

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

Discipliana - Archival Issues

1998

Discipliana Vol-58-Nos-1-4-1998

Newell Williams

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/discipliana>



Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

WRITING DENOMINATIONAL HISTORY

Henry E. Webb

THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST IN THE PHILIPPINES

L. Sheldon Woods

THE APOCALYPTIC ORIGINS OF A CHURCH OF CHRIST MISSIONARY: O. D. BIXLER'S EARLY YEARS IN THE UNITED STATES (1896-1918)

Yukikazu Obata

Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Seminar for Stone-Campbell Historians

April 24-25, 1998

see page 2 for details



Volume 58 • Number 1 • Spring, 1998

Published by	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY Peter M. Morgan, President (morganpm@aol.com)	
Founding Editor	Claude E. Spencer	
Editorial Committee	D. Newell Williams, Editor (nwilliam@cts.edu) Edward W. Dodds, Managing Editor (dishistsoc@aol.com) Anthony L. Dunnivant Douglas A. Foster Kenneth Henry Daisy Machado Eva Jean Wrather	
Editorial Consultants	Carisse Berryhill James O. Duke David A. Jones Mark G. Toulouse	Paul M. Blowers Richard T. Hughes Erma Jean Loveland
Board of Trustees Officers	Chairperson Vice-Chairperson Secretary Treasurer	William O. Paulsell Lester G. McAllister Karen D. Nolan Charlotte H. Gadberry

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: dishistsoc@aol.com.
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: <http://users.aol.com/dishistsoc>
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM, published by the American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston, IL 60201-5613. atla@atla.com <http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP+4).

— From the Editor's Desk

This issue combines a discussion of the challenge of writing "denominational" history with two samples of efforts to meet that challenge. Henry E. Webb's "Writing Denominational History" was one of three papers presented at the 1997 Kirkpatrick Seminar for Stone-Campbell Historians. The other two papers presented at that seminar appeared in the winter issue. "Selectivity" is one aspect of the challenge that Webb addresses. He asks, "Ought the writer of history who becomes aware of some unsavory factors, incidents, or qualities associated with leaders, items that nevertheless are critical to the events in the story (denominational bureaucrats don't always act with the most pristine motives) be candid about them; or in the interest of propriety and denominational image, bury these matters and thereby avoid bringing criticism to the cause by casting it in a somewhat unfavorable light?" Closely related to this aspect of the challenge is the goal of fairly representing the positions of all parties in addressing controversial issues of which, as Webb notes, the Stone-Campbell Movement has certainly had its share! Webb is primarily interested, however, in the challenge of interpreting denominational history in a way that offers fresh angles of vision while remaining faithful to the essence of the story. After providing a helpful review of the historiographical models that have been employed in telling the story of the Stone-Campbell Movement, he identifies challenges facing contemporary interpreters of this tradition.

L. Shelton Woods, "The Disciples of Christ in the Philippines" is a sample of denominational history that addresses the challenges of selectivity and fairness of representation. Woods' account of the relation of Disciples missionaries in the Philippines to the Evangelical Union of the Philippines differs from an earlier Disciples account. Though not, at least from one perspective, as complimentary of the Disciples missionaries as the earlier account, Wood's version does help to explain later conflicts within the Disciples fold regarding mission in the Philippines not discussed in this article.

"The Apocalyptic Origins of a Church of Christ Missionary: O.D. Bixler's Early Years in the United States (1896-1918), written by Yukikazu Obata, is a sample of using a fresh interpretive lens for understanding an aspect of Stone-Campbell history. It is also a sample of research on a "new" topic that presents data never before published.

These articles by Webb, Woods and Obata are evidence that the writing of the history of the Stone-Campbell Movement is alive and well!

D. Newell Williams

— *From the President's Desk*

I recently have been in the company of the saints. I read *A Master-Builder on the Congo* which describes the labors of two missionaries who gave their lives for the cause of Christ: Robert Ray Eldred (1872-1913) and Edith Byers Eldred (1871-1912).

I invite you to join me in remembering the saints who reached out to God's world. The Stone-Campbell mission work will be vividly in the attention of historians in the next several months. We celebrate the sesquicentennial of the founding of the American Christian Missionary Society. Our mission works in the Congo and Puerto Rico are 100 years old in 1999. We also celebrate the centennial of the Disciples home mission work with Hispanics.

Kirkpatrick Historians' Seminar on Missions

You have an excellent opportunity to participate in our work as historians. Join colleagues on April 24, 1998 at 7:00 p.m. here at the Society in Nashville. The Seminar will conclude by 4:00 p.m. on Saturday, April 25. Topic: Mission in the Stone-Campbell Movement.

The Lectures:

- Mission/Evangelization prior to 1849, Thomas H. Olbricht
- Development of Missionary Societies 1849 to the Present in the Disciples of Christ, William J. Nottingham
- Twentieth Century Mission/Evangelization among Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, Frederick W. Norris.

You will participate in this "hands on" history project. The lectures and discussion are for the purpose of refining a general article in a forthcoming Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Stone-Campbell Movement.

Please register as soon as possible. The fee is \$25.00 but is waived for students. The Society has booked rooms at a reduced rate at a conveniently located motel. Let us know if you need a room reservation.

Our history of missions is complex and sadly has been the ground on which we often divided. Our work as historians transcends the divisions as in our work we honor the saints who gave their labors and sometimes, as in the case of the Eldreds, their lives in the cause of Christ.

I look forward to learning that you will join us in this important work.

Peter M. Morgan

Writing Denominational History

by Henry E. Webb*

The topic is: Writing Denominational History. On first learning of this topic I had to ask myself: Does anybody have any interest in denominational history? Are we not living in what has been described as The Post-denominational Age? Do denominations have relevance anymore? And if they don't, who would be interested in the history of what no longer is important to most American church-goers? Is there really any market for histories of denominations in this post-denominational era?

But, are we really in a post-denominational era? Perhaps this characterization of our time needs some examination. There are reasons, to be sure, for such a description of our times. Not the least of these reasons may be found within the denominations themselves. The doctrinal and theological distinctions that once stood at the very heart of denominational identity have largely disappeared from almost every denomination. These distinctions are almost never mentioned in sermonic deliverances nor in the printed materials issued by the major denominations. Dogmatics are out of date. They have yielded to religious psychology as the core material about which most sermons are organized. Since the social and psychological "needs" of Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, or whatever are remarkably similar, there is a corresponding similarity in the content of most Protestant sermons today. Major differences may be found in the sophistication with which these "needs" are discussed, but the quest for human fulfillment, which is at the base of much of what is heard from the pulpit regardless of the denominational alignment of the congregation, has a remarkable uniformity about it that transcends and obliterates doctrinal differences. (And this creates a big market for a handful of writers who specialize in this field and crank out books of essays and sermonic material which are often cited from a host of different denominational pulpits).

Further evidence of the post denominational nature of our times is found in the ease with which people in our mobile society change denominations when they change their address, with little or no awareness of the magnitude of the theological or dogmatic shift implicit in the change of alignment they have made. On several occasions I have inquired into the difficulty of making such a significant adjustment only to be told that the persons involved were not aware of any kind of change of thinking required by their denominational move, nor were they even remotely interested. They simply "liked" the new religious environment and that was the beginning and end of their concern. Religious affiliation in today's world has much more to do with music and worship-style than it has to do with denominational beliefs or dogma; and music and worship styles have no denominational

*Henry E. Webb is the Dean E. Walker Professor of Church History Emeritus at Milligan College, Johnson City, Tennessee.

exclusiveness. The distinctiveness which identified the denominations in past decades ranks way down on the list of items what are of interest to the average person, especially those of the post WW II generation. In this sense, our times are post-denominational. To be sure, there are differences in the denominations, but these differences are not what they were even a half a century ago. This should surprise nobody, given the cultural explosions in American society since World War II.

But, from another perspective, denominations are still significant on the American religious landscape. Religious life in Protestant America is still organized around denominational structures. These structures reflect an amazing diversity in their nature, effectiveness, and interests. While the denominations provide less religious identity than was the case some decades ago, their sociological identity has become more significant. Within somewhat broad parameters, it is possible to discern something of one's economic, cultural, educational, and political posture by one's denominational affiliation.

I have been asked to address four aspects of writing a denominational history. The first relates to academic competence. It is a given that the historian's subject be thoughtfully and responsibly analyzed, carefully researched, adequately provided with documentation of sources, and include a good bibliography. With the excellent research facilities available to historians of this denomination, there is little excuse for failure in these areas. Beyond research, the historian who undertakes to write a denomination's history carries a twofold responsibility. First, the historian must provide an account of the events, persons, and ideas which gave birth to the denomination and marked its development. Second, the historian must interpret these events, ideas, and persons in terms of the larger context within which the particular denomination exists. And these two functions, relating and interpreting, are not separate; they must be interwoven throughout the narrative. Research provides the basic information about people, ideas, and events needed to relate the story. The historian will often be forced by the sheer magnitude of the material to choose carefully what is significant and what can be dispensed with without harming or seriously distorting the narrative. Sometimes this involves a difficult choice and may even pose a moral problem. It is this: Ought the writer of history who becomes aware of some unsavory factors, incidents, or qualities associated with leaders, items that nevertheless are critical to the events in the story (denominational bureaucrats don't always act with the most pristine motives) be candid about them; or in the interest of propriety and denominational image, bury these matters and thereby avoid bringing criticism to the cause by casting it in a somewhat unfavorable light? Should history reveal the warts as well as the glamour of a denomination? Here is a dilemma that has confronted many a historian. Of course, I am not suggesting that the writing of history has anything in common with the tabloids; historians do not deal in scandal. But when less than honorable actions lead to serious results for the denomination as a whole, should the historian bury these actions in the interest of the

larger whole? Or should the historian deal candidly with the regrettable as well as the laudable? Sound academics mandate that the historian resist the temptation to cover over history by failing to take into account all of the factors that impinge on a given event. Historical narrative may be as seriously distorted by omission as by intentional misrepresentation. Where one draws the line as to what to include and what to exclude in the narrative can often test the skill and judgment of the historian in an uncomfortable way. It seems to me that the manner in which one copes with this problem involves precisely the fine line that constitutes the distinction between history and propaganda. In the free-wheeling Stone-Campbell tradition this is, and will likely continue to be, a major challenge.

Closely related is the manner in which the historian deals with controversial issues (and we have certainly had our share of these). While the myth of objectivity has been exploded decades ago, one can still strive to state the position of others in such a manner as the proponents themselves would not be able to improve upon. To do less than this is to forsake historiography and revert to sheer propaganda.

It is the second and fourth dimensions of this our topic that pique my major interest, namely interpreting the materials in a way that offers fresh angles of vision while remaining faithful to the essence of those who made the history that is being recounted. Once basic facts have been researched it is necessary to relate them to each other and to the broader context in such a way as to make the narrative intelligible and part of the whole portrait of American life. The interpretation of the data is the essential and critical part of the art of historiography. At this point a very brief review of some of the historiographical models that have been employed in presenting the history of the Stone-Campbell Movement may be in order.

In the span of its existence the Stone-Campbell Movement has produced, and will continue to produce, a goodly number of histories, both comprehensive and specialized. Newell Williams has noted that "history, as the telling of what happened in the past, changes all the time. It changes in response to the differing questions, concerns, and commitments that drive historians to investigate and tell the past."¹ In this century widely recognized developments in American society and culture have mandated a radical revision of the perspective from which historians view events.

From our perspectives today, we are made aware of the presence of operative factors in the shaping of events that either escaped the notice of historians in the past or else were dismissed as of little consequence. Recent new historiographical insights have made many denominational histories obsolete and have mandated fresh investigation into the past to ascertain what really happened and why.

Most denominations trace their origin to some leader whose insights won support from contemporaries in such numbers as to create a sizable following. Such was a Luther, a Calvin, a Wesley, and a host of others to whom existing American denominations trace their origin.

This means that in almost every case denominational histories begin with biography, and we are no exception. Alexander Campbell was not the only leader in the saga of Disciples of Christ, but he was certainly the dominant one in its early years. His insights, his convictions, and his interests became those of his followers. In the early years it was Campbell who gave definition to the Movement. It is not surprising to find that Robert Richardson's lengthy biography published as *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*² provides much of the history of the formative period of this Movement. But, by the time of Campbell's death in 1866 the Movement had grown to the point where others were significant and new issues were determining the direction in which the Movement would develop.

It was Thomas Carlyle who advanced the idea that history is the story of its great individuals, thereby making history essentially biography. The earliest histories of the Movement come to us primarily in the form of biographies, and this genre of historiography which organizes historical development around great leaders is clearly reflected in the earliest histories of our people. W. T. Moore's *Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ*³ is heavy into biographic narrative, though it isn't restricted to this approach. However, it was Moore who first expressed the idea that Disciples don't have bishops, they have editors, an indication of the large role he assigned to these leading personages. Another example of this genre is found in John T. Brown's *Churches of Christ*,⁴ clearly a string of biographies.

This genre has continued to have significant appeal as a useful method of presenting the denomination's history. I see it especially in the historians of the Churches of Christ. Examples may be found in Earl West's multi-volume *Search For the Ancient Order*,⁵ and more recently in Leroy Garrett's *The Stone-Campbell Movement*,⁶ which presents the history of the denomination largely as a string of biographies. The relative isolation and more uniform culture in the environment that cradled the Disciples on the nineteenth century American frontier tended to magnify the role of individual leaders. But the development of sectional interests in our nation and the rise of industrialization and urbanization in this century brought into being a host of new factors that impinged upon the Movement in ways that had to be taken into account by historians in later times. These changes mandated that the focus of historiography shift from the predominance of the highly visible leadership in the nineteenth century to socioeconomic and cultural factors in the twentieth. This change of focus is easily seen in Richard Hughes' *Reviving the Ancient Faith, The Story of the Churches of Christ in America*,⁷ which begins on the great-man theme but quickly moves to take note of some interesting sectional characteristics in the southwest where the Churches of Christ denomination incubated and it concludes by recognizing the impact on these churches of cultural influences in the society at large.

As the Stone-Campbell Movement grew it was inevitable that some kind of national organization would be created. In that segment of the

Movement which embraced and developed these organizations it is not surprising to find that its historiography would be heavily freighted with the accounts of the origin and contributions of these agencies. This can be seen in the work of the Disciples historians. I refer especially to *The Disciples: A History*⁸ by W. E. Garrison and A. T. DeGroot, and to the more recent denominational history, *Journey in Faith*,⁹ by William Tucker and Lester McAllister. The creation, the opposition and difficulties as well as the accomplishments of the organized work of the Disciples of Christ quite naturally becomes a compelling theme for historians in this part of the Movement.

After the turn of the century sociological changes in the nation rendered it inevitable that the Movement enter more fully into the mainstream of American religious life and be influenced by trends in Protestantism at large. Thus, it was not possible for our people to escape the furious Modernist/Fundamentalist Controversy and its bitter legacy of factional and fratricidal hatred.¹⁰ So I suppose it was only to be expected that we would develop what I have facetiously called "the cops and robbers genre of historiography" in which the "good guys" defending truth are always fighting heroic battles against the "bad guys" bent on destroying Christianity from within the Church itself. This style of writing history (which more accurately might be styled the "polemic genre") had great appeal for many, especially laymen who yearned to be assured that their views were lodged securely within the will of God. Deeply scarred from the conflicts, historians who worked in this genre of doing history often employed pejorative language when referring to those whose agenda differed from their own. A prime example is found in James DeForest Murch's *Christians Only*.¹¹ The book went through several printings and enjoyed a wide circulation for a quarter of a century. This trend is continued in the most recent history coming from Christian Churches, *Union in Truth: An Interpretive History of the Restoration Movement* by James B. North.¹²

A significant and new historiographic genre was introduced to the Movement in 1931 with the publication of W. E. Garrison's *Religion Follows the Frontier*.¹³ In the preface to this volume Garrison wrote:

It has become increasingly clear that in the history of a religious body the most significant factors are not its doctrines or its philosophical backgrounds, important as these are, but rather the responses which it makes to the changing social and cultural situation in which it finds itself.¹⁴

Garrison interpreted the history of the movement from the perspective of the cultural impact of the American frontier as this had earlier been outlined by Fredrick Jackson Turner. Garrison noted how the message of the Disciples was particularly suited to the psyche of the frontier, which he offered as an explanation of the phenomenal growth of the Disciples in the nineteenth century. Similarly, sociological factors were employed to explain some of the trauma through which the Movement suffered during the early decades of the twentieth century when the frontier/rural society gave way to an urban/industrial social structure.

Here the role of the heroic leader was, if not displaced, at least modified by sociological factors. This was a new genre in the historiography of Disciples and it met with considerable opposition.

This method of understanding history was raised to an even higher level by the contemporary social historian, David Edwin Harrell, whose first volume, *Quest For A Christian America*¹⁵ was followed by his *Social Sources of Division in the Disciples of Christ 1865-1900*.¹⁶ The focus of David Edwin Harrell's work was light-years away from that of previous historians.

Sociological factors are also very prominent in the newest history of Churches of Christ by Richard Hughes, to which reference has already been made, and somewhat in my own volume *In Search of Christian Unity: A History of the Restoration Movement*.¹⁷ Indeed, the most serious review criticism I received was for my sociological interpretation of the division between Disciples and Churches of Christ in the latter third of the last century as largely a matter of sectional hostility. It was once customary for us to point with pride to the fact that Disciples were the only major denomination that did not divide over slavery and the War, as if it were possible for Disciples to go through that dreadful conflict and somehow be above the bitter sectional animosities that were generated. Even the Disciples historians W. E. Garrison and A. T. DeGroot subscribed to this view as recently as fifty years ago. DeGroot, who wrote the chapter on "War And Controversies," titled one section "Through Civil War Without Division."¹⁸ He cited the oft-quoted editorial by Moses E. Lard, "Can We Divide?"¹⁹ He explained the myth that we didn't divide partly on the ground that we had no national body to fracture. The fact is, however, that we did divide after the war, when sectional hostility was so intense as to make north-south fraternity every bit as difficult for Disciples to resume as it was for any other denomination. The schism was in place, caused by the war; all that was missing was an issue to justify it. Since emancipation had eliminated slavery as an issue, another divisive issue had to be found. It wasn't difficult to find several that served the purpose very well by providing religious sanction for preserving separate identities within the hostile sections of the nation. The War Resolution of the Missionary Society in 1863²⁰ deeply exacerbated the fracture in the fellowship that resulted from the conflict, and the post-war prosperity in the north resulting in new church buildings and the introduction of organs and choirs provided a ready symbol of infidelity to the ancient ways and a cause for severing fellowship from those who were already disliked for completely different reasons.

For frankly recognizing the impact of sectional social influences on the development of one segment of the Stone-Campbell Movement, I must commend again the most recent history of Churches of Christ, namely Richard Hughes' interpretation, to which reference has previously been made. Hughes opened to public scrutiny important new understandings of the dynamics which created and shaped the Churches of Christ fellowship and which have since motivated its

development to its present position among American denominations. His insights in identifying these dynamics and his honesty and candor in detailing their influence on this denomination have raised this genre of historiography to new heights among Disciples historians. None of these efforts will endear him to his own people. Fortunately, Hughes had the advantage of working with a publisher outside his own denomination, which gave him a measure of freedom not often enjoyed by denominational historians.

Finally, the most serious contemporary challenge facing one who seeks to interpret the history of the Stone-Campbell tradition, or of many other Protestant denominations, has to do with understanding and interpreting the impact on the denomination of the enormous changes that are now taking place in contemporary culture. The cultural climate inevitably changes, and historians are increasingly aware of the impact of such changes on religious life in the nation.²¹ Sometimes this change is so slight as to be almost imperceptible, but there are times when change is traumatic and revolutionary. We are currently in the midst of a very significant cultural change. The reality is that people, especially younger people, think in different categories today than they did in the early days of the Movement, or even in the first half of this century. Issues that were important to people living in the cultural context of half a century ago are of little or no importance to most persons who live in today's culture. This reality hit me hard in 1984 when 200 leaders in our part of the Movement were summoned to meet in a conference in St. Louis. Participants were carefully selected to represent as many persons under 50 years of age as over, and as many from west of the Mississippi as from the east. The purpose was to evaluate and to explore ways to energize the Movement, but the discussion had not proceeded far before it became obvious that there was no consensus within the group as to what constitutes the basic aims of the Movement. To the surprise and horror of some of us, we were facing an identity crisis. The agenda was scrapped and a new tack was taken. Two of us were appointed to bring a statement of what we understood the aims of the movement to be. Both of us labored far into the night and came forth with remarkably similar statements that were largely in keeping with the platform published by the Centennial Convention in Pittsburgh in 1909 to the effect that our movement is an effort seeking the unity of all Christians on the basis of a restoration of the faith and practices found in the New Testament. The younger contingent present was polite but firm in saying, in effect: We agree that this is what the movement USED TO BE, but we don't agree at all that this is what it is NOW, OR WHAT IT SHOULD BE IN THE FUTURE. In effect they were saying: The climate has changed and we will have to adapt to the new reality if we are to be in touch with where people are today. Frankly, I was shocked, tending to view this as a repudiation of our heritage. (Some of these "young Turks" were my own students). I was aware that some of the Disciples scholars had repudiated the heritage on theoretical grounds; here was a repudiation on pragmatic

grounds. I have since modified this judgment somewhat, but I am still struggling with the problem of accommodating the heritage of the movement to the realities of changes in contemporary culture. I have real trouble accepting the idea that we are now nothing more than another sect in the American Evangelical Community.²² Meanwhile, none of us can escape noticing the strong influence of Evangelicalism in the appeal that new styles of music, new forms of worship, and new and different modes of preaching is currently having on our churches.

How to account for and interpret this shift presents a new challenge to historians of the Stone-Campbell Movement. My book was complete before the magnitude of these influences became part of my serious awareness. To my knowledge, Richard Hughes is the only historian among us who has recognized this cultural revolution. In the concluding chapter of his recently published history, in which he deals with "Renewal and Reform," Hughes calls attention to "The Hermeneutic Crisis" facing Churches of Christ and he discusses a radical paradigm shift taking place among these congregations at the present time.²³ He notes that the generation of the 1980s

rediscovered a theology of grace and had to ask whether the older restoration vision that had defined the Churches of Christ since the early nineteenth century was compatible with the new theology of grace... and how Enlightenment foundations of Churches of Christ might comport with the new postmodern culture... which resisted Enlightenment empiricism.²⁴

Hughes notes that this radical paradigm shift constitutes "an identity crisis of significant proportions" for Churches of Christ.²⁵ Unforeseen problems lie ahead because to this point the change "has failed to touch a sizable segment of the communion."²⁶ I see the same thing ahead for Christian Churches, and for the same reasons.

This paradigm shift is unquestionably derived from the Post-Modern culture in which we now live, a culture that has little or no interest in the Enlightenment orientation out of which our movement finds its pre-suppositions. It gives poignancy to the over-all theme of recent Kirkpatrick Lectures: Can a Nineteenth Century Religious Movement Survive in the Twenty-First Century? What such a paradigm shift means to the future of the Movement as a whole is not yet entirely clear. What is clear is that the new hermeneutic abandons much of the methodological base on which the Stone-Campbell Movement traditionally predicated its plea. Precisely how this cultural revolution will play out remains for future historians to detail.

To this point I have not dealt with that portion of my assignment that relates to writing history that is "publishable and marketable." I can add little on this subject. Most of our historians have published through "in-house" agencies, which have also provided the marketing outlets for their work. Considering the reduced interest in denominations *per se*, the relative downsizing of all three of our denominations, and the increased costs of publication, it does not appear to me that publication of the history of any one of our denominations would find publishers

standing in line for the opportunity. Nevertheless, the three streams of the Stone-Campbell Movement constitute a significant sector of the American religious landscape and as new historiographic perspectives emerge new histories will be needed. It is surprising to me how soon denominational histories go out-of-date and need revision. I can only add that, from my perspective, the experience of writing a history of our people was at the same time fulfilling, frustrating, exciting, and disappointing. Nonetheless, I can recommend it to any person who has an obsession to discover and understand his spiritual roots.

Notes

¹Williams, D. Newell, *Discipliana*, (Nashville, Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Vol. 56, No. 4, Winter, 1996) p. 97

²Richardson, Robert, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, (Phil., J. Lippincott, 1888).

³Moore, W. T. *A Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ*, (New York, Revell, 1909). Moore's comprehensive history does not fail to detail the rise of institutions and the conflicts rising out of growing differences in interpretation of the aims and purposes of the Disciples.

⁴Brown, John T., *Churches of Christ*, (Louisville, John P. Morton, 1904).

⁵West, Earl, *Search for the Ancient Order: A History of the Restoration Movement*, 4 vols., (Nashville, Gospel Advocate Co., 1974-1987).

⁶Garrett, Leroy, *The Stone Campbell Movement*, (Joplin, Mo., College Press, 1981, revised 1995) Garrett's work focuses primarily on the nineteenth century. Fourteen of his eighteen chapters in the original volume are devoted to this period, which limits its usefulness to those who seek to understand the Stone-Campbell Movement in its present context. This imbalance is somewhat relieved in the revised edition.

⁷Hughes, Richard, *Reviving the Ancient Faith*, (Grand Rapids, MI, Wm.B. Eerdmans, 1996).

⁸Garrison, W. E. & DeGroot, A. T. *The Disciples: A History*, (St. Louis, MO, Christian Bd. of Pub., 1948). These authors detail the sectional expansion of the Movement and the formation of state as well as national missionary organizations.

⁹Tucker, William and McAllister, Lester, *Journey In Faith*, (St. Louis, MO., Christian Bd. of Pub., 1975). The process of Restructure within the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) was a major development that needed explanation and historical coverage. This mandated an updated history for Disciples of Christ.

¹⁰Churches of Christ were spared much of the trauma of the conflict. Wm. Banowsky accounts for this on the basis of their cultural isolation from the mainstream of American religious life. *Mirror of a Movement* (Dallas, Christian Publishing Co., 1965), pp 45-50

¹¹Murch, James DeForest, *Christians Only: A History of the Restoration Movement* (Cincinnati, OH, Standard Pub. Co., 1962). Murch was a deeply committed Fundamentalist and no stranger to the controversies, as detailed in his autobiography; *Adventuring For Christ* (Louisville KY., Restoration Press, 1973). Neo-Orthodoxy was an enigma for Murch. He approved much of the theological emphases he discerned among its advocates but could not endorse its Biblical scholarship.

¹²North, James B., *Union In Truth: An interpretive History of the Restoration Movement*, (Cincinnati, OH, Standard Pub. Co., 1994). The major theme of this work divides "liberals" and "conservatives" on the litmus test of his concept of "Biblical authority," in this case tied to a dogma of "inerrancy." Allowance is not made for variant understanding of Biblical authority. For many Christians the concept of "authority," with its harsh legalistic overtones, is not the most appropriate term to describe the role of Scripture in the life of the believer and is not congenial with hermeneutical insight in these postmodern times. Too often the motives of those whose interpretation of the role of the Bible in the Christian community differs from the author's are impugned.

¹³Garrison, W. E., *Religion Follows the Frontier*, (New York, Harper & Bros, 1931).

¹⁴*Ibid.*, xiv.

¹⁵Harrell, David E., *Quest For A Christian America* (Nashville, Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966) Harrell surveys the impact on Disciples of Christ of emerging social issues such as developing Capitalism, Abolitionism, Pacifism, Political involve-

ment, the Temperance Movement, Women's Suffrage, Tobacco, and attitudes toward divorce, all of which tended to have polarizing effects.

¹⁶Harrell, David, E., *The Social Sources of Division in the Disciples of Christ 1860-1900*, (Atlanta, GA, pub. by the author, 1978). In his continued investigation of social influences on the Movement Harrell considers urbanization, capital-labor tensions, the Social Gospel, and concludes: "In short, the division in 1906 between the conservative Churches of Christ and the more liberal Disciples of Christ clearly reflected the economical development of the nation" p. 334. Regrettably, this research has not been carried into the twentieth century.

¹⁷Webb, Henry E., *In Search of Christian Unity: A History of the Restoration Movement*, (Cincinnati, OH., Standard Pub. Co., 1990) sectional nature of this division is still seen in the heavy concentration of this body in the states of the Confederacy.

¹⁸Garrison, W. E. & DeGroot, A. T., op. cit, p. 333.

¹⁹Lard, Moses E., "Can We Divide?," *Lard's Quarterly*, (April, 1866), Vol. III, p. 335-6. A similar view of this widely held conviction is expressed by W. T. Moore, op. cit., p. 495.

²⁰The resolution that was adopted by the American Christian Missionary Society in 1863 stated:

Resolved, That we tender our sympathies to our brave soldiers in the fields, who are defending us from the attempts of armed traitors to overthrow our Government, and also to those bereaved, and rendered desolate by the ravages of war.

Report of Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Christian Missionary Society, (Cincinnati, OH, E Morgan & Sons, 1863), p. 13

²¹For a very perceptive analysis of historian's attitudes toward the phenomenon of change see Albanese, Catherine, "Refusing the Wild Pomegranate Seed: American Religious History and the Life of the Academy," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Summer 1995, Vol. LXIII, No. 2, p. 205.

²²An evaluation accepted by several of the younger leaders involved in the St Louis meeting in 1984 and the direction Richard Hughes sees many of the Churches of Christ moving. Hughes, R., op cit. p. 373.

²³Hughes, Richard, *ibid.*, p. 365. Hughes notes that younger scholars from the church met in several colloquia in the summers of 1992 and 1993 and "were unavoidably confronted with the issue of the nature of the Bible. Was it primarily an ancient constitution or blueprint that must govern every aspect of church life, from its terms of admission to worship and church organization- or, was the Bible principally a theological treatise describing a God who seeks relationships with his children and whose relationship with them sustains their relations with one another?," p. 367.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p 365

²⁵*Ibid.*, p 373

²⁶*Ibid.*

The Disciples of Christ in the Philippines

by L. Shelton Woods*

Introduction

Spain was the Philippines' colonial mother between 1565-1898. During this period Protestant missionaries were not permitted to proselytize in the archipelago.¹ Consequently, it was American Protestant leaders who lobbied the loudest for U.S. annexation of the Philippines in 1898.² Following President McKinley's decision to annex the Philippines, Protestant groups began sending missionaries to the islands.³ By 1900 there were eight Protestant organizations registered in Manila. Seven of these met together in April 1901 and established the Evangelical Union. This ecumenical organization was created in order to promote "comity and cooperation" among the disparate Protestant groups.⁴ The Evangelical Union assigned various geographical areas of the Philippines to particular mission societies. There was a twofold purpose in doing this: to limit competition (friction) between Protestant denominations, and to ensure that the entire archipelago would be evangelized. Manila was designated an area open to all Protestant missionaries.

The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) missionaries arrived in the Philippines during August and December 1901. These missionaries joined the Evangelical Union that same year. This essay chronicles the early relations between the Disciples missionaries and the Evangelical Union. Before addressing this issue, however, a brief survey of the Disciples' road to the Philippines is presented.

Disciples in the Philippines

During their first half century, Disciples churches were nominally interested in foreign missions. In 1849 they created the *American Christian Missionary Society* (ACMS) under the direction of Alexander Campbell. Only three missionaries were sent out by the ACMS during its first 25 years.⁵ Two of these missionaries were forced to return to the United States due to lack of financial support from the ACMS, and the third perished on the foreign field two months after his arrival. Paradoxically, disunity was the main obstacle the Disciples had to overcome before they could create a strong mission society. Disciples churches were particularly wary of joining any organization that might threaten their complete independence.

However, by the early 1870s Disciples could not ignore the facts. Missionary endeavors were growing at a feverish pitch during the second half of the nineteenth century and their ill-fated ACMS could not support one missionary.⁶ Consequently, at the Disciples' National Association Convention of 1874 a resolution was passed that the Disciples organize a mission society. One year later, October 21, 1875,

*L. Shelton Woods is Assistant Professor, History Department, Boise State University, Boise, Idaho.

the Disciples formed the *Foreign Christian Missionary Society* (FCMS). In its forty-five years of existence the FCMS was a picture of stability and growth. It had but three presidents and grew from supporting two missionaries to 190. Disciples contributing churches increased from thirty to 3,173 and the annual financial support increased from \$1,706.35 to \$625,522.73. In 1919 the FCMS united with two other mission societies, to form the United Christian Missionary Society.⁷

Europe was the initial foreign field in which FCMS missionaries served. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the FCMS had placed missionaries in India, Turkey, Japan, China, and the Congo. The Philippines would be the next country to which the FCMS would send missionaries. In 1901 the FCMS commissioned two families as full-time missionaries to the Philippines: Hermon and Beulah Williams and William and Elinor Hanna. These two families were scheduled to depart for the Philippines in the summer of 1901; however, the Williamses departure was delayed due to the impending birth of their child. Consequently, on August 3, 1901, the Hannas arrived in Manila as the first Disciples family in the Philippines. Four months later they were joined by the Williamses.

During their first eighteen months in the Philippines the Disciples missionaries worked in Manila. Various problems caused them to leave Manila and they moved their mission to the Ilocano province of Ilocos Norte in January 1903. They chose Laoag, the capital of Ilocos Norte, as their base of operations. During the next seven years the Williamses and Hannas were joined by fellow Disciples missionaries Drs. Cyrus and Leta Pickett (1903), Bruce and Ethel Kershner (1905), Leslie and Carrie Wolfe (1907), John Lord (1907), Inez Logan (1908), Sylvia Siegfried (1908), and Dr. William and Daisy Lemmon (1909).

With the additional personnel support, the Disciples eventually established three bases of operation: Laoag, Manila, and Vigan, the capital of Ilocos Sur. Each of these centers had its own particular strength. The skills of the Disciples personnel at each site determined each center's emphasis. When the Picketts arrived in 1903 they joined the Williamses and Hannas in Laoag. The Picketts set up a medical clinic and Laoag became the center for the Disciples' medical work. After the arrival of the Picketts, the Williamses moved to the neighboring province of Ilocos Sur. They chose its capital, Vigan, as their home. Mr. Williams was particularly skilled in translation work. By 1903 he was fluent in Tagalog, Spanish and Ilocano. He wrote and published the first English/Ilocano dictionary and grammar in 1908. Due to Williams' linguistic prowess, Vigan became the Disciples' center for translating and publishing. With the Picketts in Laoag, and the Williamses in Vigan, the next FCMS missionary family in the Philippines, the Kershners (1905), were assigned to Manila. Mr. Kershner had been a professor of Greek language and literature at Bethany College (1903-1905) and a professor of Latin language and literature at Kee Mar College (1905) prior to his work in the Philippines.⁸ He therefore became a teacher at the Union Theological Seminary, a training school established by the

Evangelical Union. Manila was designated as the theological training center for the FCMS mission in the Philippines.

Since two of the three FCMS sites were among the Ilocanos and the missionaries with the most seniority served in the Ilocano area, the emphasis of the Disciples' ministry was among the Ilocanos. More Disciples churches, converts, missionaries, and funds went to the Ilocanos than any other Filipino ethnic group.

Disciples and the Evangelical Union

Throughout the first decade of their ministry in the Philippines, the Disciples were in constant communication with the Evangelical Union. Opinions regarding the nature of the Disciples/Evangelical Union relations are wide ranging. The conventional—and older—view asserts that there was complete harmony between these groups.⁹ This thesis has more recently been challenged by scholars including Kenton Clymer and Arthur L. Tuggy.¹⁰ Clymer and Tuggy assert that the Disciples' relations with the Evangelical Union and other Protestant denominations was, for the most part, acrimonious. Public and private records corroborate the assertion that, at best, the Disciples/Evangelical Union relations were volatile, and, at worse, they were hostile. Three things, in particular, led to strained relations between these two groups. These include: the geographical limitations placed on the Disciples by the Evangelical Union, the exclusive nature of the Disciples' message and the independent character of the Disciples' ministry.¹¹

When the Disciples joined the Evangelical Union in 1901, the Philippines had already been divided up between the United Brethren, Presbyterian and Methodist missions. This left Manila as the only viable area for the Disciples' future mission. The Disciples' first year in the capital city proved frustrating. Their labors in Manila had been met with "complete apathy" on the part of the Filipino people. The lack of conversions galled Hanna. On his one-year anniversary in Manila he wrote: "The first difficulty encountered has been that of keeping at it—a personal difficulty. Coming, as I did, from a field where about every invitation of the gospel brought a response, and where there were hearers numbered by the hundred [sic] at every service, this new and unresponsive field vexed my soul."¹²

The inability of the FCMS missionaries to communicate with the Filipinos, in part, accounted for the minimal results in Manila. These missionaries had learned Spanish but found that only the Filipino elite and educated spoke this language and this group was less likely to leave the Catholic Church.¹³ Unable to preach in the dominant language spoken in Manila (Tagalog), the Hannas and Williamses decided to organize an English-speaking congregation in Manila. But at the time, very few Filipinos spoke English and the American teachers and bureaucrats—who did speak English—had other priorities on Sundays.¹⁴ Out of frustration Hanna complained that the godless example set by the highest ranking Americans in the Philippines accounted for the general indifference to the gospel:

“There is not a member of the Civil Commission, outside of native members, that goes to church on Sundays. He who proclaimed a day of Thanksgiving, and exhorted Americans to seek their accustomed place of worship, never went near. All this influences the young clerks, away from mother, sister, home, friends, to exchange religion for irreligion, or, at least, indifference.”¹⁵

The Disciples wanted to move out of Manila and requested permission from the Evangelical Union to begin work in the Cagayan Valley. This area was on the northeast tip of Luzon—the main island of the archipelago. The Disciples asked for this region since there were no Protestant missionaries working in the area. The Disciples’ request was denied as the Methodist Episcopalians insisted that the Cagayan area be included as part of their sphere of influence. Undeterred, the Disciples decided to move out of Manila with or without the Evangelical Union’s blessing.¹⁶ They chose the Ilocano region of the Northwest coast of Luzon.¹⁷ This area had earlier been assigned to the United Brethren. However, due to lack of personnel, the United Brethren had abandoned their mission in the region. Thus, Disciples moved into the area and chose Laoag, Ilocos Norte, the northern most Philippine provincial capital, as their base of operations. As noted, they eventually centered their missions in the Ilocano provinces of Ilocos Sur and Ilocos Norte.

The Disciples took this step in opposition to the Evangelical Union’s specific geographical assignments. At the time it caused a rift between the Disciples and the other Protestant denominations.¹⁸ Time has a way of changing the original story. Writing in 1944, Edith Eberle, a former Disciples missionary stationed in the Philippines wrote:

“From the very beginning the Christian Mission [Disciples] shared in cooperative work. The division of territory was cooperative missions....In the provinces of northern Luzon w(h)ere (sic) Methodists, United Brethren, and Disciples of Christ all carried on well-organized and established work this matter of cooperation worked itself out so well that in few places, except in larger towns or cities did one find more than one Protestant church....The Evangelical Union, an association of missionaries and other American religious leaders founded in 1901, found our missionaries in full accord, attending the annual meetings, sharing in its program of betterment, cooperating in its plans for a united approach to the people of the islands.”¹⁹

The records do not corroborate the above assessment. The Methodists protested the Disciples’ move into the Ilocos provinces. Their protest was mild, however, since the area was not under their jurisdiction but under the United Brethren. The Methodist protest was probably rooted in their distrust of the Disciples. The Cagayan Valley, which was the first choice of the Disciples, bordered Ilocos Norte and the Methodists were concerned that the Disciples would invade “their” territory. Their fears were confirmed when the Disciples began a mission in Aparri, the major port city of Cagayan in 1906. The Methodists accused the Disciples of stealing their converts and disregarding the territorial assignments.²⁰ The Disciples scrambled to find a justification for moving into Methodists’ territory. They requested the minutes of previous Evangelical Union

meetings to determine if the Methodists had actually been given the Cagayan region. When they found out that this was actually the case, they then justified their move into Cagayan on the complete absence of American missionaries in the area.²¹ Disciples missionary C. L. Pickett used a different approach in claiming the Cagayan area as Disciple territory. Pickett wrote to his supporters:

"As to the coast towns of the Cagayan, I have already explained the situation here so will not repeat it now. The territory is ours really by right of contiguity. It is ours also in that the Ilocanos form the principal part of the population of these towns. The Methodist Episcopalians claim the whole valley, but they saw fit to put a missionary in Vigan, in Ilocos Sur, territory which was not theirs, and leave this region unoccupied."²²

But the ace up the Disciples' sleeve in all their disputes with the Evangelical Union was that the Disciples claimed they alone represented the true Apostolic Church.²³ Thus, if they got into a theological spat with other Protestants, the Disciples would point to the Bible and the early Apostolic Churches as their authority and example. So, while they were publicly arguing with the Methodists in Cagayan, the Disciples privately justified their move into this area as they had a greater understanding of the gospel than did the Methodists. In fact, they insinuated that the Methodists themselves needed to be converted.²⁴ Note a letter written to Hanna from fellow Disciples missionary Bruce Kershner:

"Looks as if the Evangelical Union were moving north doesn't it...we are never going to have peace with these people until we move into their territory and teach them the gospel of Jesus Christ at the expense of their own work.... There can be no compromising, they intend to suppress our work. We must strike them a body blow and we must strike hard."²⁵

The Disciples missionaries viewed the other Protestant missionaries with some suspicion as denominational Christianity was the antithesis of the Christian Church.²⁶ But the paradox that faced the Disciples was their desire to have an inclusive church with an exclusive message. To be sure, their desire to unite all Christians was a driving motive in their mission. But in order to have this unity, denominations would have to align their theology with that of the Disciples. The issue of baptism serves as a clear example. It was not unusual for Filipino Protestant converts to transfer membership between the various Protestant churches. For the majority of the Protestant groups there was no problem with this. For the Disciples, however, they insisted that if Methodists or Presbyterians joined their churches they would have to be rebaptized. The Evangelical Union sought to overcome this "controversy." But the Disciples would not compromise on this point. They lashed out at the denominations who would not completely immerse their converts:

"A gentleman in Manila said some time ago: 'I have no use for this baptismal controversy; I see no merit in it.' He might have said the same thing about every controversy in which the truth is involved....No one has ever yet found any

divine authorization for the so called infant baptism, or for the pouring or sprinkling of water upon the heads of people in the sacred name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit; all find there the immersion of believers in water."²⁷

Since the Disciples sought to mirror the Apostolic Church, they also insisted that their churches remain independent. Denominational Christianity was anathema to them. This independence at times even led to disputes between the missionaries and the FCMS officers.²⁸ The Evangelical Union was the antithesis of independence. The local independent church was the pattern the Disciples sought to emulate. The Disciples in the Philippines published a defense for their view of the Church and it sums up their irreconcilable differences with the Evangelical Union:

It is easy to solve the problem by saying to every body else: "Come to us; let us be one." Anyone can say that, and the one who is not saying it is out of harmony with this age of unity; but it is just as vain as it is useless. Instead of saying: "Come to us" let us say "Go to Christ." Let us wear his name, make him our King, his life our Creed, his word our Law, his teachings, with their doctrines and ordinances, our religion, and drop our human tests of fellowship. When we all get to Christ we will have an undenominational and a united Christianity. Let us roll away the stumbling blocks, lest the relentless hand of Eternal Truth roll them away for us.²⁹

Conclusion

The acrimonious relationship between the Disciples and the other Protestant missionaries, particularly the Methodists, was rooted in historical circumstance as well as long-standing theological disagreements—both of these issues led to irreconcilable differences between these groups.

