

**DR THOMAS: HIS LIFE & WORK  
A BIOGRAPHY  
ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE PROCESS BY WHICH  
THE SYSTEM OF TRUTH REVEALED IN THE BIBLE  
HAS BEEN  
EXTRICATED IN MODERN TIMES  
FROM THE  
OBSCURATION OF ROMISH AND PROTESTANT  
TRADITION  
BY ROBERT ROBERTS  
OF BIRMINGHAM ENGLAND  
LONDON, CHRISTADELPHIAN BOOK DEPOT, 69, UPPER STREET, ISLINGTON  
BIRMINGHAM: R ROBERTS, ATHENÆUM ROOMS, TEMPLE ROW**

**1873**

PREFACE

THIS book is published as a contribution to the work in which Dr Thomas's life was spent. It is not a mere story, nor a story at all, in the ordinary sense. It is the illustration of a development of Bible truth, which in the absence of miracle and direct communication from God, has taken years to come to maturity; which the world at large is unaware of; which some part of the professing Christian world, knowing of it, rejects with bitterness; which others have received with joy; which can be conclusively demonstrated as the teaching of God's word, and quickly seen by any mind of ordinary power, honestly looking into the evidences.

But though not a mere story, the book has some of the interest always attaching more or less to biographical narrative. This may make it especially useful. It will, of course, be valuable to those already acquainted with the truth of which Dr Thomas has been the agent of development in this age of the world; but others may be induced to look at the truth in this form, who could not be brought to read a formal demonstration of it. They may thus be made pleasantly acquainted with that which certainly will be to their profit, if they give heed with an earnest mind.

No intelligent person can read through this narrative without being largely interested, not only in Dr Thomas, but in the Bible controversies in which he so successfully engaged; nor can he fail to be made acquainted to a considerable extent with the scriptural grounds upon which the Dr maintained his positions. This result is ensured by copious quotations from the articles and correspondence in which the controversy was conducted at its various stages. Ordinarily, such quotations are dry reading, but the intelligent reader will find that their interest in this case is as exceptional as was the man among his fellows, or the controversy among the public questions of the day. They are decidedly what is described as

“racy”. They are vigorous and beautiful in style, even to the point of being sparkling; and the supreme importance attaching to the topics so treated, completes the charm they have over the reader.

Amongst books teeming from the press in the present day, this has a significance which we cannot but think would be thankfully appreciated by thousands of intelligent minds who are tossed to and fro in the religious uncertainties of the day. Called upon to choose between the absurdities of priest craft and the cheerlessness of a practically atheistic philosophy, they are distracted and heartless, while they hold on, perhaps, with a certain reverence to the Bible which they cannot surrender. Many such have been overjoyed to find an end of their embarrassment in the system of truth hereby presented to notice; and there must be many thousands in English society, throughout the globe, whose experience would be similar; who would find herein the ground on which the difficulties of science on the problems of human origin and destiny, are reconcilable with a full acceptance of the Bible with all its accomplished facts in history, and enlivening hopes connected with the re-appearance of Christ and the future of the Jewish nation.

It may be the purpose of God to reach this class in increasing numbers. It may be that the controversy involved in this book may become one of the public questions of the day, as it certainly well deserves (for all other questions are insignificant compared to it). But whether or not, it is the privilege of those who at present have the matter in charge to avail themselves of every means, and use every opportunity within reach, of calling attention to this most important matter. This policy is the explanation of the appearance of this book in the form adopted.

A likeness of the Dr (on steel), as he was a year previous to his death, is inserted at the beginning of the book, to gratify the curiosity that will naturally be felt by every interested reader. The three medallions at the bottom of the picture show his likeness at three earlier stages of his active career.

A complete list of the Dr’s published works will be found at the end of the book.

In thanksgiving to God for the man and his work, as the agency of much enlightenment that prevails, and in prayer that thousands more may be brought within reach of the joyful benefit, and, above all things, that the Lord Jesus may quickly re-appear to save his people, to disentangle the hopeless affairs of mankind, and bring peace after the great storm, and cause the promised blessing in Abraham and his seed to prevail to the utmost bounds of the world, this work is sent forth by one who is more its editor than

THE AUTHOR

64m Belgrave Road, Birmingham

9th April 1873

---

## C O N T E N T S

Preface . . . . . i

### CHAPTER 1

Introductory – The Christadelphian contention – Its abstract improbability – A proposed explanation – The history of a work rather than of a man – An unpremeditated enterprise – Unwelcome incidents and unexpected conclusions – The American Reformation alias

“Campbellism”, a preparation for the truth – Alexander Campbell necessary to John Thomas  
– Prominence of Campbellism in the succeeding narrative – Dr Thomas’s natural  
qualifications – Sources from which this narrative is drawn. Page 1

## CHAPTER 2

Birth of Dr Thomas – His inherited qualities – His father’s early days and subsequent  
pursuits – First a Government clerk, then an independent preacher, then keeper of a  
boarding school for sons of deceased ministers, - again a preacher, and finally clerk in a gas  
office - The Dr’s medical studies at Chorley and London – Takes his diploma at St Thomas’s  
Hospital – Acts as demonstrator of anatomy – Writes a course of lectures on obstetrics –  
Commences practice for himself – Contributes to the Lancet – The Dr’s early notions on the  
subject of immortality.

