

Foundation Facts
and
Primary Principles

BEING THE RESTORATION STORY
RELATED
AND
RE - EXAMINED

In A Manner Suited For A Textbook

BY

G. C. BREWER

Copyright, 1949
OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
6646 Rockhill Road
Kansas City 4, Missouri

DEDICATED

To:

B S H E R R O D

An elder in the Broadway Church at Lubbock, Texas; Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Abilene Christian College; my faithful friend and brother who gave me the typewriter upon which this entire manuscript was written; and because he has befriended me in ways too numerous to mention and too precious to discuss; because, on account of his position, he can have great influence in keeping the churches, the schools and the preachers loyal to the restoration ideal, and walking in the Old Paths, this book is affectionately

Dedicated by the Author,

G. C. Brewer.

INTRODUCTION

"Of the making of books there is no end." And let us hope that there never will be. The Wise Man who uttered that saying did not do so for the purpose of discouraging those who would make books or those who read books; he simply indicated that there is a quick and easy way of reaching the conclusion that embraces all that could be said in all the books. All the books that could be written would be written in vain if they did not reach the same conclusion and enforce the same principle that the Wise Man announced. But, as people are continually reading books, the more books we have to enforce, illustrate and impress that conclusion, the better it will be for the human race. The pen is mightier than the sword; and, as we hope to render the sword completely obsolete and useless, we should continue to use the pen. The influence of books in the lives of men cannot be estimated, but we know that it is great; therefore, we continue to make books and to distribute them among the generation now living, with the conviction, also, that they will fall into the hands of generations yet unborn. Seeds that were sown a hundred years ago are bearing fruit now, and there is no reason to doubt that seeds now being sown will bear fruit in the lives of people who live a century farther down in time.

Books are strange things. Although untongued and dumb,
Yet with their eloquence they sway the world:

And, powerless and impassive as they seem,
Move o'er the impressive minds and hearts of men

Like fire across a prairie. Mind sparks,
They star the else dark firmament.

The contents of the present book will make known its purpose better than we could announce the purpose in the introduction. It seems more important to state a few negative thoughts in reference to the book than it is to try to explain the

underlying reason for its production. These negatives are as follows:

1. This book is not intended as a history of the Restoration Movement. That history has been written by different authors and their books are still extant. This history has been well written and has been read and studied by millions of people. It would be hard to see how any author could improve upon this phase of the work, and certainly the author of this present volume has not undertaken to do so. The dates and facts of history that are given in this book are merely incidental to the principles that are under discussion.

2. This book was not written for scholars, but for any ordinary student of these principles and the history that is connected with the fight that has been made and the sacrifices that have been suffered for the purpose of disseminating the truth upon the issues involved. While the book has been arranged for use in class study, the classes that were contemplated were not those of college students working for credit. The classes that were had in view included those college students who, in their preparation for serving the Lord primarily and for obtaining a college credit secondarily, may find this book of service. But classes in the various congregations composed of people who have never reached even high school grade were also had in mind. It is the desire of the author that the book will be read and studied by members of the Lord's body who have no education, in the common acceptation of that term, and who never hope or expect to complete an academic course. The book has not, therefore, used technical language and has not been organized in the order of a regular college textbook. This would have been difficult, anyway, since a large portion of the book consists in sermons or lectures that were delivered long ago and have already been in print, some of them for more than a half century. In giving references, the author has not used the abbreviated forms such as *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, and *in loc. ext.*, and other such marginal notes. The average reader pays little attention to these things, and

some of them, perhaps, would not even know their meaning. When reference, therefore, has been made to other books, the name of the book has been given in full, and the name of the author and the page upon which the quotation is found, when a quotation is used.

3. This book is not intended as the author's own interpretation of the purpose and principles of the Restoration Movement. He has, therefore, availed himself of the lectures of Tyler, Sweeney and Allen for the purpose of allowing these men to set forth these principles and objects in their own forceful and impressive manner. These sermons were preached originally for the purpose of informing people and of impressing them with the high aim of the men who began directing the attention of the world back to the New Testament and to the order of work and worship set forth in the New Testament. If the people of that day needed to be reminded and informed, certainly the people of this day are in greater need of this information. If men were convinced by the sermons preached by Tyler, Sweeney and Allen—and certainly many of them were, and many more of them were confirmed in their position and purpose—why should we not believe that people of today will be convinced by these same sermons? The sermons quoted from the three men were among the first things that this author himself ever read on the Restoration Movement. They confirmed and impressed and enlightened him to such a degree that he has now, for a third of a century or more, been doing all in his power to get others to read these same sermons. He has directed the attention of many preachers, and a greater number of persons who are not preachers, to these sermons. Because of his personal appreciation for these, and because of the influence they have had upon his own life, he has included them in this book in the hope that they will go on doing good in the lives of men after this author has gone to join the authors of these sermons.

It will, perhaps, not be out of place to tell in the introduction what may be found in the body of the book concerning these

sermons that are quoted. If there is a repetition, it will be for the purpose of making a clear and fair statement so that it cannot be misunderstood. There is a repetition in the book, of course, since the lectures by different men were upon the same subject.

Sweeney's sermon was published in the book called "Sweeney's Sermons." The Gospel Advocate Company brought out this book in 1892. The book was widely distributed and it may still be obtained from that office.

Allen's sermon was published in a book entitled "The Old-Path Pulpit." It was originally published for the author by the Guide Printing and Publishing Company, Covington, Kentucky, in the Year 1885. It has recently been republished by the Gospel Advocate Company, and it may be obtained from that office.

Tyler's address is found in a book entitled "Kinship to Christ and Other Sermons." It was published by John Burns, Publisher, St. Louis, in the Year 1883. Tyler belonged to the group that is known as Disciples of Christ, but they had not departed in his day to the extent that they have since gone. He and his brother, B. B. Tyler, were prominent men in the Restoration Movement and their father before them had preached the gospel for fifty years. He became identified with the movement in its earliest years and had learned much concerning the New Testament before he knew of the Campbells and of the effort that they were making to lead men in the old paths. However "digressive" Tyler may have been, his sermons in the book from which we have quoted are sound and Scriptural. His statement of principles as given in this book is certainly worth our study.

That which the author has quoted from his own writings of a former day has been published before. As will be stated in the book, there is one lecture that was published in a book called "Murfreesboro Addresses," published by F. L. Rowe in 1917. The other two may be found in "Abilene Christian College Lec-

tures of 1934." This book was published by the Firm Foundation Company, Austin, Texas.

This completes the explanation that seems to be due to the readers, and there is little else that needs to be said by way of introduction to the contents of this book. Credit should be given to many people for help and encouragement in the production of the book. Miss Margaret Tucker, a member of the Jackson Avenue Church, Memphis, Tennessee, has done the greater part of the labor that the preparation of this book entailed. She typed the lectures out of the books in which they were originally published. She took by dictation other chapters in the book, including the discussions between the two imaginary men whose names will become familiar to the readers.

These discussions are intended to emphasize and elaborate the points that may arise in the classes which study the other chapters of the book. The intention was not to give an exhaustive treatment of anything that was discussed between these two hypothetical characters. In some instances, the purpose was to give references to works that treat the subject in an adequate manner.

With these words to the reader, we give the book to the public with the earnest prayer that it will be used of God for the honor of his name, as a blessing to his people, and as a means of teaching truth wherever it may go.

G. C. Brewer,
Memphis, Tennessee
July 6, 1949.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I _____ 15

NAMES AND CLAIMS, *by G. C. Brewer*
Points and Principles
Men and Movements

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER II _____ 43

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER III. _____ 55

ARE WE A DENOMINATION? *by G. C. Brewer*
What is a Denomination?
Who Are We?

Why Are We Not A Denomination?

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER IV. _____ 70

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER V. _____ 87

THE CHURCH AND SECTARIANISM *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER VII _____ 121

MODERN SCHISM IN THE CHURCH *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER VIII _____ 144

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER IX. _____ 155

THE PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTS OF THE CURRENT
CURRENT REFORMATION *by F. G. Allen*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER XI _____ 183

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER XI _____ 196

OUR AIM *by John S. Sweeney*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER XII _____ 219

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER XIII _____ 229

THE DISTINCTIVE PECULIARITIES OF THE DISCIPLES
By J. Z. Tyler

Questions For The Classroom

CHAPTER IX _____ 259

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS
AND DANIEL DIDACTICUS *by G. C. Brewer*

Questions For The Classroom

Names and Claims

From the rise of the papacy, which reached its climax with the crowning of Boniface III as the first Pope of Rome in A. D. 606, to the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, believers in Christ—those who professed to follow Him and to represent His cause in the earth—were held captives to human authority, and were, therefore practicing many things which our Lord never ordained: some of which were wholly inimical to His teaching. It was the fact that certain things which were at once unscriptural and unjust, were being imposed upon the people that caused the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century to protest. But when the righteousness or the justice of any doctrine or practice was questioned naturally the issue would quickly shift to the *point of authority*. If those who authorized the matter in question were infallible, then the controversy was at an end. Infallibility must not—nay, it cannot, be questioned. By the monstrous assumption of authority on the part of fallible, sinful men the followers of Christ were for more than a thousand years robbed of their freedom, They were also deprived of their right to read the Word of God. If any individual did read the Bible he could not for one moment entertain the thought that his "Infallible" teachers and rulers were to be measured by this standard. On the contrary he proceeded upon the assumption that the Bible derived its authority from these men, and that it had to be interpreted to the people by them.

It was the desire to free men from the domination of human authority in religion that caused the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century to take place.

But after the Reformers had thrown off the yoke of the Roman Church and had repudiated many of the corrupt doc-

FOUNDATION FACTS AND

trines of that church these free people formed themselves into various denominations; each denomination having some form of human head and some place on earth as headquarters. Thus the people were again governed by human authority and any man seeking membership in a denomination would be required in the initiatory process, to vow allegiance to the governing authority of the denomination. Only thus would he be received. For even a preacher, an ordained official in the denomination, to question the rules or the "usage" of the denomination was a serious offense.

It was for that "offense" exactly that Thomas Campbell was reprimanded by his Superiors (?) in the Seceder branch of the Presbyterian Church. (The details of this are given in another chapter of this book.) This unpleasant affair caused Campbell to disconnect himself not from the Presbyterian Church—the Presbytery; but the machinery of the organization. He continued to preach as an independent worker; as a free servant of the Lord.

The narrow, sectarian views that then prevailed and the arbitrary authority exercised by denominational officials caused men in different parts of the world to deplore denominationalism and to begin to seek freedom for the people of God. Some sincere souls saw the evil of division and they began working and praying for unity and fellowship among the followers of Christ. They saw that human names and sectarian doctrines—party preachments, were keeping people divided and arrayed against each other in warring groups.

Among the men who saw the evil of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" and who led in a move to find a closer conformity to the New Testament teaching, we may mention the following:

1. Greeville Ewing and Robert and James A. Haldane in Scotland. These men were preachers in the Scotch Presbyterian Church, but they began studying their doctrines in the light of

New Testament teaching and changed their practice on many points. Mr. Ewing saw that the practice of attending the Lord's Supper but twice a year was not in harmony with Apostolic precedent and began to celebrate the communion each Lord's day in the church that he was serving in Glasgow; that example was followed by many other churches, and this item of New Testament practice was restored. Following close upon this change Mr. Ewing, the Haldanes and others, became convinced that infant baptism was unscriptural, and that nothing but immersion met the conditions of baptism as set forth in the teaching and examples found in the sacred records. Seeing this, they ceased to practice infant baptism and affusion, and were themselves immersed. Thus apostolic practice was restored in these important respects, and acts of obedience to the Lord were witnessed by many people then living who had never before seen it in this manner.

About this time the question of "Church Order" came up for investigation, and a number of leading reformers engaged in the discussion of the subject by tongue and pen. Perhaps the most influential paper produced in this discussion was a document entitled "A Treatise On The Elder's Office," by William Ballantine. This writer contended vigorously for a plurality of elders in every congregation. The Haldanes accepted this view of the question and acted as co-elders in the church in Edinburgh.

2. In America also men were beginning to exercise the freedom that had come to the world under Protestantism and were examining their religious practices in the light of God's Word. In 1792 James O'Kelly, a Methodist preacher in Virginia, protested against the human authority which governed the Methodist Church and organized his followers into "Republican Methodists"; later they repudiated that name and discarded all laws and rules they had formerly made and proposed to accept only the Word of God as authority and they desired to be known as "The Christian Church." This declaration and

decision was reached in the year 1801, and the birthplace of this movement is given as Mannakin Town, North Carolina. This group became a distinct denomination and continued to exist as such for more than a hundred years. They finally united with the Baptists.

3. Some of the historians tell of a movement among the Baptists that was designed to lead the people back to the Bible; to renounce all human authority in religion; to discard all uninspired creeds and all party names and to be simply Christians. Elias Smith was an ordained Baptist preacher in New England; he first gave up Calvinism and began to find the truth on matters of sin and redemption. He was joined in his efforts by another Baptist preacher whose name was Abner Jones. Smith and Jones together organized a "Christian Church" at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and withdrew from the fellowship of the Baptists. This was around the turn of the century and although these movements had no connection with each other and these reformers were at first unknown to each other, Elias Smith and Abner Jones, Baptists, James O'Kelly, Methodist, Barton W. Stone, Presbyterian, and Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Seceders, were all moving in the same direction at about the same time: they were all prompted by the same motive, viz.—to renounce denominationalism and to be simply Christians, disciples of Christ.

4. Barton Warren Stone was born at Port-Tobacco, Maryland, Dec. 24, 1772. He was ordained to preach in the Presbyterian Church. In 1798 he received a call from the united churches at Cane Ridge and Concord, Ky., and entered upon his work of preaching in solemn earnestness. Stone became dissatisfied with Calvinism and was convinced from the reading of the Word that God loves all men and has provided salvation for all, and the responsibility of accepting this salvation is upon men. This, of course, put him at variance with the Presbyterians. In September, 1803, he and four friends withdrew from the Presbyterian synod, not from the Presbyterian

Church, and formed what they called the "Springfield Presbytery." In less than one year, however, these men became convinced that this "Presbytery" had no more right to exist than did other religious governing bodies and they promptly dissolved this body on June 28, 1804. This formal dissolution was effected by a document which they titled "The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery." This document is something of a curiosity and it should be read by all serious students of reformatory movements. It can be found in many books.

Stone and his fellow reformers called themselves "Christians" and refused to wear any party name or to recognize any human creed. This reformation was taking place in Kentucky before Thomas Campbell had ever set foot upon the continent of North America.

In 1832 the Christians of Kentucky led by Stone and the Christians of Virginia led by Campbell became acquainted with each other and, seeing that they were wearing the same name, recognizing the same authority and, therefore, practicing the same things in all the essentials of the Christian faith began fellowshiping each other and cooperating in the work of the Lord. There was no formal uniting of two bodies, for neither group was an *organized body*, and there could not be, therefore, the merging of the two organizations into one bigger organization.

5. Thomas and Alexander Campbell and Their Efforts.

Thomas Campbell was born in County Down, Ireland, Feb. 1, 1763. His father was a member of the Church of England, but Thomas united with the Seceder, Presbyterians, preferring the simpler worship which they offered to the more formal and stilted style of the Anglican Church. He was educated for the ministry and became an ordained preacher in the Presbyterian Church. He was serving as the pastor of a Seceder Church at Ahorey, County Antrim, near Shane's Castle, at a

place called Rich-Hill when his son Alexander was born September 12, 1788.

Thomas Campbell came to America in May, 1807. His son Alexander, with the other members of the family, arrived in America September 29, 1809.

Thomas Campbell was living in Washington, Penn., and the family had to travel by land in a wagon from New York to Washington. The father, however, met them en route and the united family made a large portion of the trip together.

Thomas Campbell, because of the narrow and arbitrary action of the Presbytery and Synod—which incident is related more in detail in another chapter of this book, had disconnected himself from the machinery of his denomination—not from the church itself—and was acting as independent preacher for his community when his family arrived. These neighbors belonged to various denominations but many of them were deprived of the privilege of worship because there was no congregation or organized group of their faith accessible to them. Under the leadership of Thomas Campbell these neighbors, without at first severing their connections with their respective churches, formed a community church or banded themselves together for edification and worship. They called themselves the "Christian Association of Washington." Naturally they had to have some rules of procedure since they could not adopt the "usages" of all the denominations represented in the group. Which one should they select as their pattern and whose practices should they follow? One can see at once that they would never have agreed to *one denomination* in preference to all the others represented. *Hence they agreed to follow no denomination at all.* This "Christian Association of Washington" was formally inaugurated on Aug. 17, 1809. On that day the group appointed twenty-one men of their number to confer together, and with the assistance of Thomas Campbell, to determine upon the proper means to carry into effect the important ends of the Association. In answer to this demand Mr. Campbell wrote

what has now become famous as "A Declaration and Address." This was designed to set forth to the public in a clear and definite manner the objects of the movement in which he and those associated with him were engaged. The whole document only clarified, amplified and emphasized their purpose to eschew all parties, disregard all human creeds and to be governed only by God's Word. This was beautifully expressed in the motto which has become familiar to millions of people: "*Where the Bible Speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent.*" The document was heartily approved by the whole committee and they called a special meeting of the members of the Association and read it to them for their approval and adoption. The group unanimously approved the "*Declaration and Address*" and ordered it to be printed, September 7, 1809.

This was just about two weeks before Alexander Campbell arrived in America. He approved his father's stand and joined with the group in applying and carrying out these principles.

One of the first items of religious practice that was subjected to the test of the rule which they had adopted was infant baptism. Both the Campbells held to this doctrine. It came into question from the first day, but a decision upon the point was made necessary by the fact that Alexander Campbell, having married Margaret Brown March 12, 1811, had now an infant of his own. When no authority from the Scriptures could be found for infant baptism Alexander saw that neither he nor his father had been baptized: they had both been sprinkled in infancy. The discussions now included also the question of the proper or Scriptural *form, mode* or *action* of baptism.

Because of the application of the rule—"Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent" there had been some defections from the "Christian Association." Some members did not have the strength of faith and the courage to give up their inherited practices. They had all learned that the course they had proposed to follow not only required

sacrifices; it brought bitter persecution. Thomas Campbell had now left the town of Washington and was living on a farm, from which, with the assistance of his neighbors, he gained a living for his family. Because of the depletion in their number and because he felt that the Association was neither a *denomination* nor a *congregation* Thomas Campbell decided that it had no Scriptural status; hence he set about to organize a congregation or church. He wanted to set in order a church just as Paul established churches at various points—Phillippi, Thessalonica, Corinth, etc. Since, however, Mr. Campbell at this time knew only the baptism which the Presbyterians preach, the work of Apollos would hold an analogy to his efforts. The church was organized and given the name of the Brush Run Church. (The word "run" as they use it in that section means creek or branch, hence, as the people of another section would say, this was the Brush Creek Church.) The church consisted of only thirty members, but they made Thomas Campbell an elder and ordained Alexander Campbell to preach. (Alexander never, however, in all his long and arduous life accepted money for his preaching. He was a prosperous planter and sheep raiser and became a wealthy man. He owned slaves at one time but he voluntarily freed his slaves before the question became a *causus belli*.) The Brush Run Church built a new meeting-house and began celebrating the Lord's Supper every Lord's day. Some of the members would not partake, however, because they had not been baptized: they were demanding immersion and Thomas Campbell acceded to their request and baptized three persons in Buffalo Creek which ran through David Bryant's pasture. The place of baptizing was near Bryants' house. This was done when Alexander Campbell was away on a preaching tour. Neither of the Campbells had yet been immersed.

When Alexander reached the conviction that he had not been baptized he set about to find some one who would baptize him upon a simple confession of his faith, without requiring an "experience" or the vote of a church. He wanted to follow New

Testament example simply and accurately. He found a Baptist preacher by the name of Matthias Luce who consented to accommodate him, although this was contrary to Baptist usage. (They baptize by the authority of a Baptist church and this authority must be given by a vote of the church for each individual baptized.) Accordingly, on Wednesday June 12, 1812, Matthias Luce, accompanied by another Baptist preacher by the name of Henry Spears, came by the home of Thomas Campbell on his way to the appointed place for the baptizing, supposing that he was to baptize only Alexander Campbell and, perhaps, his wife, Margaret. But Thomas Campbell indicated that he and his wife were also ready to submit to the Word of God and be buried with the Lord in baptism (Rom. 6:1-6; Col. 2:11-12; Acts 8:26-39). When they reached the place in David Bryants' pasture where Thomas Campbell had himself immersed three persons about one year previous to this, Mr. Thomas Campbell preached a long sermon and went over the whole ground that they had all been covering in their investigations, and showed convincingly the reasons that moved them to take this unusual step. (T. Campbell was now in his *fiftieth* year and had been an ordained preacher for about thirty years.) At the conclusion of the talk seven persons made the "good confession" (I Tim. 6:13), and were baptized according to the "ancient order," or, as Alexander was wont to express it, they were "baptized into the Christian faith." These seven were: Thomas Campbell and his wife, Jane, Alexander Campbell and his wife, Margaret, Miss Dorothea Campbell, daughter and sister respectively to the two men mentioned, and a Mr. and Mrs. James Haven.

These two scholarly preachers having now openly renounced their life-long denominational views, and having so emphatically repudiated both infant baptism and affusion were hailed as the champions of these points of Baptist belief and as the most formidable foes that the affusionists and Pedit-Baptists of that age had to meet. The battle was on and the younger man, strong,

courageous, intellectual, scholarly and by nature more controversial than his father ever was, went forth to meet the multifarious attacks, and soon eclipsed the older man and became known as the leader in the movement that was to reach round the world and to shake the foundations of sectdom.

The Baptists were elated over the fact that these two Presbyterian preachers had come to agree with them in opposing infant baptism and in advocating immersion, and the Redstone Association wanted to take the Brush Run Church into their fellowship, though these brethren were not members of the Baptist Church and *never were*. The Brush Run Church went into the Redstone Association and affiliated with these Baptists for awhile. Finally, at one of their meetings, Alexander Campbell preached a sermon *on the law* which gave offense to some of the Baptists and they began to talk about "unseating" the Brush Run Church. Before this could be done, however, Alexander, having now seen that he could not preach what the Bible plainly teaches without first stopping to see if this would be approved by some denominational officials, withdrew from the Association. This was accomplished by taking some brethren with him from Brush Run and establishing a church at Wellsburg Virginia. Brush Run Church was over the line in Pennsylvania. The Wellsburg church was in the Mahoning Baptist Association and the church was cordially fellowshipped by those people. The majority of the churches of this Association under the influence and teaching of A. Campbell ceased to be Baptist Churches and became simple churches of Christ. Then in 1827 the Association adjourned as such, *sine die*, the majority believing that there is no warrant in Scripture for such an organization of churches.

The restoration movement is now well on its way, and as it is the purpose of this book, not so much to give a complete history of the effort as to discover and make plain the *principles and objects* of the movement, it is time now to sum up the principles underlying the actions so far taken:

1. That it was not the purpose of these men at that time or at any time in their later lives to teach a *new system*, to *found a new denomination*, or to *inaugurate and head a new party* was made abundantly clear by their own declarations and by the statements of all those who have attempted to write a history of the restoration movement. They claimed nothing *new* about their work *except the New Testament*. Anything newer than that was too modern for them. They were seeking the "*Old Paths*"—not new ones. Jeremiah 6:16 was a famous text with the Reformers: "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way: and walk therein and ye shall find rest for your souls."

Some of the other Scripture passages that were made familiar by the pioneers, because they so exactly expressed their views and aims, are here given:

"What saith the Scripture?" (Rom. 4:3).

"What is written in the law? How readest thou?" (Luke 10:26).

"The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law" (Deut. 29:29).

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20).

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God" (I Pet. 4:11).

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (II Tim. 3:16-17).

"Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman

that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (II Tim. 2:17).

The following quotations will set forth the views, the aims and the claims of the Campbells and their coadjutors:

1. A. Campbell:

We have no system of our own, or of others, to substitute in lieu of the reigning systems. We only aim at substituting the New Testament in lieu of every creed in existence, whether Mohammedan, Pagan, Jewish, or Presbyterian. We wish to call Christians to consider that Jesus Christ has made them kings and priests to God. We neither advocate Calvinism, Arminianism, Socinianism, Arianism, Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Deism nor Sectarianism, but *New Testamentisin*.—A. Campbell, *Christian Baptist*, Vol. I, page 89.

2. Robert Richardson says:

The concealments of the Bible are as Divine as its revelations. Infinite wisdom was required as much to determine of which man should be ignorant as what man should know. Indeed, since, in regard to all matters connected with the unseen spiritual world, man is entirely dependent upon Divine revelation, the limits of that revelation must necessarily mark out also the domain of human ignorance, as the shores of a continent become the boundaries of a trackless and unfathomed ocean. Hence it is, that the silence of the Bible is to be revered equally with its teachings, and that to intrude into things not seen and not revealed, evinces the vanity of a fleshly mind as much as to misinterpret and pervert the express statements of the Scriptures. Unfortunately, both of these errors had prevailed in religious society, which was not content with either the reticence or the teachings of the Bible, but had presumed to supply the former by speculations upon the eternal decrees of God, the Trinity, the Divine nature, the future destiny of mankind, etc.; and to substitute for the latter, the commentaries of

party leaders and the decisions of councils or other ecclesiastical tribunals. Against this latter usurpation of Divine authority, where men had assumed to regulate the faith and practice of the Church, eminent reformers had, indeed, from age to age, remonstrated. Unfortunately, however, while endeavoring to correct this error, and to reinstate the Scripture in its proper position as an infallible and Divine revelation, too little attention was paid to the fact that this revelation had its appointed limits, and these reformers themselves presumed to transcend these boundaries, and to superadd their own opinions and speculations about questions of which the Scriptures do not treat. There was, therefore, a necessity for both the specifications in the principle which Thomas Campbell had adopted, "where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent," as it was not merely necessary to take Divine revelation as a guide, but equally so to prohibit the addition and admixture of human opinions. It was this last point particularly, viz.: that the silence of the Scriptures is to be respected equally with its teachings, that was almost peculiar to the reformation urged by Mr. Campbell, and continued to be one of its most important and characteristic traits.

As it was the distinguishing error of Romanism to presume to dictate the faith and regulate the ordinances of the Church, irrespective of the teaching of the Scriptures; so the chief mistake of Protestantism consisted in substituting for the silence of the Bible human opinions and speculative theories. The great principle urged by Thomas Campbell, which demanded implicit faith in express revelation alone, and an acknowledged or explicit ignorance in regard to all untaught questions, brought, therefore, those who adopted it into direct antagonism with the religious world. Accordingly, with perhaps the exception of the churches established by the Haldanes and a few other small independent bodies of reformers, who had, in various parts of Europe and America, been led to take the Bible alone as a guide, there was not any religious denomination whatever,

known to them, with which the reformers could consistently have established a real and fraternal union. Whatever confidence they might have in the faith and piety of many of the individuals composing a party, they could have none in the party itself or in the system upon which it was maintained, and could not therefore, by uniting, give their sanction to those divisive principles which it was their chief purpose to subvert. On the other hand, it is obvious that no party desiring to continue such, and comprehending the sweeping character of the great fundamental principle adopted by Thomas Campbell, could, consistently with its own security, receive the reformers into religious fellowship.

"Am I asked," asked Alexander Campbell about this period (in an address after sermon at the house of Mr. Buchanan), in order to anticipate certain objections, "why I am not a party man? or why I do not join some party? I ask, in return, Which party would the Apostle Paul join if now on earth? Or, in other words, which party would receive him? I dare not be a party man for these reasons:

"1. Because Christ has forbidden men. He has commanded us to keep the 'unity of spirit'; to be 'of one mind and of one judgment'; to 'love each other with a pure heart fervently,' and to 'call no man master' on earth.

"2. Because no party will receive into communion all whom God would receive into heaven. God loves His children more than our creeds, and man was not made for the Bible, but the Bible for man. But if I am asked by a partisan, Could you not join us and let these things alone? I answer, No, because—

"3. The man that promotes the interests of a party stands next in guilt to the man that made it. The man that puts the second stone on a building is as instrumental in its erection as the man that laid the first. He that supports a party bids the party God speed; and he that bids them God speed is a partaker of their evil deeds.

"4. Because all parties oppose reformation. They all pray for it, but they will not work for it. None of them dare return to the original standard. I speak not against any denomination in particular, but against all. I speak not against any system of truth, but against all except the Bible. 'Hold fast the form of sound words' condemns them all. It is a doleful truth, that the very persons who ought to have advocated reformation, always opposed it. See the History of the Christian Church, and Matthew xxiii. When I consider what Paul and thousands of others suffered for a good conscience, I would do so too. I desire to fight for 'the faith once delivered to the saints.' I like the bold Christian hero."

Such, at this period, were the noble and decided utterances of Alexander Campbell in relation to partyism and to his own convictions of religious duty; and such were the feelings which he and those associated with him then entertained in reference to these sad defections from primitive precept and example. Such, too, were the views which they labored to impress upon the religious community as opportunity was afforded.

Memoirs of Alexander Campbell.

Vol. I, PP-351-354

3. Richardson again says:

Resolved, That whereas certain things believed and propagated by Dr. Thomas, in relation to the mortality of man, the resurrection of the dead and the final destiny of the wicked, having given offence to many brethren, and being likely to produce a division among us; and believing the said views to be of no practical benefit, we recommend to Brother Thomas to discontinue the discussion of them, unless in his defence when misrepresented."

Dr. Thomas having consented to abide by the requirements of this resolution, the matter was seemingly adjusted, and great

hopes were entertained at the time that he would devote his abilities to the cause of Bible Christianity.

"I cannot but hope," said Mr. Campbell, speaking of the interview with Dr. Thomas," that the discussion held at Painesville will fully satisfy all that where the Bible is silent we ought to be as silent as the grave; and when it speaks often and clear, we ought to speak with corresponding clearness and frequency. May the Lord bless all who are led by the Bible!" The hope, however, it may be here stated, that Dr. Thomas would abandon his speculations, proved fallacious. His indomitable self-esteem would not suffer him to keep his covenant with the brethren and suffer the world to remain ignorant of his imagined new discoveries. He, therefore, soon after, while on a visit to England, endeavored to spread his materialism there, and after his return commenced in Illinois the publication of a paper called the "Investigator," in which he so openly displayed his apostasy from the cause he had at first espoused that Mr. Campbell was compelled to denounce him publicly as having departed from the Reformation ground and as seeking to form a new party. In this, however, the doctor's success was extremely small, for, notwithstanding the most persevering and unwearied efforts on his part, he was able to make but few converts to his opinions, and soon ceased to attract attention, being utterly discounted by the churches.

Memoirs of Alexander Campbell.

Vol. 2, Pages 448-449,

4. Richardson, once more:

Amidst all his successes, however, and though consciously wielding a prodigious influence over the minds of a large portion of the religious world, Mr. Campbell never for a moment entertained the thought of becoming the head of a party or of allowing himself to be recognized as the founder of a religious

denomination. Thus, when, at New Orleans, one of the papers so represented him in announcing his appointments there, he at once addressed to the editors the following note:

"To The Editors of The Commercial Bulletin:

"Gentlemen: Allow me to thank you for the kind and complimentary notice which you gave me, in your issue of the 13th inst., of my arrival in your city.

"I also feel very grateful to the ministers and members of the Methodist Church for tendering me the use of their house of worship for Lord's day evening, and regret that it is not in my power to accept it.

"You have done me, gentlemen, too much honor in saying that I am the 'founder' of the denomination, quite numerous and respectable in many portions of the West, technically known as 'Christians,' but more commonly as 'Campbellites.'

"I have always repudiated all human heads and human names for the people of the Lord, and shall feel very thankful if you will correct the erroneous impression which your article may have made in thus representing me as the founder of a religious denomination.

"With very great respect, I am yours,

"A. Campbell.

"New Orleans, March 14."

Vol. 2, P-441

Memoirs of Alexander Campbell

5. Isaac Errett:

The first issue of the Christian Standard was just ready to

come from the press when a telegram came to the Editor, Isaac Errett, announcing the death of Alexander Campbell, on Lord's Day, March 4, 1866. Errett held up the paper until he could prepare an editorial on the life and labors of Brother Campbell. It is a masterpiece of editorial writing. The life of no man was ever more accurately and touchingly told in so few words—few words compared to the volumes that have been written by others. His summing up of the principles of Campbell's plea could not be excelled. That much of the article is here quoted:

"It is not designed to enter here on a consideration of the peculiar features of Mr. Campbell's teaching. Briefly, they may be sketched thus:

"Christ the only Master: involving a rejection of all human names and leaderships in religion. The Bible the only authoritative book: necessitating the denial of the authority of all human creeds. The Church of Christ, as founded by him, and built by the Apostles, for a habitation of the Spirit, the only divine institution for spiritual ends: logically leading to the repudiation of all sects in religion as unscriptural and dishonoring to the Head of the church. Faith in Jesus, as the Christ, the Son of God, and repentance toward God, the only scriptural prerequisite to baptism and consequent church membership; thus dismissing all doctrinal speculation and all theological dogmata, whether true or false, as unworthy to be urged as tests of fitness for membership in the Church of Christ. Obedience to the divine commandments, and not correctness of opinion, the test of Christian standing. The gospel the essential channel of spiritual influence in conversion: thus ignoring all reliance on abstract and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, and calling the attention of inquirers away from dreams, visions and impressions, which are so liable to deceive, to the living and powerful truths of the Gospel, which are reliable, immutable and eternal. The truth of the Gospel to enlighten; the love of God in the Gospel to persuade; the ordinances of the Gospel, as tests

of submission to the divine will; the promises of the Gospel, as the evidence of pardon and acceptance; and the Holy Spirit, in and through all these, accomplishing His work of enlightening, convincing of sin, guiding the penitent soul to pardon, and bearing witness to the obedient believer of his adoption into the family of God.

"He was intensely Protestant, steadily cherishing throughout his life the cardinal principles of what is called evangelical faith and piety—the divinity of Christ, His sacrificial death, as a sin-offering, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers. A Trinitarian in sentiment, he repudiated the unscriptural technicalities of Trinitarian theology as involving a mischievous strife of words. A devout believer in the atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God, he would not teach, as Gospel, any theory of atonement. A stout advocate of spiritual influence and special providence, he was the enemy of all theories of abstract spiritual power, as tending to ignore the Word of God, and leading to a deceptive trust in psychological peculiarities as the voice of the Spirit of God. Sternly opposed to baptismal regeneration, he still insisted on the baptism of the believing penitent 'for the remission of sins.' Educated in Calvinism, and always inclining to that school, he was so fearful of the tendency of all speculative theology, that it is difficult to trace his own proclivities on these questions anywhere in his voluminous writings. Deeply sympathizing with evangelical Protestantism in its grand ideas and principles, he nevertheless looked on its present divided and distracted state as evidence that Protestants are only partially rescued from the great apostasy; regarded the enforcement of speculative doctrines and creed-authority as the tap-root of sectarianism; and insisted, through half a century, on the abandonment of party names, leaders and symbols, to prepare the way for the union of all believers in one body; arguing that thus only have we a right to expect the conversion of the world. He suffered much unjust

reproach for a plea which, just as he was passing away, he saw rising into exceeding interest among all evangelical parties. . . .

"His reputation was without spot. His bitterest enemies failed to find a flaw in his character for truth, integrity and goodness. But those who knew him well, he was most cheerful, gentle, genial, just, and devout; and as dearly loved for his goodness as he was venerated for his greatness. It will ever be remembered to his honor, that with an almost unbounded personal influence over a religious community, numbering hundreds of thousands, he never sought the least ecclesiastical control. Although the telegram from Wheeling announcing his death spoke of him as "Bishop Campbell," it will surprise many to learn that he was merely one of the bishops of the congregation meeting in Bethany, and that outside of this, he never sought and never exercised, the least ecclesiastical authority.

"He was a profound admirer of American institutions. His heart ever beat with the impulses of freedom. The communities of disciples grew to be large, both North and South of Mason and Dixon's line, and in earnest desire to preserve their unity unbroken, led him sometimes to lean over towards slavery in apology and defense, many of us thought, too far. Yet he was always in sympathy and practice, an anti-slavery man. The best proof of this is found in the emancipation of all the slaves who, by marriage came into his possession. His tract to the people of Kentucky, urging them to adopt a system of gradual emancipation, was an earnest and powerful appeal. Although it fell on ears that were dull of hearing, the people of that state, who rejected his counsels, will learn how true he was to their best interests, as well as to the noblest instincts of his own nature.

"For many years he was possessed of the conviction that the year 1866 would exhaust many prophetic dates, and witness great changes in ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs—It is not unpleasant to think that this has become to him the year of years, and to his ransomed spirit will unseal many of the mys-

teries of apocalyptic vision which, here, even his piercing intellect failed to penetrate.

"He passed away on the Lord's day—the day in which he so much delighted—to the peace and bliss of an eternal Sabbath. We have not yet learned the particulars of his last hours, only that it was a kingly triumph. In his later years, the personal dignity and official relations of the Son of God was his constant theme of discourse. Who can imagine the reverence and rapture that shall fill his spirit when beholding the glory of Immanuel, whom, unseen, he loved so well, and at whose feet he laid, adoringly, the gifts of his nature, and the toils of his life."

Christian Standard, Vol. 1, No. 1

Also quoted in "Churches of Christ" by John Brown pp.396-401

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. All reformatory movements are based on a protest against something, or come as a reaction from something. Against what did the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century protest?

2. Did they start out with the purpose to establish a new church, or several churches?

3. What freedom did they gain for themselves and for the world?

4. In what way was this freedom to some extent forfeited?

5. What man, or what body of men, has any right to make laws to bind the consciences of his fellowmen in matters of religion?

6. Who was Thomas Campbell?

7. What was his religious affiliation?

8. Did he believe the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church?

9. Against what, then, did he protest?

Note: Yes, he believed the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, but he did not think that the doctrines that were peculiar to the Seceder branch of the church were essential to salvation. In other words, he thought that the members of other Presbyterian branches were Christians, and he regretted that the laws of his church—the Seceders—would not permit him to give the Lord's Supper to these "other Christians," or as denominationalists have always expressed it, these "Christians of another name." He protested against sectarian exclusiveness, at first: against sectarianism, later: against divisions into sects or parties, governed by human authority.

10. What caused Thomas Campbell to withdraw from the Presbytery?

11. Did he cease to preach?

12. For whom did he now preach and with whom did he associate?

Answer: He preached for his neighbors and ministered to all Christians "*of whatever name.*"

13. Did these neighbors form any sort of an organization?

Answer: Yes, they formed what they called the "Christian Association of Washington."

14. Did this Association have any rules or laws by which to govern their efforts?

Answer: Yes, these are found in Thomas Campbell's famous "Declaration and Address." His plan of action and pattern for peace among the warring sects, like President Woodrow Wilson's plan for peace among the warring nations a little more than one hundred years later, contained *fourteen points*. (The teacher should require the students to read the "Declaration and Address" and to report on its points.)

15. What rule expressed in this document became the slogan of the restoration movement?

16. Does anybody today recognize this motto or maxim as a rule of action? Could not unity and peace among the people of God be secured upon this basis now?

17. Were all the members of the "Christian Association of Washington" members of the same denomination?

Answer: No, they were members of various denominations: some of them were not members of any denomination at all.

18. Did they have to disconnect themselves from their respective denominations in order to be members of the Association?

Answer: No, but of course they could not work together if the different ones were trying to work according to the different rules of the differing parties. The effort was to find a plan by which they could all work together as *Christians*—and forget their denominational differences.

19. Was the Association a new denomination? If so, and since the members had *not* quit their respective churches, were not some of them members of two denominations at once?

Answer: The Association was not thought of as a church or a denomination at all by any of its members.

20. What became of this "Christian Association of Washington"?

Answer: It died. Some of the members quit because when they began applying the rule "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," they saw that the doctrines of their ancestral denominations could not stand the test. Others became indifferent. Thomas Campbell and his family moved away from Washington and located on a farm some miles distant from the town.

21. Did not the Campbells then found a church?

Answer: They established a congregation at Brush Run, Pennsylvania.

22. Was this not a Campbellite Church or denomination?

Answer: No, it was not a denomination at all. *It was a congregation struggling to make itself fit the New Testament pattern.* Neither of the Campbells would have ever consented to allow Christians to wear their name.

23. Was this a church of Christ?

Answer: It became such. At first some of the members—including the Campbells—had not been baptized.

24. What was the first doctrine to have the "Bible speaks, Bible silent" rule applied to it?

25. What was the next point to be resolved according to this rule?

26. How often did the Brush Run Church partake of the Lord's Supper?

27. From whom did they get this practice?

28. Why would some of the members not partake?

29. When some of the members demanded immersion did Thomas Campbell agree to apply the rule here?

30. When Thomas Campbell immersed three persons what shows that this was a new experience for him?

Answer: See "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," Volume I, p. 373.

31. Why did some think this baptizing was not Scriptural?

32. Who baptized the Campbells? What was the order of this baptizing? Whose rules or what example did they follow?

33. Did this constitute these persons Baptists? Or make them members of a Baptist Church?

34. Was the Brush Run Church taken into a Baptist Association?

35. What caused Alexander Campbell to withdraw from this Association?

36. With what group were he and his associates—the Wellsburg Church—then aligned?

37. What became of the Mahoning Baptist Association?

38. Were the Campbells ever members of the Baptist Church?

Answer: See "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," Volume I, p. 466.

39. Could they have been ejected from that church, seeing that they were never members?

40. Did the Lord Jesus Christ establish a church? and was that church in existence in the New Testament Day? (Matt. 16:18; Acts 8:1; 20:28; Eph. 1:22; 3:10; 5:22-32).

41. Was that church ever destroyed? If not, where was it before the Campbells were born?

42. What did these men propose to do and claim to do?

43. Upon what basis, or according to what plan did they propose to establish or *restore* the "ancient order of things"?

44. Did they succeed?

45. If they failed in their efforts, to what degree and in what respects did they fail?

46. Was the failure due to a fault in the plea and the plan, or was it a failure to follow the plan accurately?

47. If the efforts of those men failed, could we not today go to the New Testament and apply its teaching—follow both the precepts and the examples of the inspired men—and *restore* the New Testament church?

48. If men today hear the same gospel that the apostles preached, believe it and obey it just as the people did when they heard the apostles preach it, will this not make men today just what it made the people of the apostles' day?

49. What did the people become under the apostles' preaching? (Matt. 28:16-20 R. V.; Acts 26:28; Gal. 3:26-27).

50. To what were they added, and who added them? (Acts 2:41,47; Acts 5:14).

51. Could people today read the New Testament, believe its facts, obey its commands, follow its examples, trust its promises and thus become and be Christians without ever having heard of Thomas or Alexander Campbell?

52. Would a number of such persons together constitute a church? If so, whose church or "what church" would it be?

53. Could we not in this way *restore* New Testament teaching and practice?

54. When that is *restored* what would we lack of having the New Testament church restored?

55. Does the fact that men fail in their application and observance of a rule constitute a reason to repudiate the rule itself?

56. If men have failed to apply and to follow the motto—"Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," does that prove that the rule is impracticable or unworkable?

57. Did the pioneers put as much stress upon the *silence* of the Scriptures as they did upon the *teaching* of the sacred writings?

58. What does it mean to be *silent* where the Bible is silent?

59. Would we be *speaking* where the Bible is *silent* should we protest against an unauthorized practice after someone else introduced this practice about which the Bible is silent?

60. Who is speaking where the Bible is silent, the man who introduces an unauthorized practice or the man who protests against this practice?

61. Did A. Campbell claim to be the founder of a denomination? Did he ever protest against such a report concerning him?

62. Did he want his brethren to wear his name?

63. Have any people ever willingly applied his name to themselves?

64. Did Campbell ever hold any official position in any kind of an ecclesiastical organization?

65. How do you account for these statements from the pen of Isaac Errett concerning Campbell's views, viz.: "The Church of Christ, as founded by him, and built by the apostles, for a habitation of the Spirit, *the only divine institution for spiritual ends*"; and "Although a telegram from Wheeling announcing his death spoke of him as 'Bishop Campbell,' it will surprise many to learn that he was merely *one* of the bishops of the congregation meeting in Bethany, and that outside of this, he never sought and never exercised, the least ecclesiastical authority," in view of the fact that Mr. Campbell was at his death and had been for seventeen years the President of the American Christian Missionary Society?

66. How do you account for the fact that Errett, in his excellent biographical obituary, makes no mention at all of Campbell's Presidency of the Missionary Society?

67. Does Robert Richardson, in his "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," consisting of more than a thousand pages, tell of his being elected as President of the American Christian Missionary Society? (See Vol. II, P. 57, 589, 600, 601.)

68. Did Campbell change his views on these organizations in his last days?

69. Is there any evidence that Campbell was beginning to fail mentally when he allowed himself to be elected (1849) President of the American Christian Missionary Society? (He died in 1866.)