The Evangelical Union met in April 1901 and divided the Philippines between the Methodists, Presbyterians and United Brethren. Four months later, August 1901, the Disciples arrived on the scene. The issue that divided the Disciples from the Evangelical Union for years was that the Disciples had been denied a mission station because they were not present at the founding of the Evangelical Union. How different things might have been had the Disciples arrived in the Philippines four months earlier. They would have then been assigned a specific geographical area to evangelize.

However, it is too simplistic to claim that a matter of months would have completely altered the Disciples/Evangelical Union relations. In short, the Disciples found it difficult to join in any ecumenical organization. The primary reason for discord between the Disciples and other American Protestant missionaries in the Philippines was rooted in theological differences. These dissimilarities included the mode and significance of baptism and denominational versus non-denominational Christianity. Four months, four years, or four decades would not have been sufficient time to overcome these differences.

Notes

¹ For more on this see John L. Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1959). A satirical view of the Spanish friars in the Philippines is presented in Jose Rizal's *The Lost Eden. Noli Mi Tangere*, trans. Leon Ma. Guerrero (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961).

² For more information on the role of Protestant's lobbying for Philippine annexation see Julius Pratt, *Expansionists of the 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936), 279-316.

³ The best work on the early Protestant missionaries in the Philippines is Kenton J. Clymer's *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898-1916* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986).

⁴ For more information on the Evangelical Union see Enrique Sobrepena, *The United Church of Christ in the Philippines* (Manila: New Day, 1965).

⁵ The three men and the places they served as missionaries are as follows: Dr. J. T. Barclay - Jerusalem; J. O. Beardslee - Jamaica; Alexander Cross - Liberia. For more information on this mission society see Archibald McLean, *The History of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1919), 22-23.

⁶ The dramatic numerical growth of mission societies in America during the nineteenth century is noted in William R. Hutchinson's *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987). In this work Hutchinson notes: "The renewed strength and acceptability of civilizing ideals at the end of the nineteenth century owed a great deal to the sheer momentum that missions attained in that period. By 1900 the sixteen American missionary societies of the 1860s had swelled to about ninety. That kind of spectacular growth encouraged 'the impatient generation' (as Valentin Rabe calls them) to hope for the evangelization of the entire world in their own time." 91.

⁷ For more information on the United Christian Missionary Society see Joseph M. Smith, *A Guide to Materials Related to the United Christian Missionary Society* (Nashville, TN.: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1987).

⁸ Professor Kershner continued in academe upon his return from the Philippines in 1917. From 1918-1925 he was Professor of Biblical History and Literature at Lynchburg College and from 1925-1942 he was Clarence L. Goodwin Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in the Butler University School of Religion. See the *Bruce Kershner Papers*, DCA.

⁹ A former Disciples missionary in the Philippines describes the supposed conversation of the early missionaries in these words: "Let's work together,' they said, 'that these people may as quickly as possible know the Way of Life. We will divide islands and areas in order that we may reach all parts of the country as soon as possible.' Comity was the word; division of territory among the different missions was its meaning. So the representatives of the churches met together in 1901 and decided that the Methodists would work here, the Presbyterians there, the United Brethren, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Disciples of Christ in other places with only here and there an overlapping or sharing of territory. Manila was the mutual territory. Most missions established headquarters there." Edith Eberle, *Disciples of Christ in the Philippines* (United Christian Missionary Society Library, 1944), 9.

¹⁰ Professor Clymer explains the relationship between the Disciples and the Evangelical Union in these terms: "Though there were occasional instances of cooperation between Disciples and other missions, and even genuine friendship with the United Brethren mission, bitterness and deep suspicion were more characteristic of the relationship." Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 55.

Arthur L. Tuggy claims that the Evangelical Union was not as great a success as previously thought: "Evangelical Alliance...did not remove all sources of friction and competition. Those who had received the largest areas in which to work were most satisfied with it." Arthur L. Tuggy, *Iglesia ni Cristo: A Study in Independent Church Dynamics* (Quezon City: Conservative Baptist Publishing, 1976), 6.

¹¹ Clymer notes regarding the role of the Disciples theology: "More disturbing to the usual view of amicable relations among Protestants in the Philippines were the relations of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) with the other denominations. The first Disciples arrived in 1901, and for a time relations seemed pleasant...But because the

Disciples held uncompromising views on a variety of doctrinal issues, effective comity arrangements were unlikely to be instituted.” Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries*, 54.

¹² W. H. Hanna, “The Philippines,” *The Missionary Intelligencer*, 15(1902), 372.

¹³ There are numerous references about the unresponsiveness of the “higher class” Filipinos in the Disciples’ correspondence. A typical statement is as follows: “Our work confines itself as yet to the common people. Some rich and well-educated think well of the truth, but they lack that love of the truth that will lead them to identify themselves with an unpopular cause.” W. H. Hanna, “The Philippine Mission,” *Mission Intelligencer*, 18(1905), 417.

¹⁴ Hanna’s disappointment in Americans is demonstrated in his first year report: “I have been tempted to let the Americans go to perdition. I have wondered if I would not be justified in shaking the dust off my feet as a testimony against this multitude of careless souls. I have preached the Word as best I knew, and the brethren by words or actions have seldom found these sermons blameworthy or praiseworthy. But, by God’s help, I am still at it.” W. H. Hanna, “The Philippines,” *Mission Intelligencer*, 15(1902), 373.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ As late as 1907 the Disciples were still complaining about the Evangelical Union’s division of the Philippines: “The time is about come for another annual meeting of the Evan. Union. If its members can get over the theological thorn fences it has built between their fields without too many scratches, and assemble without too great spiritual disfigurement, it ought to be a meeting of some importance. If, on the contrary, it is to give its attention to the perpetuation of a territorial distribution among its members which has never been satisfactory, and to an insistence that enactments made by some are mandatory upon all even though those who dissent act from motives of conscience, it may very properly asked to justify the reasons for its continued existence.” Bruce Kershner, *Philippine Christian*, 31 January 1907.

¹⁷ For more on Ilocano history and society see Felix Keesing, *The Ethno History of Northern Luzon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962); and F. Landa Jocano, *The Ilocanos: An Ethnography of Family and Community Life in the Ilocos Region* (Quezon City: University of the Philippine Press, 1982).

¹⁸ The Disciples were severely criticized because of this action by one of the most prestigious early Methodist missionaries in the Philippines Dr. Homer C. Stuntz. Kershner wrote to his colleague, Hanna, regarding this: “I may run up against some people who received all they know against us from the statements of Dr. Stuntz as he told the people that the Campbellites were the only denomination who did not work harmoniously with the Ev. Union. I want to show them that we had some reason and that the worthy Doctor’s piggishness was the chief obstacle to the same co-operation.” Bruce Kershner to W. H. Hanna, 22 September 1906 (Kershner Papers, DCA).

¹⁹ Eberle, *Disciples of Christ*, 22-23.

²⁰ Methodist missionary O. Huddleston angrily wrote the Disciples missionaries in 1907: “I take the liberty to write you for information as to your plans for your native preachers in the Philippines, and especially in the Cagayan Valley as I am the representative of the M.E. Church in this Valley. Is it your plan and desire that your native preachers follow up another protestant [sic] worker or workers and attempt to form churches or societies of the people or congregations those other workers have secured? Is it your desire that your workers make a special effort to secure members by entering the homes of members of other Protestant churches and urging them to leave the one and go to your church? Is it your desire while preaching another doctrine to have your workers go to the congregation of another Protestant church and in the absence of said workers have your workers represent themselves as the representatives of this said church and thereby deceive the people?

Many are the unmanly and unbrotherly things your workers resort to in trying to proselyte from our church...” O. Huddleston to the Missionaries of the Christian Mission, 20 July 1907. (Pickett Papers, DCA).

²¹ Writing several decades after this Frank V. Stipp, a former Disciples missionary explained this move: “Lying just around the coast to the east was the important city of Aparri, the port of the great Cagayan valley, which had been the mission’s original choice of territory. No protestant [sic] work had ever been undertaken in these provinces. Therefore the mission sent a missionary over to spy out he land in the year 1905. His report was most enthusiastic and urgent. He found conditions very favorable and very needy, the

people ready to listen and 'the door of opportunity wide open'.[sic] He recommended entering the territory at the earliest possible moment." Frank V. Stipp, "The Disciples of Christ in the Philippine Islands" (Presented to the Divinity School of Yale University, 1927), 19.

²² C. L. Pickett, "The Work in the Philippines," *Mission Intelligencer* 19(1906), 184.

²³ Disciples missionary C. L. Pickett insinuates the Disciples' superior theology in his reply to the Methodist complaint that the Disciples were invading their territory in Cagayan: "1st. It is our 'plan' that they shall study to show themselves approved unto God, workmen that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. And furthermore that they should be all means shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. 2nd. It is our 'plan' that out preachers shall 'Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine.'" Pickett to Huddleston, July 1907 (Pickett Papers, DCA).

²⁴ Writing about their intrusion into Cagayan Pickett wrote to Kershner: "It is true that we have no rights which they are bound to respect. But it is also true, and our preachers in the Cagayan are proving it continually, that the gospel of Jesus Christ will convert Methodists as well as others who have not fully obeyed its teachings." Pickett to Kershner, 24 July 1909 (Kershner Papers, DCA).

²⁵ Kershner to Hanna, 23 March 1907, (Kershner Papers, DCA).

²⁶ Kershner wrote an open letter to Protestants in the Philippines on denominational Christianity: "Undenominational Christianity is the strangest thing in the world to a great many people. They were born and reared as sectarians and sometimes they boast that they are going to die as such. That there can be a Christianity which is undenominational is a tale as idle as any told to the Disciples on the resurrection morn.

The strangest thing about such a tale is that it is true. There was an undenominational Christianity before Paul rebuked the Corinthians with the words: 'Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? And there has been an undenominational Christianity ever since, though it is obscured by denominational teachers." Kershner *Philippine Christian*, 21 March 1907.

²⁷ Kershner, *Philippine Christian*, 5 June 1907.

²⁸ Pickett wrote to Kershner complaining about the limitations placed on Kershner by the FCMS: "Your statement that you hear from an unexpected source that you are not to be permitted to make a success of your work is about the most depressing sentiment that has reached us lately. Where are we at anyway? Are we missionaries on an equality or not? Who appointed our Archbishop anyway and gave him authority to say unto this man go and he goeth and to that one come and he cometh?" Pickett to Kershner 28 March 1910 (Kershner Papers, DCA).

²⁹ Kershner, *Philippine Christian*, 21 March 1907.

The Apocalyptic Origins of a Church of Christ Missionary: O. D. Bixler's Early Years in the United States (1896-1918)¹

Yukikazu Obata*

Orville Dean Bixler (1896-1968) was an early and significant missionary to Japan from Churches of Christ. J. Harding McCaleb, son of a prominent missionary to Japan and one of the supporters of Bixler, described Bixler's mission in these words:

[During] the twenty-five years before the War [he] established faith, and trust, and love in the hearts of the Japanese people. . . . [His years after the War] brought new life and hope to a discouraged race. Many have been touched, and many have responded—the lame, the halt, the blind; as well as the higher strata of society. The poor leper has yielded to the healing of baptism, and the Emperor has given a gracious and attentive ear.²

In spite of such tremendous achievements, there has been no serious effort to collect biographical materials of O. D. Bixler. Even less is known of his early days in the United States, prior to his departure for Japan. This paper, therefore, is an attempt to investigate the early life of O. D. Bixler, from his birth in 1896 to the departure for Japan in 1918. The aim of this paper is not only to display the factual biographical information, but also to examine the religious context of Churches of Christ in his day which might help us understand why and how he became a missionary. In the end I will argue that the apocalyptic perspective of Churches of Christ in the period was the driving force for Bixler to become a missionary.

Childhood

Orville D. Bixler was born on May 12, 1896, in the small town of Albion, Nebraska, as the fourth son of William and Marcia Bixler. He had three older brothers, Harold (1884-1950), Jesse (1886-1957), and Roy (1890-1957), who later became a preacher among Churches of Christ and had a significant role in Orville's life.³ Both of Orville's parents are said to have come "from families who had long been members of the New Testament church."⁴

Orville's father William Grant Bixler, whose lineage can be traced back to a sixteenth century Anabaptist family in Bern, Switzerland,⁵ was born in 1864 in Pekin, Indiana. After the birth of four children, he attended the medical school at the University of Louisville in 1900 and the Hospital College of Medicine (also located in Louisville, Kentucky) in 1901 and 1902. Then he moved back to Nebraska where his family was and attended the Lincoln Medical College⁶ in Lincoln, Nebraska, where he graduated in 1903. Upon graduation he received a medical license from the (Nebraska) State Board of Health and started his practice as an "eclectic" physician in a small town called Panama (Lancaster county), where there was only one doctor for 171 people

*Yukikazu Obata ministers to the Churches of Christ in Tokyo, Japan.

before 1903.⁷ Throughout his life, he was a physician in several small towns in Nebraska, including Hickman (Lancaster county), Ruskin (Nuckolls county), and back in Panama. He died at the age of sixty-one in Panama, when Orville was in Japan on February 14, 1926. Orville's mother, Marcia Elvira Phillips was the daughter of William Phillips and Mary Martin of Martinsburg, Indiana. Mary Martin's father, Marcia's grandfather (Orville's great-grandfather), was J. Lemuel Martin (1810-1871), the author of *The Voice of the Seven Thunders; or, Lectures on the Apocalypse*,⁸ who is described as "one of the most noted preachers in southern Indiana in his day"⁹ among the Stone-Campbell movement.

Orville attended a public school in Ruskin, Nebraska, from the spring of 1910 to the fall of 1911. Soon after he started attending high school, at the age of fourteen, he was baptized by H. L. Olmstead (1883-1958) in Ruskin on April 10, 1910.¹⁰ Following this occasion, Orville continued to have a close association with Olmstead particularly as he moved to Odessa, Missouri, and Louisville, Kentucky. As Orville was proceeding in his adolescence to greater maturity, a tragedy hit the entire Bixler family. Orville's mother Marcia, who had long suffered intense pain from diabetes, died on July 19, 1911.¹¹ The irretrievable loss of his mother must have brought emotional suffering to the heart of the young Orville, who was only fifteen and the youngest in his family.

Orville was then sent to live with his brother Roy who had just started preaching in Burlingame, Kansas, and was married to Bessie Mae Conner on September 10, 1911. It was Roy's encouragement which made Orville decide to go to a Christian school in Odessa, Missouri, from which both Roy and Bessie had graduated. Orville, at the age of ten or eleven, "had a dream of being better fitted to do the Lord's work."¹² Attending a Christian school was a step forward for this goal.

Attending Christian Schools

Bixler attended Western Bible and Literary College (WBLC)¹³ from 1912 to 1914. This small school, established in 1905, was operated by persons associated with the Nashville Bible School and its founders, David Lipscomb and James A. Harding, who believed in anti-modern, modest, and unworldly small Christian schools. The founders of WBLC, J. N. Armstrong (son-in-law of Harding), R. C. Bell, and R. N. Gardner were all graduates of the Nashville Bible School and had previously taught at Potter Bible College. The influence of the Lipscomb-Harding vision of Christian education is clearly seen in the school's "Policy":

We are not seeking to have a popular school; that is, one that conforms to prevailing customs or seeks to incorporate popular ideas and practices for the sake of patronage. . . . In this age of worldliness there is great necessity for studying what is good for man, and of having courage to teach it. . . . Too much stress is put on education as a means to a livelihood, or to fit one for society, when in reality those things should scarcely be considered. . . . True education assists in helping men to live above worldly things, and gives them a taste and a love for spiritual things. *Whether such a school is popular or not, we believe it pleases God.*¹⁴

The teachers taught the Bible as the chief textbook of the school, and they maintained strict discipline, such as: "The young men and women over sixteen are permitted to spend some time together socially, but *only* in a general assembly; Students are not permitted to engage in the modern brutal game, football, nor in any intercollegiate game."¹⁵ The intention of the rules was to make the school become like one large family with distinctive Christian disciplines.

After attending WBLC for three years, Orville moved to Oklahoma in 1915 to attend Cordell Christian College (CCC)¹⁶ for a half year. This school, founded in 1907, was similar to WBLC in its commitment to a smaller and distinctive Christian school, as well as in its curriculum, which emphasized the Bible. At Cordell, Bixler met J. N. Armstrong (1870-1944) who had been the president of the school since 1908. Armstrong was the first president of WBLC, but due to health problems he left WBLC before Bixler entered the school. The coming of WWI "found Armstrong and most of his faculty [at CCC] holding firmly to David Lipscomb's views on civil government and refusing to participate or encourage military service."¹⁷ He asked his fellow Christians: "How long must Christians follow the Prince of Peace? When may they depart from *his method* and use weapons? Under what conditions, in what emergency, may Christians adopt other means and methods than the Christ's in the settlement of trouble?" In reply, he said:

I used to hold very conscientiously that it was not only the right but the duty of every citizen to exercise suffrage. . . . I thought, if Christian men did not so perform this duty, that we might expect the wicked to rule and the government to be ruined with corruption. Now I am assured by a better knowledge of the Bible that the above position is wrong for the Christian, and that he is a foreigner to every civil government in the world; that he violates some most sacred principles of the Christ whenever he exercises political rights in any earthly government.¹⁸

Although it is not certain how much Armstrong expressed his view toward the war at the time Bixler was in the school, his Christian pacifism was a clear manifestation of the lesson he learned at the Nashville Bible School. This Lipscomb-Harding line of thought was also present in Louisville, Kentucky, the next place Bixler moved.

Life in Louisville and Emporia

Upon graduation from Cordell Christian College on May 20, 1915, Bixler applied for admission to the University of Louisville, where his father had previously attended. This time, another brother Jesse, a barber, was living in Louisville. Orville attended the university for one year during 1915-16. The real significance of Orville's stay in Louisville was from the two churches he associated with, the Highland church where E. L. Jorgenson was preaching and the Portland Avenue church where R. H. Boll had been preaching since 1904 and where Bixler attended Bible classes taught by Boll.

The period Bixler stayed in Louisville is significant in at least two

ways. First, the two congregations in Louisville (Highland and Portland) were the center for mission work among Churches of Christ at that time. Many missionaries visited Louisville. Jorgenson took care of the wife and children of J. M. McCaleb, one of the earliest missionaries to Japan from Churches of Christ and a leading figure for succeeding missionaries coming to Japan.¹⁹ In 1916 Sarah Andrews, a single female missionary to Japan, stopped by Louisville on her way to Japan and possibly met with Bixler.²⁰ The chief promoter of foreign missions in Louisville was Don Carlos Janes (1877-1944), who had already met Bixler at WBLC. When Janes was a student at Potter Bible College in 1902, William J. Bishop, former missionary to Japan, spoke at chapel about the work in Japan. Janes “listened intensely and resolved then and there to spend the rest of his life in mission work.”²¹ In 1916, he began writing missionary news articles in *Word and Work*. Most importantly, as early as 1914 he started to keep books on funds received for missionaries²² as Treasurer of Missionary Funds for the Highland church. This was a new way of supporting and promoting mission work among Churches of Christ that had become a “distinct people,” rejecting the missionary society movement of the Disciples. In 1906, Churches of Christ had only 12 missionaries for 159,658 members. Ten years later the total number of members had almost doubled to 317,937, but there were only 16 missionaries.²³ In this context “it became imperative for churches of Christ to develop their own methods for supporting missionaries.”²⁴ The efforts of Janes and other Louisville Christians, therefore, were a significant step toward the growth of interest in mission work among Churches of Christ. According to Jane Henry, Don Carlos Janes and E. L. Jorgenson encouraged Orville first to go to Japan for a few years of language study and then return to continue his medical study toward becoming a medical missionary.²⁵

Second, Bixler’s Louisville year took place in the period when the early stages of the Premillennial controversy were emerging. In 1916 Robert H. Boll (1875-1956), who had resigned from the *Gospel Advocate* the previous year, started editing *Word and Work* from Louisville and began a series of articles on (dispensational) premillennialism in that journal. He had come to the United States from Germany when he was fifteen and later attended Nashville Bible School for five years, studying under prominent leaders among Churches of Christ like David Lipscomb, James A. Harding, and E. G. Sewell.²⁶ Boll was a well-respected person among Churches of Christ, as he, in 1909, became “front-page editor” of the *Gospel Advocate*, the most influential journal among Churches of Christ at that time. As he began to write articles on biblical prophecy with a dispensational premillennial interpretation, however, he was dismissed from the editorship in late 1915 because of the teaching.

Bixler had deep respect for Boll, whose warm and charismatic character with “an aura of graciousness . . . which was unmistakably eminent”²⁷ was recognized even by those who accused him of being a “premillennial visionary.” According to Harry R. Fox, Jr., Bixler and H. R. Fox, Sr., who was in Louisville at the same time and also went to

Japan as a missionary in December, 1919, did not agree with Boll's premillennial doctrine despite their respect for him.²⁸ It is true that in the post WWII era many in Churches of Christ regarded Bixler as a "premillennialist."²⁹ Nonetheless, what he stood for may well be called a "moderate" position. Bixler did not believe in Boll's specific theory of a literal thousand-year reign of Christ, but he would not have denied a "remote possibility" for such a view. In most situations, he simply refused to clarify his view—much more important for him was missions in Japan. In short, he was neither an *explicit* premillennialist (he did not teach premillennialism in Japan) nor an *anti*-premillennialist, believing that the premillennial doctrine should not divide the church and should not be a test of fellowship, a stance much like that of David Lipscomb³⁰ or J. N. Armstrong.³¹ After the long controversies over this issue, for many in Churches of Christ in America, refusing to oppose premillennialism was identical with being a premillennialist. Bixler lived in the context of such turmoil.

The mobility which characterizes Bixler's early life, next brought him to Emporia, Kansas. There he attended the Kansas State Normal School for a year and a half from June 1916. He then returned to Louisville and re-attended Boll's Bible classes at the Portland church. Then, in May 1918, Bixler went back to the normal school in Emporia and took a few classes to finish his teacher certificate program there.³²

Marriage and the Departure for Japan

Exactly how Orville met Anna Adcock Davis (1894-1946) is not known, but most likely they met in Louisville, either at Portland church or Highland church. Her parents (the Adcocks) died early in Powderly, Kentucky, and her uncle (Mr. Davis) who lived in Louisville adopted Anna. One day while she was employed as a stenographer at the L & N Railroad company in Louisville, she and her friend Sara Jane Flaughter³³ went to a church to hear the gospel message. The preacher there was R. H. Boll, and his speech was titled "Why Not be Just a Christian."³⁴ It was to this eminent preacher's invitation that Anna responded and was baptized.³⁵ Since the Davis family was Presbyterian, Anna left their home and lived in E. L. Jorgenson's home. On April 20, 1918, the young couple was married by Orville's uncle Elmer G. Philips in Pekin, Indiana.

In Louisville, Don Carlos Janes and others were continuing to promote foreign missions. C. G. Vincent and his wife had come back to the United States from Japan in 1916 because of Mrs. Vincent's health problem. Only four missionaries from Churches of Christ, mostly singles, were left in Japan.³⁶ Thus, Janes was asking repeatedly: "Who that is suitable will take up Bro. Vincent's work in Japan? Who will go to cooperate with Bro. McCaleb?"³⁷ E. L. Jorgenson also wrote an article just two months before the Bixlers' departure calling people to mission work as well as teaching the "essentials in a missionary Christian's life."³⁸

Orville and Anna responded to these calls and decided to go to Japan.

Their arrival was significant, for in Japan they were the only missionary couple among Churches of Christ at that time. It seems that the Bixlers' decision, with strong support from people like Don Carlos Janes, triggered a new era of mission work in Japan among Churches of Christ. A host of young people, including four couples, followed them within the next ten years and most of them, along with the Bixlers, became some of the most influential missionaries in Japan both before and after WWII.³⁹

Becoming a Missionary by the Apocalyptic Vision

Orville grew up in Churches of Christ which had already become a "distinct people" from the rest of the Disciples.⁴⁰ In this sense Bixler is distinct from earlier missionaries of Churches of Christ like J. M. McCaleb, whose early life was more in the context of the larger Disciples (e.g., at the College of the Bible). This is obvious first in Bixler's attendance at the two distinctively Churches of Christ schools, WBLC and CCC, operated by graduates of the Nashville Bible School. In this last section we will examine whether there was any causal connection between Bixler's decision to become a missionary and such a distinctive Church of Christ context in which he lived.

Bixler accepted calls from some Christians in Louisville to be a missionary. So, we could say that Bixler gained at least an immediate formal motivation to be a missionary from the Louisville Christians who were enthusiastic about foreign missions and who were premillennialists. Then, we might well ask if there was an intrinsic relationship between the Louisville Christians' premillennialism and their zeal for foreign missions. A contemporary parallel is found among the early fundamentalist movement which held to (dispensational) premillennialism and was having "the years of greatest enthusiasm for foreign missions."⁴¹ The chief motive of these premillennialists' missionary zeal, according to Timothy Weber, came from the connection of 1) a concern for the lost, for "all who died without faith in Christ were eternally lost"; and 2) the "belief in Christ's imminent return."⁴² Premillennialists, unlike optimistic postmillennialists, did not dream of the total "Christianization" of the world; rather, they focused on *their* urgent responsibility for evangelism, because the second coming is imminent. Missions meant for them simply "the dispensing of the gospel to non-Christian people."⁴³ In other words, missions was crucial as *Christian's obligation*, and the result, conversion of the whole world by human efforts, was not their primary concern.

The leading mission promoter among Churches of Christ, Don Carlos Janes, who shared Boll's premillennialism, also had similar motives toward missions. He expressed his conviction that the heathen are totally lost when he said: "They [heathen] live in the bondage of sin, spend their lives in fear, endure needless sickness, suffer many inconveniences from their ignorance, die without hope, and go in vast numbers to populate the Regions of the Damned."⁴⁴ At the same time, Janes believed that mission work, according to the New Testament,

was the work of God and a “scripturally-bound obligation”⁴⁵ for all Christians. Thus, Janes’ motivation for missions was presumably connected to his premillennial eschatology, with a conviction that Christians live in the present age of evil and they must be engaged in God’s mission while in this world until the day of judgment, which is imminent. In a book which collected some premillennial and related beliefs, E. L. Jorgenson praised Hudson Taylor, one of the most famous missionaries among conservative Protestants and founder of the China Inland Mission in 1865.⁴⁶ It is possible to explain that Jorgenson could identify his missionary zeal with such a non-Church of Christ missionary as Taylor because between them there was a common motive principle for missions, namely, premillennialism. Therefore, one could presume that premillennialism which was behind the fundamentalist’s missionary movement was also behind the missionary zeal of the Louisville Christians as well. Bixler, however, did not accept their specific version of premillennialism. If the assumption that premillennialism was the driving force for missions for the Louisville Christians is plausible, we must then ask why Bixler could share their missionary zeal while not accepting its driving force, premillennialism.

In order to find an answer, the premillennial outlook of the Louisville Christians needs to be examined carefully. As Richard Hughes points out, the premillennialism of its principle advocate R. H. Boll included the dispensationalism of the early fundamentalist movement.⁴⁷ His view was closer to *dispensational* premillennialism than historic (or classical) premillennialism. Hughes, however, argues carefully that the primary *source* of Boll’s millennial view was *not* the early fundamentalist’s dispensational premillennialism, but the “apocalyptic worldview” he learned through his teachers, David Lipscomb and James A. Harding, at the Nashville Bible School. Hughes explains this apocalyptic worldview as:

a radical sense of estrangement and separation from the world and its values and a keen allegiance to a transcendent vision, . . . ‘the Kingdom of God’ . . . [which] had manifested itself in the earliest days of primitive Christianity, perpetually stood in judgment on the kingdoms of this earth, and would finally triumph over all things.⁴⁸

It is important to note that this apocalyptic view does not necessarily reside with premillennialism, especially if one understands premillennialism to be a belief in a *literal thousand-year* reign of Christ on the earth. In Boll’s case, he *expanded* this apocalyptic worldview to dispensational premillennialism. However,

there were some who embraced the apocalyptic worldview but stoutly resisted premillennial thinking.⁴⁹

Hughes also points out that the apocalyptic perspective in Churches of Christ can be traced back to the early restoration father Barton W. Stone,⁵⁰ whose view came to be widespread among Churches of Christ

at the time of their two principal leaders, Lipscomb and Harding. Consequently, their students at the Nashville Bible School, including Boll and teachers at WBLC and CCC, were strongly influenced by this apocalyptic perspective.

A chief characteristic of the Lipscomb-Harding vision of Christian education was the separation from the evil of the world and the allegiance to God's order alone, however unpopular it might be. Such a characteristic, a significant element of the apocalyptic worldview, was present in a high call for counter-cultural and distinctively Christian morality at both WBLC and CCC. Another characteristic of the apocalyptic vision was the transcendent view of the kingdom of God. It was evident in J. N. Armstrong's pacifism, which he inherited from David Lipscomb. The Louisville premillennialists' attitude of tolerance toward people of differing beliefs may also be a manifestation of this characteristic. Although they were committed to the restoration of the New Testament church as strongly as others in Churches of Christ,⁵¹ they did not possess exclusivistic attitudes toward other Christians whose convictions were different in minor details. Don Carlos Janes, for example, looked at other denominations for self-criticism: "We bear unfavorable comparison with denominations who have about the same membership we have, but who are sounder on the matter of giving to missions than we are."⁵² Thus, it is not surprising that Janes and Jorgenson were involved in one of the first "unity" meetings between Churches of Christ and independent Christian Churches held in Detroit on May 3 and 4, 1938.⁵³ Soon after the meeting, Janes "furnished" some information regarding missionaries among "non-instrumental" brethren, including O. D. Bixler, for the Christian Church's leading journal, the *Christian Standard*.⁵⁴ It is also necessary to see even the chief advocate of premillennialism Boll and his teachings in this light. A main point of Boll's teaching, at least in the eyes of his opponents, was the conviction that the church is not identical to the kingdom of God (or the church of the New Testament) in its fullest sense. This view became controversial and even intolerable for some among Churches of Christ. As Hughes explains,

between roughly 1880 and 1906, Churches of Christ passed through a bitter division with Disciples of Christ . . . In effect, Churches of Christ were left to begin all over again. Angered and defensive, Churches of Christ increasingly embraced the conviction that they, and they alone, were the true church, descended from days of the apostles.⁵⁵

The apocalyptic worldview was normative for the Churches of Christ in which Bixler spent his early days. Consequently, it would be possible to explain that Bixler acquired the missionary zeal of the Louisville premillennialists precisely because its root, perceptual framework was the apocalyptic worldview he had acquired already throughout his educational process. For Bixler, the specific theory of (dispensational) premillennialism was merely an option he did not have to accept in order to share their missionary zeal. If asked what vision or perspective

was behind Bixler's motivation to be a missionary, the apocalyptic worldview of the Lipscomb-Harding tradition would probably stand out.

The time span of Bixler's early life was during the period of "a search for (new) direction" for Churches of Christ (1906-1930).⁵⁶ In fact, it was in a crucial *transitional* era. The Stone-Lipscomb-Harding apocalyptic/anti-modern worldview may have still been alive, but the foreshadowing of a departure from such a perspective toward what Hughes calls the "triumph of modernism" was approaching quickly. David Lipscomb's death in 1917 was a symbol for such a transition, for he stands "as a pinnacle in the history of Churches of Christ, looking . . . forward to a monolithic Church of Christ that would expel Stone's apocalyptic anti-modernism from its agenda."⁵⁷ Leaving for Japan in 1918, Bixler's early life took place barely in time to gain the apocalyptic perspective in Churches of Christ.⁵⁸

Notes

¹The original version of this paper was prepared for the course "History of the Restoration Movement in America (B)" taught by Dr. Earl I. West at Harding University Graduate School of Religion in Memphis, Tennessee. I express profound gratitude to Jane M. Henry and O. Dean Bixler, daughter and son of O. D. Bixler, for allowing me to interview them numerous times as well as for providing me with many precious materials. Acknowledgment is also due to Douglas Foster, H. R. Fox, Jr., Robert G. Neil, Motoyuki Nomura, Earl I. West, Mary K. Becker of the Kornhauser Health Sciences Library at the University of Louisville, the office of the registrar at Emporia State University, the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, and Harding University Graduate School of Religion Library.

²Harding McCaleb, "Christian Work in Japan: Back to Japan," (Brookfield, Ill.: Brookfield Church of Christ, n.d.).

³Roy Bixler's biographical sketch is included in Loyd L. Smith, *Gospel Preachers of Yesteryears* (Allen, Tex.: L. L. Smith, 1986), 34-37.

⁴*Ibid.*, 34.

⁵The family name then was "Bichsel." For the information on the Bichsel family in the sixteenth century Bern, see Delbert L. Gratz, "Bixel [Bixler, Bichsel]," in *The Mennonite Encyclopedia*, ed. Harold S. Bender and C. Henry Smith (Scottsdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1955), 1: 350; Christian Neff, "Bichsel, Ulrich," in *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, 1:338. For the origin of the Bernese Anabaptists, see Delbert L. Gratz, "The Bernese Anabaptists in the Sixteenth Century," chap. in *Bernese Anabaptists and Their American Descendants* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald, 1981), 1-14. Christian Bichsel (1685-1769), along with his family and his brother John Bichsel (1688-1765), was probably the first of the family to migrate to America around 1725. They settled in the York, Pennsylvania area. In the new country, the family changed its name to an English form, "Bixler." Then Christian Bichsel's grandson, Jacob Bixler, great-great grandfather of Orville, moved to Ohio in 1804.

⁶This "eclectic" medical school had opened in 1890 as the Medical Department of Cotner University (former Nebraska Christian University), a Disciples institution established in 1888 by the Nebraska Christian Missionary Society. See Leon A. Moomaw, *History of Cotner University* (Bethany, Nebr., 1916), 72-74; D. Duane Cummins, *The Disciple Colleges: A History* (St. Louis, Mo.: CBP, 1987), 82.

⁷*The Standard Medical Directory of North America, 1903-4* (Chicago: G. P. Engelhard & Co., 1903), 353, 359.

⁸(Bedford, Ind.: James M. Mathes, 1870).

⁹Commodore Wesley Cauble, *Disciples of Christ in Indiana: Achievements of a Century* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Meigs Publishing, 1930), 202. Little biographical information is available in "Biographical Sketch" in J. L. Martin, *The Voice* 10th ed. (Cincinnati: Central Book Concern, 1879), ix-xl.

¹⁰Earl Irvin West, *The Search for the Ancient Order* (Germantown, Tenn.: Religious Book Service, 1987), 4:284.

¹¹William Bixler was remarried to Agnes Forrest in 1913.

¹²Robert Heid, "Brother O. D. Bixler is Called Home," (October 1968); in *O. D. Bixler sensei wo shinobu* [A book of tribute to the late O. D. Bixler] (Tokyo: Ochanomizu Church of Christ, 1985), 172.

¹³For historical overviews of the school, see M. Norvel Young, *A History of Colleges Established and Controlled by Members of the Churches of Christ* (Kansas City, Mo.: Old Path Book Club, 1949), 116-122; Earl Irvin West, *The Search for the Ancient Order* (Indianapolis: Religious Book Service, 1979), 3:276-78.

¹⁴*Western Bible and Literary College, Announcement 1915-1916* (my emphasis).

¹⁵*Ibid.* (my emphasis).

¹⁶See Young, *History of Colleges*, 122-29; West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 3:279-81.

¹⁷West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 3:281. On Lipscomb's view, see his *Civil Government: Its Origin, Mission, and Destiny, and the Christian's Relation to It* (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing, 1889). Cf. C. Leonard Allen, *Distant Voices: Discovering a Forgotten Past for a Changing Church* (Abilene, Tex.: Abilene Christian University, 1993), 84-91.

¹⁸L. C. Sears, *For Freedom: The Biography of John Nelson Armstrong* (Austin, Tex: Sweet, 1969), 153-54 (my emphasis).

¹⁹West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 3:232.

²⁰"On Foreign Fields," *Word and Work* 10 (January 1916): 34. Sarah Andrews became the only missionary among Churches of Christ who stayed in Japan during WWII. She continues to receive special attention from recent historians. See, for example, Robert E. Hooper, *A Distinct People: A History of the Churches of Christ in the 20th Century* (West Monroe, La.: Howard, 1993), 81-83; and Richard T. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith: The Story of Churches of Christ in America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 379.

²¹West, *Search for the Ancient Order*, 3:325.

²²P. W. Elkins, *Church Sponsored Missions: An Evaluation* (Austin, Tex.: Firm Foundation, 1976), 10.

²³Elkins, *Church Sponsored Missions*, 6.

²⁴Hooper, *Distinct People*, 67.

²⁵Jane M. Henry, daughter of O. D. Bixler, interview by author, 12 March 1995, Dallas, tape recording. When he and his colleagues started the Tokyo Bible Institute in 1950 (Bixler was the president), Bixler's teaching role included "preventive medicine" besides Bible and English. *Bulletin of Tokyo Bible Institute* (Tokyo, 1950).

²⁶In 1910 he received a honorary degree from the Nashville Bible School.

²⁷Robert C. Welch, "R. H. Boll: Premillennial Visionary," in *They Being Dead Yet Speak: Florida College Annual Lectures, 1981*, ed. Melvin D. Curry (Temple Terrence, Fla.: Florida College Bookstore, 1981), 55.

²⁸On the other hand, two missionaries to Japan, Herman Fox, twin brother of H. R., Sr., and E. A. Rhodes, held the premillennial doctrine explicitly. H. R. Fox, Jr., interview by author, 12 March 1995.

²⁹See "Bixler's Statement Concerning the Work in Japan," *Gospel Advocate* 89 (August 21, 1947): 628, 637; E. W. McMillan, "Status of Work in Japan," *Firm Foundation* 65 (June 1, 1948): 4; and "The Union Avenue Congregation and Premillennialists," *Gospel Advocate* 91 (September 29, 1949): 610.

³⁰*Gospel Advocate* 40 (June 23, 1898): 397.

³¹Both Armstrong and Bixler were convinced that their ideas of the millennium were closest to that of T. W. Brents as expressed in his sermons printed by the Gospel Advocate Company. Sears, *For Freedom*, 216; "Bixler's Statement," 628. During the premillennial controversy, Armstrong wrote: "I have never believed that Boll needed to be ruthlessly handled and then crucified as I consider has been done." Sears, *For Freedom*, 277. See also *Gospel Advocate* (1935): 60-61.

³²Bixler received the three-year State (teacher's) Certificate on July 26, 1918.

³³This Presbyterian lady was a long time friend of Anna. Later Anna and Orville named their second daughter Jane after Sara Jane Flaughter (Dean Bixler, son of O. D. Bixler, interview by author, 2 April 1995).

³⁴Boll published an article under the same title, in which he emphasized the need to come to Christ and the Bible without distorted human teachings. Then he, from the Book of Acts, taught of the right and simple pattern to be Christians, namely, baptism, and said

"whatever else may or may not be 'baptism,' immersion certainly is baptism" (R. H. Boll, "Why Not be Just a Christian?" *Word and Work* 10 [March 1916]: 114). Boll also published this message as a pamphlet (n.d.).