Page 3

## CHAPTER 3

The Dr’s father is seized with the American emigration fever – The Dr proposes to go first  
and spy the land – Sails for New York as surgeon of the Marquis of Wellesley – Storm at sea  
– Uncertain reckonings of the ship – Ship strikes the bottom thirteen times at Sable Island –  
All hope of being saved taken away – The Dr in a state of religious mist – Resolves if ever he  
gets to land again to search for the truth till he should find it – Ship gets off the shoal, and in  
a leaky state, finishes the voyage in safety – The Dr arrives in New York – His father arrives  
three days after him. Page 5

## CHAPTER 4

The Dr commences his search for truth – Clerical introduction of no service – the Dr starts  
for Cincinnati – Meets there a Major Gano, a Campbellite convert, who presses Campbellism  
on his attention – The Dr will not read Campbellism for fear of being biased – Major Gano  
introduces him to Walter Scott the founder of Campbellism – In conversation with that  
gentleman, is overcome in argument, and is immersed by him the same night by moonlight  
in the Miami Canal.

Page 8

## CHAPTER 5

The Dr’s introduction to Campbellism in spite of his resolution not to connect himself with  
any sect – A providential occurrence – The Dr stays seven months in Cincinnati – Is advised  
by Walter Scott to become a preacher, but refuses – Leaves Cincinnati for the Eastern States  
– On the way, calls at Wellsburgh, Va, where he meets Mr Alexander Campbell – Is invited  
by Mr Campbell to his establishment at Bethany – Accompanies him thither – Goes with  
him to a preaching meeting, and is called on by Mr Campbell to speak – Mr Campbell wants  
to try the Dr’s mettle – The Dr speaks on Dan ii – Again called on, speaks on the Apostacy –  
The Dr loves Mr Campbell, but disinclined for such work, decides to leave Bethany, and  
proceed to his destination – Calls at Somerset Courthouse, and proceeds to Baltimore,  
where he is made to speak. Page 10

## CHAPTER 6

The Dr determined to break away from the preaching career being forced upon him, leaves

Baltimore and goes to Philadelphia – Arrived at Philadelphia, is called upon to speak – Cannot get away from it – Accepts a medical practice among the Philadelphian Campbellites on the understanding that he is to speak on Sundays – The result unfavourable to temporalities, but conducive to scriptural enlightenment – His adoption to become the subject of this – The Dr marries.

Page 14

#### CHAPTER 7

The Dr becomes an Editor without intending it – A Morrison pill vendor proposes to get up a magazine – The Dr by request proposes a name and writes a prospectus – The pastor is angry, and the Dr abandons the matter – The pastor intends to carry on the magazine, but takes ill, and on his recovery, asks the Dr to proceed with it – The Dr does so, and issues the prospectus – Mr Campbell publishes the prospectus – The first number of the Apostolic Advocate – The matter mostly the Dr's own – Specimens – The Dr's wonderful comprehension of the Apocalypse so early as 1834 – A characteristic editorial notice. Page

15

#### CHAPTER 8

The Dr leaves Philadelphia, visits Baltimore, and takes up his residence at Richmond – Is offered employment as an evangelist – Declines, and gives his reasons – Conducts the Advocate, and follows medical practice – His troubles with Campbellism begin – Publishes an article advocating re-immersion where Campbellites had not been intelligently baptised – The Dr writes on the subject to the Campbellite Church at Baltimore – Mr Campbell opposes him in the Harbinger – The Dr's reply. Page 21

#### CHAPTER 9

The Dr writes to Mr Campbell, arguing the question with him at length – Letter 1 – Letter 2 – Letter 3 – Letter 4. Page 28

#### CHAPTER 10

Increasing opposition to the Dr – A few faithful – Albert Anderson's letter to Mr Campbell – The Dr urges the Campbellites to be consistent with their principles – Mr Campbell writes a long article against re-immersion – The Dr comments thereon – Another source of contention. Page 43

#### CHAPTER 11

Deeper subjects and further controversies – The Dr publishes thirty-four questions under the heading "Information wanted". The reception they met with, and the effect on the Dr's mind – origin of the hostility – candid correspondents and their objections – Enoch and Elijah – The thief on the cross – Stephen's dying prayer – Spirits of just men made perfect – The Dr's explanations – Mr Campbell seeks to counteract the effects by publishing an imaginary conversation – The Dr publishes an imaginary conversation in reply. Page 48

#### CHAPTER 12

The next stage of the conflict – Mr Campbell writes directly against the Dr in his paper – The Dr's response – Mr Campbell writes a series of articles on materialism, indirectly aimed

at the Dr – The Dr replies; extracts from his articles. Page 59

#### CHAPTER 13

Open rupture between Dr Thomas and the Campbellites – A defamatory letter against the Dr – The Dr defended – An armistice proposed and accepted between the Dr and Mr Campbell – The condition, mutual silence – The silence broken by Mr Campbell, upon which the Dr writes to Mr Campbell – Mr Campbell resolves to take no further notice of the Dr.  
Page X

#### CHAPTER 14

Mr Campbell breaks through his resolution to take no notice of the Dr – Writes about the Dr – The Dr rejoins – The Dr leaves Richmond and takes to farming at Amelia – Gives up medical practice, because he finds it incompatible with editing and preaching – The printer of the Advocate sells his business to a clerical, who refuses to print the Advocate – The Dr, with the aid of friends, buys a press and types, and becomes his own printer – The office on the farm at Amelia – Publishing difficulties – A one-horse mail – Slow dispatch – Accidents and runaway assistants. Page X