70. What was it that A. Campbell taught that caused the denominations to fear, to hate and to persecute him and his brethren?

71. Did they ever change their attitude toward Campbell during his life?

Answer: Yes, some of them did. After his defeat of Owen (infidelity) and his defeat of Purcell (Catholicism), fair minded men everywhere recognized his ability and worth. He was honored in many ways, but he was still hated and slandered by sectarian bitterness.

72. Did this bitterness continue to be manifested toward Campbell's brethren, or, as the world would say, followers?

73. When did this begin to abate?

74. Do we often hear the name "Campbellite" now applied to anybody?

75. If we should contend against the same evils and for the same principles now that the pioneers opposed and espoused, would we not suffer as they did? Would we not also succeed as they did? Would not the same causes have the same effects?

76. Was the New Testament church *restored*? If yes, is it still here? If no, can we *now* restore it? If so, how?

77. Can you recite from memory and give chapter and verse

some of the passages that were made familiar by the pioneers?

78. For what were *all* the members of the churches of Christ seventy-five years ago?

79. Why were they superior in that respect to the members of this age?

SO. Did they hear a different type of preaching to that which is heard in this age?

81. Would the people of this age endure the type of preaching that the pioneers of the restoration movement did? If not, what should the preachers do about it? (2 Tim. 4:1-8).

CHAPTER TWO

A Discussion Between Sampson Schismaticus and Daniel Didacticus

(D. D., Evangelist in the church at Prophets' Pass, entered his own study, called Searcher's Sanctum, to find his friend and fellow-townsmen, S. S., preacher for a church called Schism-side, who does not agree with anybody but who contends that he fellowships everybody because everybody agrees with him on some point wherein he differs from somebody, waiting for him.)

1. D. D.: "Good morning, Samp, I am sorry to have kept you waiting. I hope I have not wasted too much of your precious time. What can I do for you now?"

2. S. S.: "No, no, you have not inconvenienced me at all. In fact, this time has been turned to my advantage definitely. I came over here to talk to you about the number of books that is being printed today on some phase of the so-called *restoration movement*, or about some characteristic of Alexander Campbell, or about what the 'fathers' or pioneers did or thought or said or smelt. I never saw anything like it. What is the occasion for all this renewed interest in the *dead past*? I knew you would have all these books and, lo, I found the very latest one here on your desk. I've been reading it while I waited. It is from the *Old Paths Book Club* and claims to 're-examine' the *restoration*—testing its sanity, I suppose. This author thinks he has drawn out leviathan with a fish hook, doesn't he?"

3. D. D.: "Well, I had not observed that. But he has evidently snagged a saurian,—he has you floundering on the bank. What is your chief complaint? What is the head and front of this

author's offending? Why do you object to these *restoration* books? Why do you speak of the *dead past*; is *all* the past *dead*, or just *some* of it? Do you not agree with Alexander Pope that the proper study for man is *man*? Why not study Alexander Campbell? Was he not a great man? Have you read all his works? Did not Longfellow say, "The lives of great men' . . .?"

4. S. S.: "Hold! Wait a minute, Dan! You can ask more questions than a Congressional Committeeman interrogating a Communist suspect! I want to speak to the point. I am not going to answer a barrage of questions!"

5. D. D.: "Your illustration is apt, Sam. Those suspects also are noted for not answering questions, remember? What point is it that you want to discuss?"

6. S. S.: "O, this idea of looking back instead of looking forward. Why go back into the *dead past* to get ideas and ideals? We are far more enlightened than men were a hundred and fifty years ago. The *issues* they discussed are *dead* now. Moreover, you have always claimed that you were not a follower of Campbell and that he did not start your church, and now it looks as if you folks are trying to canonize Campbell. And yet you are far away from the Campbellian Creed. He allowed liberty of opinion and you disfellowship everyone that differs with you on any point. He renounced creeds and then adopted one of his own: *No-Creedism was the creed of Campbellism*, but now you reactionary and anti-factionists insert your creed in every deed and add a new item about every time a new house is built. You are the worst creed-bound cranks in Christendom: you profess to practice open communion, and yet at heart you are the worst close communionists that ever crunched a cracker. You will not call on a denominationalist to pray in your assemblies, but you urge them to sing praises with you; you would not allow one to say a benediction, but you sanction his joining in the communion and jointly partaking in the one body and one blood, yet you believe he is out of the body and has never been

cleansed by the blood. Campbell recognized all denominationalists as Christians. I honor Campbell, but you folks are a disgrace to his name. You . . ."

7. D. D.: "Wait a minute, Samp, and get your breath. You might say something harsh about us if you keep going. A stranger would think you do not like us. Yet, I know that aside from a few such peccadillos as being bigots and cantankerous cranks and crooks, you think we are all right. Just wait now! Yes, I know, you were reared among us, and you soaked up all the bad that is to be found in our fellowship and failed to imbibe the good that is always apparent. You found some faulty apples and ran out of the orchard shouting maledictions. Among the apostles, you concentrate on Judas and overlook John. You magnify Peter's mistakes and forget his life of faithful service. Hold! I know you do not do that with reference to those apostles, but you have that attitude toward the Lord's present-day servants. But *your* faults and *our* faults cannot change facts or alter issues. Let us discuss principles: As to looking backward, *that is exactly -what the pioneers did.* We are looking back to them for an example of looking back to the apostles. Have you forgotten all the *restoration* texts, such as Jer. 6:16; Isa. 8:20; Isa. 1:18; 2 Tim. 2:14; 3:16; Jude 3, 17? As to why we are having renewed interest in the story of the restoration, that is not hard to see either: Men have again corrupted their ways, forgotten God and put their necks under the yoke of human authority. We need another *restoration*. We need to *restore* the *restoration*. Another king has arisen who knew not Joseph . . ."

8. S. S.: "May I speak now? Thank you! Dan, you talk fluently but you do not stick to the issue. You did not mention my point that we are so much more enlightened now than men were a century ago. Why look back to them? Where is the chapter and verse for looking backward? The Bible tells us to *press forward*, to go on to perfection, to forget the things—That's it, I just thought of it, 'forget the things that are be-

hind'! Dan, that surely fits you and your *restoration* 're-examiners'! Ho, ho, you boys amuse me! It has been *examined* and *examined*, now here is a guy that proposes to *re-examine* it!"

9. D. D.: "Samp, that amusement works both ways: What did Shakespeare say about woman, '*Contradiction is thy name*'? Or perhaps it was Pope who said that. That may not apply to women, but it fits you perfectly. You say why look backward in one breath and in the very next exhalation you run back to the Bible and call for chapter and verse. You ignore the references I gave (Jer. 6:16; Jude 3, etc.) and then misuse those that happen to come into your mind. You know . . ."

10. S. S.: "Yeah, Dan, instead of singing, 'I'm Pressing On the Upward Way,' you should sing

Backward, turn backward,

O time in your flight,

And bring back A. Campbell

With all his might.

"Ha, ha. Yeah, Dan, you ought to look *forward* not *backward*. 'Forgetting the things that are behind'—that is the Pauline platform."

11. D. D.: "Samp, will you be serious long enough to learn that you are perverting the word of God?"

12. S. S.: "I am as serious as I can be, and I don't see how I am perverting the Scripture when I give you the exact language of the Apostle, Phil. 3:13. Read it yourself."

13. D. D.: "But Paul was talking of the advantages that he had as a Jew—things that were gain, he counted as loss and refuse in order to be a Christian—to gain Christ. Likewise, we give up and leave and forget sinful habits, advantages and relationships in order to follow Christ and be saved. Paul did not

forget Christ and the Cross: he did not forget that 'heavenly vision' and the commission from Christ. He did not forget the basic facts of the faith. The Bible—both Old and New Testaments—is full of memorials. A memorial points backward and celebrates something that took place in bygone days. Yes, and we are to look to and honor certain men, too. What else was the Eleventh Chapter of Hebrews written for? Then read these references, Samp, and quit your quibbling: Isa. 51:1; Phil. 2: 29; Heb. 13:7. Also keep in mind that a tree must grow downward before it can grow upward. We must be *rooted* and *grounded* and *stedfast* (Col. 1:23)."

15. S. S.: "Well, there is a sense, of course, in which our faith is anchored in events of history, but not in the history of uninspired men. You have not yet answered my point that men are more enlightened now than they were a century ago. What do you say to that, Daniel the dauntless?"

16. D. D.: "That is a very common fallacy, Samp, and I am surprised that you do not see it. Suppose we admit that men are more enlightened today than they were a century ago—and they are in some respects—what effect does that have upon *truth*—upon *eternal principles*? Truth cannot change; principles do not go out of date."

17. S. S.: "Of course, truth does not change, but men change in relation to truth; you cannot deny that, Dan."

18. D. D.: "I would not think of denying it, Samp; I've seen it happen. You are an example yourself. What relationships can men sustain to truth? Just wait, I'll answer that! First, they can *know* the truth or they can be *ignorant* of the truth. If they are ignorant, they can *learn* and thus be ignorant no more. A change for the better. If they know the truth, they can either *believe* it or *disbelieve* it. If they once believed it and come to disbelieve it, that is a tragic change. If they once disbelieved it

and then come to believe it, that is a triumphant change. What else can man do in reference to truth?"

19. S. S.: "Well, men who know truth can learn *more truth*. That is what progress means. We must not assume that what *we believe* is the *ne plus ultra*. We must not become static. You try to limit the knowledge of men by what the Campbells knew. Hold! Well, at least by what the apostles knew. You cannot deny that! I'm glad I have had the fetters cut off the hands and feet of my intellect, and I can run with the modern giants and shout with the minds that have been emancipated. I would hate to have to deny facts that the scientists demonstrate just because I cannot read them in my creed-book. You have too bright a mind for that sort of thing, Dan, if you would only throw off your inherited shackles, and quit talking about the *restoration* of something old and out of date and be prepared for the discoveries of things that are new and modern."

20. D. D.: "Samp, you really have it in bad form, and your case is typical. All types of modernists—unbelievers and atheists—boast of their *emancipation* and their superior intellect! They think they are *free-thinkers*, when, as a rule, they are neither *free* nor do they *think*. What they say is exactly what they are expected to say—what every other sycophant in the world is saying. Not one of them has a new thought or an original way of expressing their universal boast and blasphemy. They have a *common plaint* and a *uniform preachment*—negative in logical analysis, self-laudatory in attitude and chronic in character . . ."

21. S. S.: "If denunciation were argumentation, Dan, you would be invincible. But . . ."

22. D. D.: "Just wait, I intend to answer every implied point in your speech. You are not logical and consistent, Samp. You are like a pugilist who swings wildly and blindly and lands a blow whenever and wherever he can . . ."

23. S. S.: "Yeah, and you are the cool, calculating, scientific slugger that bides his time and knocks his opponent out, eh?"

24. D. D.: "You have said some things that are so fallacious that I must refute them:

1. "You say we must learn *more truth* than our predecessors knew. Very good, but you assume that the truth we learn will make out of date and nullify the truth they knew. This is the basis of modernistic absurdities. Truth never changes. No truth will ever destroy or even conflict with any other truth. However much more truth we may learn than our fathers knew, *we still must hold to the truth they taught us.*

2. "I challenge you to show one fact of science that I deny or that I need to deny. The facts of natural science do not conflict with any spiritual truth.

3. "You say repeatedly that men are more enlightened today than they were a century ago. In reply to that, I must make several observations:

a. "If we grant that point, wherein does that affect our *faith* or our *morals* or our *social behavior*? Our faith does not stand in the wisdom of men—ancient or modern—but in the power of God (I Cor. 2:5). We speak wisdom, all right, the kind that has confounded and destroyed or made foolish the wisdom of the world. We walk by faith and not by philosophy (I Cor. 1: 17-20; II Cor. 5:7). The wisdom we speak is from God, and that it is wisdom is proved by its results—its fruits. Samp, did you ever really weigh this passage?

We speak wisdom, however, among them that are full-grown: yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, who are coming to nought: but we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, *even the wisdom* that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory: which none of the rulers of this world hath known:

for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory: but as it is written,

Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not,

And *which* entered not into the heart of man,

Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love

him. (I Cor. 2:6 to 10—R.V.)

b. "As to this generation being more enlightened than former generations: that is a huge joke, if you use the word *enlightened* to mean *common sense* and *practical judgment* and a sense of *moral values* and *social justice*. This age is in *utter confusion*. Does the increase of crime show superior enlightenment? Does the shameful increase of divorces, disrupted families and homeless children show advanced enlightenment? Does the heartsickening record of youth delinquency show our great intellectual achievements? Do atom bombs and murdered millions of helpless human beings prove our boastful claims of superiority? Does the confiscation of property—robbing of men by governmental powers—the enslaving of helpless persons and the torturing of human beings to death—does all this establish your claim to learning and culture and enlightenment? Slavery and torture, and 'purges' and 'liquidations' form a beautiful bouquet for your Daughter of Enlightenment and Modernism to wear as she parades before the eyes of the world to be worshipped. Communism is the acme of Modernism. It is the top note of the crescendo in the aria of Enlightenment. Strikes and lock-outs and 'goon squad' operations in the United States are impressive illustrations of what modern education and enlightenment does for us. (Most of the Union leaders are college men.) The traitors and saboteurs, the betrayers of trust, false swearers and vicious liars in the pay of the Devil's own enthroned agents, are all graduates of modern colleges and universities.

"Yes, Samp, our Enlightenment is *really something to boast of!* Man's enlightenment cannot save man from himself—much less save him from sin and death."

25. S. S.: "You really go to town when you get on the line that you are constantly haranguing,—pardon, I mean, lecturing on, don't you, Dan? Well, I had no business of letting you get off on that line. I have to admit that the world is in a mad mess. But—now don't get excited, Dan — Christianity — what you preach—had been in the world nearly two thousand years before men went modernistic, communistic and crazy. Why didn't Christianity prevent this? Now, what is your answer?"

26. D. D.: "The answer is simple, Samp, and I am surprised that even you can't see it. Christianity has been in the world, truly, but it has never been adopted by the world, and you know it. Is it fair to condemn a remedy before it has ever been tried? You . . ."

27. S. S.: "Wait, Dan, don't run off with the wagon again. But, while you are expatiating on these philosophical themes, I'd like to hear you *explain*—not just babble about—how it is true—if it is true—that God has made foolish, brought to nought and destroyed the wisdom of this world, as Paul says (I Cor. 1:19-20)."

28. D. D.: "Why, I have just done that very thing, Samp. When the philosophies, ideologies, social theories and political plans of men fail to prevent wars, crimes, upheavals, revolutions and wrecks of nations and of individuals, and leave all the races of men confused, bewildered and hopeless; and, when God in his mercy gives us a Savior who transforms cruel criminals into kind, humble Christians and gives them a system of teaching that brings peace, joy and good will on earth, puts hope into the heart and lights the path of a pilgrim through the valley and the shadow and into a land of endless bliss . . ."

29. S. S.: "Please, Dan, I'm not coming to the mourners

bench. Keep your breath to Kool your Koffee (Boy, I can use alliteration, too.), and reserve your rhetoric for your revivals.

"We got clear away from my subject: *A. Campbell and the Restoration*. I've got you in a situation in that controversy that you can't talk yourself out of, Dan."

30. D. D.: "Tut, Samp, what are you talking about? I am not in any sort of situation, that I know of. Out with your charges, lame me with your logic!"

31. S. S.: "You claim that Campbell did not *start a denomination*, and that *you folks are not a sect*. I can prove that you are wrong on both points."

32. D. D.: "You don't say! Samp, I knew you had long ago ceased to claim to be a Scriptorian, but I did not know you had turned magician. Go on, let me see you pull that rabbit out of your hat!"

33. S. S.: "I'll begin by showing that here we have a *sect*, denomination, and I'll trace it back to its origin and that will head us squarely into A. Campbell, Brush Run and Bethany."

34. D. D.: "That *will* be an interesting performance! I had no idea that you had become such a prestidigitator. When are you going to trace our pedigree and proclaim our progenitor?"

35. S. S.: " I will have to come back tomorrow for that task, I must be going now. You are a swift spieler, Dan, but you are not going to out talk me on that *denomination business*. I am going to 'quench your coal and leave you neither seed nor remainder', Dan."

36. D. D.: "You run home now and read I Kings 20:11, and come back tomorrow."

37. S. S.: "Does I Kings 20:11 say anything about A Campbell and your sect? But I will read it. For now, goodbye, Dan."

38. D. D.: "So long, Samp."

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. What question concerning the study of the restoration story does Sampson Schismaticus raise?

2. Is there any point of value in this objection?

3. Did Daniel Didacticus clarify the point and answer the objection?

4. What points worthy of our attention did Sampson raise in the sixth speech?

5. Did Dan give a satisfactory answer to all these points?

6. What points did he overlook?

7. What Scripture passages were used in this discussion? Give the number and references.

8. Were there any allusions to Scriptures that were not cited?

9. Were any passages misused?

10. What current happenings (in the year 1949) are worked in as illustrations?

12. What professional sports are used in illustration?

13. What historical events are taxed to support a point?

14. What point in nature study does Dan use?

Answer: The tree growing *downward* and then *upward*.

15. Is this illustration apt and effective?

16. Are the points made by Samp ever made in real life or are they fictitious like Samp himself?

17. Is Samp true to life?

18. Even if men are more enlightened today than in a former age, would this or should this affect our faith? If not, why not?

19. Are men really more enlightened today than ever before? If so in what respects?

Answer: In mechanical inventions and scientific discoveries.

20. Are there any new ideas in the philosophical, social and economic theories that men are advocating today?

Answer: The author of this book says no. If you can find one he will pay you for it.

21. Is there anything Modern in Modernism?

Answer: No, Modernism is paganism.

22. By what do we walk in religion?

23. How does faith come or upon what is it based?

24. In speech number 24 does Dan expose Samp's fallacies?

25. Is his description of present-day world conditions accurate?

26. What then does this prove in reference to man's wisdom and philosophies? (See Jer. 23:10).

27. In what way has God made foolish the wisdom of the world?

28. Were there any witticisms, or examples of repartee in this discussion?

29. Where did Samp get his "quench your coal" quotation?

30. What do you think of Dan's comeback with I Kings 20 L 11? Did Samp see the point?

CHAPTER THREE

Are We A Denomination?*BY*

G. C. BREWER

(These are excerpts from a lecture which was delivered at Murfreesboro, Term., on the night of May 5, 1917, and was published by F. L. Rowe in a book called "Murfreesboro Addresses")

1. First, then, What is a denomination? According to the etymology of the word denomination, it means "concerning a name." It is derived from two Latin words, "de" and "nomen," which means "concerning a name." A thing is denominated when it has a name given to it by which it is distinguished from other things, or by which it is designated; but to give a more general answer to the question, What is a denomination? I would say that a religious denomination is a party of religious people who are in agreement, or who have a platform upon which they stand, or who have a creed or rules or forms by which they are governed in their religious activities and who have a name that distinguishes them, or belongs peculiarly to them. What is a political party? Is it not a party of people in politics that are agreed on some principles of political economy or government—that is, they have a platform on which they stand? That is a political party. A religious party or denomination is different in that the principles for which it stands are religious principles instead of political principles. You can see then what a religious denomination is,—that it is a party in religion; a body of people organized to carry out certain principles, or to advocate certain doctrines. Now, almost every religious denomination on earth today is named either for the form of government which it has, or for some doctrine, or for some

man. I believe that would include almost all, if not quite all, the religious denominations today; and I would have you understand in the outset, that the doctrine or principle for which the religious body stands does not necessarily have to be an erroneous principle in order to make that body a denomination. It doesn't have to be what we call heresy before they are denominational, or before they are sectarian. If people stress one doctrine or one point in religion to the neglect of other doctrines or other points, then that point or that doctrine becomes a heresy. Heresy, according to our use of the term, means error or false teaching. According to the original signification of the word it doesn't mean that, but it means what we term a "hobby"—some idea that is exalted above other ideas or opinions—something that is given undue prominence or is stressed unduly.

People can therefore become sectarian by exalting one religious idea or principle and crystallizing around that, and making that their creed or doctrine.

To illustrate what I said—that each denomination is named for its doctrine, or its government, or for some man—I will call the names of some of our religious denominations, and you will see whence its name is derived.

The Episcopal Church is called Episcopal because of the form of government which they have. *Episcopos* is a Greek word and means an elder or a bishop, hence they are under the rule of bishops. A bishop is the highest officer in the church. Its form of government is episcopal, hence its name.

The Presbyterians are so-called because they take their form of government from the word *presbuteros*, which means elder—that is they are under the rule of elders, hence the Presbyterian government.

The Methodist-Episcopal Church is called "Episcopal" because there is the same bishop rule, or same form of government. To a great extent it has the same government as the Episcopal Church—hence the name.

The Baptist Church is named for the ordinance of baptism. Formerly in the history of the church all professed Christians were divided into two classes, namely, Pedo-Baptists and Ana-Baptists. The Pedo-Baptists were people who baptized infants as well as adults and the Ana-Baptists were those who admitted only adults to the rite of baptism. But later the prefix, Ana, was dropped and religious people were distinguished as Baptists and Pedo-Baptists. And today all people who practice immersion, matters not how much they differ on other points of doctrine, are known as Baptists—and all who practice affusion, matters not how greatly they may differ on other points of doctrine, are called Pedo-Baptists. Thus it would seem that the doctrine of baptism divides Christians as the Jordan river divided Israel; two tribes and a half tribe on the one side and nine tribes and a half tribe on the other side. But the term, Baptist, is here used in what we might call its generic sense. The Baptist denomination is a body entirely surrounded by water; bound together by special rules of faith and order. All who are admitted into their fellowship must not only have been baptized, but baptized by their authority.

The Adventists are called Adventists because they have preached the second coming of Christ; stressed it—exalted it unduly probably for they have set dates for the coming of the Lord. They take their name, therefore, from their most important doctrine. When they began to observe the seventh day of the week and preach that chiefly they enlarged their name and are therefore now called Seventh-Day Adventists. Of course they claim to be Christians too. Hence they are Seventh-Day Adventists Christians as distinguished from Mormon-Latter-Day-Saint-Christians, Christian-Science-Christians, Christadelphian-Christians, Presbyterian-Christians, Cumberland-Presbyterian-Christians, United - States - of - America - Presbyterian-Christians, etc., etc.

See what absurdities denominationalism has run us into?

* * * * *

But a thoughtful man might ask, can we not all preach all the truth and not exalt any portion of it above any other portion and be agreed therefore? Then we would not need the characteristic designations and distinguishing names, we would all be the same, namely, just Christians. "Ay, there is the rub," can it be done? *We* have contended that it can and should be done. But that brings us to the next division.

Who are we? It is a difficult matter in this world to be consistent. . . . What I mean by saying it is hard for us to be consistent is illustrated by our use of the pronoun "We" in the question that I am now discussing. When we preach against denominationalism—against distinguishing certain bodied and parties of people in religion by denominational designations and at the same time speak of a body of people and include them in the terms "we," "us," "our," are we not inconsistent? When we say "our" claims are this or that, do we use the word "our" in the same sense that it has when we say "Our Father who art in heaven"? Do we mean to include, therefore, all who are the children of God when we say "Our Father," meaning that He is the Father of all who obey Him? If we do, then of course that is not a denominational use of the term; but it is strictly true that what is referred to as "our claims" are the claims of all Christian? Are they not rather simply the claims of a certain number—a small number probably—and therefore sectarian claims? Let us be careful. It is not only difficult to be consistent in the use of these terms but it is difficult to make people understand you. When a man finds that his views are out of harmony with the views of the people around him he finds that he has a hard road to travel. In the midst of denominational ideas—in the midst of denominational activities—in the midst of denominational phraseology—it is hard for us to express ourselves without using terms that are denominational or using terms that will leave the impression upon the hearer that we are a denomination. Again it seems difficult because people will misunder-

stand you; you will appear discourteous if you do not speak in terms they are accustomed to use. If a man sees I am a preacher, on a train for instance, his first question is, "So you are a preacher, of what denomination, may I ask?" "I belong to the Church of Christ." That ends the conversation on that subject. The man understands perfectly what I am and I have permitted him to think that I am a member of a denomination. But if I say I am not a member of any denomination he thinks I am some sort of crank or else he thinks I am too discourteous to give him a civil answer and am trying to evade the question. But usually he asks in surprise, "Well, what is your belief?"

Then of course my reply is, "I believe the Bible, I try to follow its teaching; I am a member of the church of God. I am a Christian." Then he is certain to think one or two things: Either I am a fanatic or I am a Campbellite and trying to start an argument. You know they say you can "resist the devil and he will flee from you but resist a Campbellite and he will flee at you." I may try to be as gentle as I can but when I say I am not a member of any denomination he can not understand. It is hard for people to understand why we are not a denomination; and it is hard for us too, I repeat, in dealing with them, to keep from becoming denominational in our speech and views. In fact, I am not sure that we do it.

But I may say now that it is not the purpose of the people included in the "We" to form a denomination. If we are denominational in any sense, and we are, it is because we are forced to be so. If I say the church of Christ is not a denomination all my denominational friends who hear the statement understand that I claim that a certain sectarian body of people calling themselves the "Church of Christ"—a denomination denominated church of Christ—is not a denomination and to them it is a contradiction and a puzzle. But if I can make them understand that I use the terms church of Christ in its scriptural sense—to include all Christ's followers, all of God's children; that I mean the same when I say Church of Christ or Christian

Church (either is acceptable to me) that I do when I say the Christian religion then they will agree with me. When you speak of the Christian religion everybody understands that you refer to the principles of righteousness and right living given to the world by Christ; to be the religion taught by Christ and not to some parts of it taught by a certain religious party. Well now that is just what I mean when I speak of the church of Christ. You would as well try to separate the sunlight from the sunshine as to try to separate the religion of Christ from the church of Christ, or *vice versa*. "Oh," our friends are ready to say, "I know the Church of Christ in that sense, the great church of Christ, the universal church is not a denomination." Well, that is the sense in which we speak of it. "Yes," some one objects, "but if you speak of the church in its universal sense—the one that includes all Christians—why do you say 'we' are not denominational? Do you include all Christians in the term 'we'? Some Christians *are* denominational. Do you not admit that there are Christians among the denominations?"

No, we do not mean to include all Christians in the "we"—if there are Christians in the denominations, we do not include them for we are speaking of Christians who are not in a denomination—Christians who do not compose a denomination. But if we group undenominational Christians, separate them into a party and distinguish them from other Christians have we not made them a denomination? We must admit that we are a distinct group. But it is not our fault. We are forced to it. We are forced to be denominational by reason of the fact that we are undenominational. I can illustrate that this way: Let us suppose that we have on this desk a great heap of cards. Some of the cards are stamped with figures, 2, 4, 6, 8, etc., and there is a great number of them that are unstamped—have no figures on them. I am set to the task of separating these cards and classifying them. I place the "twos" in one stack, the "fours" in another stack, the "sixes" in still another stack and so on until I have stacked all the different numbers in separate

stacks; and then I have a stack of cards that we would call nondescript—unstamped cards. They are a stack of cards just as much as the others are. But let us give to the cards human intelligence and place in them the purpose that we have as Christians and we will witness a great debate. A card from the stack of "fours" arises and says, "Here, you fanatical and inconsistent fellows, you claim to be unstamped and unstacked and yet you are bunched, stacked and classified as much as any of us." Then a card from the nondescript bunch arises in his righteous indignation and vehemently denies. He says, "We are not classified. We are not a stack of cards; We are just cards." But they are a stack of cards, as you can see. They are forced to be in a stack to themselves because the others are separated into stacks and left them alone. They are classified by reason of the fact that they are unclassified. It is not their purpose to be a separate and distinct division of cards. They think that all cards ought to be just cards and all be stacked together in one big stack, but these other cards are all stamped with different figures and are therefore distinguished from one another and from those unstamped. The stamp differentiates them and that forces the unstamped cards to be *classed* as unclassified or else be stamped and go into the different stacks and they know that they can never all be one stack as long as they are separated into different classes.

You can all see the application. It is in this sense that we are denominated. We are forced to be a separate body of people because we are undenominational; because we will not have put upon us the party names, marks and brands of the different denominations. We want the fellowship of all of God's people and we will affiliate with anybody in anything the Bible sanctions, but we can not have the fellowship of our denominational friends without going into their peculiar and several denominations. We are therefore left in the predicament of being a separate people by virtue of the fact that we are undenominational. We have no denominational organization. Thank God

we have no pope to boss us, no ecclesiastical court to try us and anathematize us, no council, convention, conference or synod to make laws to bind our consciences, and no human creeds to trammel and hamper us in our search after the will and way of God. If we are denominational then it is because our purposes and work as a body of Christians—undenominational Christians, simply Christians, Christians *only*—make it necessary for us to labor apart from the denominations or else become members of some one or different denominations and thus perpetuate divisions. And division is wrong, we know.

I was once in conversation with two preachers when one of them said, "It is unfortunate that we have so many antagonistic denominations." I said, "I agree with you. It is indeed unfortunate." He said, "Do you suppose we will ever all agree, your denomination and my denomination and all the others? I would be willing to be a member of a disappearing brotherhood in order that we might unite; willing for my denomination to be swallowed up and lose its identity and its name in the great merger." I said, "Thank God for that. If all denominational people felt that way there would be hope." He said, "Would you be willing for that?" I said, "I am not a member of a denomination. I wear no name but the divine—the name all followers of Christ wear—Christian. You would not ask me to give that up." He said, "Your name is all right, but I can't see to save my life why your church is not a denomination." I said, "I will show you. I'll make you see it." I then related to him how I became a Christian. I heard the gospel, believed on Christ, repented of my sins, confessed my faith in Christ before men and was baptized into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit and arose from that burial to walk in a new life and I have ever since tried to walk worthy of the calling. I did none of these things because they are taught by a church or required by a party but because they are the plain commandments of my Master. Is faith a sectarian doctrine, a denominational requirement? Is repentance? Is the confession of the

name of Christ such a doctrine? Is baptism in Christ's name a sectarian doctrine? If so, why? Is it not commanded by the same Lord, authorized by the same God who requires us to have faith?

When I had told of obeying Christ in these things I asked the preacher if he thought I was a Christian. He replied unhesitatingly, "O, yes, I accept you as a Christian. I think you are saved." I said, "You accept me as a Christian and yet you would not receive me into your denomination until I became something else—take some other steps." He said, "Of course you would have to submit to the rules of our church." I said, "Now that is a thing I have never done. I have never agreed to submit to the rules of any denomination. I have never subscribed to any creed made by men. I have only given my heart and life to the Lord. Now can you see why I am not a member of a denomination?"

Now the next question is why do we not want to become a denomination? Why do we object to denominationalism? We are hostile to all denominations and we may as well frankly state it. Of course we are not antagonistic to the people of the denominations for we should have love for all and ill will toward none and true Christians do, but I say again tonight that we are hostile to denominations because we believe denominationalism is wrong. We believe it is contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures, and opposed to Christian unity. The Bible teaches that all Christians should be one. The night our Lord was betrayed and just before He fell into the hands of sinners He prayed in the upper room with His disciples, and a very earnest prayer it was. It embraced all his disciples both present and future and the great petition for them was that they might be one. "Holy Father, *keep* them in thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are." "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one." "That they may be one even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they

may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me and lovedst them even as thou lovedst me" (John 17:11,20,22). In the first chapter of First Corinthians, 10th verse, Paul says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and the same judgment. For it hath been signified unto me concerning you, my brethren, by them that are the household of Chloe, that there are contentions among you. Now this I mean that each one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollo; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized into the name of Paul?" Could the apostle have condemned divisions in stronger language? and *shall we* not cry against them today? Again when he asked, "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? And were you baptized into the name of Paul?" Did he not mean to make them ashamed and is not that the strongest form of denial? Meaning of course Christ is not divided; Paul was not crucified for you; ye were not baptized into Paul's name. If they were forbidden to wear Paul's name because he was not crucified for them and because they were not baptized into his name then it follows with a clearness of a demonstration that they should all wear the name of Him who *was* crucified for them, and into whose name they *were* baptized.

In the 4th chapter of Ephesians the same apostle says, "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Unity and peace! Sweet words, those! Every Christian's heart-desire and prayer to God is for unity and peace.

Right here let me say that Paul gives us in this place a rule by which we may keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond

of peace, namely, lowliness, meekness, long sufferance, forbearance, love. If we possessed these we would be rid of our contentions and strife. But instead we have pride of position, glory of name, zeal for the party, and bias for dogmas. If we had as much zeal for the spread of the gospel as we have for the promulgation of our party platforms and demonstrational tenets we would soon all be one—all engaged in the same work with one purpose of heart. Then we would send the gospel around the world like a belt of golden glory.

Surely it is not necessary to quote other Scriptures to prove that divisions are wrong! That God wants us to be united; that we should be one as God and Christ are one.

3. But will the denominations *ever* be united? Will they *ever* be one? I answer unhesitatingly, No, The denominations will never be one. He who hopes for that has a vain hope. He who works for it and prays for it works and prays uselessly. I don't hope for it, work for it, or pray for it.

Now I hope and pray that the time will come when there will be no denominations, but I do not hope to see all the denominations federate or merge into one gigantic organization; one great denomination. No, indeed I don't want to see that and never expect anybody else to see that. That can never be. The more denominational we become the farther away we get from *Christian* unity—unity and union as *Christians*, one as children of God and not one in an organization; one by the rules of the organization or by the creed of the mammoth denomination. We can never have organic union. It would be a sad day for the world if we should have. The Christian religion is not an organized religion. There is no organization known to the Bible larger than a local congregation. Every congregation is an organization with its divinely appointed officers, bishops and deacons, who have the oversight and charge of that congregation, but that congregation is independent of all other congregations and its officers have no jurisdiction over any

other congregation. We may have a cooperation of congregations, but we can never have a corporation of congregations if we wish to follow the New Testament order. To have a corporation with a common head or controlling board—to form a diocese with its exalted ruler—is to depart from New Testament simplicity and to embark for Rome; it is to reject the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ and pattern the ecclesiasticism of the "Lord God (?) the Pope." Such things are inimical to the spirit of Christianity. The denominations around us are called Protestants. Do you know why? Because they protested against the authority of the Pope,—against the Roman hierarchy. They claimed that the individual should be free to read the Bible for himself and not have to have it doled out to him by the Pope and his priests. They said all Christians are equal and every man should be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Our fathers fought and died to gain this freedom for us and having gained it they wrote that principle into the constitution of our government.

Yet in the face of all this these denominations—the same that protested against such things—have grown into great ecclesiasticisms with officers of different rank—a hierarchy, you see—and different titles of honor and degrees of authority. Each one aspiring to go higher and the question among all is "Who shall be the greatest." These officers make laws for the denomination and each man who joins the denomination must subscribe to their creed, obey their rules, and puts himself under their lordship. All this with the blessed Master telling us—"The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. *But ye shall not be so*" (Luke 22:25). He said again of the Pharisees that they love "to be called of men, Rabbi. But be ye not called Rabbi; for *One* is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth; for one is your Father, even he who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters, for one is your master, even Christ" (Matthew 23:6-12). How can we

now call the pope God, or the priest father as the Catholics do? Or how can we call the Bishop Right Reverend and the preachers Reverend as the Protestants do? How can we have High Churchmen and Low Churchmen and Down-in-the-Cellar-Churchmen. How can we have aristocrats, plutocrats, and proletariats in religion?

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. What is the etymology of the word denomination?
2. Is everything that is named denominated?
3. What is a name for?
4. If we allow the claim that all who profess to be Christians are Christians, then does the name Christian distinguish one Christian from another?
5. Is it then a denominational name?
6. If we have separate groups or kinds of Christians, do we not have to have a distinguishing name for each kind of Christian?
7. How many different kinds of Christians should we have?
8. What then makes denominational names necessary?
9. Are divisions right? What Scriptures can you cite to prove that divisions are wrong?
10. From what do the different denominations derive their names?
11. Give some denominational names to illustrate the point.
12. Is it difficult to make people understand you without using denominational phraseology? Illustrate.
13. When people ask, To *what* church do you belong, what does that imply?
14. If you answer, I belong to the Church of Christ or the Church of God, would they not immediately ask, Which?
15. Would that not imply that you named two churches?
16. If you simply say, I am a member of the church of

Christ, have you not told "*What*" church? Then does that not imply that the Church of Christ is *a church* among churches?

17. Have you not then denominationalized the name?

18. If you say, I am just a member of Christ's body, would people understand? If they ever come to understand, would then Christ's Body become a denominational designation?

19. Then is it possible for us to be undenominational without being misunderstood?

20. Would not, then, a kind and clear explanation be a good way to teach the truth?

21. In the light of New Testament teaching, is it not just as sensible to say, To what Christ do you belong as it is to say to what church do you belong?

22. But when people are not acquainted with New Testament teaching and use and understand terms as they are used today, in the light of existing conditions, do we not have to take this into account and speak so as to be understood?

23. How can we do this without using denominational phraseology? Or without using scriptural phraseology in a denominational sense?

24. If the term Christian is a denominational name, then do not those who have a name in addition to Christian—as Baptist Christians—have *two denominational names*?

25. If church of Christ is a denominational designation, then why do the Eddyites have to add the word "Scientists" in order to identify their group?

26. What of the illustrations with cards? Does this make any point clear?

27. Were not the unstamped cards a separate stack of cards? Were they not as distinct a stack as any other stack?

28. What distinguished them from the other stacks?

29. Who was responsible for this distinguishing peculiarity?

30. Is this point apt when applied to Christians?

31. What is the basic assumption upon which this illustration is made?

Answer: Since all were *cards* regardless of the distinguishing stamps or marks, then all the people contemplated are Christians, regardless of denominational differences.

32. Was this the assumption upon which the *restoration plea* was made?

Note: This point will be discussed fully in a later chapter, but the students should begin now to think upon the point and to watch for anything that will throw light upon it.

33. When we use the terms "we," "us," and "our," do we have a well defined idea as to who is included in the terms?

34. Do we intend to include all Christians or only a limited number of Christians?

35. If a limited number, what marks the limits?

36. Are not such limitations sectarian? Why not?

37. Is oneness or unity taught in the Scriptures?

38. In what sense do the denominational people claim *we are one*?

39. What do they mean when they sing

"We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in hope and doctrine,
One in Charity"?

40. Is there any sense in which this is true?

41. If we have invisible and spiritual unity but visible and physical separation, is this the unity for which Christ prayed?

42. Are not two congregations of the Lord's people physically separated?

43. Is this parallel with denominational separations?

44. Can you show a difference between *unity* and *uniformity*?

45. Suppose someone argues that what we have is *unity* but what we do not have is *uniformity*, how would you deal with that argument?

46. Should we try to have uniformity?

47. Will the denominations all ever unite?

48. Would it be desirable for them to merge or combine into a giant body?

49. What then is the first essential to unity?

50. Upon what basis can we ever attain unity?

CHAPTER FOUR

A Discussion Between Sampson Schismaticus and Daniel Didacticus

**(Samp enters Searcher's Sanctum and finds Dan reading
Restoration Literature.)**

1. D. D.: "Good morning, Samp. Come right in. I hope you are feeling fit. You did not come back 'on the morrow' as you promised, or threatened."

2. S. S.: "No, I was hindered. I've had a lot of things to do recently. You didn't get the idea that I was afraid, did you?"

3. D. D.: "No, no, Samp, nothing like that. On the contrary, I thought perhaps you had decided to show mercy to me and postpone my annihilation. You were going to rub me out, you know."

4. S. S.: "You think you are smart. Always trying to quote something clever. That reference to I Kings 20:11 was a cute cut, I must say. No doubt, you laughed uproariously with your folk when you thought of my looking that up and reading it. That was a great feat, you thought."

5. D. D.: "Well, it caused you to read a passage in the Bible, —that was quite an achievement, Samp."

6. S. S.: "Well, it did not show any great intellect on your part. I'll wager that you had read where A. Campbell or some other of the pioneers had used that passage in exactly the same way. It was not original with you."

7. D. D.: "You are entirely right, Samp. But I am not the man that boasts of special and superior enlightenment. I can do nothing of myself (John 15:5; 2 Cor. 3:5; John 5:19,30).

I 'look backward' and depend on authority. And I borrow from the true men of God who went before me. They believed the word of God, meditated on it, quoted it, defended it, loved it and lived it. 'Their works will follow them'."

8. S.S. : "O, I thought your claim is that you do not follow men. No, you are not the offspring of A. Campbell or of any other uninspired man. Dan, you are the man that has the way that is right and can't be wrong!"

9. D. D. : "You *thought!* Samp, you never had a *sound, logical thought* in your life. At least, you never reached a sound conclusion from logical thinking. We follow men as they follow Christ (1 Cor. 11:1). Our claim, as you should know, is that we do not teach for doctrines the commandments of men (Matt. 15:9). Anyone who is sound in the faith and pure in life can teach and lead us in the service of the Lord. But we are not proposing to 'run with modern giants and shout with the minds that have been emancipated.' No, our intellects are still fettered by truth and circumscribed by sanity."

10. S. S. : "And you still indulge in low insinuations, Dan. That 'sanity' remark was beautiful! You imply that modernistic thinkers and philosophers, such as I read, are not sane."

11. D. D. : "Don't get sensitive, Samp; you know better than to accuse me of insinuating and implying something that I will not say! I often boldly declare just what you accuse me of insinuating. Modernistic philosophy is not sane; and some of the philosophers from whom modernists derive their views were personally insane. Either their philosophy produced their insanity or their insanity produced their philosophy. Take your choice. Furthermore, some of the founders and fomenters of present-day thinking were sex perverts. How is that for an insinuation?"

12. S. S. : "Of whom do you speak? Give us some instance, Dan."

13. D. D.: "You do not know anything about Nietzsche and Freud, do you?"

14. S. S.: "Yes, I know about both of them. Nietzsche was a philosopher and Freud a scientist: a psychologist."

15. D. D.: "Yes, and Nietzsche spent ten years in the insane asylum. He is the author of the super-man idea. To be a super-man, you must rise above all sentimentality; you must not countenance any such maudlin things as love or mercy or sympathy. All Nazi cruelty came from the Nietzsche teaching. Freud is the author of psycho-analysis, and he teaches that everything is based on sex. Even music, art and religion are all just so many expressions of the sex passion. He justifies perversions."

16. S. S.: "Well, I don't follow those guys."

17. D. D.: "No? Do you not realize that underlying all modernism are the theories of Kant and Nietzsche and Freud? Without the support of their theories, there could be no modernism."

18. S. S.: "Wait a minute. What are we discussing? I came over here to convince you that Campbell started your church, and you promptly changed the course of the conversation. Now aren't you the 'artful dodger'?"

19. D. D.: "I beg your pardon, Samp. I am not dodging anything, I am only replying to the points you raised. I want you to lead. You take the floor and state your proposition and advance your arguments. I will not interrupt you."

20. S. S.: "Now that is really kind of you, Dan, and I believe you mean it. But you'll 'butt in' on me before I get very far. You can't take it.

"Well, here are the facts, 'rough hew them how you will.' We have a group of religious people known as the Church of Christ, and we begin investigating to know who they are, how

many people in the number, when they came into existence, where and how and what for, etc., etc. Naturally, we go to the Bureau of Statistics or to the Census Bureau at Washington. There we find that this sect began registering in the Year 1906—just forty-three years ago. Dan, you have been preaching about that long, yourself. I heard you preach forty years ago."

21. D. D.: "I have been preaching longer than that. And, if 'my sect' just began in 1906, pray, whose sect was I preaching for in 1904 and 1905, etc. You see, Samp, you have lost your beginning point right there . . ."

22. S. S.: "Now, Dan, you said you would not interrupt me. I was going to explain. We find that this sect just began registering as a separate group in 1906. Before that, they had been included in the group that registers as the Disciples of Christ or as the Christian Church. You see, Dan, I am telling you facts. From 1906, we will have to travel with the 'digressives' on our backward march. Before that year, the Disciples published a denominational yearbook which included the anti-organ faction and all the others. But in 1906, J. W. Shepherd—you knew him, Dan—who was then Office Editor of the Gospel Advocate got the Census Bureau to put the Church of Christ in a separate class and he campaigned to get all the anti churches to register. He then compiled and published a booklet called 'List of Preachers of the Church of Christ.' This list included you, Dan. It has been enlarged, but it is still published and you are still in it. Then somebody got up a catalogue of all the anti churches, and that is still published. These books are corrected and published each year. So here we have a denomination with its denominational yearbook: its statistics are obtainable. It has papers, schools and colleges, etc., just like any other denomination—Hold! Now you wait, Dan. Thus we can designate or denominate the group, investigate it, learn its origin, its strength—financial and numerical, learn of its agencies or enterprises—their number, their names, their locations and their value—the

amount of investments they represent. We can learn their creed—or what they believe and teach from any preacher, any paper or any school among them. And one would better learn that creed letter perfect before one claims their fellowship; if one veers to the right or the left a hair's breadth, one will be cast out of the synagogues—(You keep quiet now, Dan.) and yet they—you, Dan, have the unmitigated audacity, the colossal gall to claim that they are not a denomination, *not a sect*—not a separate people with boundaries clearly observable, statistics easily obtainable and tenets immediately accessible. And what is more, they themselves keep their boundaries clearly defined and marked out, their statistics corrected and published and their doctrines debated, defended and proclaimed. And all the time they are constantly crying: 'We are not a sect—or separate people; we have no boundaries; we know no statistics; there ain't no *our* doctrine; *we ain't no we*, no how—(Hold, now Dan, I know it is hard on you, but you must face the facts for once. I am not denouncing you, I am only describing you. That's what makes it hurt.)