³⁵J. H. Childress notes that it was Orville who converted Anna. "Introducing Our Missionaries," *Gospel Herald* 1 (November 22, 1928): 4.

³⁶Those four were: J. M. McCaleb, Alice Miller, Sara Andrews, and Lillie Cypert. McCaleb was separated from his wife who, along with three children, had returned to the United States in 1907.

³⁷Janes, "On Foreign Fields," *Word and Work* 12 (February 1918): 69.

³⁸Jorgenson, "What Makes a Missionary Christian," *Word and Work* 12 (October 1918): 338-40.

³⁹E. A. Rhodes and his wife arrived in Japan in May, 1919; Harry R. Fox, Sr. and his wife arrived in December, 1919; Herman Fox and his wife arrived in 1920; Clara Kennedy arrived in 1924; B. D. Morehead and his wife, along with Edith Langford arrived in 1925; and Hettie Ewing arrived in 1926. McCaleb, *Once Traveled Roads* (Nashville: Gospel Advocate, 1934), 366-68. It must also be noted that the decade of 1916-1926 showed a significant increase in the ratio of missionaries to the members of Churches of Christ: the number of missionaries was more than doubled from 16 to 33 while membership increased from 317,937 to 433,714. Elkins, *Church Sponsored Missions*, 6, 95-96.

⁴⁰David Lipscomb wrote: "there is a distinct people taking the word of God as their only sufficient rule of faith, calling their churches 'churches of Christ' or 'churches of God,' distinct and separate in name, work, or rule of faith, from all other bodies or peoples" ("The Church of Christ and the Disciples of Christ," *Gospel Advocate* 49 [1907]: 457).

⁴¹George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1980), 97.

⁴²Timothy P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 67.

⁴³*Ibid.*, 70.

⁴⁴Janes, *Missionary Sentiments* (Louisville: Janes Printing, 1942), 11.

⁴⁵Janes, *The Missionary Obligation* (n.d.). The similar thought is throughout his writings (especially pamphlets). For example, see also his *Missionary Giving* (n.d.).

⁴⁶E. L. Jorgenson, ed. *Faith of Our Fathers* (Louisville, Ky.: Word and Work, 1953).

⁴⁷Richard T. Hughes, "The Apocalyptic Origins of Churches of Christ and the Triumph of Modernism," *Religion and American Culture* 2 (Summer 1992): 199-200.

⁴⁸Hughes, "Apocalyptic Origins," 182.

⁴⁹Hughes, "Apocalyptic Origins," 182.

⁵⁰Hughes, "Apocalyptic Origins." Cf. Hughes, *Reviving the Ancient Faith*; C. Leonard Allen, "'The Stone That the Builders Rejected': Barton W. Stone in the Memory of Churches of Christ," in *Cane Ridge in Context: Perspectives on Barton W. Stone and the Revival*, ed. Anthony L. Dunnavant (Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1992), 43-61; C. Leonard Allen, "Primitivism in the Stone-Campbell Movement: Historic Strength and Weaknesses," Paper presented at the conference on "Christian Primitivism and Modernization: Coming to Terms with Our Age," Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, 6-9 June 1991.

⁵¹See Boll's pamphlet *The Church I Found and How I Found It* (Louisville: Word and Work, n.d.). Janes believed that to do mission work was to restore the apostolic church. See his *The Missionary Obligation*.

⁵²Janes, *Missionary Giving*.

⁵³Hooper, *Distinct People*, 160-63.

⁵⁴"Some Other Missionaries," *Christian Standard* 73 (October 15, 1938): 1021-1022. The name of O. D. Bixler reappears on the pages of *Christian Standard* in 1952 (Janice Turner, "Open Door in Japan," *Christian Standard* 88 [March 22, 1952]: 187-88).

⁵⁵Hughes, "Apocalyptic Origins," 200.

⁵⁶Hooper, *Distinct People*, 65-85.

⁵⁷Hughes, "Apocalyptic Origins," 194.

⁵⁸Of course, this is not to say that this earlier period of Bixler's life determined the entire direction of his life. There are many other factors that determined his later life, particularly his mission work after WWII. For example, Bixler later came back to the United States several times and acquired further education: he attended David Lipscomb College in 1935, received a B.S. degree from George Peabody College in Nashville in 1936, and then received a M.A. degree from Pepperdine College in 1948.

Congregations

can receive

Discipliana!

Those Disciples congregations who contribute to Basic Mission Finance will receive the Historical Society's newsletter, "We're History."

YOU MAY STILL RECEIVE *DISCIPLIANA*

The Staff and Board of Trustees wish to encourage the reading of *Discipliana*. We invite readers, congregations and organizations who are not members to join the 1500 other persons who support the work of the Society and receive both *Discipliana* and "We're History." You may become a member by returning the form below with your check to the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1101 19th Ave. S., Nashville, TN 37212-2196 U.S.A.

YOUR INVITATION TO MEMBERSHIP

Regular	\$20
Student	10
Non-US	25
Participating	30
Sustaining	50-249
Life (Endowment)	250
Life Link (Endowment)	500
Life Patron (Endowment)	1,000
Institutional	ask
Organizational	ask



Name _____

Address _____

City, State Zip _____

Phone _____ E-mail _____

Fax _____ Home page _____

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

DID RELIGION FOLLOW THE FRONTIER?

W. Clark Gilpin

**THE INFLUENCE OF BETHANY COLLEGE ON THE
HIGHER CRITICISM DEBATE, 1841-1891**

C. Kent Clinger

**ALBAN P. HOOKE, AN UNUSUAL CONTRIBUTOR
TO THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER**

Hans Rollmann



Volume 58 • Number 2 • Summer, 1998

Published by	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY Peter M. Morgan, President (morganpm@aol.com)	
Founding Editor	Claude E. Spencer	
Editorial Committee	D. Newell Williams, Editor (nwilliam@cts.edu) Edward W. Dodds, Managing Editor (dishistsoc@aol.com) Anthony L. Dunnivant Douglas A. Foster Henry E. Webb	
Editorial Consultants	Carisse Berryhill James O. Duke David A. Jones Daisy L. Machado Eva Jean Wrather	Paul M. Blowers Richard T. Hughes Erma Jean Loveland Mark G. Toulouse
Board of Trustees Officers	Chairperson Vice-Chairperson Secretary Treasurer	William O. Paulsell Lester G. McAllister David A. Caldwell Charlotte H. Gadberry

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: dishistsoc@aol.com.
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: <http://users.aol.com/dishistsoc>
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM, published by the American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston, IL 60201-5613. atla@atla.com <http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP+4).

—From the Editor's Desk

The articles in this issue address in different ways the relationship of Christianity and culture. W. Clark Gilpin's, "Did Religion Follow the Frontier?" discusses Winfred E. Garrison's understanding of the relationship of the "frontier" to the development of the Disciples of Christ. Gilpin examines the interpretive resources that Garrison derived from nineteenth century Disciples' writers (comparing Robert Richardson's depiction of "nature's aristocrats" with John Augustus Williams' account of "Raccoon" John Smith) and also the perspectives of professional historians of Garrison's era, Frederick Jackson Turner, Peter Mode and William Warren Sweet. For the reader who follows this article to the end (by no means a wearying task!), there is a surprise that underscores similarities between challenges confronting Christians on the nineteenth century frontier and in our own time.

Kent Clinger's, "The Influence of Bethany College on the Higher Criticism Debate, 1841-1891" examines the different responses of Disciples to the higher criticism of the Bible as reflected in the history of Bethany College and its graduates. The significance of this study to the relationship of Christianity and culture derives from the fact that Disciples liberal, Alexander Procter and Disciples conservative, J.W. McGarvey were Bethany classmates. As Clinger shows, "Truly, the teachers of Bethany College could be heard in many different ways."

Finally, Hans Rollmann's, "Alban P. Hooke, an Unusual Contributor to the *Millennial Harbinger*" explores the significance of the appearance in the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1857 of a sample of speculative anthropology and translations of two German works: a character profile of liberal theologian Daniel Friedrich Ernst Schleiermacher, by his colleague Friedrich Lücke, and a portion of the introduction to a commentary on the Gospel of John by the evangelical theologian August Tholuck. As Rollmann states, the appearance of these contributions in Campbell's journal which, on the whole, stayed within the sphere of Anglo-Saxon Enlightenment supernaturalism rather than its Romantic reaction, is surprising. Analyzing the three articles, Rollmann locates their compatibility to the readership of the *Millennial Harbinger* in "the moral substratum of upper-class Victorian Disciples." He also does some sleuthing into the beliefs and values of Alban P. Hooke, the contributor of the three articles, which discloses why Hooke is not better known among Disciples.

D. Newell Williams

—From the President's Desk

You are invited to a history-making moment at a history-making place. The 1998 Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Lectures will be an educational gala at Bethany College, (Bethany, West Virginia) Commencement Hall on October 1. The topic is "Alexander Campbell's Living Legacy in Education."

Alexander Campbell sent out from Bethany College educators who took with them his vision of an informed faith and life-long learning. Literally hundreds of colleges, universities and centers of theological education can name Alexander Campbell and Bethany College as either the inspiration or a primary influence in their founding and/or formation. The colleges and universities of the Stone-Campbell Movement are being called back to Bethany to be informed and inspired by Campbell's vision and by his college, Bethany.

Heads of schools or their designates will represent their schools in a formal processional in full academic regalia at the opening lecture at 11:00 a.m. Two lectures will be offered. D. Duane Cummins, President of Bethany College, will speak on Alexander Campbell's philosophical principle, "Education of the Total Person." After lunch Gerald C. Tiffin, recently Dean of Pacific Christian College and now Provost of Northwest Christian College, will address "Philosophy of Education: 21st Century Concerns and 19th Century Roots."

Bethany College is generously providing lunch. Reservations are required. Please contact Sherry Tallman (304-829-7111), Office of the President, Bethany College, Bethany, WV 26032.

These lectures are made possible by the generous support of Forrest H. Kirkpatrick. I write this column immediately after returning to Nashville from Dr. Kirkpatrick's funeral at Bethany. He was very interested in this fall's lectures. Your attendance will be a tribute to Dr. Kirkpatrick and will contribute to expressing the church's gratitude to the college he loved.

Peter M. Morgan

Did Religion Follow the Frontier?

by W. Clark Gilpin*

“Did religion follow the frontier?”¹ The question builds, of course, on the work of Winfred E. Garrison (1874-1969), the single most influential historian of the Disciples of Christ, and specifically his 1931 history of the Disciples entitled *Religion Follows the Frontier*. But Garrison’s answer to our question was by no means as unequivocal as the title of his book suggests. In *Religion Follows the Frontier* Garrison began by acknowledging that the Disciples of Christ were a “characteristically American” religious movement that quite obviously was “in its origin, a phenomenon of the frontier.” He immediately went on to say, however, that the denomination had gradually undergone “modifications of attitude, structure, and interests with the passing of the frontier stage, the developing economic, social, and cultural life of its environment, and the urbanization and sophistication of what had been a simple and rural society.” As this clearly indicated, the focus of Garrison’s attention fell upon the process of religious change that occurred as America developed toward the modern, urbanized and industrialized society in which he himself lived and worked, as dean of Disciples Divinity House, professor at the University of Chicago, and editor for the arts at the *Christian Century*. He felt profoundly the twentieth-century religious tensions that beset the Disciples of Christ, and he sought to understand those tensions by mapping them onto a transition from frontier America to modern America. “What we have to consider,” he wrote, is “a study in social evolution—the natural history of a group under the changing circumstances which have constituted the real history of the United States . . . from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present time.”²

To put the matter another way, Garrison fastened on the concept of the frontier beginnings of the Disciples of Christ in order to resolve questions about the continuity of a religious tradition and the influence of environment, especially a rapidly changing environment, on that continuity. We therefore need to read a double connotation into his title *Religion Follows the Frontier*. On the one hand, Garrison sought to identify what was characteristic about the Disciples as they moved in tandem with the frontier, and “rode the crest of the wave of that advancing frontier which swept across woodlands and prairies.”³ On the other hand, he was fascinated by the religion that followed the frontier in the sense of being subsequent to the frontier, because understanding religion in the developing culture of the Middle West enabled him to come to grips with the continuities and discontinuities that presented challenging questions of worship, theology, and ethics to him and his contemporaries. In Garrison’s hands, the question “Did religion follow the frontier?” thus became a question of fundamental

*W. Clark Gilpin is Dean of the Divinity School, the University of Chicago, Illinois and Professor of the history of Christianity and Theology.

importance about the defining characteristics of the Disciples of Christ, the social forces that brought them into being, and their continuing viability under changed conditions.

In short, by announcing that “religion follows the frontier,” Garrison consolidated the story of “who we are,” first in *Religion Follows the Frontier* (1931), then in *An American Religious Movement* (1945), and, especially, with A. T. DeGroot, in *The Disciples of Christ: A History* (1948), which, carried forward in the revision by Lester G. McAllister and William E. Tucker, has now provided the basic narrative structure to the history of the Disciples for nearly a half century. Largely through Garrison’s influence, the importance of the American frontier for understanding Disciples history has thoroughly permeated both our own self-understanding and the perceptions of others. It is evident not only in formal histories of our denomination and general histories of American religion but also in our popular imagery. For example, the costume drama by which a congregation, region, or general assembly celebrates a milestone in its history is almost invariably a “buggies and bonnets” affair: farming families flocking to hear a frontier preacher’s impassioned presentation of “our plea,” the earnest simplicity of hardworking communities, close to the soil, fireside readers turning to the Bible as their “sole rule of faith,” gathered in rough equality around the communion table, empowered by the vast and unifying possibilities of a democratic faith. For us to raise the Garrisonian question—Did religion follow the frontier?—is thus to revisit and to re-envision the underlying continuities in our life as a people, our corporate religious identity.

In the following consideration of that question, I will first explore the interpretive resources that Garrison derived from Disciples of Christ writers of the late nineteenth century and from professional scholars of American history who were his own contemporaries. I will then describe how Garrison reworked these materials into his own interpretation. Finally, since I think Garrison’s effort to understand the relationship of continuity to change is critically important for contemporary Disciples, I will conclude by reflecting on how he might help us to answer the question “Did religion follow the frontier?”

Historical Narratives by Nineteenth-Century Disciples

Disciples’ interest in their history began with the passing of the founding generation at the end of the 1860s, especially the death of Alexander Campbell in 1866. Biographies soon became the favored literary form, presenting “the rise and progress of the current reformation” through the words and deeds of a principal actor. While these early Disciples biographers did not organize their narratives around the idea of “the frontier,” they nevertheless conveyed vivid images of the social and religious conditions of the frontier and of the personalities of the frontier leaders. Illuminating examples of such images appear in two exceptionally well-written biographies, the two-volume memoir of Alexander Campbell published by Robert Richardson

in 1868 and 1870 and the biography of "Raccoon" John Smith published by John Augustus Williams in 1870.

Richardson's verbal portraits of the early leaders of the Disciples are instructive. Although Richardson constantly reiterated that the power of the early Disciples message was its appeal to the "simple and obvious meaning" of the Bible or the "simple truths of the gospel," he was at considerable pains to make clear that the proclaimers of this simple message were not themselves simple rustics. When, for instance, he characterized the "Reformers" and "Christians" who effected the union of the Campbell and Stone movements in 1832, the images tend clearly in a single direction. John Rogers, J. T. Johnson, Thomas Allen, Thomas Smith, and the Palmer brothers were men of "clear perception and sober judgment," "noble nature," "peculiar dignity of . . . manner," "fine personal appearance," "courteous bearing," "more than ordinary abilities and attainments," and all in all possessed of "noble Christian character."⁴ Far from being "backwoods preachers," the ministers who populated Richardson's biography of Campbell were nature's aristocrats, identified by bearing and manner as the purveyors of Christian civilization to the western settlements. As enunciated by these preachers, the "simple and obvious meaning" of Scripture had the power to elevate frontier families above fruitless denominational strife and educate them into independent study and interpretation of the Bible.

Richardson's representation of the frontier itself fully corresponded with this image of the ministry. Consider, for example, his depiction of a "ramble in the forest" by the young Alexander Campbell, immediately upon his arrival in the United States:

As in former years, he had bathed in the bright streams of his native isle, oppressed then with a consciousness of the civil and religious misrule and discord, the hatred, the bigotry, superstition and revenge which brooded over the land, he now in the country of his adoption, for the first time, with new feelings and an indescribable sense of relief plunged into the depths of an American forest. . . . he trod upon the soil of a new world—the land of liberty and of Washington, whose liberal institutions had long been the object of his admiration. All nature around him seemed to sympathize with his emotions. The balmy air . . . the new varieties of birds . . . the approaching shades of evening . . . all seemed to speak of liberty, security and peace.⁵

This is an encounter with nature that is more in the tradition of Ralph Waldo Emerson than of Daniel Boone, and it is perhaps no accident that Richardson selected the epigraph for his memoir of Campbell from a poem by the English Romantic William Wordsworth.

John Augustus Williams's biography of Elder John Smith presents both continuities and contrasts with Richardson. Like Richardson, Williams loses little time in identifying the religion of the Smith family with patriotism; the elder Smith, a staunch Baptist of German descent, left "his plow to his sturdy boys, and the general care of the farm and family to his wife . . . shouldered his musket, and went out to bear his part in the struggle for Independence."⁶ But for John Smith's family, the natural surroundings of the frontier were by no means the confirming,

aesthetic landscape of Romanticism. Instead, the story of his life was a contest with the natural elements, regular relocation in search of viable farm land, and labor to establish an economic foothold in an environment of chance and tragedy. Furthermore, Williams presented Smith as a figure much closer to the classic type of the frontier preacher, direct in speech, given to colloquial humor and anecdote, and practicing a theological oratory marked more by native wit than formal education.

The manner by which John Smith received the epithet "Raccoon" illuminates the contrast with Robert Richardson's cultivated preachers. Returning to Kentucky from a brief sojourn in Alabama in 1815, Smith was invited to preach to the regular meeting of the Baptist association by another future Disciples leader Jacob Creath, despite Smith's generally woebegone attire: "He wore a pair of homespun cotton pantaloons, striped with copperas—loose enough, but far too short for him—and a cotton coat, once checked with blue and white, but now of undistinguishable colors; they had been given to him in Alabama. His shapeless hat was streaked with sweat and dust. His socks, too large for his shrunken ankles, hung down upon his foxy shoes. His shirt was coarse and dirty, and unbuttoned at the neck." Smith's companion on the speaker's platform, looking somewhat askance, was a young divinity school student who had just arrived from Philadelphia, with, one would suppose, properly fitting socks. Nonetheless, the return to his native state inspired Smith, and "his eye kindled" as he rose to speak:

'I am John Smith, from Stockton's Valley. In more recent years, I have lived in Wayne, among the rocks and hills of the Cumberland. Down there, saltpeter caves abound, and raccoons make their homes. On that wild frontier we never had good schools, nor many books; consequently, I stand before you to-day a man without an education. But, my brethren, even in that ill-favored region, the Lord, in good time, found me. He showed me his wondrous grace, and called me to preach the everlasting Gospel of his Son. Redemption! Redemption!!' he shouted, and his voice sounded through the woods like the tones of trumpet. He had no Bible, but he quoted, in the same loud voice, his text: 'He sent redemption to his people; he hath commanded his covenant forever: holy and reverend is his name' (Psalm 3:9).

In later years, his name appeared on announcements of public preaching as "Raccoon John Smith."⁷

What patterns emerge from the verbal portraits drawn by Robert Richardson and John Augustus Williams? Notice, first, that their images are related not to the exploration of the frontier but to its settlement: forming new communities, establishing patterns of leadership, exemplifying moral virtues and standards of behavior, developing educational competence. These biographies were egalitarian celebrations of the common people and their ability to read and think for themselves, in order to arrive at religious meaning. They ascribed dignity to these independent thinkers, who, whatever their formal education, possessed and used "clear perception and sober judgment." In these narratives, the frontier context certainly confronted the early

Disciples leaders with social and natural challenges and rewarded persons of character and perseverance. But, the fundamental point was the retrieval of a message and a plan of church order that transcended the environment. In a sharply drawn contrast between Europe and the United States, the happy occasion of civil and religious liberty in America presented a providential opportunity to hear this message in all its clarity for the first time in many centuries, unencumbered by inherited customs and opinions.

These sensibilities are epitomized in Williams's account of how John Smith and his second wife, Nancy, were led "to reexamine the popular theories of religion." Deeply troubled that their personal religious experience did not conform to the prescribed patterns of orthodox Calvinist theology, the couple prayed together for illumination. United in prayer, Smith "pledged himself, both to heaven and to her, that he would take God's Word as his only oracle, examine it carefully, and calling no man master, follow its teachings wherever they might lead him."⁸ As Smith's pledge makes clear, biblical restorationism emancipated the early Disciples from adherence to customary doctrines and practices, authorizing resistance to cultural norms by suggesting that it was possible for each individual to surmount "the popular theories of religion" and arrive at an independent position based on direct study of the Bible. The "frontier" environment thus might be said to have contributed a setting of religious freedom and choice in which John Smith and others like him were free to explore the Bible as their "only oracle," but they did not consider their beliefs a product of the frontier environment, or, indeed, of any other historical environment. Robert Richardson crisply enunciated their common conviction that they were recovering a transcendent message, when he described Thomas Campbell's *Declaration and Address* (1809) as a call

To begin anew—to begin at the beginning; to ascend at once to the pure fountain of truth, and to neglect and disregard, as though they had never been, the decrees of Popes, Councils, Synods, and Assemblies, and all the traditions and corruptions of an apostate Church. By coming at once to the primitive model and rejecting all human inventions, the Church was to be at once released from the controversies of eighteen centuries, and the primitive gospel of salvation was to be disentangled and disembarassed from all those corruptions and perversions which had heretofore delayed or arrested its progress.⁹

Fifty years after Robert Richardson and John Augustus Williams, the midwestern Disciples poet Vachel Lindsay looked back and beautifully consolidated their images of the frontier preacher, with a poem he wrote in 1917, entitled "The Proud Farmer." Lindsay communicated, as well, the clear sense that by 1917 the social world of the "proud farmer" was irretrievably lost, and yet somehow, across separating years, stirred the hopes of our own new and different day.

Into the acres of the newborn state
He poured his strength, and plowed his ancient name,
And, when the traders followed him, he stood
Towering above their furtive souls and tame

That brow without a stain, that fearless eye
Oft left the passing stranger wondering
To find such knighthood in the sprawling land,
To see a democrat well-nigh a king.

He lived with liberal hand, with guests from far,
With talk and joke and fellowship to spare,—
Watching the wide world's life from sun to sun,
Lining his walls with books from everywhere.

He read by night, he built his world by day.
The farm and house of God to him were one.
For forty years he preached and plowed and wrought—
A statesman in the fields, who bent to none.

His plowmen-neighbors were as lords to him.
His was an ironside, democratic pride.
He served a rigid Christ, but served him well—
And, for a lifetime, saved the countryside.

Here lie the dead, who gave the church their best
Under his fiery preaching of the word.
They sleep with him beneath the ragged grass
The village withers, by his voice unstirred.

And tho' his tribe be scattered to the wind
From the Atlantic to the China sea,
Yet do they think of that bright lamp he burned
Of family worth and proud integrity.

And many a sturdy grandchild hears his name
In reverence spoken, till he feels akin
To all the lion-eyed who built the world—
And lion-dreams begin to burn within.¹⁰

Garrison's Interpretation of the Frontier

Vachel Lindsay's contemporary, Winfred E. Garrison, shared the poet's sense of respectful distance from frontier religion. Garrison wanted to understand what continuities still linked the generations, despite the dramatic social changes that had irrevocably intervened. His sensitivity to this issue was heightened by the emphasis that he and his historian contemporaries were placing on the extent to which environmental factors influenced social development.

In one important respect, the focus of historians on the formative power of the frontier environment worked against Garrison's concern for religious continuity by tending in their hands to underscore discontinuity with the past, a theme that is particularly evident in the work of Frederick Jackson Turner. First in a famous address to the American Historical Association in 1893, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," and subsequently in a collection of essays, Turner creatively recast the nineteenth-century rhetoric of

egalitarian possibility on the frontier into an historical explanation for the distinctive development of American democratic society. Turner found the key to this development in the process of national westward expansion into "free land," and he argued that, as settled civilization receded on the eastern horizon of the advancing pioneers, society was continually "beginning over again on the frontier." This perennial social rebirth through westward settlement furnished "the forces dominating American character."¹¹

The frontier, Turner declared, forced a return to more primitive economic and political conditions and, as frontier society gradually matured, the result was not a duplication of European society but something distinctively American, a society created out of the elemental interaction of the pioneers with a new environment.

For a moment, at the frontier, the bonds of custom are broken and unrestraint is triumphant. There is not *tabula rasa*. The stubborn American environment is there with its imperious summons to accept its conditions; the inherited ways of doing things are also there; and yet, in spite of environment, and in spite of custom, each frontier did furnish a new field of opportunity, a gate of escape from the bondage of the past; and freshness, and confidence, and scorn of older society, impatience of its restraints and ideas, and indifference to its lessons, have accompanied the frontier.¹²

Indeed, Turner concluded, "the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines." In the Mississippi Valley, there had evolved, "not by revolutionary theory, but by growth among free opportunities, the conception of a vast democracy made up of mobile ascending individuals, conscious of their power and responsibilities." To study the institutions and traits of character that emerged from interaction between "an expanding people" and the frontier was, therefore, "to study the really American part of our history."¹³ Peter Mode and William Warren Sweet, who were Garrison's colleagues at the University of Chicago, elaborated Turner's ideas in order to develop a general historical narrative of religion in America. Mode, for example, proposed that to recognize the fact that entrance into "the unappropriated domain of the interior" was "the one unifying feature in all the vicissitudes of our national development," and this recognition made possible "a much clearer insight into what constitutes the Americanizing of Christianity."¹⁴

Although W. E. Garrison concurred that the concrete exigencies of frontier life had challenged inherited practices and led the early settlers to emphasize individual freedom and self-reliance, he resisted any implication that the frontier provided the touchstone for understanding, in Turner's phrase, "the really American part of our history." Garrison did think that the pioneer was undaunted by change and fully prepared "to believe that even the most fundamental institutions—such as state and church—could be made over if they did not serve his need."¹⁵ Garrison also thought that such character traits were accentuated by

frontier life. He did not, however, elevate these features into the normative qualities of "genuine" American religion. From Garrison's perspective, both Frederick Jackson Turner and, in a quite different way, the nineteenth-century Disciples biographers Richardson and Williams could be characterized, in David W. Noble's phrase, as "historians against history."¹⁶ Turner had attributed generative power to the "free land" itself and vested it with the capacity to redeem American history from the social complexities of Europe and regularly renew American democratic life. Richardson and Williams had also looked beyond history, not to the primitive frontier environment, but rather to the primitive gospel as the source of escape from history. To return to apostolic Christianity was to overleap intervening centuries of human opinion in order to renew true religion by the original simplicity of the Christian message.

In contrast, Garrison considered the frontier to be only one phase in a continuous series of historical phases through which the church was passing. His view of history undercut the authority of "origins," whether an origin in the apostolic church or on the American frontier. Garrison thus challenged the emphasis nineteenth-century Disciples gave to an unique, time-transcending message. He thought, instead, that the unfolding life of any religious group invariably used inherited materials to fashion a religious and ethical response to the time in which it found itself. Garrison likewise doubted that the traits of character prompted by the frontier environment were somehow more authentically American. He chose to emphasize the capacity of living traditions to adapt to continually changing historical environments and thus to engage in the process of social evolution under altered circumstances. He therefore concentrated his attention not on the frontier itself but on the development of the church in the areas through which the frontier had passed: the small towns and cities within which the Disciples participated in civic culture, founded educational institutions, and responded to the social problems of urban life.

Different responses to the social process of change had created tensions within the Disciples of Christ, Garrison thought. Some held on to the older frontier ways, an authoritarian appeal to Scripture and forms of worship characterized by stark simplicity. Others adapted to advancing social life, appropriated new views of biblical interpretation and preferred worship that included organ music and preachers who held advanced degrees. These different responses to modernization went far to explain the controversies that beset the Disciples in the opening decades of the twentieth century. "The deeper meanings of all the controversies which have disturbed the harmony of the Disciples during the past thirty years," Garrison wrote in 1931, "must be sought in the diversity of attitudes toward . . . those social, cultural, and intellectual changes which have accompanied the passing of the frontier."¹⁷ In an important sense, Garrison had transformed the frontier from a symbol of American space into a symbol of American time.

Did Religion Follow the Frontier?

Did religion follow the frontier? Garrison's perspective, I believe, encourages us to answer this question differently from what we might have anticipated. Although frontier beginnings doubtless had, and continue to have, significant influence on the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the faith and conduct arising from these beginnings are not permanent and are certainly not without theological and moral ambiguity. Religion on the American frontier faced distinctive challenges that could not be addressed merely by repeating inherited patterns. It was caught up in massive economic, political, and cultural changes of which individual participants could be, at best, only dimly aware. Congregations and ministers made religious and ethical decisions that, even when they represented the best judgment of the moment, had unintended and unforeseen consequences. In short, the frontier presented the perennial features of the human predicament. Hence, if contemporary religious meaning somehow follows the frontier, Garrison inclines me to say that it will not be because the frontier is a model but because it offers analogies.

In order to illustrate this religious analogy, I would like to return to the story of "Raccoon" John Smith. I have described the public preaching at which Smith received his nickname, following his sudden return from Alabama. That incident acquires richer meanings when it is set in the larger context of frontier social history and of Smith's personal life history.¹⁸ John Smith, like his father, regularly relocated in order to gain enough land for his family to "make a go of it" on the frontier, improving one farm and then selling it to buy a larger holding of cheaper land farther west. He was an individual actor in a "market revolution" that was transforming the American economy from one built around subsistence agriculture to one built around trade and communications. Williams's biography fails to state, however, that the land Smith bought in Alabama was available because Andrew Jackson had led a devastating military defeat of the Creeks in 1814, after which the Creeks ceded nearly three-fifths of the present state of Alabama. Furthermore, the extent of the land Smith purchased was tempting him to depart from his father's deeply held principle of never owning slaves, and this question of the westward extension of slavery was, of course, becoming the crucial political question of the age.

On Saturday, January 7, 1815, these societal developments on the Alabama frontier intersected personal tragedy. Smith had left home to preach the following day for some Baptist neighbors. During the night, his house was consumed in a fire that killed two of his children, Eli and Elvira. A few mournful weeks later, his wife Anna died of grief. Smith himself lay seriously ill for some weeks before returning to Kentucky and preaching at the Baptist association gathering I described earlier. He spoke that day with his shirt open because he had buried his cravat with Anna before turning north. This was the mix of life, sorrow, personal courage, massive economic and social forces, and the necessity to live and act within a situation that he—or we—could not fully discern.

Raccoon John Smith, the frontier preacher, presented the perennial dilemma of the religiously informed life; yet, amidst vicissitudes and moral ambiguity, he had the courage to proclaim : "Redemption! Redemption!! . . . [God] sent Redemption to his people; he hath commanded his covenant forever: holy and reverend is his name."

Notes

¹I am grateful to the Disciples of Christ Historical Society and its president, Peter M. Morgan, for the invitation to deliver the 1997 Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Lecture.

²Winfred E. Garrison, *Religion Follows the Frontier: A History of the Disciples of Christ* (New York: Harper, 1931), pp. ix-xii.

³Winfred E. Garrison and Alfred T. DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ: A History*, rev. ed. (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1958), pp. 16-17.

⁴Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1868-70), 2: 376-86.

⁵Richardson, *Alexander Campbell*, 1: 206-07.

⁶John Augustus Williams, *Life of Elder John Smith* (Cincinnati: Carroll, 1870), p. 12.

⁷Williams, *Elder John Smith*, pp. 111-17, 277-78.

⁸Williams, *Elder John Smith*, pp. 145-47.

⁹Richardson, *Alexander Campbell*, 1: 257-58.

¹⁰Vachel Lindsay, "The Proud Farmer," in *Progress: Anniversary Volume of the Campbell Institute on the Completion of Twenty Years of History*, ed. Herbert L. Willett, Orvis F. Jordan, and Charles M. Sharpe (Chicago: Christian Century Press, 1917), pp. 328-29.

¹¹Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Holt, 1920), pp. 1-4.

¹²Turner, *Frontier*, pp. 37-38.

¹³Turner, *Frontier*, pp. 1, 2, 4, 203.

¹⁴Peter G. Mode, *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1923), pp. 1-14. For further discussion of the influence of Turner on American religious historiography, see John B. Boles, "Turner, the Frontier, and the Study of Religion in America," *Journal of the Early Republic* 13 (1993): 205-16, and W. Clark Gilpin, "Faith on the Frontier: Historical Interpretations of the Disciples of Christ," in *A Case Study of Mainstream Protestantism: The Disciples' Relation to American Culture, 1880-1989*, ed. D. Newell Williams (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).

¹⁵Garrison, *Religion Follows the Frontier*, pp. 55-58.

¹⁶David W. Noble, *Historians against History: the Frontier Thesis and the National Covenant in American Historical Writing since 1830* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965).

¹⁷Garrison, *Religion Follows the Frontier*, pp. 301-02.

¹⁸Williams, *Elder John Smith*, pp. 14-15, 96-109; Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 3-102.

The Influence of Bethany College on the Higher Criticism Debate, 1841-1891

by C. Kent Clinger*

Bethany College, the brainchild of Alexander Campbell and beneficiary of much of his energy and wealth, was one of the most influential institutions among the Disciples of Christ in the mid-nineteenth century. Indeed, it was one of the most prominent colleges public or private west of the Appalachians during this time period. It is said that at one time it had a higher percentage of its graduates than of any other American college listed in *Who's Who*.¹ Today, it remains the oldest continually operating college among those established in the Restoration Movement. Its faculty, friends, students, and graduates constituted a "who's who" among the Disciples in the mid-nineteenth century. The Bethany College faculty included at times besides Campbell himself, William K. Pendleton, Robert Richardson, Charles Louis Loos, Robert Milligan, Barton W. Johnson, and J.T. Barclay. Its Board of Trustees included at various times Thomas Campbell (first chairman), Robert Richardson, Philip S. Fall, Isaac Errett, James A. Garfield, Thomas W. Phillips, Sr., Robert Graham, and J.S. Lamar. Prominent students who attended Bethany from its inception until the 1870s include John T. Johnson, J.W. McGarvey, Moses E. Lard, I.B. Grubbs, William T. Moore, James A. Harding, F.D. Power, Ely Vaughn Zollars, Daniel Sommer, R.C. Cave, and Archibald McLean. Business and political leaders who studied at Bethany included Archibald Campbell (Alexander's nephew, who became the editor of the *Wheeling Intelligencer*), George T. Oliver (a U.S. senator from Pennsylvania), Earl W. Oglebay (businessman who donated the Oglebay Park resort to the city of Wheeling), Benjamin Butler Odell (governor of New York), Champ Clark (the President of Marshall College, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and later Senator from Missouri), and Joseph Rucker Lamar (an Associate Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court).

Bethany College, probably due to the prominence of its founder, Alexander Campbell, produced a large fraction of the ministers and teachers of the Disciples of Christ in the nineteenth century. They often constituted the leaders in the various controversies that confronted the movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As can be seen by a cursory glance at Bethany's alumni, faculty, and friends, Bethanians were a diverse group. Consequently, Bethanians often found themselves on opposing sides in the controversies.

Of all the problems that created division in the Restoration Movement in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, one of the most fundamental was that of Higher Criticism. The acceptance and espousal of Higher Criticism by some preachers and teachers among

*C. Kent Clinger is Associate Professor of Chemistry at Lipscomb University, Nashville, Tennessee.

the Disciples of Christ drove a wedge between those in the fellowship who were open to the ideas of the European scholars and those who felt that any use of these methods denied the inspiration of scripture. The position of J.W. McGarvey on Biblical Criticism is well-known even today among members of the Churches of Christ and has been well-documented elsewhere.² Less well known among conservative Christians are the leaders who were attacked by McGarvey and the positions they took in the discussions. Who were the members of the editorial staff of the *Christian Evangelist*, George Longan, J. H. Garrison, Barton W. Johnson, and Alexander Procter? What did they espouse that so moved McGarvey to action? It should surprise no one that Johnson and Procter, along with McGarvey, were Bethany College alumni.³ J.H. Garrison sent two sons to Bethany at about the time of the eruption of the controversy. What had these men learned at Bethany and how had it shaped their thinking about Higher Criticism? This study will attempt to trace Bethany College's teaching on Higher Criticism and its influence on its students.

Any attempt to trace Bethany's influence in the Higher Criticism debate must start with Alexander Campbell. Although much has been written about Campbell's educational philosophy and theology, and he has left an enormous body of literature in his *Christian Baptist* and *Millennial Harbinger* as well as many books, he said little or nothing directly about the higher critics. However, Campbell is noted as an educational innovator in that he pioneered the teaching of the Bible in Christian Colleges and also in the teaching of science. He insisted on the Bible being taught as any other college textbook. The 1855-1856 Bethany College catalog reads "At no period of the College Course is the regular study and recitation of the Sacred Volume intermitted, and it is now made as necessary... to stand an approved examination upon this volume, as upon any other text-book, or course of lectures, introduced into the college."⁴

Bethany College also was one of the first colleges to add a science curriculum to the classical curriculum that had been common previously. The first faculty included Dr. Robert Richardson, who was listed as Professor of Chemistry. Students in mathematics studied "Fluxions, Civil Engineering; Navigation" and in Natural Science "Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, Natural History, Chemistry, Geology, and Botany". The first catalog stated "...It is the paramount object of this Institution to educate the youth of the community placed under its care in harmony with the genius of human nature and in accordance with the whole constitution of man, as a physical, intellectual, and moral being..."⁵ Campbell was a believer in the truths that were gained through science, and felt strongly that no educated person, including ministers, should be ignorant of science and the scientific method.

Alexander Campbell tried to bring the same discipline that scientists used in studying nature to the study of the Bible. The influence of the Baconian method on Campbell is readily apparent.⁶ One discussion in the book *Christian Baptism* dealt with how to do Bible Study.⁷ Included

in his approach to scripture were such things as determining the author of a passage, to whom he was speaking, the type of literature the passage represents, and other questions that reflect the best of Biblical interpretation today.⁸ Apparently, Campbell's rules for Biblical interpretation were influenced by Moses Stuart. Stuart is credited with introducing historical criticism into orthodox churches in the 1800s.⁹

Due to his "scientific" approach to the Bible, and his desire to study it like any other book, some have speculated that Campbell surely would have used the techniques of Higher Criticism in his Bible study had he lived long enough for these techniques to be in common use in America.¹⁰ He did share an emphasis on a historico-critical interpretation of scripture with many on the forefront of biblical scholarship in the early nineteenth century. As Thompson has said, "We do not know how he would have responded to the debates ...over the synoptic problem, to various suggestions regarding the pseudonymity of various NT writings, and the critical positions of such German radicals as D.F. Strauss and F.C. Baur. We can only make inferences."¹¹ However, no one has been able to show that Campbell used the Higher Critical methods or adopted any of its positions. W.T. Moore, in compiling Campbell's *Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch* states that "...we should be slow to condemn Mr. Campbell for sustaining the Bible against all the deductions of human reason, drawn from improper conceptions of scientific truth."¹² To Alexander Campbell, the Bible and science were compatible. If there were any apparent contradictions between the two, clearly the Bible was correct and the "scientific deductions" were wrong.

However, it has been recently pointed out¹³ that there is an article concerning Schleiermacher in the *Millennial Harbinger*¹⁴ in 1857. This article, which is surprisingly favorable toward Schleiermacher, contains a translation of an article by Lücke describing Schleiermacher's last years and days. The entire article is signed A. P. H. This person is likely to be A. P. Hooke, who contributed two other articles to the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1857¹⁵ and was a Bethany College faculty member from 1850-1855.¹⁶ One of the other *Millennial Harbinger* articles contributed by Hooke was apparently his translation of some introductory material by Tholick in his *Commentary on John*.¹⁷ It seems that Hooke read and translated the German literature in Bethany in the 1850s.

The teachings of Ernest Renan were well known to Campbell and his contemporaries at Bethany in the 1860s. Just one year after the appearance of Renan's *Life of Jesus* in English and only five years since its publication in French, the *Millennial Harbinger* disapprovingly refers to the book and its rejection of miracles.¹⁸ Bethany alumni of this time period often refer to Colenso, Renan, and Strauss in their later writings.¹⁹

Another identifying feature of a Bethany College education in the early years was the prominence of the "Literary Societies" and the requirements of the school for public speaking. Students were required to make speeches before the faculty and student body for evaluation by the faculty. The student-run "Literary Societies" used speech-making and debating as practice for these occasions as well as for

entertainment.²⁰ Students were given topics on which to speak, and they were free to develop their own positions and to defend the positions taken. Faculty and other outsiders were brought in as judges. Friendly rivalries were often the result of the spirited literary society contests. Daniel Sommer and Champ Clark debated “the Liquor Traffic”²¹ during their years at Bethany. Apparently both remembered the debate fondly in their later years. It is really no wonder that students developed their own ideas and a sense of self-confidence in their positions and understanding. After all, had not Alexander Campbell and his father stood virtually alone religiously for many years in the hills of Western Pennsylvania and the Northern Panhandle of Virginia?