#### CHAPTER 15

Discussion between Dr Thomas and Mr Watt, a Presbyterian clergyman – Mr Campbell republishes an enemy's report of it, and declares fellowship between him and the Dr at an end – A bull of excommunication – The Dr writes to Mr Campbell on the subject. Page X

#### CHAPTER 16

Mr Campbell justifies his disfellowship of Dr Thomas – The Dr replies – The Painsville church obeys Mr Campbell's call to investigate Dr Thomas's case – They address a report thereon to the Campbellite body generally – The Dr's remarks thereon – The Bethel congregation also reports on the same matter – The Dr's comments – Mr Campbell attacks the Advocate – The Dr replies in a long letter. Page X

#### CHAPTER 17

Anonymous slanders begin to circulate against the Dr – They cause him to abandon an intended tour in Southern Va – Afterwards makes the tour, and is cordially received everywhere – Friends beseech a reconciliation between Mr Campbell and himself – He goes to Richmond to meet Mr Campbell for this purpose – Hears him preaching – Talks with him three hours on a railway bridge – Afterwards letters pass between them – They have a second meeting, at Painsville – Friends propose a discussion between them – The discussion takes place, after which there is a reconciliation – The reconciliation is short-lived.

Page X

#### CHAPTER 18

The Dr depressed with the backward state of everything in Virginia – A letter from the ?far west? causes him to entertain the idea of removing – Determines to visit Illinois, to spy the land, before making up his mind – Sets out on a ride of 900 miles on horseback – Amid the difficulties of the way cogitates on the power of the ?letter? which had taken him from home – Comments on the popular dogma that the ?word of God? is a ?dead letter? –

Occupies twenty-three days on the journey – Inspects a sublime piece of scenery, which stirs his emotions – Carries no means of defence – Is unmolested – Arrived at Illinois, is satisfied with the country, purchases nearly 300 acres of land at Longrove, and decides to remove to it – Returns to Virginia, and winds up his affairs – At the end of five months, sets out for Illinois with his family, in a four-horse wagon – Occupies two months in the journey – Meets with an accident nearly fatal – Arrive at their destination in a storm of sleet – In due course, has a house built, and commences farming – Suspension of the Advocate – Cultivates medical practice, while a man does the hard work on the farm – A fall in the price of wheat makes farming unprofitable – The Dr finally dispenses with hired labour, and takes to working the farm himself – Ploughing, harrowing, milking cows, too hard work – Resorts to labour-saving expedients, ingenious but amusing – Finally decides to give up farming – Removes to St Charles to start a paper, leaving a man in charge of the farm till he should sell – Opens a printing office which is burnt down immediately after – The office reopened with money advanced by townspeople – commences the publication of a weekly paper – A paper incident. Page X

#### CHAPTER 19

The Dr disliking paper associations, gives up the paper and starts a religious monthly magazine, the Investigator – Preaches the word as he has opportunity – Fills a vacancy in a Universalist meeting-house – A Mormon preaching at the same place is opposed by the Dr – A two days' discussion follows – The Dr Re-visits Virginia on business – On the way calls at Pittsburgh, and sees Mr Walter Scott, who complains of Mr Campbell – At Fredericksburgh was objected to by the Campbellites, who, however, decided by a majority to hear him – Is invited by the Campbellites to various parts of East Virginia, but finds enemies multiplied – Has various offers to settle, but declines and returns westward – Calls at Louisville, where he makes up his mind to leave Illinois – The of this decision precipitates business calamities at St Charles – The Dr is left penniless and in debt. Page X

#### CHAPTER 20

The Dr's stay at Louisville – Preaches to the Campbellites – Holds a week's debate with a Universalist – Offers to show the Adventists they were wrong in expecting the Lord in 1843 – Article written by him for the purpose on the world's age, with interesting prefatory remarks – Acts as paper editor protem – Writes an article on the nature and tendency of Popery, which excites public indignation – Starts the Herald of the Future Age – After the issue of a few numbers, returns to Richmond, where the Campbellites object to receive him – First organic separation of the truth from Campbellism – The Dr's progressing studies. Page X

#### CHAPTER 21

A lull in the controversy between Dr Thomas and Mr Campbell – The lull terminated and the war resumed – Mr Campbell's misrepresentations corrected by one who knew – A Campbellite congregation's protest against Mr Campbell's treatment of the Dr – Peculiar position of the Dr – Unexcommunicated yet rejected – The Campbellite question. "Do you belong to us?" – The Dr's answer – Another proposed reconciliation between the Dr and Mr Campbell – The Dr's response – Failure – The last attempt – The Dr weary of Campbellite inconsistency – Speaks out in defence of an uncompromising apostolic testimony and

repudiation of the apostacy from which Campbellism had professed to have come out. Page X

#### CHAPTER 22

A Campbellite editor visits the Dr and afterwards reports the interview in his paper – Speaks of the Dr as a curiosity and a dangerous man – The Dr replies at length in a letter to the editor – The Dr’s explanation of the motives which actuated him in his apparently bootless opposition to the state of things around him.

