt at home with John Stuart Mill's essay on liberty, but not with Adam Smith's version of "Natural Liberty". He lacked the inclination to "improve his condition" economically.

Lindsay thought of himself as a patriot, a pacifist and a socialist. He had very limited understanding of what the word "socialism" meant.

He did not see it as collective ownership. He did not think of it as government controlling the lives of its people. His idea of socialism was that everybody should be well-fed and happy.

Lindsay had no time for Karl Marx. Individual freedom was so dear to the heart of the poet that the grim collectivism and economic determinism of Marx would have been offensive. Lindsay disliked commercialism, but he disliked any kind of government dictatorship even more.

Lindsay was fascinated by William Jennings Bryan. Bryan's populism picked up the beat of that sixteen-year-old Springfield boy and prompted him to organize a march in Bryan's honor. This was for the Campaign of 1896. Throughout Lindsay's life, he thought of Bryan as a strong advocate in behalf of individual people. When the Scopes Trial came later in 1925, Lindsay was busy with other things. It was the year of his marriage, and he was on one of his major lecture tours. He made no mention of Mr. Bryan's involvement. Lindsay not only believed in people, but he also had an open mind for scientific discovery. His idealized image of Bryan stayed with him. He closed his poem in honor of that famed orator of the common man . . .

“. . .Where is that boy, that Heaven-born Bryan,
That Homer Bryan, who sang from the West?
Gone to join the shadows with Altgeld the Eagle,
Where the kings and the slaves and the troubadours rest.”¹⁷

THE JOHNNY APPLESEED OF BEAUTY

Lindsay found a copy of *Harper's Monthly Magazine* for November, 1871, which gave the career of John Chapman, who had the nickname "Johnny Appleseed". Chapman was born in 1775 and died in 1847. He wandered westward over the Appalachians, driving always toward the setting sun, planting apple seed everywhere with the hope that future generations would taste the fruit of his labors. He asked nothing but the joy of causing apples to spring up, bringing happiness to posterity. This story caught the vibrant imagination of the poet. He wrote a long poem titled, "In Praise of Johnny Appleseed", whose westward expedition started in Virginia and ended in Indiana. The poem concludes . . .

“. . .Hear the lazy weeds murmuring, bays and rivers whispering,
from Michigan to Texas, California to Maine;
Listen to the eagles screaming, calling
'Johnny Appleseed, Johnny Appleseed,'
There by the doors of old Fort Wayne.

In the four-poster bed Johnny Appleseed built,
Autumn rains were the curtains, autumn leaves were the quilt.
He laid him down sweetly, and slept through the night,
Like a stone washed white,
There by the doors of old Fort Wayne."¹⁸

Lindsay's inner vision of himself was a modern Johnny Appleseed causing beauty to spring up everywhere in America. This was the motive for his wandering as he traded poems for bread. He actually picked up the rhythm of the universe and shared it through the song of the Rachel-Jane in "The Santa Fe Trail". He had more than the rhythm of an old hymn in the poem, "General William Booth Enters Into Heaven". It was the pulsating, throbbing life of human-kind. His verses live, because they reflect universal rhythm. He sang, he painted, he wrote poetry, he danced to the drum beat of young America.

Practical people might well think of Johnny Appleseed and Vachel Lindsay as shiftless — thriftless would be a better word for them. They had far dreams and wide horizons which prompted them to neglect such mundane things as earning, thrift and self-support. Their aspirations did not fit the common mold. Lindsay scorned commercial America. He wrote one day, "waste not your precious youth in industry. . . All you who raise grain are petty imitation wheat kings. Your little souls are full of the venom of covetousness. You are subscribers to the business axioms that make this a land of death. If any man has a dollar in his pocket let him throw it away, lest it transform him into spiritual garbage"¹⁹.

He so disliked the commercial aspects of life that he felt a deep resentment against industry. It was in this mood that he wrote "Factory Windows Are Always Broken".

