



Breakup of a movement:

Documents from Sand Creek

By A. K. Guthrie

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

A GRAND OCCASION

Daniel Sommer's Preliminary Report of the Meeting

AN ADDRESS (Daniel Sommer)

Sommer's Introduction to the Declaration

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION (Version I)

Version published in Sommer's Octographic Review

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION (Version II)

Version published a week later in Christian Leader
(this one mentions Instrumental Music)



SAND CREEK CHRONICLES

Reaction by the Christian Standard

SAND CREEK ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

Reaction by David Lipscomb in Gospel Advocate

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE

Decision of the Shelby County, IL Circuit Court from Gospel Advocate

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE

Decision of the Illinois Supreme Court from Gospel Advocate

A HISTORY OF THE SAND CREEK CHURCH

Looking back, seventy years later from The Truth

INTRODUCTION

HOW THIS CAME ABOUT

I am a life-long part of the (non-instrumental) Church of Christ and an amateur historian of the Stone-Campbell (or "Restoration") Movement . I'm increasingly amazed that our movement, begun to "unify the Christians in the sects," could divide into many factions, and do it in fewer than two hundred years.

Many authors contribute to my continuing education. Cecil Hook's "Our Heritage of Unity and Fellowship" (available from him at 10905 S.W. Mira Court, Tigard, OR 97223) is especially valuable. It reproduces essays by W. Carl Ketcherside (from Mission Messenger) and Leroy Garrett (from Restoration Review).

Chapter 13, The Sand Creek Address (from Mission Messenger , February, 1962) caught my eye. I believe the Sand Creek Address and Declaration is a key to understanding the mind sets which erupted into the 1880-1910 "Great" Division. Ketcherside commented, after a lengthy quotation, "It is interesting to note that the question of instrumental music is not specifically mentioned in the document ."

My other source, "Christians Only" (James DeForest Murch), in its quotation says "Some of these things of which we hereby complain and against which we protest the use of instrumental music in the worship ."

I wrote Leroy Garrett for a "steer" to an authentic copy. I also sought a copy of the "original" from Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

Leroy's response exceeded my expectations!. There were two versions in circulation from the beginning. The earlier was from Daniel Sommer's Octographic Review of September 5, 1889; the second from J. L. Rowe's Christian Leader, September 10, 1889. Ketcherside quoted the Sommer version; Murch the Rowe version; both are true to their sources! Even better, Leroy loaned me dog-eared photocopies of both and also of Sommer's account of his "hour and forty minute" speech which immediately preceded the public reading!

The Historical Society responded also. They couldn't come up with a copy (authentic or otherwise) of the Address, but did provide a copy of a rebuttal from Christian Standard for September 28, 1889.

To keep this enlightening information readily available for my own use (and make it

available for others), I typed it all into my word processor. I hope I have not introduced additional errors of punctuation, grammar, etc. The originals have plenty of their own!

I "finished" this effort in April, 1995 and provided copies to a few interested people. This was a smart move because they, in turn, sent me enough more material to make revision possible and desirable.

As the compiler, I have a few words to say about each document. The documents, though, really speak for themselves.

Sand Creek is a fascinating subject. I'm glad to share my collection with others who share my interest.

A GRAND OCCASION

Daniel Sommer, who crosses my Indiana heritage more than once, was an able exploiter of the mass media of his day the printed page and oratory. Billy Graham didn't invent mass gatherings--the audience at Sand Creek exceeded 5,000! Since Sommer includes "independent" verification, people must have suspected "preacher counts" even in 1889!

There are traces of demagoguery here and in this article and even more in the Address. Sommer plays to the county vs. town/city social pressures of the time. His main constituency, mostly in the backwoods, were the "good guys." The problems came from the cities and towns!

Daniel Sommer is proved a prophet. The (event) "is destined to pass into history and the influence thereof will doubtless be felt until the close of time." The "end of time" hasn't arrived, but after more than one hundred years, the impact of Sand Creek is still felt!

Sommer returned to Ohio from Sand Creek sometime after Sunday, August 18 (1889). He met his first deadline (August 29) with this "teaser" and no doubt burned midnight oil getting ready for the main blast.

AN ADDRESS

Daniel Sommer prepared the assembled audience for the carefully crafted Address and Declaration which followed. He acknowledges the published version of his speech as "written out" after the fact. One insertion is identified; there may be others.

More than half of the transcript is the introduction. Sommer rehashes controversy-less matters to get the audience into an agreeing mood. He hammers his theme over and over: Faith comes from testimony; no testimony no faith; a religious practice not based on faith is sin. Religious concepts not supported by a "thus saith the Lord" are products of inference; "supposition, presumption, view, notion, idea."

Sommer then recites targeted "non-faith" issues:

THE "LOCATED" PREACHER. Sommer had doubts about Paul and Barnabas; they stayed too long at Antioch!

THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY. Half the treatment deals with the lack of scriptural authority. Sommer fails to see his creed-adopting session as equally unauthorized. The other half concerned money. Sommer made his hearers (in back country which missed the 1890 city/town prosperity) feel closer to the impecunious Peter, John and Jesus than to moneyed disciples in the cities and towns. "Poor but faithful country folk" vs. "rich and progressive city folk" is a persistent theme.

MONEY-RAISING, MORE GENERALLY. Sommer finds a doctrine of "simplicity" in scripture. His interesting ideas on the causes of poverty of individuals are fit directly to congregations. His comments about box suppers will enlighten later generations! Sommer tosses one tidbit to the audience's appetite for the risqué. He sets the older (male) against the younger (female); the "goat" of the one story is "boy just out of his teens"; it's the older businessman against the young, fun-loving, female.

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC. While I've heard most of Sommers' arguments "from my youth up," the "backslidden Jews" slant is new to me! Note one novel twist: The "weak" consciences of the strongest, least ignorant and most highly esteemed (those in the audience) should not be offended by those of opposite characteristics. One paragraph is sufficient to deal with objections! Meeting houses and artificial lighting and heat therein are specifically authorized in scripture! You need only know where to look!

At the end, the erring brethren are "formally" charged. They've been found guilty; the congregations assembled by proxy are about to pronounce judgment! The ball is passed to Elder P. P. Warren.

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION (Version I; Version II)

"Protestant denominations have bishops; the Church of Christ has editors!"

"Editor-bishop" shows up often in our written lore. Our movement was shaped by men who used the printed page effectively. Alexander Campbell was first with Christian Baptist and later Millennial Harbinger. Campbell used his near monopoly to keep the movement relatively unified into the 1860s. He was followed by potential successors with differing "axes to grind." None combined Campbell's mixture of charisma and financial resources; no one since has captured the loyalty of the entire restoration movement.

Four publications figure in the Sand Creek story. Octographic Review (published by Daniel Sommer) and Christian Leader (published by J. L. Rowe) agreed with the sentiments of "Address and Declaration." Gospel Advocate (edited by David Lipscomb) agreed with the intent but found fault with the mechanism. Christian Standard was on the other side, supporting (I assume) the "innovators" and opposing tactics of the conservatives. Sommer and Rowe put the Address into print without delay. The Standard followed with a rebuttal two weeks later. Lipscomb expressed his reservations some three years after the fact.

Presumably, the title "Address and Declaration" implied continuity with Thomas Campbell's "Declaration and Address."

Sommer's version includes a brief introduction by P. P. Warren. Warren says the document was "decided upon" by "prominent brethren" the preceding day. It's straightforward. If the last sentence weren't there, it would be a concise statement of position and a starting point for serious discussion. Unlike Sommer's speech, there are no cheap appeals to "town vs. country," "male vs. female" and "old vs. young." And, there is no mention of instrumental music.

The last sentence converts the position paper to an ultimatum! "Get In" (with us) or "Get Out" (of the brotherhood)! Daniel Sommer said a few minutes before: "The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God." This is it!

Considering the emotional turmoil prevailing, some supporters may have thought the Address too tame. I wonder if any considered the unbridled arrogance (as the "last word" interpreters of God's will) which it conveys?

Except for editorial details, the versions agree with one exception: Instrumental Music in Worship is condemned in the Rowe version but unmentioned in the Sommer version. Why?

First, I do not doubt Sommer's accuracy; I'm convinced that instrumental music was, indeed, omitted. Sommer (like others of his kind) was a stickler for "crossed t's and dotted i's." Some of Sommer's readers (and supporters) were in the audience; some helped to prepare the Declaration. Omission would have been noticed, gossiped about and used to cast doubt on his Sommer's "soundness."

Leroy Garrett suggests "It is possible that Warren did not see instrumental music in the same light as Sommer." I suggest a holdout, (which would have prevented unanimous approval) by one or more of the other signers. Or, perhaps, Sommer injected "instrumental music" into the manuscript he sent Rowe for publication or Rowe, knowing Sommer's sentiments, put it in himself. The message may have been tailored a bit to suit different audiences.

It's hard to understand everything which surfaces in a church squabble even if you're part of it -- it's even harder after a hundred years!

SAND CREEK CHRONICLES (Christian Standard)

The editor of Christian Standard missed a golden opportunity to soothe the emerging conflagration. Instead of reason, he used sarcasm! Quoting "rumor" and "ridicule" doesn't encourage objectivity.

The editor compares "Man-made religious papers" and "imported editor" vs. "Man-made missionary societies" and "imported pastors." Presented constructively, this might have encouraged rethinking by Sand Creek supporters. Presented as it was, it drove the wedge even deeper!

SAND CREED ADDRESS AND DECLARATION (Lipscomb)

David Lipscomb must have lived in a vacuum! It's difficult to understand how, in this time of general unrest in our brotherhood North and South, that news from Illinois required three years to get to Nashville. Mason-Dixon must really be a line!

Perhaps Lipscomb didn't want to hear--in this period, he tended to oppose division while Sommer tended to egg it on.

Lipscomb, it appears, agreed with the thrust of the Declaration. "The evils opposed, we oppose." He didn't object to the "can not and will not regard them as brethren" attitude. He did object to the nature of the gathering which produced the Declaration and, thereby, pushed it aside.

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE (Supreme Court Decision)

The Sand Creek Declaration was more than ten years old when this lawsuit over ownership of church property wound its way through the courts.

Note the subtle change of attitude evidenced by the Advocate's introductory paragraph. The conveners of the unauthorized convention in 1889 are now "those loyal to the Bible." By now, David Lipscomb sees division coming and values allies.

The Circuit Court decision, itself, is plain enough and more economical with words than most legal documents! From the laudatory remarks considering both sides, you can suspect that the judge was to soon run for reelection!

The Supreme Court decision, while more wordy, rubber stamps the trial judge's logic and affirms his decision.

I'm struck by unfamiliar phrases in the Supreme Court decision: "plaintiffs in error" and "defendants in error." I haven't the slightest idea about the legal significance of "in error" but it seems that when groups of brethren oppose each other in court, everybody concerned is "in error."

A HISTORY OF SAND CREEK CHURCH

Leroy Garrett shared this terse summary of the Sand Creek story after I had already compiled the bulk of this collection. I've chosen to add it.

I know nothing about the author except what I read between the lines of his essay. While I suspect he has emotional ties to the Sand Creek congregation, I'm sure he has strong ties to the Stone-Campbell movement. I'm sure, too, that he shares my deep sorrow with our well-documented tendency to divide.

Written after some seventy years of "reflection" by himself and others, he puts the whole affair into perspective much better than I can. I commend it.

AS A WHOLE

The Address, Address and Declaration, and Sand Creek Chronicles are a superb "don't do it this way" example for the Church of Christ through all time.

Neither side gave the other credit for being God fearing disciples, or even for good intentions. Both displayed the arrogance of absolute certainty. Neither came close to the

real issue: scripture-respecting disciples in different circumstances do not necessarily apply scripture in the same way. Both were so anxious to make war that they ignored the Prince of Peace!

The consequences were tragic! Such is inevitable when contrary-minded brethren fan differences into a confrontation.

The documents, as accurate as I can make them, follow. Form your own conclusions. The right "to interpret" still applies.

A. K. (Kenny) Guthrie 2044 Indian Hill Road Lynchburg, VA 24503 April 27, 1996

Revised to Include "A History of Sand Creek Church," April 26, 1996

SAND CREEK ADDRESS AND DECLARATION (by David Lipscomb)

From Gospel Advocate, November 7, 1892 (Transcribed by A. K. Guthrie, April 26, 1996, from photocopy)

SAND CREEK ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

Bro. Sommer publishes for our benefit the Sand Creek "Address and Declaration, by the congregations represented by their respective church officers in a mass meeting at Sand Creek, Shelby County, Illinois, August 17th, A. D. 1889."

We never saw it before. The evils opposed, we oppose. But there is no more authority for officers of different congregations to assemble in a meeting or convention to oppose and provide a remedy for these sins of individuals and churches, than there is for individuals and church representatives to assemble to oppose and provide a remedy for the failure of Christians and churches to evangelize the world. This was a convention of the elders to oppose and remedy one class of evils. The society is a convention to oppose and remedy another.