Page X

#### CHAPTER 23

The Dr’s visit to New York – How it came about – A cold reception – Nevertheless the Dr receives the use of the Meeting-House and lectures ten times – Interest created – Synopsis of the things unfolded, which were pronounced “chaffy” by the leaders of Campbellism – Proposal to the Dr to accept a “call” to become preacher to the New York Campbellites – The Dr’s response. Page X

#### CHAPTER 24

A Campbellite criticism on the Dr’s visit to New York – His expositions denounced as “husks and useless speculations – The effect on the Dr’s mind described by himself – Description of the process by which he had arrived at his conclusions – The conviction it brought him to: that he was an unbaptised man – Re-immersed for the hope of Israel – Thereupon publishes a Confession and Abjuration, in which he confesses his mistakes and abjures his errors – The interesting document in which he did so. Page X

#### CHAPTER 25

The Dr proposes to Alexander Campbell a full written discussion of the immortality of the soul – Mr Campbell’s contemptuous reply – The Dr’s rejoinder – A military allegory illustrative of the career of the Dr and Mr Campbell, by one who had watched both. Page X

#### CHAPTER 26

After twelve years’ polemic warfare, the two combatants examined by Mr Fowler, the phrenologist – Light thrown on their careers – The Dr comments thereon. Mr Campbell’s phrenological description – Dr Thomas’s phrenological description – Remarks. Page X

#### CHAPTER 27

Having made a new start, the Dr visits Baltimore, New York, and Buffalo, to make known his perfected apprehension to his friends – Encouraging reception at Baltimore – The truth embraced at New York; disturbance in consequence – A new meeting formed – No result at Buffalo – Visits and lectures at Rochester without result – Closes his first tour for the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom. Page X

#### CHAPTER 28

A new stage in the Dr’s work – Britain to be visited – Outbreak of revolution in Europe in 1848 – The Dr thinks the opportunity favourable for a hearing, but does not see how, in the absence of friends and influence, it is to be obtained – Goes to New York to embark – Is

permitted the use of the Campbellite meeting-house and speaks – Obtains letters of recommendation to Campbellites in England – Before starting, writes to the New York Morning Star on the political situation, in the light of prophecy – Is announced in the papers as “A Missionary for Europe” – Sails, with his daughter, from New York on June 1st; lands at Liverpool on June 22nd – Hostile notification of his errand to England in the English Campbellite organ – The Dr transmits letter of recommendation to the editor – Receives an unfavourable reply – Sends an answer, which, by inadvertence, gets into the hands of the Campbellite-Adventists at Nottingham, who invite him – This the opening of the door – The Dr’s remarks thereon.

Page X

#### CHAPTER 29

A rival Campbellite periodical is friendly to the Dr because of Wallis’s opposition – Publishes the Dr’s correspondence with Wallis, also articles from his pen, greatly to the advantage of the truth – Origin of the paper which thus gave the Dr access to the very people from which it was sought to exclude him – The Dr’s account – The Dr visits Nottingham – Is heard by large and attentive audiences – Formation of a community on the basis of the truth in consequence. His visit to Nottingham introduces the Dr to Derby, Birmingham, Plymouth, Lincoln and Newark. Page X

#### CHAPTER 30

An attempt to injure the Dr’s growing influence in Britain – The Campbellites get up a charge of falsehood – The facts of the case – The Dr denied having rejected, or having been excommunicated from Campbellite fellowship – This is construed into a denial of having published the Confession and Abjuration – Correspondence on the subject – The episode not altogether difficult to understand – The Dr’s remarks thereon. Page X

#### CHAPTER 31

The reason these personal matters are noticed now – The natural growth of the situation – The Dr emerging but not disentangled from Campbellite associations, to which he naturally clung as giving him facilities for disseminating the truth – The Dr visits Glasgow – Attends the Campbellite Convention there in the capacity of a Campbellite delegate from Lincoln – His admission opposed – Stormy proceedings – The Dr’s action blamed; but when understood, appears in another than a reprehensible light – The Drs account of the matter.

#### CHAPTER 32

The Dr obtains a large hearing while in Glasgow – Addresses thousands in the City Hall – Interest due to the troubles on the Continent – Visits Paisley – Public soiree at Glasgow in acknowledgment of the Dr’s lectures – Before the separation of the meeting, the Dr asked to write a book – He consents – A committee formed to obtain orders – Elpis Israel afterwards the result – Accepts an invitation to visit Edinburgh – Cold reception, but the iciness thaws after a few lectures, and cordial friendship takes the place of hostility – A farewell soiree at which the Dr is presented with a contribution to travelling expenses – The Dr returns to London to write Elpis Israel – Attends a Peace Society’s meeting in Exeter Hall, to show that war is a divine appointment in the present state of things. Page X

#### CHAPTER 33

The Dr having finished Elpis Israel, makes a second tour of the country, visiting Aberdeen,



Dundee and other additional places – Elpis Israel makes its appearance – Many friends at once turn hostile – They had no idea of the Dr's views on general theology, his lectures having principally been on prophetic subjects – Elpis Israel burnt; nevertheless the means of enlightening many unto life eternal – Visits Plymouth, and on the return journey holds conversation with a fellow-traveller on the Gorham case, which he afterwards published under the title of The Wisdom of the Clergy proved to be Folly – Afterwards makes a tour of Holland, Prussia, Germany and France – Returns to America as ship's doctor in the Marathon, arriving in New York just two years-and-a-half after his departure to England – On arriving at Richmond, is seized with a nearly fatal illness – His remarks thereon. Page X