"This sect began registering in 1906 as a separate people. Hence, that is their *beginning as a separate people*. That is your birth date, Dan.

"The Disciples, a sect or a separate people, with whom the Church of Christ was included up to 1906, began with Thomas and Alexander Campbell. I am now ready to prove that . . ."

23. D. D.: "You have talked about thirty minutes, Samp. When are you going to let me speak?"

24. S. S.: "You broke in on me right then. You just will not keep quiet. If you will let me get through, then I will leave—I have an engagement—and you can get you up a reply at your leisure. You know, however, that you cannot deny facts; and that is what I am giving you."

25. D. D.: "So that is your plan! Nice scheme, I must say,

but you are not going to get away with it. You are not going to walk out on me, you Bolshevick! (*Dan arises and locks the door.*) Now go on with your recital of facts. I shall not deny any fact you state, but you must not distort facts and draw false conclusions, and that is what I am going to take care of when you get through. Now go on."

26. S. S.: "Dan, you are as mean as the Devil. I told you I have an engagement."

27. D. D.: "You surely do have an engagement. You are 'engaged' now, boy! Go on!"

28. S. S.: "I should have known better than to trust you. You will not be fair in an argument . . ."

29. D. D.: "Isn't it fair for *both* sides to speak? Is it fair to hit and then jump out of the ring and run off? Would a fighter ever win a decision that way?"

30. S. S.: "Well, there is no one here to referee our bout.

"I'll continue, but I am afraid we will not have time to cover the whole ground. I am only stating things that are obvious to everybody, except you.

"We saw that your group began a separate existence in 1906; that you now have a name and a local habitation—you are a denominational entity. Now we must deal with the group from which you pulled off—the Disciples. It will surely be admitted that they are a separate people—a sect or denomination. Then if we can prove that they originated with the Campbells we will have established our claim. (The enlightened men among the Disciples admit that they began with and grew out of the work of the Campbells. They have written their own histories and they reckon their beginning at Brush Run; it was the *first* church. They so state.)

"But let us observe and reason a little:

"Thomas Campbell was a preacher in the Presbyterian

Church. He quit the Presbyterians but he did not quit preaching. For whom did he now preach? He did not apply for membership in any other denomination. Yet he preached for a group that exercised all the functions of an organized denomination. They ordained Alexander Campbell to preach or as a preacher *to represent them*. He soon outstripped his father and was soon looked upon as the *head* of the group he represented: the group that ordained him and put him out: the group organized by his father. The group became affiliated with the Red Stone Baptist Association, but when Alexander could not get along with this Association, he withdrew and joined the Mahoning Association, *and so did all his group!* Thus, what the head did, the body did. Then Alexander became the head of this Association—that is, he controlled it. He changed the whole Association from Baptists to Disciples. Thus it ceased to be a Baptist Association and became a Disciple Association. Of course, the Baptists said it became a *Campbellite Association*—and I cannot see how you can deny it, since Campbell was its leader. They were following Campbell. Now do you deny that Campbell *began* anything? Wait, now! Who ordained Alexander to preach? Was it the Presbyterians? Was it the Baptists? If the Presbyterians, then he represented the Presbyterians and should be called a Presbyterian. If the Baptists, then he represented the Baptists, and should be called a Baptist. (He did and was, for a while). But if he was ordained by that group that T. Campbell assembled—started—and organized into the 'Christian Association of Washington,' then he represented the 'Christian Association of Washington' and should have been and was designated as the representative of that organization, group or sect. And when he became the leader of this group and they became his followers, what better name could have been given them than Campbellites?

"The organization grew and founded and published papers, soon had a distinctive literature. A. Campbell wrote some sixty volumes himself. He defined and formulated the doctrine of his

group in a book called 'The Christian System.' They founded and maintained schools. They held conventions—local and general—and they organized Missionary Societies and Benevolent Societies, etc. They are still going strong and organizing more and more agencies of the denomination, but Campbell started both it and them, and you can't deny it. You antis demurred on the music and the organizations, but you grew out of the Campbell movement. So that only enables us to trace not only one denomination back to Campbell, but two distinct and well defined sects.

"Let me go now, Dan, my time is out. I've only stated things that can be verified. You write your reply and publish it. That is what you will do, even if I stay. But you are going to howl over this road like an old hound on a cold trail that he can't straighten out. I don't have time to wait on you now. Let me go, please."

31. D. D.: "You didn't say 'pretty please.' If I am an *old hound*, you are a *man-gey pup*, so you just sit there and scratch, while I show you how quickly I can straighten out this trail and put that 'varmint' up a tree."

32. S. S.: "I'll concede, Dan, that you can use stronger terms than I can, and you can turn a quip into your favor pretty quickly. I will give you the plume on that point. Now may I go?"

33. D. D.: "Flattery will not work either, Sampson. But to leave off all quips and cuts, you honestly would not want to misrepresent good men—both living and dead—and not allow me to defend them, would you? If you are honestly mistaken, you should want to be corrected. If you are dishonestly handling the facts and discussing an issue that involves the record of the lives of good men now dead, and the consciences of millions of good people now living, you should be *exposed* and your *perfidy* should be branded upon you like the mark God placed on Cain."

34. S. S.: "I did not mean to make you angry, Dan. I am not dishonest, either."

35. D. D.: "No, I don't think you are, Samp. But you are so anxious to be regarded as *modern* and *broadminded* and *enlightened* that you gave up the faith of your childhood, and now when you come to discuss that faith, you repeat the same old false charges that were *exposed* and *refuted* a century ago. You have to condemn that faith in order to justify yourself in your cowardly repudiation of it in order to be reckoned *smart*. Men who have strong intellects, Samp, manifest that by their individuality and originality. Not by fawning before modern pedants and pretenders: not by seeking to attract attention by being novel and daring, or bold and blasphemous."

36. S. S.: "You are trying to browbeat and humiliate me, Dan. Now you show where I misrepresented facts, or you let me go."

37. D. D.: "Didn't I hear you say something about somebody who could not take it? Men who hand it out must learn to take it."

38. S. S.: "I only stated facts."

39. D. D.: "You stated some facts, Samp, but you stated more half-facts. You gave the wrong twist to facts and drew false conclusions. I'll show you:

"Your talk about J. W. Shepherd and 1906. In that year, I had already been preaching for some time. I was preaching the gospel and was not a member of any sect and held no sort of official position in any organization. Nothing that happened that year changed me in any way: my preaching was not changed, my relationships were unchanged. I was not in anything after 1906 that I was not in before that year. All this was true of Brother J. W. Shepherd himself, except that he had been preaching for a *third of a century* before 1906. He was not a member of any sect before that year and he was not a mem-

ber of any after that year. The year 1906 did not change the faith, the affiliation, the position or the practice of any of us.

"You say a group of people began registering that year as the *Church of Christ* and that Brother Shepherd compiled a list of preachers and entitled the booklet, 'List of Preachers of The Church of Christ.' You are as wrong as a rat in a snake's den. Some independent and Scriptural churches began that year to register as *churches of Christ* (Notice the plural, please.); and Brother Shepherd compiled a 'List of Preachers of the churches of Christ.' Some of these churches had been in existence for a hundred years and, as said, they were all independent and self-governed (except in faith, of course) bodies, but they had been included in *Disciples* statistics, though they had no connection whatever with that denomination. There is no sect and no record of a sect called *Church of Christ*. We may speak of the church of Christ in a universal sense, but in that aspect it has no organization, no 'local habitation,' no earthly head or headquarters, and it has no statistics. Its members are enrolled in heaven and no where else (Heb. 12:23). All of us have always stood for this basic truth. Let me read you this from Alexander Campbell, to wit:

There may, indeed, be "churches of God," "churches of Christ," "churches of the saints," in a city, as well as in a province or an empire. And there may also be but one church of Christ in a city or in a province. In both cases, however, a church of Christ is a single society of believing men and women, stately meeting in one place to worship God through the one Mediator. But a church of churches, or a church collective of all the churches in a State or nation, is an institution of man, and not an ordinance of God. Nothing in the constitution of a church of Christ is more evident than its individual responsibility to the Lord Jesus Christ for all its acts and deeds. No one can read, with proper discrimination, any one of the apostolic epistles,

without recognizing this great and important fact. (Millennial Harbinger, 1849, Page 223.)

"So, Samp, there is no such thing as a *Church of Christ* registering in Washington; and '*preachers of the Church of Christ*' is an expression that is Ashdodic. And 'a Church of Christ preacher' is Ashdodic and abominable. As for *church of Christ* schools, papers, etc., how can there be any such things since there is no *Church of Christ*? How can you have denominational institutions if you do not have a denomination? Churches of Christ are not combined or grouped and they cannot be taken in the aggregate.

"As to being a separate people: Of course, we are that, but we are not an organized group. We are Christians and the local groups are *churches*—New Testament churches. We are separated from everything that is false, wrong or in any other way sinful. Read 2 Cor. 6:17-18.

"Next I must answer what you said about the Campbells:

"You asked naively, Did not the Campbells begin or start anything?

"Yes, they inaugurated a movement back to the Bible: they rejected all human creeds and repudiated all denominational organizations, and human names for the people of God. They began to seek the old paths and to walk therein. They labored to restore the 'ancient order of things.' They built no organization and held no official position in any. When Thomas quit the Presbytery, he had no hope of support for his family except through the labor of his hands. He began farming. He was inexperienced in this and his neighbors helped him as he ministered to their spiritual needs. Alexander *never* accepted pay for his preaching. He was no professional preacher. He was a successful sheep raiser and agriculturist and became a very wealthy man. He labored in the Lord's kingdom night and day, by tongue and by pen, simply for the love of truth and for the glory of the Lord.

"The 'Christian Association of Washington' died when they, following the Thomas Campbell motto, learned more of the New Testament church. They formed a congregation—a church—at Brush Run. This they endeavored to form after the pattern of a New Testament church, though at that time neither of the Campbells had been baptized. It was this congregation that licensed Alexander to preach—and he preached before he was baptized. They learned the truth on *authority first*: no human creed or human authority. Then on *organisation second*: no organization except a congregation—local church—and each one independent of every other one. Then later they learned the truth on *doctrines*: Infant baptism was the first point upon which they were challenged, and began to apply the motto or rule. When authority for infant baptism could not be found, the Campbells knew that they had not been baptized. Thus they advanced step by step in restoring 'the ancient order of things.'

"Alexander changed to the Mahoning Association because he established a church at Wellsburg and this was in the Mahoning district. The Wellsburg church was accepted as a member church of the Mahoning Baptist Association, but all these churches ceased to be Baptist Churches and became simple churches of Christ. Then they discovered that an Association or combination of churches is unscriptural and they dissolved the Association in fifteen minutes. This took place in 1828 and it is referred to by A. Campbell in the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1849, p. 272.

"In 1804 Barton W. Stone and his colleagues dissolved the Springfield Presbytery as an unscriptural organization and began emphasizing the doctrine of congregational independence and the Word of God as the only and all-sufficient authority for Christians.

"Now for you to say that we have a *Church of Christ Organisation*, is an inexcusable misstatement. And your charge that the '*Christian System*' was intended or used as a creed or

a church manual is even worse. That falsehood was told even in Campbell's day. Here, let me read you a statement and a quotation from Homer Hailey's book—another Old Paths Book Club publication. Hear it:

In his debate with N. L. Rice, held at Lexington, Kentucky, November 15 to December 1, 1843, one of the propositions affirmed by Mr. Campbell was, "Human Creeds, as Bonds of Union or Communion, Are Necessarily Heretical and Schismatical." One of the sharpest and most caustic statements ever made by the great reformer and debater was in reply to the charge by Mr. Rice that his "Christian System" was used by Campbell's associates as a creed, when he said:

He that does not, or cannot appreciate the difference between making a doctrinal standard, to measure candidates for admission into Christian churches, and a book explanatory of our views of anything in the Bible, or out of it, is not to be reasoned with on any subject.

"The quotation Brother Hailey uses is from Page 783 of the Campbell-Rice Debate.

"Then, for you to say that these men who fought denominationalism so earnestly and labored so hard and at the cost of so much persecution to restore the truth of God—for you to say they founded a denomination and held official positions in it is a slander that I can hardly correct without becoming abusive, Samp."

40. S. S.: "All right, Dan. If you will let me go, I will not disturb the bones at Bethany any more at present. But Campbell did hold an official position. He was President of the American Christian Missionary Society, you know. What about that? Wait, wait, don't tell me now, I must be on my way, Dan, please."

41. D. D.: "Will you come back?"

42. S. S.: "You know I will; I like to see you get going on undenominationalism. You quit wisecracking when you get on that point. Please let me go.

43. D. D.: (Opening the door) "All right, Samp. Come again. Goodbye!"

44. S. S.: "Goodbye, Dan. Phew, it is good to be free again."

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Is Samp's charge that Dan used hackneyed witticisms justified?

2. Does a witticism always have to be original in order to be appropriate?

3. Is it best to relate where and how some other man retorted with witticism or a story and then say "I say the same in this case" or "that is my answer on this point," or is it best just to give the answer and say nothing about another man's use of it?

4. Is it wrong to follow men in any sense?

5. Is it wrong to honor men and to celebrate their memories?

6. Was Dan correct in his statements about Nietzsche and Freud?

7. Is it true that their theories underlie modernism?

8. Give the gist of Nietzsche's philosophy.

9. What common expression describing mental states is traceable to Freud's theories?

Answer: "Complexes."

10. What "Complex" described by Freud is the worst exaggeration or perversion of natural relationships?

11. What is meant by the "Oedipus Complex"?

12. Name another man whose philosophy underlies modernism.

13. What is the point that Samp made about the year 1906?

14. What began that year?

15. Had these churches been in existence prior to that date?

16. Is there a "Church of Christ" registering at Washington?

17. Is it correct for a missionary to say he represents the "Church of Christ"?

18. Whom does a missionary represent if he represents any body?

Answer: He represents Christ, if he is a true missionary. He is preaching the gospel, and not proclaiming the doctrines of some group or sect.

19. Does not a missionary represent his "sponsoring church"?

Answer: Heavens, No! What is there about a congregation that needs to be represented or proclaimed?

20. Is it possible, according to New Testament teaching, to have a church composed of *churches*?

21. What did A. Campbell teach upon this point?

22. Is it right, therefore, to speak of a "Congregation of the Church of Christ"?

Answer: No. A congregation is a church of Christ; it is not a unit in an organization known as Church of Christ.

23. Is it correct to say "List of Preachers of the Church of Christ"?

24. Is it correct to say "A Church of Christ preacher"?

25. Are there any such things as Church of Christ schools? Or Church of Christ Orphan Homes?

26. Why are the schools and orphan homes that are builded and supported by the Church of Christ *not* Church of Christ institutions?

Answer: There are no such institutions. Denominational institutions are builded, controlled and supported by the denomination: the decision to build is voted by the governing body or board; the money is appropriated from denominational funds and the rules are made and the operating

forces are employed by the same board or body or by some sub-agency under the governing body.

The *Church of Christ* as a denomination is *non est*. Of course, therefore, there are no denominational funds; no governing or appropriating board or body.

27. Do not churches of Christ sometimes operate schools and orphan homes?

Answer; No. Members of Christ's body as members of *a church* or of various churches may as individuals undertake to raise the money and build and operate such institutions. Any Christian or Christians may contribute—donate—to such an undertaking if he thinks or if they think it worthy.

28. Does such an institution belong to the churches because some churches contributed to it?

29. If so, then why does not an institution to which individuals have contributed belong to those individuals?

30. Could such individuals claim such an institution by law and take it out of the hands of those who are operating it? If not, why not?

31. Was not Samp wrong, then, in saying he could learn of the financial investments of the Church of Christ?

32. Did Dan do wrong in locking the door and in forcing Samp to hear his answer?

33. Can this be interpreted to Dan's discredit?

34. Did Dan make a satisfactory explanation of what Bro. J. W. Shepherd did?

35. Did he successfully defend the Campbells against Samp's charges?

36. Were any of the charges Samp made new?

37. Who long ago charged that the "Christian System" was written as a Creed?

38. Who answered the charge?

39. To what sources in restoration literature did Dan appeal in this speech?

40. What passages of Scripture did Dan cite?

41. Were any of these misused?

42. Can you give a clear and an understandable answer to those who want to know what Campbell did, if he did not found a church?

43. Can you explain that the churches of Christ did not come into existence in 1906?

44. Do you know whether or not this has ever been given as the date of their origin?

45. Did the churches of Christ secede or "pull out" from the Disciples. If so, then are the Disciples the older?

CHAPTER FIVE

The Church and Sectarianism

As this lecture is one of a series on the church and as some six or seven brethren have preceded me on this program it will hardly be necessary to give a lengthy definition of the church, at this time. The other speakers have no doubt clearly defined the word and described the institution that we are studying during this lectureship. However, the subject of this lecture makes it absolutely necessary that we have a clear understanding of what the church is; of what that word as used in this speech includes. We must, therefore, survey our field and learn the metes and bounds of our territory. If there is a repetition in this lecture of the thoughts that have been presented by the speakers who have preceded me you may blame the program committee who selected the subjects and assigned them to men who live in different states and at great distances from each other, and who were required to write their addresses before they came to the scene of action, and to the hour of delivery. There will be some repetition of thought in the different divisions of this lecture.

The points of this address, then, shall be given in the following order and in answer to these questions:

- I. The Church.
 1. What is it?
 2. Whom does it include?
 3. What names should be used to designate it?
- II. Sectarianism.
 1. What is a sect?
 2. The word sect as used in the Scriptures.
 3. "The Christian sects."
 4. Sectarianizing scriptural names.
 5. Rising above sectarianism.

Turning now to the task thus outlined let us consider

I. *The Church.* Paul tells us that the church, whatever that is, is subject to Christ in all things (Eph. 5:24); that Christ is the head of the church (Eph. 1:22; 5:23; Col. 1:18); that Christ "loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:25-27). The institution here called the church is not defined in these passages but what is said about it is sufficient to arouse interest and provoke inquiry in the mind of every intelligent reader. We may not learn what the church is from these references but we could not fail to note the relationship that it sustains to Christ. Christ loves it; has given himself up for it; has prepared to present it unto himself as something that is *holy* and *glorious*. Christ is its head and it is subject to Christ in all things. Whatever we do or regardless of what other lesson we learn we must never forget these basic truths. We must never give any recognition to any impudent assumption of power over the church by man, for its Head is divine, infallible and eternal. We must never suffer the church to submit to any laws, obey any orders or follow any decrees that emanate from any authority except from its divine Head. Nor can we allow the church to assume to be a self-governing, democratic body, making its rules and regulating its course by the vote of its members, for "the church is subject to Christ in all things." And the thought of corrupting or of polluting this cleansed and sanctified institution should perish before it materializes or before it finds form and substance in either word or deed. We should delight to use the exact phraseology of these passages and never hesitate or blush to apply the adjectives that the inspired penman here attached to the word church. Our language should need no explanation when we speak of *the church* and there should be no

embargo upon our tongues when we desire to enunciate the phrases *the holy church, the glorious church*.

1. What is the church? This question can be quickly answered in the exact language of the Scriptures. The most indifferent reader of the Pauline epistles could not overlook such expressions as "And he is the head of the body, the church"; "for his body's sake, which is the church," "the church which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all"; "the house of God which is the church of the living" (Col. 1:18,24; Eph. 1:22; I Tim. 3:15). And then with only a modicum of mental effort he would see that "we are members of his body" (Eph. 5:30); and that, "Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (I Cor. 12:27): that "All the members of the body, being many, are one body: So also is Christ. For in one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one spirit" (I Cor. 12:12-13). That Christ is "high priest over the house of God" (Heb. 10:19), and that he is not a servant in the house but that he is "A Son over his house whose house we are" (Heb. 3:6).

With these quotations before us we are forced to see that the church is the body of Christ, the house of God and that individual Christians are the members of that body and that collectively they compose that house. And these Christians are elsewhere referred to as the household of God and as being builded together as a Temple and a habitation for God (Eph. 2:19-23). Therefore the followers of Christ, Christians, regenerated or saved persons compose the church. We read that God added to the church day by day those that were being saved (Acts 2:47). Since this was done each day as they were saved—the same day they were saved—it follows that no saved persons ever remained out of the church overnight. The idea therefore of being a saved person, a Christian, and not being in the church is not only unscriptural it is absurd. One could no more be saved and not be added to the church than one

could be born and not thereby be added to the family into which one is born.

2. *Whom does the church include?* This question has just been plainly and completely answered and you are no doubt wondering why it should be repeated and used as a sub-heading in this discussion. But your perplexity will soon pass and the reason for this will immediately become apparent. This question has ramifications that must be fully run out and removed.

Since the church is the body of Christ and Christians are severally members thereof it is inevitable that the body includes all of its members, therefore includes all Christians, of course. Since the church is the household of God it must of course include all of the children of God. God has no children who are not allowed to live in his house, associate with and enjoy the fellowship of the family and to inherit the blessings to which all his children are heirs. Any institution that does not include all of God's children cannot be the church of God. Even if such an institution is composed entirely of Christians, contains only Christians, and yet does not contain all Christians it cannot be the church of God. The best that it could claim to be is a faction of the church of God, therefore a sect, as we shall see. To apply the terms *the church*, or the church of God, or the church of Christ to any limited number of Christians is to sectarianize these Scriptural phrases of which we shall soon speak more particularly.

The church of the New Testament includes all Christians of every race, color and clime. It not only includes all Christians who now live but it includes all Christians who have ever lived since the day of Pentecost. Paul speaks of the whole family both in heaven and on earth (Eph. 3:15). God does not have two families—one in heaven and the other on earth. He has one family and a part of it is in heaven while the other part is still sojourning and suffering on the earth and Our Father speaks to the blessed dead beneath the altar; and bids them

rest until their *fellow-servants, their brethren* upon the earth should finish their course (Rev. 6:9). They are still our brothers and we are theirs. Paul tells us that whether we live or die we are the Lord's (Rom. 14:7-9). Death does not change our relationship to Jehovah. We are his children while we live and we are none the less his children after we are dead for all live unto him (Luke 20:35). Therefore God's family, God's church is composed of all God's redeemed children in heaven and on earth.

We become children of God and therefore members of the church of God by the spiritual birth—the birth of water and the spirit—or by conversion or by obeying the gospel. Nothing less than this can make anyone a Christian—a member of the church in the true sense. People are in a general way recognized as Christians if they possess some outstanding Christian characteristic—if they are charitable and truthful and kind. This however, is not enough. "Ye must be born again."

3. *What names should be used to designate the church? The church* is the only designation that the body of Christ needs when it is thought of as a called out host or band of people. When other features or characteristics of the holy institution are contemplated it is designated as a bride, a body, a house, temple, kingdom, army, et cetera. The church is nowhere named in the Bible in the sense in which we speak of church names. Why should it be? The word church is a noun that is applied to the institution of which Christ is the founder and head. It is therefore the name that is divinely given to that redeemed host who compose Christ's body. No limiting or distinguishing adjective is ever used to modify this noun in God's word. There are adjectives that describe qualities or attributes of the church, but there is never any term attached to that noun that would designate *a church* among many churches or to name the particular church that is in mind. I repeat, the church is nowhere named in the New Testament. All our talk about the Scriptural names for the church is simply unscriptural jargon.

We may talk about the names that are given to individual members of the church and these are several, and we may, if we have intelligence enough not to make a distinction where there is no difference, apply these names to Christians collectively, hence to the church, without contravening any principle of divine teaching. Paul did this when he spoke of the "churches of the saints" and of the "church of the first born who are enrolled in heaven" meaning the church of the children of God or the Christians, of course. We may apply any terms to the church that express any Scriptural thought concerning the church. If the terms used convey a Scriptural idea and only a Scriptural idea the terms themselves are bound to be Scriptural even if they are not found *ipsissimis* in the Bible. We may correctly speak of the church as the New Testament church, the first century church, the blood purchased church, the apostolic church, the Christian church, the Christly church, the saintly church, the catholic church, the holy church, the cleansed church, the sanctified church, the Redeemer's church, the rock-founded church, the age-lasting church, the missionary church and so on until we have exhausted the entire teaching of the word of God concerning the origin and the organization, the attributes and the functions of that institution. We could without doing violence to the Scriptures speak of the holy, sanctified catholic church of God in Christ. That combination of words, as well as some of the others used in reference to church, might not escape the criticism of the teachers of English, but the idea that it expresses is entirely Scriptural.

While we may use any or all these descriptive designations of the church according as our purpose demands or our taste dictates, yet if we should exalt and set apart any one of them as *the name of the church*, we would be guilty of a serious error. We would be presumptuously supplementing the work of inspiration for no inspired man ever gave any name to the church.

The expressions "the church of God," "the church of the

living God," and "the churches of God" are found quite often in the Scriptures and the expression "the churches of Christ" is found one time in the New Testament. But no one of these expressions is intended as the name of the church. If it were that name would be used when the writer comes again to refer to the church and the expression would not be varied with each recurring reference. Furthermore, the initial capital letter that grammar always demands in spelling proper names would be used in each word of that name. The copyists and the translators failed to see this demand in these expressions for they did not turn the phrase into a proper name. These expressions, church of God and church of Christ denote ownership. They tell us something about that institution that is designated by the noun church. So also does the phrase "my church." That is not a name. "My" is neither a noun nor an adjective and could not form a part of a name, it is a pronoun in the possessive case and therefore denotes ownership of the church. Christ designated or denominated that building which he proposed to build by the noun,—name, *church*.

The church is called the "Israel of God" but that is not *the name* of the church. We read also of "the churches of the Gentiles," "the churches of the Laodiceans," "the church of the Thessalonians" (Rom. 16:4; Col. 4:16; I Thess. 1:1) but these expressions only describe the particular congregations referred to by naming the people who compose those congregations.

Abraham is called the "friend of God" and "the father of the faithful" but neither of these complimentary titles was his name. God gave him the name *Abraham*. The Jews of old were called by Jehovah "my people," "the people," "the people of God," "his people and the sheep of his flock" but no one of these was their name. Their God given name was Israel.

The word church is the singular and the plural form is found one hundred and twelve times in the New Testament when used to designate the kingdom of Christ. The Greek word

Ecclesia occurs one hundred and sixteen times but once it refers to the Jews in the wilderness and three times to the mob at Ephesus. The other hundred and twelve times the church of our Lord is named by this word. Yet never one time is it limited or distinguished by any qualifying adjective. We read that Christ "*loved the church,*" Christ is "*the head of the church,*" "*the Lord added to the church,*" Paul "*made havoc of the church,*" "*God hath set some in the church,*" "*unto him be glory in the church,*" "*Call the elders of the church,*" that the manifold wisdom of God "*might be made known through the church,*" etc. *The church* was a sufficient designation for inspiration.

To speak of the Latin church, the Greek church and the Anglican church is to restrict the word church in each case to a certain people and a certain language. The three terms designate three different peoples of as many different languages. While each one of the churches claims to be the Catholic church each one destroys the idea of catholicity by confining the church to the people of one language. The names Roman Catholic Church, Greek Catholic Church and Anglican Catholic church each contains a contradiction. The word catholic means universal and the words Roman, Greek and Anglican mean something particular and local. If the church is Roman or Greek or Anglican then it is not Catholic—not universal. It does not contain all those who acknowledge Christ as Lord, but only those of a definite brand. Therefore each one of these churches is a sect in the fair import of that word.

In his debate with Bishop Purcell, Alexander Campbell affirmed and Purcell denied this proposition:

"The Roman Catholic Institution sometimes called the Holy, Apostolic, Catholic, Church, is not now, nor was she ever, Catholic, Apostolic or holy; but is a sect in the fair import of that word, older than any other sect now existing, not the Mother and Mistress of all churches, but an apostasy from the only true, holy, apostolic and catholic church of Christ."

Since the expression *the church* as used in the New Testament designates the universal institution we do not need to insert the epithet *catholic* between the article and the noun.

II. *Sectarianism.*

1. *What is a sect?* The word sect means to cut off, to separate. The English word is from the same Latin root from which we get our word section. It denotes a part of a whole. The word section may refer to the dividing or the parcelling of a pie, an apple or of a body of land. But the word sect connotes a division of a people according to religious or philosophic principles. Those who compose the different sects must belong to one people. They must be one on some general principle. If they were not one in some sense they could not be divided. The Jews were a special race of people. They were one in blood, in history and in the broad outlines of religion. They all recognized the one God, one Law-giver and one law. But they were divided over interpretations of the law and over speculative opinions. The best known sects of the Jews were the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes. The unbelieving Jews characterized Christianity as a new sect; a sect among the Jews, a new division or party among the one people—Jews.

The Greeks were one people—distinct from other people. As the Jews were devoted to religion and to religious controversy the Greeks devoted themselves to philosophy and to philosophical speculations. The Greeks were divided into sects. The two most prominent sects among the Greeks were at first the Cynics founded by Antisthenes and the Academics who were followers of Plato. Later the Cynics became known as Stoics and the Academics as the Peripatetics. Still later these became known as Epicureans.

We would not think of comparing one of the Jewish sects with one of the Greek sects because they are not parts of the same whole. Their fields of thought were entirely different. They were not one in blood, in religion, in philosophy or in any

other sense except they both belonged to the human family. The terms Greeks and Jews would be sufficient to distinguish them from each other without descending to the details of the particular sect of the Jews or of the Greeks to which an individual might belong.

This illustrates the fact that different sects must belong to the same general body. Religious sects are composed of people who have the same religion. The sects, as we speak of them today, are sects among professed Christians. They are believers in the Christian religion and claim to follow Christ. That is why they are sometimes called "Christian Sects." They are all one in general outline. They are one in their agreement on some basic principles. In fact, if we would find and emphasize the points of agreement instead of the points of difference between them, we would find that there is such complete agreement on some of the most vital principles that we would feel that it should be an easy matter to remove the differences and bring them together. In solemn truth the principles upon which they are agreed if applied and adhered to would bring them together. In other words, if they practiced what they preached they would soon be united.

Especially is this true of Protestant sects. They all in a general sense recognize the same rule of faith, the same standard of authority. In the preface to "Wesley's Notes" John Wesley says, "Would to God that all sectarian names were forgotten, and that we, as humble, loving disciples, might sit down together at the Master's feet, read his Holy Word, imbibe his Holy Spirit and transcribe his life in our own." Speaking of the general rules in the Discipline, Mr. Wesley says, "All of which we are taught of God to observe even in his written word, *which is the only rule*, and the sufficient rule, both for our faith and practice."

In the Prayer Book of the church of England, in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and in the Methodist Discipline

the following substantially is found: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, or may not be proved thereby, is not required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or thought requisite or necessary to salvation." The words of Chillingworth have been adopted and quoted by all Protestants—"The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." Protestants are by this seen to be one in the most fundamental postulate. If they would live by this they would all be one in the Scriptural sense. But at any rate we see that the sects are only factions or portions or separate bands of the same great body of people—the people who at least accept Christianity as the true religion.

2. *The word sect as used in the Scriptures.* The word sect is found five times in the King James translation and six times in the Revised Version. It is from the Greek word *hairesis* and this word occurs nine times in the Greek New Testament. The Authorized Version translated it *heresy* four times and *sect* five times. The Revisers rendered it *sect* six times, *factions* twice and *heresies* once. While in three places it is applied to Christians it was so applied by their enemies and was not accepted by them. Paul did not admit that he was the leader of a sect but he confessed that after the manner which his enemies called *heresy or a sect* he worshipped the God of his fathers. The word does not have a favorable meaning at all. We have seen that our translators used the words *sect*, *faction* and *heresy* interchangeably and no one understands either faction or heresy to connote something that is good and praiseworthy. Paul numbers sects among the works of the flesh. He says: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, scorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wrath, *factions*, (*hairesis*—sects) divisions, parties, envyings, drunkenness, revelings, and such like" (Gal. 5:19-20). Thus the apostle classes *sects* or *factions* among the blackest sins ever committed by a fallen race and even goes so far

as to say "that they who practice such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God." Surely a more positive and severe condemnation of *sects* could not be asked for.

The apostle Peter speaks of damnable heresies or sects, or according to the margin of the Revised version, of "*sects of perdition*" (II Peter 2:1). Paul says there must be "factions or sects among you, that they that are approved may be made manifest among you" (I Cor. 11:20). In other words, there must be sects or sectarians among you in order that those who are not factious—not sectarian in spirit—may be known as the approved ones. The others of course are not approved.

Certainly sects and sectarianism are condemned in the Scriptures, not only in the strong admonitions for all saints to be perfectly joined together in one mind and one judgment and in the severe denunciations of divisions but also in the very use of the term *sect* and in its reprobation.

3. "*The Christian sects.*"

In his "Review of Campbellism" Dr. J. B. Jeter says: "Mr. Campbell aspired to the honor of being a *reformer*. That a reformation was needed by the Christian sects of that time none, who possess a tolerable acquaintance with their condition and the claims of the gospel, will deny." Dr. Jeter is by no means the only Doctor of Divinity who has characterized the sects as Christian. But we have seen that sects meet with unqualified condemnation in the Scriptures. They are called *damnable* by inspired writers and of course they cannot by those who respect inspiration be considered Christian. Yet we have seen that they originate among those who compose one body in some sense. They are simply the separating of Christians into different and warring bands. This being true, that is, since each band is composed of Christians why are they not Christian bands or sects? They are Christians to atheists or to people of a heathen religion. They profess to follow Christ.

As Moses E. Lard very aptly said, "sectarianism originates

in the church but finds its consummation out of it." When Christians become sectarians in spirit, when the partisan feeling runs high and becomes regnant, they then and thereby become un-Christian. Though it is often true that persons who by rearing or by some fortuitous circumstance are members of a sect and yet not at all possessed of a sectarian spirit.

This whole point is so dexterously handled by Brother Lard in his reply to Dr. Jeter that I here beg leave to give you his complete statement. He says:

"But Mr. Campbell never proposed a reformation of '*Christian sects*' as such. He proposed that all sincere and pious Christians should abandon these 'sects,' and, uniting upon the great foundation upon which, as upon a rock, Christ said he would build his church, form themselves into a *church of Christ*, and not into a 'sect.' A 'Christian sect' pronounces simply an impossible thing. Sects there may be, innumerable; but *Christian, as sects*, they can never be. A church of Christ is not a sect, in any legitimate sense of the term. As soon as a body of believers, claiming to be a church of Christ, becomes a sect, it ceases to be a church of Christ. Sect and Christian are terms denoting incompatible ideas. Christians there may be in all the 'sects,' as we believe there are; but, in them though they may be, yet of them, if Christians, clearly they are not. Mr. Campbell's proposition never looked to the reformation of sects as such. A sect reformed would still be a sect; and sect and Christian are not convertible terms. Sectarianism originates, and necessarily, *in the church*, but has its consummation out of it. Hence Paul, in addressing the church at Corinth, says, "There must be also heresies (*sectarianism*) among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest." But here is something which seems never to have struck the mind of Mr. Jeter. With the apostle, sectarianism originated with the bad, and the good, were excluded; but with Mr. Jeter it includes the good, and the bad excluded. How

shall we account for the difference? As soon, however, as the 'heretic' (the *sectarian*) is discovered in the church, he is, by the apostle's direction, to be admonished a first and second time, and then, if he repent not, to be rejected. Now we request to be informed by Mr. Jeter how, according to this rule, a '*Christian sect*' can exclude here '*sectarians*' and still remain a 'sect'? Heresy and sectarianism are identical, being both represented by the same term in the same sense in the original; and that which they represent has its origin in the flesh. Hence the same apostle, in enumerating the works of the flesh, mentions, among other things strife, sedition, *heresy*, (sectarianism). Heresy or sectarianism, we are taught by the Apostle Peter, is introduced into the church by '*false teachers*,' and is 'damnable'; and yet Mr. Jeter, with true foster-father tenderness, can talk of 'Christian sects'."

4. *Sectarianizing Scriptural Phraseology.* Divisions always call for party names and party names in return perpetuate divisions. Whenever a new sect is born some name must be applied to it that will distinguish it from all other sects. The factious or party spirit which gave rise to the new sect will very probably find expression in the appellation that is applied to the sect. The doctrine for which it contends will be intimated in its name or the man who led in the secession and formation of the sect will bequeath his name, willingly or unwillingly, to his party. Thus the spirit of division, the party spirit, becomes embalmed in the name and will be held as a precious treasure by members of the sect and given as a heritage to their children.

But since each sect usually makes a special plea for some point that it believes the Scriptures to teach and which others have neglected or perverted, it is but natural that such a sect would apply Scriptural terms to itself. Hence, we very frequently see a sect using a Bible phrase for its name; designating itself with Scriptural terms. And there are those who will contend that if the terms are Scriptural the name is proper. But

any sensible person who will give a sober second thought to the proposition must know that it is unscriptural to give a sectarian sense to New Testament terms. The terms themselves are right but that use of them is wrong.

The noun *church* is eminently Scriptural, as we have seen, but it is grossly unscriptural to apply that term to a sect. The *church* is composed of all the children of God and they "are severally members thereof" but to apply the term to a sect, faction or to only a portion of God's children, granting that all members of the sect are God's children, is bigotry and presumption.

The followers of Mrs. Eddy call themselves, when considered collectively, *The Church of Christ* and of course this is a Scriptural expression. But do these people use it in the New Testament sense? Are they speaking of the church that embraces all of Christs' disciples or do they mean to include only those disciples of Christ—granting that they are such—who subscribe to and agree in some principles that are peculiar to themselves—not common to all Christians? If they do that, then of course they have applied the name to a sect—sectarianized it. This is exactly what they do and they even add a qualifying term to show precisely who is included in the name. Hence upon the corner stone we read, "*Church of Christ, Scientist.*"

The followers of Joseph Smith afford us another illustration. They call themselves "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints" and then another faction records their division in its title and proclaims it in its insignia. It is "The Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." Now we all must admit that the expression *the church of Jesus Christ* is Scriptural; and while it might not be either euphonious or grammatical, *the church of Jesus Christ of All Saints* would not be unscriptural though it would be wrong to use it as a proper name. But when they add the limiting terms "of Latter Day" they clearly intend to include in their use of the word *church* only those saints—granting that they all are saints—

who live in modern times or in these last days. By their own admission, therefore, their sect does not include Peter and Paul and James and John or any other former day saint. Their sect cannot, therefore, be the church of Jesus Christ

The people who started out to restore the New Testament church and who adopted the maxims, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent" and "Bible names for Bible things, and Bible thoughts in Bible terms" have fallen into the error of using Bible terms in a sectarian sense. When we used Bible designations in their proper sense we could with no amount of persuasion induce our friends among the sects to apply these terms to us. They would concede that we were Christians but they vehemently insisted that we were "Campbellites"—that is, that we belonged to a sect of Christians. Our fundamental proposition was to destroy all sects and induce all followers of Christ to be Christians only and this was the one point that brought the bitterest opposition from all sectarians. They would allow us to differ from them on any special point of doctrine and still be friendly with us but they could never endure the idea that we were not a sect in the same way that they are sects. They might even concede that we had more truth than any of them had if only we would agree to make our portion of truth the creed of a sect. They did not care what we contended for if only we would make the contention as a sect. That is why our opposition has grown so weak in these days. We have, in spite of ourselves, become a sect whose special purpose is to contend against sectarianism. The word Campbellite has about disappeared from the vocabulary of our neighbors. Why? Because they are willing for us to have a Scriptural name if we will give it sectarian limitations. They are ready to concede us the right to form a sect and then to name that sect whatever we choose. They scruple not nor hesitate to call us "Disciples of Christ" using the capital "d" for disciples and thus making a proper name out of the expression. That denotes a sect and all *sectdom* is ready to felicitate

the newcomer. Or the terms "Christian Church" and "Church of Christ" using the capital "c" for church in each case are thus made proper names and they are entirely acceptable to our opponents. They become the name of a sect. They designate a special band of professed Christians and that is all any sect is.

But some brother whose feelings are deeper than his thinking is ready to rise and vociferate that the expression "*church of Christ*" is Scriptural. *Of course it is.* That could never be denied. So also is the expression "*disciples of Christ.*" It is not the expression that is questioned. It is the *use* of the expression that is wrong.

It is never wrong to speak of the church as the church of Christ or the church of God or the church of the saints or the church of the firstborn, but to repeat what has been said before, to exalt any one of these into *the patented name of the church* is to sectarianize that expression. If we have not done that very thing with the expression *church of Christ* then why do we not vary our terms in speaking of the church? Why is every deed made to the Church of Christ? Why is "Church of Christ" put upon every corner stone or front of every meetinghouse? Why does the "Church of Christ" have a literature series? So fixed and uniform is this designation that if we should insert the name of Jesus in the expression it would cause confusion. If a disciple were in a strange city and while looking for the meeting place of the saints he should come upon a house with this inscription, "The Church of Jesus Christ" if he did not pass it up he would hesitate and make further inquiry before he entered the house. He is looking for a church of the Lord but he is not looking for this particular one. He is looking for one that wears the stabilized, invariable name "Church of Christ." A name which, therefore, distinguishes it from the *church of Jesus Christ* or *the church of God* or *the church of the saints* and all other of the Lord's churches—implying, of course, that he has several. To use the terms *church of Christ* to include any lim-

ited number of saints or to make it *the name* of the church is to sectarianize the expression.

Brethren, I do not expect you to get this point without some suffering but if you will endure the necessary pain caused by forcing the needle through the skin by which you get the anti-sectarian serum your suffering will then be over and your spiritual condition will soon be much better. So may be.

5. *Rising above sectarianism.*

A more noble purpose never glowed in the bosom of any reformer, crusader or martyr than that which inspired those heroic souls who inaugurated what is known as the restoration movement. They had no intention of founding a new sect to contend for any special doctrine or for any particular set of Christian principles. They called upon all the professed followers of Christ to abandon sectarian names, remove sectarian boundaries, rise above the sectarian spirit and be members only of the church—the church which includes all Christians and teaches *all* Christian principles. Nor did they ever assume, much less say, that there were no people who were sincerely endeavoring to follow Christ among the sects. Nay, they proceeded upon the basis that the sects were all earnestly serving God day and night and they, like the grand apostle to the Gentiles, simply endeavored to show them all things that were spoken by the law and the prophets, by Christ and the apostles and to tell them how to reach that which they all hoped to attain. They did not found a church of their own and leave everybody out of it who did not agree with them. They did not make a fetish of baptism or of any other special doctrine. They proposed to teach just what the New Testament teaches on all question.

* * * * *

Moses E. Lard: We shall again avail ourselves of a few crisp, terse sentences from this fearless contender for the faith. In his review of Dr. Jeter, Page 31, he says:

"But Mr. Campbell does not claim for himself and his

brethren that they, as a body, exhaust the meaning of the term *the church*, nor that they are the only persons who are members of the church. Hence, no apology can be pleaded for Mr. Jeter's dishonorable insinuation to the contrary. Mr. Campbell concedes to all, no matter where found, who have been, in the true acceptance of the phrase, "*bam again*," that they are members of *the church* or body of Christ. True, he believes many of these members to be in organizations purely sectarian, and hence unsanctioned by the Bible. And to all such members his counsel is, "Come out of these organizations."

We now see what was the grand purpose of the restoration movement and in getting a clear conception of that purpose we at the same time get the vision of undenominational Christianity: of the holy catholic, undivided church. Of the united host of redeemed souls contending earnestly and in one voice for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

Some of us still have this vision and are prayerfully working toward this goal. Christ is our only Master and Lord and His Word is our only guide and law. His spirit is our desired disposition and Christ in us is the hope of glory. Substituting the word *revelation* for *nature* in Pope's language, we are

Slaves to no sect, who takes no private road,
But looks through revelation up to revelation's God;
Pursue that chain which links the immense design
Joins heaven and earth, and mortal and divine.

We strive to be Christian not only in name and claim but in deed and in truth. We strive to be Christians without entangling alliances: We strive for loyalty without bigotry: for sincerity without sanctimoniousness: for brotherliness without compromise and for love without limit.

Ye different sects who all declare
Lo, Christ is here or Christ is there
Your stronger proofs divinely give
And show me where the Christians live.