Then they say: "We state we are impelled, from a sense of duty, to say that all such as are guilty of teaching or allowing and practicing the many innovations and corruptions to which we have referred, that, after being admonished and having had sufficient length of time for reflection, if they do not turn away from such abominations, that we can not and will not regard them as brethren."

This was signed by the elders and members of six churches. This looks very much like a convention unknown to the New Testament exercising judicial and executive functions to oppose error and maintain truth, and it looks very much like doing the thing they condemn. It has been the besetting sin of Christians, when they start out to oppose a wrong, to commit another wrong to oppose this. There is no more authority for that convention of elders to rectify these wrongs, than of the convention to rectify the wrongs of Christians and churches in failing to preach the gospel.

Bro. Sommer delivers a long lecture to the Advocate on its failure to be settled in the truth and be satisfied therewith, which we duly appreciate. But, Bro. Sommer fails to quote a single scripture we violate or fail to teach. Bro. Sommer's opinions as to mass meetings and such things are not law and gospel. We shall dissent from them when we deem their influence dangerous.

He makes three complaints against the Advocate:

1. We published the card directing those wishing to attend the late Convention how to

write to get entertainment. Bro. Sommer knows no one was led by this to think we approved the Convention. It may not have been according to Bro. Sommer's taste. But we must remind him that his taste and his opinions are no part of the law of God. And he must allow others to exercise their own taste and judgment. Bro. Sommer published at one time that he intended to attend. Was not this advertising the Convention? If he could attend, we do not see why it was a crime for us to tell him and others how they could find entertainment, as requested by the managers.

2.The next complaint is the statement that the Advocate has steadily spoken against it (the Sand Creek Address) and all other unauthorized conventions.

The brother who wrote this was mistaken as to what the Advocate had done. Bro. Srygley had criticised [sic] some things about it. Bros. Sewell or McQuiddy, so far as I know, had never referred to it. All my allusions to it were hypothetical, for none of us had seen it. I have now seen it, and do oppose all such unauthorized conventions, to exercise judicial or executive powers to suppress or maintain truth. The order of the scriptures must no more be violated to maintain truth than to oppose error.

We prefer, for the present, to let the matters involving the use of public questions for personal ends rest, though ready at any time to give reasons for the charge.

D. L.

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE

(Decision of the Circuit Court)

From Gospel Advocate, June 14, 1906

NOTE: Unfortunately, the source omits both official title and date of this decision. From other sources, I believe the Circuit Court decision was rendered in 1904.

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE

There has been recently a decision of the Circuit and Supreme Courts of Illinois in a trial of rights of property between those loyal to the Bible and those favoring the innovations in the church. This week we give the decision of the Circuit Court; next week we will give that of the Supreme Court. Remember, in reading these, the judges are not Christians and speak only as judges. Their style is not what we would expect from Christians, but from men knowing nothing but their public duty.

DECISION OF THE CIRCUIT COURT

In his decision Judge Dwight said:

"This case, although not involving a large amount in dollars and cents is, in some respects, one of importance and one in which a large number of persons seems to be deeply interested.

"The able manner in which the case has been conducted and the evidence presented to the court, both on the part of counsel for the complainants and for the defendants, indicate the great learning and research of able counsel in behalf of their clients.

"Although the interests involved ordinarily would engender some feeling, there appears to have been no manifestation of ill will between the parties during the progress of the trial.

"It is worthy of note that the character of citizenship of all the parties, as well as their adherents, commends them to our favor.

"Every one who has watched the progress of this case could not fail to have noticed the religious fervor that seemed to animate all the parties as they urged their respective claims or sat by and carefully noted the progress of the case in which they seemed to be so deeply interested.

"The taking of the evidence, consuming as it did nearly two weeks, unfolded the history of the Christian Church--a splendid organization--coming into existence perhaps a century ago, avoiding tiresome creeds and looking alone to the Bible as a guide in faith and practice.

"That church has grown and spread throughout the Union, and its faith and teachings find a response in the hearts of the people everywhere.

"This church was the only religious body, I believe, to have a headquarters upon the grounds of the World's Fair at St. Louis.

"In its early organization, its mode of worship was much as it was in the church of apostolic times. It is represented as a monarchy. I do not like the term. To me Christ was the King, but his was a scriptural kingdom. His church upon earth has only the form of a monarchy.

"Christ, while upon the earth, went among the people without any effort at organization. He was not a product of the schools. As he walked beneath the palms of Palestine or along the shores of the Sea of Galilee, he taught the people. His teaching were drawn from nature. Everything was an object lesson.

"So this church, founded a hundred years ago, was modeled apparently as was the church at Corinth and other places in the days of the apostles.

"As time progressed many of the churches of the faith gradually changed their mode of worship and the means employed; in other words, keeping abreast with all the changes that crowded into the religious world as well as every other sphere of life.

"The Sand Creek Church withstood all the 'innovations.'

"For seventy years that church has had an existence and during all that long lapse of time has continued its mode of worship in the same simple way as did the fathers when it was first established.

"It, as all other congregations of the brotherhood, is an independent body. It is responsible to no other ecclesiastical body; without dictation whatever from any source, that congregation may regulate its own affairs.

"A decided majority of that congregation have abided in the faith of their fathers in the simple mode of worship first adopted.

"However much we may prefer the modern methods adopted in forms of worship, one cannot but admire this people.

"A splendid community in this grand county of Shelby, who are able to turn aside from all 'innovations' and continue to worship their 'Lord and Master' as did the apostles in the early days of the church.

"The complainants [progressives--akg], a part of the congregation, seem to have grown dissatisfied with existing things. As a result this suit was begun.

"Of other congregations of this faith and brotherhood we have nothing to do, and the real question in this case is:

"Have the defendants departed from the faith?"

"Taking all things into consideration and with no sort of any personal feeling, and from all the evidence submitted and the able arguments of counsel, and with a keen desire to do right in this matter and to follow the law, I must come to the conclusion that they have not.

"The finding of the court will be for the defendants [conservatives--akg]. The bill will be dismissed for want of equity."

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE

(Decision of the Illinois Supreme Court)

From Gospel Advocate, June 21, 1906

NOTE: Unfortunately, the source omits both official title and date of this decision. N. S. Hayes in His. Of DofC in Ill, p. 391 says the State Supreme Court made its ruling in favor of the conservatives in October, 1905 and the progressives began meeting in a school house.

THE SAND CREEK CHURCH CASE

There has recently been a decision of the Circuit and supreme Courts of Illinois in a trial of rights of property between those loyal to the Bible and those favoring the innovations in the church. Last week we gave the decision of the Circuit Court; this week we give that of the Supreme Court. Remember, in reading these, the judges are not Christians and speak only as judges. Their style is not what we would expect from Christians, but from men knowing nothing but their public duty.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT, DELIVERED BY MR. JUSTICE HAND.

There was a bill in chancery filed by plaintiffs in error in the Circuit Court of Shelby County, against the defendants in error [conservatives--akg], to obtain a construction of a certain deed bearing date of July 18, 1874, from James A. Turrentine and wife to the trustees of the Christian Church of Sand Creek, Shelby County, Ill., and for a decree adjudging the premises described in said deed, and the brick church located thereon, to be the property of the plaintiffs in error [progressives--akg]. An answer and replication were filed, the cause was tried in open court and a decree was entered dismissing the bill for want of equity, and a writ of error has been sued out from this court to reverse said decree.

It appears from the pleadings and proofs that in the year 1834 a church was organized at Sand Creek, Shelby County, Ill., by followers of the Rev. Alexander Campbell; that the congregation first erected a log church, in 1851 a frame church, and in 1874 a brick church, in which the congregation worshiped until in the year 1904, when the Sand Creek congregation divided, about thirty members thereof designating their organization as the "Christian Church of Sand Creek," and the remainder of the congregation, about one hundred in number, designating their church organization as the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek;" and that since the division of the congregations the defendants in error have worshiped [sic] in said brick church and the plaintiffs in error have worshiped [sic] in a schoolhouse nearby. From the time of the organization of said congregation, in 1834, up to its division, in 1904, it was called the "Christian Church of Sand Creek" or the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek,"

the name "Christian Church" and "Church of Christ" seem to have been used synonymously by the members of the Sand Creek congregation, some preferring one name and some the other. After the brick church was erected, in 1874, for a time the words "Christian Church, Erected in 1874" were conspicuously placed above the front door of the church. Those words were removed from above the door, however, several years prior to 1904 at a time when the church building was undergoing repairs.

The several church organizations formed by the followers of Alexander Campbell---and they are numerous--at the time of their organization were, and now are, purely congregational in their government--that is, there is no general conference, synod, presbytery, or other similar body which exercises supervision over said church congregations, but each organization, in matters of practice, in church government and otherwise, is sovereign, and the congregations so organized have no creed except the Bible, the view of the followers of said Alexander Campbell being, that where the Bible speaks, the congregation and its several members are authorized to speak; but where it is silent, the congregations and the members thereof should also remain silent. In 1849 there sprang up among the members of said religious sect different views upon subjects of practice to be adopted by the congregations with reference to matters upon which the Bible is silent, one view being, that in the matters upon which the Bible is silent, such silence should be construed as a positive prohibition; the other view being, that if the Bible is silent upon a given subject pertaining to church government, then the congregation may formulate a rule in that particular for the government of the congregation. The diversion along the lines above suggested seems to have grown as the church membership increased, and in 1889 there was a wide difference in views between the several congregations, and between the members of the same congregation, relative to many practices in the church, such as to the propriety of having instrumental music in the church during church services, the employment by the congregation of ministers of the gospel for a fixed time and for a fixed salary, the organization of missionary societies and Sunday schools as separate organizations outside the regular church organizations, the raising of funds for the support of the gospel by holding church fairs and festivals, and perhaps in other matters of a similar character; and in that year, at the annual August meeting held at the Sand Creek Church, and when there was present a large concourse of people drawn together from different congregations, Rev. Daniel Sommers [sic], a follower of Alexander Campbell, preached a sermon upon what was characterized as innovations upon the practices of the church, and afterwards a declaration, known as the "Sand Creek Declaration," was presented to the brethren present for their indorsement. That declaration condemned many, if not all, of the practices above referred to. It was signed by a few, only, of those who were present, and was not considered binding upon any member of the church or upon any congregation unless signed by the member or adopted by the church congregation, but was considered merely advisory to the members of the church. The division heretofore referred to, from that time forward seems to have spread, and at the time this suit was commenced the evidence shows the followers of Alexander Campbell had divided upon those lines to such an extent that one faction in the church was

characterized as progressives and the other conservatives, the members favoring the more liberal view being called "Progressives" while those entertaining the more conservative view were called "Antis." The persons entertaining the progressive view appear latterly to have usually favored and taken in their church organizations the name "Christian Church," while those favoring the conservative view have taken the name "Church of Christ" as the name of their organizations.

While there was some discussion between the members of the Sand Creek congregation prior to the year 1904 in regard to the "Sand Creek Declaration," and as to the propriety of having instrumental music in church during church services, the employment of a minister of the gospel for a fixed time for a fixed salary, the organization of missionary societies and Sunday schools outside the church congregation, and the holding of church fairs and festivals for the purpose of raising money for the support of the church congregation, none of these matters were ever brought before the Sand Creek congregation for discussion and determination; and that congregation, as such, never took action with reference thereto, and none of the matters in church practice which are characterized as innovations were ever indorsed or practiced by the Sand Creek congregation; but that congregation, as a congregation, up to the time of its division, in 1904, remained conservative. Prior to 1904 the plaintiffs in error and the defendants in error met as one congregation in the Sand Creek brick church and communed together as one congregation in apparent harmony. There was, however, shortly prior to that time, some friction between the members of the Sand Creek congregation with reference to the powers exercised by the trustees, elders, and deacons of that congregation, in their official capacity, in the conduct of the business of the congregation, but no complaints were brought before the congregation and upon these matters there was at least apparent harmony until in the year 1904. In the fall of 1903 a question arose in the congregation as to the propriety of using the brick church as a place to hold a singing school. The officers of the church--that is, the trustees, elders, and deacons, who had acted as such and had controlled the affairs of the church organization for many years--opposed the holding of the singing school in the church building at that time and refused to permit its use for that purpose. After some considerable discussion upon that question, in the spring of 1904, the dissensions which it appears had existed in the congregation broke out and the congregation divided. It was then discovered that the organization, under the statute, which had been attempted by the Sand Creek congregation in 1897 as the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek" was invalid by reason of the fact that the formalities required by the statute to effect a legal incorporation had not been observed, and there were then made hurried attempts by each faction to effect an incorporation under the statute, the minority as the "Christian Church of Sand Creek" and the majority as the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek," and separate meetings were held by these factions, and the papers required by the statute to be executed and filed to effect an incorporation of a religious body were executed by each faction and were filed in the office of the recorder of deeds of Shelby County and recorded. The majority, who were incorporated as the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek," were in possession of the church property, and the minority, who were incorporated

as the "Christian Church," were refused the use of said church building by the majority and thereafter held their meetings in a schoolhouse near by. This litigation resulted, and the sole question to be decided is: Does the brick church erected by the Sand Creek congregation in 1874, and the land upon which it stands and which is appurtenant thereto, belong to the plaintiff in error the "Christian Church of Sand Creek" or to the defendant in error, the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek?"