#### CHAPTER 34

Recovered of his illness, the Dr resumes the publication of the Herald, which he continues eleven years afterwards – Makes periodical tours of the States – Communication through the Herald with friends everywhere – The outbreak of civil war in America compels the suspension of the Herald. The Dr accepts an invitation to re-visit Britain – Arrives in Liverpool, May, 1862 – Visits and lectures at about twenty places; but little done beyond the encouragement of the friends of the truth – Returns to America and publishes Eureka – Communicates with friends through the Ambassador – Travels during the American war – To save brethren from the American conscription, petitions for their exemption; is compelled in doing so to give them a designation; hence the origin of "Christadelphian" – Revisits England in 1869 – Visits and lectures at nearly thirty places – Is gratified with the comparative prosperity of the truth, and decides to settle in England for the rest of his days – The name of the Ambassador changed to the Christadelphian – The Dr cooperates with friends to place it on a stable footing – Returns to America to wind-up his affairs, with a view to removal to England – Sets out on a tour through the States and Canada, but is arrested by sickness, and returns home to die. Page X

#### CHAPTER 35

Death of Dr Thomas – His daughter's account of his illness. Remarks on his character and career. Page X

#### CHAPTER 36

The reception of the at the Birmingham ecclesia – The epistolary expressions of friends on the event – The Dr's first interment – Executors' journey to America – Visit to the Dr's remains in the vault where they had been placed – Interment in Greenwood Cemetery – Tombstone inscription. Page X

#### CHAPTER 37

Concluding words – Character of the foregoing narrative – The man and the career – The Dr's summary of results – His qualification for the work – The story in brief – The Dr's alleged failure in the prophetic dates – The state of the case – His own view of the matter – The Dr not yet proved wrong – The time of the end upon us – Whether or not, the truth unaffected by chronology – The Dr's prophetic-political prognostications and their verification during the last 23 years – The remaining items of the programme – The probability of their early fulfilment, and of the Dr's re-appearance in the land of the living – The consummation. Page X

## DR THOMAS: HIS LIFE AND WORK

### CHAPTER 1

THIS book has to do with an important religious problem which is daily becoming more widely agitated. The people known as the Christadelphians contend that the popular theologies of the day are destitute of the principles revealed in the Bible, on which they profess to be based; and, further, that the things the Christadelphians believe are the elements of the Christian faith, as originally delivered by the apostles. This contention they are able to maintain with a force of argument that opponents find it difficult to meet; and the latter generally fall back on the abstract improbability of a claim which implies ignorance of Bible teaching on the part of men and systems specially consecrated to the work of Bible study. "How is it," say they, "that this has not been found out before? How is it that Dr Thomas should find it out and nobody else?"

The present work indirectly proposed an answer to this question, at all events, to the second part of it. It proposed to shew how the truth has been found out, without dealing with the question of why so many have not found it. It proposes to do this by a narrative, which cannot fail to be especially interesting to those who have endorsed Christadelphian conclusions; and which may not be an uninteresting one to those who are still content with an inherited but unexamined faith.

This history to be set forth is the history of a work rather than of a man. For this reason, it deals more with the fortunes of "questions" and principles, than with personal incidents and characteristics, introducing the latter only in so far as they are essential to the elucidation and illustration of the former.

The history is altogether a remarkable one. It is not that of a man starting out with a crotchet, or a theory, or an enterprise, to which he successfully applies the energies of a life-time. It is that of a mind circumstantially driven into a path of research which he was not seeking, and impelled forward in it by a series of unwelcome incidents and experiences, which imposed on him the acquisition of knowledge not, in the first instance, sought for, and conclusions as unexpected as they were startling and disastrous to popularity. The narrative shews a clear intellect, and an inflexible conscience arriving at convictions unpalatable to coadjutors, and advocating them with a recklessness of consequences which unsuited him for sectarian schemes.

This was a slow and unpremeditated result. It came about as the effect of a providential concatenation of circumstances, without plan or anticipation on the part of the Dr. Prominent among these, was the Dr's contact with the American Reformation, currently known among non-reformationists as "Campbellism", an account of the leading part taken in the movement by Mr Alexander Campbell (deceased some eight years ago). Not regarding it in the light of true reformation, the writer of this biography will speak of it under its current designation; not out of disrespect, but merely as a distinctive and appropriate appellation. Disrespect will not be the sentiment entertained by a believer of the truth towards a system of things which, though not the truth itself, led up to the development of the truth. Though not a true reformation, it was a large step toward it. This generation is undoubtedly indebted to it for the true reformation since developed by the instrumentality of Dr Thomas. But for Alexander Campbell, the human probability is there

would have been no John Thomas; and so far as we can see, but for John Thomas, those who now

rejoice in the truth, would still have been sitting, like the rest of the world, in “darkness and the shadow of death”.

The inseparable connection between Campbellism and the career that led Dr Thomas to the discovery of the truth, accounts for the prominence of the former throughout the succeeding narrative. That prominence will not be regretted by those who desire to see unbarred the various links in the chain of circumstances that led the Dr, step by step, to the grand result for which Campbellism paved the way. The interesting and instructive story of the truth’s revival in our century, cannot be told without a recital of the history of Campbellism, in so far as it bore upon the career of that man by whom that revival was effected – a man at first welcomed by the leaders of Campbellism as a “chosen vessel,” but soon as bitterly discarded and maligned as he was vastly misunderstood.