Note—This lecture by G. C. Brewer was delivered at Abilene Christian College and was published in the 1934 volume of lectures.

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. What is the Church?
2. From what word in the Greek do we get our word church?
3. Of what two Greek words is that word compounded?

Answer: *ek* and *kaleo*.

4. How many times does this word occur in the Greek New Testament? (See Englishman's Greek Concordance.)
5. How many times does it refer to the church of our Lord?
6. To what else does it refer in four instances?
7. What is the name of *the church*?

Note: You would as well ask, What is the name of John Jones.

8. Who founded the church?
9. Who is the head of the church?
10. To whom does the church belong?
11. By virtue of what is it his?
12. Who controls the church?
13. What organization does the church have? Or what organized form does it have?
14. Can we have a *church* composed of *churches*? If not, why not?
15. Whom does the church include?
16. Where are these names recorded?
17. Can we know just how many names the roll includes?
18. Can we know some names that are written there? (Phil. 4:3).
19. Do we know this or do we just believe it?
20. How about your own name? Can you have assurance on that point?
21. Are the church members registered in Washington?

22. Do not such reference works as the government reports and the World Almanac give the number of members in the churches of Christ?

23. Are these all the Christians in the world?

24. Is it right then for us to report to the government which virtually says, Here are all the people who are in the churches of Christ—All the Christians in the world?

25. Is it true that the report gives the number of all the Christians in the world?

26. Then does the report give the number of all the members of Christ's body in the world?

27. Do men die out of the church?

28. Then does not the church still include all who have died in it?

29. How are persons added to the church?

30. Is "Join the church" a Scriptural expression?

31. Is it not just as Scriptural to say "join the church" as it is to say "unite with the church"? Is it not just as Scriptural to say "open the doors of the church" as it is to say "extend the invitation"?

32. What is a sect?

33. Why do we call denominations sects?

34. Were there any sects in Paul's day? Careful now.

35. Does the word *sect* have the same meaning as the word *party*?

36. Does the word *sect* mean a *section* or "a part of"?

37. If a sect is a *part of*," of what is it a part?

38. If a sect is a part of the church, then is not the church composed of all its parts?

39. Do not the sects, therefore, compose the church?

40. Should they not then be called "Christian Sects" and are they not all in the church?

Answer: In that they all recognize Christ and not Moses or Buddha or Confucius, they are Christians—they are "parties," "groups" or "sects" composed of people who profess to follow Christ — to represent the Christian religion. In the true Bible sense they are not Christian. The terms "sect" and "Christian" are incompatible.

41. What is the Greek for sect?
42. How many times is this word found in the Greek New Testament?
43. How is it rendered in the A. V.? The R. V.?
44. Does the word connote something that is approved?
45. What qualifying term does Peter connect with the word? (2 Peter 2:1).
46. Along with what sins does Paul put sects?
47. According to Lard's argument and the Scripture he cites where do sects *originate*? Where do they *terminate*?
48. What good purpose do sects serve according to Paul? (1 Cor. 11:20).
49. But what good do the sects, sectarians—those guilty—get out of it?

Note: They are *not approved* (1 Cor. 11:20); they are *damnable* (1 Pet. 2:1); they *cannot inherit the kingdom of God* (Gal. 5:19-20).
50. Can Scriptural terms be used in a sectarian sense?
51. Illustrate how some Bible terms have been sectarianized?
52. Is the expression Church of Christ ever used in a sectarian sense? Give examples and illustrate.

CHAPTER SIX

A Discussion Between Sampson Schismaticus and Daniel Didacticus

As the days went by, Dan was so absorbed in the regular duties of his position as minister and elder of the church, and in his studies in Searcher's Sanctum, that he had not been aware that two or more weeks had passed since Samp had come to Searcher's Sanctum to prove that Dan is a member of a sect and that A. Campbell was the founder of that sect. Dan and Samp had known each other all of Samp's life; and, although Dan had often exposed some of Samp's false reasoning and had rebuked him on some points, he had always loved Samp. Samp had always seemed to love and respect Dan, and on non-controversial matters Samp had always come to Dan as a son to a father. Discussions between the two men had always been considered as informal and friendly, even though they did not spare each other in their arguments or their quips. These discussions were private and there was no possibility of either one injuring the other's reputation by any remark, as no one heard such remarks. It was well known, however, to both men and to all their friends, that Samp considered Dan out of date in his thinking; considered him a legalist and a radical. While Samp wanted to be known as broadminded, liberal and modern, he would agree with anything that masqueraded under the name of *modern* but he would repudiate and ridicule anything that did not have the stamp of modern upon it. At heart Samp loved an argument and, in fact, by nature he was a quibbler and delighted in a wrangle. He would not, however, for any consideration, have allowed his "parishioners" to know that he ever "stooped" to engage in a controversy on religious questions:

that would have been unpardonable in their eyes. To contend for any point, in their thinking, is to announce oneself as narrow, bigoted and intolerant. They believed nothing and knew less and, therefore, could not endure sound thinking or logical reasoning, and especially upon questions involving an issue among religious people.

All the facts given here were known to Dan and he had not expected anything at all to come from the friendly discussions that he had been having with Samp. He was greatly surprised, therefore, when one of his good friends and brothers, Phillip Worthy, came to Searcher's Sanctum with something upon his mind which seemed to embarrass him somewhat. The following conversation took place between these two men, and, from what they say, the reader can see the situation that had been created in Prophet's Pass.

D. D.: "Good morning, Brother Worthy, come right in. I hope you are feeling well and that everything is normal with you and your family."

P. W.: "Good morning, Brother Didacticus. Yes, we are well, thank you, and I suppose we have no reason to complain of the way life is serving us."

D. D.: "What do you have on your mind at this time?"

P. W.: "Well, I don't know how to begin, and I don't want you to think that I am blaming you for anything, but I would like to ask a question or two to see if I can get the truth on some things I have been hearing."

D. D.: "Very well, Brother Worthy, Let us have your questions and I am sure we can soon learn the truth on whatever it is that's troubling you."

P. W.: "Well, first, Brother Dan, I would like to ask if you, sometime ago, engaged in a heated argument with Brother Sampson Schismaticus."

D. D.: "Why, yes, Brother Worthy, Samp and I had one of our usual arguments not many days ago, but it was not especially heated, there was nothing unpleasant about it that I recall. I don't think Samp considered it unpleasant."

P. W.: "Well, is it a fact that you locked the door and would not allow Samp to leave until you had called him ugly names and abused him unmercifully?"

D. D.: "Ho, that's it! Well, yes, I did lock the door because Samp was trying to run out before I could reply to some things that he alleged and which did not square with the truth, but I did not abuse Samp. Why, Brother Worthy, who told you about this matter?"

P. W.: "Well, it is being talked among the women that you mistreated Samp in a most horrible way. Mrs. Wilsay Wylde-words saw my wife up town and told her that Mrs. Will B. Liplong had said that Samp was manhandled and mistreated in a shameful manner. She said that it had been talked at a meeting of the club over at Samp's church. I didn't think there was any truth in this but I thought I would come and see you about it."

D. D.: "Manhandled, indeed! Do those women not realize that Samp is twenty years younger than I am, that he is about four inches taller and weighs about fifty pounds more than I do? How could I overcome Samp in a physical fight?"

P. W.: "Well, I knew you had not made any attack on him, but from the report I thought perhaps you got too hard on Samp in the language you used, or at least the women said you did. They seemed to think that you called him vile names. Miss Etta T. Cake said that you used terms that reflected upon Samp's mother. Mrs. T. Brawney Brawl was very highly incensed and said she was going to send her husband, T. Brawney, down to your study to beat the face off you. Miss Dosa Bitters said she had been teaching for many, many years and that she

had chastised boys regularly for their misconduct and that she felt sure she could take care of you without having to call in T. Brawney. Mrs. Shurley Autoshave said she was going to report you to the sheriff and that her brother-in-law who is the County Attorney would prosecute you for aggravated assault. Mrs. Cedric Liversworse suggested to the club that it would be a disgrace to them to become involved in any such an affair and she thought it would be better to ignore it and to chastise Samp for ever going to your office. She said that if they did take it up, she believed you could be prosecuted for kidnapping since you locked Samp up in your office."

D. D.: "Well, this does seem to be a tempest in a teapot, or perhaps a Storm in a Sisters' Society. But what I want to know now is, where was Samp when all of this was taking place? Did he tell all of these things to the women? If not, how did they ever learn that such a condition existed?"

P. W.: "I didn't hear whether Samp was at their meeting or whether he had anything to do with what they were suggesting, and I can't answer as to his responsibility for this report's getting out. But, although these sentimental sisters are much opposed to abusive language, it seems that they are no paupers when it comes to thinking of uncomplimentary things to say about you. It is reported that they said you were coarse, crude, bigoted, narrowminded, intolerant and of low birth. From the report as it came to me, it wouldn't be safe for you to be in one of their meetings, Dan. Another Daniel was once providentially protected in a lion's den, for the Lord closed the mouths of the lions. But, from what I hear, Dan, the Lord would have a hard time closing the mouths of this group."

D. D.: "Ah, well, Brother Worthy, I am not concerned about what the ladies said. They had to be saying something, and, while this subject was on their minds, they gave vent to their emotions and these emotions were aroused by their imaginations, and their imaginations had been stimulated by a false re-

port; and, after all, if the ladies knew the facts, they would probably laugh over the situation that they have created in their own minds. I am concerned about Samp's part in this matter and I shall get him on the telephone in just a few minutes and see what explanation he can make. He has not been back here for about two weeks, and yet he promised to come back to finish a subject we were discussing. I know he is not offended at what I said, but if he knows that the women have been talking this way, he is afraid to come back lest they find it out and censure him for having anything to do with me. Of course, that is cowardly on Samp's part, but I have an idea that explains the situation. Before you brought this up, I had not realized that Samp had not been back for so long a time. If you will be patient, I will see if I can get Samp on the 'phone now and hear his explanation, then you may know it before you leave here."

Dan, accordingly, called Samp, and Samp responded in his usual cheery and cordial manner. When Dan asked him why he had not been back. Samp made excuses of usual nature: he had been busy and had not found time to resume the discussion. Dan asked him if he became offended at anything that took place in their last interview. Samp disclaimed this with a laugh and said he had not thought of any such thing. Then Dan asked him if he knew what the ladies of his church had been saying and Samp had to admit that he knew a little about it and seemed to be embarrassed that this report had reached Dan. He had to confess that it was through him that the first information had got out. He said he was so late getting home that his wife asked him for an explanation. He laughingly told her that he had got Dan down in an argument and that Dan had made him stay and hear his effort at refutation and had even locked the door. He said he told this in a laughing way and had no intention of accusing Dan of unChristian behavior and that he considered it all as a part of the friendly attitude that he and Dan had always had toward each other. Dan told him that he

had the responsibility now of correcting these rumors and that the best refutation of them would be for Samp to come on back to Searcher's Sanctum once and again in order to show that there was no anger or bad feeling between the two. Samp was ready to admit that this was the proper course and he assured Dan that he would be over again at an early hour.

According to his promise, Samp appeared at Searcher's Sanctum the very next day after his 'phone conversation and was his usual smiling self. Then the following discussion took place:

1. D. D.: "Samp, it is good to have you back in my Sanctum and, if you won't run out in a crisis, I will promise not to lock the door. There are many points that you and I have briefly touched upon that should really be discussed more fully; and, if you honestly think that some of the things that you charge are true, you ought to be willing to hear the other side of the matter."

2. S. S.: "I agree with that, Dan, but you know we *can* talk too long, and when we become involved in some of these discussions we can go over time without realizing it; and, when I do realize that my time is up I have to go. That's the explanation, Dan. I don't want to run out of an argument."

3. D. D.: "Very well, Samp, that is a plausible explanation, but you must not do all the talking and leave. When we both have had our say on the points, we may terminate the discussion for the time being and resume it again. With that understanding, there should be no further agitation about the things that have already gone by."

4. S. S.: "Well, now that we understand our plan of procedure, what points do you really think should be discussed more freely?"

5. D. D.: "You raised the question in our last conversation about A. Campbell being the President of the American Chris-

tian Missionary Society. This is a point that certainly must be discussed, but I really think it should come when we get farther along in the history of the Restoration Movement. You know we will have to discuss the points of difference between the Disciples and the churches of Christ; and, when this discussion comes up, the Missionary Society will be in for a lion's share, then we can find the truth about Campbell and his relationship to this organization."

6. S. S.: "I am willing to wait about the details in this division, but perhaps the fact that the division took place—as you admit that it did—in 1906, is a point that we might consider further. You stated that the Disciples were a sect and that the churches of Christ had been included with them up till the Year 1906 and at that time the churches of Christ became a separate group and, I would say, sect. You and these churches pulled out of what you admit was a sect, and that sect is the one that Campbell started. It seems to me, Dan, that you are in an inconsistent position here. You deny that Campbell started a sect, and you admit that those who sprang from him and became enthusiasts for the principles that he preached were a sect in 1906. Then the churches of Christ separated themselves from this sect. Now, either the churches of Christ withdrew from a sect and became a separate sect in 1906, or else they became churches of durst in 1906; and either way there was a beginning. Something began that year that hadn't existed before. A sect began, or churches of Christ began—if you please, and here is a beginning point, Dan."

7. D. D.: "I'll give you credit for one thing, Samp, and that is that you can take a thing that has no truth in it and make it sound about as plausible as anybody I ever heard. There was a beginning of something in the days of Campbell, and there was a beginning of something in 1906. A Campbell had a large part in the beginning of his day, and J. W. Shepherd had a large part in the beginning of 1906; and you think since some-

thing began, it was bound to be a *sect*, and since these men had a part in that beginning, they were the *founders of the sect.*"

8. S. S.: "That's exactly my position, Dan, and I don't see yet how you are going to explain it. Don't forget you said you pulled out of a sect in 1906; and, if this sect had its origin with Campbell, then Campbell was the founder of a sect. Deny it, who can?"

9. D. D.: "Very well, Samp, if you will be patient, I will give you the explanation of all of these things:

"Alexander Campbell did not begin anything that had never existed before; therefore, nothing originated with him, was authorized by him; no organization was formed by him; no law was given, no decree issued; no authoritative dictum ever came from Brother Campbell. You have to admit, Samp, that the Lord Jesus Christ founded a church. You have to admit that churches existed in the days of Paul. You surely know how people became members of those churches, and if you do not know you can learn by reading the New Testament or you can learn how those churches came into existence at the points where they were located. You can learn how these congregations were organized, when they met, what they did, etc. Now, if these things existed in the day of the New Testament, and we know they did, then why cannot people preach the same thing that Paul preached at Corinth, and why cannot people do the same things today that they did then and, thereby, become now just what they became then? If Campbell had never lived, could not you and I preach the gospel today, lead people to Christ or make them disciples just as the Lord instructs us to do (Matt. 28:16-20; Luke 24:46-49; Acts 2)? If people today hear what they heard in that day, do what they did in that day, would that not make them Christians—disciples—and would it not make a group of them together a church at any given point? And, if I happen to be the preacher, would these people who

believed on the Lord and turned to him with their whole hearts be Danites?"

10. S. S.: "No. Of course, they would be Christians, disciples of Christ."

11. D.D.: "Correct, Samp, and a group of them together would be a church of Christ, and I would be the one who established or brought about that church. Now this is exactly what the Campbells and those who labored with them did at a great sacrifice. They labored, learned and suffered in order to get a clear picture of the New Testament church before the people and to get people to become Christians, nothing more and nothing less. And Christians at any particular point constituted a church, not a Campbellite church, but a church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Through the efforts of Mr. Campbell, churches were established in many, many places. *They were only and simply churches after the New Testament order, hence churches of Christ.*"

12. S. S.: "How, then, had they become a sect in 1906 to such an extent that you and your churches had to pull out from them?"

13. D. D.: "These simple churches of Christ grew into a denomination by various gradual departures from New Testament teaching and by disregarding or failing to apply the Thomas Campbell motto to the things that they practiced. They degenerated into a denomination in the same way that the New Testament churches apostatized, beginning with small departures and eventuating in the Roman Catholic hierarchy. If you know church history, Samp, you know how this took place and you could name the steps in the apostasy. I know you had this course, because I know the men under whom you studied.

"The churches that were established in the days of Campbell began to introduce innovations later, that is, they began to practice things for which they could give no scriptural authority and thus ceased to be silent where the Bible is silent. They departed

from the plain principle of congregational independence and formed organizations which combined these congregations into an ecclesiastical body. They held conventions and the churches that sent delegates to the conventions were bound by the decisions or actions of these conventions, and thus they became *a Church* composed of *churches*, which Alexander Campbell said could never be if we adhere to New Testament teaching. They fraternized with the denominations, considered themselves a sister denomination, boasted of statistics and claimed people who were not in sympathy with them at all in order to pad their report and balloon their statistics.

"This is the condition that existed in 1906. That year something did begin, but it was not something just coming into existence. There were churches of Christ that had been in existence for a long period of time—some of them for nearly a hundred years—who had no sympathy whatever for any of the departures made by those churches who had apostatized as just described; they used no innovations; they affiliated not at all with the Society; *they were simple New Testament churches*. They were not reporting at all to the Government Census Board, but those described above were reporting them as of their number. Brother Shepherd thought this was wrong and that, since we did not belong to that group, we should not be enumerated among them. He, therefore, informed the government officials of the differences that existed and showed that we had no part with the people who were claiming us and therefore, caused the churches to '*begin*' to report or to register with the government. That is what '*began*,' Samp. That point certainly ought to be plain enough even for you, Samp. Now one further statement and I shall be satisfied with this discussion.

"You say we '*pulled out*' of a sect. This is incorrect. We were never in a sect and, therefore, could never pull out of one. We had never departed from New Testament ground and, therefore, needed not to return to that ground. We had not apos-

tatized and, therefore, we needed no reformation. The only way we had been included in a sect was that the sect reported us in their census reports. If certain people were included in a city directory, and if it should later be found that these people are not in the city limits, would you insist that these people had then pulled out of the city and should, on account of this *'pulling out'* be exempt from city taxes? Or would it be true that they had never been inside the city limits and that the report was merely a mistake? What do you say, Samp?"

14. S. S.: "Well, Dan, I have to admit, as I always do, that you are an adept in talking yourself out of a situation. You should have been a lawyer, Dan."

15. D. D.: "Thank you, Samp, but I prefer to be a preacher, and I shall continue to preach as long as I live, and I shall always remember to do what Jude exhorted me to do (Jude 3). Come back to see me again, Samp, whenever you find it convenient."

16. S. S.: "Thank you, Dan. And now goodbye!"

17. D. D.: "Au revoir, Samp!"

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Is the rumor and agitation that arose from the fact that Dan locked Samp in true to life, or is it exaggerated and unnatural?

2. Could a tragedy have grown out of this? Do tragedies ever grow out of things that are trivial?

3. Was it proper for Phillip Worthy to come to Dan with this matter?

4. Was Samp blameworthy in this furor?

5. Could Samp have taken an attitude that would have made the matter tenfold worse?

6. Does Samp establish the fact that *something began* with the Campbells? That *something began* in 1906?

7. Can you make it clear that what *began* each time was not the church? Not a new sect?

8. Have you heard in real life this argument about the churches of Christ beginning in 1906?

9. Did Samp and Dan agree that the Disciples are a sect—and were in 1906?

10. Then did Campbell not found this sect?

11. How does Dan say that simple churches of Christ turned into a sect?

12. How did the churches apostatize in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th centuries?

13. Could this happen again?

14. How could we prevent such an apostasy?

15. Were the churches of Christ included in a sect in 1906?

16. If so, were they not then sectarians?

17. How did they get out of the sect?

18. If we pulled out from the Disciples, then are we not a fragment or a faction sprung off from them? Explain fully.

19. Can you state any of Samp's points in a better way than he did? Try it.

20. Can you make any of Dan's points clearer than he made them? Try it. Let members of the class argue these points pro and con.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Modern Schism in The Church

- I THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.
- (a) *The Roman Catholic Claim.*
 - (b) *The battle won by Luther and the basic principle of Protestantism.*
 - (c) *The failure to apply the principle.*
- II THE COMING OF THE CAMPBELLS.
- (a) *Schism rife and regnant.*
 - (b) *A plea for the principle as a basis union.*
 - (c) *The principle works.*
- III DIVISION AMONG THOSE WHO PLEAD FOR UNITY.
- (a) *First defections.*
 - (b) *A surrender of the plea.*
 - (c) *Details in the departure.*
 - (d) *Conditions today among those who departed.*

1. SOURCES OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

Schism means division and where there is division there is either a lack of authority or a failure to recognize and respect that authority. A company of soldiers always moves with measured tread, with uniform step and always starts and stops with "columns left" or "columns right" in perfect unison because these soldiers are trained to obey orders and each one instantly responds to the raucous call of the officer in command. There could be the same harmony of movement and concert of action among religious people if all religionists would recognize and obey one voice of authority. But that raises a momentous question: What is the true source of authority in religion? Answering that let us consider:

- (a) *The Roman Catholic Claim.*

It will not be denied by any professed believer in Christianity

that our Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church and that the church is—hence all members of the Church, all Christians are—subject to Him in all things. But Christ is in heaven and we are upon the earth and we cannot therefore hear him speak in audible tones. In what way, then, does he direct our movements now? The church of Rome claims that He delegated the right and power to govern His people to the Apostle Peter and the other apostles, and that at the death of the original twelve other men succeeded them in office and authority and that even now the pope and his prelates have divine authority to issue decrees for the church; to make laws to govern the followers of Christ and that Christ will ratify these laws in heaven. But there is no basis in the Scriptures for the assumption that the apostles themselves ever claimed any such authority as this. They represented themselves as bond-servants of Christ and as vessels of clay in which the precious treasure of the gospel had been placed. They believed that they possessed the Holy Spirit and they spoke the will of Christ as the Spirit enabled them. They taught that their word would become normative and that Christians in all ages should "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto" them—the apostles. There is therefore no intimation that they expected to have any successors and there is not the slightest intimation in history that they did have any successors—that any man followed them who could manifest the "signs of an apostle" (I Cor. 9:1).

(b) *The battle won by Luther and the basic principle of Protestantism.*

The assumption of complete authority by the papal court robbed Christians of their liberty and the church of its purity for more than a thousand years. Any sort of immoral measure or corrupt scheme that these self-called infallible officials wished to adopt or to promote was accepted and suffered by the people because they were under the awful belief that these measures and schemes were ratified in heaven. A few heroic souls like

Wycliffe, Huss and Savonorola dared to protest against such spiritual wickedness in high places but none of these ever thought of disputing this blasphemous claim of authority by which such wickedness was made possible. It remained for Luther to attack the authority of the pope and to repudiate the decisions of councils as final in matters of doctrine. But even he at first made his fight against the corruptions that were in the church and was driven to see that he would have to accept these corruptions or else rebel against and reject the authority of those who authorized them. When Luther denied that the church had any divine right or even moral right to sell indulgences and showed that justification is by faith and not by work and that forgiveness is granted upon repentance and not secured by penance he was only discussing theological questions as a monk with monks. But Luther's ideas were gaining so much favor with the people and therefore retarding the pope's schemes to such an extent that Leo X took cognizance of him and sent the most learned men in the church which called him father to argue with Doctor Luther, to confute him, conquer him. All that was imposing in names, in authority, in traditions, in associations, was arrayed against him.

The great Goliath of controversy of that day was Doctor John Eck. He was superior to Luther in reputation, in dialectical skill and in scholastic learning. Doctor Eck challenged Luther for a public debate at Leipsic. All Germany was interested. The questions at issue stirred the nation to its very depths.

The disputants met in the great hall of the palace of the Elctor. Never before was seen in Germany such an array of doctors and theologians and dignitaries. It rivalled in importance and dignity the Council of Nice, when the great Constantino presided, to settle the Trinitarian controversy. The combatants were as great as Athanasius and Arius,—as vehement, as earnest, though not so fierce. Doctor Eck was the pride of the universities. He was the champion of the schools, of sophistries and authorities, of dead-letter literature, of quibbles, of refine-

merits and words. He was about to overwhelm Luther with his citations, decrees of councils, opinions of eminent ecclesiastics—the mighty authority of the church, but Luther's genius and his deep consciousness of truth came to his rescue. Under the mighty conviction of the righteousness of his cause and under the inspiration of the hour Luther caught a far vision of truth. He then swept away the very premises of his opponent's argument. He denied the supreme authority of popes and councils and universities. *He appealed to the Scriptures as the only ultimate ground of authority.*

Thus was born the basal idea of the Reformation—the *supreme authority of the Scriptures*,—to which Protestants have ever since professed to cling.

Doctor Eck and the church were not prepared to deny openly the authority of Paul and Peter and the other inspired men, hence they were left gasping for breath by Luther's appeal to the Scriptures. But their cunning soon found a way to save their own authority. They said, "Yes, we accept the Scriptures as authority too. We even put them above Augustine and Thomas Aquinas and the councils. But who is to interpret the Scriptures? The Bible cannot be understood by the common people. It must be interpreted by the church—that is by the priests. We will not let the people have the Bible. They would become fanatics. We will tell them what the Bible teaches. They must look to us."

Then Luther rose more powerful, more eloquent, more majestic than before. The *second great principle of the Reformation* was born from his soul—the *right of private judgment—the right of every individual to have the light of life as it shines upon his soul from the sacred pages.*

These two great principles freed the people from the power of the pope and set on foot the greatest movement that the world has known since the days of Paul.

(c) *The failure to apply the principle.*

Although Luther found the principle upon which all religious questions must be resolved he did not apply the principle to all questions. He confined his efforts to those points largely upon which he had joined issue with the church of Rome. He and his contemporaries Knox and Calvin never did entirely get away from the idea of the authority of the clergy and their right to assemble in convention and formulate doctrines to govern their followers. Only one reformer of that period seemed to have the correct idea as to the work that needed to be done, and that was Zwingli. The different views of Luther and Zwingli are set forth in D'Augbigue's History of the Reformation in these words: "Luther was desirous of retaining in the church all that was not expressly contradicted by the Scriptures, while Zwingli was intent on abolishing all that could not be proved by Scripture. The German Reformer wished to remain united to the church of all preceding ages (that is, the Roman Catholic Church), and sought only to purify it from everything that was repugnant to the word of God. The Reformer of Zurich passed back over ever intervening age 'till he reached the times of the apostles; and subjecting the church to an entire transformation, labored to restore it to its primitive condition." But Zwingli was overshadowed by Luther and his principles did not control the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Then in the eighteenth century came the work of John Wesley. He labored to reform the church of England, of which he lived and died a member. His efforts to reform the church failed to accomplish their purpose but they resulted in building up a new denomination with practically the same form of government of the Church of England but characterized by the zeal and warmth and spiritual fervor that he had endeavored to infuse into the old church. It never seemed to enter Wesley's mind to leave all human organizations and to go back over the intervening ages to the time of the apostles and to reconstruct the church just as it was in the beginning.

So we see that all these reformers simply protested against corruptions that existed in the older churches and when they could not correct these errors their followers organized new denominations that recognized human founders, human heads and had their own lawmaking bodies.

II. THE COMING OF THE CAMPBELLS.

(a) *Schism Rife and Regnant.*

When Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander came into the picture the different denominations that had been formed among the Protestants were warring with each other with as much hatred as had ever existed between the Protestants and the Catholics. They recognized each other as composed of Christians and they were ready to make common cause against the Catholics but they were not willing to fellowship each other at the Lord's table or to work together in peace. Even the Presbyterian church, in which Thomas Campbell was a preacher, was divided into several contending factions. The work assigned him in America was Washington County, Pennsylvania. As the country was then sparsely populated and as the people had come from other countries, there were many denominations represented among them but there were few organized congregations of any sect. His duties as a minister required Thomas Campbell to make a trip up in the Alleghany Valley to preach and to give the Lord's Supper to the few scattered members of his branch of the Presbyterian church who lived in that vicinity. The people of the neighborhood gathered together to hear the preaching which was a rare opportunity for them. They had no preaching and no opportunity to celebrate the Lord's Supper. To us who have been reared to see any band of humble Christians meet and conduct the Lord's service this seems strange, but we must not forget that the denominations have never gotten away from the idea that clergy are different from the laity and possess powers and privileges that the ordinary Christian does not dare to claim. With them no one can give the Lord's Supper to God's

children or administer baptism to a penitent believer but an ordained clergyman. Therefore the people of the Alleghany Valley being deprived of the "benefit of clergy" were also deprived of the privilege of worshipping God as did the New Testament disciples (Acts 20:7). The great heart of Thomas Campbell was moved with pity for these people and he publicly expressed his regrets that he could not invite members of other branches of the Presbyterian church—all Presbyterians and only Presbyterians—to partake of the Lord's Supper with him and his peculiar kind of Presbyterians. For this offense he was reported to the Presbytery by a young preacher by the name of Wilson who was an understudy of Mr. Campbell. The Presbytery reprimanded Mr. Campbell for criticizing the rules and usages of his church. Mr. Campbell appealed to the Synod but that august body did not look with any degree of favor upon a man who would criticize the rules made by the authorities of his church or attempt to change the "usages" of that church.

Again we see the principle upon which Eck attempted to meet Luther prevailing. Questions must be decided by the usages of the church and by the decisions of councils.

(b) *A pica for the principle as a basis of union.*

As a result of the divided state in which Mr. Campbell found the religious people of his time and of his community and because he found that the spirit of sectarian narrowness and bigotry would not allow him to minister to a child of God if that individual did not chance to be a member of his denomination, Mr. Campbell withdrew from the Presbytery—not from the the Presbyterian church—and began independent work. He became a preacher for the whole community and asked all professed Christians to work with him though these did not at first sever their denominational affiliations. They were banding themselves together in an undenominational, and, at first an interdenominational capacity in order that they might all together enjoy the worship of God.

This was not brought about by any differences over some particular doctrine. Certainly it was not about baptism as Mr. Campbell himself had at this time never been baptized. He had been sprinkled in infancy. It was not caused by a love for controversy or by the desire for a debate. Thomas Campbell was never a controversialist. He desired to preach and practice only those things about which there could be no controversy. In explaining and defining his position to the Synod he said:

"Is it, therefore, because I plead the cause of the scriptural and apostolic worship of the church, in opposition to the various errors and schisms which have so awfully corrupted and divided it, that the brethren of the Union should feel it difficult to admit me as their fellow-laborer in that blessed work? I sincerely rejoice with them in what they have done in that way; but still, all is not yet done; and surely they can have no just objections to go farther. Nor do I presume to dictate to them or to others as to how they should proceed for the glorious purpose of promoting the unity and purity of the church; but only beg leave, for my own part, to walk upon such sure and peaceable ground that I may have nothing to do with human controversy, about the right or wrong side of any opinion whatsoever, by simply acquiescing in what is written, as quite sufficient for every purpose of faith and duty; and thereby to influence as many as possible to depart from human controversy, to betake themselves to the Scriptures, and, in so doing, to the study and practice of faith, holiness and love."

That association of neighbors in Washington, Pennsylvania was a band of Christians agreed upon certain principles upon which they were to work. These were set forth by Thomas Campbell in what was called then and what has since become famous as the "Declaration and Address." This address was an arraignment of sectism and a plea for Christian union. It contended for a practice of only those things that are authorized by the New Testament Scriptures and that were practiced by disciples in New Testament times. Its whole plea was summed

up in the now famous slogan, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent." Upon this principle those neighbors could work together forgetting their denominational differences.

(c) *The principle works.*

They afterward abandoned their denominations altogether and served the Lord as Christians only. Alexander Campbell joined his father and took the lead in applying their rule to many of their denominational ideas and found that they were not Scriptural. They made the Bible their sole ground of authority and decided every question by a "thus saith the Lord." They proceeded upon the exact principle that Luther had contended for but failed to follow out to a conclusion. They took up the plan proposed by Zwingli two centuries before them and made it work. They not only respected the statements of Scripture but they respected its silence as well. Luther desired to retain all that was *not contradicted* by the Scriptures—all that the Scriptures do not say thou shalt not do—but Zwingli advocated abolishing all that could not be proved by the Scriptures. And this was the plan of the Campbells and their co-laborers. Even years after both the Campbells were gone from the earth the disciples strictly followed this rule and would not practice anything that could not be proved by the Scriptures.

This principle of recognizing the Bible alone as a standard of authority in religion began to shake the walls of sectdom and creed-making bodies felt their power going from them. Barton W. Stone and his fellow-members of the Springfield Presbytery had, even before Campbell was known to them, dissolved their Presbytery as an un-Scriptural body and insisted that the Bible alone is authority and that individual churches remain independent and not form any combination. No ruling bodies or governing assemblies should exist. None existed in New Testament times.

A mighty host of people rallied to the support of this prin-

ciple and simple gospel churches were established in thousands of places. Churches composed of Christians who lived in each community. These churches sustained no organic connection with each other, yet they were all alike for they were fashioned after the same divine pattern and recognized the same Head, King and Lord—Peace prevailed, good will reigned and success crowned their efforts. The plea was invincible and the ultimate overthrow of all sectarianism and the union of all Christians seemed to be a goal not impossible. But then came division.

III. DIVISION AMONG THOSE WHO PLEAD FOR UNITY.

(a) *First defections.* It is probably too much to expect perfection of anything with which human beings have to do. The Lord's order is perfect but weak mortal beings will not continue to forget self and follow the Lord. It is sad to have to chronicle the fact that those who plead for unity by a return to the New Testament order of work and worship have divided into separate and antagonistic groups. The first defection could not properly be called a division as those few who broke off went completely away. Three names tell the story of the beginning of the greatest religious hoax ever perpetrated. But one of these men was not responsible for the hoax, he was a victim though he supplied the literature for the scheme. Soloman Spaulding, an educated man, for a long time a Presbyterian preacher but who had quit the ministry and become skeptical, wrote a novel in which he wove a fanciful story about the origin of the American Indians. He represented them as being the ten lost tribes of Israel. Spaulding put this manuscript into the hands of a printer at Pittsburg but it was lost. Sydney Rigdon, a preacher among the disciples but who was never looked upon as very dependable worked in the printing shop from which the Spaulding manuscript disappeared.

Joseph Smith in New York was a lazy lout who professed to be a diviner. He told fortunes and had men dig for hidden treasures. His father while digging a well for Willard Chase

threw out a stone of peculiar shape and of almost transparent color. The Chase children kept the stone among their playthings. But young Joe Smith stole it from the children and began to use it as a peep-stone in telling fortunes and in pretending to tell where lost property might be found. The court records of that county show where Joe was made to pay a fine for charging a farmer \$10.00 to tell him by the power of his peep-stone where to find a cow that had strayed. The cow was not at the place designated, hence the court action and the fine.

Now, about this time Joe had his vision about the buried plates and he by the instructions of the angels dug them up and translated them by the peep-stone and thus the book of Mormon appeared which was nothing more nor less than the old Spaulding manuscript revamped by Sydney Rigdon. Rigdon became Smith's right-hand man and was the first preacher of the first Mormon church. Thus Mormonism originated in the brain of a renegade Christian preacher which accounts for the truth that the Mormons teach on baptism and some other points.

Some years later Dr. John Thomas, a physician but a man who had given up his profession for the study and the proclamation of the gospel, came to America from England. He heard the plea for a return to the New Testament and for a restoration of the ancient order. He became obedient to the faith and preached the truth for several years. He founded and edited a paper and was highly commended by Alexander Campbell for his labors. But he began speculating on prophecy and theorizing about the Millennium and making these theories the very acme of all Bible teaching. He also taught the idea of soul-sleeping and the annihilation of the wicked. He led away disciples after him and became the founder of the sect known as Christadelphians. These however, unlike the Mormons held strictly to the idea of congregational independence and of no organized ecclesiasticism. They have for this reason remained weak while the Mormons combining religion with militarism have become a mighty empire.

(b) *A surrender of the plea.* Those who went away with Dr. Thomas and Sydney Rigdon have so far departed that they are now never thought of in connection with the restoration movement—only the few know that they were ever associated in any way with us. It is a sadder story that we must tell of those who yet claim to belong to the restoration movement but who have completely surrendered the plea for Bible authority in all things. The United States Census Bureau now lists two branches of the people who profess to exist for the express purpose of preaching unity upon the Bible alone and as Christians only. These two groups are in these last days usually distinguished by the name "Christian Church" for the one and "Church of Christ" for the other which names alone clearly announce that here are two sects and both claiming to be the church Christ founded. What a shameful situation! Of course there are not two different churches but factions of the same church—therefore sects. Persons enter into the church of the Lord by conversion, by obeying the gospel or, to be specific, by hearing the gospel, believing the gospel, by repenting of sins, by confessing Christ and by being baptized unto the remission of sins. To require more of any one who desires to enter the church would be to make a human requirement, a human law and therefore to make such church a human institution. When people come from the so-called "Christian Church" to the so-called "Church of Christ" do they have to obey the gospel—hear, believe, repent and be baptized? No, they have already done that. Then of course they are already in the true church, which is the church of Christ, and are not now coming into it. They have been in a sect called "Christian Church" and should be now coming out of it. Not out of a sect into the church but out of the sect to be in nothing but the church. They have been in error but have now learned the way of the Lord more perfectly.

While the names mentioned above are now used to distinguish the two sides—by some at least—this has come about in only recent years. Formerly, they used other terms. One group called

themselves "Progressives" and their opponents "Antis." The other group called themselves "Loyals" and their opponents "Digressives." These terms were neither beautiful nor brotherly but with all their ugliness they did not manifest the sectarianism that the names we now use exhibit. But if we did not have the two sides we would not need the distinguishing designations. The fact that we have the two sides is the crying shame. This situation forces us to accept one of two conclusions, namely, *To speak where the Bible speaks, and to be silent where the Bible is silent will not unite the children of God and restore the New Testament church as we have claimed it would, or else somebody has failed to live by this motto and has therefore departed, digressed, from our plea.* Since the plea was to have Bible authority, therefore to digress from the Lord's way.

Which conclusion shall we accept? To accept the first would be to reject the Bible as a standard of authority and as a basis of union. We cannot agree to such a dire conclusion as that. Then we are forced to say that somebody has left the original ground and surrendered the plea. Who is it and in what respect have they digressed? This brings us to:

(c) *Details in the departure.* We unhesitatingly charge that our brethren who call themselves Progressives have surrendered our plea, departed from our motto and brought reproach upon the cause of our Master. They have introduced things into the worship for which there is no Scriptural sanction and have formed organizations to usurp the functions of the church.

Without attempting to give a chronological account of these departures we notice the primary causes of the trouble.

Instrumental music in the worship. It is a fact that is known to all persons who are only tolerably informed in either sacred or profane history that the New Testament churches did not use instruments of music in the worship of God, and that they were never used among professed Christians until the seventh century. Of course, therefore, when our fathers set out to re-

store the New Testament church they did not *restore* something that was never in it. The churches of the nineteenth century did not use such instruments in their worship for about sixty years. They all worshipped alike and all stood together for more than a half century. The first instrument was an organ introduced into the Olive Street Church in St. Louis in 1869. It at once caused division. A committee was appointed to settle the matter. The committee was composed of Isaac Errett, Robert Graham, Alexander Proctor and J. K. Rogers. This committee removed the organ and restored peace. Since these brethren were walking by the rule of "speak where the Bible speaks" and since they were all willing to accept anything for which there is Bible authority why did the organ cause division? Why did not those who wanted the organ give the chapter and verse that authorized it and settle the matter? That committee was composed of some of the best Bible scholars and some of the ablest defenders of the faith then living. Why did they remove the organ to placate the objectors? Why did they not show the brethren the authority in God's Word for the instrument and let it remain in the church? The fact that they did not do this is evidence sufficient that it could not be done. Their decision in the matter is an admission that there is no Scriptural authority for the instrument and that it was not in the New Testament church which we set out to restore.

Then to use the instrument is a clear surrender of our plea; a departure, a digression.

But the case in St. Louis did not remain settled. Those who wanted instrumental music in the worship would not abide by the decision of the committee to be governed by the Zwingli plan and the Thomas Campbell motto. At other places the instruments were forced in nearly always causing division, those who would not worship with the innovation withdrawing and worshipping in a separate congregation. In many places the question of the ownership of the church property arose and the matter was taken into civil courts. Hard fought trials, bitter

strife and alienation followed. And all this about something for which there is absolutely no Bible authority and among people whose basic principle was union upon the Bible and the Bible alone!

But the advocates of the instrument have resorted to every possible artifice and exhausted the whole catalogue of fallacies in an effort to justify their course. They, in nearly all instances, will admit that there is no Bible authority for their instruments but they instantly rally with the utterly disingenuous shout. But the Bible does not condemn the use of instruments! It does not say we shall not have them! They do not seem to see that this is a complete surrender of and a departure from the Zwingli plan and the Campbell motto. They have utterly repudiated the second clause of the old motto, "Where the Bible is silent, we are silent." There is no way for these brethren to clear themselves of the charge of having digressed.

Organized Societies. After the restoration movement had been in existence for nearly a half century and after the simple gospel had been preached by individuals and by independent churches until the plea for restoration of the ancient order had been heard in all the English speaking world, some men began to insist that missionary societies should be formed for the purpose of preaching the gospel to the world. Faithful men pointed out that the church itself was founded and established for the sole purpose of evangelizing the world, that it is the "light of the world," "the salt of the earth," "the pillar and support of the truth" and that it is to "hold forth the word of life in a crooked and perverse generation." But the advocates of the societies claimed that such organizations would only be the churches cooperating to do the work they were ordained to do. Again, faithful men insisted that while it is Scriptural and proper to co-operate it is not Scriptural to form a corporation of congregations for that would take away the independence of each church and result in an ecclesiastical organization which would not only be human but that would necessitate the making

of human laws to govern it. This would not only be something that the New Testament churches—which we are trying to restore—never had but it would lead entirely away from the plea and purpose of the restoration movement since it would form the churches into an organized denomination with local headquarters and with human governing authorities. But despite the protests the societies were formed and multiplied. As they grew in size they assumed more and more control of the churches and became such determining factors in the work of the Progressives that an individual preacher or even an independent paper could have no more influence in checking their plans and purposes than a single individual would have in opposing the action of the convention of his political party. In order that these many societies might not conflict with each other and thus hinder their efforts and limit their power over the churches they in recent years have formed a merger. They have all gone into what is known as the United Society. This is a super-society with subordinate branches, and the ecclesiasticism is complete. Thus a much more powerful body than that which Barton W. Stone and his associates dissolved in order to return to the New Testament order has been formed by those who claim to be carrying on the plan which Stone and others inaugurated.

Conventions. Those churches that use instrumental music and that work under the societies have long been accustomed to hold conventions. When this practice first began the conservative brethren raised a protest and showed that no such conventions were held in New Testament times but that they were held in the second and third centuries and that they constituted one of the first steps in the great apostasy; that they became law-making bodies. The Progressives insisted that they were only mass meetings. That they had no legislative powers at all. That all Christians were at liberty to attend and no individual had any more power or authority than another and that the convention could not decide questions, bestow favors or do any-

thing else that had any resemblance to official action. But no one can now make that claim for those conventions. They did consider questions, appoint committees, hear reports and exercise all other functions of a political or religious convention. Then the societies began to control the machinery and direct all maneuvers of the conventions. These lobbyists found it more difficult to control the mass meeting than they liked and they therefore legislated through the convention that these, conventions should become delegate bodies. That is, that no one should have a voice or vote except delegates and these delegates of course should be elected by the churches. Of course this made the convention an official body. A representative or law-making body. Churches that send delegates to the convention are of course bound by the action of the convention. These conventions have voted on the terms of membership in the church even, as though Christ and the apostles did not make and ratify these once and forever. They have voted on the question of "open membership," that is whether people should be baptized in order to be admitted into the church or whether they should be admitted without baptism.

(d) *Conditions today among those who departed.*

Of course this turns those brethren definitely into a sect with their law-making body deciding who shall and who shall not be admitted into their denomination. They have not only surrendered the purpose to destroy all sectism and the plea of the restoration movement but they have actually gone back of the victory won by Luther and again established the custom of deciding questions by the decree of councils and the vote of conventions instead of by the Word of God. Suppose the conventions vote that baptism is not essential, can that change the teaching of the Word of God? If the convention can vote to eliminate baptism altogether could it not vote to change the form of baptism and substitute sprinkling? If not, why not?

Then if all of us participate in the convention and abide by

its action it would only be a short time until doctrines and practices ordered by the convention would be at such a dissonance with the Scriptures that there would have to arise other reformers to protest against such impudent assumption of power and lead the world back to the New Testament. The fact that the convention has not yet decided to eliminate or change baptism does not alter our point or mitigate the circumstance. The vote has been taken and that is the assumption of power to make such changes whenever the delegates may so elect. The whole thing is now on the shifting sands of man's vacillating judgment and no doctrine of the sect today may be its doctrine tomorrow.