The courts of this State are powerless to pass upon the questions of differences between the contending factions of the Sand Creek congregation except in so far as property rights are involved (23 Ill. 403; 154 id. 394; *Ferraria v. Vasconcellos*, 31 id. 25; *Kuns v. Robertson*, 154 id. 394), as it will be readily conceded by all that every person in this country has the full and free right to entertain any religious belief, to practice any religious principle, and to teach any religious doctrine which he may desire, so long as it does not violate the laws of morality and property and does not infringe upon personal rights. (*Watson v. Jones*, 13 Wall. 679). It is not, therefore, within the province of this court to pronounce judgment upon the doctrines taught by Alexander Campbell and believed and practiced by his followers, or to determine which faction of the Sand Creek congregation, from an ecclesiastical standpoint, is correct, as the courts have no concern with the questions whether a religious congregation is progressive or conservative, whether a musical instrument shall be present or absent during church services, whether the preacher shall be selected from the congregation or shall be a person employed by the congregation for a stated time at a stated salary, whether missionary societies and Sunday schools shall have separate organizations from the church congregations or not, or whether the funds necessary for the support of the church shall be contributed wholly by its members or raised in part by fairs and festivals. All those questions, and kindred questions, must be left to the determination of the church congregation. Incidentally, however, those questions in this case bear upon the ownership of the church property here involved, and for the purpose of determining to which faction of the Sand Creek congregation the property here in question belongs, the practices of the Sand Creek congregation in the past have a bearing.

When the members of a religious congregation divide and one faction breaks away from the congregation and forms a new organization, the title to the property of the congregation will remain in that part of the congregation which adheres to the tenets and doctrines originally taught by the congregation to whose use the property was originally dedicated. (*Ferraria v. Vasconcelles* [sic], *supra*; *Ferraria v. Vasconcellos*, *supra*; *Church of Christ v. Christian Church of Hammond*, 193 Ill. 144.) Here the property was originally donated to the Sand Creek congregation and has been in use by that congregation from 1834 to 1904, a period of seventy years. When the church site was slightly changed, in 1874, and the brick church erected, the deed to the new site, which was made in exchange for a deed to the old site, was made to the trustees of the Christian Church of Sand Creek. We think that fact, however, entitled to but little weight in determining the question as to which faction of the congregation the church property should now be held to belong. At the time the deed was

made the Sand Creek congregation had not been incorporated, and the congregation which worshiped [sic] at that place was called at times the "Christian Church" or the "church of Christ," and no question seems to have been raised as to the legal name of the congregation worshipping [sic] at that place until about the time this suit was commenced. While the deed was made to the trustees of the "Christian Church," and the words "Christian Church" were placed for a time above the church door, the business of the Sand Creek congregation, such as the issuing of church letters to departing members, appears to have been carried on in the name of the "Church of Christ." At the time of the execution of the deed the Sand Creek congregation had trustees, elders, and deacons of the church, and the title to the property conveyed by James A. Turrentine and wife to the trustees of the Christian Church clearly was intended by the grantors to be vested by said deed in said trustees for the benefit of the members who formed the church congregation known as the "Sand Creek Congregation;" and although said Sand Creek congregation was not incorporated, the deed was not void for the want of a grantee, the conveyance being in the nature of a charitable trust, and all the members of the Sand Creek congregation became, by virtue of the execution of said conveyance, beneficiaries in the property they conveyed. (*Ferraria v. Vasconcellos*, 31 Ill. 25; *Alden v. St. Peter's Parish in the City of Sycamore*, 158 id. 631.)

It is also clear from the evidence that the Sand Creek congregation, from the inception of its organization to the time of the division, in 1904, as a congregation, was opposed to any innovations in the practices of the church--that is, the congregation only acted in [words illegible--akg] accordance with what they believed to be the positive commands of God as found in the Old and New Testaments, and the defendants in error, at the time of the division of the congregation, and since that time, have maintained that position, and appear to have maintained from the beginning, and now maintain, the tenets and doctrines which were taught in the Sand Creek congregation at its organization and which have been maintained and taught in that congregation all through its history, and that the plaintiffs in error, since their separation from the Sand Creek congregation, have taught and practiced what are known and characterized as the "innovations." This being true, the defendants in error were rightfully held by the trial court to be the successors and representatives of the original donees of the church property originally donated to the Sand Creek congregation and the lawful owners of said property; and the plaintiffs in error having seceded from the Sand Creek congregation and effected a new organization where the innovations are taught and practiced, were properly held by the court to have abandoned all interest in the property which belonged to the Sand Creek congregation at the time they left the organization and effected a new organization. (*Ferraria vs. Vasconcelles* [sic], *supra*; *Ferraria vs. Vasconcellos*, *supra*.)

It is, however, urged that the great majority of the church congregations which are professed followers of Alexander Campbell have adopted, in practice, the innovations from the practice of which defendants in error hold aloof, and that the plaintiffs in error are in accord with the spirit of a more enlightened age than the defendants in error, and that their

practices are in harmony with the later teachings of Alexander Campbell himself upon the subjects upon which they differ in their practices and beliefs from the defendants in error. It appears from the undisputed testimony that the churches organized in accordance with the teachings of Alexander Campbell were all congregational, and that these congregations, including the Sand Creek congregation, were, and always have been, sovereign in all matters pertaining to church government--that is, each congregation has the right to determine for itself what its practices in the matter of conducting the worship of God in the congregation and its church business shall be, so long as such practices are not in conflict with the positive commands of the Bible. Such being the fact, although it might appear that every congregation bearing the name "Christian Church" or "Church of Christ" organized throughout the land, other than the Sand Creek congregation, had adopted the practices heretofore referred to, the action of those congregations would not be binding upon the Sand Creek congregation unless that congregation had indorsed and adopted them for the government of the Sand Creek congregation. In July, 1904, after the plaintiffs in error had broken away from the Sand Creek congregation who had not seceded met and pursuant to the statute incorporated as the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek." By that act of incorporation all the property of the Sand Creek congregation became immediately vested in that corporation (Dubs v. Egli, 167 Ill. 514), and its title thereto was not divested by the act of the plaintiffs in error in subsequently incorporating as the "Christian Church of Sand Creek" (Happy v. Morton, 33 Ill. 398.)

In the determination of the question here involved, it must be borne in mind that this is a contest between two incorporated church organizations, and that the only question that this court can deal with is: in which corporation is the title to the church property which formerly belonged to the Sand Creek congregation now bested? From a careful examination of the record in this case, which contains over sixteen hundred pages, we have reached the conclusion that the learned chancellor who heard the case below rightfully reached the conclusion that the title to that property, at the commencement of this suit, was in the defendant in error the "Church of Christ of Sand Creek," and not in the plaintiff in error the "Christian Church of Sand Creek," and rightfully so decreed.

The decree of the Circuit Court will therefore be affirmed.

[Decree affirmed.]

SAND CREEK CHRONICLES

(Author not identified)

From Christian Standard, September 28, 1889

SAND CREEK CHRONICLES

Sand Creek is the name of a congregation of Disciples of Christ not far from Windsor, in the county of Shelby, and State of Illinois, and the United States of America. Sand Creek has recently taken long steps toward immortality. It is wonderful how places you never heard of before and brethren whose names have never been in print, can suddenly develop into marvelous proportions! Sand Creek! How suggestive of obscurity and fleetness and shallowness! And yet Sand Creek is not obscure, nor fleeting, nor shallow! Sand Creek has come to the front, and stands out like Pike's Peak--the great tower and bay window of the Rockies! Sand Creek has become profound! Sand Creek proposes to lead in a valiant warfare against vile corruptions which have crept into the ranks of the brotherhood; and in this courageous struggle, she is to be seconded by Ash Grove and Green Creek and Liberty and Mode and Union--country churches which, at the call of one Sommer, are coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty! The world has had its Luther leading in the fight against the ecclesiastical corruptions and moral deformities and iniquities of Rome; its Wesley leading in the fight against coldness and godless formalities in religion; its Williams, leading in the struggle for civil and religious liberty; its Campbell, leading in the struggle against sectarianism and in favor of Christian Unity. And these great leaders have made history of which every true man is proud. But it is left for Sand Creek Church, under the lead of humble but determined elders, to excel all others in the work of reformation! They have four great evils--the like of which none cursed the church before--compared with which Romish indulgences, wickedness in high places, ecclesiastical tyranny and unholy sectarianism--against which war was urged by Luther, Wesley and Campbell--sink into utter insignificance. Sand Creek has lifted up her voice against missionary societies, church festivals, church organs and the pastor! Was there ever a greater reform than this? Their remedy is admonition, meditation and reflection. They administer the admonition themselves and the people meditate and reflect! "If, after having had sufficient time to meditate and reflect"--how considerate!--they continue to contribute to the treasury of a missionary society for home or foreign missions, or if they attend a church festival, and especially if they pay an admission fee at the door, or if they sanction the use of an organ in the house of worship, or if they want to employ a pastor to look after the flock of God, then what? Why simply this "We can not and will not regard them as brethren"--and so the church will be purified and God will be glorified. Sand Creek is immortal. Sand Creek has taken lessons of the Pope who issued his bull against the comet. Sand Creek will live forever! See Octographic Review of Sept 12.

Rumor has it that nearly all the churches at Sand Creek have signed the four articles of the new faith. They have had serious trouble in formulating them. There is, however, substantial agreement that they shall read as follows:

ART. I.--that missionary societies are man-made and therefore to be avoided as sinful and unholy. ART. II.--That church festivals, especially if there be an admittance fee at the door, are wrong and therefore can not be tolerated. ART. III.--That the organ in public worship is a corruption of the worship, is a very wholesome doctrine and full of comfort. ART. IV.--That one man should be employed to give all his time to taking heed to the flock, is a practice dangerous to liberty, and specially subversive of the privileges of the elders. Better that the flock be not cared for, than one man should do it.

There was considerable discussion over the first Article. There was no dispute about the societies being "man-made," as nearly everything is more or less "man-made." The chief objection was a phraseology which indicated that they would cease to support them. Sand Creek was never guilty of giving a penny for missions, and therefore could not stop giving to these man-made institutions. So they wrote "to be avoided as sinful and holy." [Sic] They also had a good deal of discussion over the last clause in the new creed, "Better that the flock be not cared for, than one man should do it." But, after long discussion, they left it on record, chiefly as a testimony to their loyalty to the Word of God.

Rumor also says that they expect trouble from two sources, viz.: There is a brother there who insists that the adoption and signing of these articles of faith is a grave departure from the ground of the Campbells, Scotts, etc., and he threatens for this reason to withdraw from them, and induce others to do the same, and start a new church. To overcome this, they depend on the vindication of Sommer and Rowe, which, they are assured, will be able and sufficient. There is another brother who is anxious to add to the creed as follows:

ART. V.--That Sunday-schools are man-made institutions, and to be avoided as sinful and unholy. ART. VI.--That religious papers are man-made institutions, and therefore not to be subscribed for or circulated.

The church would have little trouble as to these additional articles, if it were not for Sommer and Rowe, who insist that Article VI. would ruin their business, to which this brother retorts that it is none of their business what the Sand Creek Church wants, and had the audacity to insinuate than an imported editor was no better than an imported pastor.

And yet Sand Creek hopes to get on with this great reformation and survive the attacks of these extremists.

Some one has tried to block the wheels of this great movement by ridicule, as witness the following:

Think of Haynes, and Allen, and Radford, and Briney, and Howe, and Gilliland, and scores of others, going down to Sand Creek, and not being regarded as brethren! Think of these men standing up to be admonished by the elders of Sand Creek Church for the grave sin of supporting missionary societies, or sanctioning the use of an organ in public worship, or attending a church social where they had something to eat, or being pastors of their respective churches! Think of these men after "meditating and reflecting" after such admonition--and because they can not subscribe to these four articles of the new faith, the elders gravely inform them that they can not "regard them as brethren"; or, think of these men, after "meditating and reflecting," yielding to the admonition, signing the articles and joining a sect which outsectarianizes all sectarianism!

Think further of these Sand Creek brethren moving on to the "pale realms of shade"; and reaching the pearly gates, they see inside Campbell, and Scott, and Johnson, and Hayden, and Stone, and Franklin, and Milligan, and Errett, and scores of others who worked in the missionary societies; and they hear the sound of the harps and golden reeds accompanying the song of redeeming love; and all joining in the chorus of praise, because they have been redeemed out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation--a grand reunion missionary song--think of these Sand Creek brethren refusing to go in because of the instrumental music, and the presence of persons they could not regard as brethren on this mundane sphere; and the grand results of organized missionary work, as seen in the host that no man can number! Think of Sand Creek refusing to go in!