This independence of thought and self-confidence reflected not only Alexander Campbell’s thinking, but also Bethany College. In 1855, Campbell wrote in the *Millennial Harbinger*, “Freedom of thought and inquiry, in harmony with the laws of analysis and synthesis, is encouraged; original modes of demonstration are highly estimated in the grading of scholarship; and every proper stimulus is employed to inspire in the student a generous love of science.”²² Perry Gresham has quoted Campbell as often saying “You were not created or educated to be a mere drone in the hive of humanity.”²³ In a popular lecture, Campbell stated, “Intelligence and freedom are but two names for the same thing.”²⁴ A Bethany student was to be a creative, analytical thinker, a leader in whatever endeavor he chose to enter. Campbell was so enthralled by independence that he scheduled the Bethany College commencement exercises every July 4. Independence in the church and in the state were intertwined to Alexander Campbell. As he put it, “It is not possible, or, in other words, it is not in human nature, to love liberty, freedom of thought, of speech and of action, in the state, and to hate it in the church; or to love it in the church and to hate it in the state.”²⁵ As W. T. Moore wrote of Campbell in 1867, “He was emphatically a free man, and his thoughts were always full of the inspiration of freedom.”²⁶

By the time of the Civil War, Alexander Campbell was in failing health. He gradually gave up his professorial duties at Bethany College, then passed the editorship of the *Millennial Harbinger* to W. K. Pendleton. Upon Campbell’s death in 1866, W.K. Pendleton was nominated to be Campbell’s successor as president of Bethany College.²⁷ Pendleton was not the acknowledged leader that Campbell was, but nonetheless was held in great esteem for his demeanor and spirit by his students and Bethany’s alumni. There can be no mistake about where Pendleton stood on Higher Criticism when he took over the *Harbinger*. In 1865, Pendleton responded to a questioner by strongly defending the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.²⁸ Pendleton explained the use of third person for referring to Moses in the Pentateuch, but did admit that someone else did write the 34th chapter of Deuteronomy (the death and burial of Moses). Pendleton may have slowly softened his views, however.

Besides its presidents, Bethany College had other very distinguished

faculty. Charles Louis Loos, Robert Richardson, and many others who taught at Bethany for shorter periods also had great influences on Bethany students. Since few class notes are still available, what these teachers taught in their courses can only be surmised from what materials they have left to us. As early as 1865, Loos was calling attention to the evils of what he termed "Liberal Christianity."²⁹ In this article, Loos criticized Liberal Christianity's principle proponents, including in his article Schenkel, Renan, Colenso, Strauss, and Schleiermacher. In Loos' mind, Liberal Christianity was opposed to the Primitive Christianity that he and all that truly love God espoused. Loos apparently passed his information on to his students. Just a few years after his graduation W. T. Moore wrote in 1867 that he was aware of a reexamination of "the foundations of the Christian Faith" which was taking place in the world. This "Infidelity, in the garb of science..." was clearly "Error" and "Strauss, Colenso and Renan are only the leaders of the hosts of Skepticism."³⁰ By 1882, Loos was warning in the *Christian Standard* about the higher criticism espoused by European scholars.³¹ Loos had an advantage over many Disciples in that he was fluent in German and could read the German literature without having to wait for English translations or relying on the reviews of the books by other authors.³² Two lectures by Charles Louis Loos that indirectly deal with critical issues and critics were given in the Missouri Christian Lectures series. Although these come from Loos' tenure at the College of the Bible in Lexington, KY, they show that he was well aware of the contributions of critical scholarship and the Tübingen school.³³ Apparently, the Bethany faculty diligently tried to keep up with the world of scholarship both in Europe and in America.

Bethany's influence on the Restoration Movement slowly waned under Pendleton. Many able students continued to enroll at Bethany, but the College of the Bible and Kentucky University were attracting many influential students and faculty (indeed, Robert Graham, Robert Milligan, and even C.L. Loos and Robert Richardson were lured to Kentucky by the newer school). The establishment of Butler, Hiram, and Eureka also meant more competition for Bethany for students and leadership. The school was further hurt by the discontinuation of the *Millennial Harbinger* after 1870. Pendleton had too many other activities to edit the paper, and did not find a successor.³⁴ Money was also a major problem, since the school had borrowed money from its endowment to complete the southern wing of the campus building, now known as Commencement Hall.³⁵ The loss of faculty to Kentucky University and other schools was likely due to a lack of funds. Bethany was behind in its salary payments constantly in the 1870s through the 1890s.

Despite the decreasing money and influence of the College, it continued to have strong academic programs and several strong students. When J. W. McGarvey left the College of the Bible for a short time in 1873, several students transferred to Bethany. One of these students was William Henry Woolery.³⁶

W. H. Woolery was an outstanding student, although Hebrew seemed

to give him trouble. Bethany's course load at the time seems to have been more strenuous than that of the College of the Bible since Woolery often complained of the work load at Bethany. Woolery graduated from Bethany with honors and was ordained in June 1876. After serving as a minister ("pastorate") in Pompey Hill, New York, Hopedale, Ohio, and Somerset, Pennsylvania, Woolery accepted an invitation to join the faculty of Bethany College in 1882. He had been studying Biblical languages almost constantly since he graduated. Woolery had been awarded the M.A. from Bethany in this time period, and apparently he became a member of the American Institute of Hebrew about this time.³⁷

W.K. Pendleton left Bethany in 1884 and retired to Florida, even though he retained the title of President.³⁸ Day-to-day operation of the College was left to Woolery in 1885, who had been picked by the Board of Trustees to be the chairman of the faculty. This untenable situation continued until 1887, when Hiram College offered Woolery its presidency and Woolery accepted. At this point, the Bethany College Board of Trustees decided to take action to retain Woolery. He was appointed president of the College and withdrew from Hiram.³⁹

During Woolery's presidency of Bethany, the College rebounded from an enrollment of 57 in June 1887 to 129 in June 1889. During this time he was accorded an LL.D. by the University of West Virginia and donations to the College also increased.⁴⁰ But what was Bethany College teaching about Higher Criticism? Herbert L. Willett (Bethany class of 1886) said late in his life that Bethany when he attended was "thoroughly sound." Apparently, critical issues were not discussed in the classroom.⁴¹ However, this does not mean that Woolery and other faculty were unaware of higher criticism. A *Christian-Evangelist* article in 1887 reported that Pendleton thought that Woolery was the "best posted on the higher criticism of the Old Testament of any man among the Disciples."⁴² The same article said that Woolery had been studying the canonization of the Old Testament, certainly a critical study. Indeed, as early as 1884 Woolery had penned a series of four articles in the *Christian Standard* describing and evaluating the "Higher Criticism of the Old Testament."⁴³

Woolery had a balanced view (at least at this time) toward Higher Criticism which he detailed in these articles. His conclusions in the fourth article would be seen as exceedingly modern by conservative scholars today. Woolery states "that the church will not readily take up with a theory" that results in the Bible becoming "a mere trickle of history through a meadow of fable." Yet, he admits that "the author of the Pentateuch wrote as a historian of to-day would write, by making a judicious use of preëxisting material."⁴⁴ Woolery was careful to point out that not all criticism of the Pentateuch was unbelieving, and that unbelief was neither a necessary prerequisite nor conclusion for higher criticism.⁴⁵ His last prediction/conclusion about Higher Criticism probably is worth noting in its entirety.

12. It will result in a closer study of the Bible as human literature. Heretofore the Bible has been studied on the divine side to secure an infallible guide in the religious life — an infallible book instead of an infallible pope — and very little attention has been given to the human side of Scripture. This does not present the whole truth, for the Bible, like its great central Personage, is human as well as divine.. It is a heavenly treasure in an earthen vessel.⁴⁶

An article in the *Christian Quarterly Review* from 1886 further illustrates Woolery's position on Higher Criticism. He offered some advice that others should have heeded:

"Whoever proceeds on the ground that it is an easy thing to overturn the rationalistic criticism of the old world, has a very high register of his own ability, and it is more than doubtful if it can be depended on..." "For, however much we may condemn the standpoint of Kuenen, Graf, Reuss, and Wellhausen (to go no further back), contest their critical procedure, and deplore the results of their methods, yet no one can close his eyes to their profound scholarship, keen analytical power, and candid, patient, exhaustive examination of the separate books of the Bible. These men must be met, if met successfully, on their own ground. Without any question, here is to be the theological battle-field for the next half century....As the battle goes on, different religious people will adjust themselves to the changed circumstances about as follows:

1. There will be those who, having read little of the causes producing the changes, will arrange themselves in opposition to the new, chiefly because it is not like what they held in the past. They see no good in the new. They stand with their backs toward the future, yet the onward current moves them. These we always have with us. 2. Those who go to the other extreme. In every great movement there are always some who are carried away by the extravagances that are accidentally drawn in by the rapidity of the whirl. 3. Those who hold to as much of the old as new investigation has not disproved, and appropriate without fear whatever of truth has been brought out in recent researches. They hold that knowledge of Scripture, as well as of science, must be progressive. In these three divisions is comprised the history of the church's attitude toward the great changes in physical science, metaphysics, politics and religion. It need hardly be said to which class a reasonable man wishes to belong. Nor do we have the privilege of ignoring the results of the Higher Criticism, if we would. They can not be confined to German Universities. And, perhaps, more in the argument from prophecy than in any-thing else, has there been compelled a change of base...."⁴⁷

Woolery made appeals to teach and study more Hebrew, and also promoted more higher education for Disciples' ministers. He enlarged the Bethany College ministerial faculty with the addition of J. M. Tribble of Buffalo, New York⁴⁸. W. H. Woolery had wanted to enlarge Bethany's offerings to include more of a graduate curriculum. Since Bethany had not the money to establish such a school, he encouraged ministerial students to attend established graduate schools and seminaries.⁴⁹ Unlike his contemporaries at other Disciples schools, Woolery even recommended that they attend Yale Divinity School or Union Theological Seminary.⁵⁰ It should be noted that Yale (from 1886-1891) was the school of W.R. Harper, one of the first higher critics in America and later the founding president of the University of Chicago.⁵¹ Apparently, Woolery was acquainted with Harper through the American Institute of Hebrew, and the journals *Hebraica* and the *Old Testament Student* which Harper

started and edited.⁵² Woolery, who taught the Hebrew courses at Bethany, used Harper's Hebrew textbook and perhaps Harper's methods in his classes. These classes were apparently quite successful, as it was reported in the *CE* that Bethany's Hebrew class was the largest ever, probably due to Woolery's influence and reputation as a teacher.⁵³ H. L. Willett said that Woolery's teaching and preaching stood out like "fresh air."⁵⁴ Union was where the scholar Charles Augustus Briggs was a professor. Briggs was expelled from Presbyterianism because of his critical views.⁵⁵ Not much is known about Bethanians or other Disciples attending Union during this period, but Disciples at Yale are first found in 1872. By 1900, 27 Disciples had enrolled at Yale Divinity School.⁵⁶ When Harper left Yale to take the presidency of the University of Chicago, H. L. Willett followed him to Chicago a few years later.⁵⁷ The history of the Disciples who attended the University of Chicago has been well documented.⁵⁸

Woolery represented an informed source of knowledge about Higher Criticism probably derived from the extensive articles in *The Old Testament Student* (now *The Journal of Religion*) and *Hebraica* (now *The Journal of Near Eastern Studies*).⁵⁹ His approach saw major problems with some of it, but he was also cognizant of the new insights into Biblical studies that Higher Criticism could provide. Woolery apparently made no effort to popularize Higher Criticism among the churches as did George W. Longan and Alexander Procter, but neither did he attack and ridicule those who adopted Higher Critical methods as did J. W. McGarvey. Unfortunately, his life was cut short when he died of typhoid fever July 30, 1889.⁶⁰ A moderating influence in the Higher Criticism debate was lost and the Disciples' vacuum of moderate leadership in this area grew even more pronounced. McGarvey and the "Missouri Rationalists" probably felt that they filled this void, but the result was that only the extreme positions had effective spokesmen. Tony Ash has written that from the late 1880s until 1905 four groups of Disciples could be discerned based on their attitude toward Old Testament scripture: a radical left and a radical right (represented by Edward Scribner Ames on the left and David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell on the right), and two centrist groups represented by H. L. Willett and J. W. McGarvey. Clearly, at his death W. H. Woolery occupied a position between Willett and McGarvey.⁶¹

J. M. Tribble began teaching at Bethany College shortly after Woolery's death in 1889. He quickly became an influential faculty member and served as Vice President of the college and would have been acting president after Archibald McLean's resignation in 1891 but he too succumbed to typhoid on September 25.⁶² Tribble was reported to have been one of the first to teach using higher critical methods at Bethany.⁶³ What he actually taught about Higher Criticism is unclear. Tribble was clearly opposed to some of the teaching of Renan and Colenso.⁶⁴ He used his summer vacations on at least two occasions to attend the lectures at Chautauqua at the same time that W. R. Harper was a participant and then Principal of the programs⁶⁵ and Tribble was clearly

stimulated and influenced by the speakers there.

What course the controversy over Higher Criticism would have taken had Woolery and Tribble lived is pure speculation. Whether they would have had any lasting influence is unknown. The one clear conclusion is that the legacy of W. H. Woolery is young ministerial students in the Disciples of Christ began to attend Yale and Chicago in comparatively large numbers at about the time he was teaching at Bethany. Woolery was the only Disciples faculty member who openly encouraged attendance at these graduate schools.⁶⁶ What Woolery believed in 1884 when he wrote in the *Christian Standard* might not have been what he believed later in life. Harper's beliefs on Higher Criticism clearly changed over time as can be seen by reading the articles which he published in *The Old Testament Student*.⁶⁷ In the early years of the *OTS* the articles were primarily critical of Higher Criticism,⁶⁸ but gradually the articles published in *Old Testament Student* became more in favor of Higher Criticism. Willett's views changed drastically between his early days at Yale and a decade later.⁶⁹

Of the others that were involved in the arguments about Higher Criticism perhaps one of the more interesting personalities (or least interesting judging from the amount of material written about his life and work) is Barton W. Johnson. Johnson was educated first at the predecessor of Eureka College and then at Bethany, graduating with honors in 1856.⁷⁰ After graduation, he taught and preached seven years at Eureka College, serving two years as its president. In 1864, Johnson returned to Bethany where he served as professor of mathematics. After Campbell died in 1866, Johnson left Bethany and soon became president of Oskaloosa College in Oskaloosa, Iowa and began editing the *Evangelist*. Upon the merger of this publication with that of the *Christian* (edited by such men as Garrison, Procter, and Longan), Johnson became the co-editor of the *Christian-Evangelist*. Meanwhile, Johnson wrote a commentary on John and published *The People's New Testament with Notes*.

Johnson apparently helped the *CE* maintain a more moderate tone than a journal with an editorial staff consisting of Garrison, Longan, and Procter might be assumed to adopt.⁷¹ His views on Higher Criticism were much more cautionary than those of Longan and Procter. Johnson wrote a long article for *The New Christian Quarterly* in 1893 detailing various views on Higher Criticism.⁷²

Alexander Procter and J. W. McGarvey were students together at Campbell's Bethany. Early on, Procter was one of McGarvey's best friends.⁷³ Procter was involved in McGarvey's ordination ceremony, performed McGarvey's wedding, and preached with McGarvey in Missouri. By the 1880s, however, they were opponents in the Higher Criticism debate.

Compared to McGarvey, little is known about the life and preaching of Alexander Procter. This is attributed to the fact that he apparently hated to write.⁷⁴ His book of sermons was recorded by a listener and edited posthumously. When Procter was born in Kentucky in 1825 he

was named by his mother for Alexander Campbell. In 1836, his family moved to Missouri where Procter grew tall and robust. Procter won a special scholarship for a Missouri student to Bethany College in 1845.⁷⁵

Procter's stay at Bethany was marked by his excellent academic record and his contraction of tuberculosis. He was chosen to speak at Bethany's commencement in 1847, when he spoke on "The Progressive Principle."⁷⁶ Procter was the valedictorian in 1848, receiving his B.A. on July 4. Procter's family reported that he traveled on a preaching tour with Alexander Campbell while a student at Bethany, and he certainly preached in the Ohio River and Buffalo Creek Valleys. Whether he traveled with Campbell or not as a student, he was fondly remembered by Selina B. Campbell in the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1860. Procter definitely traveled with Campbell on a fund raising tour for Bethany in Missouri during 1852. Campbell apparently spoke so often that he lost his voice, and Procter was called upon on short notice to speak in Campbell's stead.⁷⁷

Upon graduation, Procter returned to Missouri and began evangelistic efforts in several small Missouri towns. Eventually, he was invited to preach for a congregation in St. Louis. Here, Procter made use of the Mercantile Library, one of the best of the western United States of the day, and became acquainted with ministers of many denominations of the city. The heavy smoke of the big city was not conducive to his health, so Procter moved to Independence, MO, in 1860 upon the recommendation of Moses Lard.⁷⁸ Here he would minister the remainder of his life. His reputation as a minister resulted in Bethany College conferring on Procter an honorary M.A. in 1853 and an honorary LL.D. in 1897.

Procter began to attract a following among Missouri ministers. Three men became so commonly associated with Procter that together they began to be called "The Missouri Quartet" or the "Big Four" of Missouri.⁷⁹ Besides Procter, the "Quartet" included George W. Longan, Thomas P. Haley, and Allen Bailey Jones. Of these, Longan was Procter's closest friend, and Thomas P. Haley was Procter's kinsman (probably a distant cousin, and Haley married J. W. McGarvey's sister in 1855). Procter and Haley had known each other virtually their entire lives.⁸⁰ Longan and Procter were probably the first practitioners of Higher Criticism among the Disciples. As early as 1868 Longan asserted that he did not believe that Moses wrote the entire Pentateuch since "the facts of the Pentateuch itself are entirely irreconcilable with that conclusion."⁸¹ Procter wrote in one of his few recorded sermons "Historical criticism may show that the records we have in the Bible are fragmentary, that in their collection there may have been displacements and misarrangement of books and of parts of books, that there are many errors in its chronology..."⁸²

Other than Procter, little is known about Longan's influences. He never went to college. One of his sons, George B. Longan, married Moses Lard's daughter, Emma Lard in 1871.⁸³ Procter and Longan were under almost constant attack from the 1860s until their deaths, often by McGarvey and Lard. When Longan died in 1891, Procter wrote "Of all

those who were in the field in Missouri, and of those who began their ministry as early as Bro. Longan and I began, we only were left. I shall feel more alone now than I have ever felt."⁸⁴ How much Procter influenced Longan, and Longan Procter, will probably never be known.

How much did Bethany College influence Procter? Procter recalled Campbell's teaching in one of his lectures as follows: "Whoever sat under the teaching of Alexander Campbell in the fullness and ripeness of his mental power, knows that the highest inspiration of his genius was always the personal aggrandizement and divine glory of Jesus as the Messiah. All the movements of his tongue and pen took their direction from the one absorbing conviction of this original, apostolic, central truth. It was 'the master light of all his seeing.'"⁸⁵

Quite possibly, Procter, Johnson, McGarvey, and Lard heard the same or similar lectures of Alexander Campbell and the other Bethany faculty. And yet, they responded in quite different ways. Procter seems to have particularly heard Campbell as the lover of truth, gathered in any way, including science. He also seems to have had the idea of free-thinking instilled in him. This, too, could be traced to Campbell's iconoclastic spirit and emphasis on freedom.

On the other hand, McGarvey always emphasized the teaching of Campbell that the Bible was the inspired Word of God. His hearing of Campbell was Campbell's emphasis on learning the Bible, and its inspiration precluded any attack of man's reason on it. Willett and others reported that McGarvey was always gracious when visiting in his opponents' homes and in small groups, but tried to destroy the opinions with which he disagreed.⁸⁶ Truly, the teachers of Bethany College could be heard in many different ways. The only constant was that the faculty and students of Bethany College were well educated students of the Bible.

It is interesting to read of the impact that Bethany College had on the controversies of the 19th century. Particularly this is enlightening in the case of Higher Criticism. Bethanians shaped the debate in the late 1800s. Many Disciples were under the influence of Garrison, Johnson, Longan, and Procter. J. W. McGarvey seems to have had a much more lasting influence on other Disciples who completely opposed the higher critical methods.⁸⁷ Other Disciples adopted some of the critical methods, but rejected other conclusions drawn by the Tübingen school. Each group was and is something of an intellectual descendant of W. H. Woolery, J. W. McGarvey, or Alexander Procter.

Notes

¹Sears, Lloyd Cline, *The Eyes of Jehovah: The Life and Faith of James Alexander Harding* (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1970), p. 10.

²Morro, W. C., *Brother McGarvey: The Life of President J. W. McGarvey of the College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky* (St. Louis, MO: The Bethany Press, 1940); Murch, James DeForest, *Christians Only* (Cincinnati, OH: Standard Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 237-262; Hooper, Robert E., *A Distinct People: A History of the Churches of Christ in the 20th Century* (West Monroe, LA: Howard Publishing Co., 1993), pp. 27-31.

³See William Edward Tucker, "A Battle Over the Book: Higher Criticism and the Disciples", *Discipliana* (September, 1962): 49-54,59; and Richard O. N. Halbrook, "J. W. McGarvey: How He Was Viewed by His Correspondents", *Discipliana* (Fall, 1977): 36.

⁴Bethany College *Catalog* (Bethany, Virginia: Bethany College, 1855),p. 9.

⁵Bethany College *Catalog* (Bethany, Virginia: Bethany College, 1841-1842), pp. 2-3, 10, 11.

⁶Casey, Michael , "Rhetoric of Induction: The Baconian Ideal in the Disciples Movement", *Christian Scholars Conference Papers* (1982): 215-230; W. E. Garrison, *Alexander Campbell's Theology*. (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1900), pp. 75-114; and Thomas H. Olbricht, "Apologetics in the Restoration Movement", *Restoration Quarterly* 6 (Fourth Quarter, 1962): 167-188.

⁷Campbell, Alexander, *Christian Baptism* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1882) p. 61, quoted in Ash, Anthony L., "Old Testament Studies in the Restoration Movement, Part I: From Campbell to 1887", *Restoration Quarterly* 9 (Fourth Quarter 1966): 218-219. This article by Ash is basically one chapter of his dissertation. Ash, Anthony L., "Attitudes Toward the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament Among the Disciples of Christ, 1887-1905" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966).

⁸Ash, *Restoration Quarterly* and see Malherbe, Abraham, "An Introduction: The Task and Method of Exegesis", *Restoration Quarterly* 5 (Fourth Quarter 1961): 169-178.

⁹Humbert, Royal, *A Compend of Alexander Campbell's Theology* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1961), pp. 53-54; Stuart's introduction of historical criticism is mentioned in Olbricht, "Apologetics", p. 179. Campbell presents rules of interpretation attributed to J. A. Ernesti and Moses Stuart in the *Millennial Harbinger*, November, 1843, pp.490-493.

¹⁰Kellems, J. R., *Alexander Campbell and the Disciples* (New York: Richard Smith, 1930), pp. 172-174 as quoted in Ash, *Restoration Quarterly*, p. 219.

¹¹Thompson, James, "New Testament Studies and the Restoration Movement",*Restoration Quarterly* 25 (Fourth Quarter 1982): 223-232.

¹²W.T. Moore, ed., in Campbell, Alexander, *Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch* (St. Louis, MO: Christian Publishing Co., 1867), p. 141n.

¹³Shaun Casey, Stone-Campbell Discussion group, 1994-06, June, 1994.

¹⁴*Millennial Harbinger*, Feb., 1857, pp.68-71. The *Millennial Harbinger* will be abbreviated *MH* from henceforth.

¹⁵*MH*, Aug, 1857, pp. 448-451, and Jan., 1857, p. 41.

¹⁶McAllister, Lester G., *Bethany: the First 150 Years* (Bethany, WV: Bethany College Press, 1991), pp. 456.

¹⁷*MH*, Aug., 1857, pp. 448-451

¹⁸*MH*, Nov. 1865, p. 497; information on Renan is from the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd Ed. edited by F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone. London: Oxford University Press, (1974).

¹⁹W. T. Moore, p. 51, and J. M. Triple, *Triple's Sermons.*, (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1892), pp. 132-141.

²⁰See Van Deusen, Kenneth, *Moses Lard: That Prince of Preachers* (Joplin, MO: College Press Publishing Company, 1987), pp. 49-65; W.K. Woolery, *The Bethany Years: The Story of Old Bethany From Her Founding Years Through a Century of Trial and Triumph* (Huntington, WV: Standard Printing and Publishing Company, 1941), pp. 83-86, and Woolery, L. C., *Life and Addresses of W. H. Woolery, LL.D.* (Cincinnati, OH: The Standard Publishing Company, 1893), pp. 93, 117-122..for descriptions of these activities.

²¹Stephen Wolfgang, *A Life of Humble Fear: The Biography of Daniel Sommer, 1850-1940*. M.A. thesis, Butler University (1975), p.45.

²²Campbell, Alexander, quoted in Gresham, Perry Epler, *Campbell and the Colleges* (Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1973), pp. 47-48.

²³Gresham, pp. 52-53.

²⁴Quoted in Gresham, p. 55; from Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures*, p. 254.

²⁵*Popular Lectures*, p. 298 as quoted in Osborn, *Experiment in Liberty*.

²⁶W. T. Moore, ed, *Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p. 51. See also, Garrett, Leroy, *Alexander Campbell and Thomas Jefferson: a Comparative Study of Two Old Virginians* (Dallas: Wilkinson Publishing Co., 1963). An electronic text of this work is available at http://www.freedomring.org/garrett/ac_tj/.

- ²⁷Power, Frederick D., *Life of William Kimbrough Pendleton, LL.D.* (St. Louis, MO: Christian Publishing Company, 1902), p. 256.
- ²⁸Pendleton, William Kimbrough, "Skeptical Difficulties", *Millennial Harbinger* 34 (1865): 137-140.
- ²⁹*MH*, April 1865, pp. 165-171.
- ³⁰W. T. Moore, *Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch*, p.53.
- ³¹Loos, Charles Louis, "Not Too Fast", *Christian Standard* 1882, pp.426. The *Christian Standard* will be hereafter abbreviated CS.
- ³²McAllister, p. 55, and W. T. Moore, *The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church*, (Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll and Co., 1868), pp. 445-446.
- ³³Loos, Charles Louis, "The Hebrew Poetry of the Old Testament", in *Missouri Christian Lectures, 1886-1888*, (Cincinnati, OH: Standard Publishing Company, 1888), pp.83-136.
- ³⁴Power, p.290-291.
- ³⁵Power, p. 396, and McAllister, pp. 132-133.
- ³⁶Woolery, L. C., *Life and Addresses of W. H. Woolery, LL.D.*, pp. 80-81.
- ³⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 82-83, 136-137, 159; W. K. Woolery, p. 131; Peter Vogel, *Tale of a Pioneer Church*. (Cincinnati, OH: The Standard Publishing Company, 1887), pp. 287-290; and *Christian-Evangelist* (April 28, 1887) p.271. The *Christian-Evangelist* will be abbreviated CE.
- ³⁸L.C. Woolery, p. 166; and Power, p.424-425.
- ³⁹L.C. Woolery, pp. 167-170, and F. M. Green, *Hiram College and Western Reserve Eclectic Institute*, (Cleveland, OH: O. S. Hubbell Printing Co., 1901) pp.289-290 .
- ⁴⁰L.C. Woolery, p. 179-180.
- ⁴¹Herbert Lockwood Willett, *The Corridor of Years: An Autobiographical Record*. Compiled and added material by Herbert Lockwood Willett III (Chicago: Disciples Divinity House of the University of Chicago, 1967) p. 32.
- ⁴²CE, (April 23, 1887), p. 271.
- ⁴³*Christian Standard*, (April 5, 12, 19, and 26, 1884) and reprinted by L.C. Woolery, pp. 362-392.
- ⁴⁴L.C. Woolery, p.390.
- ⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 392.
- ⁴⁶*Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷W. H. Woolery, "The Shiloh of Genesis XLIX:10 and Messianic Prophecy". *Christian Quarterly Review*, April 1886, p 171-172
- ⁴⁸L.C. Woolery,, p. 179.
- ⁴⁹*Christian Standard*, (August 11, 1888, August 18, 1888, August 25, 1888, and September 1, 1888) and reprinted in L.C. Woolery, p. 336-361.
- ⁵⁰*Ibid.* p. 348. Willett, pp. 36-37.
- ⁵¹James Brownlee North, *The Fundamentalism Controversy in the Disciples of Christ*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1973. pp. 48-58.
- ⁵²McAllister, p.160; and W.K. Woolery, p. 131; and North, p. 60, advertisement in *Old Testament Student*, Vol. VI, No. 10, June 1887, after p. 332.
- ⁵³Cooper, S. M., CE, XXV (Oct. 18, 1888), p.649
- ⁵⁴Willett, p.32.
- ⁵⁵Ash, Anthony L., "Old Testament Studies in the Restoration Movement: Part II: From 1887 to 1892", *Restoration Quarterly* 10 (First Quarter, 1967): 27-29.
- ⁵⁶Becker, Edwin L., *Yale Divinity School and the Disciples of Christ, 1872-1989* (Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1990), p. 9.
- ⁵⁷North, *The Fundamentalism Controversy in the Disciples of Christ*, p. 51.
- ⁵⁸Tucker, William Edward and McAllister, Lester G., *Journey in Faith: A History of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1975), p. 371; and Jennison, William, "The University of Chicago and the Disciples of Christ: The Development of Biblical Criticism", *Discipliana* xxxviii (Fall, 1978): 41-47.
- ⁵⁹North, *The Fundamentalism Controversy in the Disciples of Christ*, p. 60.
- ⁶⁰CS, (Aug. 10, 1889), p. 520, which is a reprint of an article in the August 2, 1889 edition of the *Wheeling Intelligencer*.
- ⁶¹Ash, Tony, "Old Testament Scholarship and the Restoration Movement", *Restoration Quarterly* 25 (Fourth Quarter, 1982): 213-222.
- ⁶²Biographical sketch by Archibald McLean in J. M. Trible, *Trible's Sermons*, p.IX.
- ⁶³McAllister, p. 167.

⁶⁴Trible's *Sermons*, p. 132-141.

⁶⁵J. M. Tribble, "At Chautauqua", *CE*, 1888, p. 547, and "Some Vacation Notes", *CE*, 1890, p. 610, and North, *The Fundamentalism Controversy in the Disciples of Christ*, p.55.

⁶⁶Willett, *The Corridor of Years*, p. 36-37; North, p. 46-47.

⁶⁷See the *Old Testament Student* articles, "Delitzsch on the Pentateuch: Translated from Manuscript Notes by Samuel Ives Curtiss, D.D." Vol. 1 No.1, pp. 1-5; "The New Criticism" Vol. 1 no. 1, pp. 6-7; and Rev. C. N. Patterson, "Isaiah and the New Criticism" Vol. III No. 1, (1883) pp. 11-14; and North, *The Fundamentalism Controversy in the Disciples of Christ* pp. 54-69.

⁶⁸See particularly the article by Franz Delitzsch, "Delitzsch on the Pentateuch: Translated from Manuscript Notes by Samuel Ives Curtiss, D.D." *The Hebrew Student*. (later the *Old Testament Student*) Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1-5, (1882).

⁶⁹Willett, *The Corridor of Years*, pp.; North, pp.50-51.

⁷⁰Anonymous biographical note in J.H. Garrison, ed., *The Old Faith Restored*, (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1891) facing p. 399.

⁷¹See Tucker, *Discipliana*, p. 49-50.

⁷²Barton W. Johnson, "The Higher Criticism: What Is It, and Whither Does It Tend". *New Christian Quarterly*, Jan. 1893, pp. 37-51.

⁷³Morro, p. 59.

⁷⁴J.H. Garrison, ed., in Procter, Alexander, *The Witness of Jesus and other Sermons*, (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1901), pp. 3-4.

⁷⁵The biographical information about Alexander Procter is primarily from Jeter, Joseph R., Jr., *Alexander Procter: The Sage of Independence* (Claremont, CA: Disciples Seminary Foundation, 1983). pp. 11-16.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 17-49, and *Millenial Harbinger*, Aug. 1847, p.467.

⁷⁷Jeter, p. 62.

⁷⁸Van Deusen, p. 233.

⁷⁹Jeter, pp. 62-71.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*

⁸¹Longan, George W., in "The Conditions of the Gospel Reasonable", in *The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church*, ed. by W. T. Moore (Cincinnati: R.W. Carroll, 1868), p. 189-206.

⁸²Procter, Alexander, "Why the Bible Will Retain Its Hold on Thoughtful Minds", in *Missouri Christian Lectures, 1884-1885*, (Chicago: Oracle Publishing Company, 1886), p. 349.

⁸³Van Deusen, pp. 218-219.

⁸⁴Jeter, p. 68-70.

⁸⁵Procter, "The Great Truth and the Great Lie" in *The Missouri Christian Lectures, 1882*, (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1883) p. 118.

⁸⁶See William Edward Tucker, "A Battle Over the Book: Higher Criticism and the Disciples," *Discipliana* (September, 1962): 49-54,59; and Richard O. N. Halbrook, "J. W. McGarvey: How He Was Viewed by His Correspondents," *Discipliana* (Fall, 1977): 36.

⁸⁷Although McGarvey used something of a Higher Critical analysis in his Bible study guide when discussing the Song of Songs; McGarvey, J. W., *A Guide to Bible Study*. (Cleveland, OH: Bethany C. E. Company, n.d. [reprinted 1950 by Old Paths Book Club])p.46; see also McGarvey's discussion of Job, pp. 41-42.

Acknowledgements

Four libraries were primarily used in the preparation of this article. The library resources at Bethany College, David Lipscomb University, Vanderbilt University, and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society were invaluable. The staffs of these libraries were most courteous and helpful to the author. The author would particularly like to thank Mrs. Marilyn Shaver and Mrs. Jean Cobb who were the archivists at Bethany College in 1989-1990. Also, the author would like to thank the entire staffs of the David Lipscomb University library and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society. The author would like to thank Vanderbilt University for allowing him to have access to both its microfilm and Divinity collections.

The first draft of this paper was essentially a paper written for Dr. Robert Hooper's graduate class in the History of the American Restoration Movement at Lipscomb University in the summer of 1994. The author wishes to thank Dr. Hooper for his helpful

discussions and encouragement. A presentation of the bulk of this work was made at the Christian Scholars' Conference at David Lipscomb University in July, 1996. This article has benefitted from discussions with several individuals at that time, especially with Dr. Thomas H. Olbricht concerning Alexander Campbell. However, all responsibilities for errors and omissions remain with the author.

The author would particularly like to express his appreciation to his father, N. W. Clinger. Mr. Clinger provided support for this article in numerous ways. This included but is not limited to: making various copies of documents, proofreading, and discussions concerning the content of the article.

Forrest Hunter Kirkpatrick 1905-1998

Dr. Forrest H. Kirkpatrick died Sunday, May 31, 1998 in Wheeling, West Virginia. His life began on September 4, 1905. His childhood was lived in Shelby, Ohio.

Dr. Forrest H. Kirkpatrick became a distinguished leader in the church, the academy and industry.

His industrial leadership was in the field of the development of personnel with R.C.A. and Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corporation. He also gave extensive service as consultant to the United States government.

Education was a focus of passionate commitment. He taught with distinction at Bethany College, New York University, Columbia University, West Virginia University and the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Kirkpatrick served faithfully the Bethany Memorial Christian Church of Bethany, West Virginia and the church at large, often through the Historical Society. He was committed to works of mutual enrichment to the three communions of the Stone-Campbell Movement.

Through Dr. Kirkpatrick's philanthropic support the Disciples of Christ Historical Society offers the annual Church Historians' Seminar and the Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Lectures. In gratitude for his support and as a sign of his opening the doors of opportunity to Stone-Campbell scholarship a portrait of Dr. Kirkpatrick has been placed at the doorway of the Historical Society's lecture hall.

Alban P. Hooke, an Unusual Contributor to the *Millennial Harbinger*

by Hans Rollmann*

"Germany has not produced a deeper spirit or better man, than Schleiermacher."¹

Readers of the *Millennial Harbinger* were treated in 1857 to somewhat unexpected intellectual fare. Under the name of A.P. Hooke or the abbreviation A.P.H. three articles stand out from among the others.

The first is a piece of analogizing anthropology, entitled "Figures of Figures." The author relates human character types to the numbers 0 and 7, and in the process he develops moral ideals, the qualities of which are clarified and mirrored by the two mathematical numbers and their attributes. The article could more easily have come from the pen of an Old World speculative Romantic instead of an ante-bellum Disciple.²

The next writing, simply entitled "Schleiermacher," represents a translation from the German: a contemporary character profile of no one less than the prince of liberal theology, Daniel Friedrich Ernst Schleiermacher, by his admirer and colleague Friedrich Lücke. Character is central to this statement of appreciation as well. Schleiermacher becomes for Lücke the ideal of an happy symbiosis of life and thought as expressed in the theologian's ennobling character. We are told very little of Schleiermacher's theology, which the translator, however, is willing to furnish privately to any inquiring reader of the *Millennial Harbinger*. Schleiermacher's life and death become for Hooke an instructive example of the great human being from whom contemporaries can learn amidst similar worldly struggles. He writes in the introduction to his translation:

We have, all of us, in our peculiar sphere, a problem to *work out*; and while contending in our daily life with the practical difficulties and annoying perplexities which more or less, inevitably beset all men, accordingly as they more or less faithfully address themselves to their respective duties, how refreshing it is to peruse the record of a mighty spirit mastering the same difficulties that are opposing us, contending with the same embarrassments, involved in the same perplexities, assailed by the same troubles, subject to the same annoyances, and surmounting the same obstacles, that daily and hourly array themselves against us so appallingly, and occasionally bring upon our spirits such sickening discouragement.³

And there is no doubt in our translator's mind that Schleiermacher represents such a "mighty spirit," for the whole of Lücke's Schleiermacher appreciation is introduced in the most positive terms. For Hooke, "Germany has not produced a deeper spirit or a better man, than Schleiermacher," even if, in intellectual stature, Hooke does not

*Hans Rollmann is Professor, Religious Studies, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

wish to see him compared with “our great English Corypheus” Samuel Taylor Coleridge. It is ironic that the polemic strength that Lücke lauds in Schleiermacher is directed against evangelical and orthodox opponents which in America would be represented by the average members of the Restoration Movement. It seems that if Hooke had any audience for his Schleiermacher appreciation, it is the educated elite that shared a substratum of Victorian attitudes and morality, but by no means Schleiermacher’s theology.

By presenting Schleiermacher almost exclusively as an intellectual and moral character type, his theology did not become a stumbling block for Disciples. The restitutionist and biblically oriented ecumenical agenda of the Restoration Movement could hardly have been more different intellectually from Schleiermacher’s views on religion in the *Speeches* or the ecclesiology of the *Glaubenslehre*.

Incidentally, Friedrich Lücke, whom Hooke translated, is the same theologian who also rediscovered and published Peter Meiderlin’s seventeenth-century *Paraenesis votiva* with the famous peace formula “In Essentials, Unity; in Non-Essentials, Liberty; in all Things, Charity,” which became one of the identifiable slogans of the Restoration Movement and for many years graced in a peculiarly administrative variant the masthead of J.H. Garrison’s and B.W. Johnson’s amalgamated journal *The Christian-Evangelist*.⁴

Finally, there is also Hooke’s translation from the German of a portion of the introduction to a commentary on the Gospel of John by the then best-selling evangelical theologian August Tholuck, who had a considerable number of disciples also in America.⁵ Character once again dominates this text choice. Hooke translates from Tholuck’s commentary on John that section in the introduction which explores the character of the Beloved Disciple as reflected in the patristic testimonials pertaining to John’s person. As so much in Tholuck’s writings, the biblical text and patristic witness have to yield prematurely to the needs of practical religiosity and religious experience. In the traditions about the Fourth Evangelist, strength of purposive action, yet balanced by the spirit of gentleness and love, become religious and moral desiderata for nineteenth-century people.

These translations and the speculative anthropology are surprising in a journal like the *Millennial Harbinger* which, on the whole, stays well within the Anglo-Saxon sphere of influence and champions intellectually an Enlightenment supernaturalism rather than its Romantic reaction. Where the Restoration Movement of the nineteenth century engages German theology at all, it speaks mainly of it in adversarial terms. The three contributions of A.P. Hooke stand somewhat like erratic blocks, were it not for the moral substratum of upper-class Victorian Disciples that could appreciate as well the cultural Protestantism of its German cousin.

We are not given anything else from the pen of A. P. Hooke, who vanished from the pages of the *Millennial Harbinger* and the consciousness of Disciples as quickly as he had appeared. The short-

lived presence raised, nevertheless, in the mind of this writer the question of who he might have been. What follows are some preliminary probings into the life and work of this unusual Disciple. I am most grateful to Ms. R. Jeanne Cobb, archivist of the T.W. Phillips Memorial Library of Bethany College; Mr. William H. Hooke, Jr., a relative of Alban P.; and Ms. Laura McLemore, Archivist of Austin College, for sharing materials with me that relate to the life and labors of A.P. Hooke.