" . . . Factory windows are always broken.
Other windows are let alone.
No one throws through the chapel-window
The bitter, snarling, derisive stone."²⁰

THE APOSTOLIC DISCIPLE

The religion of Vachel Lindsay has a touch of the universal. I only wish his dreams could have been reviewed by his famous contemporary, Carl Jung. Lindsay lived with lovely phantoms. He made a great thing of Egyptian hieroglyphics. His "Map of the Universe" included boats in the sky, wheeling planets and rolling clouds encased in hieroglyphics — all vibrant with musical rhyme. There is unhappiness in the drawing, but a sensible religious insight, which is a bit unusual for Lindsay. Jung would have found great significance in Lindsay's archetypes of the collective unconscious.

Vachel Lindsay described his life as “a moving picture turned too fast”. This describes, indeed, his greatest problem. His imagination flew up to the moon and the stars. He ran as fast as he could toward the sun. His feet, however, were limited in speed, and the railroad trains he rode seemed to have square wheels — at least this is the way he described it. He was always plagued with money problems, and he always suffered from inner turmoil. He had a touch of epilepsy. No wonder he thought of himself as “The Broncho That Would Not Be Broken”.

Lindsay’s commitment to the Gospel of Beauty was an integral part of his religious faith which came to him from his parents and his grandparents. His grandfather Frazee, studied at Bethany College in West Virginia with Alexander Campbell, the founder. Lindsay called himself a Campbellite and learned much from the Christian Church ministers he knew, among whom were some of the greatest men of his time — such as Edward Scribner Ames, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago; Edgar DeWitt Jones, world-famous preacher and Lincoln scholar who was pastor of Central Woodward Christian Church in Detroit; Frederick W. Burnham, pastor of his own Christian Church in Springfield, Illinois; and Charles Clayton Morrison, pastor of his church for a short while, and later to become Editor of the *Christian Century*. Lindsay described these and the earlier followers of Campbell and his Restoration Movement — such as Walter Scott, J. W. McGarvey, Tolbert Fanning and Barton Stone — as preachers who “breathed fire, but thought in granite”.

The ministers of Lindsay’s home church are a fascinating lot. They include E. V. Zollars, who became President of Hiram College; J. B. Briney, who was a renowned pioneer of the Restoration Movement; W. F. Rothenberger, whose gentleness became a legend in the Disciple communion; and Clarke Cummings, who was pastor at the time of Lindsay’s death.

Masters was dead wrong in his assessment of Campbell. How a great lawyer-poet could set forth such unfortunate misinformation is a mystery. He said of Campbell as he denegated the clergy who proclaimed the Restoration message, “We are made by these reverences to forget that Campbell opposed the emancipation of the Negro, and that he predicted the Second Advent in 1866”.²¹ Masters may have confused Campbell with Lindsay’s other religious hero, Emanuel Swedenborg.

Both Alexander Campbell and his father, Thomas, were strong in the cause of emancipation. Alexander could not free the two slaves that were given to him, because of the climate of opinion that would have sent them back to their former owners had they been set free. He made provision for them at the time of the emancipation. The idea that Campbell expected the Second Advent in 1866 is ridiculous. This was the year of Campbell’s own death. When he talked of a millennium, he referred to a “secular millennium”.

One pleasant evening when I was guest of Olive Wakefield, the talented sister of Vachel Lindsay, she told me of how Vachel had written his long poem, "Alexander Campbell", especially for his brother-in-law, Paul Wakefield, a missionary to China who had edged away from the Campbellite faith. Vachel, therefore, wrote into the poem "A Rhymed Address To All Renegade Campbellites, Exhorting Them To Return".

“. . . I come to you from Campbell,
Turn again, prodigal
Haunted by his name!
Artist, singer, builder,
The forest's son or daughter!
You, the blasphemer
Will yet know repentance,
And Campbell old and gray
Will lead you to the dream-side
Of a pennyroyal river.
While your proud heart is shaken
Your confession will be taken
And your sins baptized away".²²

The West Going Heart by Eleanor Ruggles is a first-rate biography. This thorough and perceptive scholar was first to find and call attention to Lindsay's problem with epilepsy. Her insight to the tender relationships of Lindsay with his sister, Olive, and with his contemporary poet, Sara Teasdale, are both beautiful and sensitive. She caught the deep meaning of his love for Sara Teasdale and the subtle and lingering influence of her love for him. But Ruggles, like Masters, did not understand Lindsay's religion. She referred to the long poem, "Alexander Campbell," as "sectarian". She missed the subtle humor of the poet as he twitted his brother-in-law for becoming too revolutionary.