With these facts facing us it must be clear to all that those of us who wish to be governed by the word of God in all things; who wish to get back of all creeds, all decrees of councils, and other human authorities to the church of the New Testament must stay out of these conventions and from under the domination of the United Society and from all other machinations of men. This we are doing and as much as we deplore division we are forced to work apart from all who will not abide within the doctrine of Christ. There are several thousand independent churches of Christ that are still prayerfully endeavoring to be just what the New Testament churches were in organization, in doctrine, in faith and zeal and good works. May the Lord multiply their number and increase their faith. And may He help them not to allow the fact that they must thus stand aloof from all sects to turn that aloofness itself into sectarianism.

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. On what point is there an age-old controversy?
2. Is this an issue among religious people today?
3. What two sources of authority are recognized by religious people?

4. Do the Roman Catholics recognize the Bible as an authority?

5. Will they recognize its teaching when Protestants use it against them?

6. What is the first point then to establish?

7. On what two points did Luther win a victory?

8. With whom did Luther debate and when and where was the debate held?

9. When Luther contended that the Bible must be the authority by which we decide all issues what reply did the Catholics make?

11. How did Luther meet this?

12. Wherein did Luther and his followers fail to apply the principle?

13. In what respect did Luther differ from Zwingli?

14. What is the difference in the plea made by Zwingli and that made by Alexander Campbell?

15. In what way do the Disciples and other denominations today reject the rule for which Zwingli contended?

16. What condition existed among the sects in the days of the Campbells?

17. What is told in this lecture concerning the Campbells that has not been told before in this book?

18. For what was T. Campbell reported to the Presbytery?

19. What was the result?

20. What did T. Campbell finally do about this?

21. Is the condition today among the denominations any different from that that obtained in Campbell's day?

22. If there is a difference, in what does the difference consist? And what caused this difference to come about?

23. Do the denominations allow any one except an ordained minister to "wait on" the Lord's table or to give the "Sacrament" to members?

24. Can these denominational preachers give the Supper to any except their own members?

25. Is it always a good indication to see people disloyal to and disregarding the rules of their denominations?

Answer: If it is because of a lack of faith, as with Modernists, No. If it is because of a desire to be free to do the will of the Lord, yes.

26. Is it always a good indication to see men clamoring against the Roman Catholic Church? What if it is because they are Communists?

27. Did the plea made by the Campbells succeed?

28. What gave impetus to the plea?

29. What caused Alexander Campbell to become famous?

30. What battles did he fight that the general populace applauded?

31. About how many people were numbered among those who were pleading for the "ancient order" before Campbell died?

32. What other evidence can you give to prove that the plea is appealing and convincing? Can you quote what prominent men said of it?

33. Is the same plea as appealing and convincing to the people of today as it was to those of a hundred years ago?

34. If not, is it the fault of the plea?

35. What has dulled the edge of the sword?

Note: If you say divisions among those who plead for unity and a failure to recognize a "thus saith the Lord" as a finality, do not forget to consider "Crankiness," ignorance, hobbyism, egotism and personal petulance, spite and vengeance as factors in the matter. It is an inexpressibly sad evidence of Satan's power and cunning when intelligent and sincere people can look at those who claim to be portraying the New Testament principles and order in life and religion and say, "If that group is going to heaven we prefer to go somewhere else"! Define the difference between those who accept the Restoration Plea as a theory and an inheritance and use it as propaganda, and those who are seeking sincerely to serve God and to be saved: the first group cares nothing about saving anybody but is dead

set on "defeating" everybody! The second class is anxious to save everybody and is, therefore, actively missionary, and may be driven by the cantankerousness of the other group into compromises of the truth. Care and prayer are needed here.

36. Name some of the first defections among those who set out to *restore* the ancient order?

37. Did the brethren of that day believe what is related in this chapter about the Spaulding Manuscript, the Sidney Rigdon steal and the Joe Smith hoax?

38. Who among the pioneers affirmed this and attempted to prove it?

Answer: Clark Braden in the *Braden-Kelley Debate*. This debate is still extant.

39. What of the Dr. Thomas defection?

40. Where can you read about this?

Answer: Robert Richardson's "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell."

41. What were the points of Dr. Thomas' speculation?

42. What became of his faction?

43. Why did it not grow into a strong denomination?

44. What caused the Rigdon-Smith sect to become strong?

45. Is this a good argument in favor of organization, and against the New Testament plan of congregational independence?

46. What other divisions took place among the people of the Restoration?

48. On what points were these divisions based?

49. Did these divisions occur before the death of Alexander Campbell?

50. What point of New Testament teaching contended for by Campbell was violated and nullified by the organization of the missionary society?

51. Did Campbell change his position on this point?

Answer: See Chapter X I I .

52. How long was it after the beginning of the Restoration Movement before the "Organized Effort" began?

53. Had the *churches* succeeded in missionary work during those years?

54. Why then was organization thought necessary?

55. What is the chief objection to missionary societies?

Answer: The answer to question No. 48 will answer this. That point should be strongly pressed.

56. Can you show the difference between cooperation of independent churches and the *combining* of these churches into a super-organization?

57. What is the difference in *co-operating* and *corporation*?

58. What is lost when power is centralized?

Answer: *Freedom*.

59. Does this apply to Government as well as church?

60. What point in the Thomas Campbell motto and the Alexander Campbell contention was violated when instrumental music was introduced?

61. Were those who departed on these points *avowedly* surrendering the plea?

62. Did those who formed the organizations and who introduced the instruments of music continue to plead for a Restoration of the "ancient order of things," and to condemn human creeds, human names, sects, etc.?

63. Did they surrender other points of the plea?

65. Have they now abandoned the plea altogether?

65. If so, what excuse do they have for their existence as a separate people?

Answer: Some of them admit that they have none, and if they were not already established with their organizations, enterprises, investments or monetary interests they would favor going out of existence by allowing the members to be absorbed by the denominations. Each one go into the church of his choice.

66. In addition to favoring unscriptural organizations to do the work of the church, and the use of instrumental music in the worship, on what other points have the Disciples departed from the Restoration platform?

67. Would the Disciples of today endure or allow such preaching as Campbell, Lard, Fanning and Benjamin Franklin did?

68. Did they not more or less discard McGarvey before he died?

69. Have they not belittled and discredited him since his death? See the book entitled "*Brother McGarvey.*"

70. Are there some among the Disciples who endeavor to be conservative?

Note: The Christian Standard, R. C. Foster and the Cincinnati Seminary are more conservative than some others.

71. Do you observe any tendencies among churches of Christ to relax on the plea for the "ancient order"?

72. On what points or in what particulars do you observe these tendencies?

73. Do you think that there is also a danger of making a custom a law?

74. Do some regard anything that *they* do not like as unscriptural?

75. Is there also the possibility that some men will brand another man as disloyal because of personal enmity against the man?

76. Will any claim or hobby or proposition that is based upon prejudice, ignorance or personalities live any longer than the persons involved live?

77. Will issues based on bitterness live after those who hold the bitterness are gone?

78. Can we afford to allow ourselves to be moved by such unworthy motives?

79. Should we encourage and support men who manifestly are actuated by such motives?

80. How can we know when an issue is real and when it is manufactured?

Answer: Hear *both* sides and search the Scriptures. Do not allow personal friendships or personal dislikes to enter the question.

CHAPTER EIGHT

A DISCUSSION BETWEEN
SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS & DANIEL DIDACTICUS**(Searcher's Sanctum, Enter Samp.)**

1. D. D.: "Good morning, Samp.! I'm glad to see you. I don't suppose you have anything that you would care to argue about this morning?"

2. S. S.: Good morning, Dan! You know I am not the man who argues. You are the man whose whole religion consists in arguments and contentions, and you get into an argument with your whole soul. With me, these questions we talk about are matters of indifference. I am not deeply concerned in which way any argument goes. I think all who are sincere are going to heaven and I don't have to try to force everybody to agree with me and, as you know, I don't agree with very many people."

3. D. D.: "Well, Samp, if I didn't believe anything, I would not be concerned either about who knows the truth or who doesn't know it; but, since only the truth can make a man free, I am anxious to know the truth and to teach it to my fellow-men that they may be the Lord's disciples, free and happy. When I see that men are being misled by false teachers and are being blinded by false statements, it grieves my soul, and I would feel that I do not have the proper interest in my fellow-man if I did not endeavor to correct all the error and to enlighten all the people possible. Your statement that whoever is sincere is right is absurd, Samp. You know that people are sincere in the practice of some of the most foolish and fanatical things in the world. You know that people are sincere in believing things which you absolutely know to be wrong. You do not believe that a Catholic priest has power to forgive sins or to ab-

solve a sinner, but you know that millions of sincere Catholics believe this. How can you say that they're right?"

4. S. S.: "You misunderstood me, Dan. I did not say that all who are sincere are *right*; I said that all who are sincere are going to heaven."

5. D. D.: "Then you will admit, Samp, that people can be wrong in their religious beliefs and practices and still go to heaven? Can error save people? Or was Christ correct in saying that the truth makes men free (John 8:32) and that men are sanctified by the truth (John 17:17) and that men must worship God in spirit and in truth (John 4:25)? Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ (John 1:17). And Christ said he is the way, the truth and the life and that no one can come to the Father but by him (John 14:6). But according to you, men would have been as well off if truth had not come, and they can come to the leather by a way that *is not truth* as well as they can by the way which *is truth*."

6. S. S.: "Now, Dan, don't make me say things I didn't say. Of course, I think men ought to know the truth and that's the reason I try to lead you out of your narrow contentions. I believe in progress and enlightenment."

7. D. D.: "But you do not believe in correcting those who are in error and, therefore, you are indifferent about whether they learn the truth or not. In fact, I am the only one that you believe needs to be corrected, and you take that attitude because of your antagonism to the views that you were once taught. You believe that we are so wrong that you left your former friends, changed your position, but you do not believe that anyone else needs to change; therefore, you do not endeavor to correct anyone else."

8. S. S.: "I think that some people can be saved in spite of their errors. Do you believe that everybody has to be perfect and correct in every idea that he holds before he can be saved?"

9. D. D.: "In answering you, I must say first, Samp, that I do not believe that the question of one's salvation is the only thing involved in trying to correct an error. *Error is error*, whether it is of such enormity to cause the soul to be lost or not. Error, therefore, should be corrected without regard to the proportion of the error or without regard to the consequence of the error. The very fact that it is error is a sufficient reason to make correction and to teach the truth upon the point involved. Any error that men hold to with a blind and stubborn tenacity would probably cause them to be lost. The attitude of the person toward his error becomes, then, a greater wrong than the error itself. Men should want to know and to do the will of the Lord for the very reason that they want to please the Lord. This is the highest motive that they can have, and the question of what the Lord will give them as a reward doesn't enter their minds; and the question of what kind of punishment the Lord will mete out to them if they refuse to do what he teaches does not enter the equation either. It is not a question of if I do this I'll get what, and if I don't do this I'll suffer what; it's a question of what does the Lord want me to do in his behalf. When one has this attitude, one is then willing to hear whatever the Lord says and then to do what he commands."

10. S. S.: "There you go again, Dan. You're right back to the point that people must do all that's commanded in the Bible and that they must first find a specific statement in the Bible for what they do or else they cannot do anything. It is that legalistic and literalistic interpretation that I object to. Nothing is right unless you can find it expressed *ipsissima verba* in the Bible."

11. D. D.: "I have never said that everything has to be spoken in just so many words or in a certain set number of syllables in order to be Scriptural, but I do insist that the Scriptures must either authorize our practice in specific terms or by example or by necessary inference. You know that this is

the position, Samp, and there is no use trying to say that it is legalistic or literalistic. It is sensible and practical and it is no more difficult to follow this than it is for men to submit to the instructions and requirements of creeds that men write or of documents and statutes in our civil courts. Do you recognize any standard of truth or any criterion by which we may decide what is right and what is wrong?"

12. S. S.: "Sure, I recognize truth as a standard, and truth is that which men discover by trial and error, by experimentation, by study and research, I think that we should accept truth anywhere we discover it and I think that a man's inner consciousness must approve a thing because it appeals to him as the right thing to do and not because somebody told him that it was right or that it has been written in the traditions of men."

13. D. D.: "You move in a circle, Samp. We have had this point up before and I have shown you that truth does not change and that no truth ever goes out of date. Any truth that we learn today does not render obsolete any truth that our forefathers knew; but, in this respect, we are talking about things that men have to search out and discover. In matters of religion, we have revelation or the word of God. Men would know nothing of God or of the soul or of eternity if they did not have the Bible; they would know nothing of man's origin or of his destiny. And, on these points, there is no way for a man to discover the truth. Man, by his wisdom, could not know God (1 Cor. 1:21). God, by his wisdom, made this impossible. And, then, God decreed that, by the foolishness of preaching, men should be saved. This means by inspired preaching—by revelation instead of man's discoveries and man's inventions, man should be saved. Do you not believe that the Bible is the word of God?"

14. S. S.: "That leads us into a discussion that we could not bring to a conclusion. I know men have thought through the ages that the Bible is the word of God and they have believed

it, and many of them rejoiced in its promises and I have no doubt that they have gone to a better world. But you know, Dan, that we have found out that the Bible cannot be accepted as God's word. We do not censure those who went before us for believing it; but, with all that we have found out now, we cannot be expected to accept the Bible as they did. It contains truth and it contains some lofty principles, and many of the writers were inspired by holy motives and uttered some sublime sentences. All of this, we accept ,of course."

15. D. D.: "Now, Samp, it devolves upon you to name the things or *the thing*—just one, please—that we have learned that now makes the Bible no longer worthy of credence. What is it that we know today that John Calvin, John Wesley and Alexander Campbell did not know about the word of God? What is it that we have learned that makes it impossible for us to believe the Bible in the same way that they believed it?"

16. S. S.: "Oh, you know, Dan, that men have found out that the Bible was not written by the men that we once thought wrote it. It is a compilation of the various fragments that were written by different men. The priests wrote the Bible in order to bring the people under their influence and, therefore, to keep them under control."

17. D. D.: "Samp, you are referring to what is known as the Documentary Hypothesis, and you know that this has been thoroughly exposed and has been even abandoned by the leading scholars of our day. Only atheists who lack information and other scoffers and blasphemers repeat the assertions that men made in this respect and then were unable to sustain by any reputable scholarship. You ought to know this, Samp. And, while you may make these statements to uninformed people, you should know better than to make them to people who have been studying in this field for nearly a half century."

18. S. S.: "What makes you say that the Documentary Hy-

pothesis has been exposed and that it has been abandoned by modern scholars. I'm not ready to admit this claim."

19. D. D.: "Samp, did you ever hear of 'The Webb' and Miss Florence Deeks, and do you not know that she claimed that H. G. Wells plagiarized from her book in 'The Outline of History'? Do you not know that in the court, when this case came to trial, Dr. W. A. Irwin applied the historico-literary methods to the analysis of the Wells book and endeavored to prove that he did, indeed, steal the works of Miss Deeks? He used the same methods, applied the same rules, reached the same conclusions that they use in the Documentary Hypothesis concerning the authorship of the Bible. Do you not know that Miss Deeks lost her case and that the judge said the learned Dr. Irwin had engaged in an 'infinite deal of nonsense'? Aren't you acquainted with this story? Furthermore, did you ever hear of the Polychrome Bible? As this name indicates, they published the Bible in different colors, attributing each color to a different author. This enabled any reader to see what it was that they attributed to the different authors, and sometimes one color consisted of not more than a sentence. This, of course, made even the common man see that they couldn't judge a literary style from one sentence or one verse. Yes, Samp, that whole Documentary Hypothesis has been exploded, and those of us who keep up with modern scholarship, as you profess to do, would not be guilty of making the assertions that you have made."

20. S. S.: "Well, I told you, Dan, that we could not settle these great questions and it was not my intention to lead off on that line. You have your opinions and I have mine and I don't suppose either one of us is going to change. So, what boots it?"

21. D. D.: "Then you expressed your true self, Samp. You got back to the old canard: 'You have your opinion and I have mine, so we will go our separate ways.' That is a wise statement for a lover of truth! We are not talking about opinions at all,

Samp, we are talking about what is true and what is not true. I am not concerned about opinions, yours or mine, but I am desperately concerned about knowing the truth and teaching the truth, and you ought to be."

22. S. S.: "But you think that nobody has the truth but you, and that's the reason you're so aggressive and controversial."

23. D. D.: "Wouldn't that be a good reason? If I, alone, have the truth, would I be a worthy man if I didn't try to share that truth with others?"

24. S. S.: "But you want everybody to believe what you believe."

25. D. D.: "If I believe the truth, of course, I should want everybody to believe what I believe. So, Samp, after all it is the same question, is it truth or not truth. We are seeking the truth, not seeking for a perpetuation of a party, the defense of a denomination, the spreading of propoganda, or for the extension of our personal influence, or for anything else that is personal, selfish or partisan. We wish to teach the word of the Lord in order to honor God and to save men. And, Samp, if that is bigotry, then I'm a bigot."

26. S. S.: "In the beginning of this discussion, we were talking about everybody being sincere and of being saved. You never have said whether you think people in error can be saved or not saved, and there's a point I want to discuss: I think you and your churches of Christ have departed from the doctrines of the pioneers on this question: they believed that there were Christians in all denominations, and that's what I believe. You try to get people to quit their denominations, and in that respect you're a digressive."

27. D. D.: "Samp, you never undertake to state anything concerning the pioneers that you do not misstate the facts .It is true that these pioneers believed that there are Christians among the denominational people. This has been stated by all of them

and by everyone who has recorded the history of their efforts. To say that they believed there are Christians in all denominations might be too broad a statement. They would not have said that people who do not believe that Jesus has come in the flesh and died on the cross could be Christians. The so-called Christian Scientists do not accept this teaching, and yet they do believe many principles taught in the New Testament. And, so far as their moral behavior is concerned, they would be called Christians by the world; but, in the Bible acceptance of the term, a Christian is one who believes in Christ, obeys his word, lives according to his teaching, trusts his promises, relies upon his sacrifices, and expects his return and anticipates living with him in a better world. Unitarians and modernists do not accept these things. The pioneers would not, therefore, believe that they are Christians. Moses E. Lard expresses what Mr. Campbell believed and what all those who endeavored, as he did, to return to the New Testament also believed. Here is what he says:

Mr. Campbell concedes to all, no matter where found, who have been, in the true acceptance of the phrase, "born again," that they are members of the church or body of Christ. True, he believes many of these members to be in organizations purely sectarian, and hence unsanctioned by the Bible. And to all such members his counsel is, "Come out of these organizations."

"You see, while the pioneers believed that all who had truly been born of God or who had obeyed the gospel were Christians, they thought that it was wrong for these Christians to be in denominations, and they, therefore, labored and preached and persuaded to get Christians to come out of denominationalism. They believed that denominationalism was wrong. The whole of their efforts was to bring people out of error, therefore out of the denominations. They did not believe what you believe and what the so-called Disciples of Christ believe today. You and they believe that Christians are in denominations and are right in being there; that they should not be disturbed and

that we should not try to correct their error or to bring them to see the beauty of the church of the Lord, a non-sectarian, undenominational, undivided, therefore, church. There is a big difference, you see, in their attitude toward denominations and in your attitude toward the denominations. You plead the fact that they conceded that Christians could be found among the denominations to mean that they believed the denominations were right. If you know anything at all, you know they did not believe or teach that. They were hostile to denominationalism, and this point cannot be over emphasized."

25. S. S.: "Well, will not Christians be saved? If a man is a Christian and will, therefore, be saved even though he is in a denomination, what is the use in trying to bring him out of that denomination? That's the point I want you to answer. But I believe our discussion has gone long enough and, if you will allow me to go now, I will come back and we will continue on that point."

29. D. D.: "That is a vital point and I would rather you would stay with me until I can make explanation; but, if you must go, I will not try to hinder you. I must exact a promise from you, however, that you will come back."

30. S. S.: "I make the promise. I'll be seeing you in a few more days, but f©r the present I must tell you goodbye."

31. S. S.: "So long, Samp! Hurry back."

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Was Samp right in saying that those who are sincere will be saved?
2. Was he logical in admitting that those who are in error will still be saved?
3. Was Dan right in saying that we do not necessarily affirm

that an error will damn the soul of the one who holds it before we correct the error?

4. Should any one hold to his error after he is convinced that it is error, even if he does not think that the error is sufficiently grave to jeopardize his soul?

5. Is it characteristic of those who believe that everybody should be allowed to hold his own views and we should not try to correct him, to argue with you and to try to correct you if you do not agree on that point?

6. Does it not boil down to this: They think everybody is right who thinks they are right in thinking everybody is right, but he who thinks they are wrong in thinking that everybody is right is wrong and should be treated with contempt?

7. Is it legalistic to require Bible authority for our practice?

8. What does it mean to be legalistic?

9. Have you seen people who are legalistic? Discuss legalism.

10. Is Samp's idea of what Truth is a common view today?

11. Have men learned anything today that makes the Bible untrue?

12. Are there any established facts of science that contradict the Bible?

13. Did "Higher Critics" of fifty years ago hold a theory that scholars no longer hold?

14. Are you acquainted with the story of Miss Deeks and her charge against H. G. Wells?

Note: You may read about this in the book entitled *The Bible vs. Modernism* by Chas. H. Roberson and A. N. Trice.

15. Is the position that Dan says he holds an evidence of bigotry?

16. What is bigotry? What kind of man is a bigot?

17. Did the pioneers believe that there are Christians in the denominations?

18. Did they think that it was right for them to be there?

19. What call did they sound for all such Christians?

20. Is Samp's contention that if they are Christians they should be left where they are correct?

21. Did Dan give good reason for calling them out of denominationalism, even if we know they are Christians?

22. What is the difference in the attitude that the pioneers held on this point and that held by the Disciples of our day?

23. Do you know any one today who goes to the other extreme and denies that there can be Christians among the denominations?

24. If we admit that persons can be baptized Scripturally by a denominational preacher would we not have to admit that some may have been so baptized?

25. If persons cannot be baptized Scripturally by a denominational preacher, then was A. Campbell ever baptized?

26. Can you give better reasons than Dan gave for calling people out of denominationalism?

27. Why is denominationalism wrong? Is it just because denominations teach error on doctrinal points?

28. Suppose you find a denomination that teaches nothing but truth, would it be right to belong to it?

29. Would it be right to form a denomination to teach truth?

30. If a denomination is right on every point of teaching is it still wrong? Wherein is it wrong?

Note: For a fuller treatment of denominational baptism see "Contending for the Faith" by G. C. Brewer, the Gospel Advocate Co., Nashville, Tenn.

CHAPTER NINE

The Principles and Objects of The Current Reformation

By F. G. ALLEN

(Delivered before the Kentucky Christian Missionary Convention, Lexington, Kentucky, August 27, 1878)

"I am doing a great work, so that I can not come down; why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?"—*Nehemiah* vi:3.

This is the language of Nehemiah, the servant of God, to the delegation sent to him by Sanballat and Geshem, asking him to meet them in some one of the villages in the plain of Ono, to hold a council together with reference to the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem. In order that we may understand the force and significance of this language, it is necessary that we understand something of the circumstances under which it was spoken. It has an interesting and important history underlying it; and to this your attention is first directed. It is the history of the

REBUILDING OF JERUSALEM BY NEHEMIAH

Those of you who are Bible readers, and I presume that most of this intelligent audience are, remember that when the Jews were carried away into Babylonian captivity, some of the poorest of the land were left for vine dressers and husbandmen. These continued, with their posterity, in the land of their fathers. During the whole of the captivity, therefore, there were some Jews in and around Jerusalem.

It will be also remembered that during the captivity, a Jew might, by the special favor and providence of God, obtain a high position of trust and honor in the Persian government, such as we find in the case of Daniel, and that of Nehemiah.

Now it came to pass that during the latter part of the captivity, Nehemiah, a man of whose previous history we know nothing, obtained great favor in the eyes of the King, Artaxerxes; so that he enjoyed one of the first positions of confidence and honor in his government—that of cup-bearer to the King. While occupying this position, he came into the presence of the King on one occasion with a sad countenance. This was both unbecoming in the King's court, and dangerous; hence we infer that his grief was too intense to be hid. The King saw at once that he had some great sorrow at heart, and immediately asked him the cause. Nehemiah told him that one of his brethren and other Jews had come down from Jerusalem, and he had inquired of them of the condition of the Jews that had escaped, who were left of the captivity, and of the condition of the city of Jerusalem.

From these he had learned that the remnants that were left of the captivity were in great affliction and reproach, and that the walls of Jerusalem were broken down, and her gates consumed with fire. Consequently he said: "Let the King live forever; why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?" In the kindness of his heart, the King asked Nehemiah what he could do to alleviate his distress. Then Nehemiah, forgetting all selfish considerations, and prompted by the holy patriotism of his heart, having previously taken the whole matter to God in prayer, in answer to which this favor was granted, asked permission to go over into the land of Judea and rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. This was granted, and Nehemiah had placed under his command a small force for the accomplishment of the work. With this little band, he came over to the city of Jerusalem. Nehemiah kept his own counsel. He told no man of the purpose that God had put into his heart. He selected a few reliable men, and with these he went by night and took a survey of the city. The moon must have been riding high in the heavens, and pouring the light of

her full-orbed splendor upon the ruins of the "City of the great King," as Nehemiah beheld and described them. The city was in silent slumber; fit emblem of the slumber of the glory of Israel. As an indication of the utter ruin of the city, when Nehemiah came to the gate of the fountain, and to the King's pool, the beast on which he rode could not pass for the debris that filled the way. Having thus made himself thoroughly acquainted with the conditions of the city, he matured his plans, and immediately set to work to rebuild the walls, and restore the place of his fathers' sepulchres to its former grandeur and glory. He then revealed to his men the purpose of his heart, and how, through the Divine favor, he had obtained a commission from the King to accomplish the work. The grand idea of restoring from ruin the city of their fathers, and wresting it from the reproach of their enemies, filled their souls with a holy enthusiasm, so that with one voice they said: "Let us rise up and build the walls."

But no sooner was the work of rebuilding the walls known to the Samaritans and other surrounding tribes, than it met with a united opposition. At first it was to them a source of merriment. They sharpened the shafts of their ridicule, and hurled them at it with fiendish delight. As a sample of their sarcasm, Tobiah, one of the leaders of the opposition, said: They talk about rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem! Hm! "The walls that they would build, even if a fox were to go up, he would break down *their* stone wall!" But Nehemiah was not to be turned from his purpose by this kind of warfare. His heart was set upon his work, and he was taking counsel with God, not with men.

But when the opposition saw that this kind of warfare was unavailable, like the farmer who could not bring the boy down from his apple-tree with tufts of grass, tried what virtue there was in stones, they resorted to a severer kind of weapons. They now brought the force of their united armies to bear against the work. When they saw that the walls were going to be built, and

that a fox would not be likely to push them down, then the Arabians and the Amonites and the Ashdodites, were exceedingly wroth, and conspired all of them together to fight against Jerusalem, and to prevent the accomplishment of the work.

When this emergency arose, Nehemiah placed some of his men on guard, fully armed and equipped, and every man of his working force had his sword girded by his side, and with one hand held a weapon while he wrought upon the wall with the other. The enthusiasm with which the nobility of their work inspired them was manifest in that they worked upon the walls from the "rising of the morning" till the stars appeared at evening, and then slept by their work at night, so as to be a perpetual guard to it; and none of them put off his clothing, save that every one put them off for washing. Catching the spirit of their leader, the unanimity of the entire force is thus expressed: "The people had a mind to work."

It was also the purpose of Nehemiah to bring the walls up in uniformity, not one part to the neglect of another. This being the case, and the walls being "great and large," his men were "separated upon the wall one far from another," consequently they were few and weak at any given point. Therefore, Nehemiah issued an order that at the sound of the trumpet, which was kept near him, they should all rally to the point of attack. Whenever an attack was made, the bugle sounded, the forces rallied, the enemy was driven back, and never was there a breach made in the wall.

Now, that the walls are completed, and the ponderous gates are ready to be set up, there comes a change in the tactics of the opposition. Sanballat and Geshem, two of the principal leaders, send a delegation to Nehemiah, requesting that he meet them at some one of the villages of the plain of Ono, to hold a council together with reference to the rebuilding of Jerusalem. This is the coolest specimen of impudence on inspired record. The devil himself never surpassed it. They had opposed the work

from its incipency; first by ridicule, then by force of arms. But now that they see it is to be a grand success in spite of all their opposition, they want to hold a council about it, as if it were any of their business. But Nehemiah knew their purpose. He was too old a bird to be caught with chaff. He knew that they sought to do him mischief. And well might one less wise than he know that when such diplomacy follows the unsuccessful force of arms, mischief is always brewing. Nehemiah had no respect for such trickery; consequently he had no time for a council with such men in the plain of Ono, or anywhere else. He therefore responded in the language of the text: "I am doing a great work, and can not come down; why should the work cease while I leave it and come down to you?"

But, perhaps, some one is ready to say, "All this is a very interesting lesson in Jewish history, but what is there in it for us? What bearing has it on the religion of Christ?" Much in several respects. I think it contains a very important lesson for us in our plea for the restoration of New Testament Christianity. For, be it remembered, much of Jewish history was typical of a diviner substance in the Church of Christ, and especially was this true of that part that pertained to the temple and to the Holy City. But even if we should waive the typical character of the lesson, we are enabled, by analogy, to get a clearer conception of our work as a religious people, than we could perhaps otherwise get. Hence, to this analogy your attention is now invited. It is found in the

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

When Christ established His Church on the earth, it continued for about three hundred years one united body. During this time, while it had its troubles without, and its imperfections within, it was not troubled with the divisions now produced by sects and denominations. This was before denominationalism was born, or sectarianism became respectable. The followers of Christ were simply disciples, or Christians. They belonged simply to the Church of Christ, or, which is the same, to the

Church of God. They wore no human names, nor did they belong to any sect or denomination, such as are now claimed to be within the pale of the Church of God. This everybody knows who knows anything of the New Testament. But finally the "Man of Sin," whom Paul describes, began to be manifest. One corruption followed another, till the Church was led away into a dark night of captivity, strikingly typified by the Babylonian captivity of the Jews. The Church was in Babylon, and, like the Jews, the devoted friends of the Master, hung their harps on the willows, and mourned over the desolation of Zion. The great apostasy predicted by Paul was upon the Church, and her few uncorrupted children sat in sack-cloth and ashes. Be it remembered that this great apostasy originated and developed *within* the Church, not without. Brethren, allow me to suggest a gentle warning just at this point.

The night of the Church's captivity grew darker as it grew longer, till twelve hundred years lay like a pall of death upon her prostrate form. During the greater part of this time the Bible was virtually a sealed book, just as the Church of Rome would like to have it sealed today. The priest-ridden people were kept in ignorance of the Word of God; indulgences were sold as cattle in the market, to meet the extravagances of the papal court, and the temples dedicated to the service of Jehovah became but whitened sepulchres, full of the corruption of death.

In the sixteenth century that grand man of God, Martin Luther, awoke the world, as it were, from a slumber of ages, and gave the Bible to the people. By exposing the corruptions of the church of Rome, and giving the Bible to the people to read for themselves, he gave the "Man of Sin" a blow from which he has never recovered, and never will.

Luther attempted to reform the Church of Rome. In this he failed. That Church is as corrupt today, except so far as it has been influenced externally by its contact with Protestantism, as it was in the days of Martin Luther. But while Luther failed,

signally, to reform the Church of Rome, he succeeded in building up a mighty power in the earth, protesting against these corruptions, and hence called Protestantism.

But while Luther accomplished a great work in the world, for which we delight to honor his memory, it never entered into his mind to cease his fruitless efforts at reforming a corrupt and apostate Church—a thing which, as yet, has never been accomplished—and going back over all the dark and corrupt ages of the Church's history, and taking the divine model which God has left us of it in the days of its primitive purity, reconstruct the Church as it was at the beginning. At least, if such a thought ever entered his mind, he never acted upon it; hence it has never come down to us.

Contemporary with Luther, and co-operating with him in his grand work, were other great reformers; such as Zwingle, Knox and Calvin. Of all these, Zwingli alone seemed to have a correct conception of such a reformation as the age demanded. These are the different lights in which he and Luther viewed the same subject. "Luther was desirous of retaining in the Church all that was not expressly contradicted by Scripture, while Zwingle was intent on abolishing all that could not be proved by Scripture. The German Reformer wished to remain united to the Church of all preceding ages (that is, the Roman Catholic Church), and sought only to purify it from everything that was repugnant to the word of God. The Reformer of Zurich passed back over every intervening age till he reached the times of the Apostles; and, subjecting the Church to an entire transformation, labored to restore it to its primitive condition."—*D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation*.

But while Zwingle had this just conception of a true reformation, his influence was overshadowed by that of Luther; hence his principles never obtained in what is known as the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Following this, in the eighteenth century, was the Reforma-

tion of John Wesley. Wesley's work was, in some respects, similar to that of Luther. He labored to reform the Church of England, of which he lived and died a member. But in this, like Luther in trying to reform the Church of Rome, he made a signal failure. His efforts resulted, however, in the building up of another denomination characterized largely by those principles which he tried to infuse into the Church of England. But great as was the work of Mr. Wesley, for which we delight to do him honor, it seems never to have entered into his mind to leave the Church with which he stood identified, whose corruptions he was powerless to correct, and, going back over all the intervening ages to the days of the Apostles, reconstruct the Church of Christ as it was at the beginning. None of the Reformations of the past, therefore, were based upon this principle. It is chiefly in this respect that the Reformation with which we today stand identified differs from all others. Hence it is in strict propriety called

THE RESTORATION

The current Reformation, inaugurated by the Campbells and their co-laborers, was not an effort to reform some existing church or denomination, as such. Evidently the correction of the unscriptural abuses in all the denominations was one purpose for which these godly men labored, yet it was not the fundamental principle on which their Reformation was based, nor the leading object for which it was inaugurated.

Neither was it the purpose of these Reformers to establish a new church, or to build up another sect or denomination in the world. They believed that already the world was cursed with too many; hence, to add another to the number was the farthest thing from their purpose.

Since their leading object was not to reform churches or denominations as such, nor to establish another, the question arises, what was the specific

OBJECT OF THIS REFORMATION

I shall attempt briefly to answer this question:

About the beginning of the second quarter of the nineteenth century, there seemed to be, in the special providence of God, a turning of many minds, wholly disassociated and unknown to one another, to the Word of God as the only authority in religion. There seemed to be almost a simultaneous longing in many hearts to throw off the yoke of human bondage in religion, and form their faith and practice simply and purely by the Holy Scriptures. Chief among these were Thomas and Alexander Campbell.

In contemplating the Word of God as our only authority in religion, these men saw the wonderful reformation that it involved as a consequence. They saw that the Church, as it was at first established, when it knew no other authority but that of divine inspiration, had fallen under the apostasy predicted by Paul. It had been led away into its Babylonish captivity by the "Man of Sin"; and from this bondage it had never been liberated. Luther had broken the fetters with which Rome had for ages manacled the people of God; but instead of bidding the captives go free, and return to their native land, he strove only to mitigate their bondage. Consequently the Church was yet in Babylon. It had long been her privilege to go out, but as yet she had no one to lead the way. This was what the Church of God needed above all things else—to be taken out of Babylon; and this, by the help of God, they resolved to attempt. They resolved to go back over all the dark and polluted pages of the Church's history, disregarding all authority that had been usurped during the long centuries of her captivity, until the golden age of her virgin purity was found, before the polluting touch of human hands was laid upon her, or the perfumes of her garments deodorized by the foul breath of the apostasy, and restore her to the world in all the divine perfection that characterized her when she emanated from Him who said: On this rock I will build my Church. Or, in other words, it was

their purpose, like that of Nehemiah, to go up out of the land of captivity and rebuild the walls of the spiritual Jerusalem. Those walls had been broken down. Those gates had been consumed. The city of our fathers lay in ruins. Its principal highways were blockaded with rubbish. Even the sepulchres of those dearest to our hearts were dishonored. Laying aside the figure, it was their purpose to go back to the beginning, and, taking the Church as it is revealed to us in all its characteristics in the New Testament, restore it to the world precisely as it was at first. Their work, then, was really a work of *restoration*.

Every one must admit that the Church of God, during the first age of its history, when everything, both in faith and practice, organically, was given it by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, was just such a Church as God would have. Had He desired it otherwise, He would have ordered it otherwise. Not only was this true for that age, but for all ages. He who saw the end from the beginning, constituted His Church to meet the wants of His cause in all times and in all countries. This being true, it follows that the restoration of that Church in all respects as it was at the beginning, is the thing above all others that God in His providence would have accomplished. If He does not look upon a work of this kind with special favor, then we are without evidence that He looks with favor upon the observance of any divine precept or example. That which was well pleasing to the divine Father in the establishing and perfecting of the Church, must be well pleasing to Him now. If this be not true, then we are left in this age without a criterion of truth. It seems to us, therefore, that this work, when properly understood, must meet the approbation of all good men. While it lays the ax at the root of all sect and parties in religion, it lifts us infinitely above them. Since the Church of God at the beginning was purely a divine institution, its restoration is a divine work. Such a work is as far above that of laboring to build up a mere sect or party in the world, as the divine is above the human. This work is not in the spirit of sect. It is wholly

UNDENOMINATIONAL

Since the Church of God in the apostolic age did not contain sects and denominations such as now claim to be identified with that institution, it follows that whenever the Church is restored as it was in that age, it will be divested of all these denominational peculiarities. Whether the Church restored shall eventually cover the whole earth, and destroy all denominationalism, or whether it shall obtain only in part, the principle is the same—it will be wholly undenominational.

The world is exceedingly slow to learn that Christianity may be purely undenominational. I do not mean in the sense in which Moody and that class of sensationalists use the word, and even in which some brethren are now using it—that is, laboring in the interests of *All* denominations. But I mean it in its true sense—that is, standing identified with *no* denomination.

When you talk to men about being a Christian, they want to know what *kind* of a Christian. Or, in other words, they want to know what you are in addition to being a Christian. When you tell them that you are simply a Christian; that you decline to be anything else, they know not where to place you. When you tell them that you belong to the Church of God, or, which is the same, the Church of Christ, they want to know to what branch of the Church, or to what denomination you belong. When you tell them that you don't belong to any denomination, but simply to the Church of Christ, they are unable to give you a "local habitation and a name." Yet this is one of the simplest things in all the world. This was precisely the position of the first Christians. They were Christians, or disciples of Christ, and they were not anything else. They belonged to the Church of Christ, and they did not belong to anything else. In this consisted their unity.

The undenominational attitude of New Testament Christianity may be clearly perceived by the aid of a simple illustration. It is said that during the late war a circumstance of this kind

occurred in Northern Kentucky. Two preachers of different denominations who were quite friendly, as all preachers would be if it were not for these unscriptural divisions, concluded to hold a meeting together. The understanding was that each was to lay aside his denominational peculiarities, and they would labor together to bring sinners to Christ, without reference to denomination. Then, at the conclusion of the meeting, their converts, if they should have any, would be left free to identify themselves with either denomination, as they preferred. As well as I remember, and it was near where I lived, they had about twenty converts. Assuming that they were truly converted, they were converts to Christ, not to party. They were all brought to faith in Christ, and to repentance of sins, and were buried with Christ in baptism. Now, before these converts are divided, and take their denominational stand, while on the seat before us, I want to ask with reference to them, a few questions.

1. What are they? They are Christians. This every one must admit. For if they are not Christians, then believing in Christ and obeying the Gospel do not make one a Christian. But what else are they? Nothing. Not yet; as yet they have taken no other name. They are simply Christians; nothing more; nothing less.

2. To what church do they belong? To the Church of Christ. If not, then becoming a Christian does not make one a member of the Church of Christ. They have believed in Christ, have been baptized into His death, and become members of His body. They, therefore, belong to the Church of God. But to what denomination do they belong? They do not belong to any. As yet they have taken no denominational stand. They belong simply to the Church of Christ; nothing more; nothing less. They now occupy a position in which all Protestants, at least, admit them to be Christians and members of the Church of Christ.

3. Now suppose that, perceiving this, and seeing that they occupy the most popular and "orthodox" position possible, they

conclude to continue in that position, and refuse, therefore, to go with either of the preachers. On the contrary, they continue to edify one another, and to keep the ordinances as they were observed by the first Christians. Then what are they? The world must answer: They are Christians. What more than Christians? Nothing more. To what church do they belong? To the Church of Christ. To what denomination do they now belong? To none. They stand precisely where the first Christians stood in all these respects; and they constitute just such a congregation as those engaged in this work of restoration have been constituting all over the land for the last half a century.

I know it is sometimes thought presumptuous to speak of belonging to the same Church to which Paul and Peter belonged. But I must be allowed to say, that if I could not belong to the same Church to which they belonged, I would not belong to any. If I could not stand where the Apostles stood, I would stand nowhere. Everyone admits that Paul belonged to the Church of Christ. But to what denomination did he belong? Every one knows that he did not belong to any. Therefore, there is such a thing as belonging to the Church of Christ without belonging to any denomination; and, in so doing, standing precisely where the Apostles stood, and occupying the position of all the primitive Christians and thus presenting the only Scripture ground of

CHRISTIAN UNION

The leaders of the Reformation saw very clearly that the Church thus restored would enable all God's people, who love truth more than party, to unite on the ground on which the first Christians were united during the golden age of the Church's purity. The Church as it was, without any human legislation, furnished the ground of Christian union then, and that alone can furnish a basis of Christian union now. Consequently the union of all God's people on the Bible as our only authority in religion was the ultimate object to be accomplished by the restoration of the Church. Grand conception! Glorious execution! The very thought never ceases to thrill me! I desire

no higher honor on earth than to give all the powers of my life to the advancement of such a work, nor any greater glory in heaven than that which God has in reservation for those who are true to Him in this the divinest and holiest work ever committed to uninspired men.

That we occupy the only ground on which Protestantism can unite against its common and relentless foe—Catholicism—is simply conceded by those who have the freedom to impartially think, and the courage to fearlessly speak. Of this we had, but a few years ago, a striking illustration. During the excitement in the city of Cincinnati over the exclusion of the Bible from the public schools in the interests of Roman Catholicism, a public meeting was held at some point that I do not now remember, in the state of Indiana, of various denominations, to express their sentiments with reference to this introductory step in a mighty contest between the enemies and the friends of the Bible—a contest between the authority of "the Church" on the one hand, and that of the Book on the other. During that meeting, a minister of high standing in one of the most influential denominations in the world, speaking of the conflict which must inevitably come between Catholicism and Protestantism, and how Protestantism must be united in order to meet it, turned to one of our preachers who was occupying the stand with him, and, taking him by the hand, said: "*When it comes to this, my brother, then we will meet you on 'THE BIBLE AND THE BIBLE ALONE!'*"

The inference from this is clear. As the exponent of the sentiments of that meeting, and of the Protestantism which it represented, that speaker virtually said: "We will maintain our partyism, and keep up our divisions, till in the providence of God we are *driven* together; then we will come to that position to which you have for half a century been inviting us in harmony with the intercessory prayer of Jesus! Your position is right, and the only Scriptural and possible ground of union, but we will not come to it as long as we can help it! When forced

from our sectarian position we will go to yours!" How wondrous are God's ways in making the wrath of man to praise Him!

Since "it is glorious to create, but more glorious to redeem," the redemption of the Church of God from its captivity and apostasy, is the most glorious work that ever thrilled the human heart, or nerved the human will. My faith is that God's benediction will ever rest on the man who is faithful to this work, and that his curse will ever follow him who abandons it, or understandingly opposes it. But that the work of restoring the Church was to be opposed is clearly indicated in several places in the Bible, and typified, perhaps, in the opposition experienced by Nehemiah. Hence a few words with reference to the

OPPOSITION TO THE WORK

The ridicule and contempt heaped upon the work of Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, have been more than reproduced by those who have set themselves in opposition to the work of rebuilding the walls of the spiritual Jerusalem of which that was a type. Especially have the fathers in this Restoration experienced this in a high degree. "These people talk about restoring the Church as it was at the beginning! Why the church that they would restore, even the bats and owls would hardly deign to occupy in twenty years!"

Forty years ago such prophetic sarcasm was common as household words, not only in the family, and the irresponsible neighborhood gossip, but in the pulpit and the public prints. But there were false prophets in those days, even as there are false prophets now. These sect-inspired seers were estimated at their proper value; hence those grand men of God were not to be turned from their heaven-born purpose by the sneers and scoffs of a people who did not comprehend, and consequently did not appreciate, their work.