Well, Sand Creek will be consistent and stay out--Sand Creek has sand. OHIO

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

(Version I)

From Octographic Review,

September 5, 1889

Transcribed April 6, 1995 by A. K. Guthrie from imperfect photocopy

--Followed a speech--duration one hour and forty minutes--by Daniel Sommer--

(Elder P. P. Warren then took the stand and addressed the audience substantially as given below)

My brethren--

I come before you today with thoughts and feelings different from what I have ever had before in addressing you. For about forty years I have stood in this and adjoining communities as a proclaimer of the gospel. I took up the work in company with those who were the pioneers of this country. We started on the platform of the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible. The New Testament we took as our rule of faith and practice. "Where the Bible speaks we will speak and where the Bible is silent we will be silent" was our watchword. Then we prospered and became, as our brother who preceded me has shown you, a great and a mighty people. For a continuation of this order of things we hoped and labored and prayed. But there have arisen many among us who have shown themselves to be unsatisfied with what is written. They have introduced things which our King has never authorized, and as a result have made us a divided and an unhappy people. We pled and entreated that we might have the peace of the gospel, but they would not hear our entreaties. Therefore, after much earnest thought on the part of loyal brethren it was decided that something should be said and done which would relieve those who intend to be true to the Lord Jesus Christ from responsibility for the misdemeanors, of those who are not satisfied with what is written in the word of God. That is to say, these brethren decided that those who are loyal to Christ should no longer have thrust in their faces by wordlings and their religious neighbors, such taunts as this: "Why your people have fairs--your people have festivals and your people have a good many things that Christ never authorized." As a result a goodly number of Churches sent prominent brethren and we met yesterday, August 17th, in the Sand Creek house of worship and decided upon the following document which I will read:

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

BY THE CONGREGATIONS REPRESENTED BY THEIR RESPECTIVE CHURCH

OFFICERS IN A MASS MEETING ASSEMBLED AT SAND CREEK, SHELBY CO.,
ILL., AUG. 17th, A. D. 1889

TO ALL THOSE WHO IT MAY CONCERN: greeting

Brethren:

You doubtless know that we as disciples of Christ (with scarcely an exception) many long years ago took the position that in matters of doctrine and practice, religiously, that "where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent;" and that further, we held that nothing should be taught, received or practiced for which we could not produce a "thus saith the Lord." And doubtless many of you also know that as long as the above principles were constantly and faithfully observed, that we were a happy and prosperous people. Then we were of one heart and of one soul, we lived in peace and prospered in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Then what was written as doctrine and for practice was taught and observed by the disciples. And, it may not be amiss in this connection to say that many, yes, very many in the sectarian churches saw the beauty, consistency and wonderful strength and harmony in the plea, as set forth by the disciples, for the restoration of primitive or apostolic Christianity in spirit and in practice; and so came and united with us in the same great and godly work. It is, perhaps, needless for us to add in this connection that we, as a people, discarded all man-made laws, disciplines, and confessions of faith, as means of governing the church. We have always acknowledged and do now acknowledge the all-sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to govern us as individuals and as congregations. As an apostle has said, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

And now, please allow us to call attention to more painful facts and considerations. There are those among us who do teach and practice things not taught nor found in the New Testament, which have been received by many well meaning disciples, but rejected by those more thoughtful and, in most instances, better informed in the scriptures, and who have repeatedly protested against this false teaching and these corrupt practices among the disciples. Some of the things against which we protest are the unlawful methods resorted to in order to raise or get money for religious purposes, NAMELY, that of the church holding festivals of various kinds in the house of the Lord or elsewhere, demanding sometimes that each participant shall pay a certain sum for an admittance fee; the select choir to the virtual, if not the real, abandonment of congregational singing; likewise the manmade society for missionary work, and the one man, imported preacher-pastor to take the oversight of the church. These with many other objectionable and unauthorized things are now taught and practiced in many of the congregations, and that to the great grief and mortification of some of the members of said congregations.

And, now, brethren, you that teach such things, and such like things, and those who practice the same, must certainly know that they are not only not in harmony with the gospel, but are in opposition thereto. You surely will admit that it is safe, and only safe to teach and practice what the divine record enjoins upon the disciples. To this none can reasonably object, and this is exactly what we want and for which we contend. And, now, we say, that we beg of you to turn away speedily and at once from such things, and remember that though we are the Lord's freemen yet we are bound by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. You know that by keeping His commandments and not the commandments of men that we have the assurance of his approval. Therefore, brethren, without addressing you further by using other arguments, and without going further in detailing these unpleasant, and as we see them, vicious things, you must allow us in kindness, and in Christian courtesy, and at the same time with firmness, to declare that we cannot tolerate the things of which we complain; for if we do, then we are (in a measure at least) blamable ourselves. And, let it be distinctly understood, that this "Address and Declaration" is not made in any spirit of envy or hate, or malice or any such thing. But we are only actuated from a sense of duty to ourselves and to all concerned; for we feel that the time has fully come when something of a more definite character ought to be known and recognized between the church and the world. Especially is this apparent when we consider the scriptural teachings in the matters to which we have herein referred--such for instance as the following: "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed, by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

It is therefore, with the view, if possible, of counteracting the usages and practices that have crept into the church, that this effort on the part of the congregations hereafter named is made. And now, in closing up this address and declaration, we state that we are impelled from a sense of duty to say, that all such as are guilty of teaching, or allowing and practicing the many innovations to which we have referred, that after being admonished and having had sufficient time for reflection, if they do not turn away from such abominations, that we can not and will not regard them as brethren.

[Signed] P. P. Warren, A. J. Nance, Daniel Baker, Peter Robertson, J. K. P. Rose, James W. Warren, Officers of Sand Creek Church. Randolph Miller, Charles Erwin, W. K. Baker, Wm. Cozier, Officers of Liberty Church.

[Signed] Wm. R. Storm, Ash Grove Church. J. H. Hagan, Union Church. Isaac Walters, Mode Church.

The brethren whose names stand alone in signing this document, represented the churches from which they came. Beside these, Elder Colson, of Gays, and Elder Hoke, of Stricklyn congregation, signed as individuals only, because the congregations whence they came had not been called together and formally sent them.

Green Creek congregation was represented by letter from Bro. Jesse Baker, indorsing the movement.

A HISTORY OF THE SAND CREEK CHURCH

(by Sam Carter)

From The Truth, February, 1975

Transcribed April 25, 1996 from photocopy by A. K. (Kenny) Guthrie

The Truth, J. D. Phillips, Editor and Publisher, was published monthly from Cowden, Illinois

The day dawned bright and clear on the mid-August morning, and as the horses churned up the dust in the quiet country lane, it was evident that the day which was waking would be humid. The heat had scorched the grass to a pale yellow, and as the battered boards of the bridge clattered under the carriage wheels, everyone noticed that the creek bed was dry. Summer had taken its toll. But it had been a pleasant drive. The Illinois countryside was ablaze with splotches of color, while birds conversed in sweet melody. The beauty of God's creation was everywhere.

The carriage turned west onto a better-beaten road, and its occupants immediately were stricken with the realization that they were not alone. The church-yard was filled with horses and carriages, wagons of all descriptions, children running and playing, and groups of men huddling in small clusters in obviously avid discussion. Inside the small brick meeting-house, all was a bustle of confusion. Relatives and friends who had not met for many years were recalling old times, and others were vainly seeking an unoccupied seat.

The rural congregation had come a long way since the days of old. Men of the stature of John Storm, who could be correctly called the father of Sand Creek Church, had first trod the path of righteousness in the untamed land. Tobias Grider, who had striven earnestly in the vineyard of the Lord as a frontier evangelist, lay a hundred yards west, his spirit returned to its Maker. Bushrod Washington Henry, whose long, flowing white beard must have been reminiscent of Elijah, tirelessly established new churches in the new land and was an original trustee of Eureka College. These men had labored valiantly to establish a foothold for the Lord among the newly settled inhabitants. The raw country was hard, and life was hard, and theirs was a hard religion to match. Often, denied the use of homes and barns in which to preach, the pioneers would retire to groves and riverbanks to exhort those who would listen toward a more perfect way. The men of God often were forced to travel from house to house, asking for work, and living hand-to-mouth and from day-to-day. Farm labor in the 1830's meant long hours of exhaustive toil from sunup to sunset, but these preachers were so filled with the Spirit that they did not hesitate to proclaim the word of God after the day was done. Popularity, security, riches and easy work did not appeal to them. Their task was to proclaim the gospel to an unsaved and ungrateful world, and they performed that task with gusto.

Camp meetings drew thousands of settlers from many miles distant. The people became converted to God's Son, returned home and spread their new-found faith among their neighbors. Theirs was a burning faith; an out-reaching faith which was not content to remain locked in a shell. They were compelled to shout it out to all who would hear. The tears and sweat manifested itself in the steadfastness with which the church at Sand Creek held to the things of God. Since at least 1834, the poor people of the area had served their Master, perhaps imperfectly, perhaps ignorant of some fine doctrinal points, but always in the determination to do their best.

Now the little church was the proud parent of a half-dozen other congregations of Saints, all looking to Sand Creek as the benefactor of their faith. Preaching points had been established through the years by Sand Creek, all of which had matured into separate units of the Body in their own right. A brick building had been constructed in 1874, bigger and better than the old log and frame meeting-houses of earlier days, situated on a small knoll amid oak and walnut trees. A small cemetery lay due west, hallowed with the graves of the immortal soldiers of God. There was an older cemetery a quarter-mile northwest, on the site of the original log house. Under its sod lay the mouldering remains of those who had gone before, those whose footsteps of righteousness first echoed in the unbelieving chasm of godlessness in the then-great West. Now they had gone home, and it remained for their successors to carry the torch which had been held high for so long. The younger generation was not indifferent to this challenge, as they believed their presence this day would attest.

It was a great day. For a decade and a half, protracted meetings had been held at the old church for the purpose of Christian fellowship. But this day held more in store. For today, with the building overflowing with humanity and more pouring in, would be the culmination of all the years of effort at Sand Creek. Little did the farmers who were assembling in this spot on the prairie realize that history would be made, and the Lord's church forever altered, by these activities. They had assembled to hear a man who was probably the most influential gospel preacher outside the South, whose name was to be spread far and wide, and whose name, like that of Sand Creek, would be praised or cursed by later generations for the events that transpired here this day. Daniel Sommer was coming.

Sommer was the rare type of man who appeared once in a lifetime before these humble folk. Abundantly blessed with the gift of nearly supernatural eloquence, he excelled in his ability to command the attention of his hearers and to draw upon the emotions of men, provoking tears, laughter, resentment or delight. His very bearing was awe-inspiring, and his composure under fire and adroitness in debate won the grudging respect of his adversaries. While this oracle of the common man was a mortal who erred and fell on occasion, as mortals will, he believed in his heart that his cause was just and his purpose true.

For several years the church in various parts of the country, including the midwest, had been faced with the dilemma of what to do about the increasing popularity of commercial

festivities to secure funds, the use of a choir, the use of the missionary society to spread the Word, and the yet embryonic practice of employing Ministers to feed the local flock. The use of instrumental music in the worship had not yet become a major concern to either Sommer or the brethren assembled at Sand Creek. Some Christians were of the opinion that these points were simply matters of opinion and could be decided by the conscience of the individual, since "where there is no law there is no transgression." Others felt that the silence of the Holy Writ regarding these "innovations" justified their continued exclusion from the Christian church, pointing to the oft-quoted statement of Campbell: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent."

It was Sommer's contention that these practices over which so much wrangling would ensue were unwarranted by scripture and divisive in nature, and ought therefore to be avoided. Thus far, those brethren who had embraced such things were regarded as brethren, and no effort had yet been made on a grand scale to draw a line of demarcation between the two schools of thought. Views, however, were changing. It was apparent by 1889 that many Christians were ready and willing to separate themselves from those who had taken a tolerant stance on these questions. The Church of the Lord was to be purged of unclean and disreputable apostasy, even to the point of division. If the reprobates were disinclined to cast aside these "traditions of men" then the hand of Christian fellowship was to be withdrawn from them. Such a position as assumed by Sommer was not a new one by any means, but it did reflect a growing uneasiness in the ranks of the conservative brethren, and a general feeling that the time was ripe for a step toward making these "innovations" into tests of faith and fellowship.

What better place to proclaim this doctrine than Sand Creek? Born on the Illinois frontier, tested in the bleak years of hardship, tried in the difficult times when despair was so easy, and matured to the stature of a respected and praiseworthy mother of countless children of God, Sand Creek held the trust and the allegiance of congregations far distant. This simple country church was destined to be the proving ground for Sommer's idealism. It became the springboard for a new era in religious history. Here one segment of the brotherhood crossed its Rubicon, and from this, there was no return.

This August morning, it was clear that the meeting would of necessity be held out-of-doors. Those whose perseverance and luck had led them to the remaining empty seats in the sweltering building rose and streamed through the doors to the already-filled churchyard. Willowy wisps of heat danced off the grass, and the air was still. It seemed as though the entire county had elected to be present. The shade of the old trees was soon occupied, the less fortunate being forced to stand in the path of the blazing sun.