Alban P. Hooke was the son of the Methodist clergyman Rev. Alban P. Hooke and Jane Magill Hooke of Marshallton, Chester Co., Pennsylvania.⁶ In 1851 he succeeded James P. Mason as chair of the mathematics department at Bethany College and may have been a teacher already at the institution for the academic year 1850-51. During his tenure at Bethany, he also taught astronomy and was, in 1853, a member of the committee engaged in the construction of a physical education building on campus. In July of 1854, Bethany's Board of Trustees accepted his resignation from the college, and no one less than that prominent Disciple Robert Milligan succeeded him in the chair of mathematics. While at Bethany, his younger brother, Ben P. Hooke, later a medical doctor in Andesville, Perry Co., Pennsylvania, was a student in the School of Mathematics, from which he graduated in 1853.⁷

After his departure, Alban P. Hooke seems to have stayed in touch with Bethany's president, Alexander Campbell, because in 1856, on one of his travels into eastern Virginia, he accompanied his old employer for part of the way. In his travel account, Campbell tells the readers that the former professor at Bethany was "now teaching an Academy at Walkerton, Virginia, ..." An "Editorial Notice" of March 1856 in the *Millennial Harbinger* reveals that Hooke had become the "Principal of a Male and Female Seminary at White Hall, King and Queen county, Va." Campbell reports as well the auspicious commencement of his principalship at the institution, also referred to as "Walkerton Male and Female Seminary," and is quite effusive in his advertisement about Hooke's and the academy's pedagogical prospects when he writes:

We are pleased to learn that already he has quite a respectable class of young gentlemen and ladies. We know that he lacks no talent, taste, or acquirements of any sort, to make his seminary a centre of much attraction to the youth of the country. We shall be much disappointed if he have not one of the best seminaries in that portion of the Old Dominion.⁹

In an item entitled "Our Schools and Colleges" in September of 1856 there is a further reference in the *Millennial Harbinger* to A.P. Hooke and his educational establishment. A former student at Bethany is mentioned as assistant to Principal A.P. Hooke: W.T. Boulware, a graduate in ancient and modern languages.¹⁰

Hooke seems to have been a restless soul, however, for a year later we find him no longer employed as a private-school principal in Virginia but as a teacher of languages at Austin College in Huntsville, Texas. He is married to a Virginian and advises his brother, Ben P., to marry rich, if at all possible. Family tradition has A.P. Hooke wedded to

the daughter of the governor of Texas, which appears unlikely, however, since the 1860 census of Walker county lists his wife as a native of Virginia.¹¹

Two letters from Austin College to Hooke's brother, the doctor, are revealing not only about the Texas frontier but also about Hooke's character and the reason for his disappearance without a trace from Disciples history. In his first letter, he reports that he was offered a pay increase from 1,300 to 1,500 dollars if he stayed at Austin College, an educational institution which Hooke considered as the finest in the state. He seems to have remained in the area at least until 1860, because the census still documents his presence in Walker Co.¹²

Whether he remained associated with Austin College is somewhat doubtful. According to the minutes of the Board of Trustees of 24 June 1858, Hooke, along with three others, was being considered for the position of professor of languages for the coming year, but he was not elected. Yet the letter of the previous year was very enthusiastic about the opportunities that Texas offered, a place which he called "out of this world," even if the whisky drinking habits of Texans did not find the approval of this easterner. Hooke appreciated the escape, whatever dark allusions these words hold, that the "new country" provided from old ties and "particular friends."¹³

The two letters are especially revealing about his religious disposition. In the first one, of 19 January, the former Disciples professor writes cryptically in connection with his brother's restored health by "dear Providence": "How would you like the dear old Episcopal church? It is the church, Ben." Later in the letter, he returns once more to this topic in connection with an intended "pious and goody letter" of Hooke's own wife Harriet to her brother-in-law. Hooke writes: "But remember the hint about the Episcopal Church." The mystery surrounding these words finds an answer in Hooke's letter to his brother of 1 April 1858. For here he reveals his intention to join the Episcopal Church. He writes:

If I live, I identify myself with the Episcopal Church next week. You each go as you please to the Episcopalians or Presbyterians, but I should prefer you with one in the good & the true Church, & the church that will increase in proportion to the culture of our people. Mark that. My heart is in this Church, but in no other.¹⁴

Hooke must have become dissatisfied with what he considered to be a culturally narrow religious option, although the importance of the "good & the true Church" may conceivably continue a theological focus of the Disciples.¹⁵

His articles, published during the stay at Huntsville, may have been a last attempt to express himself in the culturally most sophisticated medium of the Disciples, the *Millennial Harbinger*. The tribute to the intellectual and moral world of Schleiermacher and Tholuck, while providing religious solace to this "cultured despiser" of the Restoration Movement, stands as a singular witness to an ultimately different theological tradition. For this *Kulturprotestant* of the 1850s, while

anticipating the change in climate that would rock the Restoration Movement only a few decades later, must have felt so out of place in his adopted tradition that he eventually chose a route a few Restoration Movement members would also travel after him: the road to Canterbury.

Notes

¹I am grateful to several real and virtual friends who have commented upon this little article and to Shaun Casey who first drew my attention to Hooke's article on Schleiermacher.

²*The Millennial Harbinger*, January 1857, 41-2.

³*Ibid.*, February 1857, 68.

⁴See Hans Rollmann, "In Essentials Unity: The Pre-history of a Restoration Movement Slogan," *Restoration Quarterly* 39/3(1997), 129-39; also on-line via the following URL: http://www.rq.acu.edu/Volume_039/rq03903rollmann.htm

⁵*The Millennial Harbinger*, August 1857, 448-51.

⁶Communication of William Hooke, a direct descendant of Ben P. Hooke, Alban Hooke's brother.

⁷R. Jeanne Cobb to William H. Hooke, 23 January 1997: summary of Bethany archival records on Alban P. Hooke; also: A.P. Hooke, A Report of the Dep[artment] of Mathematics, Bethany College Archives, undated.

⁸Alexander Campbell, "Notes on a Tour to Eastern Virginia (No. II)," *Millennial Harbinger*, March 1856, 142; see also *ibid.*, April 1856, 211.

⁹*Millennial Harbinger*, March 1856, 175.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, September 1856, 533-4; also advertisement of 1856 by A.P. Hooke and Wm. T. Boulware (private possession of William H. Hooke).

¹¹The information regarding A.P. Hooke's stay in Texas is based on the Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Austin College of 24 June 1858 as well as census information supplied by Austin College archivist Ms. Laura McLemore.

¹²A.P. Hooke to Ben P. Hooke, from Austin College: 19 January and 1 April 1858 (private possession of William H. Hooke).

¹³A.P. Hooke to Ben P. Hooke, 18 January 1858.

¹⁴A.P. Hooke to Ben P. Hooke, 1 April 1858.

¹⁵*Ibid.*

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

MISSIONS AND EVANGELIZATION PRIOR TO 1848
Thomas H. Olbricht

ORIGIN AND LEGACY OF THE COMMON GLOBAL
MINISTRIES BOARD
William J. Nottingham

Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Lectures
October 1, 1998
11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Bethany College
Commencement Hall

**“Alexander Campbell's
Living Legacy in Education”**

Lecturers:
D. Duane Cummins
Gerald C. Tiffin

Phone: (304) 829-7111
for luncheon reservations



Volume 58 • Number 3 • Fall, 1998

Published by	DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY Peter M. Morgan, President (morganpm@aol.com)	
Founding Editor	Claude E. Spencer	
Editorial Committee	D. Newell Williams, Editor (nwilliam@cts.edu) Edward W. Dodds, Managing Editor (dishistsoc@aol.com) Anthony L. Dunnavant Douglas A. Foster Henry E. Webb	
Editorial Consultants	Carisse Berryhill James O. Duke David A. Jones Daisy L. Machado Eva Jean Wrather	Paul M. Blowers Richard T. Hughes Erma Jean Loveland Mark G. Toulouse
Board of Trustees Officers	Chairperson Vice-Chairperson Secretary Treasurer	William O. Paulsell Lester G. McAllister David A. Caldwell Charlotte H. Gadberry

DISCIPLIANA (USPS 995-060) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which was established in 1941 "to maintain and further interest in religious heritage, backgrounds, origins, development, and general history of Disciples of Christ, Christian Churches, Churches of Christ and related groups." Members of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society receive *DISCIPLIANA* quarterly, along with other benefits. Annual membership categories are: Sustaining - \$50 to \$249, Participating - \$30, Regular - \$20, Students - \$10.00, Non-U.S. - \$25. Life Memberships are: Life - \$250, Life Link - \$500, Life Patron - \$1,000.

Contributors to *DISCIPLIANA* should submit manuscripts on 3.5 floppy disk in Wordperfect 5.1 or "text" format. Electronic manuscript submission via "text only" formatted e-mail or attached file accepted at dishistsoc@aol.com. Postal mail should be addressed to: *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 Nineteenth Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196.

Phone: (615) 327-1444. Fax: (615) 327-1445. E-mail: dishistsoc@aol.com.
The Disciples of Christ Historical Society Home Page: <http://users.aol.com/dishistsoc>
Periodical postage paid at Nashville, TN.

Copyright 1997. Disciples of Christ Historical Society
Indexed by Restoration Serials Index
ISSN 0732-9881

Indexed in Religion Index One: Periodicals, the Index to Book Reviews in Religion, Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM, and the ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM, published by the American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston, IL 60201-5613. atla@atla.com <http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *DISCIPLIANA*, 1101 - 19th Avenue, South, Nashville, TN 37212-2196. Please give both old and new addresses and attach a mailing label from an old issue. USA: Please provide nine-digit code (ZIP +4).

—From the Editor's Desk

At the conclusion of Matthew's gospel, the risen Jesus commissions the eleven disciples saying, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you." The meaning and implications of this commission for the contemporary church have been the topic of much debate in the Stone-Campbell Movement and were a significant issue in the two major divisions of the Movement.

In "Missions and Evangelism Prior to 1848," Thomas H. Olbricht sets the early Stone-Campbell position on overseas missions in the context of eighteenth and early nineteenth century developments in evangelism and missions in Europe, Britain and America. Given Alexander Campbell's prominence in the Movement, Olbricht gives special attention to his early views on both mission and evangelism.

William J. Nottingham takes the story forward in "Origin and Legacy of the Common Global Ministries Board." Noting developments in Alexander Campbell's thought regarding missions, Nottingham discusses the formation of missionary societies in the Stone-Campbell Movement and their evolution into administrative units of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). He also traces the initiatives of the Division of Overseas Ministries and the Board for World Ministries of the United Church of Christ that have resulted in the formation of the Common Global Ministries Board, bringing the programs and activities of mission units of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and the United Church of Christ into one mission operation.

Both articles were first presented at the fifth annual Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Seminar for Stone-Campbell Historians, April 24-25, 1998. A paper by Frederick W. Norris, "Mission Among Christian Churches and Churches of Christ," was also presented at the April meeting and will be published in the Winter issue.

D. Newell Williams

—From the President's Desk

I sing of our leaders of intelligence. I sing of those who in memory glimpse Mr. Campbell in his study and nod in knowing approval. My song is inspired by a glimpse of the giants of that ilk, a privileged, private glimpse given by Willis Jones, my predecessor three times removed.

Willis is remembering.

Willis remembers his father, Edgar DeWitt Jones, pastor of the Central Woodward Christian Church of Detroit and a leader of intelligence of the Disciples in the first half of the 20th century. The scene is Pentwater in the dunes of Michigan where Edgar DeWitt Jones is gathered with his cronies Edward Scribner Ames, Charles Clayton Morrison, Winfred Ernest Garrison, George Alexander Campbell and Herbert L. Willett.

In freeze frame it is a Rushmore of our intelligentsia. But the scene is animated in play. Dr. Ames is Ed, Dr. Morrison is Charles, Dr. Garrison is Ernest, Dr. Campbell is George and Dr. Willett is Dr. Willett (never Herbert and most assuredly never Herb).

Edgar and Ernest are entertaining. The evening is spent in the rapture of beautiful language. Edgar and Ernest spontaneously alternate in reciting from memory the poetry of Shelley, Keats, Byron. The language soars in a crescendo of beauty, casting a magic spell. The evening is climaxed and concluded when Edgar turns to Ernest, "You know from memory the first book of Paradise Lost. Send us home with that one." Ernest obliges.

Willis remembers and I sing of gentle men and their giant minds.

Edgar was a leader of intelligence, a preacher and theologian. He was also an eminent Lincoln scholar. His work was recognized by the University of Michigan with an honorary doctorate. Edgar was also celebrated by his friend and fellow Lincoln scholar Carl Sandberg. Soon after Dr. Jones died Carl Sandberg received Edgar's last Lincoln paper and inscribed a message for the family: "Remembering an old friend with reverence."

I sing of our well-loved memories of our leaders of intelligence, including Edgar and his son Willis. And, I sing of you, gentle reader, as you read the pages of this scholarly journal. For my song of the giants is not to intimidate, but to inspire.

Peter M. Morgan

Missions and Evangelization Prior to 1848

by Thomas H. Olbricht*

Missions and evangelism are inextricably interlaced in the Stone-Campbell movement in the first half of the nineteenth century. In a sense, the outlook was evangelism yes and missions no, but it all depends on how these terms are defined. In these early years of the movement it is important, in order to appreciate what was going on, to assess missions and evangelism in eighteenth-century Christendom, and notably Protestantism. Especially apropos are developments in Continental Pietism and Moravianism, the Methodist movement and the Anglican Church. The reason these backgrounds are crucial is that the approaches to evangelism and missions in all wings of the Stone-Campbell movement are indebted to British evangelicalism, and to American awakening predilections since it was from among these peoples that the leaders of the movement came.

The Beginnings of Missions

Christianity began as a missions-oriented faith, the disciples being sent out two by two and the tradition being that the twelve took responsibility for different regions of the ancient world. Whatever may have been the accuracy of the latter claim, by the fourth century A. D., Christianity extended from Roman Great Britain to beyond the Indus River and into China. In the fourteenth century, Roman Catholic missionaries could be found among the Muslims, the Mongols in what is now eastern Russia, China, India, and by the sixteenth century in regions of Africa and Central and South America.¹ The churches of the reformation carried their new perspectives into their own regions and wherever these Protestants relocated, but only a few individuals promoted missions to non-Christian populations of the world.

The primary task of the Lutheran and Swiss Reformers in the early years was to restore the churches in their regions to what they perceived as original, Biblical visions of Christianity. Afterward the religious wars broke out, the best known being the Thirty Years War in central Europe (1618-1648). Luther was aware of the need to carry the gospel to other lands, but he never proposed any foreign missions. In the seventeenth century various Lutheran leaders opposed missions on the grounds that the ordination for preaching to the world was available only for the Apostles and included the gift of tongues. According to a handbook published at the University of Wittenburg 1651-52, no later missions commission is assured, and therefore Christians are to stay in their own community in order to establish the true church. Alexander Campbell, in the 1820s opposed missions for similar reasons as we shall see. The Reformers in Switzerland under the leadership of John Calvin thought much the same way and certain later Calvinists questioned whether it

*Thomas H. Olbricht is Distinguished Professor of Religion, Emeritus, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California.

was not presumptuous to try to force foreordained conversion through preaching and missions.²

Changes in outlook in regard to both missions and evangelism came with the rise of the Pietist movement. The father of German pietism was Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705) born in Rappoltswiler. He emphasized the practical side of the church and in Frankfurt set out to train the young, and to encourage private devotional meetings especially spent in a study of Scripture. He also developed a new approach to preaching which he designated edification. He was later able, because of a church role in Berlin, to influence the new University at Halle (1694) in the direction of Pietism.³

The new publicly explicit path to conversion, however, was pioneered by August Hermann Francke (1663-1727) who was mentored by Spener, and who received an appointment to a professorship at Halle because of Spener. Francke was born in Lübeck and after studying at Erfurt and Kiel was called to Leipzig as a teacher of Hebrew in 1684. He read Johann Arnd (1555-1621) a Lutheran with mystical tendencies, and other mystics and commenced a long series involving the translation of the mystics. After meeting with Spener, Francke and another professor launched a Bible class for students. In 1687 he was invited to Lüneburg and asked to preach on John 20:31. In preparing the sermon on faith he concluded that he himself did not possess true faith. He began to question the Bible, God receded, and his sins appeared in bold relief. He spent time in prayer to the God in whom he did not believe. On Saturday he decided not to preach, and fell once more to his knees begging God for mercy. All at once he experienced the living God and was able to call him father. He sprang up joyfully and praised God. From his own experience he concluded that everyone should be involved in such a struggle and should be able to give an exact date for their conversion. Soon Francke required a similar experience from all connected with him. It was this experience which ultimately became standard for the American awakenings. John Calvin himself professed an experience, but he never revealed the exact nature of it. The conversion experience of Francke became the norm for later Calvinists. So ironically the "Calvinist" conversion experience, so labeled by its opponents, was actually Franckean or Pietistic.

The result was that this adult conversion experience led those who embraced it to a new urgency of evangelism and missions which later was transported to America. The first Lutheran missions were launched by King Frederick IV of Denmark and organized through his court chaplain. Soon, however, Francke was involved. The first missionaries were Bartholomew Ziegenbalg (1682-1719) and Henry Plütschau (1678-1747) who set sail for the Danish colony of Tranquebar in India. Ziegenbalg perceived himself as Christ's ambassador to all of India and emphasized that "...every Christian living among non-Christians is a missionary," a point Alexander Campbell was to make later.⁴ Both Ziegenbalg and Plütschau were born in northern Germany and studied at the University at Halle under Francke.⁵ In the eighteenth century at

least sixty missionaries who spent some time in Halle went to various regions of the world, the most famous of whom was Christian Friedrich Schwartz (1726-1798) who labored in India.⁶

These Pietist interests in evangelism and missions also influenced Count Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760) and the Moravians, and through the latter, John Wesley and the Methodists. Zinzendorf was born at Dresden and studied at Francke's school in Halle where he came under the influence of Lutheran Pietism. In 1722 a religious community designated Herrnhut was founded on his estate east of Dresden made up of exiles from Bohemia, the Moravian Brethren (*Unitas Fratrum*). In 1727 Zinzendorf accepted a role of leadership in the community which by now included several German Pietists. As the result of visiting in Denmark at the coronation of Christian VI, Zinzendorf came in contact with natives from the West Indies and Greenland igniting his passions for missions. Soon missionaries from Herrnhut traveled to various places of the world, including August Gottlieb Spangenberg (1704-1792) and others to Georgia in 1735.⁷ Zinzendorf came to America in 1741, and named the Moravian settlement in Pennsylvania, Bethlehem.⁸

In England the earliest interests in missions were reflected in founding of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge by Thomas Bray and four laymen in 1698 (SPCK). At first the work was focused on charity schools in England and Wales. In 1701 the same group formed the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts (SPG) to supply materials for Britishers in foreign lands and for evangelizing non-Christians mostly in British colonies. Still, however, the greatest mission thrust came about as the result of the influence of the "Evangelical Revival" of John Wesley (1703-1791), Charles Wesley (1707-1788) and George Whitefield (1714-1770). The Methodist Missionary Society was founded in 1786, and the Baptist Mission Society in 1792, the latter which sent the famous missionary William Carey (1761-1834) to India in 1793. The London Missionary Society was founded in 1795, the Church Missionary Society in 1799, and the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804.⁹

John Wesley set out in 1735 with his brother Charles to Georgia under the auspices of the SPG. By his own admission his efforts were by and large ineffective and he returned home in 1737. In Georgia and on the trips across the Atlantic he had considerable contact with the Moravians, and even at one time considered joining them. In 1738 in London, after contact with Moravian Peter Böhler, on May 24, he experienced a Pietist type conversion experience, in which he felt his heart "strangely warmed." In August he made a pilgrimage to Herrnhut, and upon his return he and his "Methodist" friends commenced evangelizing in London and elsewhere. "The pattern was exactly that of Herrnhut and the religious societies, viz., revivalistic preaching and organization of small groups."¹⁰

George Whitefield soon took up the Wesleyan teachings on piety and spiritual regeneration. After his ordination in 1737 he preached

throughout England, often in open fields, sparking what British writers refer to as the Evangelical Revival. The Revival was a counterpart to the Great Awakening in America. Whitefield seldom spent more than one day in a town or more than a month in a region. His preaching, unlike most sermonizing in the Anglican church which involved writing manuscripts and reading them, was extemporaneous, if not impromptu. Whitefield made seven preaching trips to America, his greatest success coming on his second tour 1739-41, and especially his travel through the towns of New England in 1740. He made his final trip in 1769-70 on the eve of the Revolutionary War.¹¹

The Great Awakening in America

Now that we have explored the European backgrounds we are ready to notice the impact these movements had in America. The first American signs of the Awakening resulted from the preaching of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen (1691-1747) in the Raritan Valley of New Jersey. Frelinghuysen, who immigrated from the Netherlands in 1720, was influenced by the Pietists. He made a considerable impression on William Tennant (1673-1746) and Gilbert Tennant (1703-1764), as well as Jonathan Edwards. William Tennant, a Presbyterian, took up the challenge of the revivalistic approach, and opened a school for young men including his four sons, which later was declared the Log College. His son Gilbert was one of the significant revivalists in the Great Awakening and was sought out by George Whitefield in 1739. Gilbert Tennant, in the manner of Whitefield, emphasized extempore preaching, and especially the use of personal pronouns by which he directly addressed his auditors. Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), a Yale graduate, followed the course of the awakening, and his preaching sparked an awakening in his Northampton, Massachusetts, congregation in 1734-35. In 1737 he published *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of Many Hundred Souls in Northampton* which provided a pattern for the revivals which swept through the colonies from north to south.¹²

The approaches in the Great Awakening were much like those of George Whitefield, and many ministers traveled from place to place staying not more than one or two nights in any specific locality. One such evangelist was Eleazar Wheelock (1711-1779), a graduate of Yale, one of the most active itinerant preachers in New England. Later Wheelock became interested in evangelizing the Mohegan Indians. He set up a school for Native Americans which upon being moved to Hanover, New Hampshire, in 1769 became Dartmouth College.¹³

The effects of the Great Awakening still lingered as the new groups that later fed the Stone-Campbell movement emerged, especially on two fronts, first in the middle colonies (specifically Virginia and North Carolina) and then in New England. The roots of the Stone-Campbell Movement extend backward to the period after the Revolutionary War in which several Americans with religious interests grew restless over autocratic structures, European control and theology, and

denominational boundaries. These pressures revamped the mainline churches, but also resulted in independent constituencies springing up in various regions. Four such independent groups in (1) Virginia, (2) New England, (3) Kentucky and (4) Pennsylvania—western Virginia—Ohio, played a key role in the crystallization of the Stone-Campbell Movement in the 1830s. The contributions of the constituencies in Virginia and New England were contributory rather than direct.

In Virginia in the 1780s, a group of Methodist ministers led by James O’Kelly (1757-1826) sought freedom from supervision so that Methodist circuit riders could determine their own itinerary.¹⁴ Methodist circuit riding continued the practice of the Evangelical Revival in England and the Great Awakening in America. For a time it seemed that the O’Kelly group would succeed, but the outcome was that the prerogatives of the Bishop, Francis Asbury were upheld. Those who favored self determination broke away, founding the Republican Methodist Church. In 1794 they changed the name of the body to the Christian Church. Before the turn of the century preachers from the O’Kelly movement were traveling into the Carolinas and making their way through the Cumberland Gap into Kentucky and Tennessee. They also went west to the Ohio River and migrated into Ohio and Indiana. The evangelistic approaches remained those of the Great Awakening.¹⁵

In New England, especially in the newly developing regions of New Hampshire and Vermont, persons of Baptist heritage, chiefly Abner Jones (1772-1841) and Elias Smith (1769-1846), formed new churches.¹⁶ They went by the name Christian, or Christian Connexion. They championed defeat of tax support for establishment ministers (Congregational), and rejected the Calvinistic features of Puritan theology in regard to election and predestination. The Bible was heralded, especially the New Testament, as the only source of authority and faith. In their opinion, Christians should cut adrift from historical encrustations so as to create the New Testament church in its first-century purity. They started migrating westward after 1810, into upper New York, where they became especially strong, then on to Ohio, Indiana and Michigan. As with the O’Kelly group, their evangelistic approaches remained those of the Great Awakening.¹⁷

The Second Awakening

The Second Awakening commenced with the great camp meetings, beginning in Logan County Kentucky, in 1800. A new arrival in the state, Barton W. Stone (1772-1844) traveled westward to witness the excitement at first hand, then returned to Bourbon County, that is, Cane Ridge, and helped arrange the great 1801 camp meeting which became the bench mark for all later ones. Because of these meetings in which persons from all the frontier denominations were involved, barriers crumbled and the call to struggle, followed by conversion, diluted traditional election theology. As the months wore on, some of the preachers, especially among the Presbyterians, favored the ecumenical savor. They thereupon formed an independent presbytery. Not too long

after, carrying their interests to their logical conclusions, they dissolved the Springfield Presbytery in order to “sink into union with the body of Christ at large.” These leaders found many frontiersmen ready to embrace their sentiments and rapid growth ensued. Barton Warren Stone, born in Maryland, and who later lived in North Carolina before migrating to Kentucky, eventually emerged as the chief spokesman.

The approach of the camp meetings were much the same as in the Great Awakening, except that people assembled for a long stay and the preachers proclaimed in one place rather than one night stands in the small towns. Another new development was the invitation to enter the designated area or pen, in order to “struggle through.” This process was later designated “the altar call” when extended in church buildings and it invited the listener to come forward to the mourner’s bench.

Descriptions of the group struggles for salvation from the Great Awakening do not mention an invitation or altar call. The reason for its creation came about because of the circumstances of the camp meetings. It was common for people to repair to the woods to struggle. But with the multitudes present, Barton W. Stone estimated 20,000 to 30,000 at Cane Ridge, struggles other than for salvation occurred in the woods. So before the “preacher stands” in the woods, pens of logs were constructed and persons interested in the welfare of their souls were invited to enter.¹⁸

The Campbells

The Campbells, father Thomas (1763-1854) and son, Alexander (1788-1866) provided for the most part the intellectual vision for the Stone-Campbell Movement. Though they at first followed a less aggressive British mode of evangelism, upon the successes of Walter Scott on the Western Reserve, they adapted to the Awakening mode, but without the experiential conversion aspect.

In 1807 Thomas Campbell, born in North Ireland of Scottish descent, arrived in Pennsylvania, settling in Washington County. Long a Presbyterian minister, he exerted considerable energy in the land of his nativity in a struggle to unify dissident Presbyterian groups. His efforts at similar rapprochement in Pennsylvania resulted in litigation to oust him from the his presbytery. Seeing the handwriting on the wall, he resigned and with others of like-mind, formed the Christian Association of Washington, Pennsylvania. In 1809, his gifted son Alexander arrived with the rest of Thomas’ family from a stint at the University of Glasgow. Out of the Campbells’ efforts, churches were formed in the region around Pittsburgh. After 1816, the Campbells joined with Baptist ministers of the Redstone and later the Mahoning Associations, winning several Ohio and Kentucky Baptist churches to their outlooks. The Campbells envisioned a mass exodus of believers from sectarian Protestantism so as to become one body, one New Testament church.

Early in the 1830s the churches from the Stone and Campbell groups commenced merging in Kentucky. The amalgamation expanded to churches in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia, Tennessee, Indiana, Illinois,

and Missouri. Several churches from the New England Jones-Smith, and Virginia O'Kelly movement also became a part of the Stone-Campbell merger. After the Civil War the Christian Connexion churches which did not merge established headquarters in Dayton, Ohio. In 1931 they merged with the Congregational Church, then with the Evangelical and Reformed Church, to form in 1957 the United Church of Christ. The Stone-Campbell churches of the 1832 merger, usually going by the name Christian Churches, multiplied rapidly, becoming the fastest growing indigenous American church, reaching a million members before 1900.

By 1850 Alexander Campbell, because of his journal editing, book publishing, debating, lecturing, and founding Bethany College, became the best known leader of the movement. His outlooks left a permanent stamp on all his descendants regardless of location on the theological spectrum. His views definitely influenced the Churches of Christ even though the perspectives of David Lipscomb (1831-1917) of Nashville, Tennessee, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, modified certain views. Thomas and Alexander Campbell were highly influenced by the Scottish Enlightenment which emphasized reason as opposed to enthusiasm, and exterior constructs in regard to the church, as opposed to inner feelings, though Alexander moved beyond his father in the rejection of experiential religion. The Campbells modified their reform views, that is, the heritage of John Calvin (1509-1564), accordingly, though remaining far more Reformed than they themselves recognized.

The early evangelistic outlook of the Campbells is declared in a document which became a classic, that is, the *Declaration and Address* published in 1809.¹⁹ It represented the decision of those involved in the forming of the Washington Association, but likely was mostly written by Thomas Campbell. The declared purpose of the Washington Association was:

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

II. That this Society, formed for the sole purpose of promoting simple evangelical Christianity, shall to the utmost of its power, countenance and support such ministers, and such only, as exhibit a manifest conformity to the original standard in conversation and doctrine, in zeal and diligence; only such as reduce to practice that simple original form of Christianity, expressly exhibited upon the sacred page...²⁰

The backdrop for the *Declaration and Address* has often been studied from the perspective of the British Enlightenment. But Hiram Lester has shown the more immediate background is the British evangelical renewal in the last decade of the eighteenth century, especially related to the form and function of the *Declaration and Address*.²¹ Several evangelical missionary and Bible societies were formed in the United Kingdom between 1790 and 1820. The paradigm for these societies was The London Missionary Society founded in 1795.

The London Missionary Society was founded by a body of Congregationalists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Wesleyans who combined to promote Christian missions to the heathen. The first 29 missionaries under its auspices sailed to Tahiti in 1796. It was one of its principles that no form of denominationalism should be preached by its members, but that decisions about the form of Church government be left to those whom they should convert.²²

Though the Society continued to exist, it did not live up to its original ecumenical vision. The *Declaration and Address* follows almost exactly the foundational documents of the LMS.²³ Thomas Campbell himself was involved in founding the Evangelical Society of Ulster dedicated to itinerant preaching after the manner of the earlier evangelical revival of the Wesleyans. Though Thomas Campbell was an active participant in the Society he later was forced to curtail his activities because of the Synod of Ulster.²⁴

Despite these evangelical roots, however, the Campbells did little to spark evangelism of either the British or American variety. In fact, Alexander Campbell at times seemed to oppose it. The early task of the Campbells, as was true of the magisterial reformers, was the reformation of the church, for the former from its divided status. The Campbells were not that evangelistic at home, and did not lift their eyes at that time to other peoples and cultures.

From the first year of the *Christian Baptist*, Alexander Campbell included reports of foreign missionaries and typically disparaged their efforts. In a lengthy statement in the first issue of the *Christian Baptist* Alexander Campbell first criticized the crusades as based on superstitious views of holy places in Palestine. He next criticized the Roman Catholic efforts to missionize for three hundred years throughout the world calling that church the “most superstitious sect in christendom”.²⁵ He doubted that the people they missionized were any better off as the result, than before they arrived. He next presented what he considered the capital mistakes of modern mission schemes. He declared that the efforts of Moses, Joshua, John the Baptist, Jesus, the seventy disciples were all accompanied by signs and wonders. When these missions ceased, so did the signs and wonders.

Those spiritual gifts continued until the gospel was preached to all the world, Jews and Gentiles, and until churches were planted to all nations. Then they ceased. Why? Doubtless, because, in the eyes of Omniscience, they were no longer necessary. The missionary work was done. The gospel had been preached unto all nations before the end of the apostolic age. The Bible, then, gives us no idea of a missionary without the power of working miracles....From these plain and obvious facts and considerations, it is evident that it is a capital mistake to suppose that missionaries in heathen lands, without the power of working miracles can succeed in establishing the christian religion.²⁶

Campbell admitted that in modern times even without these gifts, certain persons had been won, though not to Christianity, but to sectarian systems. The task of taking the gospel to the world is thus assigned to the church and not to a mission organization.²⁷ The gospel

has a social nature and cannot succeed simply by the presence of a missionary family or two. It can only succeed when a church is present. And that church must “return to the ancient model delineated in the New Testament;...and keep the ordinances as delivered unto them by the apostles.”²⁸ Campbell then set forth his vision of how foreign heathen might be won.

If, in the present day, and amongst all those who talk so much of a missionary spirit, there could be found such a society, though it were composed of but twenty, willing to emigrate to some heathen land, where they would support themselves like the natives, wear the same garb, adopt the country as their own, and profess nothing like a missionary project; should such a society sit down and hold forth in word and deed the saving truth, not deriding the gods or the religion of the natives, but allowing their own works and example to speak for their religion, and practising as above hinted; we are persuaded that, in process of time, a more solid foundation for the conversion of the natives would be laid, and more actual success resulting, than from all the missionaries employed for 25 years. Such a course would have some warrant from scripture; but the present has proved itself to be all human.²⁹

Although Campbell's argument does not have to do with the Apostolic commission, nevertheless his position is much like that of the earlier Lutheran opponents to foreign missions. Since Campbell was so widely read, it seems likely that he was familiar with these earlier arguments. Campbell was later somewhat more positive. In the 1832 *Millennial Harbinger* he published with favorable comment a report by the “distinguished missionary” Adoniram Judson.³⁰ The views of Campbell on mission societies gradually mellowed into the 1840s.

Despite Campbell's objection to foreign missions, however, he supported the efforts of churches to cooperate in efforts to evangelize the United States. I will set forth Missouri as an example of cooperative efforts. By the time of the Civil War the Stone-Campbell Movement in Missouri was the largest religious group. The first churches, those of a Stone, O'Kelly or Jones/Smith background, were established in the region west of Jefferson City and Columbia in 1816.³¹ The first annual meeting was held in 1837 in Boone County. Twenty-three churches were reported upon with about 1500 members and 150 had obeyed the gospel in the previous year.³² The meeting at Paris in 1838 reported 350 additions. In 1841 in Fayette, 71 churches were reported with 4,735 members and 1,589 additions.³³ In 1844 at Fayette, 81 congregations were reported with 5,543 members and 1,282 additions. In 1845 Alexander Campbell attended the state meeting at Columbia and T. M. Allen reported 196 congregations with 13,057 members and 1,740 additions. The first effort at cooperative evangelism in the state occurred in 1841 in which J. P. Lancaster and Allen Wright were selected to evangelize.³⁴ No money was declared for their support under the supposition that the churches they would visit would supply the needs. In 1853, the state meeting selected James N. Wright and T. P. Haley to evangelize in northeast Missouri and stipulated that they receive \$400 a year, should they be able to raise it.³⁵ Similar efforts at state evangelism

could be found likewise in Kentucky, Tennessee and elsewhere.

Walter Scott

We now turn now to Walter Scott (1796-1861) who set the method and tone for the future course of evangelism in the Stone-Campbell Movement for the next one hundred years and beyond. Scott was born in Moffatt, Dumfriesshire, Scotland, and educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1818, at the invitation of a New York uncle, he immigrated and served as a Latin tutor on Long Island.³⁶ He moved to Pittsburgh in 1819 where he taught in an academy founded by George Forrester. Forrester was the preacher for a small church influenced by James A. and Robert Haldane. Scott was baptized, and a year later succeeded Forrester as teacher and minister upon Forrester's untimely death by drowning. In 1821 Scott became a tutor in Robert Richardson's school and there he met Alexander Campbell.

Scott was more interested in the ancient gospel and conversions than in the ancient order, that is, restoring the church. He concluded that the central point of Christianity is that Jesus is the Son of God, the Messiah. Scott first attended the annual meeting of the Mahoning Association at Canfield, Ohio, in 1826, at which he was invited to preach, though not a member. The next year Scott also attended at New Lisbon, Ohio. The discussion in 1827 centered upon appointing an evangelist for the Association. The Association voted to appoint Walter Scott, and after a time of contemplating the position, Scott accepted. His approach was like that of the awakenings, holding one or two day meetings in the churches of the Association or elsewhere, then moving on. According to the report of the Mahoning Association in 1827, there were 17 churches, and 34 converts for the year, but the total gain was only 13 persons. So how was Scott to turn this around? As yet the Campbell reformers did not offer an invitation at the close of sermons. Scott was interested in the successes connected with the invitation, but he sought to sidestep the effects of mourner-bench exhortation. It came to him that in the New Testament after the preaching of Christ, people were exhorted to be baptized. So this is what Walter Scott proceeded to do. He gave much attention to the order of items by which people came to salvation. In a much repeated story, he decided that the Gospel could be preached on the five fingers of a hand, that is, a five step plan of salvation. He told children to invite their parents to hear a man who declared that he would preach the gospel from the five fingers on his hand. The five steps were: 1. Faith, 2. Repentance, 3. Baptism, 4. Remission of Sins, and 5. The receiving of the Holy Spirit. Later Scott emphasized six steps:

THE GOSPEL

Duties

1. Faith. 2. Repentance. 3. Baptism

Privileges

1. Remission. 2. The Holy Spirit. 3. Eternal Life³⁷

The first time Scott offered the invitation so as to be baptized no one

came forward.

The second time Scott so offered the invitation he was in New Lisbon, Ohio, November 18, 1827. He decided to preach on Matthew 16:16 and Acts 2:38. As he was about to conclude the sermon a stranger arrived, and when the invitation was offered he responded, taking even Scott by surprise. The man's name was William Amend, a Presbyterian. He later described for Scott in writing the reasons for his unexpected response.

I had read the second chapter of Acts, when I expressed to myself to my wife as follows: Oh this is the gospel; this is the thing we wish—the remission of our sins! Oh that I could hear the gospel in these same words as Peter preached it! I hope I shall some day hear it, and the first man I meet who will preach the gospel thus, with him will I go...on the day you saw me come into the meeting-house my heart was open to receive the word of God, and when you cried... “Is there any man present who will take God at his word and be baptized for the remission of sins?”³⁸

The next time when Scott offered the invitation seventeen responded. When the year was up at the 1828 annual meeting of the Mahoning Association, Scott reported a thousand baptisms. During the course of his life Scott baptized over 30,000 persons.

The results were astounding if not puzzling to the Campbells. So Thomas Campbell went to the Western Reserve to witness Scott's methods first hand. He later wrote Alexander:

I perceive that theory and practice in religion, as well as in other things, are matters of distinct consideration. We have long known the former (the theory), and have spoken and published many things correctly concerning the ancient gospel...but I must confess that, in respect of the direct exhibition and application of it for that blessed purpose, I am at present, for the first time, upon the ground where the thing has appeared to be practically exhibited to the proper purpose.³⁹

Prior to 1827 Alexander Campbell did not report conversions in his writings. But soon he too took up the method popularized by Scott. In the 1836 *Millennial Harbinger* (485) he reported on his trip to the Northeast, in this case upper state New York:

The brethren in Cicero have a house commodious and agreeable to speak in. After our first three discourses here, five trust-worthy candidates came forward and confessed the Lord. They were immersed in the beautiful Oneida, three miles distant.

Later on the same trip when in the vicinity of Boston he wrote (546):

In Lynn there were some ten or a dozen immersed during our continuance in Massachusetts. A number also were added to the church in Boston, and the prospects of the future were full of promise.

These were churches of the Jones-Smith movement.

Such reports from other preachers appeared regularly in the *Millennial*

Harbinger, for example in 1835 (611):

On the fourth Lord's day in October our beloved and talented brother, T. Fanning, addressed the congregation in Georgetown, and Captain Warren, of the United States Navy, his wife, and daughter were immersed. They spent the Summer in Georgetown; and though they had not previously heard the ancient gospel, they soon embraced the truth...Brother T. Smith of Garrard county, writes us, October 21, that he and brother J. Creath, Jun. had a four day's meeting at Antioch...Twenty were immersed and two from the Baptists united with the brethren. Brother Smith immersed two at the Forks of Elkhorn...Brother O. Austin writes us, New Albany, Indiana, October 2, "Since I last wrote you twenty-two more have been immersed, among them were several Methodists...Brother D. S. Burnet, of Cincinnati, Ohio, writes, October 13, "Last Lord's day I immersed five persons, and Monday three. Last week there were twenty immersed at Dayton."

Conclusions: The missions and evangelism of the Stone-Campbell Movement drew heavily upon the prior approaches of the Pietists, the British Methodists, the Evangelical revivals in Great Britain, but especially from the Great Awakening and the Second Awakenings in America. But the leaders of the movement adopted these approaches to reflect their own understandings of the Biblical faith.

Notes

¹*Christianity and Missions, 1450-1800*, edited by J.S. Cummins (Brookfield, Vt. : Variorum, 1997). For Roman Catholic missions in America see: Charles H. Lippy, Robert Choquette, Stafford Poole, *Christianity Comes to the Americas, 1492-1776* (New York: Paragon House, 1992) 1-242. For a more extensive perspective on Roman Catholic missions see: *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques d'après la conception originale de J. L. Francois*, ed. S. Delacroix (Paris: Grund, 1956-) 4 vols.

²Victor B. Howard, *Conscience and Slavery: the Evangelistic Calvinist Domestic Missions, 1837-1861* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1990).