Dr Thomas was fitted by natural qualification for the great work achieved by his hand. His intellect was a fine balance between perception and reflection, adapting him for full and accurate observation and correct reasoning, while a scientific education brought out those powers to the fullest advantage. On the other hand, his great independence and fidelity to conviction, fitted him to advocate the results of study without compromise. Yet, left to himself, those natural qualifications must have taken a totally different direction from what they did. It required the circumstances to which he was subjected to bring him into the path of Biblical discovery. This discovery was not a result upon which he had set his mind. He had no idea that “discovery” in this department was possible. He supposed “theology” was as much a settled branch of knowledge as any other. It was a branch of knowledge in which, as a young man, he took no special interest. “Our pursuits”, he says, “...were purely medico-chirurgical. We went to meeting or to ‘church’ as regularly as the day of worship came, and, for two years, we attended at the French Protestant Church, near the Bank of England; not, however, for the theology, but for improvement in the French tongue. Our mind was pre-occupied with the world and our profession. ‘Divinity speculations’, as we would have termed them then, we turned over to those whose ‘call’ was more ‘divine’ than our own: we attended to the matters of fact of the passing day. In those years, our literary contributions were solely to the London Lancet; such as reports of cases, and articles on medical reform.” The pressure of circumstances alone forced him into a religious path. His theological career was emphatically a providential development. He had neither designed nor inclined it. It was the result purely of special circumstances, operating upon his peculiarly constituted mind. It is this fact that gives the narrative its highest interest, and imparts to the conclusions he arrived at, a greater value than, even upon the same evidence they could have commanded, had they been espoused at second hand.

The following narrative is of equal authenticity with an autobiography. It is founded on information imparted orally to the writer by the Dr himself, and largely drawn from the periodicals published by him over a period of thirty years; all of which the writer has been fortunate enough to procure, with the single exception of the Investigator,\* published about the year 1844. In most of these periodicals, the Dr was compelled by the polemical exigencies of the situation, to recur at intervals to personal explanations, which place at our disposal many valuable autobiographical sketches, of which we have thought it well to give the reader large benefit in the Dr’s own words.

## CHAPTER 2

Dr Thomas was born in Hoxton Square, London, on the 12th of April, 1805. His father, who was aristocratically descended, was a high-spirited, proud, and talented man, with an active temperament and energetic mind, of eminently moral and intellectual tendencies. His mother was a mild and amiable lady, of a religious turn. The Dr inherited a combination of these elements – the fire and energy of his father being tempered by the softer qualities of his mother, resulting in the gifted, quiet-working, unobtrusive, but indomitable nature with which the Dr was endowed.

His father had been brought up to the East India Civil Service, but left that employment, while yet a young man, for the ministry, which he preferred to the routine of an official clerkship. He graduated as a preacher at Hoxton College when 20 years of age, but continued his duties in the East India Company's offices, in Leadenhall Street, till he received a "call" from an Independent congregation, that met in Founder Hall, behind the Bank of England, now occupied as a station by the London Telegraph Company. This was several years after leaving college. In the interval, he had followed the clerical avocation, here and there, as opportunity allowed. He had not been many years pastor of the Founder Hall congregation when a misunderstanding arose among the deacons, that caused unpleasantness, and led him to accepting a "call" from Huntley, a small town in the north of Scotland, to which, of course, his wife and family accompanied him. This was in 1812, the Dr being then seven years of age. At Huntley, they only remained a year. The Dr's father grew tired of the country and the neighbourhood, and, in the absence of any ministerial "call", returned to London, and opened a boarding-school, at West Square, Lambeth. The boarding-school prospering, he removed to a large house at Clapham, with grounds attached, which he opened as an educational establishment for the sons of dissenting ministers. A society which had been formed for the education of the sons of deceased ministers sent a good many pupils, and the institution was an established success. At the end of five years, however, the Dr's father, preferring pastoral work to the drudgery of an educational institution, gave up the latter and removed to Richmond (eight miles from Hyde Park corner), where he became the pastor of a small Independent congregation. A year afterwards, he received and accepted a "call" from a congregation at Chorley, in Lancashire, to which he removed with his family. Here they remained about four years, at the end of which (with the exception of the Dr himself), they returned to London, where the Dr's father obtained a situation as clerk in the City Gas Office. The Dr was sixteen years of age at the time his father left Chorley and remained behind to continue his medical studies with a private surgeon (son-in-law of the curate of the parish), under whom he had been placed two years before. At this time, the Dr was a member of his father's church, which he had been asked by one of the deacons to join, and for which the deacon reported him to be quite fit, notwithstanding the Dr's "profound ignorance of the whole subject of theology", to use his own language. Six months after his father's departure, the Dr resigned his membership, and continued thence unconnected with ecclesiastical matters till the incidents that led him into the channel referred to in the last chapter. About the same time he returned to London, and was put under a general practitioner near Paddington, to continue his medical studies. At the end of two years he joined the students at St Thomas's hospital, where he attended lectures for three years, while, at the same time, prosecuting

his private studies. During a portion of the period, he acted as demonstrator of anatomy in a school connected with one of the hospitals in the borough of London. On finishing his medical course, and obtaining his diploma, he spent a year as companion to a London physician, for whom he wrote a course of lectures on obstetrics. At the end of the year, he commenced practice as a physician, on his own behalf, at Hackney, where he continued for three years, realizing tolerable success in his profession.

During this time the Dr wrote, or began to write, a history of the parish, for the completion of which, he had to apply to the ecclesiastical authorities for access to the parish records. This was denied, and the authorities, on getting to know what was in progress, gave themselves no rest until they had purchased and suppressed the unfinished MS. During the same period, he also made frequent contributions to the *Lancet*, one of which is interesting as indicative of the state of the Dr's mind, at this time, on the subject of natural immortality. We cannot do better than reproduce his own account of it, from the *Apostolic Advocate* (vol iii, p 223) and *Herald of the Future Age* (vol iii, p 123), using both to make a complete narrative.