When the multitude became reasonably silent, Daniel Sommer stepped forward to address his audience. This Demosthenes of the Church was at his best with a gathering of this nature. His discourse on the evils of innovations in church affairs was thorough and

lengthy. Stripping the issue to what he believed was the crux of the matter, he paraded before his hearers the divisive elements which had crept into the once-sanctified worship of the King of Heaven and bitterly denounced them as unfit for Christians to countenance. He insisted that to tolerate such practices was tantamount to turning the fruit of the noble efforts of the Restoration fathers back into Popery. He pleaded with his progressive brethren to abandon their attempts to introduce, and their laxity in allowing, such vices. Then came the climax; the moment of truth whose time Sommer had convinced had come. His voice booming like thunder from on high, he declared emphatically that if, after repeated warnings, congregations which had condoned money-raising festivals, choirs, missionary societies, and pastors did not renounce their headlong plunge into digression, then he and others "would no longer regard them as brethren."

The others to whom Sommer referred soon became apparent. The day before, representatives of area congregations had gathered at Sand Creek to witness and sign a document, constructed by Elder Peter P. Warren of Sand Creek, known as the "Address and Declaration." The reason for the name, which in more than one respect is the inverse of Thomas Campbell's "Declaration and Address," can only be surmised. Warren, himself an able and accomplished preacher of the Word, could claim to his credit the organizing of at least two other congregations. His father, Colonel Peter Warren, was a military leader of renown in the Black Hawk War of 1832, and served as a member of the Illinois Senate for eight years. The family was admired and respected in the community, which was a possible reason that Warren, an honest and honorable man of property, was selected to publicly present the Declaration.

The Declaration emphasized that inclusion in church life and worship of "things" for which a "thus saith the Lord" could not be produced was wrong for the simple reason that God had not sanctioned them. Sommer and Warren presumed that the age of forgivable ignorance was over, and those who had accepted these practices were knowingly defiant of the wishes of the Deity, saying: "you that teach such things, and such like things and those who practice the same, must certainly know that they are not only not in harmony with the gospel, but are in opposition thereto." The assumption was, of course, that the reprobates were not sincere, were not honestly misguided, and were not searching diligently for the truth, but were deliberately thumbing their noses at God.

As if in an attempt to cover all the bases, the Declaration continued: "You will surely admit that it is safe, and only safe to teach and practice what the divine record enjoins upon the disciples." To be on sure ground then, it would be best to disallow practices which to some would be questionable, whether or not such practices are in reality wrong, than to inch ever outward on the proverbial limb.

This statement of faith was not intended to be either harsh or contentious. The motives of the men who had affixed their names thereto were pure and just., Malice to those with

whom they differed was not the underlying feeling. But while the Declaration was written and presented in an atmosphere of good-will and Christian charity, these brethren would have been violating their consciences to have remained silent any longer: "You must allow us in kindness, and in Christian courtesy, and at the same time with firmness to declare that we can not tolerate the things of which we complain; for if we do, then we are (in a measure at least) blamable ourselves." The gentlemen were fearful lest by not speaking out, their silence would be construed by the Almighty as acquiescence in the misdeeds of others. This solemn warning closed with the assertion that they were "impelled from a sense of duty to say, that all such that are guilty of teaching, or allowing and practicing the many innovations and corruptions to which we have referred, that after being admonished, and having had sufficient time for reflection, that if they do not turn away from such abominations, that we can not and will not regard them as brethren."

Here was the new manifesto. Here was what later became the unofficial creed of a large and powerful group of congregations which adhered to the tenets of the Sand Creek Doctrine. This was to be the mainstay, and still is, of the brethren who believed that separation was the answer to the progressive tendency of others. No longer would unorthodox views and unacceptable practices be tolerated. No longer would the plea for unity be allowed to overshadow the growing cleavage between brethren. Apostasy and impurity would be eradicated, even at the expense of division, regardless of whether everyone agreed that the issues in question were impure or whether they were even worth the fuss. A wedge was to be driven into the widening breach which would forever part the warring camps. A willingness to split off from one's brethren to prove one's loyalty to the true church became prevalent. The core of the conservative movement would henceforth picture themselves as vanguards of the truth, ready and willing to defend the bulwarks of the church against the onslaughts of modernism, whatever the price.

What is more, it is ironic that the path being followed by the Sand Creek brethren under the name of the "Address and Declaration" was in some respects the opposite one trod by the Restoration fathers under the banner of the "Declaration and Address." While Stone and the Campbells fought for the unity of all believers as a means to achieve what the Lord demanded in His church, the Sand Creek Doctrine stated that henceforward, division among believers would be the means to weed out the unfit and to show just what the Lord's church really was. While the forebears of the movement advocated subordination of lesser doctrinal points to greater issues as a means to destroy the creedal mentality of the time, Sommer and Warren were convinced that the Sand Creek Declaration, in effect an unofficial creed, was needed to assure uniformity in detail while at the same time, many would argue, neglecting "the weightier matters of the law."

While these abstract topics were at the heart of what was done at Sand Creek on this summer day, the personal and human side of the problem should not be ignored. The Declaration had bluntly stated that fellowship was to be withdrawn from those with whom

the conservatives could not agree. This meant, in practical terms, that lifelong friends could not worship together unless somebody relented. It meant that women who had spent mornings on the back porch snapping beans or putting up pickles together may never meet again in a house of worship. Men who had shucked corn and baled hay and swapped stories together for years would never share participation in a mutual worship service again. Children who had played and hunted and swam together would never again attend services with their friends because their parents could not agree on how to run the church. It meant that family ties would be strained to the breaking point, and that tears and heartbreak would ensue as a result of hurt feelings and injured pride. Never again would peace reign in the community. All attempts at communication and understanding and compromise was to be halted, never to be resumed again. It was simply finished; forgotten.

This is why it was so hard for many to take. Many of those at Sand Creek had not imagined that such an event would occur, and as the word spread into the community, there was a general feeling of shock and resentment. No one quite knew what to think. Stunned people shook their heads at the seemingly senseless civil war which now seemed imminent.

Some of those assembled at the country church felt a great sense of relief that the worst was now over. The long years of tension and uncertainty were past, and the issue was now into the open and cut-and-dried. Others believed that the worst was yet to come, and that once discussion and attempts at unity had been discarded, the body of Christ would be rent asunder in countless fragments. Some were elated at the news, while many gave vent to bitter tears.

Perhaps no one is certain why brethren divide. No doubt Satan smirks with glee as he views the cancer at work. Perhaps the dogged determination that "I am right" is so strong that it overrules other considerations such as love and concern for the feelings of others. No separation of the Lord's body is ever right, because on one side or the other, and usually on both, extremes have been reached; extremes of bitterness, opinion, and action. And the case at Sand Creek was no different, because that is just what it soon became: a "case." The children of God had decided to go to law with one another. No one thing cause it, although the break was precipitated by a disagreement over the property [sic--propriety?--akg] of holding a singing school in the building. The pot had been simmering for the years since 1889 to 1904, and was now boiling over.

In 1904, the two factions at Sand Creek took their case to the courts in order to retain control over the church property, since it was obvious that the two wings could never worship in harmony. One party in the suit rested its case on the assumption that the property at Sand Creek belonged to it because of the nature of the original deed. The deed, drawn in 1874 to the "trustees of the Christian Church at Sand Creek", had never been changed to reflect any other intention or design on the part of the membership. While many of its members referred to the congregation as the "Sand Creek Church of Christ," the deed still

remained in the name of the "Christian faction," a fact upon which the "innovators" based their claim to the land and property.

The conservative brethren countered that although the deed was indeed given to the "Christian Church at Sand Creek," the property of right belonged to the "Church of Christ at Sand Creek." This claim was based on their contention that the "liberals" had departed from the original teachings of the movement as espoused by Stone, Smith, and the Campbells, and that they (those aligned with Sommer), composed the true entity at Sand Creek because of their adherence to orthodox doctrine. In other words, the progressives had moved to the theological left while the conservatives stayed just where they had always been.

The trial itself was both humorous and tragic. It eventually was brought before the Illinois Supreme Court, which decided for the conservative faction because of their adherence to first principles. The victors had studiously and tediously labored during the suit to present their doctrinal views in such a manner as to show that they were the nearest adherents to the original positions of the founding fathers. It was upon this that the court based its decision.

But we need to remember, as these men had forgotten, that being right legally and being right in the sight of God are two different things not to be confused. Does God tolerate lawsuits between brethren? The Bible gives a resounding "No!" Some may say that the progressives were no longer brethren since they had departed from the truth. Then was a court case the most propitious manner in which to win them back? Could it not be better to yield a little and give up the building voluntarily, rather than undergo a fratricidal [sic] legal war? The Sand Creek brethren thought not. Their minds were so clouded by the inevitable personality clashes and emotional conflicts that it was difficult to see straight. Christians are human, and often allow emotion to stir the water when cooler heads and reason should prevail.

"Where is the spirit of Christian love?" the Methodists and Baptists must have been asking themselves. "Is a building so important as to cause so much strife?" The people at Sand Creek had given their answer in the affirmative.

The conservative movement of the brotherhood regarded the Sand Creek circus as a "test case" over which to attempt to influence other areas along the paths of righteousness. The progressives viewed it as highway robbery and an attempt to experiment with new and cunning methods of stealing their property. The Christian Standard suggested that it would be wise to remember that "the Sand Creek movement had its principal development in an unholy scramble for the title to church properties." The point of the ridiculous was soon reached with an account of Sommer and others entering a meeting-house through a window in order to take possession of it from the hands of the avowed majority which was progressive in opinion. The schismatic work was well on its way to fruition, that the body

of the Lord would never be the same again. Other lawsuits appeared throughout the country in an effort by one faction or another to gain control of meeting-houses, bringing disrepute on the church in every community in which such fracas ensued. One is left to shake his head in amazement and wonder what Barton Stone would have thought.

So the old church with such a history had divided itself, each party to go forever its separate ways. The progressives eventually moved to town and numbered themselves among congregations there; the conservatives continued meeting at Sand Creek as they had done before, but with drastically reduced numbers. The body was there, but as the years wore on, it grew old and limp and haggard, and eventually breathed its last.

The wintry air of December was bitterly cold as it lashed through the naked limbs of the ancient oaks and bit fiercely into the timeless face of the stark marble and granite gravestones in the cemetery. They were all there--those who could not worship together in life had at last been united in death. Death is so viselike and final that one may wonder whether one should be allowed to live life over. But we cannot, and they could not. The deeds done by those buried in the frozen clay, whether good or evil, were unalterable. The unceasing gale whipped around the ivy vines that covered the front of the decrepit brick building and rattled the window panes which had once seen the smiles and laughter of children's faces. The concrete steps, worn with age, sagged from the countless feet of those who had once called this their spiritual home. There was frost around the edges of the windows, but through the center of the panes were visible the handmade wooden pews into which had gone so much love and care. The songbooks and Bibles lay as they had been left, now untouched and unused. No one could tell how many voices had been raised in praise to the Maker from those books, or how many lives had been changed from the pages in the scriptures lying lonely and forgotten on the benches. The elders chairs in the front were empty and dust-covered, and the small table on which so many communion suppers had been shared was miserably abandoned. Even the "Amen corner" was forever stilled. The air was growing colder, for it was dusk, and the fog was thickening. The eerie feeling of being in a holy place began to set in, and it was time to go.

But one question was inescapable. What if? What if men could have been more Christlike and more loving? What if they had let peace reign in their hearts and in their lives/ Would the bitterness have been avoided and the old building be alive with praise and thanksgiving once more? Is such heartache and misery the natural order of things? Is it the destiny of man to spend a generation of building, only to see it destroyed by his successors? Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from the experience at Sand Creek, and perhaps each Christian can apply this lesson to his own life to avoid a recurrence of such trauma.

--18745 S. W. 316 Terr. Homestead, Fla. 33030.

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

(Version II) From Christian Leader
[Published by J. L. Rowe from Akron, Ohio],
September 10, 1889

Transcribed April 11, 1995 by A. K. Guthrie from photocopy

ADDRESS AND DECLARATION

By the Congregations Represented by Their Respective Church Officers in a
Mass-meeting Assembled at Sand Creek, Shelby Co., Ill., August 17, 1889

To All Those Whom It May Concern, Greeting:

Brethren--

You doubtless know that we, as disciples of Christ, with scarcely an exception, many long years ago took the position that in matters of doctrine and practice, religiously, "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent." Further, we held that nothing should be taught, received or practiced religiously, for which we could not produce a "Thus saith the Lord." And doubtless, many of you also know that, as long as the above principles were constantly and faithfully observed, we were a prosperous and happy people. Then we were of one heart and of one soul; we lived in peace and prospered in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Then what was written as doctrine and for practice was taught and observed by the disciples of Christ. And it may not be amiss in this connection to say that many--yes, very many--in the sectarian churches saw the beauty, consistency, and the wonderful strength and harmony, in the plea as set forth by the disciples for the restoration of primitive or apostolic Christianity in spirit and in practice, and so came and united with us in the same great and godly work.