But this was not the only kind of opposition which the work was destined to meet. The united force of arms brought to bear against this work, like that against the work of Nehemiah, has

made this country resound with their clash for half a century. Where is there a grand old hero in this contest for things as they were at the beginning, who has not felt the blows of the enemy, thick and heavy, from every quarter, and smiled as he heard their harmless ring upon his armor? Ah! my brethren, the man whose spirit is not stirred within him, whose best mettle is not aroused, who is not inspired with no mean kind of inspiration, as he stands in the thickest of such a fight for such a cause, clad in an armor of divine truth as impenetrable as the shield of Achilles, is a stranger to the spirit of genuine, sanctified chivalry! But, soul-inspiring as is this plea, and the labor for its accomplishment, there have ever been those who object, and I wish to notice the grounds of their

OBJECTIONS TO THE WORK

"The idea of reconstructing the Church of God after the divine model, and on this confessedly orthodox ground unite God's people as they were at the beginning, I grant," said one of the leading men of Kentucky to me, "to be a grand conception of spiritual work in this age, and worthy of all acceptance; but I have serious objections to some of your methods of accomplishing the work."

"First. I think your people are too fond of controversy. You are too pugnacious. You delight too much in theological warfare."

Now, in this, I frankly confess there may be some truth. It may be that we are just a trifle more pugnacious than necessary. People are liable at times to overestimate the importance of opposition, and do more in meeting it than it really deserves. But if, in our work of restoration, we have occupied a warlike attitude, the question arises, Who is to blame for it? If there has been too much theological warfare over this work of restoration, blame certainly attaches somewhere; then let us see who is responsible, and let the blame rest where it belongs.

When Nehemiah's men went forth on the wall day after day,

each one with a sword girded by his side, and holding a weapon in one hand while he worked upon the wall with the other, what did it mean? Why were they thus armed? Were their arms any advantage to them in their work? Were they wearing them simply as ornaments, in whose glitter they took more delight than in their work? To ask these questions is to answer them. Nehemiah's work was opposed by the force of arms. He was, therefore, left to the alternative of arming his men, and defending his work while he prosecuted it, or, in craven cowardice, to abandon the enterprise. In the fear of God, and the love of His work, he chose the former; and his name is enrolled high upon the scroll of God's grandest heroes. The arming in his case was a necessity; and it has been none the less so in ours. Our work has been opposed; opposed by theological arms; opposed by the united forces of Christendom, because it means death to their party divisions; consequently we had to arm ourselves, stand upon those walls, repulse the enemy as the work progressed, or, in the contemptible fear of human opposition against a divine work, ignobly abandon it. In the fear of God, and the love of truth, we chose to stand upon those walls, and by the help of God we expect to stand there till He shall say, "Well done! good and faithful soldiers!" It is not our purpose to leave these walls and draw a sword or poise a lance outside of their limits; but woe be unto him who assaults the work! The objection, then, to our war-like attitude is not well founded. It is based on a misconception of our relation to the work. The blame attaches to the opposition; and there let it rest.

"Secondly," says the objector, "you lay too much stress upon some parts of your work, and not enough upon other parts. For instance, you attach too much importance to baptism. You preach too much about it; write too much about it; debate too much about it. You seem to lay more stress on baptism than on any other part of your work. Instead of advancing your work, I think you retard it by this everlasting harping on baptism."

Now, that all of this may contain some truth I have no disposition to deny. I think it is at least probable that we have given just a little more attention to baptism than the strength of the opposition has demanded. Indeed, it would have required wisdom more than human to have determined at all times just the amount of force necessary to protect any part of the work from the opposition that sought its destruction. That man is a skillful gunner who never uses shot too numerous nor too heavy for the game.

But if we have given more attention to baptism than to some other parts of our work, the question again arises, Who is responsible for this? Remember that when Nehemiah was rebuilding those walls, he labored to bring them all up in uniformity—not one part to the neglect of another. Consequently he said, "The work is great and large, and we are separated upon the wall, one far from another. In what place, therefore, ye hear the sound of the trumpet, resort ye thither unto us; our God shall fight for us." Now, imagine yourself standing on one of the mountains overlooking the city. You are watching the men as they quietly perform their work on all parts of the walls. Every man has his sword girded by his side, and holds a weapon in one hand while he works on the wall with the other. You discover, however, that their minds are not on their weapons, but on their *work*. You look down one of the valleys and you see the "army of Samaria" stealthily approaching the city. It is unobserved by the workmen. It selects its point of attack, and rushes to make a breach in the wall. Instantly the trumpet sounds, instantly the forces rally—to *the other side of the city!* What would you think of it? What would the world think of it? Those workmen would be held in everlasting contempt.

When did Nehemiah's trumpet sound? When an attack was made. *When* did the workmen rally? When the trumpet sounded. *Where* did they rally? *To the point of attack—the place where the enemy was.* Therefore, if they rallied to one place

more frequently than to another, it was not because they valued this part of the wall more highly than any other part, but because the enemy had selected that part for its attack. Precisely so with the workmen on the spiritual walls of the city of our God.

If we have had much controversy over baptism, it is not because we value it more highly than any other part of the work of restoration. It has been our purpose to bring this work up in uniformity, and hence to guard with equal care every part of it. What would baptism without faith be worth? Just as much as the sprinkling of an infant. And yet we have had comparatively controversy over faith. Occasionally we are called to meet an infidel at this point, and fight the battles of our religious neighbors, as well as our own. Who met, in the city of Cincinnati, in 1829, the boastful champion of infidelity, who had come from the far-off shores of Scotland, and Goliath, like, had challenged to deadly combat the "clergy" of our land, from New Orleans to Boston? Was it a man who lightly estimated faith in Christ, and made baptism the center of a religious system? The believing world, whose battle was there fought and gloriously won, know better. Who fought the battle of Protestantism in the same city, in 1837, against a power that would nullify the Word of God, and subvert our pure faith in Jesus Christ into the veriest idolatry? Was it one who held as efficacious mere external forms, regardless of the spirituality for which Protestantism has ever contended? I envy not the head nor the heart of him who so contends.

We have had little or no controversy with our religious neighbors over the divinity of Christ, prayer, repentance, godliness and the like. Not because we do not value these things as highly as it is possible to value anything else, but because they have not been assailed. Let one of them be attacked, and the trumpet will sound, the forces will rally, and the clash of arms over that hitherto quiet point will awaken the sleeping energies of Zion! The controversy over baptism, then, depends

wholly on the movements of the opposition. So long as they see proper to attack that point, we are prepared to defend it. And equally so of every other part of the work.

NO COMPROMISE

When the opposition saw that the walls of Jerusalem were about to be completed in spite of all their efforts to prevent it, they changed their tactics. They tried to induce Nehemiah to leave the work and counsel with them with reference to its completion. But he saw that this was only another trick to accomplish that which they had failed to accomplish by the force of arms. And just here, dear brethren, is our greatest danger. While we remain true to the principles on which we started out, there is no earthly power that can impede our progress. But the day we leave these walls and go out to take counsel with the world, will mark the day of our decline.. We have nothing to fear from without. Our only danger is from within. This danger lies in the direction of indifference and compromise. While we are true to God in the maintenance of these principles, the divine blessing will rest upon our work. But should they ever be surrendered, ruin will as certainly follow as that the Bible is true.

When God dipped His hand in chaos and bespangled the universe with worlds He impressed upon them His divine will, and they rejoiced in that impression. In this impression they received the laws regulating their existence, and the moment one of those laws is resisted, disaster follows. When shining ranks of angels leaped forth from His open hand, they received a knowledge of His will, and they delighted in that knowledge; but the day that some disregarded it, they fell eternally under the divine wrath. When man issued from the plastic fingers of the Almighty, reflecting the Divine Image, the crowning work of His hands, he received a law of life unto life, or of death unto death. While he rejoiced in that law God was his companion and friend, but the day he compromised it with Satan,

he fell from the favor of God, and went out under the curse of the Almighty. When God established His Church on the divinity of Jesus, and under the authority of His Son, He developed that Church under His fostering care till it rejoiced in a full-grown manhood in Christ. But when that Church forgot the lessons of its development, it went into apostasy and bondage. When God put it into the hearts of our fathers to restore that Church according to its divine model, their souls were thrilled with the thought, and they rejoiced in the privilege. While they have builded according to the model, as Moses built the tabernacle, they have received unsurpassed tokens of God's approbation; but the day that their posterity depart from that model and begin to build after the wisdom of the world, that day will God's presence and glory depart from them! Would to God I had the power to express this thought with angelic force, and burn it into the memory of our young preachers with a tongue of fire!

Never did a people have greater encouragement to hold fast their fundamental principles than do we. Their growth in the world has been unprecedented. The growth of Methodism has been regarded as one of the wonders of the world; and yet, when Mr. Wesley's plea for reformation had been earnestly pressed for nearly forty years, its adherents in Great Britain and Ireland numbered only 150 preachers and 35,000 members. At Mr. Wesley's death, when the principles of his Reformation had been proclaimed for about half a century, they were accepted in Europe, America and the West India Islands, by a membership of only 80,000.

In estimating the numbers throughout the world that have accepted the principles of Restoration in half a century, would it be far from correct to multiply these figures by ten? The growth of Methodism was after the first half century of its existence. Our growth in the past has been unprecedented, and we have only to be true to God in the work He has assigned us. to see results in the next half century that will amaze the world.

But in estimating the influence of our pica for Restoration we are not to look simply to the numbers that have publicly taken their stand on this ground. The influence of these principles on the denominational world in the correction of excesses and abuses, has been one of its marked results. The religious thought of the world is today drifting more in the direction of the supreme authority of the one Book, and the union of God's people on that Book, than ever before since the apostasy of the Church. We have, then, but to remain true to our principles—a "thus sayeth the Lord," in matters of faith; the largest liberty in matters of opinion. Uncompromising in essentials; relenting in incidentals. As unchangeable as the divine decrees, where God has bound us; as yielding as a mother's love, where He has left us free—and ere long they will prevail from pole to pole, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth.

In conclusion, let us not forget an important fact in the history of Nehemiah's work. The secret of his grand success is thus expressed: "We made our prayer unto our God, and set a watch day and night." Brethren, while eternal vigilance is the price of an uncorrupted religion, eternal prayerfulness is its life. Therefore, while we set a watch day and night over the faith of the Church, let us not forget to make our prayer unto our God for its purity. While we gird on our sword and sleep by our work, "that we may be on guard to it by night, and labor on the day," let us not forget that "our sufficiency is of God."

One by one will we lay our armor down at the feet of the Captain of our salvation. One by one will we be laid away by tender hands and aching hearts to rest on the bosom of Jesus. One by one will our ranks be thus thinned, till ere long we shall all pass over to the other side. But our cause will live. Eternal truth shall never perish. God will look down from His habitation on high, watch over it in His providence, and encircle it in the arms of His love. God will raise up others to take our places: and may we transmit the cause to them in its purity! Though dead, we shall thus speak for generations yet to come,

and God grant that we shall give no uncertain sound! Then may we from our blissful home on high, watch the growth of the cause we love, till it shall cover the whole earth as the waters cover the face of the great deep.

—From "*The Old Path Pulpit*"

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Who was the author of the sermon of this chapter?
2. When and where was it first preached?
3. In what book was it first published? Is this book in print now? Where may it be obtained?

Answer: See Introduction.

4. Who was F. G. Allen?

Answer: Frank Gibbs Allen was born, lived, died and was buried in Kentucky. He was born March 7, 1836 and died of tuberculosis Jan. 6, 1887. He was a farmer until he was a man with a family, and had been a Methodist from childhood. He then heard the gospel and obeyed it from the heart. He had a burning desire to preach the gospel to his fellowmen, and thus late in life he entered school to prepare himself for this work. He founded and edited *The Old Path Guide* which was published in Louisville. It was later consolidated with *The Apostolic Times* of Lexington, but Allen continued to write for the paper and he largely dominated it by the force of his pen. He prepared the sermons of the book from which this is taken when he was in the last stages of the fatal disease. The book was completed only about one year before he died. He seems to have been associated with those who favored the Missionary Societies but his preaching, if applied, would condemn them. He left some definite pronouncements against the use of instrumental music.

5. Do you think his use of the story of Nehemiah to illustrate the work of restoration apt and appropriate?

6. Is the story well told?
7. What two things does he say the *restoration* did *not* intend to accomplish?
8. Does he state clearly what the purpose was?
9. Where does he say the church was when the restoration was inaugurated.
10. How could the church be in Babylon if the church was not then already in existence?
11. If it was already in existence then Campbell did not found it, did he?
12. What about his contention that the church was perfect in the Apostolic age?
13. What of his statement that had God wanted the church "otherwise he would have ordered it otherwise"?
14. What does this do for the contention that the church was to grow and improve through the ages and that we today are far in advance of those of the New Testament day?
15. Allen discusses his subject under what divisions?
 Answer: (1) History of the Church, (2) The Restoration, (3) Object of this Reformation, (4) Undenominational, (5) Christian Union, (6) Opposition to the Work, (7) Objection to the Work, (8) No Compromise. Under these headings the answers to these questions will be found.

1—HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

16. Where does he begin with his history of the church?
17. How long does he indicate that the church was united?
18. Does he say the church was perfect through those years?
19. What was it that had not been born then?
20. How does he say the apostasy came?
21. From what source did it come?
22. Who or what developed out of this apostasy?
23. What prophetic Scriptures were fulfilled in this apostasy and in the development of the "Man of Sin"?

24. What Reformers does he name and what does he say they attempted to do?
25. Why could they not accomplish what they tried to do?
26. What did they do instead?
27. What Reformer proposed the plan that the Campbells later put into execution?
28. Why did he not succeed?

2—THE RESTORATION AND

3—THE OBJECT OF THIS REFORMATION

Questions 1 to 14 bring out what is said in these divisions.

4—UNDENOMINATIONAL

29. What does he say about sects in the New Testament church?
30. What does he say about the restored church?
31. Can it contain things that were not in the original church?
32. In connection with what does he use the word *destroy*?
33. Is that the attitude that all the pioneers had toward denominationalism?
34. What does he say about the world's getting the undenominational view?
35. What difference does he point out in the view he is presenting and the one held by some others of that day?
36. Has this difference been brought out in other chapters of this book?
37. What does he say about some of his own brethren even of that day with regard to this question?
38. What does that indicate with reference to digression even in that age?
39. What does he say with reference to people misunderstanding you when you tell them that you are simply a Christian?

40. Is this true today? Has this point been brought out before in this book?

41. If you tell people what you are and make them understand will you not sectarianize Scriptural terms?

42. Does everyone in this class understand thoroughly what is involved here?

43. What illustration does Allen use to make the point clear? Does the illustration clarify the point?

5—CHRISTIAN UNION

44. What does he say was the ultimate object of the Restoration of the N. T. church?

45. How was union to be accomplished?

46. Could union still be achieved in that way?

47. Why then should we not still press that plea?

48. What noble sentiment and purpose did Allen express here?

Answer: "I desire no higher honor on earth than to give all the powers of my life to the advancement of such a work, nor any greater glory in heaven than that which God has in reservation for those who are true to him in this the divinest and holiest work ever committed to uninspired men."

49. Is that not worth committing to memory?

50. If all preachers were imbued with such a spirit of appreciation of and of devotion to their work would we not convert more people?

51. Does that savor of legalism and radicalism?

52. Why can we not make the plea he made in the spirit he made it?

53. What reason does he give why Protestants especially should unite?

6—OPPOSITION TO THE WORK

54. What does he say of the ridicule and contempt heaped upon the work of restoration?

55. Is this an exaggeration, suppose you?

56. Is such opposition and persecution encountered today by gospel preachers?

Answer: Not often, but the silent contempt is as great today as ever if the preacher proclaims the truth and condemns error.

57. What has caused the relaxed attitude on the part of our denominational friends?

58. Can it be that they no longer regard the plea as a threat to their existence?

59. Would the plea still *destroy* denominationalism if properly presented?

60. What then is the answer to the present day attitude?

Answer: There are two extremes to consider in answering this: (1) The modernistic manner of presenting *nothing definite and positive*; no conviction on the part of the preacher and none expected in the hearer; (2) The man who claims to be loyal and sound and thinks he is presenting the plea but he is manifesting a prejudice, a *sectarian attitude and view*. Sectarianism in one will never destroy sectarianism in another. When we appear to be trying to *crush* somebody instead of trying to *convert* somebody our efforts will fail to do either.

7—OBJECTIONS TO THE WORK

61. What was the first objection he mentions?

62. Did he say there was any foundation for this?

63. Does he give a sane suggestion about evaluating opposition?

64. But in answer where does he lay the blame for the attitude to which the objection was made?

65. Does he go back now and make good use of the Nehemiah story?

66. What is the second objection?

67. Does Allen meet this with a good explanation?

68. Where does he get his illustration this time?

69. Are these objections still urged against us?
70. Can you give a better answer to them than did Allen?
71. What battles does he say we have fought for our neighbors, giving dates?
72. To what debates does he here refer?

8—No COMPROMISE

73. What was his exhortation on this point?
74. What illustration did he again use? Was this a good one?
75. Did he seem to think that our foes would change their tactics as Nehemiah's foes did?
76. Should we enter a conference with them, so to speak?
77. What point did Allen make about the success of the Restoration plea?
78. With what Reformer and what denomination did he compare it?
79. Would it do to make that comparison now?
80. What checked the growth?
81. What prophecy did Allen make?
82. Has it been fulfilled?
83. Commit this to memory: "When God put it into the hearts of our fathers to restore that Church according to its divine model, their souls were thrilled with the thought, and they rejoiced in the privilege. While they have builded according to the model, as Moses built the tabernacle, they have received unsurpassed tokens of God's approbation; but the day that their posterity depart from that model and begin to build after the wisdom of the world, that day will God's presence and glory depart from them! Would to God I had the power to express this thought with angelic force, and burn it into the memory of our young preachers with a tongue of fire!" So spoke F. G. Allen, August 27, 1878.

CHAPTER TEN

**A DISCUSSION BETWEEN
SAMPSON SCHISMATICUS & DANIEL DIDACTICUS****(Searcher's Sanctum. Enter Samp.)**

1. D. D.: "Good morning, Samp! Come right into my parlor, said the spider to the fly."

2. S. S.: "Good morning, Dan. Your use of that spider analogy indicates that you intend to devour me. Is that the way you are feeling this morning?"

3. D. D.: "No, Samp, I am like Peter, 'I have never eaten anything common or unclean.' I shall not devour you, but I shall entangle you and tie you up as usual."

4. S. S.: "I suppose you think that's what you do, but I have never realized that I was tied. I confess that you locked me up."

5. D. D.: "And you went to the sisters with it and begged sympathy and got them all excited."

6. S. S.: "Now, Dan, I did no such thing. I told you that was just a rumor that got started and rolled like a snowball, getting bigger at every revolution. I didn't accuse you of mistreating me."

7. D. D.: "What you say in reference to this rumor is true of all rumors, Samp. Any little circumstance can start a conflagration. But we will forget that incident and I shall not try to preach you a sermon on gossip. What is it you have on your mind this morning?"

8. S. S.: "Well, before we are through with our talk today, I want to get back to the point we were on when we closed our last discussion. But I have been thinking, Dan, that we are not logical and consistent, either one of us. We don't stay with a

subject, but we discuss about everything from science and sociology to astronomy and theology when we get started."

9. D. D.: "You are correct, Samp, and I am wondering if you know the reason. I am not averse to discussing the relationship of any of these sciences to the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints, and I know that men will sometimes resort to arguments that run into these various fields when they attempt to justify themselves for repudiating the word of God and the faith of Christians. I am asking again, Samp, do you know the reason we ramble and scatter when we are arguing."

10. S. S.: "It must be because we are scatterbrains."

11. D. D.: "Well, I probably could not be as modest as I should be and disclaim that, but I am going to disclaim that for you, Samp. You are not ordinarily a scatterbrain and you are capable of sustained thinking on any point on which you have a sound attitude."

12. S. S.: "What do you say, is the reason for our rambling discussion?"

13. D. D.: "All right, Samp, I'll answer that. I think I know the reason. It is this: You do not have any definite convictions on any point, and you are arguing not to sustain your position on some question, but to justify yourself in having no position on any question. Your attacks upon what you once believed and upon what I believe are all negative in character and, whenever you are driven off of one position, you immediately hunt another. If one argument will not stand up, you don't feel any loss, because you were using it in the hope that it would checkmate your opponent; but, if it fails, you will seek another argument and find another objection. And it doesn't matter whether one has any relation whatever to the other: negative reasoning doesn't have to be relevant; it is only negative and destructive, and a false statement, when shown to be false, does not cause you to falter one moment. You probably had a sense of its falsity in the beginning and only hoped the other fellow

wouldn't see the fallacy; but, if he does, there is no limit to falsehood and there is no embarrassing the father of falsehoods. So, there is the reason, Samp, that you skip, hop and jump in your negative attacks upon the foundations of our faith."

14. S. S.: "I thought you were the man who accused me of following Freud. It seems that you must have imagined yourself a psycho-analyst and you are now trying to analyze me and tell the secret motives that move me in my religion."

15. D. D.: "Samp, if I had analyzed you further, I would probably have told you that you don't have *any* religion. But, as to following Freud, I have read some of his works and I admit that in the held of psychology, he tells some truth. However, I did not learn what I have said concerning you from the reading of the works of any man. This comes from long experience and observation with men, Samp, and what I have said concerning you has been observed to be true of all the men who attack the faith, and it is doubly true of men who once held the faith and then renounced it. Their arguments are intended to justify themselves rather than to convince other people. Why should an atheist care whether anybody else becomes an atheist or not? Does he believe that atheism can bring happiness to a soul that already has the peace that passeth understanding, the joy that is unspeakable and full of glory, and the hope that serves as an anchor in the storms of life? Does he have a peace that others do not have? Does he have a joy that others cannot have? Does he have a hope superior to that which Christians have? Does he have anything at all to offer in lieu of that which he tries to take away from sincere and joyous Christians? You know he does not; and yet he argues continuously, engages in banter and challenge and ridicule, and imagines he is logical and profound. He is simply trying to satisfy himself that he is right in his atheism. He could have no other reason since he has nothing to offer men for their good."

16. S. S.: "You don't mean to say that I am an atheist, do you, Dan?"

17. D. D.: "You are not consciously an atheist; but, if you should try to define the difference between a modernist and an atheist, you would have a hard time doing it. Walter Lippmann in 'A Preface to Morals' says, 'Search the writings of liberal churchmen, and when you come to the crucial passages which are intended to express their belief in God, you will find, I think, that at just this point their uncertainty is most evident.' They are uncertain as to whether they believe in God at all."

18. S. S.: "Well, I am not an atheist and I have no intention of trying to defend modernists. Modernism is taking the world and anything you say against it needs no reply. You can't stop the tide. But, while you accuse me of unbelief and uncertainty, I take that as a compliment, because it means I am not dogmatic and intolerant."

19. D. D.: "Yes, that is the compliment that all modernists and unbelievers pay to themselves. When they get bruised up in an argument and have to surrender because they can't defend their position, they usually put on a poultice made up of compliments about their liberal, tolerant, enlightened state of mind. With their wounds thus mollified, they go to sleep in the devil's boat and are carried by the tide of the times on toward the destruction that is awaiting them."

20. S. S.: "But I was charging that you are inconsistent; and, if I used as harsh terms as you do, I would say that you are hypocritical, because you claim one thing and practice another."

21. D. D.: "All right, Samp, we'll take no offense at being called hypocrites if you can prove the charge. I don't think I make any charge against you that I cannot sustain, but I am calling upon you now to point out wherein our claim is inconsistent with our practice. I do not mean, now, that some individuals are not hypocrites, but I am talking about all of us who are sincerely striving to serve the Lord. Specify, Samp."

22. S. S.: "Well, the very point that we were talking about in our former discussion. You claim not only to follow the Bible, but you claim to follow the pioneers. I was showing you that the pioneers allowed things that you do not allow; that they taught things that you do not teach. You are not, therefore, consistent in your claim. I claim that the Disciples are more closely adhering to the principles of the pioneers than are the churches of Christ."

23. D. D.: "I must still call for specific instances, Samp. What do you have in mind? Wherein are we inconsistent with the teaching of the pioneers?"

24. S. S.: "I showed you before that they believed that the sects are Christian sects and they recognized the denominational people as children of God. You do not agree in this point. You don't think anyone is a Christian except those who agree with you. If you, personally, are not guilty on this point, you know that is the attitude of the churches of Christ."

25. D. D.: "If you remember what I brought to your attention in our last speech, you would know that this point was answered then. Moses E. Lard thoroughly refuted the claim that the sects are 'Christian sects,' and he showed that people who are Christians are sometimes aligned with a sect but are not sectarian in spirit, only entangled in sectarian relationships, and these Christians should be disentangled—they should be brought out of the denominations. He showed that Mr. Campbell and all those who labored with him were laboring to that very end. They believed that people should be Christians and that, if they would be Christians only, there would be no divisions among them—they would not be separated from each other by denominational differences, by human creeds and human names. They believed and taught that division is wrong, human creeds are wrong, human names are wrong, and they called upon all Christians to repudiate all of these wrong things and be just what the Lord wants his children to be. This has been our position

through all of our lives. We are in complete agreement with the pioneers on this point and also with Paul and Christ (John 17; I Cor. 1:10-14; Eph. 4:1-11)."

26. S. S.: "But you and the preachers in the churches of Christ do not hold this position."

27. D. D.: "Why do you say that, Samp? Will you not allow that we know our own position and are we not permitted to state our own views? This book that has come from the Old Paths Book Club contains lectures by at least four men, and they all held and expressed the same views that Campbell and Lard and Richardson and Milligan, McGarvey and all the others held."

28. S. S.: "But those men, with perhaps one exception, belonged to the Disciples; they didn't belong to the 'anti' bunch. Perhaps Brewer is an exception, but Sweeney, Allen and Tyler were certainly not on the 'anti' side."

29. D. D.: "Sweeney and Tyler lived and labored before the division was very widespread. The greater part of their life's work was given to a sincere effort at restoring the 'Ancient order.' It is true that some departures had taken place even before these sermons were delivered, but at the time these sermons were preached the issue was not acute and the division was not widespread. The book of sermons by Tyler, from which that chapter is taken, is a good book: the sermons are sound and scriptural and would be endorsed by any gospel preacher of this age as they were endorsed by all the gospel preachers when the book first came from the press more than sixty years ago.

"The book of sermons by Sweeney was published by the Gospel Advocate Company and has been distributed by that company for nearly sixty years. That paper has been looked upon as the leading journal on what you call the 'anti' side. Do you suppose that paper, its editors and contributors and read-

ers, endorsed Sweeney's sermons fifty years ago and on up until now?

"F. G. Allen stood against innovations and he has left his views in print on the questions that divided those who claimed to plead for the restoration. He was a pronounced and outspoken enemy of innovations. His sermons have recently been republished by the Gospel Advocate Company and the book may be obtained from that office today. But the editors of the Gospel Advocate themselves are in print on the very issue that you are trying to raise. David Lipscomb, F. D. Srygley, M. C. Kurfees and other writers of the Gospel Advocate have expressed themselves in terms as emphatic as any that were ever used by Campbell or Lard or any of the pioneers on this point. And you surely know that Moses E. Lard stood like Gibraltar against missionary societies, instrumental music and all the innovations that the Disciples have brought in. If you don't know these facts. Samp, you're too ill-informed in restoration history to even talk about such matters."

30. S. S.: "Well, if you are stating the truth in this respect, I would like for you to explain why it is that the preachers of today—I mean those who claim to be loyal preachers of the churches of Christ—why do they so bitterly denounce the Disciples for recognizing the sects as Christian? This is the point that I want clarified, and we all know that the attitude today of you and the churches of Christ toward denominations is entirely different from the attitude that the Disciples hold toward the denominations. Can you deny this?"

31. D. D.: "I do not deny that point, Samp. But I have more than once explained the different attitudes; however, I am willing to do it again. We, as did Campbell and Lard, *et al*, realize that all those who obey the gospel of Christ are Christians and we acknowledge the possibility, even admit the probability—yes, we know from experience—that some Christians are found among the denominations; but these are there, not because de-

nominationalism is right and not because the denominations teach the truth on the conditions of salvation; but these people, having learned the truth from God's word and having obeyed it sincerely, are, for that reason, Christians. They are among the denominations because of circumstances under which they were reared and because they want to be busily engaged in serving the Lord, and they have not been shown how that they can serve the Lord without being connected with some organization of religious people. They many times disagree with the doctrines of the denominations, the manners of the people and the practice even of the preachers, but they know not how to correct these conditions and are doing the best they can to be faithful in the position in which fortuitous circumstances have placed them. We endeavor to show these people the way out of error. We tell them to disconnect themselves from the denominations, repudiate human creeds and human names and serve the Lord in the beauty of holiness. We believe denominationalism is wrong, and this was stated by Sweeney, Allen, Tyler and Brewer in the book that we have been discussing, the book you hold in your hands. Now that is our attitude.

"Your attitude, the attitude of the Disciples, is that the sects themselves are right, that is, that they have a right to exist and that people can be Christians in the sects and continue in the sects and do not need to be corrected or led out. They not only concede that there are Christians among the sects, but they believe and teach that the sects themselves are Christian. The whole purpose of the book you hold in your hand is to prove that denominationalism is wrong; that sectarianism is called in the Bible damnable, and that those who are guilty of divisions cannot inherit the kingdom of God. The attitude of the Disciples is just the reverse. They sanction sects, they endorse error and encourage people to join the church of their choice or to remain in the church they have already chosen. They no longer utter the cry, 'Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord.' Even you, Samp, should see the difference."

32. S. S.: "I see what you say, but the last question I asked you in our former discussion is, Will a Christian be saved? If a Christian will be saved, then those who are among the denominations will be saved, and you are inconsistent in trying to get them to come out of their fathers and mothers' denominations. You are disturbing them when there is no use in doing it, since they'll be saved where they are. If they will not be saved where they are, then you will have Christians that are lost. And what did you gain by admitting they were Christians in the first place? It looks, Dan, as if this is a weakness on your part. You try to be broadminded enough to save a few people who differ with you, and then you turn right around and damn the same people because they don't agree with you. I think I have you convicted on this point, Dan."

33. D. D.: "Do you remember in our former discussion that I tried to show you that error should be corrected even if the error is not of such a nature as to cause a soul to be lost. Error is error, and error can profit no one anything. Even if people are saved who are connected with things that are wrong, they will not be saved by the wrong, but they will be saved in spite of it. And, if there is a doubt as to their salvation, why should we not remove the doubt? And I want to point out the following considerations to you, Samp, on this very point that you seem to think it unanswerable:

"1. Denominationalism means division, and division is condemned in the Scriptures. If you do not know this, just take time to read these passages and see how sinful it is to practice or sanction division and partyism: Rom. 16:17; 1 Cor. 1:10-13; 1 Cor. 3:3; 1 Cor. 11:17,18; 1 Cor. 12:13,24,25; Gal. 5:19-21; James 3:14.

"2. If people know what is pointed out here—that division is wrong, and if they're shown that they can come out of human organizations and be simple New Testament Christians, and then refuse to do this, they are rebelling against the truth

—sinning against the light, and, of course, we could not hope that they would be saved. Even though they did at one time obey the Lord in an acceptable way, they are disobeying him now.

"3. If people are Christians in the denominations, and if they are ignorant of the New Testament teaching against denominationalism, they are still sanctioning what is wrong and are, by their efforts even if not by their teaching, leading people to expect salvation who have no reason to expect it. In other words, if persons, contrary to the teaching of the denomination, learned the plain conditions of salvation as laid down in the New Testament and obeyed these conditions, they, by supporting the denominations, lead others to think that they can be saved by obeying things that the Bible doesn't teach. These people would not risk their own salvation by not obeying the Lord, but they encourage and support others in disobedience.

"You can see, Samp, that these people are in error, they are sanctioning error; and, if you say they will be saved in spite of this, you will, at least, have to admit that they might lead others to be lost. So, the whole point is that people who have obeyed the gospel of Christ on the conditions of salvation should continue to be as faithful to the Lord in doing what Christians are taught to do as they were in doing what sinners are taught to do in order to become Christians. If you get this view, Samp, you will see that there is no inconsistency between our claim and our preaching. We believe denominationalism is wrong; we preach that it is wrong. We preach that denominationalism should be abandoned and those who are depending on the doctrines of men for salvation should realize that they are leaning upon a broken reed; that those who are depending upon the Lord for salvation should obey the Lord in all matters and condemn everything that is wrong, whether it is in religious practice or in moral relationships. What fault can you find with that position, Samp?"

34. S. S.: "Well, as usual, you talked around until you think

you have explained the matter. I guess you have to your own satisfaction. And if you are satisfied, why should I be bothered? You will never change, Dan. And I don't believe you'll ever change me."

35. D. D.: "Is this another case of where Ephraim is wedded to his idol?"

36. S. S.: "To which one of us would you apply that? But I must go now, so I'll say good-by."

37. D. D.: "All right, Samp. If you have to leave, I think this a good time for you to go, but I hope you will come again and, with that wish expressed, I bid you good day."

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Was Dan correct in his analysis of Samp?
2. Is it characteristic of critics of Christians and of Christianity that when one of their fallacies is exposed they will immediately resort to another?
3. If a man had a sincere objection to the faith, when that objection is met and removed would he not then accept the faith—or at least cease objecting?
4. What reason could an atheist have for wanting people to accept atheism?
5. Why then are atheists so aggressive in trying to advance atheism?
6. If it is because they like company, if they could not persuade others to walk with them would they leave the lonely and hopeless road?
7. What is the difference between modernism and atheism? (See Walter Lippman's "A Preface to Morals"; Will Durant's "The Meaning of Life"; also Fosdick's works.)
8. Is modernism taking the world?
9. What is the remedy?

10. What inconsistency did Samp charge upon Dan and the churches of Christ?

11. Is the general attitude of the churches today toward denominations the same as that held by the pioneers?

12. Are the "loyal" preachers of today more antagonistic to the denominations than were the pioneers, yet not so well informed on and intellectually opposed to *denominationalism*?

13. Do they not oppose the denominations chiefly because they teach error on baptism, instrumental music, etc.?

14. Did David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, F. D. Srygley, M. C. Kurfees, J. A. Harding, J. C. McQuiddy, E. A. Elam and T. B. Larimore teach the same things that Campbell, Lard, Allen, Sweeney and Tyler taught about the denominations and about denominationalism?

Answer: See files of Gospel Advocate; also "Queries and Answers by David Lipscomb" compiled by J. W. Shepherd, pages 344 and 381. See also a discussion between F. D. Srygley, editor of first page of the *Gospel Advocate* and J. N. Hall, editor of the *American Baptist Flag*, which was published in both papers in the years 1898-1899, and was brought out in book form by J. W. Shepherd in 1914. Consult articles by Kurfees on the church in files of G. A.

15. Does Dan set forth this attitude correctly?

16. Does he make clear the difference between this attitude and that held by the Disciples?

17. Does he make a satisfactory answer to the statement that if people are Christians in a denomination we should leave them in the denomination?

18. On what basis would we ever be justified in correcting a Christian on any point? If he is a Christian in error why not leave him in his error?

19. On that basis should Apollos have been taught the way of the Lord more accurately?

20. Even if one did truly become a Christian under denominational teaching, *if he refuses* to come out of error when he is shown that it is error, can he still be called a Christian?

21. Why should we be concerned as to whether we are in agreement with the pioneers? Is it not more important to be in agreement with the apostles?

Answer: If we strive to be in agreement with the word of the Lord on all points, we will be doing exactly what the pioneers did, and will therefore be in agreement with them.

22. Is not the old question of rebaptism,—"sect-baptism"—included in the discussions of this chapter?

23. Will this then stir up a controversy on a dead issue?

Answer: See "Denominational Baptism" in the author's book, "Contending for the Faith," order from Gospel Advocate Co.

24. Should any issue that involves the souls of men be considered *as dead*?

25. Should we fail to teach the truth on any issue for fear of controversy?

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Our Aim*By* JOHN S. SWEENEY

The aim of that religious people known willingly as "disciples of Christ" or "Christians" is the subject of this discourse.

If their distinctive aim is not a good and worthy one, then there is no sufficient reason for their existence as a religious people. That they have such existence in considerable numbers and influence, especially in the United States, is a fact; but, unless by such separate existence they aim to accomplish some good work not as likely to be done without them, they are likely only to be the cause of a useless and an inexcusable disturbance in the religious world. Every person, every association of persons—in fact, every thing—should have some good reason assignable for its existence. There are already quite enough churches, quite enough denominations, among the professed followers of Christ; and there can be no valid reason given for an attempt to create and maintain another; simply another denomination of Christians. It is believed by many that denominationalism is the greatest internal foe, and some would even say the bane, of Christianity today. The disciples generally hold this view of it. To build up another denomination of Christians and add it to the long list already in existence, therefore is not the aim of the disciples. And if they ever do so it will be in spite of a much worthier aim with which they started out. On the other hand, candor requires the acknowledgement, that their fundamental purpose is in its very nature hostile to all denominations, as such; not, of course, to Christians among the denominations, but to denominationalism itself. To build up and maintain a mere denomination, however superior to those already in existence it might be, is not within the scope of their purpose.

To aid us in getting at what is the exact and distinctive aim of the Disciples it is important that we should have before us the state of things existing in what we call the religious world, in view of which their work was begun. And to aid us in getting a correct view of the situation we will suppose a case. It shall be one fairly supposable; one that might occur. We will take a young man twenty years old, and call him Jones, and locate him in Chicago, he is well educated for one of his age. He is not a church member, and has never even made a profession of religion; but has in common with us all a religious nature, and believes, in a general way, as most young men in Christian countries do, in the Christian religion, he is more than ordinarily an independent thinker; takes a pride in thinking for himself on all questions in which he feels an interest. He determines in his own mind to become a Christian and a member of the church of God. He means to act intelligently in the matter or not at all. He is not going in this way or that, or to join this church or (hat. because somebody else did; but is going to investigate and understand the matter for himself— how to become a Christian and a member of the church of God, the true church founded by Jesus and the apostles, he is going to take nothing second-hand, but is going to the bottom of the whole matter that he may understand it for himself. With this purpose he begins his investigations. And at [he outset he meets a Roman Catholic priest, ready to enlighten him. The priest tells him, of course, that his church is the true church of God, the one founded by Jesus and the apostles, the only true church and infallible; that in his church he may be a Christian; out of it he will be a common sinner or at best a heretic. The priest preaches the church and presses its claims till he convinces young Jones that it is at least respectable: respectable for its antiquity, for its large membership, for its wealth and for its learning; claims that it is the very identical church which Jesus and the apostles founded on the Rock, of which Peter was the first Pope. After patiently hearing the speech young Jones de-

cides that in pursuance of his purpose he must at least make himself acquainted with the church of Rome and pass judgment upon her claims. But before beginning the investigation he chances to meet a representative of the Eastern or Greek church, who claims that his is the true, the orthodox, the infallible, the only church of God: that in it, one can be a Christian; out of it, only a sinner or a heretic. After hearing his speech young Jones decides that he must also study and pass upon the claims of the Greek church. This enlarges the field of investigation considerably. And while the young man is indulging in some reflections upon the field of study opened by these two churches with their antiquities, their doctrines, traditions, customs, ceremonies and infallibilities, he is approached by an Anglican of the city, anxious to enlighten him as to the English church. He too is a clergyman, a rector of one of the parishes of the city. He tells young Jones about his church. It is not Roman Catholic, or Greek Catholic, but English Catholic. He preaches against popery, but for apostolic succession: has a good deal to say about the church, the ministry, the fathers, the councils of the church, its prayer-book, its orthodox creed, its fasts and feasts, days, moons and seasons, pompous rites and ceremonies, its prayers and praises, suited to all climes and seasons—not exactly the work of the apostles themselves, but much the same thing in English, that of their direct lineal successors—almost infallible, if not quite. He tells him of all the learned and distinguished persons who have been born and died in this church, and especially among the English speaking people of the world. Young Jones hears the Anglican patiently and concludes that he must also weigh his church and decide upon its claims. And while he is considering the question where to begin and in what order to proceed in his theological and ecclesiastical investigations he meets a Protestant clergyman of the city, who, having heard of the enquiring turn his mind had taken recently, had come to enlighten him upon the great subject in which he was interested. He finds young Jones in some mental worry and

confusion about true Christianity and the church of God: and undertakes at once to relieve him of his burdens by preaching Protestantism to him. He tells him, to begin with, that all the Catholic churches so called, the Roman, the Greek and the English, are only human, and in many respects very human; that their claims to infallibility are simply preposterous—three of them, at war among themselves, and yet each claiming to be infallible! He preaches Protestantism; tells him about the great reformation, about Martin Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, etc., etc., tells him that the Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants; tells him of the great doctrine of justification by faith only, of personal regeneration, experimental religion, of conscience, etc., etc.; and concludes that the way to be a Christian is to seek and obtain an experimental knowledge of regeneration and forgiveness of sins by faith in Jesus Christ; and that the matter of church membership is of minor importance comparatively. True, he continued, every Christian should join some church; but as to what one was in his judgment largely a matter of individual taste. In fact, while he thought every Christian should unite with some evangelical church, he did not hold church membership to be in any sense essential to salvation. Every one should be allowed to join the church of his own choice. He thought it well, if convenient, for young people to go into the church of their parents. Particularly he thought it looked well for husbands and wives to belong to the same church. He, of course, thought his own church the most Scriptural of all in its faith and practice; and he supposed every Christian thought about as he did about the particular church of his choice. Mr. Jones at this point interposes a question as to how many churches there are. The clergyman did not know exactly as to that; in fact he thought there was but one church of God, and all the so-called Protestant churches are but so many branches of that one church, each one claiming to be most Scriptural and evangelical in its doctrines and practices, and that this was a question about which Christians differed,

and, he held, had a right to differ. Some thought, and he strongly inclined to that opinion himself, that it was a wise providential arrangement that there were so many evangelical denominations, so that every one could find one suited to his own taste; and he thought there should be no angry discussions of the matter, but the fullest inter-denominational fellowship and communion of all evangelical Christians.

As young Jones had set out to understand for himself the way to become a Christian and a member of the church of God, the views of his Protestant friend added somewhat to his confusion. They were entirely too indefinite for him. In fact there seemed to him something in them bordering on the haphazard, especially in reference to the matter of church membership. It seemed to him that one might miss the church of God entirely if it be a thing so wholly undefined and with so many branches—so many evangelical branches. Of course evangelical was meant to distinguish certain branches from others unevangelical. And, again, allowing that there were so many evangelical branches and that one could certainly distinguish these from the unevangelical, there comes up the difficulty of deciding as to which of the evangelical branches is the most evangelical, the most Scriptural in its teaching and practice. He seemed to be getting into deeper difficulties and deeper confusion for every lesson he took. So he concludes to retire and review the whole matter, he does so and finds himself in about this predicament: Here are three churches, the Roman, the Greek, and the English, each claiming to be Catholic, each claiming to be the church of God, each claiming to be the only true church, each claiming more or less stoutly to be infallible; and each one opening up before him a field of investigation that would require years of study. Then here is Protestantism with its innumerable evangelical denominations, and denominations unevangelical, each having its creed and customs, and each claiming to be most scriptural in its faith and practice. Now must he go all over this vast field, must he investigate all these churches and

denominations, and decide upon all questions of difference between them, before he can become a Christian and a member of the church of God? And is he certain that, should he live long enough to explore this vast field, he will in the end find a place where his soul can rest in certainty and peace? He is completely dazed—not exactly that, for that implies light: he is overwhelmed in confusion; and begins seriously to study the spiritual meaning of the word Babylon, as he had never done before.

Many an honest soul with earnest desire to understand what Christianity is, what and where the church of God is, has been lost in that confusion in which for a time we must leave young Jones. Some alas! have never come out. Others in their disappointment and despair have fallen into unbelief and denounced all religion as a fraud and a failure.