Before I understood the constitution of man, as revealed in the Scriptures, I had views very different from what are set forth in this article. About seven years ago, an essay on "The Materiality of the Mind, the Immortality of the Soul, and the Vital Principle", appeared in the *London Lancet*, from the pen of a Mr Dermott, Professor of Anatomy in that city. He supposed that the brain was one and the same thing as the mind; that it is common to all animals, only more perfectly developed in man than in the lower animals, and that the only essential difference between them and man is, that man has attached to his existence "a principle termed 'the soul', which is unconscious during this life, but starts into consciousness at death, and thus becomes the continuation of the same individual's existence". This communication set us to thinking about the soul and immortality. We were aware that Paul had written something about these in 1 Cor. We turned to the place, read it, and reflected upon it, until we thought we saw the truth of the matter, viz, that there was a vital or germinating principle in the body which continued, attached to every particle after death; that all human animal matter, like kinds of seeds, were subject to certain fixed physical laws; and that when it had lain incorruptible, at the time appointed it then germinated, and, like a plant from the earth, rose a new living being from the dust of death. The existence in man of a part of God's essence, an intellectual and moral soul, capable of thinking, seeing, hearing, tasting, feeling, &c, without brain, eyes, ears, nerves, &c, to be breathed out with the breath of death, seemed to us a 'very foolish notion'. It must then depart from the mouth or nostrils; why not, then, catch it in some appropriate apparatus, detain it in a bottle, and subject it to chemical analysis? Such were the ideas suggested by reflection upon the bearing of the case. We rejected this view of immortality as irrational and absurd, but held on to the discovery we supposed we had made. The next thing was to take up our pen, as men draw their swords to battle, and make a push at Dr Dermott's dormant soul. My article was published in the *Lancet* in the year 1830, or thereabouts. I then thought that the mind and vital principle were one and the same thing; that these in man differed from those in the brutes; so that, the first I called the immortal human principle, and the latter, the perishable brute principle; that this human principle could not exist separately from Deity, unclothed by or independent of matter; that it was not the soul, but a constituent of what would hereafter form an incorrupt and immortal soul; that this

vital spirit was to be the quickening spirit of a new and glorious body after death; that the soul was the incorruptible and spiritual body discoursed of by Paul – an immortal creature, endowed with the properties of matter inimitably beautiful, and the perfection of the Creator’s works. I supposed that the cause of the difference between the mind of animals and that of man was the two dissimilar sources from which they were derived, and not the difference of organization alone, as Mr Dermott imagined. In proof of this, I referred to Moses’ account of the formation of the lower animals and man, and laid much stress upon the very text we have been illustrating throughout. I said that the mind of man must be immortal, because God breathed it into him at his creation. That it was as the Pagans supposed, “*divinæ particular auræ*”, - a particle of His divine essence. I vainly conceived that Adam was a part of the Deity embodied in a pure and undefiled receptacle; that after the Fall, man was the same principle in an impure casket; and that the spiritual body would be the like particle re-embodied in purity at the resurrection. Such were ‘the speculations and untaught questions’, verily, of ‘my comparatively boyish days’; but since I have become a young man – though but ‘a very young man’ indeed – ‘I have put away childish things’. I erred, not knowing the Scriptures. I have since studied them closely, and they, aided by the light of nature, have taught me the true constitution of man, of the external world, and of the ultimate destiny of both.

In reviewing this first essay, we now see that though more scriptural than the doctor’s theory, we had not struck the right chord. We find, too, that we had come to a Pharisaic conclusion. Certain of the Pharisees believed in the inseparability of the soul and body, as illustrated by the inseparability of the seed and its inherent vitality. A seed may die and never vegetate, but its vital or germinating principle cannot exist independently, and be every whit a seed in another state – the spirit, soul, or ghost of a seed! Thus they taught the sleep of the soul in the grave till the resurrection, when by virtue of its own immortal vigour, it germinated a now living body out of the old materials, which was as much the body buried as the seed sown was the new body growing in the field.

Our carnal or unenlightened reason on 1 Cor. 15 led us to the elaboration of a theory identical with that to which these fleshly-minded Pharisees attained by a similar process. Our error and theirs consisted in theorizing the resurrection of the body too analogically – too strictly upon a vegeto-physiological type. Seeds are perishable; and the only reason we could see why all men should not perish as seeds and animals, was that God had decreed a resurrection. We and these Pharisees, then, believed in the inseparability and immortality of the body and principle of life, whose consciousness was suspended during the period of death, but whose intellectual and vital attributes were again associately developed by their spontaneous elaboration, according to a law superinduced by the inherent germinating energy of the ‘dust and ashes’. This energy we call soul.

We did not believe, for we never knew nor understood that the resurrection of the body was consequent not upon an inherent physical quality, but on the bringing of the energy of the Spirit of God to bear on the mortal remains of the dead saints, through the agency of Jesus Christ at his personal appearing; and that the energy, instead of being in the dead body, was extraneous to it, and deposited in Jesus Christ’ that because this immortal vigour was laid up in him, he is styled ‘the resurrection and the life’, and that, seeing he is the resurrection and the life of the saints, in this sense he is called ‘Christ our life’. We knew nothing about these things, which were all ‘hidden wisdom’, or mysteries, to us in those days.”