It is, perhaps, needless for us to add, in this connection, that we, as a people, discarded all man-made laws, rules, disciplines and confessions of faith as means of governing the Church. We have always acknowledged, and do now acknowledge, the all-sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to govern us as individuals and as congregations. And as an apostle has said: "All Scripture is given us by the inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

And now, please to allow us to call attention to some painful facts and considerations. There are among us those who do teach and practice things not taught or found in the New Testament, which have been received by many well-meaning disciples, but rejected by those

more thoughtful, and in most instances better informed in the Scriptures, and who have repeatedly protested against this false teaching and those corrupt practices among the disciples. Some of the things of which we hereby complain, and against which we protest, are the unlawful methods resorted to in order to raise or get money for religious purposes, viz: that of the church holding festivals of various kinds, in the house of the Lord, or elsewhere, demanding that each participant shall pay a certain sum as an admittance fee; the use of instrumental music in the worship; the select choir, to the virtual, if not the real, abandonment of congregational singing. Likewise the man-made society for missionary work, and the one-man, imported-preacher pastor to feed and watch over the flock. These, with many other objectionable and unauthorized things, are now taught and practiced in many of the congregations, and that to the great grief and mortification of some of the members of said congregations.

And now, brethren, you who teach such things and such like things, and those who practice the same, must certainly know that they are not only not in harmony with the gospel but are in opposition thereto. You surely will admit that it is safe, and only safe, to teach and practice what the divine record enjoins upon the disciples. To this none can reasonably object. This is exactly what we want and for which we contend.

And now we may say that we beg of you that you turn away speedily and at once from such things, and remember that though we are the Lord's freemen, yet we are bound by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. You know that it is by keeping his commandments, and not the commandments of men, that we have the assurance of his approval. Therefore, brethren, without addressing you further by using other arguments, and without going further in detailing those unpleasant and, as we see them, vicious things, you must allow us, in kindness and in Christian courtesy, and at the same time with firmness, to declare that we can not tolerate the things of which we complain, for if we do we are (in a measure, at least) blamable ourselves. And let it be distinctly understood this address and declaration is not made in any spirit of envy or hate or malice, or any such thing. But we are only actuated from a sense of duty to ourselves and to all concerned; for we feel that the time has fully come when something of a more definite character ought to be known and recognized between the Church and the world. Especially is this apparent when we consider the scriptural teaching on the matters to which we have herein referred. Such, for instance, is the following:

"Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

It is, therefore, with the view, if possible, of counteracting the usages and practices that have crept into the churches that this effort on the part of the congregations hereafter named is made. And now, in closing up this address and declaration, we state that we are impelled from a sense of duty to say that all such as are guilty of teaching or allowing and practicing

the many innovations and corruptions to which we have referred, after having had sufficient time for meditation and reflection, if they will not turn away from such abominations, that we can not and will not regard them as brethren.

[Signed] P. P. Warren, A. J. Nance, Daniel Baker, J. P. K. Rose, James Warren, Officers of Sand Creek Church.

Randolph Miller, Charles Erwin, W. K. Baker, Wm. Cozier, Officers of Liberty Church

Wm. R. Storm, Ash Grove Church J. H. Hagan, Union Church Isaac Walters, Mode Church.

AN ADDRESS

(By Daniel Sommer)

From Octographic Review [Published by Sommer],
September 5, 1889

Transcribed April 11, 1995 by A. K. Guthrie from imperfect photocopy Missing or Illegible portions are indicated thus: [**]

AN ADDRESS

[The following address or speech was delivered by Daniel Sommer at the seventeenth annual or mass meeting held at the grove on Sand Creek in Shelby Co. Ills. August 18th, 1899, on which occasion not fewer than five thousand persons were present. In view of the important "Address and Declaration" which was read on that occasion by Elder P. P. Warren of the Sand Creek congregation in behalf of a community of Christians in Shelby and Moultrie counties, it has been deemed best to write out a condensed report of this speech of one hour and forty minutes for publication in the REVIEW.]

Three years have elapsed since I was with you in this grove on a similar occasion. In some of that period many changes have taken place, yet we are spared in God's good providence to meet again in the good purpose that has called us together. But as we are assembled and the Holy Volume is open before us, your attention is kindly invited to the scripture. I first read a familiar passage in John 20th chapter. "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of the Disciples which are not written in this book. But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." I also read Rom. 10:17. "So then faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God."

These scriptures, my hearers, taken together clearly teach that the high and grand confidence called FAITH, which is necessary to salvation from sin, is proclaimed by the testimony of the word of God coming in contact with the mind of men. Whether the eye or the ear be the inlet of the testimony to the mind, yet it is true that the high and grand confidence necessary to salvation called FAITH is produced by the word of God.

Again, the domain of the divine testimony is the domain of FAITH. All that word of God declares we can believe; what the word does not declare we cannot believe.

Belief or faith is produced by the testimony of the word of God and not by inference. Inference may serve as a basis for an opinion, a supposition, a view, a notion or an idea, but inference cannot produce faith, nor serve as a foundation for faith. Faith is a high degree of confidence that is produced by testimony. The faith that is necessary to give life through the

name of Christ is produced by the testimony that is divine. Therefore, as was said, the domain of testimony determines the domain of faith. This being true, it follows that everything which the divine testimony reveals as the will of God and Christ we can believe to be their will.

But on the other hand, whatever is not revealed in the divine testimony no one can possibly believe to be the divine will. In other words, whatever the word of God declares with approbation we can believe has been or now is the will of God; but whatever the word of God does not thus declare we not only DO NOT but we CANNOT believe has ever been or now is the will of God. This discrimination between testimony and inference, and thus between faith and opinion has been the peculiar strength, clearness and power of the position occupied by the disciples of the Christ, as every disciple present today will doubtless confess.

Such a conclusion having been reached, let us examine a few scriptures as illustrations of what we can believe and should believe. Heb. 11:6 is the first in order. "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Acts 16:31 comes next. "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house." In the light of these two declarations it is evident that we CAN believe and SHOULD believe that faith or belief in God and Christ is the divine will and necessary to salvation. WHY: The answer is, BECAUSE this is a matter of divine testimony. "He that comes to God must believe that he is and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Again: "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Such is the testimony of the word of God and FAITH comes by the word of God.

I next read Luke 24:47. "And that repentance and remission of sin should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Following this comes Acts 17:30. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at (passed over); but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." In the light of these statements it is evident that we CAN believe and should believe that our repentance is the divine will and is necessary to salvation. WHY? The answer is, BECAUSE it is a matter of divine testimony. That testimony mentions repentance in the great commission of Christ and in the preaching of that commission by an inspired apostle. Repentance is therefore required by the word of God, and that high, grand, necessary confidence called "faith" comes by the word of God.

The next scripture in order is Mark 16:16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." In addition to this I read Acts 2:38. "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Here we find it clearly taught that we CAN and SHOULD believe it to be the divine will that faith and repentance and baptism precede the assurance of salvation from sin or the remission of sin.

And here again we may ask WHY? The answer is simply BECAUSE clearly and evidently and unquestionably to this effect is the explicit divine testimony and hence the testimony of the word of God, by the which word that all-important confidence called FAITH is produced.

Again, I read in your hearing, and this time I go back to Matt. 10:32. "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my father who is in heaven." Following this Rom. 10:10 is in order. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Such is the testimony on the subject of confession. But what does this teach? Certainly nothing less than that confession of faith in Christ is the divine will. WHY? The answer is, BECAUSE this is clearly set forth in the divine testimony, the which reveals the divine will. And, as we learned a while ago, that high and saving confidence called FAITH is produced by the divine testimony as found in the divine record. In other words, we learned that whether the eye or the ear becomes the inlet of the word of God, yet faith concerning the will of God is produced by the word of God.

Next I read Rom. 6:4. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism unto death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life." In harmony with this comes Col. 2:12. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Concerning these declarations we simply remark, that they show that a burial in or by baptism is a matter of faith or belief because it is a matter of divine testimony. In other words, in the light of these two declarations, it is evident that all CAN and SHOULD BELIEVE that the baptism required of us is a burial and a resurrection. If the question be asked WHY? we simply answer--because it is so stated in the testimony of the word of God.

Now let us consider the negative side of this subject for a brief period. As faith comes by the word of God it is evident that no can believe that to be the will of God which is not mentioned with approbation in the Bible--the book of God. This being true no one on earth can believe that he can meet the divine approbation here and thus get to heaven hereafter without believing in Christ as God's Son. People may INFER, may suppose, may THINK, may have VIEWS or Notions or SPECULATIONS on the subject, but they cannot have FAITH because they have no testimony in the word of God to that effect. That is to say, it is impossible for any one to believe that the divine favor can be secured or heaven attained without belief in the divinity of Christ, for the simple reason that it is impossible to believe anything to be will of God which is not mentioned and MENTIONED WITH APPROBATION in the word of God.

Next I mention the subject of repentance. Many have taught that repentance in course of this life is not necessary in order to reach heaven; but no one ever DID believe or ever CAN believe such teaching to be the will of God. The reason is found in this: IT IS

IMPOSSIBLE TO BELIEVE WITHOUT TESTIMONY. That is to say, where there is no testimony there can be no faith. Hence, there is not a preacher of Universalism who believes that it is the will of God that he should preach such a doctrine. He may INFER , or SUPPOSE, or PRESUME in favor of his doctrine, but he cannot BELIEVE such a doctrine to be the will of God.

Besides there is not a member of the Universalist church anywhere on this earth who really BELIEVES that repentance in this life has nothing to do with his salvation beyond this life. The reason is, that he cannot possibly find testimony in the word of God which so declares, and FAITH or BELIEF as we have learned is produced by the divine testimony.

Next we come to the subject of confession. In many funeral discourses and by many compromising religionists it has been by implication and even explicitly declared, that confession of faith in Christ is not necessary in order to become a Christian, meet the divine approbation and get to heaven. But no one on earth ever did or ever can BELIEVE such teaching to be the will of God. WHY? The answer is, because there is no testimony to that effect. Not a fragment of the word of God so declares. Therefore no one can so believe. What is not revealed as the will of God no one can believe to be the will of God. Therefore secret discipleship, or that kind of a religious life which those live who are ashamed or afraid to confess the name of Christ before others--such discipleship no one on earth can believe to be the will of God. There may be inferences or suppositions but not FAITH.

Now we come to the disputed subject of baptism. Applying the well-established truth concerning the domain of faith or belief it becomes evident that no one on earth DOES or CAN believe that baptism is a non-essential to salvation, or that it is not necessary in order that the alien sinner may reach a state or condition where his sins are remitted. Multitudes have had INFERENCES, or OPINIONS, or VIEWS, or NOTIONS, or SUPPOSITIONS to that effect but not one ever had or ever can have that high confidence called FAITH. Besides, multitudes have taught that baptism is a "door into the church," "an outward sign of an inward work of grace," or "the first act after conversion," but none have ever believed thus concerning baptism, or believed that such teaching is a part of the divine will. WHY! The reason is, because none have ever found a fragment of scripture to that effect and belief or faith is produced or comes by the word of God.

Concerning the question of what constitutes baptism, the same is true. Many have taught and held that baptism does not necessarily require a burial and resurrection, but that it may be performed by sprinkling or pouring; but no one has ever thus BELIEVED or ever BELIEVED such teaching was the will of God. Multitudes have said that in order to be baptized it is not necessary to have much water or go down into the water or to be buried in baptism or come up out of the water or to be raised in baptism, yet no one ever believed such teaching to be the will of God. Of course these multitudes have had "inferences" and "opinions" and "views" and "suppositions" and "preferences," but not one of the entire

company has had "faith" that such teaching ever was or ever will be the will of God. WHY? The answer is FOR WANT OF TESTIMONY.

In other words, whatever may be man's inferences, reasonings, suppositions or preferences, yet no one can believe that to be the will of God which is not mentioned with approbation in the word of God as revealed in the Bible, or rather, revealed to us as the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. So, then, it is evident that thus far the difference between disciples of Christ, and their religious neighbors are determined by the difference between TESTIMONY and INFERENCE, and between BELIEF or FAITH and OPINION or SUPPOSITION. In other words, in advocating simply what is revealed on the subjects mentioned we stand on the DIVINE TESTIMONY by which FAITH or BELIEF is produced, while those who oppose us on these subjects stand on HUMAN INFERENCE by which OPINION or SUPPOSITION is produced. All that we advocate on these subjects is a matter of divine testimony and thus is a matter of belief or faith, while all that our religious neighbors advocate in opposition to us on these subjects is not a matter of divine testimony and hence not a matter of belief or faith, but being of human inference certainly belongs to the domain of opinion or supposition or view or preference. NO ONE CAN BELIEVE THAT TO BE THE WILL OF GOD WHICH IS NOT ATTESTED WITH APPROBATION IN THE WORD OF GOD.