But that we may still further and more fully get the situation before us; that is, the state of things in the religious world in view of which the movement in which the Disciples are engaged was begun; we will resort to another supposition. We will suppose a convention of all Christians—a pan-Christian convention, in Chicago. All churches, and all branches of all churches, fallible and infallible, evangelical and unevangelical; all are represented in this convention. This is a supposable case, although it must be granted that such a thing is not likely to occur any time in the very near future. It is simply our supposition. That's all. We will suppose the representatives from all Christendom convene and an organization is effected without difficulty—another unlikely thing! But it's our supposition. And if something marvelous should follow such a convention, it need not be a cause of great surprise. So we will suppose, and escape the imputation of irreverence, we hope, that the Apostle Paul appears in the meeting, he succeeds in satisfying all present that he is the Apostle Paul returned from the dead. He informs the brethren of the convention that God has sent him back to the world to serve him here awhile again; that he in-

structed him to come back and take his position in the church to which he belonged when here before, to preach the same gospel, to labor for the propagation and spread of the same Christianity for the spread of which he labored when here before. He asks the brethren, Where is the Christianity he planted, and where the church to which he belonged? What would the convention do with him? Would it undertake to comply with his request? And should it undertake to do so, how far would it be likely to go without difference, discussion and division? Would the representative of the Roman Catholic church say that Romanism was the Christianity Paul preached and that he belonged to the Roman Catholic church? And if he did so claim, what would the other delegates say? And if they were to agree to it, which they certainly would not, what would Paul say himself? Would he not say—would he not be compelled by truth to say that he never in all his life heard of the Roman Catholic church or of Roman Catholicism? Paul a Roman Catholic! Just think of it! Was there any such thing as Roman Catholicism in Paul's time? We have the history of his time. The New Testament itself contains a history of Paul and his time. Is there anything in that about the Roman Catholic church? It seems almost like ridicule to ask the question. To speak of Roman Catholicism or of the Roman Catholic church in Paul's time is a palpable anachronism. And what is true of the Roman Catholic church in this respect is equally true of every church and denomination represented in our supposed pan-ecclesiastical convention. Paul in all his lifetime never heard of one of them. The history of his time is as silent as the grave about them all. Did Paul ever hear of the Greek church? Did he ever hear of the English church? Did he ever hear of any of the Protestant churches? To ask these questions is to answer them in the negative, as every one acquainted with the Scriptures knows. No intelligent and candid person will claim that any one of these churches existed when Paul was here. It can be claimed and it is true that each one of them holds and teaches some

things taught by the apostle. This will not be questioned. But the fact that each one of them can maintain such a claim only complicates the matter more and more. It is claimed that each one with its creed and customs has been evolved from what the apostles taught. But this cannot be true, for they do not agree one with another. They clash and are at war with each other. But what we wish to emphasize is the fact that no one of them, as a church with its creed and customs, existed in the time of the apostles. This must be admitted by all of them. Some of these churches are very old. This will be granted. But as churches they have all been born since Paul lived and died. Hence our supposed convention cannot answer the question for the apostle as to the church he belonged to when in the world. There is absolutely no hope that any such convention could ever settle that question.

We are brought then to this conclusion: that the Christianity preached by the apostles, and the church they founded in the world and of which they were members, are older than all the creeds and churches and denominations of the present day. Christianity and the church of God are older than all the creeds and denominations now in existence.

Now the question arises, Do we desire to find that primitive Christianity and church? Are they better than the denominationalism we have? We answer, yes. Yes, a thousand times over. In this conviction we are settled.

Well, can the New Testament Christianity and the New Testament church be eliminated from the creeds and churches of today? We think not. Every effort to do so will be a failure. In fact, every Protestant creed and church are but the result of an effort to do that very thing—to get back to Jesus and the apostles—to get back to primitive and New Testament Christianity. And every such effort has only increased and complicated the difficulties of the situation, by adding one more creed and one more denomination to the number heretofore in existence. Here are the mazes in which young Jones was lost.

Christianity and the church of God were before all the creeds and denominations of today. The Christianity and the church of the New Testament were established by the apostles. They were in the church and were Christians without knowing anything about the denominations and parties of our time. They were not Roman Catholics. They were not Greek Catholics. They were not English Catholics. They were not evangelical Protestants. They were Christians. They belonged to the church of God; not a branch of it but to the church itself, the body of Christ. Their Christianity and the church to which they belonged were divine.

Can we find that primitive Christianity and church? We have decided that we can, and that by the help of God we will direct all the people of God and the world to it. We believe that it is to be found in the New Testament and only there. This is generally conceded when the New Testament is said to be an all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. Then we must return to the New Testament; not through the creeds and churches, but directly. We will never get hack if we undertake to go through all the creeds and churches in the order in which they came into being. Never in the world. The way to get hack is to let go all creeds and parties, all humanisms, and go back. Let go just now, and right where we are, and return at once. That is the only way it can be done. Cut entirely loose, and at once, from all human creeds and parties, and return and lake our stand with the apostles and first Christians. Can we do it? Certainly. The New Testament will afford us all the necessary light and means. If not, then it is not an all sufficient rule of faith and practice. But we believe that it is, and to return to its teachings for our faith and practice, to make it, and it only, authoritative in all things essential to salvation. *This is our fundamental aim.*

We do not believe that we are the only people who desire primitive Christianity, while all others others prefer denominationalism. Nor do we believe we are the only people aiming to return to the church of the New Testament. We are aiming

to accomplish what is almost universally desired by Christians. The advantage we claim is in the *method* we propose. The efforts Protestants have made heretofore have failed because their method was wrong. Every Protestant party has aimed to get back to New Testament Christianity by offering to Christians a better and more Scriptural human creed than any that had been tried before; and instead of getting back to the New Testament the creed only made a new party or denomination. If we wish ever to get back to apostolic Christianity we have got to put an end to the whole business of creed making. Instead of making better creeds than former ones we must get rid of them all. They must all go. If we would return to the New Testament, and if we would understand it when we go to it, we must not be trammelled by our human creeds.

There are persons who can see no way of serving the Lord without a creed, a human creed. Such persons should have something put down to their credit for their education; but they are greatly in error. They think that every body of Christian people should write out its faith; should formulate a creed and publish it to the world; that common honesty and fairness require this. We sometimes hear such persons reason, as they suppose, in this way: "Nobody believes and is governed by the Bible itself, but by his understanding of it, whether written or unwritten; then why not write out his understanding of the Bible that all may see and know what it is." They often say to Disciples: "We have a written creed and you have an unwritten one, and that's the difference between us, as to creeds." This is rather specious. Let us look at it. Let us suppose that we cannot believe and be governed by the New Testament, as we propose, but only by our "understanding of it" as asserted; and that we ought to write out our "understanding" that everybody may know what it is. Well when we write out our "understanding" of the New Testament, can we then believe and be governed by that, or by our understanding of it? Only by our "understanding" of it, of course: and must we not write that out for the

same reason that we wrote out our first "understanding"? Then we will have written our "understanding" of our understanding of the New Testament! And so we must proceed perpetually, unless at some time we succeed in doing what the Holy Spirit through inspired men could not do, namely, in writing out something in which we can believe and be governed by without having to write out an "understanding" of it! Can we hope to do what the Holy Spirit could not or did not do? We think not. It is better not to begin the endless business of writing out interpretations or understandings of the New Testament.

Do parties who have their written creeds succeed any better with them in stopping the mouths of false teachers, in getting rid of heretics, than we do without such creeds? That's a question we might do well to consider. The fact is, human creeds only increase the troubles they are made to prevent, or to rid the church of. And this because, as interpretations of what the Spirit of God has said, they interpret too much. They make more essentials to salvations and more conditions to Christian fellowship than the Holy Spirit has made. The difficulty generally with men as lords is that they lord too much. The fundamental difficulty with all human governments is that they aim to govern too much; and hence in nothing govern very well. In religion we should not try to contract the wide margin God has left for individual freedom of thought and conduct.

But it is objected, again, that if we abandon all creeds, churches, and denominations and return at once, as we propose, to the New Testament we shall fail of "succession," "apostolic succession": That is, we will thereby fall out of the line of succession. With some people that would be a great matter. Many are depending upon apostolic succession for their salvation. But the fact is, that apostolic succession in the sense of an unbroken series of ordinations from the apostles down to their alleged successors of today—that is, a succession of official men all through the Christian dispensation—is simply an ecclesiastical figment. The Roman Catholic church claims it stoutly. So

does the Greek church, but perhaps a little less stoutly. So does the English church. And so also the Syrian, the Coptic and the Armenian churches, the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, and various Protestant denominations. But so long as there can be nothing found about it in the teachings of Jesus and the apostles, we care but little about it. Let it go along with all the other rubbish we must lose in returning to the New Testament. The succession we want is that of the *truth* and not of men. We want the truth the apostles had and preached. We can find that in the New Testament, and only there.

If we believe just what the apostles believed, confess just what they confessed, and do just what they did—if, in other words, we *believe* what they required people to believe, *confess* what they required them to confess, and *do* what they required them to do, and are content to *be* what they required people to be—will not that reproduce apostolic Christianity? That is the succession we want. All the claims to a succession of ordained men from the apostles down to the present are simply preposterous.

There are many who admit the all-sufficiency of the New Testament as a rule of faith and practice, and that a return to it as the only authoritative creed is desirable; but deny that we have succeeded or are likely to succeed in doing so. In other words, they admit that our aim is a good one, but claim that our effort to carry it out has been and is a failure. They deny that we are any more apostolic in our faith and practice than others who hold on to their human creeds, denominational organizations and names. They think they see and are able to show that we are no nearer New Testament Christianity and the New Testament church than when we abandoned denominationalism. They think we are as much a sect as any of the sects our fathers left and against which we have been inveighing these seventy years past.

We are fallible. Mr. Campbell and his co-adjutors were all

fallible men. This we admit. But we claim confidently that our aim is a good one, but admit that we may not have been entirely successful in our effort to carry it into effect. We need the help of all such persons as can show us wherein we have failed. They can be of great assistance to us. And all such persons as believe our aim is good but our effort a failure ought to be willing to help us. Better that, than misrepresent and abuse us.

But now let us take a brief look, and as impartial a one as we can, at what the Disciples have accomplished. There are in the United States alone, we will venture to say, not less than eight thousand churches or congregations of them, aggregating a membership of little if any less than seven hundred thousand. They have established several universities, a good many colleges and a great many schools. They have published a great many books and tracts, and are sustaining quite a number of newspapers; and are nearly all preachers: all advocating a return to the New Testament in all things essential to salvation or to fellowship and communion in Christ Jesus. And all this has been done without a human creed, without any denominational organization or centralization, and without any party name; simply as disciples of Christ or Christians. There is no uninspired writing today that is in any sense authoritative among us. This all well informed and candid persons will admit. Others have sometimes said that some of the writings of Mr. Campbell are authoritative over us. It is sufficient to say simply that this is not true.

Our congregations are getting on quite as peacefully and prosperously, too, as any of the denominations do with their creeds. We find quite a sufficiency in the New Testament to believe, as well as for our government. We are learning, too, to have opinions without forcing them upon others; and to allow others to entertain opinions to which we cannot subscribe. We are learning that there are many things even in religion that none of us are able to explain to the satisfaction of all others. We believe that God will hold us responsible only for what he

has plainly revealed to us; and as in other matters He leaves us free, we ought to be willing to leave each other free. We should not want to bind each other where God has left us all free. Naturally men are tyrants; the more ignorant, the greater. We are learning to allow others to be free as ourselves where God has not bound us. Nor do we have to receive and countenance every false teacher that comes alone simply because we have no human creed. We can let go such when it becomes necessary with as great facility as the parties who have creeds, made and adopted for that very purpose.

The Disciples, then, have demonstrated the feasibility of Christians getting on together without any creed but the New Testament, which fifty years ago Protestants almost universally proclaimed an impossibility. We have succeeded in getting back of all the creeds, and in this respect, are standing just where the Christians did when the apostles were here. Not only so; we have lived to see human creeds, once held to be so necessary, all certainly and rapidly going into decadence; falling into desuetude. It is only a question of time with them. The knell of their doom has been sounded.

And now, coming to the New Testament as the only authority in matters of Christian faith and practice, we have to be careful. There must be no deviation from our method either to the right hand or the left.

What must the sinner *believe* in order to salvation and membership in the church of God? Our answer must be just what we can put our finger upon in so many words in the New Testament. All that the apostles required we must require, and no more. And we must accept their own statements of the subject matter of belief, and not substitute our explanations of them. Our explanations will not make them plainer. And then, again, the explanation business once begun will prove interminable. For instance, when the apostle, speaking of the written testimonies of his gospel, says. "These are written that ye

might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (John xx. 31). We must be satisfied with that simple statement; and require persons to "*believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.*" No light needs to be thrown upon this simple apostolic statement other than that derived from other statements of the subject matter of belief to be found in the New Testament. If we require sinners to believe just what the apostles did, no more nor less, we will succeed in carrying out our aim in this respect; will we not?

As to the verbal *confession* we require of those who would come into the church, we must be able to put our finger upon that also in the words of the New Testament. There will be great temptations to make slight departures. It will be so easy, so orthodox, and so compromising, to add a little to "the good confession" of the New Testament! But we must stand firm.

And so as to what sinners are to *do*, we must stand upon the words of the commission and of the apostles in their preaching under the commission. What the apostles required persons to do to be saved, that and all that, and only that, we must require. We have in the Acts of Apostles their instructions to sinners in all conceivable conditions: to such as had not heard the word of the Lord and believed (Acts xvi. 31); to such as had heard the word and had believed (Acts ii. 38); and to such as were penitent, praying, believers (Acts xxii. 16); and we must closely track these instructions, in telling sinners what to *do*.

And in respect of what must be *believed*, what must be *confessed*, and what must be *done*, by the sinner in order to salvation, it may be claimed, fearless of contradiction sustained, that the disciples have returned to and do stand upon apostolic precept and precedent. If any one thinks not it is a matter easily tested. We are willing to be tried. Let him who thinks he can, show that, in respect of the belief, the confession and the obedience required of sinners by the apostles, we require more or less than they did. A fair and an honest trial will convince intelligent doubters. It is true that in the creeds and customs

of the churches and denominations there is so much, along here, wholly unknown to the New Testament and with which the people educated in such creeds and customs have become familiarized, it is difficult to draw the line between truth and error and make them see it readily. With many, custom is as potent as plain Scripture teaching.

In the formation of churches, in our public observances and devotions, and in all that we call church government and discipline, we have to be equally careful to make nothing essential to fellowship or anywise authoritative, but apostolic precept and precedent. This we are aiming to do. And if in anything we are yet wrong, a strict adherence to our rule will assuredly bring us right. Only let us be sure not to go into the business of legislating and making rules of government. We shall have some differences and discussions; and there is nothing alarming about that. We are not all dead people. Creeds do not put an end to discussions among those who adopt them. If differences and discussions are evil, human creeds are not a cure for them. Our differences and discussions do not grow out of the fact that we have no human creed; but out of the fact that we are mortal men and women, and fallible like other folks. Is it not a fact that no association of men and women has ever existed for any length of time in this world without differences and discussions? And are we sure that dead calms are always and everywhere desirable? The winds put a rough surface upon the waters, stir up their depths, uproot trees, tumble down houses, and often destroy life; but they do more good than harm nevertheless. While they make themselves often very disagreeable it is however better to have them blow occasionally. And spiritual stagnation is not always the best thing to have. Why, the very thought even of a spiritual state of things in this world that allows of no liberty of opinion, no differences and discussions is perfectly suffocating! But *this* can be said of the Disciples: That in all those matters made essential to salvation and membership in the church of God by the apostles no people are

characterized by more perfect accord and harmony—that is, no living, free people.

Our course, in carrying out our purpose, quite a revolution will be wrought in all our nomenclature. We shall have to call New Testament things by New Testament names; and this will throw us out of accord with the churches and denominations. In speaking of the body of Christ in general, and of the churches in different localities, and of the disciples or Christians as such, we must apply only New Testament names.

It is just at this point that we meet the fiercest and most determined opposition from the denominations. It is almost an impossibility for many among them to understand us, it would seem, and when they do, the more bigoted among them most stubbornly resist us. Then insist that we ought to take upon ourselves some party name—some unscriptural name—as they have done; so that in speaking of us they can do so without applying to us New Testament names. If we would only meet in convention, or in some other formal way, adopt a name not once applied to the disciples by the apostles—no matter though we did it under guise of a convenience for the census bureau—we would at once be generally recognized as an "orthodox denomination of Christians." As it is, however, we are called "Campbellites," "New Lights," "Reformers,"—anything but a New Testament name. We are accused of arrogance, in appropriating to ourselves the names that all Christians in all churches are equally entitled to—as if we were the only "Christians" or "disciples of Christ" in the world. But however arrogant we may seem in the eyes of such as do not understand us as well as we understand ourselves, we must stand firmly on our line here. Surrendering here we surrender our principle, and surrendering our principle we surrender all. There is no arrogance in our position. It only seems so to such as do not see what a huge wrong and departure denominationalism is. Do not those who refuse to call us "Christians" themselves profess to be "Christians"? Do they not profess to be "disciples of Christ,"

at the same time they refuse to so designate us? They certainly do. Then where is our arrogance? Really, what partisans have against us is not simply that we profess to be "Christians" or "disciples of Christ," but that we will not profess to be something *else*; that we will not profess to be partisans. They would be willing for us to profess to be "disciples of Christ" or "Christians," and make no complaint about it. if we would only take a name meaning something outside of the New Testament, for them to call us by. But we cannot do it. The New Testament believed and obeyed makes Christians and not partisans, and when all professed followers of Jesus return to the faith and practice of that book, partyism and denominationalism will disappear. Then where will be our arrogance?

Finally, we are told that our position unchristianizes all others but ourselves; that is, in accepting only New Testament names for ourselves and for our congregations, and in calling the body of Christ at large only by New Testament designations we dechristianize all who wear party names. We, however, fail to see the matter so. We dechristianize nobody. Does our professing to be Christian unchristian anyone else? Surely not. Well, does our refusing to be or be called, anything else, unchristianize others? Certainly not. How, then, do we dechristianize all but ourselves? Does our wearing the Christian name logically imply that nobody else is a Christian? It certainly does not. As a matter of fact the Disciples have ever held from the beginning of their effort to return to primitive Christianity, and do hold, that every Christian whether identified with any of the denominations or not, not only has the right to be, but ought to be, simply a Christian and to wear only New Testament names, as we ourselves are aiming to do. We claim no exclusive right to anything in the New Testament. We claim for all that it contains primitive, apostolic Christianity; that we all can learn from it what the Lord would have us believe, and do, and be, and hope; that it may be as easily understood as any of the human creeds; and that if all Christians, and all who would be

Christians, will turn away from human standards to this divine one, they may get rid of all that is human and false and be united upon what is divine and true; and that thus and only thus can all Christians be united in one body.

(This from a book called "Sweeney's Sermons." Published by Gospel Advocate Co. in 1892)

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Who is the author of "Our Aim"?
2. Who was John S. Sweeney?

Answer: He was born Sept. 4, 1834. He became a lawyer and began preaching when he was found to be the only man in his community who was able to answer the attacks that the sectarian preachers were making upon "Campbellism." He held many debates. He had three brothers who also became preachers and strong defenders of the *restoration* plea. Z. T. Sweeney was possibly the most famous of the quartette. Their pictures with a brief story of their work can be seen in John Brown's history of the "Churches of Christ." Also a longer biography of John S. is given in the book from which this sermon is taken.

3. When was this sermon first published and who was the publisher?

Answer: *See Introduction.*

4. What does he say about our having a reason for our existence?
5. Did the world then or does it now need another denomination?
6. Did he indicate that the Christians might some day become another denomination? If so, what would it be?
7. What did he say was our attitude toward denomination-alism?
8. Does he say that there are Christians in denominations?

9. What of his illustration with the inquiring young man, Jones?

10. What difficulties did Jones run into?

11. Were the attitudes and the claims of the men he approached true to life? Was the whole case easily supposable?

12. Could he not have added other denominations to the list of those approached and increased the confusion instead of relieving the mind of Jones of its perplexed condition?

13. Do all these denominations still exist?

14. Would their priests and preachers of today make the same claims that were made by those whom Jones approached?

15. Would not an honest inquirer be as much confused by these conflicting claims today as was Jones?

16. Does not the same reason exist today to preach against denominationalism that existed in the days of Campbell and Sweeney?

17. Did men preach sermons like this in the pulpit and use illustrations like these showing the sin of denominationalism in the early days?

Answer: They did and kept it up at least through the first decade of the 20th Century. The author of this book heard them.

18. Could we preach such sermons now?

Answer: Some of us do, but they are not popular.

19. Can you find a "Disciple Preacher" or a "Christian Church Preacher" who will preach sermons of that tenor and type now?

20. If the need still exists why not meet it?

21. What of Sweeney's illustration with the Apostle Paul in the convention?

22. Would Paul be a welcomed guest in such a convention?

23. Could he get in without showing that he was a "delegate" from some denomination?

24. Do you suppose that there is any denomination that would

be presumptuous enough to claim him—denying him to all the others?

27. Is there a point in this that is not brought out in the story of Jones?

28. What was the purpose in using both illustrations in the same sermon?

25. Which one would Paul claim as his own?

26. What point did Sweeney drive home here?

29. Would this meet the rules for sermonizing that men follow today?

30. What desire and effort does he say has resulted in the various denominations?

31. How does he propose that we avoid this result?

32. What does he say is "*our foundation idea*"?

33. If we do not differ from others in purpose in what respect do we differ?

34. What does he say we must get rid of entirely?

35. Have not the denominations practically abandoned their creeds today?

36. Then why are they not invited if Sweeney's point was correct?

Answer: He did *not* advocate the abandonment of *all creeds* and the *believing of nothing*. His plea was to give up all human creeds *and adhere strictly to the divine*. This is not being done today.

37. What point does he make about writing out your *understanding* of the Bible?

38. Was his point logical and convincing?

39. What does he say about succession?

40. What sort of succession does he say does not exist?

41. What sort of succession does he say we want?

42. What does he say that some were saying of our efforts after seventy years?

43. Does he deny the charge outright?

44. Could you deny it today?
45. What figures does Sweeney give to prove that the *restoration* was a success?
46. Does Allen make this same point? Do their figures agree?
47. Would the success that such statistics show prove that we had not become a sect?
48. Does Sweeney refute that charge?
49. He clearly set forth the ideal and pleads for undenominationalism, but does he refute the charge that those who left the denominations to make this plea had then become a denomination?
50. What does he say about discussions among ourselves?
51. What does he say about opinions?
52. What prediction did he make concerning creeds?
53. Does he show how one becomes just what people became in the New Testament? Should this not be convincing?
54. What excellent and timely admonition did he give us?
Answer: "In the formation of churches, in our public observances and devotions, and in all that we call church government and discipline, we have to be equally careful to make nothing essential to fellowship or anywise authoritative, but apostolic precept and precedent. This we are aiming to do. And if in anything we are yet wrong, a strict adherence to our rule will assuredly bring us right. *Only let us be sure not to go into the business of legalizing and making rules of government.*" (Italics mine, G. C. B.)
55. What does he say about "nomenclature"?
56. What does he say about opposition on this point?
57. Why do the denominations show such bitterness about Scriptural names and Scriptural terms in our speech?
58. Can it be that Scriptural terminology makes clear our undenominational status, and condemns the denominations, whereas sectarian names and terms put us on an equality with the denominations and pleases them?
59. Has this point been made in this book before this?

60. What does he say about the charge of arrogance being made against us?

61. Is that charge ever made today?

62. How does Sweeney's sermon compare with the one by Allen reproduced in this book?

63. Does Allen show more fervor than Sweeney?

64. Does Sweeney come near to admitting that we have degenerated into a denomination?

65. Does he show how to avoid this?

66. Can it be that Allen was idealistic while Sweeney was more realistic?

67. How do the two men compare in fervor, in logic and in rhetoric?

CHAPTER TWELVE

A Discussion Between Sampson Schismaticus and Daniel Didacticus

(Searcher's Sanctum. Enter Samp.)

1. D. D.: "Hello, Samp! Come in. Find a chair and make yourself comfortable. Are you prepared to slay something with a jawbone this morning?"

2. S. S.: "Thank you, Dan. By referring to the jawbone episode, I suppose you want to recognize me as the servant of the Lord who had power equal to a thousand men; and, by this classification, you put yourself among the enemies of the Lord and are expecting to be slain. Is that correct, Dan?"

3. D. D.: "Ho, ho! You must have been sharpening your wits and somebody must have read you something from the Old Testament, or do you just remember that story from childhood? At any rate, you turned it to your favor all right and I'll give you credit. What are we going to talk about today?"

4. S. S.: "Well, in our last conversation, I had charged you with inconsistency in claiming to follow the pioneers and at the same time being very different from them on many points. You endeavored to show that you occupy the same position that they held. I still think you are wrong on this point."

5. D. D.: "Very well, Samp, name the point in which you think there is an inconsistency. You tried your hand last time on showing the pioneers held an attitude toward the denominations which we do not hold. I showed you to be wrong in that respect, as *we* and *they* stand against denominationalism with the full strength of our souls. What is your point now?"

6. S. S.: "Well, I happen to remember that I pointed out to you some time ago that Alexander Campbell was elected the first President of the American Christian Missionary Society. All of the pioneers believed in organized missionary work and they held a general convention in Cincinnati and organized a missionary society and elected Campbell President. You and all the churches of Christ oppose both conventions and missionary societies. Now there is a difference and I don't see how you are going to deny it."

7. D. D.: "I do not deny, Samp, that some brethren held a convention in Cincinnati in 1849 and that they did organize what they called the American Christian Missionary Society and that they elected Alexander Campbell President. I do deny, however, that all of the pioneers sanctioned or approved what was done at that convention. Many of them did not even approve the convention, and more of them disapproved what the convention did. Also, you forgot to mention one thing, and that is that they elected Tolbert Fanning, who was the founder and editor of the Gospel Advocate, as Vice President of the American Christian Missionary Society. Did you know that. Samp?"

8. S. S.: "Well, perhaps I had forgotten that detail, but I don't see that it has any bearing on the question."

9. D. D.: "Here is the bearing it has, Samp: Tolbert Fanning was not present and he never did function as Vice President; he opposed this organization and opposed such conventions as the brethren held in 1849. If the fact that they elected a man as Vice President who opposed what they did and never did cooperate with the Society at all, then it might be that they also elected Alexander Campbell without his consent, and it might turn out that Campbell himself never did function as President of that Society. Would you be surprised, Samp, if I should establish this point?"

10. S. S.: "Well, I surely would be surprised, for it is my

understanding that Campbell was not only elected to the presidency but that he continued to be President up until his death some twenty-five or thirty years later."

11. D. D.: "Is that as accurate as you are on the history of these men? If so, we should not be surprised at what you think in this matter. The Missionary Society was organized in 1849. A. Campbell died in 1866. Hence, he lived seventeen years after this election; but, it is a well known fact that during the last few years of his life, he was an invalid, his memory was gone and his mind was no longer alert and vigorous. Now, Samp, I am prepared to tell you that Alexander Campbell was not present when he was elected President of the Society and there is no evidence that he ever presided over one of their meetings. When he was charged with having changed from the position that he occupied when he was young and was editing *The Christian Baptist*, he denied that he had changed his position at all. If he had not changed his position, then he was definitely opposed to conventions or any kind of combination or association of churches or of any organization that bound independent congregations together and destroyed, therefore, their autonomy."

12. S. S.: "Did Campbell ever repudiate the Society or ever decline the honor that was placed upon him by making him the President of the Society?"

13. D. D.: "He did not allow it to usurp the function of his home church: he left nothing in his will to the Society of which he was President. He left \$5,000.00 to his home church to be used for missionary work. That was repudiation in fact. There is no other evidence that Campbell repudiated the Society or that he refused to accept the honor that they conferred upon him, but he did not function in connection with the Society, and it is clearly established that he was so much engrossed in other matters that he gave no attention to what the Society was doing, and even the men who lived in that day believed that Mr.

Campbell was never aware of the nature of the Society and did not know just what it was doing then, and certainly did not consider what the Society later became. He did take account of one thing that the Society was doing and he opposed and rebuked it; he objected to the Society's selling life memberships. The Society later removed that objectionable feature because of Campbell's opposition and because of the opposition of others, but they then re-enacted this part of their constitution and began selling life memberships and have continued to do so."

14. S. S.: "Where do you learn all of this, Dan? You don't read it in Richardson's Memoirs of Campbell, do you?"

15. D. D.: "No, this is not all found in Richardson's history of Campbell's life, but Richardson does give certain facts that sustain the points I have made. He tells that Campbell was at this time so much engrossed in the work connected with the Bible Union that he couldn't give attention to other things. This Bible Union had undertaken the task of revising the Bible and bringing out a new translation. Campbell was a member of the group and he had been assigned the duty of translating the Book of Acts. He was much devoted to the idea of giving the people a new translation and he was spending his whole time and energy in this direction. You must remember that this was before the American Standard Revised Version had been brought out. Richardson said that Campbell was so engrossed in this work that he couldn't give attention to Dr. Jeter's attack upon Campbell that the attack merited. He said Campbell wrote a few rambling articles about Jeters' Review but, because he could not give it the attention that it deserved, Moses E. Lard, a graduate of Bethany College, undertook the task of reviewing Jeter. Alexander Campbell wrote the introduction of Lard's Review. Since that work of Lard's is still extant, you may easily see how well he took care of Jeter. I think, Samp, that Lard's Review is the most logical and withering thing that I ever read."

16. S. S.: "But you said that there were other men among the pioneers who opposed the Society. Name some of these men."

17. D. D.: "It would be easier to name those who favored the Society, since the men who are best known were, with few exceptions, on the opposing side. One of the first and most earnest opponents of the Society was Jacob Creath Jr., but he did not stand alone. And we have already told you that Tolbert Fanning threw his whole weight against such an organization. Moses E. Lard, Benjamin Franklin, and a number of other men fought such organized efforts. There were three of the leading papers of that day that stood against the organized work to about one that stood for it. The paper that led in the fight for the Society was *The Christian Standard*, of which Isaac Errett was Editor. The Standard did not appear until after Campbell's death. For 17 years the Society had no champion organ and it had not made much progress. The three papers that were against it were the *Gospel Advocate*, the *American Christian Review* and the *Apostolic Times*. This last named paper was 'established with the avowed purpose of resisting the tide setting in, in favor of modern methods and organizations in church work.' The editors of this paper were Moses E. Lard, L. B. Wilkes, Robert Graham, W. H. Hopson and J. W. McGarvey. These, Samp, were among the pioneers who fought the organized effort."

18. S. S.: "I am asking again where you get all this information."

19. D. D.: "The sentence just quoted concerning the purpose for which the *Apostolic Times* was established is from Errett Gates; he is the author of a book entitled 'The Story of the Churches—The Disciples of Christ'; and he was Associate Professor of Church History in the University of Chicago. We learn, also, some of the things stated today from the *Millennial Harbinger*. But the book from which you can get all of these

points is *The Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies* by John T. Lewis. This book was published by the Gospel Advocate Company in 1932 and it can still be had from that office. Lewis did an excellent piece of work in bringing together all the facts concerning the pioneers and their relationship to the organized efforts, as well as to the use of instrumental music in the worship. By referring to this book, you can get facts that you would have to search through many restoration libraries to find. I commend this book to you, Samp."

20. S. S.: "I've heard of this fellow Lewis. He's a radical, isn't he?"

21. D. D.: "He is about as radical as I am, I suspect, Samp."

22. S. S.: "That's worse than I heard it."

23. D. D.: "Well, we're both about as radical as were Campbell and Lard and Creath and Ben Franklin and David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell and F. D. Srygley and a host of others who stood with these grand men of God. We stand where they stood. We contend for the things for which they contended, and we settle all disputes by a 'thus saith the Lord.' That position is really radical in this age, Samp, but those who have departed from this position have nothing upon which to stand and they cannot expect to be saved themselves or to save others. Neither can they expect their names to be remembered or their works to follow them. They are doing nothing worthy, and this you know to be the truth."

24. S. S.: "Well you men do not agree on everything, do you? Haven't you and Lewis had some scraps?"

25. D. D.: "We never had any 'scraps' over the issues that you and I are discussing, and I don't know that we ever had any scrap on any vital points. We are both individuals and we exercise the right of thinking for ourselves and of reaching our conclusions in the light of the teaching of God's word. If we

differ in matters of taste or of opinion, we know how to differ and still be brothers, and we have a fine example in the pioneers on these points. They differed but they allowed for differences in matters of opinion. They stood together in matters of faith. But regardless of what may be Lewis' personal eccentricities, the book is not an expression of his views on anything; this book is a compilation of what was said by other men on these points, and it is accurate and dependable. So, regardless of what you think of either me or of John T. Lewis, you can learn from his book the true story of how digression began and how that some of the leading pioneers tried to stay the tide. But the digression was only beginning in the days of Campbell and Fanning and Lard; it has grown worse and men have drifted farther as the years go by. They have formed more organizations, bigger organizations, and then merged the organizations into a unit organization which has ecclesiastical functions and which has robbed the churches of their independence and brought them under its control and power completely. The *Christian Standard*, which we have said led in the fight for organized efforts, has, for the last thirty years, been protesting against these unscriptural assumptions of power and against the other departures of the men who control these organizations. They have had little effect, and we have said to them that the only thing to do is to renounce the whole scheme and to return to the New Testament ground of congregational activity and congregational independence."

26. S. S.: "I suppose you will be telling me that The *Christian Standard* opposes instrumental music in the worship, and I imagine you will go back and find where the 'fathers' opposed this."

27. D. D.: "As to The Standard, no, I will not make this claim; but, as to the men you call fathers, I certainly will make the claim. The man who took the most active part in leading the brethren to form organizations was D. S. Burnet. The man who first advocated the use of instrumental music was L. L.

Pinkerton. We have told you who first opposed the societies, and most of these same men opposed the use of instrumental music in the worship. Do you want the proof, Samp?"

28. S. S.: "Not on this occasion, I shall have to return for that edition of your story. And now, with your permission, I'll be on my way."

29. D. D.: "Very well, Samp, I shall be looking for your early return. Good-by!"

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. In what respects does Samp charge that we—the churches of Christ—differ from the position held by the pioneers?

2. On what point in the charge has Dan already corrected him?

3. What point does he bring up now?

4. Name some of the prominent pioneers who approved "Organized efforts"—or the Missionary Society?

5. Who took the lead in advocating the forming of these organizations?

6. On what ground did men oppose these societies?

7. When and where was the American Christian Missionary Society formed?

8. Who was elected President and who as one of the Vice Presidents?

10. Was either of these men present?

11. Which one of these came out later as an outspoken opponent of Organizations?

12. Did Campbell take a position in the *Christian Baptist against* all organization, association or combining of churches and contend for congregational independence?

13. Can you give a famous quotation from him on this point?

Answer: "*In their church capacity alone they moved.*"

14. Was Campbell charged with having changed on this point?

15. What did he say in answer to this charge?

16. Did Campbell leave any thing in his will to be used for missionary work?

17. What agency did he name to use this money?

18. What was claiming the attention of Campbell in the decade from 1850 to 1860?

19. Where can we find statements made by men of that day to the effect that Campbell's strength of mind and body was impaired in the last years of his life?

Answer: *"The Voice of the Pioneers On Instrumental Music and Societies"* by John T. Lewis. Sold by the Gospel Advocate.

20. Did anyone ever make a serious attempt to deny these statements concerning Mr. Campbell's failing powers?

Answer: Yes, the strongest effort was made by J. B. Briney in John Brown's history. Compare his statement with those quoted by Lewis from Richardson, Lard, Lipscomb, Fanning and others.

21. What papers of the early day advocated the Missionary Organizations?

Answer: *The Christian Standard* after it came into being. It appeared in 1866. The first 17 years of the Society's life were unfavorable for its growth.

22. What papers opposed it? Name one that was founded for the expressed purpose of opposing the tendency toward centralization or the combining of independent churches?

23. What paper in recent years has protested against the usurpations and control that the organizations have seized? This means a paper that aligned with the society people.

24. If the organization as it was in the 1850's was a surrender of the *restoration* plea and principles as Creath, Lard, Franklin, Fanning and Lipscomb claimed, what shall we say of the societies as they are today?

25. Why does not the Christian Standard see this?

Answer: Ask the Standard.

26. Without the aid of this book and the authorities cited herein could you give answer to the claim that all the pioneers favored "organized efforts"?

27. How many years was it before the people of the restoration effort ever formed any organization, except New Testament churches?

28. Were they anti-missionary during that period?

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

The Distinctive Peculiarities of The Disciples

By J. Z. TYLER*

But we desire to hear of thee what thou thickest; for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against. Acts xxviii :22.

This congregation, whose history I briefly sketched this morning,* stands connected with one: of the most remarkable movements that has occurred since the great apostasy. The rapidity of its growth alone is enough to arrest the attention of every thoughtful observer. The reformation, which was begun in England, by the Wesleys, with such vivifying results more than a century ago, and which has made its power so felt in this land, is remarkable for the rapidity with which its ranks increased. But statistics will show that rapid as was the growth of that movement, the reformation which was inaugurated in this country in the early part of this century, has been more rapid. For although the famous declaration and address written by Thomas Campbell (then a Presbyterian minister recently come from Scotland), was not published until 1809, and although that stands as the first distinct proposal and call for this reformatory movement, yet we already stand in the front ranks in numerical strength in the United States, according to its latest official census returns; and in other lands, as England and Australia, there are to be found many devoted to the same plea and movement. These facts I mention, not in the spirit of party pride, but to indicate that the movement is worthy of your thoughtful attention.

* This sermon was preached at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of the Seventh Street Christian Church, Richmond, Virginia, March 2, 1882. The morning sermon gave a history of the congregation from its organization by Thomas Campbell, till 1882.

I propose to speak with the utmost candor tonight of the distinctive peculiarities of this brotherhood of Christians known to the world as the Disciples of Christ. For we have peculiarities. If we had none, or if those we have were not matters of deep conviction with us, there could be found no adequate apology for our existence as a separate and distinct people. I cheerfully recognize the right of all to know just what these peculiarities are, and why we hold them. And, although these points involve matters of controversy, I will not speak to you in that spirit. I shun controversy. Especially do I shun the *spirit* of controversy. I am aware also of the natural tendency to unduly exalt, in politics, in science, in society, in religion, in everything where men think and differ, those points over which they differ and around which controversy has raged. With us all our peculiarities are our pets. Knowing this weakness of human nature, I stand on guard against it. Before taking up the special points to be considered tonight, I desire most cheerfully and emphatically to recognize a fact too often forgotten when speaking of religious differences; the fact that in many things—yea in most things—yea, more, in the best things of our common faith and holy religion—all professing Christians are in substantial agreement.

Were you to ask of me one word which would most exactly present the central purpose of the peculiar plea presented by the Disciples, I would give you the deeply significant and comprehensive word *restoration*. For it was their purpose, as they declared in the beginning, and as, without variation they have continued to declare to the present, to restore to the world in faith, in spirit, and in practice, the religion of Christ and His apostles, as found on the pages of the New Testament Scriptures. The originators of this movement did not propose to themselves as their distinct work the reformation of any existing religious body, or the recasting of any existing religious creed. They proposed to themselves, and to all who might choose to associate themselves with them in this work, a task

no less than restoration. They clearly saw, and from the beginning distinctly recognized, that in order to do this, they must ignore and pass back beyond all ecclesiastical councils, with their creeds and confessions, their speculations and controversies, since the days of the apostles, and take up the work just as these inspired men left it. In the study of any movement it is of great importance to understand its purpose; and this I present as *the* purpose of the movement whose peculiarities we are to consider tonight. Our aim is certainly right, and the work proposed is needed. Whatever peculiarities we have arise from an honest effort to realize that aim. We may have erred in some of the details. The Bible *alone* must decide that. I do not stand here to claim that we have practically, and in all its details, accomplished the end proposed. We are only working toward it.

With these preliminaries, I now proceed to a more detailed statement of distinctive peculiarities, asking for them only a candid consideration in the light of the New Testament Scriptures.

I. *We are peculiar in our plea for Christian union.*

Open your New Testament and you will find that the church there is a unit. One flock, one body, one spiritual temple, one household, are some of the figures under which we therein find it presented. It was of one mind, and of one heart. But if we look abroad over the Christian world, do we find this true today? Leaving out of view for the present, the larger factions into which it is divided—the Greek, the Papal, and the Protestant—and fixing our eyes upon the last named only, what do we behold? A house divided against itself; a kingdom made weak by internal discord and division. Turning again to the book, we hear the Savior, in the very shadow of the cross, praying for all who may believe on him, through the apostolic word, that they be one; we find all divisions deeply deplored; schismatics are sharply censured; not even a Paul, an Apollos, or a Cephas, allowed to be the leader of a party; and sectism

branded as a sin so great as to prevent the world's believing in the divine mission of our Savior. Others may say division is unwise, but in the light of this we say *it is sinful*. And whatever apologies may be made for the present divided state of the religious world, it must be evident to everyone that the restoration for which we plead cannot be complete until it can be said again, as Paul said in his day, "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all."¹

As we study the historic development of this movement, we find its protest against divisions, and its plea for Christian union was its first strongly marked feature. The declaration and address of 1809 was an arraignment of sectism, depicting its evil consequences and its sinful nature, and an earnest call upon ministers and churches to labor for the union of Christians as they were united in the beginning. "After considering the divisions in various lights," says Dr. Richardson, in his *Memoirs of A. Campbell*,² "as hindering the dispensation of the Lord's Supper; spiritual intercourse among Christians; ministerial labors, and the effective exercise of church discipline, as well as lending to promote infidelity, an appeal is made to gospel ministers to become leaders in the endeavor to remedy these evils; and especially is this urged upon those in the United States, as a country happily exempted from the baneful influence of a civil establishment of any particular form of Christianity, and from under the influence of an anti-Christian hierarchy." This movement did not arise from controversy about any particular view of baptism, spiritual influence, or kindred questions mooted at a later date, in the progress of the work. Let this statement be considered emphatic, since the popular idea seems to be that out of such controversy we arose, and that our plea finds its roots in these questions. *The central*

¹ Ephesians, iv:4-5.

² *Memoirs of A. Campbell*, Vol. I., p. 253.

aim was restoration; the first feature sought to be restored was the union of Christians as in the beginning.

During the past fifty years a great change has come over the churches and their pulpits on this question of union. Then it was seldom advocated, and was exceedingly unpopular. Now it is one of the most popular pulpit themes. The change that has taken place has greatly toned down our appearance of peculiarity on this one point. Others now advocate union. Many, recognizing the force of increasing popular feeling against divisions, are striving to show that in the midst of all strife, or rather underlying all existing divisions, there exists an essential unity. These different religious bodies, they tell us, are only so many divisions of one grand army. Here is the light infantry, here the heavy artillery, here the cavalry, here the navy; but all are fighting under one commander, and follow one flag. Now, most cheerfully conceding all the unity in doctrine, and in spirit, and in practice, which exists among these hundreds of separate bodies, let us pause to inquire whether the parts of this beautiful figure actually set forth the facts in the case. In the grand army the proper authority has so ordered the division of it, and given not only the sanction of authority to such division, but also defines the duties of each. The right of each division to be what it is, and to do what it docs, can be and must be traced up to the head of the entire army. The law that constitutes it an army at all, constitutes it just the army it is. Can this essential point be claimed by the denominations of Christianity today? Where has the Great Head of the Church authorized such a division of His body, and in what place do we find Him defining the duties of each? Or again, does the mutual support and helpfulness which exists among the armed forces of a nation, find any parallel among these denominational divisions of the church? The cavalry, the infantry, the artillery, the navy exist as separate parts of the force, that it may render more effective service by the support each may render to the others. But, when we speak in harmony with the facts concern-

ing the church, we are compelled to confess with grief and shame, that, instead of mutual support, much of its strength is worse than wasted in fratricidal strife. Rivalry, contention, excommunication, and anathema, tell the sad story. The figure may be beautiful and rhetorical, but it lacks the important feature of fidelity to facts. I have heard it said again, that it is better for the church to stand like the frowning cliffs of the riven rock than to lie like the dead sand of indifference on the barren beach. But, must we confess that our choice is limited to these two conditions? Has it come to pass that the church can live only by rending strife, or lie down in indifference, indolence and death? This is a poor apology for division; that a delusive presentation of a hidden union. These voices are but the dying echoes of the opposition to union which were heard all over the land years ago.

The fact is, the idea of union is becoming more popular as the years pass by. Yet while this is true, the plea for union, which the Disciples present, is still peculiar. They oppose division not simply as unwise and impolitic, but as *positively sinful*, and to be repented of and forsaken as any other sin. They plead not simply for an underlying and hidden unity, but for an open and manifest union, such a unity and union that the world may see it and believe, concerning Christ, that God sent him into the world.* They do not call for a confederation of sects, but labor for the total abolition of sectism. On this point we desire to see produced what is advocated in apostolic teaching. There should be no division among us.² This first point is our first peculiarity, historically considered, and is, logically considered, the prominent feature of our plea.

II. *We are peculiar in reference to human names for the children of God and the body of Christ.*

We reject all human names. Our reasons for opposing human names are such as these:

1. Because they perpetuate party spirit. It is frequently asked,

¹ John xvii:21.

² 1. Cor. i:10.

"What's in a name?" I answer, There is in every name what its surroundings and attendant events have put into that name. A time was when there was nothing in the name *Napoleon*, but the daring and sanguinary life he lived who wore that name, the victories that crowned his military exploits, as kings became uncrowned and nations cowered at his feet, has made that name to signify military genius; nothing in the name *Howard*, until John Howard, released from prison in France, and made high sheriff of Bedford, entered upon his work of prison reforms and continued to prosecute this work of humanity and benevolence, spending more than thirty thousand pounds from his own purse, and traveling over fifty thousand miles through fatigue and danger, made that name the synonym of unselfish benevolence; nothing in the name *Washington*, until by fortitude and bravery, born of devotion to his country, in just cause, our own countrymen made it mean to all the world Christian patriotism. So it is in reference to party names. There is in them what attendant circumstances and events have placed there. They all have been born of strife and christened with wormwood and gall. The church divides. Party spirit runs high and becomes regnant. A new name is chosen for a new party, and party spirit lies embalmed in that name.