In the essay by Van Meter Ames, "My Heart is a Kicking Horse," which I mentioned earlier, there is an accurate portrayal of Lindsay's religious background. Ames had the advantage of personal acquaintance with Lindsay. It was Dr. Edward Scribner Ames, father of Van Meter, who introduced young Lindsay to the University of Chicago where the senior Ames was Professor of Philosophy, and at the same time, pastor of the Disciples Church on the edge of the campus. Van Meter recalled Lindsay's visit to the Ames household and his fidelity to the Hyde Park Church where the senior Ames was pastor. Dr. Van Meter Ames points out that Lindsay's religious faith derived its reasonable philosophical grounding from John Locke, and that the principal mission of this faith was to promote the reunion of Christendom.

In preparing this essay, I have been greatly helped by my colleague, Dr. Willis Jones. He was but a lad when Vachel Lindsay came to visit the home of Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones. The father had told Willis and the

other children to be prepared for someone different. When Lindsay came walking up with his head bobbing from one side to the other, using the butt of a buggy whip for a walking stick with rawhide thongs trailing out from it, Willis and the other children knew that this genius was truly something different!

Lindsay's religion was inclusive — its boundaries were man wide and God high. He always identified with the poor and the weak. He honored the Salvation Army throughout his lifetime. His great poem, "General William Booth Enters Into Heaven", was the source of his fame and the introduction to the world as a distinguished poet. Lindsay's very soul reached out to the disinherited, the poor and the forgotten with the same yearning heart as had the great General William Booth. There is poetry to touch the heart and fill the eyes with tears in that concluding lovely tribute.

“. . .And when Booth halted by the curb for prayer
He saw his Master thro' the flag-filled air.
Christ came gently with a robe and crown
For Booth the soldier, while the throng knelt down.
He saw King Jesus. They were face to face,
And he knelt a-weeping in that holy place.
Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?"²³

As I have said, Lindsay lived by heroes. He could not forget the towering figures of the world and the celebrated leaders of religion. Swedenborg exercised a considerable influence. Lindsay wrote to the renowned William James, who had a like Swedenborgian background. The letter came, however, when the great pragmatic philosopher was old and ill. This was in the last year of his life. He answered Lindsay by saying that he was not able to "shoot the rapids, and ride the whirlwind and tramp the wilderness with you . . . Go in peace and God be with you, brilliant being that you are, and leave me to my decrepitude."²⁴

Throughout the short life of Vachel Lindsay, the prophet hero who most "helped him to be brave" was Alexander Campbell, the little known and widely misunderstood hero of his parents and grandparents. The poet had a perceptive understanding of that remarkable preacher, educator, debater and celebrity pioneer who became the principal founder of the new religious movement that included Lindsay's Christian Church in Springfield. Both Masters who saw Campbell as one who "interpreted nature through the mysticism and asceticism of Buddha", and Ruggles who misread the poem, "Alexander Campbell" as sectarian, failed to grasp the reasonable and practical message of Lindsay's hero. Read what the poet said:

“ . . . He preached with faultless logic
An American Millennium:
The social order
Of a realist and farmer
With every neighbor
Within stone wall and border.
And the tongues of flame came down
Almost in spite of him.
And now all but that Pentecost is dim.”²⁵

For Campbell The Millennium was secular and somewhat utopian, for he acknowledged the work of God in everything - not just in religion. There were no eschatological trumpets of doom in the millennium of Campbell, but only education, morality, vision and hard work. Here again he was giving wings to the American Dream!

The genius of Lindsay for selecting the best possible advisors and intellectual companions led him to such Campbellite notables as I have mentioned before — Ames, Morrison, Jones and Burnham. These men were all my friends and teachers. Even though I was still an undergraduate, I joined with Jones in his effort to place Vachel Lindsay on the program of the World Convention of Christian Churches which met at Washington, D.C., in 1930. The bureaucratic answer was, “The world platform of the Church is no place for entertainers”.