³J. Wallmann, *Philipp Jakob Spener und die Anfänge des Pietismus* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 42, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1970).

⁴Walter Holsten, "Missionary Activity (Protestant)," *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1956) 1595-1599.

⁵Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg, *Propagation of the gospel in the East: being an account of the success of two Danish missionaries, lately sent to the East-Indies, for the conversion of the heathens in Malabar. In several letters to their correspondents in Europe. Containing a narrative of their voyage to the coast of Coromandel, their settlement at Tranquebar, the divinity and philosophy of the Malabarians, their language and manners, the impediments obstructing their conversion, the several methods taken by these missionaries, the wonderful providences attending them, and the progress they have already made.* (London: Joseph Downing, 1718.) 3rd Edition.

⁶Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959) 448-449.

⁷Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, 452.

⁸Arthur James Lewis, *Zinzendorf, the Ecumenical Pioneer : a Study in the Moravian contribution to Christian Mission and Unity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962).

⁹"Missions" *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) 1095.

¹⁰Martin Schmidt, "Wesley, The Methodist Movement," *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church*, 2470.

¹¹Harry S. Stout, *The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).

¹²Jonathan Edwards, *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising work of God in the Conversion of many Hundred Souls in Northampton, and the Neighboring Towns and Villages of*

the County of Hampshire, in the Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New-England (Boston: 1737).

¹³Edwin Scott Gaustad, *The Great Awakening in New England* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957) 45, 46.

¹⁴Wilbur E. MacClenny, *The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly* (Raleigh: 1910).

¹⁵*The Heart of Asbury's Journal*, ed. Ezra Squier Tipple (New York: Eaton & Mains) 354.

¹⁶Thomas H. Olbricht, "Christian Connexion and Unitarian Relations 1800-1844," *Restoration Quarterly* 9, (1966) 160-186.

¹⁷A. D. Jones, *Memoirs of Elder Abner Jones* (Boston: William Crosby & Company, 1842) 1; *Elias Smith*, *The Life, Conversion, Preaching, travels, and Suffering* (Boston: B. True, 1840) 24.

¹⁸Thomas H. Olbricht, "The Invitation: A Historical Survey," *Restoration Quarterly*, 5 (1961) 6-16.

¹⁹*Declaration and Address*, in *Historical Documents Advocating Christian Union*, ed. Charles Alexander Young (Chicago: The Christian Century Company, 1904) 71-216.

²⁰*Declaration and Address*, 74, 75.

²¹Hiram Lester, "The Form and Function of Thomas Campbell's Declaration and Address," unpublished manuscript, to be published in a book on the *Declaration and Address* to be edited by Hans Rollmann and Thomas H. Olbricht, likely to appear in late 1999.

²²"LMS" *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 991. See also: Richard Lovett, *The History of the London Missionary Society 1795-1895* (London, 1899).

²³Hiram Lester, "The Form and Function", 8.

²⁴Hiram Lester, "The Form and Function", 14. See also: David Hempton and Myrtle Hill, *Evangelical Protestantism in Ulster Society, 1740-1890* (London: Routledge, 1992).

²⁵Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, 1827, 39. (reprint, Nashville: Gospel Advocate, 1955).

²⁶Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, 42.

²⁷Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, 43.

²⁸Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, 44.

²⁹Alexander Campbell, *The Christian Baptist*, 45.

³⁰Alexander Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, 326. In *MH*, 1831, he argued that thirty years of Baptist presence in India had resulted in at most 250 Indian Christians, a small return compared with such efforts in America. In the *MH* 1834 Campbell argued that neither Pagans, Jews or Turks could be converted to Christianity by any sects or all the sects of Christendom. Rather, "If all were united upon the *Apostles' Doctrine and Ordinances* the *light* of christianity and its *love* would melt not only the ice mountains of Siberia, but the golden calves and images of a thousand superstitions." 536.

³¹George L. Peters, *The Disciples of Christ in Missouri Celebrating One Hundred Years of Co-operative Work* (The Centennial Commission, 1837) 29.

³²George L. Peters, *The Disciples of Christ in Missouri*, 45.

³³George L. Peters, *The Disciples of Christ in Missouri*, 49.

³⁴George L. Peters, *The Disciples of Christ in Missouri*, 63.

³⁵George L. Peters, *The Disciples of Christ in Missouri*, 64.

³⁶Biographies are: William Baxter, *Life of Elder Walter Scott: With Sketches of His Fellow-Laborers, William Hayden, Adamson Bentley, John Henry, and Others* (Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase, & Hall, 1874); Dwight E. Stevenson, *Walter Scott: Voice of the Golden Oracle: A Biography* (St Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1946); and William A. Gerrard III, *A Biographical Study of Walter Scott American Frontier Evangelist* (Joplin: College Press, 1992).

³⁷Walter Scott, *The Messiahship or Great Demonstration* (Cincinnati: H. S. Bosworth, 1859) 293.

³⁸A. S. Hayden, *The History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, Ohio; with Biographical Sketches of the Principle Agents in Their Religious Movement* (Cincinnati: Chase and Hall, 1875) 76.

³⁹William Baxter, *Life of Elder Walter Scott*, 158-159.

Origin and Legacy of the Common Global Ministries Board

by William J. Nottingham*

Our study includes first the American Christian Missionary Society of which Alexander Campbell was president for many years, the Christian Woman's Board of Missions organized in 1874, the Foreign Christian Missionary Society dating from 1875, the merging of these three societies into the United Christian Missionary Society in 1920, reorganization and creation of the Division of Overseas Ministries and the Division of Homeland Ministries in 1973, and the Common Global Ministries Board in cooperation with the United Church of Christ in 1996. The characteristics of faith, leadership and temperament which prevailed in the organized missionary work in the first place were precisely the determining factors which led to the restructure of the Disciples of Christ as the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the United States and Canada. To know what we are dealing with concretely, we must begin with the present on the threshold of the 21st century, following a span of two centuries which, for our purposes, may be called "the American missionary centuries." We begin with today and the mission imperative of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the US and Canada approved by the General Assembly meeting in Pittsburgh in 1995: "We believe God's mission for the church is to be and to share the Good News of Jesus Christ, witnessing and serving from our doorsteps 'to the ends of the earth'" (Acts 1:8).¹

The missionary societies have resulted in two units of this church, namely the Divisions of Overseas Ministries (DOM) and Homeland Ministries (DHM). These two units are the immediate heirs of the United Society, already in existence twenty-five years, and including much of the continuing work of the earlier societies. The affairs of the nineteenth-century societies and the UCMS are everyday concerns of DOM and DHM, not only in ancient legal ties or long-standing mission administration and fellowship, but extended into many new partner church relationships, ecumenical councils, support of evangelism and pastoral care, ministries of health and education, justice for women and children, and care for the environment. The collective financial legacies of \$40 million still are managed by a small board of trustees in the name of UCMS. The Christian Church Foundation, another unit of the church, has been contracted for treasury services since 1993. Every year the three predecessor bodies are called into session, a board and officers elected, minutes recorded, and any business undertaken if necessary at the request of DOM and Homeland Ministries.

The mission statement drawn up by the board of directors of the Division of Homeland Ministries and president Ann Updegraff Spleth in

*William J. Nottingham is retired President of the Disciples of Christ Division of Overseas Ministries. He resides in Indianapolis, Indiana.

November, 1997, states: "God calls Homeland Ministries to serve the church and the society one congregation at a time, one person at a time, through Faith and Leadership Development, Evangelism, Ministries of Justice and Compassion." DHM includes the Office of Disciples Women which traces its past to 1874 and well before that, as seen in the long-overdue tribute of the Chalice Press book by Debra Beery Hull *Christian Church Women: Shapers of a Movement* (1994).

Concerning the other unit, the important new development pointing to the next century is the Common Global Ministries Board which brings together the programs and activities of the Division of Overseas Ministries and the United Church Board for World Ministries into one mission operation. Since 1967, thanks to the initiative of Alford Carleton and Virgil Sly, then T. J. Liggett and Robert A. Thomas, there have been joint offices serving both boards. Since January 1, 1994, all area executive secretaries have been shared, as well as the personnel officer, recruitment, deputation, etc. The motivation was the emphasis of the 1960s on Joint Action for Mission and the strong ecumenical commitment of the two churches, related to the same partners in many places and wishing to put into practice signs of Christian unity in world mission.

The background and preparation are described in detail in a document I presented to the Council of Ministers of our church, meeting December 8, 1991, in Lexington, Kentucky, which is filed with the Historical Society. Economic considerations did not enter in until the late 1980s when reduction of executive staff became advantageous to the two boards. In fact, there often were additional costs involved. Christian unity truly was "the polar star." It is worth noting that mission executives always cooperated to the fullest extent through the area committees of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA and that Luz Bacerra was executive secretary for Southeast Asia for DOM and the Presbyterians for five years from 1989. Scott S. Libbey, UCBWM executive vice-president 1985 to 1994, and Daniel F. Romero, General Secretary for Mission, 1987 through 1997, deserve much of the credit in creating the new united mission entity. This thirty years of serving and growing together was culminated by Patricia Tucker Spier and David Y. Hirano who succeeded me and Dr. Libbey upon our retirements January 1, 1994.

The Common Board was inaugurated for the two churches in April, 1996, with twenty members named by DOM, twenty by UCBWM, and six from partner churches around the world, a total of forty-six. They have voice and vote and full responsibility for the sending of approximately two hundred missionaries, global mission interns, and short-term volunteers to some of the ninety different countries where there are partner churches and ecumenical organizations. Lists of these relationships are available.

More so than previous mission units, Global Ministries has become also an intermediary or broker for congregational and regional participation in overseas relationships, even assisting with the globalization of theological education among seminaries. Reflecting

the times, much more emphasis is given to work camps, study trips, short-term volunteers, two-way missionary exchanges and the hosting of visitors at the local level.

ACMS

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was organized in 1810 by Congregationalist clergy in Massachusetts. The direct structural lineage of this board is to be found in the United Church of Christ's Board for World Ministries, and its work continues as part of the Common Global Ministries Board with the Disciples of Christ. Other boards were organized in quick succession.

However, in reading this history, we must recognize that there was a deep-seated opposition to missionaries, from ridicule by the East India Company and debate among statesmen to arguments in the assemblies of the churches. A. McLean said in his lectures to college students late in the century, "When the present era of missions began, the people of God were hostile or indifferent for the most part."²

The listing of associations helps us understand Alexander Campbell's criticism of missionary societies in *The Christian Baptist* in two respects: first, the denominationalism, confusion and pretension they represented in his view; secondly, the way they distracted people from the church and appeared to remove the missionary task from the church itself. We know that he modified his views on this subject, but Mr. Campbell's opposition to missionary societies must be explained by his reliance on the Bible and his ecclesiology derived from it, not because missionary societies are missing from the Scriptures, but because the church is the divinely instituted means of proclaiming the Gospel and nothing should take its place. In other words, it is not a case of literal interpretation but of theological interpretation. In *The Christian Baptist*, he wrote of the church that he lamented "to see its glory transferred to a human corporation" or that it be "robbed of its character by any institution, merely human, that would ape its excellence and substitute itself in its place."³

He wrote in the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1850 that from the first volume of the *Christian Baptist* he had insisted that the church is the only missionary society.⁴ In the last analysis, this opinion has been consistently maintained among many Disciples of Christ ever since. This is why my article in the festschrift for Dr. Paul A. Crow, Jr., called *The Vision of Christian Unity* is entitled "Mission as Ecclesiology."⁵ Presidents of UCMS of recent memory - A. Dale Fiers, Virgil Sly, T.J. Liggett, and Robert A. Thomas as well as the women who were UCMS vice-presidents - never saw the missionary society as anything other than a function of the church. Joseph M. Smith, in his *Strategy of World Mission* dissertation, which is indispensable to a reading of our history, related mission to the catholicity of the church, "The outreaching mission of the Disciples of Christ has been the channel through which they have expressed the catholic nature of the church in both the local and universal sense." He sees it as the practice of a catholic

congregationalism.⁶

Robert Richardson shows the change of attitude in the movement and the relativizing of opinions when he writes that it was his criticism of abuses by the clergy “that led Mr. Campbell to condemn Sunday-schools, missionary, education and even Bible societies, as THEN (sic!) conducted, because he thought them perverted to sectarian purposes.”⁷ The implication is inescapable that the times had changed by the late 1840s, and the clarifying word “then” appears twice more in the paragraph! To consider the missionary society as an “instrumentality” of the church, for which the church is represented in general convention by elected “messengers,” was a different story from *The Christian Baptist* days. The missionary society became a form of the church’s presence and outreach, both practically and theologically. It fulfilled this ecclesiological role implicitly for Disciples of Christ until restructure made it explicit a century later.

On October 23, 1849, 156 delegates from eleven states gathered in Cincinnati to create the American Christian Missionary Society. Tucker and McAllister in *Journey in Faith* show some suspicion when they say that Alexander Campbell, “either because of poor health or for strategic reasons, was not present but was represented by W.K. Pendleton.”⁸ The December edition of the *Millennial Harbinger* contains Mr. Campbell’s regrets at having been denied the pleasure due to “an unusually severe indisposition” and his hearty endorsement, being “peculiarly gratified.” Robert Richardson says nothing about the organizing of the first convention in Cincinnati and the creation of the ACMS, but he mentions that a year later, on starting a forty-day trip West with his daughter Virginia, Mr. Campbell stopped in Cincinnati to attend “the anniversary of the Missionary Society, and then visited Madison and many other points in Indiana to which appointments had been forwarded.”⁹ The *Millennial Harbinger* of 1854 includes this central conviction, “We shall, therefore, regard it as a fixed fact - that the Church of Jesus Christ is, in her nature, spirit and position, necessarily and essentially a missionary institution.” (underlined in the original!)¹⁰

Richardson writes that through the decade until 1863¹¹ “he manifested his usual interest in the great subject of missions” and “was accustomed to meet with the ACMS as its president regularly every year, delivering addresses and urging increased liberality.”¹² W.K. Pendleton wrote in 1866, “We feel that it is due to the great name of Alexander Campbell to vindicate his memory from the charge that he was ever opposed to true missionary work or true and scripturally conducted missions.”¹³

Campbell, himself, not only saw the need to give a kind of church structure to the growing movement of preachers and congregations in order to coordinate and authorize through open critical discussion the spreading of their understanding of the Christian faith for their times, but he led by a series of essays in the *Millennial Harbinger* 1842-1848 on cooperation and consensual agreement. A number of meetings were held, and David S. Burnet took the lead. He was twenty-years younger than Mr. Campbell and had been involved already in the organization

of a Bible Society, largely supported by Ohio Disciples. He became one of the many persons who pushed for discussion and decisiveness in the steps which led to the Convention that gave birth to the ACMS. John T. Johnson of Kentucky made the resolution to start a society for world evangelization. It is to be noted that Mr. Campbell had urged a delegate assembly to be representative of congregations and of the whole body, not just individuals. This was not fully realized until the provisional General Assembly held in St. Louis in 1967 leading to the restructured church.

The first missionary society was the product of a long and intense process which generated considerable soul-searching. There was shared biblical principles and at the same time fundamental differences in theological opinion. Disagreement grew concerning congregational ecclesiology, commonality in mission with other Christians, and also perhaps communion of the Holy Spirit. This tension would eventuate in separate bodies and institutions of the 20th and 21st centuries. A full appreciation is probably hidden from us in the distance from antebellum times. But the nature of the Bible's authority, the relatively new idea of the autonomy of the local congregation, and the centrality of millennialist eschatology for these men and women, with men doing most of the writing which is left to us, are mysteries that can only be observed from different angles and rarely entered into existentially by later generations like our own.

Dr. and Mrs. James T. Barclay were the first missionaries. It was in their parlor in Washington, D.C., 1843, that the congregation had been organized which became the Vermont Avenue Christian Church and in 1930 the National City Christian Church. They went to Jerusalem, not because of Acts 1:8 "beginning with Jerusalem" as a popular Disciples legend has it, but because it was taken for granted by Alexander Campbell and his followers that the Jews were to be converted before the return of Christ. The title of Campbell's journal proclaimed clearly the eschatology of the pre-Civil War spirituality, so neglected in our denominational memory by scholars and theologians since then. In the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1841, we read in what is called The Protestant Theory, "The Millennium, so far as the triumphs of Christianity is concerned, will be a state of greatly enlarged and continuous prosperity, in which the Lord will be exalted and his divine spirit enjoyed in an unprecedented measure. All the conditions of society will be vastly improved; wars shall cease, and peace and good will among men will generally abound. The Jews will be converted, and the fullness of the Gentiles will be brought into the kingdom of the Messiah."¹⁴ The Brook Farm *Harbinger*, published weekly from June 1845 to June 1847 by New England transcendentalists, could not have been more utopian, and it is not a coincidence that they both are called "harbingers" of a better world.

The founding of the American Christian Missionary Society cannot be separated from the millennialist eschatology of the period nor from the pragmatism which required a foreign dimension to keep pace with

other denominations or to outgrow them! D.S. Burnet's book *The Jerusalem Mission* and Dr. Barclay's book *The City of the Great King* make this clear, along with speeches and articles by various leaders like Isaac Errett. Barclay wrote in a journal *The Christian Age*, "The ACMS...resolved...to make the first offer of salvation to Israel...for the salvation of the Jews...for upon the conversion and resumption of Israel is unquestionably suspended the destruction of Antichrist and the salvation of the world."¹⁵ The same assumption had been indicated in the Appendix of the *Declaration and Address* of Thomas Campbell in 1809. But the conversion of the Jews is not what makes the missionary effort eschatological; rather it points to the fact that the whole of this prewar missionary conviction can be understood only in light of the eschatological theology of the times. This was thought to be biblical, with Rev. 14:6-7 regularly on the cover of the *Millennial Harbinger*, but it was also deeply influenced by contemporary moral philosophy and Anglo-Saxon utopian belief in progress.

In 1858 J. O. Beardslee, who had previously been a Congregationalist missionary in Jamaica, was sent back to Jamaica by ACMS after Beardslee had proposed this plan. Also sent by ACMS was Alexander Cross, a freedman who arrived in Liberia in 1854, only eight years after its founding. Both of these efforts were short-lived, because Mr. Cross became ill and died, and funds ran out for Mr. Beardslee's support at the time of the Civil War. The Christian Woman's Board of Missions picked up the work later in each place.

In later years, the ACMS served mainly as a home missions agency helping to start half of the congregations by 1900 and becoming a founding member of the United Society after the first World War. Opposition actually led to the change of the name in 1869 to General Christian Missionary Convention and back again in 1895!¹⁶ Archibald McLean's *Missionary Addresses* tells of the ACMS work among the Cherokees, "Negro evangelization and education," aid to churches in Philadelphia, Buffalo and Chicago, workers supported in Maine, Canada, and sixty-one cities "helped," as well as organizational work in ten states for an expenditure from 1849 to 1894 of over one million dollars. Its Church Extension Fund by 1895 had helped build 230 churches in thirty-four States and Territories.¹⁷

CWBM

The organizational participation of Disciples women was to await a post-Civil War generation. Nevertheless, women were not absent in the church and were making their contribution from the beginning in ways not adequately recorded. A. McLean wrote that Alexander Campbell's second wife Selina "read and criticized Mr. Campbell's addresses and essays before their publication."¹⁸ We can be sure of women's place in leadership and support from Julia A. Barclay's letters from Jerusalem in the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1853 or in 1856 about Mary Williams' work there. There are many signs of a ready response of women throughout the church by the 1870s.¹⁹

Things were at a standstill following the Civil War. To overcome the lack of any missions overseas of the ACMS, Caroline Neville Pearre, whose husband was pastor in Iowa City, Iowa, took the initiative. She corresponded with the secretary of the ACMS (or the General Convention) Thomas Munnell and wrote to prominent women of the Disciples of Christ in Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio and Pennsylvania urging the creation of local missionary circles.

At the 1874 General Convention in Cincinnati, women from nine states met with Jane Sloan of Ohio presiding and appointed Mrs. Pearre to head a committee to draft a constitution following the pattern of the Congregationalist women's society. On October 22, the resolution was adopted by the Convention in a unanimous standing vote.²⁰ The first officers were elected, including Maria Butler Jameson as president. She was from Indianapolis, where headquarters would be located. By-laws were written as well as a sample constitution for use in every congregation, where it was hoped a state and national network would be rooted. To show that the time was ripe for such a movement, we have only to note that Caroline Neville Pearre, recognized as the founder of CWBM, served as its corresponding secretary for only the first year. State organizers were indefatigable, including outstanding African American women of the Disciples of Christ like Susie Sublette, Sarah Lue Bostick and Rosa Brown Bracy.

In 1876, the Williams family was sent to reopen the work in Jamaica, from which constant calls had never ceased to come. Work was started in 1881 in Jackson, Mississippi, among African-Americans, and another home mission was undertaken in Montana. The most far-reaching step was the sending of four young women to India in 1882.

Lorraine Lollis in *The Shape of Adam's Rib*, 1970, prepared in advance of the CWBM centennial, wrote: "...our women were more original than they realized at the time. They became the first woman's board to do both home and foreign work, to employ both men and women, to manage their own business, to choose their fields of service, to own property, and to raise and administer their own funds."²¹ They were pioneers in starting the first Bible chairs in state universities in Michigan, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Kansas and Texas and organized the first graduate school for the training of missionaries. Ida Harrison wrote that the College of Missions "regards itself as at the service of the church universal."²² Students in the first decade were from eight different denominations.

The CWBM joined the mission of FCMS in Japan after the death of Josephine Wood Smith in Akita in 1885. It started work in Mexico in December, 1895, in Cuba from 1899 until 1919, in Puerto Rico in 1899, in Argentina in 1906. After the interdenominational Congress of Christian Work in Latin America held in 1916 in Panama, organized by CWBM missionary Samuel Guy Inman, mission was taken over from the Methodists in Paraguay in 1918-19.

As early as 1900, the CWBM journal was using the word *ecumenical*,²³ but in the first meeting of the Executive Committee January 4, 1875, the

president suggested that they look to their “religious neighbors” for new directions. They voted to subscribe to Presbyterian and Baptist missionary publications “in order to keep in touch with women’s work in other churches.”²⁴ The Foreign Missions Conference of New York in 1900 included CWBM representatives among 412 women registrants, whose Woman’s Day, held at Carnegie Hall, was reported with excitement in *Missionary Tidings* that June. It came as a surprise to the women a decade later that men outnumbered women at the historic Edinburgh Conference in 1910!²⁵

Canadian women started Disciples missionary circles, and CWBM became an international organization in 1913. President Anna Atwater was instrumental in creating the United Christian Missionary Society, and the women brought fifty-three percent of the assets into the new organization.²⁶ Their theological contribution to UCMS and the restructured church was both significant and crucial, and it is not merely a coincidence that the UCMS was organized the same year as the suffrage amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Letters found by Mae Yoho Ward reveal that a poll was taken among local missionary societies on making the change to a United Society.

After the organization of the International Christian Women’s Fellowship (ICWF) in 1953 and its World counterpart soon after, the hiatus of an international women’s movement for the USA and Canada was overcome. This represented a network of CWFs in local congregations and produced the Quadrennial Assemblies beginning in 1957 at Purdue University, under the leadership of former missionary to Japan, Jessie Trout. The eleventh was held in the summer of 1998. These periodic gatherings of thousands of Disciples of Christ women are times of spiritual renewal and growth in faith, through worship and living together, Bible study and preaching, workshops and the arts. But above all, they are occasions when mission in North America and in the whole world is given undivided attention. Missionaries are present and participate in the programs, including an appointment service for those going overseas. Women come from around the world, with time spent visiting congregations, as well. The Woman to Woman Worldwide travel program visits the overseas area of the annual interdenominational mission study. The Quadrennial is the major place in the life of the general church where there is continuation of the CWBM tradition of stewardship, mission education and enthusiasm.

The fact that Lorraine Lollis’s history of the Disciples women’s movement contains a chapter called “Early Steps Toward Unity” and another called “Everywhere Ecumenism” shows the nature of women’s involvement as Christian mission inseparable from Christian unity. The number of Disciples women who have served in interchurch organizations from local and state levels to national leadership of Church Women United and other ecumenical bodies is out of proportion to the size of the Disciples communion.

FCMS

The Foreign Christian Missionary Society was conceived at the same General Convention as the Christian Woman's Board of Missions in Cincinnati in 1874, by the appointment of a committee to prepare definite organizational plans for the following year, because as A. McLean wrote in 1904, no satisfactory conclusions were reached "owing to the lack of time."²⁷ W.T. Moore, pastor of Central Christian Church there, but not the host pastor, is credited in all the history books as the one who convened a group of men to discuss how the Disciples of Christ as a "brotherhood" of individuals and congregations could become active in foreign missions again. Tucker and McAllister say "as a whole."²⁸ In other words, it was not meant to be a men's movement but a movement of the whole church in the manner of the ACMS. Men would take a role of leadership and support because of their denominational authority and religious influence. Archibald McLean has a paragraph called "Women and the Society" in his *History of the FCMS*, saying "the sex line was never drawn by the Society," and he pays tribute to eleven women by name who were "all friends of the CWBM, but their hearts were large enough to take in both."²⁹ This has ecclesiological implications, because with the commitment to the church and to world mission practiced by the women's organization, the FCMS theology of mission would lead to the formation of the United Christian Missionary Society. It explains why the Christian Women's Fellowship grew out of the world outreach concern and the Christian Men's Fellowship did not. The women's network had an historical precedent which the men lacked, so the CMF never organized around mission study and support.

The committee met in Indianapolis that summer and drafted a tentative constitution specifically for foreign missions, recognizing that the ACMS would continue its work in the United States and Canada, mostly starting congregations, later bringing about early forms of the Board of Church Extension and, indirectly, the Pension Fund. During the General Convention at Louisville on October 22, 1875, the plans were adopted after a moving address by Isaac Errett, who was elected president. A. McLean said, "There was a sense of the Divine presence, a conviction that what was being done was in harmony with the purpose of God in the ages."³⁰ This new focus of enthusiasm made future conventions consist of interested individuals and no longer delegates of congregations representing district and state networks as the Louisville Plan of 1869 had recommended as a more "true and scriptural basis." The lines were drawn for those who refused to accept any organization beyond the local congregation, resulting in a major division thirty years later.

McLean's *History* gives five reasons for the new organization, including "that intelligent Christians wished to enjoy the culture that can come from the missionary propaganda and from no other source."³¹ This represents the hindsight of Mr. McLean more than forty years later and

shows the modern factors making their way into the self-understanding of the church in the last quarter of the 19th century and as it became a 20th century denomination. It reveals the relation between Gospel and Culture which is basic to the missionary enterprise of every age, and it shows the way cooperative Disciples had come to read the history and purpose of the common movement. Christian mission becomes proclamation of the Gospel of eternal salvation through spiritual, intellectual and social transformation, with Christian unity as the distinctive trait of the Disciples of Christ tradition and the central meaning of its practice in worship and witness. Because this was rooted in an ambiguous theological emphasis on the authority of the Bible, the catholicity of the Church, and the spirituality of freedom and reason, controversy was inevitable.

The first missionaries were not sent to so-called non-Christian lands but to England, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, France and to Orthodox Constantinople and Anatolia. All of these endeavors were promoted by people who had been there before as members of some other denomination. Only in Britain has there been continuing relations with Churches of Christ, many now part of the United Reformed Church. It must not be assumed that some of these ventures of faith simply ceased and did not continue in other communities, like twenty-two congregations once reported in Scandinavia or people touched by these ministries whose lives effected others well into the 20th century.

W.R. Warren, organizing secretary for the Centennial Convention and editor of *World Call* with Effie Cunningham from 1919 to 1929, seems to be apologetic in his 1923 biography of Archibald McLean.³² He writes that “the year 1882 witnessed the actual beginning of the work for which the Foreign Christian Missionary Society had been created seven years before. All that time no one had been found willing and qualified to undertake work in a non-Christian land.”³³ This is almost a direct quote from *A Concise History of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society by the Missionaries* published by the FCMS in 1910. A. McLean had written that the president took the first candidate aside “and begged him to volunteer for some one of the great heathen fields.”³⁴ Obviously, by Mr. Warren’s time, ecumenical conferences like Edinburgh, with German and Anglo-Catholic protests against even considering Latin America a “mission field,” had made mission to Europe an offense to Christian unity, even though Alexander Campbell and Walter Scott explicitly included Europe as a field for mission in their day!³⁵

The United Christian Missionary Society was not to send commissioned missionaries to Europe even after World War II, although UCMS and the Council on Christian Unity did send a new type of short-term mission personnel called “fraternal workers.” This became the responsibility of DOM in 1970, and such persons are now called “global mission interns.” About 110 have served in Europe in this half-century.³⁶ They were supported through Reconstruction funds later called the Week of Compassion Offering, not through regular mission funding. Fraternal workers were a preview of changes which were in store for the work of

traditional missionaries in more recent years: for example, serving with autonomous churches rather than a mission run by North Americans, being responsible to national church authorities, being invited by partner churches to share in Christ's mission as they see it, and having appointments for given periods rather than expecting lifetime service to a missionary organization.

The description of the European Evangelistic Society in Tucker and McAllister,³⁷ while true since the 1960s, ignores the fact that the initial motivation was evangelism to establish congregations in the immersionist tradition. It was also a striking example of Christian love and reconciliation by the Stuckenbrucks to accompany the German people after the destruction of World War II. James Crouch, Burton Thurston, Fred Norris, Scott Barty, and Thomas Best were among those who gave the work a scholarly dimension.

Just a month before Archibald McLean took up his duties in March 1882, the Foreign Society voted to send two couples to India "as soon as sufficient funds were in hand."³⁸ On September 16, 1882, the Whartons, the Nortons and four young women appointed by CWBM left the United States for the first permanent church planting of the new era. Mr. Warren shows his theological understanding of the church, when he writes, "It was a great day not only for these two societies but for the whole body of people that they represented..."

The first missionaries went to Japan in 1883, the Garsts and the Smiths. They were joined the following year by a medical doctor W.E. Macklin of Ontario, Canada, who determined that Japanese physicians made his work there unnecessary, so he went on to China in 1885. That same year, there were conversations with Henry M. Stanley and others in Britain about beginning work in Africa, which proved to be a false start.³⁹ The number of missionaries on the "field" was 108 in 1899, the year the "station" at Bolenge in the Belgian Congo was purchased from the American Baptists to begin what is today the Disciples of Christ Community of *l'Eglise du Christ au Congo*, until 1997 *Zaire*. Ellsworth Faris, later professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, and Dr. and Mrs. Royal J. Dye brought fame and enthusiasm among Disciples for the work in Africa. Among personnel moved by CWBM to the Congo in 1919 from Liberia, were Myrta and Emory Ross, who initiated the Council of Churches which became the Church of Christ in Zaire uniting sixty-two Protestant missions and denominations in the 1960s. The Hannas and the Williamses went to the Philippines in 1901.

Two things must be noted further from these beginnings: Laura and Dorothy Delany of a Detroit pastor's family, granddaughters of pioneer evangelist Jonas Hartzell, became the first Disciples missionaries in the historically important missions of Japan and China, along with their husbands Garst and Macklin. The Delaney family deserves recognition for their selfless contribution to the work and witness of the church. It is no small thing to read in one of A. McLean's mission studies that as a rule "those who go out have to go in spite of the protests and tears of their parents."⁴⁰ Secondly, the mention of Archibald McLean and William

Macklin is a reminder of the contribution of Canada to organized Disciples missionary work, along with Mary Rioch, C.T. Paul, Jessie Trout, Alice Porter, the Staintons and many others. The FCMS was an international organization from the start, with support and personnel coming not only from Canada but from England and Australia.⁴¹

From this point forward, the momentum is assured largely by Archibald McLean. A graduate of Bethany College and president there 1889-91, he was pastor at Mt. Healthy Church in Cincinnati when called to be part-time and then full-time secretary of the FCMS. Many prominent leaders of the time, both men and women, were responsible for the Disciples of Christ growth in missionary education and outreach, but no one identified so fully with the enterprise as he or represented more exactly what it would become in the 20th century.

He attended the first ecumenical conference on foreign missions in London June 9 to 19, 1888, rejoicing in "the unity and cooperation among the many missionary societies and the many churches represented,"⁴² attending another in New York in 1900. He was head of a delegation of twenty-three Disciples at the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference June 14 to 24, 1910, where 160 missionary organizations met together. The nature of today's ecumenical commitment through the World Council of Churches was forecast by the way Archibald McLean defines mission in the fourteen chapters and in the non-denominational character of the "Select bibliography" of 176 books in his *Missionary Addresses* in 1895. It is the spirit in which he wrote the *Hand-Book of Missions* concerning "the great triumphs...of modern missions among all religious bodies" in 1897.⁴³

After McLean's trip around the world in 1895, the restoration of the New Testament church as a missiological *raison d'être* is almost totally absent in his collected addresses and other writings. The *History* has an early quote of J.W. McGarvey about planting "churches of the primitive order."⁴⁴ His chapter "Christian Unity and World-Wide Evangelism" in *Where the Book Speaks* exegetes Jesus' prayer saying, "Unity was not as an end itself, but a means to an end."⁴⁵ He makes this claim unequivocally for the Campbells.⁴⁶ There is a summary paragraph in *The Primacy of the Missionary* saying, "As a religious people our aim is to restore the apostolic church, in principle and in practice. We have done that in part already. We have discovered the meaning and the place of the ordinances."⁴⁷ But unity for him is in the task of mission itself, made practical in the ecumenical consultations and joint projects like Nanjing University and eventually made concrete in the International Missionary Council. The emphasis was always on the gospel and human need, and the theological controversy was always waged with the widespread opposition to missionaries as such.⁴⁸ He never ceased lamenting the scarcity of funds for such a cause in such a prosperous nation and what he considered to be the narrowness of vision in the church.

It was not just that A. McLean did not make Restoration the basis for mission. It was evident that he was dissatisfied with Restorationism as

the chief focus of the majority of the congregations. It is an allusion to the five-finger exercise when he wrote that "a stranger coming into one of our assemblies might conclude that we regarded the thirty-eighth verse of the second chapter [of *Acts*] as the heart of the book," rightly important but missing the meaning of *Acts* as a record of missionary activity.⁴⁹ Referring to the earnest contention for the "faith once for all delivered to the saints," preaching in harmony with the Word of God, and the proper ordinances, he nevertheless says that in Scripture there are ten texts on missions for every one on baptism and fifty for every one on the Lord's Supper. Because missions had not been emphasized "as some other matters have been....no more than one-third of the churches and no more than one-fourth of the members give anything at all for this work!" It was not merely a call for necessary financing or even responsible stewardship. It was a question of what he thought it meant to be a faithful church. And he is equally critical of churches trying to compete for the mainline, with their heavy debt, their pipe organ and expensive singers, their costly carpets, etc.! He speaks of a better day coming when "churches will recognize the ownership and Lordship of Christ as they do not now."⁵⁰

For these very reasons, the divisions of theological positions hardened. Mr. Warren points out that in 1875 leaders had pressed forward in spite of the fact that some of the ablest and most respected preachers and editors of "the brotherhood" were opposed to the Foreign Society.⁵¹ There was the question of money that was always an aggravation, bitterly described by A. McLean in his *History*.⁵² But Warren really touches a nerve when he says that "the missionary call runs squarely against race prejudice and fixed habits." He continues, "On these and other accounts, the preacher who spoke out for missions among the Disciples of Christ fifty years ago took his ministerial life in his hands, while the most specious argument against missions could win applause from our very human fathers."⁵³ To account for the radical change in this situation, he can only give the credit to Providence as well as to A. McLean, but he fails to point out that only division made this type of missionary society possible in the Stone-Campbell tradition.

UCMS

No sooner had the Foreign Christian Missionary Society been formed in 1875 than the desire for a united structure made its appearance. A. McLean's *History* says, "The year after the Foreign Society was organized the Convention adopted with unanimity this resolution, 'That we most cordially invite these organizations to a close alliance with the American Christian Missionary Society in every practical way; and still we look forward hopefully to the time when such a general cooperation of our churches shall be secured as may enable us to resolve these organizations into one, efficient for domestic and foreign work.'"⁵⁴ A constitution for a united society was drafted by FCMS in 1893, which came to naught.⁵⁵ A committee was appointed in the FCMS convention of 1899 "to consider unification of the missionary, benevolent and

educational interests” which never reported back.⁵⁶

Mr. Warren tells how a FCMS missionary dinner at the 1902 Omaha convention grew to include officers and missionaries of CWBM and the development of a joint missionary conference in 1904.⁵⁷ After the creation of the College of Missions, these conferences became joint board meetings! The preparation of the Centennial Convention of 1909 also brought the leadership of every General Convention-related body closer together. At the laying of the cornerstone for the new building of the CWBM College of Missions and for its inauguration in 1910, A. McLean was the speaker and a member of the board of trustees.⁵⁸ Mrs. Anna Atwater wrote that in September, 1910, Mr. McLean was conversing in her office about relationships. “He remarked that our societies ought to be one,” she records, adding that she considered it impossible because the women’s organization must remain self-determining. He said that it should be possible with equal representation of men and women, and he predicted that in spite of legal obstacles it would come about someday. She wrote him on October 7, 1912, that she had come to believe that sometime “the work of extending the kingdom will be a joint work for all the forces of our people.”⁵⁹

Articles creating unification were ready for and presented to the St. Louis Convention of 1918, but all public meetings were cancelled because of the influenza epidemic. Stormy sessions occurred at the Cincinnati Convention a year later, with each of the boards facing opposition within and without, but a new organization was voted and officers elected.⁶⁰ Tucker and McAllister tell about the formal organization of the United Christian Missionary Society on June 22, 1920, by six boards: ACMS, CWBM, FCMS, Church Extension, National Benevolent Association, and Ministerial Relief or Pension Fund, three of which later separated from the United Society.⁶¹ A commanding feature was to coordinate and combine offerings though a churchwide calendar. There had been insistent pressure from local congregations and state levels for a new structure both on practical and religious grounds, not just institutional merger. The call came from the grassroots.

In Cincinnati, the president of ACMS became president of UCMS, with the presidents of CWBM and FCMS named vice-presidents. A Board of Managers of 120 persons and a Board of Trustees of 22 were appointed, equally men and women, in the manner of most other corporate mission boards. Offices were centralized in St. Louis, and moved to Indianapolis in 1928 to the College of Missions property. The enabling resolution for a joint committee which was passed at the Kansas City Convention of 1917 is in Warren’s biography of A. McLean, where it predicts that this move “will thrill our churches, bring new life to our missionaries, reduce the number of our problems at home and abroad, increase our receipts and add to our efficiency.”⁶²

The Survey of Service by W.R. Warren, 1928, gives a full picture of the UCMS at that time. But it is the *Strategy of World Mission* adopted by UCMS in 1959 and the *General Principles and Policies* adopted by the General Assembly of the restructured church in 1981 that show both the

continuity and discontinuity with the past in practice and theory. A. Dale Fiers, UCMS president 1951 to 1964, wrote in *This Is Missions* about the need for a new strategy in world mission "which enables us to give our distinctive Disciples witness for the unity of the church within the framework of the ecumenical movement - the great new fact of our time."⁶³ Virgil A. Sly, who served UCMS for forty-two years, including president from 1964 to 1968, said: "Out of the meetings of the 40s and 50s, the total strategy of the Disciples of Christ changed and moved into a completely new dimension of Christian concern."⁶⁴

A theological discussion of the characteristic Disciples of Christ view of mission and unity is to be found in my "Mission as Ecclesiology" in *The Vision of Christian Unity* published in 1997. These are constant and recurring components of a tendency in which a largely unreflective theology, called by Joseph M. Smith "contradictory and ambivalent," assumes the missionary society to be the church in mission-practice, from cooperation to ecumenical engagement and finally ecclesiological structuring. Mark Toulouse has a critical study of this process in *Joined in Discipleship* (1992) and in Newell Williams' *A Case Study of Mainstream Protestantism* (1991).

After fifty years of service the UCMS consented to cease as a program body. It had been through the heyday of missionary recruitment in the 1920s, the momentous crisis of the depression when missionary staff had to be cut from 339 to 199 by Cy Yocum, World War II, the coming into being and uniting of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council with all the changes in mission strategy and relationships that that evoked. Its homeland and world divisions would become units of the restructured church. Dr. Smith had asked in the materials prepared for ten area consultations on Christian unity in 1958, "Is the present structure of the United Christian Missionary Society and its relationship to the brotherhood through the International Convention an adequate organizational expression of the principle that both mission and unity characterize a church?"⁶⁵ Restructure was also forecast in the changes occurring at the state level, both for theological reasons and constraints growing out of the Crusade for a Christian World from 1950 onward.⁶⁶ Prospects of organic union also helped!