It is almost impossible to adequately describe the hidden potency of these names; they have a sway over human nature which we are slow to acknowledge. Let any one enter a church that wears a different name, and announce himself by his denominational name, and if recognition be accorded him it will be formal rather than fraternal. There are pulpits from which I am practically excluded, but into which I would be cordially invited *with the very message I now deliver*, if only I would assume their party name. There are churches from whose communion table I am excluded, but to which I would receive a fraternal welcome should I simply assume their denominational name. These are facts. I give them as samples of many more.

They show something of what there is in a name, and how party names perpetuate party spirit.

2. We reject them simply because it is impossible to find a human name which all Christians would consent to wear. That is, you cannot unite all the children of God under an existing denominational name. Take the most honored of these names—names worn by some of the most saintly of earth—as Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Lutheran—names like these, and can you suppose for one moment, that all Christians could be induced to unite under any one of them? Moreover, would it be right if they could? *Yet union is right, and division is sinful.* If we labor for restoration, we must labor for union; if we labor wisely for union, we must, so far as name is concerned take only that which all can consent to wear without wounding of conscience; if we take only that which all can consent to wear without wounding of conscience, we must take only what inspiration sanctions; if we take only that which inspiration sanctions, we must reject all human names for the children of God and of the body of Christ.

3. We reject them because we hold it quite enough to be simply a Christian. But if we are only a Christian, why do you need more than that name to tell what you are? If you are a Christian, and something besides, then whatever that is you are besides, for that you need some name besides. If you aim to be a modern modified Christian, rather than such as were made under inspired teaching, you should have some name to fitly set forth that fact to the world. But, if you aim to be simply a Christian, then you need no other title than some one found in the Book to set forth that fact. *We hold it is quite enough to be simply a Christian.* We use all revealed truth, all ordinances, all means of grace to make men such, and to develop them in Christian character. We do not desire them to be other than this, and we reject all human names.

4. We reject them as dishonoring to Christ. His is the worthy

name by which they were called in the beginning.¹ For Him the whole family in heaven and in earth is named.² To us He is all and all. He has washed us in His blood, and we have been espoused³ to Him. The church is His bride, the Lamb's wife.⁴ Christ is called the bridegroom.⁵ The wife should wear the name of her husband, and it would be held by the world as dishonoring him, should she wear the name of one of his servants, however faithful that servant might be to him, or that of a friend, how devoted soever his friendship may be. In the church at Corinth they were sharply rebuked for saying, "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas." Although two of those were chosen apostles, and the other an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures.⁶ "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?"⁷ are the question with which he expresses his reprehension of such a course, and his amazement. Take the names of any in later times, eminent for their devotion and services, and with equal justice may these questions be propounded to the churches wearing their names. It is no reflection upon them or their worth to refuse to be called by their names, but to wear them is a dishonor to Christ, although not so intended.

For this reason we have refused with an earnestness and persistency which are a perplexity to some, to wear the name of Campbell. Our refusal to be called Campbellites is grounded on principle. We cannot consistently consent—we *will not* consent—to wear the name of any man. To do so would be to sacrifice a fundamental principle. It would be a practical abandonment of the work upon which we have entered. "But," it is objected, "Your exclusive appropriation of the name Christian implies that, in your opinion, there are no Christians in the world except yourselves." In this objection there would be force if we really aimed at an *exclusive* appropriation of this name. But this exclusiveness is not in our claim. We distinctly teach

¹ James ii:7² II Cor. xi:2.³ I Cor. i:12⁴ Eph. iii:14-16.

Rev. xxi:9.

⁵ Acts xviii:24⁶ Mark ii:19-20.

Cor. i:13.

there are most excellent Christians who are not enrolled with us. Were this not true, pray why should we plead for the union of Christians? *We* are united, and, if we did not believe there are Christians in the world outside of our ranks, our plea would be senseless and absurd. The point in which we are peculiar is simply this—*we persistently reject all human names*. We rejoice that there are so many devout Christians in the world, and we call upon them to abandon all party names, and be content to be known by those names only which we find in the New Testament.

III. *We are peculiar in our rejection of human creeds and books of discipline, for the faith and government of the church.*

The claim of Protestantism is, that it takes only the Bible as its rule of faith and practice. As has been tersely and strongly put, "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants." And yet the parties into which Protestantism is divided practically nullify this high claim by adding creeds of their own construction. We reject all man-made creeds, and for such reasons as the following:

1. Because we believe the Bible *alone* is sufficient. We hold the sacred Scriptures as given of God to meet all the purposes of a guide to our faith, a rule for our life, and law for the government and discipline of the church. As Paul has said, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."¹ What more can we ask than is here claimed for the Scriptures? They are profitable for doctrine; this covers the whole ground of truth needed to make us wise unto salvation. They are profitable for reproof; that is, they are sufficient to silence heresy. They are profitable for correction; no other book of discipline is needed. They are profitable for instruction in righteousness; in them may be

¹ II. Tim. iii:16-17.

found all that we need for development in righteousness and personal holiness. This, remember, is God's own estimate of His Word, and His description of its purposes and use. We say it is enough. We, hence, reject all other books of faith and discipline.

Moreover, we claim that to prepare and issue any other book, as binding on the faith and practice of the children of God, is a *very grave* mistake. It not only implies that the Scriptures *alone* do *not* thoroughly furnish the man of God for the important matters specified, but the man-made creed is a step toward apostasy. As another has illustrated—"Compare this with a well known feature in the Roman apostasy. The Bible declares there is one mediator, between God and man, and that there is salvation in none other; that His blood cleanseth us from sin. What, in this cardinal point, is the very gist of Roman apostasy? Denying Christ? No. Denying that He is the Mediator? No. What then? She adds other mediators—the virgin and the saints. This is recognized by all Protestants as the very essence of her apostasy on this point. But, men and brethren, I submit to you whether the case in hand be not precisely parallel. God declares that the man of God who sincerely receives and adopts the Bible, is *perfect* for certain specified purposes. But the creed-makers declare that the man of God who sincerely receives and adopts the Bible and *this creed* is perfect for the same specified purposes." Rome adds mediators to the one Mediator appointed of God; creed-makers add creeds to the one Book given of God. We reject not only the added mediators, but added creeds. The Bible alone is sufficient.

2. We reject them because they make speculations and opinions matters of faith. Every creed has risen out of controversy. Its chief purpose has been to define the position, on these controverted points, of those who subscribe to it. Almost any one of the many creeds now in existence would serve as an illustration of this point. They are full of speculative, philosophical, metaphysical untaught questions. They undertake to define ex-

actly what we are to believe about the many questions which cluster around the doctrine of the Trinity, the fall of man, free will, divine decrees, irresistible grace, miraculous regeneration, etc., etc. Fine-spun, hair-splitting distinctions are foisted into articles of faith. Do you ever read any of these creeds? You will find what I say is the simple truth. Take the Athanasian as an illustration. I will read you only the first paragraph:

"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith" (*not the Roman Catholic*); "which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unit)'; neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one; the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost; the Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, the Holy Ghost uncreate; the Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost incomprehensible; the Father eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal; and yet they are not three eternal, but one eternal; as also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated; but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty; yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So like wise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord; yet there are not three Lords, but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord, so we are forbidden by the catholic religion to say there be three Gods, or three Lords."

I might read more of this which is gravely set forth as essential to the faith that saves; but, should I continue to the end, I fear you would feel so bewildered as to need a directory to show you the way out of church. I give you this as a sample. Every question about which men have differed, every fine distinction of which schoolmen have dreamed and disputed, every point of controversy that has risen and agitated the body of Christ, has been lifted into an article of faith. The natural tendency of controversy is to magnify into undue proportion the points involved. But, every man-made creed of Christendom has either risen directly or indirectly out of a religious controversy. It is, therefore, but the outgrowth of a natural law that they foist speculation and matters of opinion into articles of faith.

There are other reasons which I cannot take the time to elaborate; such as these: No man, no body of men, *has the right* to say what faith is essential. That prerogative belongs to God only. Again, creeds of man's composition *are useless*. For if they contain more than is in the Bible, they contain too much; if they contain less than is in the Bible, they contain too little; if they contain only what is in the Bible, they are wholly useless. And, finally, time has demonstrated that instead of their being bonds of union they *are schismatical* in their tendency. We seek to avoid speculations on untaught questions. We hold that they gender strife. The silence of the Bible is to be respected as much as its revelations. "Infinite wisdom was required as much to determine of what men should be ignorant as what men should know. Indeed, since, in regard to all matters connected with the unseen spiritual world, man is dependent upon Divine revelation, the limits of that revelation must necessarily mark out also the domain of human ignorance, as the shores of a continent become the boundaries of a trackless and unfathomed ocean." Out of this view there have arisen among us such maxims as these: "Where the Bible speaks, we will

spake; where the Bible is silent, we will be silent," and "Bible names for Bible things, and Bible thoughts in Bible terms."

IV. *We are somewhat peculiar in our division of the Bible, and the exclusive authority we ascribe to the New Testament.*

That you may understand our position on this entire question, I submit these points: 1. We hold and teach, as others, the *inspiration* of the entire Bible. We believe that in olden times "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." 2. We hold the New Testament *only* as a *book of authority* to us. "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last days, spoken unto us by his Son."¹ 3. We hold that the Old Testament was a book of authority to the Jews, but that with the establishment of the new covenant, of which Christ is Mediator, the old covenant closed and the *authority* of its book gave way to the authority of the Scriptures of the new covenant.² 4. We believe that the Old Testament is necessary for *our understanding* of the New, and that it contains, for us, many examples of faith and godliness, and lessons in personal holiness. In the declaration and address of 1809 may be found this proposition, submitted alone with others, looking toward restoration and union.

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

¹ Heb. 1:1-2.

² Heb. viii:6-13; II Cor. Hi:6-11; Rom. viii:2-S; vi:14; Gal. iii:24.

and government of the Old Testament church and the particular duties of its members."

Very early in our movement the broad distinction between the law and the gospel, as held and taught by the Disciples, attracted attention and aroused hostility. For a while the Campbells were connected with the Redstone Baptist Association. At the meeting of this Association in 18-16, Alexander Campbell preached his famous sermon on *The Law and the Gospel*, from Romans viii:3, which created such a stir among the members of the Association that the Campbells were compelled to withdraw for the sake of peace. With us Christianity is not a modified form of Judaism; the gospel is not an appendix to the law; no precept of the old covenant as such is binding upon us. If a precept in that covenant is binding upon us, it is because it has been re-enacted and promulgated in the New. With many precepts this is true—they are found in both. But the authority which binds them upon us is found in the New. Just as many of our present civil laws were laws for the colonies when under the British crown. But these laws are now binding upon the American citizen, because they have been re-enacted and promulgated in our new Constitution, and form a part of the American law. The old law, described as "the handwriting of ordinances," Christ nailed to the cross.¹ The "ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," and given to the Jews by Moses, their mediator, Paul declares has been done away.² We do not send sinners to Sinai now to hear the thunderings of that law. We do not direct them to the Psalms of David, or to the utterances of the Jewish prophets to find peace. The New Testament alone is our guide to the inquiring sinner, and our law to the believing saint. The gospel testimony is given to produce saving faith;³ the Acts of Apostles shows how men and women were made Christian under the preaching of inspired men; the epistles give directions in practical life, for individual Christians, and instructions to churches as such, while the book

¹ Col. ii:14.

² II Cor. iii:7-11.

³ John xx:30-31.

of Revelation is a highly symbolic description of things which were shortly to come to pass.

We are not under law, but under grace.¹ The law was for a nation only; the gospel is for the world. The law was never of authority to any but a Jew, either by birth or by purchase. It was never given to us. It was provisional and preparatory. When the new covenant was given the old one was removed. The new found its formal beginning and its first authoritative announcement on the ever-memorable Pentecost which followed Christ's ascension. From that point we go forward to find the question of salvation from sin through the merits of his blood answered. We do not send sinners to a dead covenant to find life. With us the New Testament only is a *book of authority*, and we follow this fundamental fact to its legitimate conclusions.

V. *We are peculiar in the position we give to the Messiahship and the divine Sonship of Jesus.*

With all who are known as evangelical, we hold that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah long promised by Jewish prophets, and that he is the only begotten Son of God. But with us this is not *an* article of faith, standing on a plane with others, but it is *the* article of faith in the Christian system. In the records of the work of apostles and evangelists we find it treated as *the problem* of the gospel. They turned all testimony to the support of the proposition—Jesus is the Christ, the Sou of the Living God. John recorded his wonderful words, and preserved an account of the miraculous signs he wrought that this might be demonstrated.² The belief of this is saving faith, according to his statement. Upon this Christ built his church.³ As every system centres in some fact or doctrine, as every organization among men must have some cornerstone in common thought and faith, so in the system revealed in the New Testament and the church built by Christ and called His own. It was this which in the beginning men were required to believe and to

¹ Rom. vi:14.

² John xi:30-31

³ Matt. xvi:15-18.

confess before they were baptized.¹ Properly speaking, this constitutes *the* Christian confession of faith. We lift it above all other things, it is pre-eminent above all other teaching. We sweep away all speculations, and place the fact of the Messiahship and the divine Sonship of Jesus in their stead, as the one thing to be believed. As the definition of the circle in geometry embraces within itself every proposition afterward deduced and demonstrated in the further prosecution of that study, so there lies enwrapped in this brief proposition all revealed truth. Our after-growth in knowledge is but an enlargement of our conception of this pregnant proposition. The emphasis we place upon it, the position we assign it, the use we make of it, constitute one of our peculiarities.

VI. In reference to spiritual influence in conversation, we are peculiar.

To correct a popular mistake, I desire to state, with all possible clearness, that we believe in the existence, the personality, the divinity of the Holy Spirit. We believe that he is the author of our conversion. We teach that he is the abiding comforter, and that he dwells in Christians. But we repudiate all theories of direct spiritual influence exerted, independent of the word of God, upon sinners, to make them Christians. Others teach the absolute need of the direct agency, and work to enable the sinner to believe, to repent, and to obey the commandments of God. We reject this, and with it all theories of human depravity which render it necessary. We hold that no special divine influence, super-added to the word to energize it, is either needed or promised. We believe that the Word faithfully preached produces faith, and that where it fails to do so, the fault is in man, in the quality and condition of the soil, not in the lack of energy or spiritual force in the seed. Paul says faith comes by hearing

¹ Acts viii:36-38.

the Word of God.¹ When Paul and his companions entered the synagogue in Iconium, they so spake the Word of the Lord that a great multitude of both Jews and Greeks believed.² If it be impossible for man to believe unless there be exerted over him some subtle influence to make him believe, where is there ground for any moral quality in faith, or any just ground for condemnation for not believing? Yet our Savior says, "He that believeth not shall be damned."³ Nor does any man need some subtle power, independent of that which dwells in God's Word, to enable him to repent and turn. God calls him to turn. Then he has the power. He demands repentance. Then can man repent. The revelation of the fearful consequences of sin, the marvelous goodness of God, the pathetic pleadings of the cross, are to lead men to repentance and reformation of life. He needs no magic power to enable him to bow down in humble, filial obedience. The call of God runs upon the supposition, from first to last, that man can heed the call and be saved. He treats man as a rational, responsible, free, moral agent. The word he sends to us is the word of the Spirit. He is the great revealer. He works on sinners, so far as we know, only through the word, Christ, in speaking of the coming of the spirit, says distinctly, "Whom the world cannot receive."⁴ We, therefore, in rejecting these theories, of necessity reject the anxious seat, with all that belongs to the anxious seat system. We teach men that they are able to hear, to believe, to repent, to obey, and so, to be saved. Perhaps no point, of all that is peculiar to us, has given greater offense than this. And, yet, it is a necessary result of our fundamental principle, and is in perfect accord with apostolic practice in preaching. Where do you find an apostle teaching men of this inability? Where do you find them inviting them to come forward to be prayed for, that they may be converted? Where do we find an inspired preacher closing a meeting with many seeking? These are modern things. They spring from modern theories of man's necessity. Worse still, these theories

¹ Rom. x:17.² Mark xvi:16.³ Acts xiv:1.⁴ John xiv:17.

are often mischievous in their consequences. The word is the seed of the kingdom; it converts the soul; it imparts life; it is God's power to save.¹ we reject all theories which make His word a dead letter, and that teach sinners to expect and await some special spiritual quickening power apart from it.

VII. *We are peculiar in our teaching concerning the DESIGN of Christian baptism.*

But, perhaps, not *so* peculiar as many suppose. There seems to be an idea quite common that the one great and overshadowing peculiarity of the Disciples lies just here. I suppose I would not exaggerate were I to say that if the masses outside of our membership were asked to state the peculiarities of the Disciples, a majority would state that their first and chief peculiarity is concerning the *design* of baptism. Yet, in doing so, they would do us an injustice. For, neither in point of time, nor in degree of importance, is this chief. Our peculiarity concerning this ordinance is the out-growth and an after-development of our central and fundamental peculiarity, which, as already stated, is restoration.

To correct a common but gross misconception, let me say, *We do not believe in what is popularly understood by the phrase "baptismal regeneration."* We attach no mystic, magic virtue to the baptismal waters, or to the act of obedience in this ordinance. We do not teach a water salvation. So far from this, we teach, with a clearness and Constance, which it seems should have made such a mistake impossible, that unless this ordinance is, in each case, preceded by a heartfelt faith, and a genuine repentance, it is not worthy the name of Christian baptism. Or, as Mr. Campbell put it in his debate with Dr. Rice, "I have said a thousand times, that if a person were to be immersed twice seven times in the Jordan for the remission of sins, or for the reception of the Holy Spirit, it would avail nothing more than

¹ Rom. i:16.

the wetting the face of a babe, *unless his heart is changed by the Word and Spirit of God.*"

Our peculiarity is this: We teach that, according to the Scriptures, baptism is for the remission of sins. Or, to elaborate the statement, we teach that baptism is one of three divinely-appointed conditions upon which God promises to forgive an alien's sins. You will do us a favor by remembering this statement, and thinking it carefully over, item by item. You will see that we do not place baptism by itself. Faith and repentance go with it and before it. You will see that it is not held as a *cause* of forgiveness, but a *condition*. It has no *essential* connection with pardon, but stands related to it only by virtue of a divine appointment. We do not say God cannot forgive without it. We speak only of what is promised. It is not a condition upon which hangs the promise of pardon to any but to aliens. The Christian finds forgiveness through repentance, confession and prayer.

Is it, then, a divinely-appointed condition which God promises the forgiveness of the alien's sins? This is clearly a question of fact. To the law and to the testimony for some of the reasons for our teaching. I can give only a few passages to answer the question. Has God placed baptism before the promise of present salvation or forgiveness?

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi:15-16.

On what two things does salvation here depend? Is baptism one of them?

"Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts ii:38.

¹ Campbell and Rice Debate, p. 544.

What two things did Peter command his audience to do? Did he command them to do these two things *for* remission of sins? Is baptism one of the things commanded?

"And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii:16.

What did Ananias command Paul to do? Did he command him to wash away his sins? In what act?

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. iii:27.

How docs Paul here say we enter into Christ, or put on Christ? Is there promise of forgiveness outside of Christ? I give these passages only to indicate the tendency of the testimony of the Scriptures, and to show something of the ground of our teaching on this point.

VIII. *In reference to the subjects of baptism, or the persons who are scripturally qualified for baptism, we are peculiar.*

For, while we are in general accord with all Baptist bodies in practising believer's baptism only, we differ from them in this: We do not demand the narration of an experience; we do not require them to spend a season in seeking; we do not require them to say they believe they are already forgiven; we do not require them to come before the church to be voted upon. None of these things were required in New Testament times, and we do not require them now. As then, so now, heartfelt faith in Christ, with a genuine repentance of sin, is enough. As an indication that Christ publicly confessed, was, and therefore still is, sufficient, we find that in the great commission it reads, faith first, then baptism; in the cases recorded, as occurring under inspired preaching like Paul to the jailer,¹ and Philip to the eunuch,² it was heartfelt faith in Christ, confessed, and then baptism without delay, and then rejoicing.

¹ Acts xvi:30-34.

² Acts viii:35-39.

If it be objected that this makes access to this ordinance too easy by not hedging it in with sufficient restrictions, our answer is: first, perhaps it is not as easy as you suppose. We require a heartfelt faith and a genuine repentance. Secondly, what right have we to hedge it in by restriction which our Lord, who gave it, has not seen fit to place around it? If it be said that the simple confession required is not enough to keep out heretics and false teachers who may desire to come in, we answer it was not enough to do that in apostolic times, for Paul says false brethren had come into the Galatian churches in his time,¹ and yet *they* did not endeavor to prevent this by the imposition of more stringent conditions, but continued to practice this simple confession of faith. Should it be objected further, that hypocrites can make this confession and so come in, we reply, so can hypocrites give in most glowing experiences, or meet the requirements of the most rigid conditions you may see fit to impose, provided they are determined to deceive. Would it not be well to reflect also that in your zeal to keep out all of these of whom you have spoken, there is danger of imposing conditions which would be stumbling stones and hindrances in the way of some honest souls whom the Lord would receive? I think we have kept quite as clear of these objectionable characters as others, and it is certainly well not to be wise above what is written.

IX. I come now to consider the last point in our peculiarities. *In at least two things concerning the Lord's Supper, we are peculiar.*

1. In its weekly observance. We teach that the Lord's Supper should be observed each Lord's Day. The Christians in the beginning certainly met on the first day of each week. We learn that one purpose—if not *the* purpose of their meeting—was to break bread.² This was a part of their regular worship on the first day. The day which was set apart to commemorate the resurrection of our Savior, found also spread in the midst of the Disciples the table on which were the memorials of his

¹ Gal. ii:4.

² Acts xx:7.

sacrificial death. It should be so now. While in this we are not in accord with any religious body known to me, we are in perfect accord, in theory if not in practice, with such reformers and leaders as Calvin and Wesley, and a host of others.

2. Our position on the question of close communion is peculiar. We hold that the Supper is simply and only a *memorial* feast. We emphasize and exalt the *memorial* idea to the exclusion of every other which has, in the course of time, attached itself to this observance. "*Do this in memory of me.*" This is the full explanation of the divine import of this simple and sacred observance. We eat, and drink, and worship as we remember our suffering Savior. We do not partake of the emblems to signify our indorsation of others who may choose to partake at the same time. Paul says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup, for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." Fix clearly in your mind the idea that it is *simply* a memorial feast, and you will be prepared to understand me when I say that the Disciples are neither open-communists nor close-communists. In this view it is no more reasonable to speak of *open* or *close*, in connection with the Lord's Supper, than it would be in connection with singing, prayer, or the contribution. These are acts of worship in which Christians unite, but who thinks of raising such questions about them?

And, now, that you have listened patiently to this statement of our peculiarities, presented, I humbly trust, in none other than a Christian spirit, I take the liberty of asking you, in the same spirit, what you think of them. "Not exactly the points that current reports present," do you reply? Well, that may be; but I do not think I overstep the bounds of modesty in claiming that what I say on these matters is worthy of more weight with you than that which Madame Rumor may present. I have enjoyed the best opportunities of knowing exactly what the Disciples believe and leach. I was born among the Disciples; my

¹ I. Cor. xi:28-29.

venerable father is a preacher among them of nearly fifty years standing; I have been brought up on their literature, and I attended their largest school; I know their leading men throughout this entire land. I now candidly present this as their views upon the points involved. "Well," says another, "the points in which you are peculiar are neither so numerous, nor are they so great as I expected to hear." I am glad to hear that. I do sincerely regret that there exists any necessity for our being peculiar on any point. I love to think of those things in which we all agree, rather than of those in which we differ. I rejoice that the changes which have taken place in the religious world during the last half century have caused these points to appear less peculiar than formerly they did. For one, I rejoice in the general drift of religious thought. I hope for a better day. But, in the meantime, could you advise us to relinquish our position and abandon our work? Is not our aim worthy of zealous endeavor? Would it not be better for a divided religious world to go back to the unity of the beginning, casting aside all creeds but the Bible and all names but Christ's? Is it not true that the New Testament alone is the book of authority for the Church of Christ and for its members? Would it not be better to sweep speculation and dogmas away by giving to the doctrine of the Messiahship and divine Sonship of Jesus the place it occupied at first? Would it not be a gain to truth, at least, if we would attach to the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper the significance which their Author gave them? And, would not we come nearer to primitive preaching and practice if, instead of teaching men to look for strange sights and sounds, and mysterious and inexplicable spiritual influences, we should exalt the word of the Lord as the faith-giving and converting and saving power of God?

But, if you are not able to agree with me in these matters, I sincerely trust you may cheerfully and heartily agree with me to exercise that Christian charity which will not allow our dif-

ferences to kindle into animosity; that you will join with me in praying for the peace and prosperity of all them that love our Lord Jesus in sincerity; and, that we will renew our prayerful study of the sacred volume, hoping for the time when we may see eye to eye, and face to face. The Lord hasten that day. Amen.

—From *"Tyler's Sermons."*

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. Who preached the sermon of this chapter?
2. When and where was it delivered?
3. Who was J. Z. Tyler?

Answer: See Introduction.

4. What Scripture did he use as a text?
 5. Was this a common text with pioneer preachers?
- Answer: Eligah Goodwin has a sermon on this text which the student will do well to read. The answer is, yes.

6. Why was this text apropos 75 years ago?

Answer: The "Campbellites" were "everywhere spoken against." They were misrepresented and misunderstood. This gave preachers a golden opportunity to speak in defense and explanation, and thus to present the plea for restoration of the "ancient order."

7. Does the title of this sermon contain a sectarian implication?

8. Is not the word Disciple used with denominational connotation?

9. Is he not speaking of a separate group of people and giving reasons for their existence?

10. Can this be justified with the card illustration used in a preceding chapter?

11. Could you think of a better way to name and announce the sermon—and then name the peculiarities of a people?

12. Would it be any better—or as well—to say, *What the Church of Christ Believes and Teaches?*

13. What does Tyler say about the growth of the restoration movement?

14. With whom does he compare it?

15. Has this same comparison been made before in this book?

16. How would the Disciples—all groups of restoration pre-tenders and contenders—compare in numbers with the Methodists—all groups—of today?

17. What retarded our growth?

18. If you say division, would it not be better to say "*the abandonment of the plea and purpose*" as set forth here by Tyler?

19. Were not most—yes, practically all—of the people who obeyed the gospel in the early days, or who otherwise fell in with the restoration effort brought out of the denominations?

20. Did not the pioneers often swing an entire congregation into the "right way of the Lord"?

21. Can you bring people out of denominations without teaching them that denominationalism is wrong?

22. Can you bring them out by preaching even the truth in a sectarian sense? Can you expect people to leave one sect and join another?

23. What does Tyler say about controversy? Was he not "*peculiar*" in that respect for his day?

24. How many "*peculiarities*" does he name and discuss?

25. *What is the first one?*

26. What was it Campbell "*arraigned*"?

27. What was it the Disciples held to be sinful?

28. What does he quote Richardson as saying on this point?

29. What point in the statement from Richardson do we get as to the advantages the people of the United States enjoy?

30. What did Dr. Richardson say we are free from in the United States?

31. Is there other evidence that Campbell, Richardson and all

the other pioneers praised, defended and rejoiced in the freedoms of the U. S. A.?

32. Did Campbell ever give special praise and credit to the institutions of the U. S.?

Answer: Yes, indeed. See his "Popular Lectures and Addresses"; see also his debates with Owen and Purcell.

33. Could the restoration movement have succeeded in any other country?

34. What then does Tyler say was the "*central aim*," and what the first "*feature*" to be *restored*?

35. What change did he say had taken place among the denominations?

36. How had this toned down the plea of the disciples?

37. What did he say concerning the denominational claim as to, a *spiritual* or *hidden* unity?

38. By what did he illustrate their idea?

39. Is not this the same point that they often try to picture by the vine and branches illustration?

40. Does Tyler answer this claim and expose the fallacy?

41. Was his point that the divisions of the Army are authorized by the same authority that constituted it an army a good one? Would this not apply also to the divisions of the *Union*—United States—into separate states?

42. How many times does Tyler say in this division of his sermon *that divisions are sinful*?

43. What sort of unity does Tyler say the disciples plead for?

44. What does he say about a confederation of sects?

45. The disciples seek for a "*total abolition*" of what?

46. Do the big D. Disciples seek for this today?

47. How now did the disciples propose to bring about this union?

48. What did the denominations of that day say that the disciples asked the people to do in order to have union?

Answer: "All of you unite with us; quit your denomination and join ours."

49. Was this a misrepresentation?
50. If not, how could the disciples urge the abolition of all sectism?
51. *What is the second peculiarity mentioned by Tyler?*
52. What four reasons does he give for rejecting human names?
53. Is his discussion under each of these four reasons logical and convincing?
54. Were his arguments peculiar to him or did all gospel preachers make these points sixty years ago?
55. Did Tyler call names in this sermon? Was that common in his day? Can we do that today?
56. *What was the third peculiarity?*
57. What were the two reasons given for rejecting human creeds?
58. Can you give the points he makes under these two reasons?
59. What does he say concerning speculations and opinions?
60. What motto does he repeat?
61. Upon which point of the motto did he put emphasis—the "*speak*" or the "*silent*" phrase?
62. Do Disciple preachers do that today? Why do they not?
63. What kind of speculations was Tyler talking about?
64. *What was the fourth peculiarity?*
65. Was he correct in saying we differ from others in the division of the Bible? Do not all scholars recognize the different priests, altars and sacrifices?
66. In just what respects, if any, do we differ from the view held by the Bible scholars of the denominations—such as Calvin, Wesley, Clark and Macknight on the divisions of the Bible?

Note: Don't forget that all religionists are not scholars. What about Campbell's sermon on the *Law*; what did that sermon cause?

67. *What was the fifth peculiarity?*

68. Was Tyler correct here and do we still put more stress on this item than do others?

69. *What was the sixth peculiarity?*

70. Has a fierce battle always raged on this point?

71. Why did Tyler give a good discussion on this point?

72. Is this still an issue?

73. How do we usually designate this issue?

74. *What was the seventh peculiarity?*

75. Have there been battles on this point?

76. What are some of the untrue charges that have been made against us because of this teaching?

77. Do you ever hear these charges made now?

78. What quotation did Tyler give from A. Campbell on this point?

79. Did Tyler set forth the truth on this point in a good way?

80. Why have the denominations been so vehemently opposed to this doctrine which is so plainly taught in the New Testament?

Answer: This stems from two causes at least: (1) It is a reaction against the teaching of the Catholics on *baptismal regeneration*—a baby or an unconscious person regenerated by baptism without faith or repentance, etc.; (2) It comes from the idea that man is *depraved*, helpless, and that *conversion* is done by *miracle*: for man to obey or to do something to be *saved* means salvation by *works*, leaves God out and makes *grace* void. We should know this and clarify these points.

81. *What was the eighth peculiarity?*

82. What point does he make here as to our agreement with Baptist bodies?

83. Wherein does he say we differ with them?

84. Do these points of difference exist today?

85. What change has taken place among the Baptists on this point?

86. *What was the ninth peculiarity?*

87. What are the two points concerning the Lord's Supper that are peculiar to us, according to Tyler?

88. Does he argue the first point as fully as it can be argued? Is his point clear enough?

89. What scholars and reformers does he say agree with us on point number one?

90. What does he say is the purpose of the Lord's Supper?

91. Do not all the denominations regard it as a *memorial*?

Note: Not as "*simply a memorial.*" Investigate this point.

92. What would this have to do with *open* or *close* communion?

Note: You should investigate. What is a *Sacrament*? What is the "*sacrifice of Mass*"? Does the Lord's Supper have anything to do with remission of sins? Be informed and then you will appreciate the "simplicity that is in Christ."

93. Does Tyler present the idea of *open* communion?

94. Should we teach *open* communion?

95. Should we teach that the Supper is for only those who are disciples—children of God?

96. Would that not mean for baptized believers only?

97. Is that not *close* communion? If not, why not?

98. Do you think that we need much teaching on this subject? When are we going to do it?

99. How does Tyler's sermon compare with those of Allen and Sweeney?

100. Which of the three do you like best?

101. How many points do they make in common?

102. On what points do they differ, if any, except in method of presentation?

103. Which sermon is the most apologetic? Are they all apologetic?

104. Which sermon is the most fervent in its appeal—contains the soul of the preacher?

Note: What now would you say is the purpose of this book?

Answer: *Restoration*; to plead for an *undenominational non-sectarian* preaching and practice of New Testament teaching. Have you been inspired with the idea?

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

A Discussion Between Sampson Schismaticus and Daniel Didacticus

(Searcher's Sanctum. Enter Samp.)

1. D. D.: "Well, you kept your promise to return. I suppose you are wanting to talk about the harps in Revelation."

2. S. S.: "Well, I'm not as much interested in those harps as I am in hearing you harp on your usual string. This music question, Dan, is a silly thing in my opinion."

3. D. D.: "But we are not governed by your opinion, Samp, nor by mine either. If it were a matter of opinion, most of us would probably favor the use of instrumental music in the worship. But, since it is the Lord that we are worshipping, we had better offer him the worship that he authorizes and not try to offer him that which we would prefer if the worship were being offered to us."

4. S. S.: "But why do you think the Lord would not enjoy instrumental music? What is there about the music that you object to?"

5. D. D.: "What was there about Cain's sacrifice that the Lord objected to? That sacrifice consisted of the fruits of the field. The Lord had created these fruits in the beginning and had ordained that the earth should produce them, and Cain brought them before the Lord as an offering. And I submit that this offering probably cost as much or involved a more generous gift than did Abel's offering. Moreover, these fruits were more beautiful, the aroma was more pleasing and, from man's point of view, the whole sacrifice was more aesthetic than a bleeding and a dying lamb. Why did God reject this, Samp?"

6. S. S.: "Well, you are assuming that this was more beautiful than Abel's offering, but Paul says that Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than did Cain. Abel's was, then, more excellent, and you are wrong in your assumption."

7. D. D.: "Now, Samp, why was it more excellent? You surely know what Paul was writing about in the Eleventh Chapter of Hebrews: He was talking about *faith* and what men had done by faith. Abel's sacrifice was offered by faith and Cain's was not. That's what made the difference; and, in that respect, Abel's sacrifice was acceptable, excellent, correct."

8. S. S.: "Well, that means that Abel's was serious and sincere and Cain's was not—It was a heartless performance."

9. D. D.: "Samp, you know that when a thing is done by faith it has to be done according to God's word. Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. Abel offered what God ordained or commanded; Cain offered what he preferred. This is the well understood meaning of the case, and that is what it means to offer a sacrifice by faith. But this is further manifest by what is said in Genesis 4:7. God said to Cain, 'If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee *shall be* his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.' This means that God pointed to the sacrifice that Cain should have offered and that sacrifice was under his control: he could have offered it, but he would not. If he had committed no sin, he would have needed no sacrifice. If he did commit sin, there was the sacrifice prepared and ready. But Cain did not like the Lord's way, he wanted to do it his own way, and, therefore, he was rejected. *He was the first modernist in history.* He didn't believe in blood atonement; he didn't believe in obeying the command of the Lord; he didn't think it was necessary to follow strictly the Lord's instructions. He thought he could worship God in a way to please himself and God ought to accept it."

10. S. S.: "And now, what does all that have to do with instrumental music?"

'11. D. D.: "It just means that we offer the praise to God that God commands, just as Abel offered what God authorized. Those who use instrumental music offer that which pleases them, without any authority from the Lord for so doing."

12. S. S.: "And you claim that those who introduced the use of such instruments departed from the restoration plea and digressed. Are you going to be able to establish that?"

13. D. D.: "I never had an easier task in my life than that, Samp. The first instrument that was ever used among those who claimed to be endeavoring to restore the New Testament church was at Midway, Kentucky, and Dr. L. L. Pinkerton was responsible for its introduction there. The instrument they used was called a melodeon. But this was not known generally and the issue did not spread from there at all. Then an instrument was introduced in the Olive Street Church of St. Louis in 1869. This divided the church and the brethren endeavored to heal the breach, and they called a committee to come and sit upon this case and endeavor to bring about peace. That committee consisted of Isaac Errett, Robert Graham, Alexander Proctor and J. K. Rogers. This committee removed the instrument and united the church.

"Now the point, Samp, is that if there had been any scriptural authority for this music, the men who composed this committee would certainly have known it; they could have pointed out the chapter and verse that authorizes its use and have reconciled those who protested and left the instrument in the congregation. Do you believe that this committee could have found the authority if it existed? The fact that they did not find it shows that the authority did not exist."

14. S. S.: "Well, if they put the instrument out, how did it get back? Or did they put it out at other places?"

15. D. D.: "You know the story, Samp. Those who wanted instrumental music introduced it without any authority, divided the churches and drove out some of the best people that ever lived, among them J. W. McGarvey at Lexington, Kentucky, E. G. Sewell at Nashville, Tennessee, and many others in many places. Those who favored the instrument refused to be governed by the motto 'Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent.' They began to speak where the Bible is silent."

16. S. S.: "Dan, it is the opinion of most of us that you folks do all the 'speaking' on this question. You write and preach and debate and wrangle on instrumental music from morning till night, from the cradle to the grave, and yet you claim to be silent on the point."

17. D. D.: "But, Samp, you know what it means to be silent and to speak: it means to do that which is authorized and to refrain from doing that for which there is no authority. When we speak against instrumental music, we are speaking against that which people have introduced without authority. They '*spoke*' in that they began doing that for which they could give no divine authority, and we protested against this departure from the New Testament simplicity and from the restoration motto. They keep up their *unscriptural practice* and we keep up our *scriptural protesting*. If there were no such practice, there would be no such preaching as you describe. Hence, the innovation brought the protest; the protest did not bring the innovation."

18. S. S.: "Well, I am not sure that there is not authority in the Bible for the use of instrumental music. But, even if there is no authority, since it is not a corruption of the spirit of worship and is not sinful per se, I don't see why you should raise such a hue and cry about the instrument."

19. D. D.: "If we are going to restore the New Testament

church, we cannot restore something that was not in it; and it is a well known fact that the New Testament churches did not have instrumental music in their worship. This is admitted by church historians, by commentators, and by the encyclopedias. There is no use to bring all these arguments up now, since we have literature upon every point that either you or I could bring up today. This has been discussed *pro* and *con* for about seventy-five years and we can inform ourselves on the question if we desire to do so. We can find the strongest things that have ever been written in our libraries now."

22. S. S.: "What books do you recommend on this subject, Dan?"

21. D. D.: "Well, there are so many that I am afraid I couldn't name them all, and I don't want to leave out any worthy author; but, if you are trying to find out what the pioneers said on the question, the book by John T. Lewis is a very ready reference volume on that particular point. The book called 'Instrumental Music in the Worship' by M. C. Kurfees is probably the most exhaustive treatment that we have on the subject. He not only shows why we should be content with what the Lord says, he answers the arguments that are made by those who advocate the instrument. He deals at length with the Greek verb *psallo* and its cognate noun, *psalmos*, in a masterly manner. The debate between M. C. Clubb and H. Leo Boles is a fine treatment with both sides presented. Then M. C. Kurfees' Review of O. E. Payne is a masterpiece. Payne's book is the most pretentious book that was ever put out in favor of the instrument, and the Kurfees Review is next to Moses E. Lard's Review of Jeter in its withering expose of the false reasoning of the man under review. A later book, and one less pretentious, is 'A Medley on the Music Question: Or A Potpourri of Philology' by G. C. Brewer. This was published by the Gospel Advocate Company and may still be obtained from that office. This is also a review of some arguments that were made in favor of the use of instrumental music."

22. S. S.: "Yeah, that Brewer is the one that wobbles on the gudgeon, isn't he?"

23. D. D.: "You would better read his writings and decide for yourself, hadn't you, Samp? What makes you think he is uncertain in his peregrinations?"

24. S. S.: "I think I saw where somebody said he is the Errett of this present age, and I supposed he was, therefore, the leader of the new progressives."

25. D. D.: "He is the author of this book from the Old Paths Book Club and he has other books you might read. And, if he has ever championed any departure from the practice engaged in by the churches of Christ since before he was born, someone will have to point it out to me. I have not seen it. According to my understanding, he has the reputation of contending for the restoration plea and of referring to the pioneers more than any other man of his age. I have seen him accused of worshipping some of these 'fathers'; but I have never felt called upon to make any defense of him or of any other man now living. They can speak for themselves. What I am saying is that those who introduced instrumental music digressed and departed; and, thus, the point on which you charged me with being hypocritical, that is, you say that I claim to stand where the pioneers stood and yet I do not stand with them—my claim is false; this point is easily refuted. If we begin with Brush Run in 1811 and see churches of Christ springing up all over the United States and realize that they were formed after the New Testament pattern and practice only that for which they could find New Testament authority; and then we see that none of them used instrumental music until after Alexander Campbell was dead, then you can see that, in refusing to use such instruments, we stand where these restoration churches stood for more than fifty years, without an exception. They stood where the New Testament churches stood, without an exception and without a question. We do that for which we can give Bible authority, and

our practice is not in question: vocal music is sanctioned by everybody; it has universal approbation. *Our practice is unquestioned because unquestionable.* The other man's practice is what the argument is all about. Quit your unscriptural practice and the controversy will be over."

26. S. S.: "You don't think anybody is going to quit it, do you, Dan?"

27. D. D.: "Perhaps not, but we can adopt the statement of Joshua, 'Let others do as they will, but as for me and my house, we will serve God' (Joshua 24:15). That's my position, Samp, and that's where I expect to stand until the Lord shall call me home."

28. S. S.: "Speaking of home, that reminds me that I have a home and I'm expected there about now. So, if you'll excuse me, Dan, I will be on my way again."

29. D. D.: "That's agreeable with me, Samp, but I hope you won't forget to read some of these books that I mentioned, and come back sometime and let's go into this question in a more minute and exhaustive way. Good-by, Samp!"

QUESTIONS FOR CLASSROOM

1. What is the point at issue in this discussion?
2. How do we know what worship will please the Lord?
3. Should we try to do that which is pleasing in his sight? (1 John 3:22).
4. Is not music made on instruments pleasing to us?
5. Was Cain's sacrifice as beautiful and as valuable as that offered by Abel?
6. Wherein was Abel's more *excellent* than that offered by Cain?
7. What does it mean to do things *by faith*?

8. When one *worships* God does he not have *faith*?

9. Is *sincerity* equal to faith?

10. What shows that Cain rejected the offering God had appointed?

11. Does the word "sin" in Gen. 4:7 mean *sin offering*?

Answer: It does; notice the masculine pronouns "his" and "him" in A. V. Notice also the word "*desire*" attributed to "sin." The word has this meaning in 2 Cor. 5:21 and Heb. 9:27.

12. Is it not clear then that Cain rejected what God had appointed and offered what he preferred—substituted his own will for God's will?

13. Can we do that today without being sinful?

14. What is our attitude on the instrumental music question?

Answer: Negative.

15. Is our practice in question?

16. Does anybody ask us to give our *authority for singing*?

17. Is it not then the practice of the other man that is in question?

18. Why then are we constantly asked why we do *not* use instrumental music?

19. If we restore the New Testament church can we restore what was *not in it*?

20. Should this not settle the question for us, unless we have given up the plea for restoration?

21. Why make further arguments against the instruments?

22. Do the authorities agree that instrumental music was not used in the churches of the New Testament? If you say no, find the reference work that gives discordant testimony?

23. Did the churches established by the pioneers who were *restoring* the "ancient order" from 1809 to 1869 have instrumental music in them?

24. Why did they not? Were the brethren failing to do what they were claiming to do?

25. What was A. Campbell's view on instrumental music in the worship?

Answer: Richardson says "*he was utterly opposed to it.*"
Memoirs, Vol. 2, page 366.

26. Did the Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians use instrumental music *one hundred years ago*?

27. Did any of their scholars ever *write against* the practice?

28. As you say goodbye to Dan and Samp, would you like to read a book-length discussion between these two men on some subject—say Evolution?

Answer: Dan and Samp are available for such a debate.

OTHER WORKS FROM THE PEN
OF THE SAME AUTHOR:

*"A Medley on the Music Question: Or A Potpourri
of Philology"*

"Contending for the Faith"

"Forty Years on the Firing Line"

"Brewer's Sermons"

"As Touching Those Who Were Once Enlightened"

"Bobbed Hair: Or Customs and Christianity"

"Is the Church of Christ a Denomination?"

The Immortality of the Soul"—The Brewer-Spence Debate

"Companionate Marriage"—The Brewer-Lindsey Debate

"Darkness or Light?"

"Review of O. E. Payne on Instrumental Music"

"Review of Homer Strong on Instrumental Music"

"Communism and Its Four Horsemen"