E.S. Ames, my major professor and Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Chicago, spoke often of Lindsay — and always with admiration and respect. When we talked about Lindsay, he would shake his head and say, “Here was a genius who could not quite find himself”. It was this wise professor who arranged for the Poet to lecture at Mandel Hall. Note Lindsay’s own report of the occasion:

“The substance of the Mandel Hall event was this: I chanted the poems, by the side of the stage, and Miss Dougherty occupied the entire stage for the evening, dancing to the syllables of the verses. She used her own interpretations of “The King of Yellow Butterflies”, “The Potatoes’ Dance”, “Aladdin and the Jinn”, “The Rose and the Lotus”, “King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba”, and others. The stage directions of King Solomon are hers. Miss Lovett and her group, having witnessed Miss Dougherty’s dancing in public and in private many times, evolved the present University of Chicago production of “The Chinese Nightingale”.”²⁶

Mrs. William Vaughn Moody, Carl Sandburg and Harriett Monroe joined with other Chicago poets in sponsoring this presentation. Ruth Lovett of the English Department and Eleanor Dougherty, a famous dancer and sister of Walter Hampden, were the principals who responded to the Ames request. The event was a memorable success.

Burnham was minister at The First Christian Church in Springfield where Lindsay was a member. The late Mary Bowden, piano teacher and one time pianist for the famed evangelist, Billy Sunday, was a member of that Church. She described a typical Sunday Service in the Church with Burnham in the pulpit and Lindsay in the pew. The poet would sit through the sermon with his head thrown back and his eyes fastened on the ceiling. When the service concluded and the last ewe of the flock had said good-bye, Lindsay would go up to the pastor and say, "Fred, let's go down to the Mission and save a soul!"

The last public lecture for Vachel Lindsay was delivered to a crowded audience in his own Church. He received a standing ovation. Townspeople from many backgrounds gathered to hear their own famous son. His performance was inspired and dramatic. When the applause had died and the crowd had departed he said, "I feel that at last I have won Springfield!"

THE BRONCHO THAT WOULD NOT BE BROKEN

One hundred six years ago, here in this Prairie State, "The Broncho That Would Not Be Broken" was born. He lived his life among the rolling clouds of an irrepressible imagination, whether he was tramping the dusty roads, riding the bumpy trains, lionized in the courts of Europe or sitting along trying to make some sense of his visions. He loved every human being. His boyish heart could not relinquish the fun and games of childhood.

HIRAM COLLEGE

October 10, 1930, was a day of triumph for Vachel Lindsay. He received the honorary degree, Doctor of Literature, from Hiram College. In 1897, he had entered Hiram to study medicine. He had great fun and made quite a strong impression, but he left before his graduation. He did not so much flunk out as fade out in order that he might study art at Chicago. All through his life he felt deep affection for that College of Arts and Sciences located in the village of Hiram in Northern Ohio. Mark Van Doren mistakenly referred to it as located in Hiram, Illinois. Lindsay's life had concluded before *Masterpieces of American Poets* appeared in print.²⁷

Ohio would smile at the Van Doren error, but Lindsay would have strongly objected. His love for his Alma Mater was touched with guilt for having left without completing his work. The kudo at the end of his life meant as much to him as a voted "Triumph" meant to a conquering

Roman general. Few colleges could claim the lovely poetic tribute which Lindsay gave to his Alma Mater in "Hiram's Classic Hill".

"Now on this hill apart, we watch
The future through the stars astream;
Far from the towns we therefore see,
In special forms Ezekiel's dream,

We see the colors of his mind
In maple sugar groves turned red;
In autumn winds through chestnut boughs
Hear special words the prophet said.

And when high thoughts have caught the hill
The student orators, made great
By youth's applause, and Heaven's applause,
Unlock the far millennial gate."²⁸

He was moonstruck with love for his land, his faith and his visions. His patriotism began at home in Springfield, but it extended to every land and nation. He wanted to "Sew the Flags Together". His faith began with his Campbellite Church, but it included Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles, Buddhists and Mohammedans, with Pagans and Atheists thrown in for good measure. He picked up the rhythm of the universe and gave it articulation. Nobody who has heard the beat can travel the West without hearing the sweet song of the Rachel Jane. The nightingale lends mystic enchantment to the moon over Asia. The Congo still rolls in Africa, and the moonbeams still fall on myriad kitchen floors. The march of his "heroes" brings us to attention and applause as persons of mighty deeds prance by. We see again "The Map of the Universe", with its many boats for conscripts of his visions of glorious leaders.