It is not within the scope of this study to give the details of efforts to prevent the creation of the UCMS, to disrupt its proceedings, and to vilify A. McLean, the women leaders, and all who were accused of succumbing to "German rationalism."⁶⁷ This story is touched on in Tucker and McAllister in reporting the "Restoration Congress" in 1919 at Cincinnati to compete with the Convention and to confuse the public⁶⁸ and Warren tells of the same in A. McLean's last convention, St. Louis in 1920.⁶⁹ *Fifty Years of Attack and Controversy* by Stephen J. Corey in 1953 provides further details. Garrison and DeGroot tell more about the conflicts headed up by the *Christian Standard* and the Cincinnati Bible College and other institutions and leaders,⁷⁰ leading to the North American Christian Convention which first met in 1927. In their book *Disciples of Christ: A History*, they could still write in 1948 about the Independent

Missions and Benevolences of the “brotherhood”.⁷¹

A. McLean died on December 20, 1920, the year UCMS was incorporated. *The Indianapolis News* of June 9 tells about the graduation of twenty-eight men and women on the tenth anniversary of the College of Missions. F.W. Burnham is referred to as president of UCMS, but Anna Atwater and A. McLean are still called presidents of their respective societies. The following year at the largest graduation ever with a class of forty-six, no further mention is made of FCMS and CWBM. Stephen J. Corey, A. Dale Fiers, Virgil A. Sly, Joseph M. Smith,⁷² T.J. Liggett and Robert A. Thomas give the principle theological direction in the following decades.

Notes

¹*Yearbook and Directory 1996*, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), p. 306.

²Archibald McLean, *Missionary Addresses* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Christian Publishing Company, 1895), pp. 6, 46, 209.

³Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, Vol. II (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1897), p. 97.

⁴*Millennial Harbinger* (Bethany, Va.: Published by A. Campbell, 1850), p. 207.

William J. Nottingham, “Mission As Ecclesiology: Christian Identity and the Burden of Denominationalism,” in *The Vision of Christian Unity* (Indianapolis: Oikoumene Publications, 1997), pp. 133-147.

⁵*The Vision of Christian Unity*.

⁶Joseph M. Smith and Vern Rossman, *Called To Mission And Unity* (Indianapolis: United Christian Missionary Society, 1965), pp. 28-9; see footnote 72.

⁷*Memoirs*, op. cit., p. 57.

⁸William E. Tucker and Lester G. McAllister, *Journey in Faith: A History of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1975), p. 175.

⁹*Memoirs*, op. cit., p. 589.

¹⁰*Millennial Harbinger*, 1854, p. 547.

¹¹*Memoirs*, op. cit., p. 647.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 607.

¹³*Millennial Harbinger*, 1866, p. 497.

¹⁴*Millennial Harbinger*, 1841, p. 9.

¹⁵Cited in D.S. Burnet, *The Jerusalem Mission*, according to George F. Miller, Bethany; cf. Paul M. Blowers, “Living in a Land of Prophets: James T. Barclay and an Early Disciples of Christ Mission to Jews in the Holy Land,” *Church History*, Vol. 62 #4, 1993.

¹⁶Archibald McLean, *History of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1919), p. 26.

¹⁷*Missionary Addresses*, op. cit., pp. 232-9.

¹⁸A. McLean, *Thomas and Alexander Campbell* (Cincinnati:FCMS, 1910), p. 60.

¹⁹Lorraine Lollis, *The Shape of Adam's Rib* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1970), pp. 50-1; *Millennial Harbinger*, 1856, pp. 55ff.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 262; Anna R. Atwater, *Historical Sketch of the CWBM* (1911). p. 8.

²¹Lollis, op. cit., p. 42.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 92.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 85.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 42.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 91.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 102.

²⁷John T. Brown, *Churches of Christ: A Historical, Biographical, and Pictorial History* (Louisville, Ky.: John P. Morton & Co., 1904), p. 186.

²⁸Tucker and McAllister, op. cit., p. 263.

²⁹*History of the FCMS*, op. cit., p. 74.

³⁰Brown, op. cit., p. 186.

³¹*History of the FCMS*, op. cit., pp. 42-50.

- ³²W.R. Warren, *Archibald McLean* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1923), p. 96.
- ³³*Ibid.*, p. 93; cf. *History of the FCMS*, op. cit., pp. 51 ff.
- ³⁴Brown, op. cit., p. 188.
- ³⁵*Missionary Addresses*, op. cit., p. 228.
- ³⁶William J. Nottingham, *The History of Fraternal Workers* (DOM unpublished, 1988)
- ³⁷Tucker and McAllister, op. cit., p. 400.
- ³⁸Warren, op. cit., p. 93.
- ³⁹*Survey of Service* (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1928), p. 495; Herbert Smith, *Fifty Years in Congo*, (Indianapolis: UCMS, 1949), pp. 3-8.
- ⁴⁰Archibald McLean, *Where the Book Speaks: Or Mission Studies in the Bible* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Christian Publishing Co., 1907), p. 51.
- ⁴¹Brown, op. cit., p.193.
- ⁴²Warren, op. cit., p. 114.
- ⁴³Archibald McLean, *Hand-Book of Missions* (St. Louis, Mo.: Christian Publishing Company, 1897), p. 10.
- ⁴⁴*History of the FCMS*, op. cit., p. 399.
- ⁴⁵*Where the Book Speaks*, op. cit., p. 234.
- ⁴⁶*Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, op. cit., p. 22.
- ⁴⁷Archibald McLean, *The Primacy of the Missionary And Other Addresses* (St. Louis, Mo.: Christian Board of Publication, 1920), p. 35.
- ⁴⁸*Missionary Addresses*, op. cit., pp. 14, 34, 46; cf. *Primacy*, op. cit., pp. 175-6.
- ⁴⁹*Where the Book Speaks*, op. cit., p. 14; cf. for direct reference to Walter Scott and *Acts* 2:38, *Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, op. cit., p. 34.
- ⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 38.
- ⁵¹Warren, op. cit., pp. 264-5.
- ⁵²*History*, op. cit., pp. 381-5.
- ⁵³Warren, op. cit., p. 265.
- ⁵⁴*History*, op. cit., pp. 40-1.
- ⁵⁵Winfred E. Garrison and Alfred T. DeGroot, *The Disciples of Christ: A History* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Bethany Press, 1948), p. 521.
- ⁵⁶Loc. cit.
- ⁵⁷Warren, op. cit., pp. 171-2.
- ⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 200.
- ⁵⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 207-8.
- ⁶⁰*50th Anniversary Celebration*, UCMS, 1971, p. 7.
- ⁶¹Tucker and McAllister, op. cit., pp. 344-351.
- ⁶²Warren, op. cit., pp. 311-13.
- ⁶³A. Dale Fiers, *This Is Missions* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Bethany Press, 1953), p. 255.
- ⁶⁴Virgil A. Sly, *To The Ends Of The Earth* (Lincoln: The Nebraska School of Religion, 1970), pp. 57-58.
- ⁶⁵Joseph M. Smith, in *Issues in Unity* (Indianapolis: Council On Christian Unity, 1958), p. 95.
- ⁶⁶Loren E. Lair, *The Christian Churches and their Work* (St. Louis, Mo.: The Bethany Press, 1963), pp. 160, 254.
- ⁶⁷Warren, op. cit., pp. 274 ff.
- ⁶⁸Tucker and McAllister, op. cit., pp. 379-386.
- ⁶⁹Warren, op. cit., p. 275-77.
- ⁷⁰Garrison and DeGroot, op. cit., pp. 524-28.
- ⁷¹*Ibid.*, pp. 508-14.
- ⁷²Joseph M. Smith, *A Strategy of World Mission: The Theory and Practice of Mission as Seen in the Present World Mission Enterprise of the Disciples of Christ* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Microfilms, Inc., 1961), 471 pages.

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ORDER OF THE STONE-CAMPBELL FELLOWSHIP

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society has been blessed through the years with gifts from estates. Some have come unsolicited; others have been planned in advance with leadership of the Society. These gifts have measurably strengthened the ministry of the Society. Through the Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship the Society can recognize these intended gifts and express appreciation to those planning the gifts.

SUCH A FELLOWSHIP EXPRESSES CONFIDENCE IN THE FUTURE OF THE SOCIETY

Members of the Fellowship are persons who have a hope and a dream for the future of the Society as it continues to serve individuals and the church. They have named the Historical Society in their will, established a charitable gift Annuity or Trust, made a gift of life insurance, or given their home or personal property while retaining lifetime use of the property. Some of these provisions were made early in the days of the Society's 50 year history while others were made in recent months. Each is a testimony to a life of stewardship and an expression of faith in the purpose and mission of the Historical Society.

THE FELLOWSHIP IS NAMED FOR TWO OF THE EARLIEST CHURCH LEADERS

Barton Warren Stone was the first of the major leaders to appear on the scene in 19th century America. Soon thereafter Alexander Campbell's voice was heard. From the followers of these men a church was born which continues to spread the gospel. The history of that movement housed in the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial is a legacy of their early faith and witness. Their gifts live on in the life of the church and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

DISCIPLIANA

The Quarterly Historical Journal of the
DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

MISSION AMONG CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND CHURCHES OF CHRIST

Fredrick W. Norris

THE UNITARIAN AND ORTHODOX BACKGROUNDS OF THE STONE-CAMPBELL ATONEMENT DEBATE

Victor McCracken



Volume 58 • Number 4 • Winter, 1998

—From the Editor's Desk

As promised, this issue includes an article by Frederick W. Norris, "Mission Among Christian Churches and Churches of Christ." This paper, along with Thomas H. Olbricht's, "Missions and Evangelism Prior to 1848" and William J. Nottingham's, "Origin and Legacy of the Common Global Ministries Board," both published in the Fall issue, was presented at the fifth annual Forrest H. Kirkpatrick Seminar for Stone-Campbell Historians, April 24-25, 1998.

Norris traces the story of the remarkable growth of missions in that wing of the Stone-Campbell movement that has sometimes been referred to as the Independent Christian Churches, owing to the conflict that surfaced in the 1920s between support of "independent" missionaries and the United Christian Missionary Society. Although the majority of the missionaries of that portion of the Stone-Campbell movement officially known as the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ have gone out under the support of local congregations with the assistance of a forwarding agent, Norris notes that the Christian Missionary Fellowship, founded in 1949, is now probably the largest mission agency in any of the three branches of the Stone-Campbell movement. Norris also identifies issues related to a reduction in the number of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ missionaries in service over the past decade and current developments in the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ related to missionary personnel, recruitment and terms of service. Noting the religious pluralism of the late twentieth century, and the view that missionaries should not seek to make converts from other religions, Norris concludes his paper by arguing a case for missionary efforts that seek to make converts to the Christian faith.

Also in this issue is Victor McCracken's, "The Unitarian and Orthodox Backgrounds of the Stone-Campbell Atonement Debate." McCracken summarizes the issues in the debate between Barton W. Stone and Alexander Campbell regarding the atonement, showing their relation to the larger discussion of the atonement in nineteenth-century Britain and the United States. He also identifies questions for further research and suggests the importance of the doctrine of atonement for contemporary theological reflection.

—From the President's Desk

A Sacred Trust: Fostering a community and a network of historians who provide each other with stimulation, support and critique.

This Historical Society is committed to excellence in historical scholarship. This journal offers a prime opportunity for historians to both refine and offer their work to an audience informed in the Stone-Campbell tradition.

Here is how we “stimulate, support and critique.” Manuscripts are sent to my office where they are copied and sent to the editor. The submissions selected by the editors are then “refereed.” They are sent without identification to other qualified scholars for comment and recommendation. Items selected for possible publication are sent to the writer for redraft. The editor then selects the articles which appear in *Discipliana*. My office then publishes and distributes *Discipliana* to institutional and individual members of the Society.

I invite you to keep the Historical Society in mind for possible publication of your work. Manuscripts of twenty pages, double-spaced are welcome. Please submit in both paper and disk form.

Discipliana has evolved over fifty-seven years from a student-mimeographed sheet to a general readership periodical on Stone-Campbell history. With the birth of “We’re History” for general audiences, *Discipliana* is now in its glory days as a first-rate scholarly journal under the editorship of Dr. Newell Williams. This president is proud to offer it to historians as a refining outlet for their work and to offer it to our readers as an informing word on our well-loved tradition.

- Peter M. Morgan

Mission among Christian Churches and Churches of Christ

by Frederick W. Norris*

My remarks most probably should be heard as the impressions of an eccentric.

I have been identified in my professional career as a church historian and theologian for some decades, but only one year as a missiologist. Yet my concern for the mission of God in the world appeared in my mother's cuddling and my father's embrace. Indeed it was deeper than that. My maternal grandfather was the secretary of the first North American Christian Convention. My paternal grandfather was a life-long elder in a conservative Disciples congregation. The only years of my early life which were not punctuated with the visits and conversations of missionaries were those in which my father served as a chaplain in World War II and Korea.

I also come to this task with a deep sense of the difficulties raised by putting church history, theology and missiology together. On the one hand, history is never just the facts. Knowing exactly what happened in some distanced, objective, neutral way is beyond us. Both anthropology and physics continually remind us that the observers influence what they observe. When I offer some statistics and dates early in this lecture, they stand within an interpretive web just as much as the comments I wish to make in the final sections about what faces us as we move toward the 21st century. On the other hand, I am not assuming that chronological order has no bearing in explanation

Mission among Christian Churches, sometimes also called Churches of Christ, has been integral to our self definition. In the 1920s when the growing fissures between so-called "conservative" and "classical" Disciples of Christ became painfully apparent, many of the most heated debates were about mission. The context of those debates included different issues, some of which coalesced around the proper study of Scripture, an understanding of history, and various readings of the contemporary situation. Yet one of the hottest of those topics concerned comity agreements made by missionaries in China. The question was whether or not some cities or regions with massive populations should be divided among missionaries from various Protestant traditions so that from the "classical" Disciples perspective needed efforts were not duplicated. Some "conservative" Disciples thought that work together with Protestants was at cross purposes with who we were as a people. If we were not in agreement with those traditions here in the USA, how could we pretend to be in agreement with them on the mission field?

What came to be the North American Christian Convention began when what the conservatives considered to be satisfactory answers to

*Frederick W. Norris is the Dean E. Walker Professor of World Mission and Evangelism of Emmanuel School of Religion, Johnson City, TN.

such questions about what was happening on the mission field could not be obtained. Henry Webb's doctoral thesis at Southern Baptist, completed in 1954, details those developments. I take it is part of my task to look at developments beyond his work.

The datable beginnings of serious separation in 1926 at Memphis seems clear, but developments in mission within Christian Churches tended to be overwhelmed by other events. Building separate mission supporting institutions or teaching local congregations to be those support institutions during a depression and then a world war was very difficult. In 1940 Christian Churches had 48 adult missionaries in 8 countries, but by 1953, the last year that Webb reports, there were 208 in at least 20 countries. The flowering of such congregational awareness and encouraging institutions on which mission greatly depended clearly came immediately after the war years. But it continued to grow. If I use the numbers available from our unofficial *Directory of Ministry*, by 1967 there were 503 missionaries in 32 countries, by 1977, 696 in 45 countries, by 1987 934 in 55 countries. The 1997 Directory reported that Christian Churches with an estimated membership of 1,141,000 members supported 961 missionaries in 72 countries. From a people who often do not feel comfortable reporting to a national agency, I suspect that the figures are relatively accurate and on the low side.

Conservative Disciples had to rebuild their educational systems which were needed to prepare both missionaries for foreign service and ministers for local congregations. Their perception of many of the colleges founded early in the history of the Stone-Campbell Movement was negative and sometimes hostile. Three colleges founded between 1881 and 1900, Johnson, Milligan and Northwest Christian, were considered reasonably sound in the 1920s. Kentucky Christian and Minnesota had begun in the period from 1901-1920 in response to some calls for changes. In Canada Alberta Bible College and in the United States: Atlanta, Cincinnati, Manhattan (Kansas), Pacific (California) and San Jose appeared between 1921 and 1940. But the burgeoning years of college building were the two decades between 1941 and 1960. During that period 30 colleges were founded and an old stalwart like Milligan in 1950 was brought back into service after near death. With various types of consolidation and demise, Christian Churches in 1997 now claim 33 colleges in the United States and since the 1960s three full seminaries and some other graduate programs. Many of those colleges belong to the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges or the regional accrediting agencies that stand behind all state and most private colleges. The seminaries have either reached or are moving toward accreditation through regional associations and the Association of Theological Schools.

Growth in mission over the last fifty years has been considerable. But statistics can be a rather barren field for explanation. More important is the sense observable in publications and conversations with the now elderly that during the late 1940s and early 1950s there was a significant passion for the lost. It was often expressed within a somewhat dark

vision that if Christians did not reach out successfully to those in other religions or those with apparently no interest in religion, such Christians and those unreached would be eternally damned. A much brighter view insisted that Christians had salvation to share as well as more abundant living before death.

People were moving into what they experienced as booming local economies. The needs to house and feed those parents and children were replacing war production. Money was there; overseas the dollar was strong. Young men and women who had themselves lived through the horrors of war had strong thoughts about life and death. My father preached in a church in Sciotoville, Ohio, a steel town, both before and after World War II. Three men came back from that war converted by the death of Christians close to them. They doubled the size of the congregation in less than three years.

Missionaries in that same period went out singly and as married couples; they were inspired by the stories of missionary heroism, particularly ones like those of the Morse family who fled from persecution by the Japanese in Burma and suffered it in the Philippines. Born in 1941, I remember the "comic book" style publications about their suffering and the visits of some of them in our home. Hearing them many felt they had to go and preach. Their children would survive well in the midst of such mission. They often did flourish and return to the countries in which they had grown up, now as rather more effective missionaries than their parents because they knew the culture from the inside.

The bulk of these missionaries went out under the support of local congregations with the assistance of a forwarding agent. There was deep distrust of missionary agencies as in some cases there still is. But some agencies began emerging. I mention only two. The National Missionary Convention, an inspirational and informational gathering, was first held in 1948. At its fiftieth meeting last year in Tulsa, Oklahoma, about 3,500 people were in attendance. Christian Missionary Fellowship, our largest mission organization, began in 1949. In 1997 it had a budget of 5.5 million dollars, 39 people in preparation, 105 missionaries on the field in 11 countries outside the USA and work with Vietnamese and Hispanic groups in Washington, DC and Los Angeles. The irony is that a people who at times prided themselves on being independent without mission agencies now probably have the largest agency in the three branches of our heritage.

Statistics, of course, do not make history. The stories of people are its fare. Christian Churches are often noted by outsiders as those who have not encouraged or allowed women in leadership. That is often true among some of our congregations and institutions, but there are interesting anecdotes that put twists on such a depiction. The Maxey family, centered around the archconservative Cincinnati Bible Seminary, had a strong matriarch who witnessed and preached. She influenced not only her husband and her boys toward mission, but also led others to commit to foreign missions. One of her sons told me nearly twenty

years ago that she also started more than one church in the Cincinnati area.

Oddly some of the strongest argumentation against women in leadership came from mission discussions. When conservative churches in the Roanoke Valley of Virginia began to turn from Disciples educational institutions to Christian Church Bible colleges for their ministers, those ministers often found local women who had saved their egg and quilting money to send to the United Christian Missionary Society of the Disciples of Christ. They had done so for years and did not plan to change their habits. Bible college trained ministers, who fought to get missionary monies sent to other mission efforts which they considered properly faithful, used Biblical admonitions against women speaking in the assembly and being submissive to men in order to get these women off the boards and get their money out from under their control.

I cannot report to you that discussions about women in leadership are settled among us. Some congregations insist that women must remain silent, but others choose them for leadership positions. Throughout our history single women on the mission field and wives in missionary families have made their mark. None can predict the way in which the trends will take us, but brilliant and talented women are becoming leaders.

The statistics do tell us that growth in the adult mission force has greatly slowed in the last ten years. Moving from 934 in 1987 to 961 in 1997 appears to be the smallest gain in any decade since the beginning of our separate congregations. But it actually represents a serious decline. In 1990 Christian Churches had 1173 missionaries on the field. Numbers have been steadily falling since that high.

There are a series of reasons for that. American citizens have in many ways grown accustomed to life which makes the bush of Africa or the poverty of Calcutta less than appealing. Ray Giles, one of our long term missionaries in Africa pointed out a decade ago that many homes require little outbuildings because their garages will not hold all the stuff. Some young people reject such developments for a simpler life, but many do not.

While the missionaries of the 1940s and 1960s expected to live a lifetime in the countries they chose, missionaries in the 1980s and 1990s speak of commitments for a term. A decade is considered a long term while a short term might be as little as three to six weeks. Effectiveness in local American congregations often only begins after the first decade, thus the efficiency of present mission time commitments must be called into question.

The mixed signals about children in American culture are a part of mission families' concerns. They might be neglected, but it is more likely that the family will leave the field when it becomes apparent that the children will soon become culturally more attuned to the mission country than the United States. Doug Priest, Jr., the director of Christian Missionary Fellowship, quipped when he returned to the United States from Asia that many Christian couples had clearly taken James Dobson

into their hearts as the ruler of their lives and decided not to go or to stay on the mission field. While missionaries of earlier generations wanted their children to partake deeply of the second culture, indeed chose to keep their teenagers out of the pressures of American high schools, some now find it difficult to think of their little ones with anything less than American education.

Christian Churches have not been particularly strong in North American urban situations. Thus we have not entered the world's metropolises with large numbers of missionaries. Because that is where so many people live, our lack of urban presence represents yet another weakness.

Teaching English as a foreign language is a growing trend that fits well with the desire not to get too deeply involved in another culture. It has some advantages particularly where witnessing to one's faith is culturally taboo or legally forbidden. But it sometimes lulls the young into a feeling of helpfulness and giving which can keep them from learning the language and culture of the people. Without such knowledge mission is suspect.

There have been some considerable gains. Most missionaries now understand that language and cultural training, anthropological and sociological understandings as well as Biblical knowledge and Christian commitment are necessary for their work. Undergraduate and graduate programs in our colleges and seminaries take seriously the laborious study necessary. Many of our students come with a raft of short term mission experience. I taught a course on the history of Christianity in Asia not long ago with sixteen students. Thirteen of them had been on short term mission trips, three of them more than once. Such folk are much more adept at understanding cultural differences.

Many of our missionaries understand that giving witness to Christ involves concern for the whole person. Mission among us still means preaching the gospel and calling for decision, but leading up to that may entail much social work. To give but one example, Greg and Becky Johnson who worked among the Masai in Kenya, built clinics, dug wells and introduced camels in dealing with the physical, social and economic welfare of the people. Yet they also started churches.

One developing trend may be the entry into mission work of retired people, particularly baby boomers who finish their careers in their forties or fifties. Helping people who have been so successful in their own cultures prepare to enter the culture of another is a challenge but perhaps a good one. They will have both time and resources.

It is also the case that the distinction between home and foreign missions is breaking down. The concerns about nonchristian values and actions in the United States as well as the struggles many local congregations have experienced in evangelism have suggested that the task of spreading the good news has strong similarities in North America and the rest of the world. The debate about polling numbers of church attendance suggests that instead of the 40% so often referred to as a steady number after World War II, the reality well may be 20% at the highest.

While it is not clear that our missionary efforts will grow at the rate they have in the last sixty years or that we will be able to replace the long term missionaries now retiring from the field, I want to take the last part of this lecture to indicate why we continue to speak of conversion. One particular issue faces us both within the United States and around the globe that bears on that decision: the clear presence of many powerful religions which have world allegiance and are not going to disappear. We live in a remarkably pluralistic age in which Islam is or soon will be the second largest religious group in the United States, indicative of its massive presence globally. Many churches in metropolitan areas know of Islamic presence primarily because so many Muslims are African-Americans.

On the Pacific Rim of North America, Asian religions influence the scene. Even in Canada, Vancouver now has an increasingly large Chinese section. Los Angeles is the obvious example in the United States; yet other cities also feel the impact.

I can perhaps quickly convince you of the pervasiveness of this religious pluralism by noting that Johnson City, TN in the Appalachian Mountains of the Bible belt has a small mosque—a converted East Tennessee house—, two Bah’ai congregations, as well as active Buddhist and Hindu groups at East Tennessee State University.

Thus we cannot speak about mission history and contemporary mission without reminding ourselves that we are in a religiously pluralistic situation. A hospital chaplain in Johnson City will expect that most of the patients and their families want a Protestant minister’s attention. But some of the doctors serving in the hospital are Muslim, Hindu or Buddhist. As we often say about conservative Appalachia, if it’s among us, it must be nearly everywhere.

In 1910 Christians meeting at the mission conference in Edinburgh saw this century as one in which all the world would be won to Christ. It hasn’t happened. Europe has fewer practicing Christians now than in 1910, but Christianity has grown dramatically in Africa, Asia and South America. With the majority of Christians living outside the North America and Europe, and world religions in good health and growing, aren’t we living in a situation drastically different from the beginning of the twentieth century, let alone the first?

The answer to that query given by a number of reputable scholars has been a resounding “yes.” The inference frequently drawn is that Christian mission should be radically changed to the point of suggesting that the singular task of any missionary is to help others take their own religion seriously. From such a perspective the most Christian response would be: “We will be happy to help you with social, political, economic improvements, but our religious call is for you to be a better Muslim, a better Hindu, a better Buddhist, not for you to convert to Christian faith.”

There are a series of explanations for why the call to conversion has been deemed inappropriate by these scholars. Part of the above message is based upon a type of guilt. Hasn’t the church too often presented the gospel as an invitation to become European and American? Hasn’t such

mission been rooted in a kind of superiority which we now recognize as unwarranted? Surely we must confess that Christian mission has many times been colonial and imperialistic, a destroyer of peoples and cultures. We have reasons to feel shame, but the best mission work in every century has affirmed everything possible about other people and cultures including important aspects of their religions, particularly through the translation of Scripture into vernacular languages. At the end of any decent translation process, the native speakers tell the missionaries whether or not the words in their language say what the missionaries intend. Good translation, proper contextualization, of the good news is finally shaped by the people themselves. It often creates a written language which the indigenous folk have not had and thus constructs a medium in which their histories and stories, their culture and religion can be preserved and circulated far beyond their own boundaries.¹ The best mission in every age has converted but not totally perverted native culture or religion.

Second, there has been a frontal attack on the statements made within Scripture. Because some know that Christian mission has been faulty, they assume that any claim for Jesus as the ultimate revelation of God is mistaken. Religious wars continue to destroy people. Some say that insistence on the ultimate truth of any religion nearly always leads to intolerance and hatred. From their perspective what is needed is mutual affirmation and work together. Again we must concede that certain kinds of mission work have incited wars. "Conversions" of whole tribes by conquest, baptisms at the point of the sword, have taken place. But such is not what many of us think about as genuine Christian mission. The Christ who calls all to himself is the Prince of Peace not the Lord of War.

An even more subtle erosion of scriptural statements has been a feature of certain types of historical, critical scholarship. For some, careful investigation of the New Testament reveals that Jesus neither claimed to be God nor insisted that all must be saved in his name. All the stories about Jesus are colored by the resurrection accounts. The historical Jesus did not see himself in such ultimate terms. One of the more remarkable books bears the title *No Other Name?* and strongly argues that salvation in no other name but that of Jesus Christ is a claim that must be adjusted, most probably abandoned.²

I myself rejoice that all our information about Jesus comes to us influenced by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The stories in the gospels about the twelve show how confused they could be by the actual events. Only after the resurrection did they fully see and understand who Jesus was. Those apostles and the early congregations worshipped the Christ and witnessed to him. We cannot get back behind their faithful response; we have no reason to try. None of us can quote a verse from the New Testament in which Jesus says exactly that he is God, but his words about the Son of Man come very close. He mentions that he is about his Father's work and that he does some of his miracles by the finger of God.

Passages from within the Church are unambiguous about their sense of who Jesus was. Early hymns were sung to Christ “as to a god” says Pliny, the Roman governor of Bithynia in the early second century who tortured deaconesses to get the truth.³ Hymnic passages in Colossians (1:19, 2:9) insist that the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily. The hymnic passage in Philippians 2, probably sung before Paul’s conversion, speaks of Christ’s preexistence with God. First Corinthians 8:6 seems to represent Paul’s attempt to split the great Jewish confession, the Shema, so that part of it refers to the Father and part to the Son. The opening verses of John’s gospel are cosmic depictions of incarnation. In that gospel, doubting Thomas confesses that Jesus Christ is his Lord and his God (John 20:28). The list of such passages is long and not to be translated away. At the same time that the humanity of Jesus is affirmed, the great questions of Christology and Trinity are raised. Some of the poetic passages are trinitarian. The end of Matthew calls for mission and baptism in the name of Father, Son and Spirit.

Good scholarship, careful scholarship, will not encourage us to claim more than is there; it always warns us to be cautious. But the possibility of demonstrating that Jesus never saw himself as one who was anything more than another prophet or priest, in my view rests on outmoded philosophical presuppositions behind a view of history which suggest that cold, hard facts are never brought to us by communities and that modern science disallows all talk of trinity, incarnation or miracles. We cannot get behind the earliest believers to the real Jesus who is someone totally different from the Christ they lived and died for. Such history doesn’t exist. We must listen to the witnesses. Even Pliny, an outsider, knew that churches sang hymns to Christ as to a god.

We must also look at contemporary disciplines of human understanding. In previous decades a sense of reality dominated those educated in the West which suggested a developing system in which God could seldom if ever act. Yet Kurt Godel warned that even in lower mathematics there are no systems which can be both consistent and complete. Within contemporary physics it is difficult to say what cannot occur when our modern systems know that as much as 90% of reality is dark matter about which we know very little. Thus when we confess the mystery of God in Christ and cannot explain it all completely and systematically, we are in line with contemporary scientific developments. Indeed Niels Bohr’s sense of complementarity linked to the character of light as wave and particle and updated for the end of this century offers one of the best models for how Jesus could be both fully God and fully man, in one person, since the fourth century.

If the modern reality of religious pluralism cannot fairly destroy the ultimate claims about Christ, can its assertion of the new situation, the coming twenty-first century circumstances, weaken those claims? Are we now in such a new time that the early statements while there in Scripture still must be abandoned? On the one hand, we probably should concede that the global extent of religious pluralism could not have been recognized in its fullest force by the earliest Christians. At the

same time we need to remember that Roman engineers built harbors in India and their businessmen traded with China and Vietnam. Yet they had not been round the world and “discovered” the new world of the Americas or the farthest reaches of the old worlds in Africa and Asia.

On the other hand, their world was religiously plural probably well beyond what we normally tend to imagine. If you read a standard introduction to Greek and Roman deities in the early centuries, you will find them described by the dozens. A simple look at the names for Zeus, however, strongly suggests that each temple dedicated to him had a local aspect which implied a different god, not a universal Zeus. Pausanius’ tale of his trip around Greece during the second century has him note the local importance of each shrine every bit as much as he assigns the temples to one of the pantheon members.⁴ Indeed Maximus of Tyre, a Greek philosopher in the same century, suggested that there were probably 30,000 gods worshipped in the Eastern Mediterranean.⁵ That is not the thirty million gods of India but it is a considerable number of deities. Early Christian communities emerged in the midst of remarkable religious pluralism.

Furthermore, those early Christians did not grow within a Christendom in which all other religious options were forbidden or unattractive. Indeed as we look at mission history we find Christians preaching Christ while living in the midst of a religious majority which did not find Christian faith the best option. In the eighth century Timothy of Baghdad was called before the caliph who wanted to find out why he was not a Muslim. Timothy thought that although Mohammed was neither the Paraclete incarnate nor a prophet in the likeness of Moses, he had claim to being a prophet of God which should be recognized by all reasonable people. He should be praised because he worshipped one God, fought polytheism and idolatry, and encouraged his followers toward good works. But Timothy graciously responded to the caliph’s puzzlement with the Christian conception of Trinity and his insistence that nothing could be three and one at the same time by asking the caliph if a three denarii gold piece must be either three or one. He did not attack Islam and its prophet as totally false, but he also did not give up his faith that Jesus Christ was God incarnate.⁶ The seventh century Dunhuang documents found in Western China were preserved in a Buddhist library. They find truth in Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism and use Chinese words and concepts already accepted in Chinese culture for speaking about God as the ones which Christians should use to speak about God, the Father. They point out how similar many aspects of the moral life are, whether in Taoism, Confucianism or Buddhism. At the same time they insist on telling the story of Jesus and singing a Trinitarian doxology.⁷ What we need for our present mission situation is not only the best biblical scholarship which encourages the texts to speak but also the best church history which insists that Christians in religiously plural environments did not give up their mission to call neighbors to conversion.

A final question often irrupts from within archconservative circles and

concerns the problems of syncretism, of so strongly affirming truth in other religions and cultures that the truth of the gospel is lost. Once more we need to return to Scripture and church history. The religion of the Old Testament both attacks some views of Canaanites and affirms others. Names for god in Hebrew scripture take forms from the Canaanite languages and cultures already there. Parts of Proverbs probably are quotations from an earlier Egyptian wisdom book. When Paul preaches in Athens he can call its people “religious,” say he is going to talk about their statue to an unknown god and quote two passages from their philosophers as true statements about God. He does not soft peddle the resurrection of Jesus; he says things that he knows will not necessarily appeal to their views (their “felt needs” if you will allow a modern description). But he finds in their religion truth to affirm, not merely error to be denied. When Christians began to call Jesus “Lord” they were using a Greek word that the Hellenistic public had heard about the highest gods of their religions. Christians knew it from the Greek translation of the Old Testament, but that word rather than the Hebrew “Messiah” let their message ring in Hellenistic culture. Missionaries in many parts of Africa found a native belief in a high god whose name was known and whose actions were described in myth and story. One of the CMF missionaries among the Turkana had a shaman walk into his camp, say that his god in a dream and told him to go to that oasis and learn more about him. You could hardly begin your response to such a man by telling him that he worshipped a totally false god.

We do live in a remarkably religiously pluralistic setting. The more we go where the people are—round the globe and into the cities—the more we will feel that pressure. But we need not abandon our confession of Jesus as God incarnate, the ultimate revelation. Scripture makes those claims. Christians as minorities in other religiously plural situations have continued to preach and to witness. But to do that in a biblical and church historical way, we will also have to affirm whatever truth we find in the other religions practiced where we live. Prophets and apostles did that; Jesus did the same.⁸ Christian mission need not be abandoned in the 21st century. But it must not be marked by the imperialism and the arrogance of some 19th century projects. The Christendom of seldom opposed privilege and power has disappeared or is disappearing.

We serve a risen Lord who came to serve, not to be served. We can be witnesses to him from within a minority situation that takes religious pluralism seriously.

Notes

¹Lamin Saneeh, *Translating the Message: the Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991)

²Paul Knitter, *No Other Name? A Critical survey of Christian Attitudes toward World Religions* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1985)

³Pliny, *Ep.* 10

⁴Jaí Elsner, *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), Chapter 4

⁵Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 11.12

⁶*The Apology of Timothy the Patriarch before the Caliph Mahdi*, Syriac text and English translation by A. Mingana, Woodbrooke Studies II (Cambridge: Heffer, 1928), 1-163

⁷Y. Saeki, *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China*, 2nd ed. (Tokyo: Academy of Oriental culture, Tokyo Institute, 1951)

⁸The arguments in the second section of this article are more fully developed in "Theological Resources for Response to Pluralism from Christian Churches/Churches of Christ," *Grounds for Understanding: Ecumenical Resources for Responses to Pluralism*, ed. S. Mark Heim (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 107-121, "God and the Gods: Expect Footprints," *Unto the Uttermost: Missions in the Christian Churches/Churches of Christ*, ed. by Doug Priest, Jr. (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1984), 55-69 and "Preaching to Pagans: Ambiguity and Clarity," *The Gospel Unhindered: Modern Missions and the Book of Acts*, ed. by Doug Priest, Jr. (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1994), 131-141

1999 Reed Lecture

Christian Women at the Turn of the Century

Churches from across the theological spectrum are engaged in discussing issues of women in church leadership. Professor **Debra Hull** will ably address these issues from her perspective as an elder at Bethany Memorial Christian Church, the Church of Thomas and Alexander Campbell and from her historical research on the subject. She is Dean of Wheeling Jesuit College and author of *Christian Church Women, Shapers of a Movement* (Chalice, 1994).

February 17, 1999

7:30pm

**Chapel, Emmanuel School of Religion
Johnson City, TN**

Lecture Host: Professor Paul M. Blowers,
Emmanuel School of Religion

The Unitarian and Orthodox Backgrounds of the Stone - Campbell Atonement Debate

by Victor McCracken*

From 1840 to 1841, Barton Stone and Alexander Campbell engaged in a lengthy debate in the pages of the Millennial Harbinger and Christian Messenger. The debate centered on the nature of the atonement and was the culmination of a controversy in the Stone-Campbell Movement which had been raging for some time. Soon after the Stone-Campbell union, Thomas Campbell engaged in a shorter discussion with Barton Stone over the nature of atonement.¹ In 1836, Stone published “a few friendly remarks” addressed to Walter Scott in which he repudiated Scott’s “unscriptural” view of atonement.² Even outside the Restoration movement, opponents were well aware that Stone held unorthodox views respecting the reason for Christ’s death. Apparently, some opponents of the Stone-Campbell Movement sought to divide the leaders by marking Stone as one who did not believe that the blood of Christ had any influence on God or his government to forgive sin.³ The doctrine of atonement, then, was one of several doctrines evidencing a diversity of beliefs in the Stone-Campbell Movement soon following the 1832 union.

Recently, John Mark Hicks has presented a paradigm to explain the atonement controversy in the Stone-Campbell Movement.⁴ It is not my purpose here to explicate Campbell’s, Stone’s, and Scott’s views of atonement already well-defined by Hicks. Rather, my purpose is twofold: (1) to identify what parties were involved in the larger atonement debate engulfing American religion in the early nineteenth century, and (2) to challenge a portion of Hicks’ thesis regarding the relationship between Campbell’s, Stone’s and Scott’s views of atonement. A closer examination of the historical context for the debate reveals the degree to which Stone on the one hand and Scott and Campbell on the other relied on the insight and rhetoric of their contemporaries.

The Crux of the Debate

Scholars have noted that the atonement debate in the nineteenth century was both important and controversial.⁵ Protestants of the nineteenth century had inherited a common substitutionary understanding of atonement from the Reformation fathers.⁶ Christ died for the sins of humanity; nothing more or less would suffice. Without his death, humanity had only to look forward to the vengeance of a God who refused to stand in the presence of sin. With his death, the elect of God could remain assured that God had been propitiated. The innocent Christ took the place of the guilty, suffering in their place in order that his righteousness might be imputed to them. He was the substitute who bore their punishment, a sacrificial lamb, a typological fulfillment of what the animal sacrifices under the Old Law only looked

*Victor McCracken is a student at Abilene Christian University, Abilene, TX. He is the 1998 winner of the Lockridge Ward Wilson Competition - an award for papers on the Stone-Campbell Movement submitted by seminary students.

forward to. It was this doctrine of substitutionary atonement that prevailed in American Protestantism in the early nineteenth century. It was also this view of atonement which Alexander Campbell advocated in The Christian System:

[Sacrifice] propitiates God and reconciles man. God's "anger is turned away;" (not a turbulent passion, not an implacable wrath;) but "*that moral sentiment and justice,*" which demands the punishment of the violated law, is pacified or well pleased; and man's hatred and animosity against God is subdued, overcome, and destroyed in and by the same sacrifice. . . . [Paul] makes the death of Christ the basis of reconciliation, saying, "Be reconciled to God," for he has made Christ a sin-offering for us; and now "God is in Christ, reconciling the world to himself."⁷

It was this doctrine of substitutionary atonement, however, that distressed Stone greatly. In 1805, Stone published two letters addressed "to a friend."⁸ These letters are the earliest written documents outlining Stone's objections to the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. Why did Stone object to this view of atonement? First, the very word atonement means to make "at-one" two entities that were previously separated. The word implies change. The doctrine of substitutionary atonement is premised on the belief that Christ's death was a way to "change God" by moving him from wrath to love. For Stone, however, the God of the Bible is an unchanging God. He has always loved his creation. It would be contradictory to believe that perfect love and perfect wrath could exist in the same being.⁹ Thus, substitutionary atonement makes a mockery of the perfect, unchanging love that exists within God.

Second, the doctrine of substitutionary atonement supposes that God's justice is at stake. Someone had to endure the punishment for sin. Without punishment, God's just nature would be violated. Stone, however, challenges the "justice" of such a substitution. Would it be just were any government in the world to start punishing the innocent in place of the guilty? For Stone, such an idea runs contrary to what would seem just, even for the supreme God of heaven and earth.¹⁰

Third, substitutionary atonement bore troubling implications for Stone's view of salvation. Newly convicted that Christ had died for all, not merely the elect, Stone concluded that if Christ died to pay the penalty for all this would naturally imply that all were saved. If all were not saved, however, Stone would be forced to conclude that the Calvinist doctrine of election was correct. Neither of these alternatives appealed to Stone. He himself implies that this was the main reason he began questioning the doctrine of substitutionary atonement.¹¹

Stone's "new doctrine" of atonement answered these three dilemmas by shifting the locus of atonement from God to humanity. Because atonement implies change, and because God is unchanging, it is then the case that atonement was the means by which *God* affected change in *humanity*. For Stone it is not God but humans who receive the propitiation for sins.¹² Through Christ's blood, God reveals his love

for humanity, and through it humanity is led to love God.¹³ The “at-one-ing” action of Christ reunites humanity with God by influencing individuals to live pious, Godly lives. In no case was Christ’s death ever intended to pay the penalty for our sins. Christ did, however, redeem humanity, but not from God or his justice. Christ redeemed humanity from the devil, who has humankind captive by his will.¹⁴ Christ’s blood was the price of redemption, paid to Satan. We are redeemed *for* God. Finally, because Christ’s death was God’s means of affecting change in the hearts of individuals, it was incumbent on each one either to accept Christ as Lord and thus have access to this atoning power, or to reject him and be cut off from God. This moral view of atonement did not lead to universalism precisely because Stone believed each individual has the capability of either accepting or rejecting the divine call. Stone’s view was a stark challenge to Calvinists who advocated both the doctrine of substitutionary atonement and divine election.