Now let us enter upon another chapter of this subject. In so doing I again read. Acts 11:26 is first suggested. I read the last sentence. "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." Next comes Acts 26:28. "Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Finally I read on this point 1 Pet 4:10. "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this behalf." In the light of such scripture it is evident that we all can and should believe that the name "Christian" is the proper name of those who have obeyed the gospel. WHY? Simply because this is a matter of divine testimony. If it can be said that such name was given the primitive followers of the Savior by their enemies, I answer by reading Eph. 3:14,15. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and on earth is named." This settles the question concerning who named the divine family on earth. Therefore, though many people may have inferences, views, opinions or suppositions to the effect that Christ's enemies gave his people the name "Christian," yet no one on earth can so believe, because to that effect THERE IS NO TESTIMONY. What disciples teach on this subject is a matter of divine testimony and hence is a matter of faith.

Next I read a short sentence in Rom. 16:16. "The churches of Christ salute you." Without going farther that shows that we all can believe that the body of Christians in any given place should be called the "Church of Christ." The reason is evident. Here we have "churches of Christ," and as the plural form of the word--"churches"--certainly embraces the singular form of the word--"church"--it becomes very evident that "Church of Christ" is a scriptural designation for those who are "Christians" in any given locality. What is a matter of

testimony is thus a matter of faith or belief, and we all can and should believe that to be the will of God which is with approbation mentioned in the Book of God.

Now your attention is invited to 1 Tim. 3:15,16. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." With this before our minds we need no argument to prove that the word of God as found in the inspired volume is clearly and evidently sufficient without manmade creeds. But WHY is no argument needed? For the simple reason that the all-sufficiency of the inspired word to perfect the man of God and thoroughly furnish him unto all good works is a matter of divine testimony. We can believe that such an estimate of the divine word is the divine will, because it is a matter of divine testimony.

But now let us again take up negative side of this question in order to ascertain what we CANNOT BELIEVE concerning the important items just mentioned. Multitudes who profess to be Christians permit themselves to be called by some other name or names than those mentioned in the gospel with approbation. They seem not to have learned the self-evident truth that "all who are Christians will be satisfied with being called Christians;" and hence they adopt human names as religious designations. But they cannot BELIEVE such a course to be the divine will. WHY NOT? For the simple lack of divine testimony. Belief or faith is a positive something, and thus belief or faith concerning the divine will can only be produced by positive divine testimony. Of course the multitudes wearing human names as religious designations may infer or suppose or think or presume that they are all right, but that is even opposed to the divine testimony as found in Paul's writings. I read in 1 Cor. 1st chapter "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" The reason why Paul asked these questions was that some in Corinth were calling themselves after his name and after the names of Apollos and Cephas. Then in 1 Cor. 3:3,4 that same apostle wrote thus: "For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying and strive and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men. For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" With these scriptures before the mind it is evident that for Christians to call themselves by humanly given names is not only without divine testimony in their favor, but it is contrary to the divine testimony on the subject. The language just cited shows that Christians have no right to wear humanly given names as religious titles, and no one on earth can BELIEVE that naming and wearing such names is conduct in harmony with the divine will. Of course, if people be not Christians, then they should not wear the name Christian, but some other name suitable to their true characters. Yet it is evident that humanly given or assumed religious names for Christians is wrong, and though people may infer, presume, suppose and opine that it is all right, yet it is impossible for them to BELIEVE that it is the will of God for Christians to be guilty of such conduct.

Now we come to consider the names of Churches. Humanly given and humanly assumed names are numerous, and the good people who have assumed them and are wearing them

may infer and suppose and hold and presume that they are acceptable to God, but they cannot so BELIEVE. No one can BELIEVE that which is not mentioned with approbation in the Book of God. And there can be no law to that effect because there is not one fragment of testimony to that effect. The testimony is all in the other direction and on the other side. Christ is the Head of the Church and as the head of every family determines the name of that family so in reference to the Church of Christ. Therefore to believe that the Church which consists of Christians may wear some humanly given name and yet the divine name be maintained is UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE. WHY? For the simple reason that there is no vestige of testimony to that effect.

The creed question comes next. On creeds, there is no such thing as belief or faith that man-made creeds or confessions of faith are in harmony with the will or are well-pleasing to God. Lack of testimony is the reason. Though multitudes hold to such creeds or confessions, yet it is IMPOSSIBLE to believe that they meet the divine approbation.

People may think, presume, suppose, reason, speculate to the effect that they are all right and that God is or will be pleased with them, but belief to that effect is impossible. Those who hold to human creeds or hold that they are necessary not only DO NOT but CAN NOT believe that such documents are pleasing to God, or that they meet the divine approbation. WHY NOT? The answer is, BECAUSE there's not one fragment of testimony that so declares.

Neither can people believe that it is the will of God that they should sprinkle water on infants and call it baptism, nor sit on a mourner's bench or anxious seat, or teach the listeners that religion is something to get and lose and get and lose time and again. WHY NOT? Simply because there is no testimony which so instructs, and without testimony it impossible to have faith.

Thus far, my hearers, we have considered the difference between disciples and their religious neighbors and we have in every instance found that difference to consist of the difference between testimony and faith or belief on the one hand, and inference and opinions or supposition on the other. In other words, wherein we differ from them is because we insist upon having the clear testimony of the word of God which produces that high grand confidence, called "faith" while our religious neighbors, on all the points thus far mentioned endeavor to justify themselves with inference, the which at its best cannot produce faith, but can only produce an opinion or supposition. Here then is the great distinction briefly set forth. WE insist upon heeding the divine testimony which produces faith, while THEY endeavor to be guided with inference which can only produce an opinion or supposition. But they should remember that Paul declared in Heb. 11:6, "Without faith it is impossible to please him," and in Rom. 14:23 he said, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Therefore all those who suppose that they can get to heaven upon inference, opinion,

supposition, presumption--all such are trying a dangerous terrible experiment. They should bear in mind that it is by faith and obedience of faith that they are to be saved and not by inferences, opinions, preferences, presumptions or anything of that character.

Now, my hearers, we come to another chapter of this great subject. Thus far we have been considering the differences between disciples and their religious neighbors as it respects the great subject of faith, and thus far I have set forth what every disciple understands and admits. The discrimination between faith and opinion, and between testimony and inference is generally well understood by disciples of Christ everywhere when we speak of the strength of our position and the weakness of the position of our religious neighbors. But now I propose to consider this same discrimination in its bearings upon the differences which exist among disciples. In other words, I propose to show that the very discrimination, which made us a great, a mighty and a prosperous people have been abandoned by a certain class of disciples who have been guilty of introducing humanisms into the work and worship of the church, whereby strife, alienation and division have been produced. By way of beginning in this direction I read first from Acts 20:28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." This language of Paul to the elders of Ephesus is an illustration or sample of the scriptures which enable us to believe that the flock or church of God at Ephesus was presided over by a plurality of bishops or overseers. The "church" is spoken of--not churches--and yet "overseers" are spoken of, showing that there were more than one. In the light of such a declaration we CAN believe and we SHOULD believe that a plurality of bishops or overseers were intended to be the feeders of the primitive flock and the watchers over the flock. Not that a little assembly of a dozen or even twice or thrice that number needed to have a plurality of bishops for the end in view or the work to be performed determined the number needed. But the Church at Ephesus, which was well established and was of size and strength, had a plurality of overseers whose business it was to feed the flock and watch over the flock and care for the flock. As all the other testimony of the New Testament is in harmony with this which has just been considered, I again say that we CAN believe and SHOULD believe that a plurality of bishops, at least for every church needing that many, was the original, divine order. Then, on the other hand, no one can possibly believe that it is the will of God that this order should be even partially ignored and the modern, imported, one-man, preacher-pastor established over the church or flock of God as the feeder and watcher thereof. WHY? the answer is because,--BECAUSE there is no testimony in the New Testament to that effect. The denominations generally have adopted the one-man pastorate, but only upon INFERENCE--certainly not upon TESTIMONY. Therefore it is not upon FAITH but upon OPINION or SUPPOSITION that it is based.

In the entire Book of God there is not one fragment of TESTIMONY in favor of the imported, one-man, preacher-pastor as the feeder and watcher over the flock after it had been gathered and established. Therefore, there is no one on earth who BELIEVES that such an

arrangement is according to the divine will. That arrangement originated with apostate Rome, and from Rome was borrowed by the Protestant denominations, and from them has been borrowed by a certain class of disciples who are determined to be like other folks and be in the fashion. Concerning the preacher the testimony is, that his business is to gather a flock, establish it and then move onward, or visit a church, proclaim the truth for a season, forewarn the brethren against all manner of evil and false teachers and move onward. Paul and Barnabas, I have sometimes thought, were a little inclined to pastorate at Antioch. The Church there was well established and no doubt it was a pleasant place to remain--good company and good eating. Not much danger there of missing a meal in traveling. As Acts 11:26 informs us, that they assembled a whole year with the church in that place. But the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Then the brethren unto whom such revelation was made fasted, prayed, laid hands on them and SENT THEM AWAY. This shows what every church should do with every man who can preach. Send him away--let him go forth and proclaim the unsearchable riches in the regions beyond. Of course it is more pleasant to remain at home if he have a good wife, and if she be a good cook and a good housekeeper, yet as certainly as that he is worthy of being called a preachers he should be sent AWAY with the benediction, blessing and support of the church. That this is the divine will we CAN believe and SHOULD believe without doubt, because we have the divine testimony to that effect. But to believe that the preacher should settle down upon an established congregation and locate himself and do the work of feeding intended to be done by the overseers--to believe this is UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE, because there is not one fragment of testimony to that effect. There may be INFERENCE and thus OPINION or SUPPOSITION, but there can be no FAITH, and whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Next I will read Eph. 3:10, "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly [high] places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." In the light of this declaration we can and should believe that the church in its congregational capacity is the divinely arranged missionary society. Other statements might be introduced as found in the record such as Philippians 4:15-1-18, and 2 Cor. 11:8, but as all are in harmony with what I read in Eph. 3rd chapter there is no need to pile up evidence. The testimony declares that by THE CHURCH the Lord proposed to make known the unsearchable riches of Christ, and hence THE CHURCH is God's own, divinely arranged missionary society to send out and support preachers--all this we can believe to be the divine will because it is a matter of divine testimony. But, on the other hand, there is no one living who does or can believe that it is God's will that besides and beyond and outside the congregation as established under the divine direction--I say there is no one who can believe that it is God's will that beyond the church there should be organized a man-made missionary society with presidents, secretaries, boards of managers, life membership, life directorship and so forth on a money basis which would shut out Christ and, a great proportion of time, the apostles of Christ. Yet, my hearers, these modern societies would shut Christ out if he were here on earth now as when he moved among men in course of his personal ministry.

He had not even sufficient money to pay his personal tax, but sent Peter fishing in order to get the money. And were he here now he would have to send Peter fishing in order to get money enough to have membership in a modern, man-made missionary society. Besides, when Peter and John went up into the temple at the hour of prayer, as mentioned in Acts 3rd chapter Peter could say, "Silver and gold have I none," and it is certain that he had no greenbacks nor any other kind of money. Hence with their pocket books thus empty they could not become members nor directors of a modern man-made missionary society without a suspension of rules. This of itself stamps the entire society business as condemnable. But the point I wish especially to impress on your minds is, that no one on earth does or can believe such a society to be the divine will on that subject, for the simple reason there is not one fragment of testimony to that effect. For want of testimony, belief or faith is simply impossible. Of course, there are inferences and opinions, reasonings and suppositions, views, notions and preferences, but there is no faith and there can be no faith, and the apostle Paul declared, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Now your attention, my hearers, is invited to Rom. 12:8. "Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth let him do it with simplicity." This clearly shows that giving is not to be done in complicity or complexity, but in simplicity. The Greek word translated "simplicity" here means also "sincerity, purity or probity of mind"--then "liberality as arising from simplicity and frankness of character." Thus as we are to give with simplicity we should not adopt the complex or complicated or roundabout way, but the simple, direct way which consists of working and saving till we have something in our pockets for the Lord's cause and then to put the hand directly into our pockets and hand it out. The difference between the simple and complex way of giving I will illustrate by way of an actual occurrence in the State of Ohio. A young sister approached one of the elderly members of the church making a subscription of five dollars to get up a festival, for they wished to put new curtains, carpet and such like things in the meeting house, as memory now serves me. That elderly member refused. Then the young sister began to plead thus: "Why, Bro. Hill, we thought surely you would help us." He answered: "No, my young sister, I cannot give you five dollars nor any other sum to get up a festival, but I will do this: I will give you ten dollars not to have the festival, but to help you get what you think you should get for the meeting house in the plain, direct and simple way." The young sister was delighted with the idea, and after taking Bro. Hill's name for ten dollars she started and raised the money in a short time without the festival, and thus without one particle of the complex or complicated way of giving. This was in harmony with the teaching found in Rom. 12:8, which enjoins those who give to do it with "simplicity." But the point I wish specially to impress is that giving in the simple, direct way we all can believe and should believe to be the divine will on the subject, because that is a matter of divine testimony. On the other hand, it is impossible for any one to believe the modern, humanly-devised methods of raising money to be according to the divine will, because there is not one particle of testimony which thus declares.