Long ago in Springfield, Illinois, a lad walked out into the night
Under the stars he was gathering moonbeams
A smarting west wind moaned, "go home"
With boundless enthusiasm he caught more than his arms could hold
He spilled moonbeams here and there along the muddy street
From an upstairs window his mother saw him approach the house
She called out, "Vachel, what on earth have you now?"
"Moonbeams, Mother". "Put them down on the canvas"
"The canvass will not hold them"
"Leave them outside for now"
The west wind caught them and sent them flying
Over the wheat and over the corn to the jet stream
They were scattered everywhere around the earth
Many years later an old professor found some traces in a library

He wrapped them in paper and carried them back to Springfield
Those who love moonbeams gathered to remember
They asked, "What have you there in your briefcase?"
"Fragments of half forgotten moonbeams"
"How would you describe them?"
They appear to be some chips from mystic golden apples!

Dr. Perry E. Gresham
President Emeritus & Distinguished Professor
Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia

THE BRONCHO THAT WOULD NOT BE BROKEN

Footnotes

1. Vachel Lindsay, "Dr. Mohawk," *Collected Poems* (Rev. ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1925), p. 436.
2. "The Hearth Eternal," *Ibid.*, p. 346.
3. "Dr. Mohawk," *Ibid.*, p. 441.
4. "Adventures While Singing These Songs, an Autobiographical Foreword," *Ibid.*, p. 19.
5. "The Broncho That Would Not Be Broken," *Ibid.*, p.77-78.
6. "The Lame Boy and the Fairy," *Ibid.*, p. 139.
7. Van Wyck Brooks, "Characters, Poe," *A Chilmark Miscellany* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1948), p. 202.
8. Vachel Lindsay, "The Chinese Nightingale," *Op. cit.*, p. 29.
9. *Ibid.*, p.33-34.
10. Robert E. Spillers, "An Essay in Historical Criticism," *The Cycle of American Literature* (New York: New American Library, 1957), p. 179.
11. Eleanor Ruggles, "General Booth Leads Boldly," *The West-Going Heart; a Life of Vachel Lindsay* (First ed.; New York: W. W. Norton, 1959), p. 275.
12. Vachel Lindsay. "The Eagle That Is Forgotten," *Op. cit.*, p. 96.
13. Van Meter Ames, "Vachel Lindsay, or, My Heart is a Kicking Horse," *Midway Magazine*, (Spring, 1968) 63-79
14. Vachel Lindsay, "Abraham Lincoln Walks at Midnight," *Op. cit.*, p. 53.
15. "A Gospel of Beauty," *Ibid.*, p. 74-75.
16. "The Springfield of the Far Future," *Ibid.*, p. 347-348.
17. "Bryan, Bryan, Bryan, Bryan," *Ibid.*, p. 105.
18. "In Praise of Johnny Appleseed," *Ibid.*, p. 90.
19. Edgar Lee Masters, *Vachel Lindsay, a Poet in America* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 205.
20. Vachel Lindsay, "Factory Windows are Always Broken," *Op. cit.*, p. 266.
21. Edgar Lee Masters, *Op. cit.*, p. 277.
22. Vachel Lindsay, "Alexander Campbell, a Rhymed Address to All Renegade Campbellites, Exhorting Them to Return," *Op. cit.*, p. 357-358.
23. "General William Booth Enters Into Heaven," *Ibid.*, p. 125.
24. Eleanor Ruggles, "A Rushing of Wings," *Op. cit.*, p. 161.
25. Vachel Lindsay, "Alexander Campbell. . .," *Op. cit.*, p. 357.
26. "Adventures While Singing These Songs," *Ibid.*, p. 4-5.
27. Mark Van Doren, "Lindsay, Vachel," *Masterpieces of American Poets*, (Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Co., 1932), p. 657.
28. Given to me by Willis Jones and taken from a Christmas message sent to friends by Elizabeth Lindsay.