As can be expected, Stone’s letters elicited no small reaction from defenders of Calvinist Orthodoxy. Later in 1805 John Campbell, a Presbyterian revivalist,¹⁵ published his Strictures on Two Letters in which he both attacked Stone’s moral view of atonement and defended substitutionary atonement as wholly biblical. Campbell faults Stone for confusing the moral justice which is at stake when individuals sin with the pecuniary justice which constitutes the need for payment of a debt. Christ did not, according to Campbell, die in order to “pay a price to Satan.”¹⁶ It is God’s law which has been violated. Campbell also concludes that Stone is heretical and has been influenced by “deistical writers” like Morgan, Herbert, and Thomas Paine.¹⁷ In the rational milieu of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, it is no surprise that deists like Paine were also arguing against the “just nature” of substitutionary atonement. At its most base level, the belief that a perfect, innocent being would die in place of a guilty sinner—and the equally astounding notion that this would be pronounced “just” by Christian orthodoxy—seemed ridiculous to enlightened intellects like Paine. On the basis of the apparent similarity between Stone’s and the deists’ repudiation of Calvinist atonement theology, Campbell criticized Stone as being no different from heretics who had renounced Christian faith altogether. Campbell further accused Stone of denying the equality of Christ with the Father, though as of 1805 Stone had written nothing with respect to his views on the Trinity.¹⁸

Stone’s response to Campbell came the same year. In light of Campbell’s criticism, Stone apparently felt some need to clarify his statement concerning the price paid to Satan. Stone agrees with Campbell that while the blood of Christ is most frequently mentioned in Scripture as the price of redemption, it is so only metaphorically. The price was not literally given the devil. Christ’s death, rather, was God’s means of drawing humankind from sin and Satan to God.¹⁹ Unlike Campbell, Stone believed that this redemption occurred because Christ’s death influenced sinners to lead new lives where piety and reverence for God was the norm. In his response to Campbell, Stone appears to

correct, or at the very least tone down, his earlier statements concerning the “ransom paid to Satan.” Stone’s clarification/retraction quite obviously continued to plague him long after he published his 1805 letters. In An Address to the Churches, published in 1821, Stone notes that many have accused him of believing that Christ’s blood was a ransom paid to the devil.²⁰ Stone rejects this altogether. Later that year, Stone felt it necessary to write a scathing response to a pamphlet printed by John R. Moreland, who accused Stone of contradicting himself in retracting his claim that the price paid Satan was the blood of Christ. Stone reaffirms that Christ did pay the price, metaphorically speaking, thus destroying the power of death and the one who possessed the power—Satan.²¹

As for the bulk of Stone’s response to Campbell’s critique, as well as for Campbell’s increasingly acerbic remarks against Stone, these have little bearing on the future debate in the Restoration movement. One is struck by the relative lack of continuity between Stone’s argumentation in his early letters and his more developed arguments respecting atonement in his Address and his later correspondence with Thomas and Alexander Campbell. It is clear that by 1821, Stone has developed a more systematic approach to the topic. In the Address, one finds Stone arguing philological points and positing proper ways to translate Hebrew and Greek words. Stone developed a rhetorical approach to atonement in which he distinguished sins of ignorance (for which sacrifice was permitted) from purposeful sins (for which no sacrifice was possible).²² It is only in Christ that the loving God can forgive those who believe in Christ and thus become new, holy creatures. Under no circumstance does Christ’s death “appease” the wrath or justice of God.²³ The Address reveals the exegetical framework of Stone’s thought which was to play a role in his debate with Alexander Campbell in 1840-41. It is Stone’s earlier letters, however, that reveal the theological and logical dilemma which initially prompted Stone to reject substitutionary atonement.

Unitarian Backgrounds

One of the nagging problems plaguing recent discussion of the atonement debate is that scholars have neglected sources written prior to the Protestant debates which shed valuable light on the controversy. David Wells, for example, begins his analysis of the atonement debate around 1822, noting only that discussion about the atonement in the 1820s was scant.²⁴ Hicks also restricts his focus to the time frame of 1830-41, when atonement was being debated in the Stone-Campbell Movement.²⁵ While both articles do justice to the discussions themselves, neither takes into account the material written *before* the time of these debates. Wells even takes steps to explain why atonement was *not* a core issue for Protestant theologians of the early nineteenth-century. First, he says that Christianity as a whole was under attack. Issues such as the authority of Scripture displaced issues like atonement, relegating them to a secondary status in the apologetic discussions. Second, Wells believes it likely that revivalism muffled discussion of the

atonement. Preachers were more concerned with issues surrounding the nature of conversion—divine election, the role of ecstatic experience, and the use of emotional persuasion in preaching.²⁶ These issues supplanted atonement as the core of debate among American evangelicals.

It is not entirely accurate to suppose that revivalism muffled discussion on Christ's redemptive activity. As noted above, Stone began questioning the validity of substitutionary atonement because he was unable to reconcile his conviction that Christ died for all with the Calvinist doctrine of divine election. At least in Stone's case, revivalism did little to quench his criticism of substitutionary atonement. Even granting that Stone is an isolated example far removed from the cultural centers of Princeton and Yale, Wells is hardly correct in claiming that discussion of the atonement in the 1820s was "scant." Stone was not a lone voice in the wilderness. Literature on the doctrine of atonement prior to 1840 reveals that the atonement was one of a few core issues that was at stake in the debate between Unitarians and Calvinist orthodoxy.

In England, John Taylor of Norwich (1694-1761) is an early example of a Unitarian dissenter who questioned the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. In many ways Taylor is a fitting counterpart to Stone. Educated in the dissenting academies at Whitehaven and Findern, Taylor disowned all party names except Christian and did his best to avoid arguing about trinitarian theology.²⁷ In the mid-eighteenth century, Taylor published a book entitled The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement, a book first printed in America in 1809, just four years after Stone published his infamous letters. Like Stone, Taylor rejects substitutionary atonement as wholly unfair:

if the lawgiver should insist upon vicarious punishment, or require the innocent to die, or accept the voluntary death of the innocent, . . . this seems *more* inconsistent with righteousness and justice, and more remote from all the ends of moral government, than simply to pardon the nocent [sic] without any consideration at all.²⁸

Also like Stone, Taylor sees Christ's death as God's means to "lead men to repentance, and to engage them to duty and obedience."²⁹ Christ's sacrifice, like sacrifices under the old law, had no effect on God but were intended "to dispose the mind to sincere love and obedience of God."³⁰ For John Taylor, the locus of Christ's redemptive activity on the cross was humanity, not God.

Richard Wright (1764-1836), a Unitarian missionary in Scotland, attests another example of the importance of the doctrine of atonement in the unitarian-Calvinist controversies. Wright published The Anti-Satisfactionist in 1805, a pointed attack against substitutionary atonement. Wright argues that God has always loved the world and that "his designs, arising from his infinite wisdom and *pure goodness* are immutable."³¹ Atonement means reconciliation, and it is humans, not God, who receive this reconciliation.³²

Taylor and Wright were not the only dissenters in England

questioning orthodox atonement theology. Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) was the most influential figure in the early history of the Unitarian movement in England.³³ In 1782, Priestley published what was to become one of the more infamous works from the Unitarian movement, An History of the Corruptions of Christianity. Priestley argues that Christ's death was the means of cleansing and sanctifying individuals, allowing them to enter the presence of God without fear.³⁴ Christ died in order to prove the truth of the resurrection³⁵ and as an example of "voluntary obedience" for Christians to emulate.³⁶ As with Taylor, Wright, and Stone, Priestley denies that Christ's death was intended to appease God's wrath or justice. Following his emigration to the United States in 1794, Priestley had a remarkable influence on American unitarianism.³⁷

The American Unitarian Hosea Ballou (1771-1852) is yet another dissenter who sharply questioned the Calvinist doctrine of atonement. In 1805, the same year that Stone published his letters on atonement, Ballou published his own challenge to Calvinist orthodoxy, A Treatise on Atonement. What is striking about Ballou's treatise is the degree to which his arguments so closely parallel Stone's. Ballou argues that substitutionary atonement nullifies the unchangeable nature of God.³⁸ Substitutionary atonement is both illogical and unjust.³⁹ God is not the one who receives the effect of Christ's death. Rather, it is humanity that receives the atonement:

Let it be understood, that it is man who receives the atonement, who stands in need of reconciliation, who, being dissatisfied, needs satisfaction; and not place those imperfections and wants in him who is infinite in his fulness.⁴⁰

It is clear that Stone was not alone in his repudiation of substitutionary atonement. For Ballou, Priestley, Wright, Taylor, and Stone, substitutionary atonement was a doctrine demonstrating the essential depravity of Calvinism.

As a caveat, it is not my claim that Stone borrowed directly from any of these writers, though this is possible. Indeed, it is highly unlikely that Stone ever heard of the Scottish missionary Richard Wright. Neither am I claiming that Stone shares all of the doctrinal convictions of his unitarian counterparts. Stone was aware that universalism was the natural alternative to the doctrine of divine election. Unlike Ballou, this was an alternative he was unwilling to accept. It is clear, however, that Stone's criticism of orthodox atonement theology did not occur in a vacuum. The objections he raises and the answers he offers to the question "why did Christ have to die?" put him in company with other dissenters of his time, chiefly unitarians. It is little wonder that John Campbell accused Stone of denying the equality of the Son with the Father. Though Stone had not published his views on the trinity, many of his arguments concerning the atonement were reflected in the writings of the heretical unitarians! If Stone was influenced by anyone, it was not Thomas Paine. Not even Hosea Ballou was willing to accept the radical criticisms levelled against Calvinist orthodoxy by the deists.⁴¹

Stone falls in line with a long list of dissenters challenging orthodox Calvinist doctrine. Divine election, trinitarian dogma, and atonement were just a few of the issues at stake in the controversy.

What interaction would Stone have had with unitarianism in Kentucky, being so far removed from the conversations circulating in England and New England? Nowhere does Stone explicitly profess what sources he drew from in reforming his view of atonement. Conjectures at this point must be held tentatively. It is clear that even in rural Kentucky unitarianism was making its mark. Augustin Eastin, a Baptist minister in Paris, Kentucky, just 12 miles from Cane Ridge, became convinced through his study of Scripture that the doctrine of the Trinity was unbiblical. He was eventually expelled from the Baptist denomination. In 1804 Eastin published a letter addressed to David Barrow in which he defended his unitarian convictions.⁴² Soon afterwards there were nearly forty unitarian Baptist preachers in Northeast Kentucky, and others scattered through other parts of the state.⁴³ It is reasonable to assume that Stone himself was acquainted with Eastin and that unitarian sentiment was not foreign to the hills of Bourbon county.

Noah Worcester (1758-1837) is another person whose work clearly influenced Stone. Worcester was sharply criticized for his unitarian leanings.⁴⁴ In 1829, he published a book which attacked the doctrine of substitutionary atonement and affirmed a moral view in accord with Stone's understanding.⁴⁵ Two years later, Stone printed a fictional episode of a "Mr. C" who upon reading B.W. Stone's Address and Noah Worcester's book on atonement exclaims,

These ideas fully prove to my mind, that the doctrine under examination [i.e. substitutionary atonement] is without foundation in scripture, and in direct opposition to some of the most prominent truths of revelation and, therefore, should be rejected from the system of theology.⁴⁶

Worcester is another link between Stone and the unitarian sentiment affecting American religion in the early nineteenth-century. Interestingly enough, just two years after Stone published his positive remarks about Worcester's book, Alexander Campbell published a private letter from Thomas Campbell to William Z. Thompson. In this correspondence, Thomas Campbell criticizes Worcester's doctrine for subverting "the basis of the divine government," and robbing "the gospel of all that glorifies the wisdom and power, the justice and mercy of God in putting away sin and in saving the sinner."⁴⁷ Stone's acceptance and Thomas Campbell's rejection of Worcester's moral view of atonement was a fitting prelude to the larger controversy between Stone and Alexander Campbell in 1840-41.

One should be careful not to assume that the word "unitarian" necessarily connotes a new denominational identity. Most unitarian preachers in England during this time were General Baptists who retained their name even after rejecting trinitarian doctrine.⁴⁸ Whether Stone was directly influenced by the Unitarians, or whether he arrived

at his conclusions independently, it is safe to say that Stone was at least prone to asking the same questions as the unitarians, if not always coming to the same conclusions.

Orthodox Response

John Mark Hicks delineates three major doctrines of atonement circulating in the nineteenth century: (1) penal substitution, (2) governmental, and (3) moral.⁴⁹ Hicks's thesis is that in the Stone-Campbell Movement, Stone represents the moral view of atonement, Campbell the penal substitution view and Scott the mediating governmental view of atonement.⁵⁰ This three-pronged paradigm for understanding the atonement debate is common in recent discussion. In like fashion, David Wells identifies three "towering figures" in New England Protestantism representing each of these views: Charles Hodge (penal substitution), Nathaniel William Taylor (governmental), and Horace Bushnell (moral).⁵¹ Hicks further cites a study by Robert Chiles, who outlines the progression from a penal substitution view to a governmental view to a moral view of atonement in nineteenth-century Methodism.⁵² It is this three-pronged paradigm that I wish to challenge in the conclusion of my paper.

The Unitarian dissenters made clear glaring weaknesses in the orthodox doctrine of substitutionary atonement. Critics observed that condemning the innocent instead of the guilty is inherently unjust. Substitutionary atonement makes the unchanging God of love into a God whose wrath is appeased by the sacrifice of his son. It is not difficult to see the logic behind criticism of the traditional view.

How did orthodoxy respond to unitarian criticism? First, defenders challenged the notion that Christ's death only affected humanity. Joseph Gilbert, in his response to unitarians in England, claims that limiting the doctrine in this manner "is really to doom us to despair." He adds that the unitarian approach to atonement as displayed in Richard Wright's *The Anti-Satisfactionist* is contrary to the scope of scriptural testimony, where salvation is generally stated "to be in connexion with such things as law, guilt, wrath, condemnation, penalty."⁵³ Gilbert also objects to the unitarians who argue from the etymology of "atonement" that the word means only a reconciliation. Gilbert grants that atonement means reconciliation, but he adds that it also signifies the means by which that reconciliation was accomplished—i.e., by the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ on the cross.⁵⁴

Second, defenders of substitutionary atonement made reference to an anecdote from ancient history which illustrated the "justice" of an innocent person suffering in place of the guilty. John Campbell says:

Zaleucus, the Locrian Legislator, framed a law, by which adultery was to be punished in the person violating it, with the loss of both his eyes. It happened that his own son was convicted of the crime and sentenced to endure the penalty. *To support the dignity of the law*, and yet to preserve the sight to his son, the benevolent Zaleucus had one of his son's eyes, and one of his own put out.⁵⁵

It will be useful if we digress for a moment and consider John Locke's influence on political thought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.⁵⁶ In his second treatise of Government, Locke argues that political societies are established in order to preserve the natural rights of individuals who have joined themselves to this society. When a crime is committed in a political society, punishment is necessary in order to preserve moral order.⁵⁷ What is crucial to our discussion is Locke's statement of what happens when a ruler fails to implement the laws of a society:

There is one way more whereby such a Government may be dissolved, and that is, when he who has the Supream [sic] Executive Power, neglects and abandons that charge, so that the Laws already made can no longer be put in execution. This is demonstratively to reduce all to Anarchy, and so effectually to *dissolve the Government*. For Laws not being made for themselves, but to be by their execution the Bonds of the Society, to keep every part of the Body Politick [sic] in its due place and function, when that totally ceases, the *Government* visibly *ceases*, and the People become a confused Multitude, without Order or Connexion.⁵⁸

For Locke it is absolutely necessary that a political ruler administer Laws without partiality. Failure to render punishment when it is due would lead to anarchy and the dissolution of the government.

Locke's political philosophy provided a fitting background for understanding the orthodox response to the unitarian challenge. Advocates of orthodox atonement theology now argued that it was not God's wrath that was the issue but rather God's divine law and the moral order of society. Samuel Drew proclaimed that divine justice would not permit God to forgive sin without punishment.⁵⁹ God was a divine ruler who established laws which must not be violated. Joseph Gilbert argues for the necessity of punishment in the case of transgression:

A guardian of public rights, indeed, for the protection of which public law is instituted, may often be bound by justice to award suffering; but it is not by justice to the individual sufferer, who would willingly forego that claim, but by justice to the public, for whose security the law, and in particular this essential part of it—its penalties—were provided.⁶⁰

Against the background of Locke's philosophy of civil law, the Locrian analogy provided a fitting explanation of the significance of Christ's death. Zaleucus had to punish his son, otherwise the dignity of the Locrian law would be profaned. In bearing the punishment for the sake of his son, Zaleucus preserved the dignity of the law, bearing the punishment absolutely necessary in order to preserve moral order while also granting mercy for the sake of his son. Like Zaleucus, Christ recognized the necessity of punishment for sin. Without punishment, God's divine law is profaned. In dying for the sins of the elect, Christ preserves the moral order by bearing the penalty that must be inflicted when God's law is broken.

Use of the Locrian analogy was widespread between 1800 and 1840. Gilbert, for example, made use of the illustration in his polemic against English Unitarians in 1836.⁶¹ In the Stone-Campbell Movement, Walter Scott also cites the Locrian anecdote as a parallel to Christ's death on the cross. "If the Divine Father had not made original law his care, but suffered it to be violated with impunity," says Scott, "on what would the grounds of our present confidence have been founded?"⁶² With this illustration, orthodoxy was able to defend the justice of substitutionary atonement against the objections of unitarian dissenters. Admittedly this view of atonement did not find its origin in Locke's thought. Nevertheless, Locke's thought did fertilize the intellectual soil which made orthodox acceptance of this view a possibility.

The Locrian analogy is a concrete illustration of the *governmental view* of atonement, a view which Hicks ascribes to Walter Scott. As previously stated, Hicks sees this approach to atonement as a mediating view between Campbell's substitutionary view and Stone's moral view of atonement. However, this paradigm is questionable. As I have demonstrated above, the "governmental view" which Scott upholds is frequently advocated by those defending substitutionary atonement. If Campbell and Scott reflected two different views of atonement, surely one would find this diversity when comparing Campbell's and Scott's arguments. When one examines Alexander Campbell's argument in The Christian System, however, one is hard pressed to prove he is saying anything different from Scott. Indeed, Campbell quotes extensively from Richard Watson in support of a view of atonement very close to the governmental view:

A government which admitted no forgiveness, would sink the guilty in despair; a government which never punishes offence, is a contradiction; it cannot exist. Not to punish the guilty is to dissolve authority; to punish without mercy is to destroy, and where all are guilty, to make destruction universal.⁶³

For Campbell Christ's death was necessary in order to preserve the moral order of the universe. Repentance is not enough, for were this principle applied to human governments, every criminal would escape and "judicial forms would become a subject of ridicule" and would lead to "endless disorder and misery."⁶⁴ Clearly, Campbell is not operating independently of a governmental understanding of atonement. Scott makes essentially the same claim when establishing the analogy between the Locrian king's punishment of himself and Christ's death on the cross. For Scott and Campbell *alike*, Christ's death was God's way of upholding respect and sanctity for his law.

My argument is that this "governmental view" of atonement as employed by Scott should not be understood as a view distinct from the substitutionary view. It is clear that a sharp separation of the substitutionary and governmental views of atonement is problematic, principally because those like Scott who are arguing for a "governmental view" do not see themselves operating independently of the orthodox substitutionary view. In this instance, the governmental view of

atonement was a further elaboration of the doctrine of substitutionary atonement, a way of explaining why Christ had to be a substitute in place of humanity.⁶⁵ Campbell and Scott appear to have drawn from the insight of the defenders of substitutionary atonement, demonstrated by Scott's use of the Locrian analogy which circulated in America and England in the 1830s.

Conclusion

Admittedly this paper only scratches the surface of the atonement debate in the Stone-Campbell movement. While Hicks has done a fine job of clarifying the primary issues for Stone and Campbell, there is still plenty of uncharted territory in the atonement debate. I offer the following suggestions for further study:

(1) More attention needs to be devoted to the unitarian background of the atonement debate. It would be interesting to explore the development of the exegetical arguments made by Stone, many of which find parallels in unitarian literature. For example, Stone presents a systematic study of the Hebrew word *nasa* (to bear). Defenders of substitutionary atonement had long claimed that Christ bore the penalty for our sins, basing this understanding on a typological reading of OT texts. Stone rebuts that *nasa* very often is used to say that God "bore" the sins of people (Exod 34:7, 32:32, Num 14:18, et al.). It would be hardly logical to suppose that this means God "bore the penalty" for sins. Rather, *nasa* means that God "forgave" or "took away" sins. Stone argues against the standard typological appropriation of OT texts to bolster the doctrine of substitutionary atonement.⁶⁶ Stone's philological arguments find a close parallel in John Taylor's The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement Examined. Taylor argues that the Hebrew word *nasa* when applied to God clearly does not mean that God "bore the sin" of humanity. God "bears sins away," and this is what Christ does as well.⁶⁷ Stone also argues that the Hebrew word *kaphar*, frequently translated "atone," only refers to making something clean, never to propitiating God.⁶⁸ Joseph Priestley makes the same observation in his critique of substitutionary atonement.⁶⁹ Without hazarding the hasty assertion that Stone drew directly from Priestley or Taylor, I believe that a more forthright study of the parallels between Stone and his contemporaries will shed light on the exegetical options available to Stone and Campbell during their debate.

(2) It would be interesting to explore the way that the Locrian analogy came to be associated with the doctrine of atonement. By 1805, John Campbell was able to use the illustration in his critique of Barton Stone's letters. Campbell cites John Flavel as his source for the Locrian story, though I have been unable to confirm the citation.⁷⁰ While Alexander Campbell clearly expresses sentiments akin to Walter Scott's, Campbell himself does not appear to have utilized the Locrian analogy in his discussion of the atonement.

(3) I believe it would be beneficial for scholars to reassess what lasting impact (or lack thereof) this debate may have had on the Restoration movement. What happened to Stone's moral view after he

died? Did any other thinkers in the Stone-Campbell movement question the doctrine of substitutionary atonement?⁷¹

Does the modern Stone-Campbell movement have a concrete doctrine of atonement that it is willing to defend, and (most importantly) is our doctrine of atonement one that we need to reassess? Irrespective of the unitarian and orthodox backgrounds of the Stone-Campbell debate, the lasting relevance of this discussion will come only when we are willing to open the question for ourselves.⁷²

Notes

¹See Thomas Campbell, "Worcester on the Atonement," Millennial Harbinger 4 (June 1833): 256-62, as well as Campbell's continuing response in Millennial Harbinger 4 (Aug.-Dec. 1833): 421-25, 439-45, 503-509, 548-53, 594-98. For Stone's side of the correspondence, see "To Elder Thomas Campbell, Senr.," Christian Messenger 7 (July-Aug. 1833): 204-10, and 225-230.

²Barton Stone, "A few friendly remarks on brother Walter Scott's views of atonement, contained in his last book, 'The ancient Gospel restored.'" Christian Messenger 10 (Nov. 1836): 171.

³See Stone's response to the Baptist Banner in his article "The Baptist Banner," Christian Messenger 10 (April 1836): 49-51. Stone continued his response later the same year by reprinting a letter written by an anonymous clergyman with his response: Christian Messenger 10 (July 1836): 103-110.

⁴"What Did Christ Accomplish on the Cross? Atonement in Campbell, Stone, and Scott," Lexington Theological Journal 30 (1995): 145-70.

⁵For example David Wells, "The Debate over the Atonement in 19th-Century America Part 1 (of 4 parts): American Society as Seen from the 19th-Century Pulpit," Bibliotheca Sacra 144 (1987): 123.

⁶L.W. Grensted, A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1920), 221.

⁷Alexander Campbell, The Christian System, 2d ed., (Pittsburgh: Forrester and Campbell, 1839; reprint, Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1956), 23-24. All page numbers are from the reprint edition.

⁸Atonement. The Substance of Two Letters Written to a Friend (Lexington, KY: Joseph Charles, 1805, text-fiche), Early American Imprints [EAI], 2d series, no. 9433. Robert Marshall and John Thompson who followed Stone and Richard McNemar in their split from the Presbyterian church later recanted their allegiance to the splinter group. They claim that Richard McNemar originated the discussion on atonement in March, 1804. Marshall and Thompson say that his comments were "generally unaccepted" until June, 1804 when all the dissenters were in agreement. In commenting on Stone's correspondence they add that his letters "had done us, and the cause of religion, in general, abundance of mischief." See A Brief Historical Account of Sundry Things in the Doctrines and State of the Christian, or as it is Commonly Called, The Newlight Church, Containing their Testimony Against Several Doctrines Held in that Church, and its Disorganized State; Together with Some Reasons Why those Two Brethren Purpose to Seek for a More Pure and Orderly Connection (Cincinnati: J. Carpenter and Co., 1811, text-fiche), p. 6-7, EAI, 2d series, no. 23285.

⁹Stone, Two Letters, 5.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 15-16.

¹¹See Stone's autobiography, in The Cane Ridge Meeting-House, by James Rogers; to which is appended the autobiography of B.W. Stone, and a sketch of David Purviance by William Rogers (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1910), 178.

¹²Stone, Two Letters, 21.

¹³*Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 22-23.

¹⁵See David Newell Williams, "The Theology of the Great Revival in the West as Seen Through the Life and Thought of Barton W. Stone" (Ph.D. Diss., Vanderbilt University, 1979), 119.

¹⁶John P. Campbell, Strictures on Two Letters Published By Barton W. Stone Entitled Atonement (Lexington: Daniel Bradford, 1805. text-fiche), p. 29-30, EAI, 2d series, no. 8131.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 24, 29, 33.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 17. For a discussion of Stone's christological views and his objections to trinitarian dogma, see David Newell Williams, "The Theology of the Great Revival," 107-118.

¹⁹Barton Stone, A Reply to John P. Campbell's Strictures on Atonement (Lexington: Joseph Charles, 1805, text-fiche), p. 54-55, EAI, 2d series, no. 9434.

²⁰See An Address to the Churches, reprinted in Works of Elder B.W. Stone, vol. 1, 2d ed., by Elder James M. Mathes (Cincinnati: Moore, Wiltach, Keys & Co., 1859; reprint, Rosemead, CA: Old Paths Book Club, 1953), 109. The reprint is the 1821 revised edition of Stone's 1814 address.

²¹Barton Stone, A Letter to Mr. John R. Moreland in Reply to His Pamphlet (Lexington, KY: Pamphlet-Office of Public Advertising, 1821), 12-13.

²²Barton Stone, An Address to the Churches, 87-89.

²³*Ibid.*, 117.

²⁴David Wells, "The Debate over the Atonement in 19th-Century America Part 2 (of 4 parts): The Shaping of the 19th-Century Debate over the Atonement," Bibliotheca Sacra 144 (1987): 246-47.

²⁵"What Did Christ Accomplish on the Cross? Atonement in Campbell, Stone, and Scott," Lexington Theological Journal 30 (1995): 145-70.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 247-48.

²⁷See Earl Morse Wilbur, A History of Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952), 267.

²⁸John Taylor, The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement Examined, 1st American Edition (Boston: Farrand, Mallory, and Co., 1809, text-fiche), p. 104, EAI, 2d series, no. 18728.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 117.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 18.

³¹Richard Wright, The Anti-Satisfactionist (Wiesbech: F.B. Wright, 1805), 178.

³²*Ibid.*, 178.

³³Wilbur, A History of Unitarianism, 294.

³⁴Joseph Priestley, An History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. 1 (Birmingham: J. Johnson, 1782), 193.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 173

³⁶*Ibid.*, 180.

³⁷For a discussion of Priestley's influence, see Wilbur, A History of Unitarianism, 393-97 and Conrad Wright, The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America (Boston: Starr King

Press, 1955), 213-216.

³⁸Hosea Ballou, A Treatise on Atonement (Randolph, VT: Serano Wright, 1805, text-fiche), p. 99, EAI, 2d series, no. 7912.

³⁹Ibid., 71.

⁴⁰Ibid., 105.

⁴¹See Ernest Cassara, Hosea Ballou: The Challenge to Orthodoxy (Boston: The Universalist Historical Society, 1961), 22-31. Cassara notes that Ballou was profoundly influenced in his early years by the deist Ethan Allen. Unlike Allen, Ballou was not willing to let go of the authority of Scripture (26). Cassara further claims that Ballou is indebted to the universalist Charles Chauncy for providing him with the exegetical arguments which he presented in his treatise (27-28).

⁴²Augustine Eastin, Letters on the Divine Unity (Lexington, KY: Bradford, 1804, text-fiche), EAI, 2d series, no. 6213.

⁴³Wilbur, A History of Unitarianism, 427.

⁴⁴For a brief biographical account of Worcester, see Daniel E. Reid, Robert D. Linder, Bruce L. Shelley, and Harry S. Stout, eds. Dictionary of Christianity in America (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1990), s.v. "Worcester, Noah." by C.H. Lippy.

⁴⁵See Noah Worcester, The Atoning Sacrifice; a display of love not wrath, 3d ed. (London: J. Marden, 1830).

⁴⁶Barton Stone, "Conference on Terra Confusa," Christian Messenger 5 (Aug 1831): 170.

⁴⁷Thomas Campbell, "Worcester on Atonement," 261.

⁴⁸Richard Wright is one example of this type of unitarian minister. See Wilbur, A History of Unitarianism, 338.

⁴⁹John Mark Hicks, "Atonement in Campbell, Stone, and Scott," 145.

⁵⁰Ibid., 161.

⁵¹See Wells's four part series in Bibliotheca Sacra 144 (1987): (1) 123-43, (2) 243-53, (3) 363-76, and Bibliotheca Sacra 145 (1988): (4) 3-14.

⁵²Robert Chiles, Theological Transition in American Methodism: 1790-1935 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), 144-83, as quoted in Hicks, "Atonement in Stone, Campbell, and Scott," 146.

⁵³Joseph Gilbert, The Christian Atonement, 2d ed. (London: Jackson and Walford, 1854), 322-23. The first edition of Gilbert's book was published in 1836.

⁵⁴Ibid., 21-22.

⁵⁵John P. Campbell, Strictures on Two Letters, 44.

⁵⁶Conrad Wright, The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America, 177, recognizes the influence of John Locke on both Arminian theology and the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence. See also Harold Lunger, The Political Ethics of Alexander Campbell (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1954), 120, et al., who argues for Locke's influence on Campbell's political thought.

⁵⁷See John Locke, Two Treatises of Government (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960; originally published 1690), 312. All page numbers are to the reprint edition.

⁵⁸John Locke, Two Treatises of Government, 459.

⁵⁹Samuel Drew, Scriptural and Philosophical Arguments to Prove the Divinity of Christ and the Necessity of the Atonement (Baltimore: John D. Toy, 1819, text-fiche), p. 22, EAI, 2d series, no 47846.

⁶⁰Joseph Gilbert, The Christian Atonement, 135-36.

⁶¹Ibid., 179-80.

⁶²Walter Scott, The Gospel Restored, A Discourse (Cincinnati: O.H. Donogh, 1836;

reprint, Kansas City: Old Paths Book Club, 1949), 85.

⁶³[Richard] Watson, as quoted in Alexander Campbell, The Christian System, 27.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, 27-28.

⁶⁵Hicks, "Atonement in Stone, Campbell, and Scott," 145, notes that the "governmental view" of atonement originated in the Dutch Calvinist-Arminian struggle in which the Dutch Remonstrants were making a conscious break from the traditional doctrine of penal substitution. My contention is that this typology, while appropriate for the Dutch Calvinist-Arminian struggle, does not find a parallel in Campbell and Scott. Scott simply does not position himself as a mediator between the views of Campbell and Stone.

⁶⁶See Barton Stone, "An humble inquiry into the meaning of the Hebrew word *nasa*, connected with sin," Christian Messenger 8 (Jan. 1834): 11-16.

⁶⁷John Taylor, The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement Examined, 36. Unlike Stone, Taylor does not make a distinction between sins of ignorance and purposeful sins. However, William Magee, a Professor in the University of Dublin, expresses his awareness that some were arguing that sacrificial atonement was allowed only for *sins of ignorance*. See William Magee, Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice (New York: James Eastburn, 1813, text-fiche), p. 190, EAI, 2d series, no. 29033.

⁶⁸Barton Stone, "Atonement: No II," Christian Messenger 11 (Sept. 1840): 14.

⁶⁹Joseph Priestley, An History of the Corruptions of Christianity, 197-98.

⁷⁰John P. Campbell, Strictures on Two Letters, 44, cites *Flavel's Works*, Vol. 1, pg 109, as a reference to this Locrian story.

⁷¹John Mark Hicks, "Atonement Theology in the late Nineteenth Century: The Pattern of Discussion," Discipliana 56 (1996): 116-127, has already made valuable headway in this regard.

⁷²David Newell Williams likewise calls for Christians to recognize the relevance of Stone's doctrine of atonement for contemporary theology. See his article "The Power of Christ's Sacrifice: Barton W. Stone's Doctrine of Atonement," Discipliana 54 (1992): 20.

1999 Kirkpatrick Historians' Seminar

Stone-Campbell Fin de Siecle

The turn of the century was a turning point for the Stone-Campbell Movement. Three distinguished scholars will address these phenomena from the perspective of the liberal, moderate and conservative clusterings of the movement. A formal response and open discussion will follow the papers.

Paper #1 - *The Pre-millennialism Controversy in the Churches of Christ.*

Presenter: Hans Rollmann, Professor at Memorial University of Newfoundland and creator of the web site, "RestorationMovement"

Paper #2 - *Turn of the Century Scholarship on the Revelation of John.*

Presenter: M. Eugene Boring, I. Wylie and Elizabeth M. Briscoe Professor of New Testament, Brite Divinity School, and author of *Disciples and the Bible: A History of Disciples Interpretation in North America*

Paper #3 - *Turn of the Century Chicago Influence.*

Presenter: W. Clark Gilpin, Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago and 1997 Kirkpatrick Lecturer

Dates and Times

The 1999 Kirkpatrick Historians' Seminar will take place in the Phillips Memorial, 1101 19th Avenue South, Nashville, TN beginning at 7:30pm April 23 and continue through mid afternoon on April 24.

Reservations and Accommodations

To make reservations send \$25 to the Disciples of Christ Historical Society. The Society will assist in arranging housing if requested.



Statement of Ownership, Management, and Circulation

(Required by 39 USC 3685)

13. Publication Title <i>Discipliana</i>		14. Issue Date for Circulation Data Below <i>9.98.</i>	
15. Extent and Nature of Circulation		Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months	Actual No. Copies of Single Issue Published Nearest to Filing Date
a. Total Number of Copies (Not press run)		1500	1500
b. Paid and/or Requested Circulation	(1) Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors, and Counter Sales (Not mailed)	none	none
	(2) Paid or Requested Mail Subscriptions (Include advertiser's proof copies and exchange copies)	1350	1350
c. Total Paid and/or Requested Circulation (Sum of 15b(1) and 15b(2))		1350	1350
d. Free Distribution by Mail (Samples, complimentary, and other free)		none	none
e. Free Distribution Outside the Mail (Carriers or other means)		none	none
f. Total Free Distribution (Sum of 15d and 15e)		none	none
g. Total Distribution (Sum of 15c and 15f)		1350	1350
h. Copies not Distributed	(1) Office Use, Leftovers, Spoiled	150	150
	(2) Returns from News Agents	none	none
i. Total (Sum of 15g, 15h(1), and 15h(2))		1500	1500
Percent Paid and/or Requested Circulation (15c / 15g x 100)		2700	2700
16. Publication of Statement of Ownership <input type="checkbox"/> Publication required. Will be printed in the <u>winter</u> issue of this publication. <input type="checkbox"/> Publication not required.			
17. Signature and Title of Editor, Publisher, Business Manager, or Owner <i>Historical Society</i> <i>President, Disciples of Christ</i>			Date <i>9.26.98</i>

I certify that all information furnished on this form is true and complete. I understand that anyone who furnishes false or misleading information on this form or who omits material or information requested on the form may be subject to criminal sanctions (including fines and imprisonment) and/or civil sanctions (including multiple damages and civil penalties).

Instructions to Publishers

- Complete and file one copy of this form with your postmaster annually on or before October 1. Keep a copy of the completed form for your records.
- In cases where the stockholder or security holder is a trustee, include in items 10 and 11 the name of the person or corporation for whom the trustee is acting. Also include the names and addresses of individuals who are stockholders who own or hold 1 percent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities of the publishing corporation. In item 11, if none, check the box. Use blank sheets if more space is required.
- Be sure to furnish all circulation information called for in item 15. Free circulation must be shown in items 15d, e, and f.
- If the publication had second-class authorization as a general or requester publication, this Statement of Ownership, Management, and Circulation must be published; it must be printed in any issue in October or, if the publication is not published during October, the first issue printed after October.
- In item 16, indicate the date of the issue in which this Statement of Ownership will be published.
- Item 17 must be signed.

Failure to file or publish a statement of ownership may lead to suspension of second-class authorization.

1. Publication Title <i>Discipliana</i>		2. Publication Number <i>9 9 5 - 0 6 0</i>			3. Filing Date <i>9.20.98</i>
4. Issue Frequency <i>quarterly</i>		5. Number of Issues Published Annually <i>4</i>			6. Annual Subscription Price <i>\$15.00</i>
7. Complete Mailing Address of Known Office of Publication (Not printer) (Street, city, county, state, and ZIP+4) <i>Disciples of Christ Historical Society</i> <i>1101 19th Ave S, Nashville TN 37212</i>					Contact Person <i>Peter Morgan</i>
8. Complete Mailing Address of Headquarters or General Business Office of Publisher (Not printer) <i>Disciples of Christ Historical Society</i> <i>1101 19th Ave S., Nashville TN 37212</i>					Telephone <i>327-1444</i>
9. Full Names and Complete Mailing Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor (Do not leave blank)					
Publisher (Name and complete mailing address) <i>Peter Morgan</i> <i>1101 19th Ave. S</i> <i>Nashville TN 37212</i>					
Editor (Name and complete mailing address) <i>Newell Williams, Christian Theological Seminary</i> <i>1000 W. 42nd St. 46208</i> <i>Indianapolis IN 46208</i>					
Managing Editor (Name and complete mailing address) <i>Peter Morgan</i> <i>1101 19th Ave. S.</i> <i>Nashville TN 37212</i>					
10. Owner (Do not leave blank. If the publication is owned by a corporation, give the name and address of the corporation immediately followed by the names and addresses of all stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of the total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, give the names and addresses of the individual owners. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, give its name and address as well as those of each individual owner. If the publication is published by a nonprofit organization, give its name and address.)					
Full Name		Complete Mailing Address			
<i>Disciplines of Christ Historical Soc.</i>		<i>1101 19th Ave. S. Nashville 37212-2196</i>			
11. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and Other Security Holders Owning or Holding 1 Percent or More of Total Amount of Bonds, Mortgages, or Other Securities. If none, check box <input type="checkbox"/> None					
Full Name		Complete Mailing Address			
<i>N/A</i>					
12. Tax Status (For completion by nonprofit organizations authorized to mail at special rates) (Check one) The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for federal income tax purposes: <input type="checkbox"/> Has Not Changed During Preceding 12 Months <input type="checkbox"/> Has Changed During Preceding 12 Months (Publisher must submit explanation of change with this statement)					



DISCIPLES OF CHRIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ORDER OF THE STONE-CAMPBELL FELLOWSHIP

The Disciples of Christ Historical Society has been blessed through the years with gifts from estates. Some have come unsolicited; others have been planned in advance with leadership of the Society. These gifts have measurably strengthened the ministry of the Society. Through the Order of the Stone-Campbell Fellowship the Society can recognize these intended gifts and express appreciation to those planning the gifts.

SUCH A FELLOWSHIP EXPRESSES CONFIDENCE IN THE FUTURE OF THE SOCIETY

Members of the Fellowship are persons who have a hope and a dream for the future of the Society as it continues to serve individuals and the church. They have named the Historical Society in their will, established a charitable gift Annuity or Trust, made a gift of life insurance, or given their home or personal property while retaining lifetime use of the property. Some of these provisions were made early in the days of the Society's 50 year history while others were made in recent months. Each is a testimony to a life of stewardship and an expression of faith in the purpose and mission of the Historical Society.

THE FELLOWSHIP IS NAMED FOR TWO OF THE EARLIEST CHURCH LEADERS

Barton Warren Stone was the first of the major leaders to appear on the scene in 19th century America. Soon thereafter Alexander Campbell's voice was heard. From the followers of these men a church was born which continues to spread the gospel. The history of that movement housed in the Thomas W. Phillips Memorial is a legacy of their early faith and witness. Their gifts live on in the life of the church and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.