Let us enter upon an examination of some of these modern methods of raising money

and we shall find they are in direct opposition to the divine will, and they impeach the Lord Jesus Christ as the great Head of the Church. I read 1 Tim. 5:8. "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." Now, when we see a man's family begging, it implies one of three things--either the man has not provided suitable support for his family or else that family is too proud to be satisfied with that which is suitable or too stingy to make use thereof. Just so it is with the church that goes begging--either Christ who is the Head of his Church as a family has not provided what is suitable or sufficient for us, or we are too proud to be satisfied with his provisions, or, we must be too mean and stingy to use the provisions which he has given. The first of these alternatives is fatal to Christ and impeaches him as not having provided for his family, and the second and third alternatives is fatal to us and bring us under condemnation. Yet the church is in many places made like the man-made missionary society--a shameless, begging institution. Society advocates have taxed their ingenuity in order to devise devices and arrange arrangements to get money. They have gotten up a little earthen something in the shape of a jug, about the size of a man's fist, and this they have given to their children. Each child has received a jug with a piece of paper pasted on whereon was printed the word "Missionary." Thus equipped the dear little folks have gone on their begging expedition--begging from any body and from everybody for missionary money to send the gospel to the heathen. Then at a certain date, these jugs are all brought together and there is advertised a jollification at the time of the breaking of the little brown jugs. As time advanced the jugs became an old thing and they devised the "missionary egg," and from that to the "missionary barrel" used on the same principle as the jug was used. Thus the little children are encouraged to become a set of bold-faced shameless beggars.

Many of the churches--those in the towns and cities mostly--have adopted similar unauthorized measures to raise money for home purposes. Fairs and festivals, pound parties and box-suppers are common in order to get money from the children of the Devil to pay the Lord's debts! How humiliating and contemptible this is! As some of you may not understand the box-supper business I will explain. The women and girls of the church and out of the church--just as many as see fit--married and single, young girls and old girls, each one will cook a supper for two and put it in a box or basket, and in connection therewith will put her own name. Then each box or basket is put up at auction to the highest bidder for cash. As all men are invited it is evident that the man who buys the supper which a virtuous wife or daughter prepared--that man may be a gambler, a drunkard, or a libertine, or he may be all of these; yet because her name is in the basket or box which he has bought she must go and eat supper with that wretch and entertain him! Is this obeying the injunction "Come out from among them and be ye separate saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing." Then the weighing scheme is another device. It is managed thus: They get up a supper and bring all the women they can together and weigh them, or "guess them off" as cattlemen would say. Then the name of each woman with her weight is put in the box and all are shaken up together. Then the men and boys come up and each takes out one name, and the one wearing that name is taken out to supper, and whatever the weight of the woman or girl is whose

name he draws that determines how much he must pay for the supper than she and he together may eat. A half cent a pound is the ordinary rate, and at one of those gatherings a boy perhaps not more than just out his teens drew the name of a woman weighing about three hundred pounds. [This weight scheme was not in the verbal address, but is here inserted because it illustrates that shame deems dismissed from the minds and hearts and lives of innovators.]

Such, my hearers, and such like are the shameless schemes of a certain class of disciples who endeavor to twist money out of the pockets of worldlings to support what they call "the Lord's cause." They appeal to the appetites of the sinners to come and eat with the saints for the sake of the Lord's cause. A brother told me of a sensible woman who was urged to come to a certain church festival because of the many good things they were going to have to eat, and who responded saying, "I don't believe in eating so much for God's sake." Nor does the Lord require of his people that they should tempt the appetites of sinners or any one else, often at unseasonable hours, in order to support his cause. But there is something else in this matter which constitutes a great charm. A preaching brother in Ohio was being told by a young lady of a certain festival and how much they made. Being a business man, he began to inquire how must the festival cost in money and time. Having figured it all up and showed her that they had made but little. "That may be so," she exclaimed, "but, then, we had a lot of fun?" ["That's the idea--they want FUN"--Elder P. P. Warren.] Yes, in this confession, my hearers, lies a prominent secret. The people generally wish to get to heaven, but along the pathway to life eternal, they wish to have an abundance of fun, frolic and nonsense. Sober mindedness is dismissed and with a kind of "hip-hurrah--here we go--Bible or no Bible," they proceed. But what I wish to say concerning this entire business is, that it is outside of the domain of faith because it is outside the domain of divine testimony. No one can believe that to be the will of God which is not mentioned with approbation in the Book of God. But in this book it is declared, "Whatever is not of faith is sin."

But the music question must not be forgotten. I read Eph. 5:19. "Speaking to yourselves in Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." I also read Col. 3:16. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." In the light of such teachings we can certainly believe without the slightest doubt that singing is part of the worship and that it is the will of the Lord that we should teach in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. This we can believe without question, because this much is clearly set forth in the divine testimony. But no one ever did or ever can believe that it is the Lord's will to play on an instrument in the worship. No one on earth can possibly believe that playing of any kind is a part of the worship of God through Christ, nor that it SHOULD or even MAY accompany the worship without offending Christ. There may be inferences, opinions, views, notions, suppositions, but there can be no such confidence as the word "faith" signifies. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

While this subject is in hand it becomes us to pause and give it a concise examination. The law given through Moses on Mt. Sinai was finished and instrumental music in connection with the worship of God was not mentioned. How then did it get into the worship of the Jews? The answer is that it was introduced by David who was the second of the Kings. Then by turning to 1 Sam. 8th chapter we learn that when Israel first asked for a king God said that they had rejected him that he should not reign over them. That was God's interpretation of their conduct. So, then, to say the least, the Israelites were in a backsliding condition from that date onward, and it was while they were in this backslidden state that instrumental music was introduced into the worship of the Jews. Coming to the New Testament we find that the gospel was given and finished without instrumental music in the worship of the church. Singing is found, but no playing on an instrument. Where then do we find it? The answer is, **DOWN ALONG THE PATHWAY OF THE APOSTASY**. According to certain statements, about thirteen hundred years had elapsed before instrumental music was even introduced into the worship of the church of Rome. Certainly it can be traced not only to Rome, but to the most corrupt age of the Romish church. From that church Protestants have borrowed the instrument and from Protestant a certain class of disciples have done some borrowing. So then, the law given through Moses says of instrumental music in the worship **IT IS NOT IN ME** and the gospel of Christ says **IT IS NOT IN ME**. This shows that no one on earth can possibly **BELIEVE** that the instrument in the church of Christ ever was according to the will of Christ. Besides, as it is an addition to the worship and is an element of discord it is certainly contrary to Christ's will. Some say that it drowns discord, but they should say that it produces discord. It is a strife and discord breeding device. It has caused strife, contention, alienation and division among the people of God. Furthermore, a headless, heartless, soulless, voiceless instrument certainly cannot teach because it cannot utter a word. It blurs and obliterates teaching. Some year ago I was in Cincinnati and heard a great pipe organ. The tones were so deep and loud that I could not hear the man next to me and could not tell except by the book what was being sung.

As I have several times said, I could not tell except by the book whether they were singing, "There is a fountain filled with blood," or, "The girl I left behind me." I could not tell whether they sang, "Come let us anew, Our journey pursue:" or, "Old Mother Flannigan, She's gone to Michigan."

In other words, the great, deep-toned organ so slurred and blurred and drowned the human voices that no one could distinguish whether they were singing in English, Dutch or Sanskrit. Such music makes teaching by means of psalms, hymns and spiritual songs simply impossible and thus it is evident that it contravenes or comes in conflict with what is divinely authorized. But this is not all. If those who are offended at the organ were the weakest, most ignorant and least to be esteemed in the church (which they are not), yet even then it would be a sin to offend them by making an unauthorized instrument a test of fellowship, as is done whenever the organ is put into the meetinghouse and used in connection with the worship, since none can then worship there without seeing it and hearing it--I say, when such a course

is pursued, even if those opposing the organ were the least and the most ignorant, yet that course would be sinful in the sight of heaven. I read 1 Cor. 8:12, "But when ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak conscience ye sin against Christ." I also refer you also to Matt. 25th chapter where the Savior said, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren ye did it unto me." This shows beyond controversy that multitudes are in danger of being finally rejected because in this life they have persistently sinned against Christ in sinning against his brethren. In conclusion on this point I mention again that in favor of the organ in the worship there may be inferences, opinions, views, nothings, preferences but there is not faith that it is the will of Christ that it should be used in connection with the worship. But "whatever is not of faith is of sin."

Here I pause to meet a few objections. When we reason with innovators on these questions they often turn upon us and ask, "Where do you get your meeting house?" A so-called "state evangelist" of Ohio once asked me that question. I answered, "We find the meeting house in the 11th chapter of 1 Corinthians where mention is made of the 'one place' where the church met, and that 'one place' was separate from the houses where they ate and drank." That closed his mouth. "But" said an Indiana preacher, "where do you get your lamps and stoves?" I answered "We find authority for them in the scriptures." Then I proceeded thus: "And there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together." Acts 20:8. This settles the "lamp" question. Next I referred to 1 Cor. 3:17 which says, "If any man defile the temple of God him shall God destroy;" also 1 Cor. 6:19, "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which temple ye are?" I then mentioned that if it were condemnable to defile the body or temple of God, it certainly would be condemnable to freeze the temple of God. Therefore we must have heat. Then by turning to John 6:12, we find "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost." The principle of economy shows that we should have heat upon the most economical principles--that nothing be lost. This settles the matter, and thus, if time permitted, we could answer every objection which the ingenuity of innovators could suggest. But this much has been mentioned only parenthetically.

Returning now to our original theme, I call heaven and earth, men and angels to witness that the discrimination between testimony and inference, and between faith and opinion--this discrimination which made disciples a great and a mighty and a separate people--this discrimination which has given us our peculiar strength and power as teachers of the religious and irreligious world--I say that I call heaven and earth, angels and men to witness that **THIS DISCRIMINATION HAS BY INNOVATORS AMONG DISCIPLES BEEN ABANDONED.** Do not infer that I mean it has been abandoned by them in every particular, but rather in relation to their innovations. While dealing with their religious neighbors they declare the difference between testimony and inference, and the difference between faith and opinion. But when they come to the worship and work of the church they make matters of inference, and thus matters of opinion, tests of fellowship by thrusting them in upon peaceable churches, so that none can worship or work with them except by practically

adopting their devices. They have in some instances even gone so far as to exclude men and women who would persist in opposing their matters of opinion. As a result they are responsible for all the evils that now afflict us as a people in consequence of the introduction among us of things unauthorized by the New Testament. We therefore lay down before and against our modern school brethren who have acted the part of innovators among us on the following charges.

1.They are responsible for every restless, sleepless night and unhappy day that has been spent by the humble disciples of Christ by reason of innovations being thrust upon the church. 2.We likewise charge upon and against our modern school of innovating brethren that they are responsible for all tears that have been shed by loyal Christians on account of human devices being urged upon them. 3.We also charge that our innovating brethren are responsible for all the angry and unchristian words and actions that have been occasioned by their innovations for the last twenty-five years. 4.We further charge upon them and against them that they are accountable for all the strifes and alienations and deviations which have resulted from their endeavors to modernize and secularize the worship and work of the church. 5.We likewise charge against them that they are responsible for every individual disciple who has become discouraged and has gone back to the world, and for every opportunity to save souls which the church has lost by reason of the confusions which have been thrust upon the church by human devices. 6.We also charge that they are accountable before earth and heaven for the entire expenditure of time and strength and money which has been made in this entire controversy from the beginning to the present time and until the end may come. 7.We finally charge upon and against our innovating brethren that they are responsible for all the bickerings and feuds, griefs and lamentations, heart-burnings and heart-breakings which has resulted from the introduction among us of human devices which are not mentioned in the word of God--not authorized by our King--but which they have borrowed from the denominations of Protestantism and from the world.

What then must be done by those who are determined to remain loyal to Christ? Shall we be longer held responsible for the misconduct, and in many respects shameful misconduct, of our erring brethren who refuse to be admonished? When they determined to have their devices if they had only left the established congregations in peace and had gone out into new fields and built up churches, they would have acted with some honor. But instead of so doing they have thrust their devices upon congregations established upon primitive simplicity, and thus have become usurpers of other men's labors. We were once a happy and a peaceful and a prosperous people and for peace we pled. We entreated them for God's sake and for the love of heaven not to thrust their devices upon us, but they would not hearken. **WHAT THEN MUST BE DONE?** In the language of the Apostle Peter I answer: **"THE TIME IS COME THAT JUDGEMENT MUST BEGIN AT THE HOUSE OF GOD."**

(Elder P. P. Warren then took the stand and addressed the audience)