## CHAPTER 3

EARLY in the year 1832, the Dr's father, who had meanwhile left the Independents and joined the Baptists, and was, concurrently with his secular employment, preaching to a small congregation at Brentford, was seized with the American emigration fever which at this time began to rage. He was desirous of winding up his affairs, and proceeding to the new country at once. The Dr, having no special prospects, and intensely disliking a priest-ridden state of society, such as that which prevailed at that time in England to a greater extent than now, did not disrelish the idea of emigrating, but, knowing his father's impetuous disposition, he was afraid he would act rashly in the matter, and therefore proposed that, as a prudent preliminary, he (the Dr) should go to America before the rest of the family, and spy the land and report. In this suggestion his father concurred, and arrangements were made for the Dr's departure to what was destined to be the sphere of his great work. He procured an appointment as surgeon to a passenger ship, named the Marquis of Wellesley, which was about to sail from St Catherine's Docks, London, to New York. The ship was about 500 tons burthen, built of strong teak (African oak) and copper bottomed. When the day of departure arrived, the Dr found himself the medical attendant of eighty-nine souls, seventy being passengers, and the remainder consisting of the crew. There were only three cabin passengers, a man of the name of Williams, and a woman and a boy whom he represented as his wife and son. The voyage and its incidents constituted an important link in the chain of events that determined the Dr's career. For this reason, we enter somewhat into detail.

The ship sailed on the 1st of May, 1832, but had no sooner cleared the river than foul weather set in, which lasted throughout a long and tedious voyage. For a fortnight they were driven about by unfavourable winds, and subjected to the sharp action of a lurchy chopping sea. At the end of that time, the main-mast was snapped off close by the insertion of the main-yard, and the fore-top mast and mizzen top were carried away. A heavy sea stove in the bulwarks, and swept the deck of everything movable and some things not intended to be movable. A heavy-clouded angry sky portended a continuation of the storm; the furious gale howled hideously in the rigging, lashing the sea into mighty high-ridged, froth-crested billows, which rolled in ponderous undulations, and broke in wanton fury over the frail hiding place of 90 souls. The ship was tossed about like a chip in a boiling cauldron. She plunged, and rolled, and creaked in a horrible manner, now lifted on a mountainous wave, and then engulfed in the trough of the sea, as if she would never rise again. The situation was alarming. The people in the ship were frightened, and turned religious, and pressed upon the captain to hold "divine service" on the Sundays. The storm continuing, the captain consented, and organized a "service" after the forms of English Church orthodoxy. Williams, the cabin passenger, who turned out to be a rogue, was appointed to read the prayers, and the captain undertook the responses, which were also eagerly joined in by the frightened congregation. It fell to the Dr's part to read a chapter from the Bible, and then a sermon from Chalmers' published Sermons. The arrangement evidently worked well, and served to calm the excited feelings of the people.

For days the storm showed no symptoms of abatement, and there was danger of the ship becoming logged, to prevent which, she was relieved of a large number of chalk blocks. The cloudy condition of the atmosphere had, for some days, prevented observations from being

taken, and there being no chronometer on board (only a log line) the ship's progress was quite uncertain. The captain was confident as to the position of the vessel, but the Dr had strong doubts from the circumstance that the reckonings of all the ships they passed were different from theirs. One Sunday, at dinner, the ship's position was the subject of conversation, and the captain remarked that if the reckoning of the other ships was correct, they could not be far from Sable Island, but he added that he believed that their own reckoning was the correct one, which made them upwards of 250 miles away from the island. The Dr suggested that it would be as well to assume that the other ships were right, and they wrong, and to take soundings; but the Dr's suggestion was disregarded. That same evening, the Dr was reading in his state room, which was so placed that he could see the whole length of the vessel and the aspect of affairs on the water, and he was struck with the appearance of the sea, which looked as though they were in shallow water. Seeing the second mate standing by the window, he called his attention to it, and told him he was satisfied if the ship continued on her present course, she would run ashore. The second mate ridiculed the remark, telling the Dr he knew nothing at all about it, being only a landsman. The Dr retired to his state room, but again came out in a few minutes, being ill satisfied with the general aspect of things, and again warned the second mate, who returned about the same reply. The Dr again went into his quarters, and was in the act of taking off his coat, for the purpose of turning into his berth, when the ship scraped on the bottom and struck heavily, almost jerking him off his feet. The cry was instantly raised, "Breakers ahead!" Consternation seized on every soul. The vessel rose with the next wave, and again struck the bottom with crashing force. Each succeeding wave lifted her in this way, and let her down again with a heavy bump, which threatened to break her to pieces every moment. She struck twelve times in succession, striking horror through her living freight with every concussion. The passengers screamed and the sailors ran about excitedly, in their endeavours to carry out the orders of the captain, who strove to get the vessel about with her head to the sea. One man, over 6 feet, was lying near the Dr exclaiming with the puling terror of a child: "We shall go to the bottom! We shall go to the bottom!" The Dr remarked to him that they were already at the bottom, and could not get lower than they were. At the same time, he felt the prospect was pretty certain that they should be broken up and submerged in the waves. His own mind was powerfully acted on by the situation, and, in fact, received a bent which determined the track of his future career. Naturally hopeful, he could not persuade himself that he had come to the end of his existence, but the chances of escape were so slim that he felt uncomfortably pressed by the question as to what would become of him in the event of his being drowned. He had never given any earnest thought to the subject of religion. He was far from being irreverent or irreligious, but he had never made religion a question of practical interest. The consequence was that at such a trying moment as the one described, he felt a cloud of uncertainty. He concluded that the best thing to do in the circumstances would be, as the waves were closing over him, to go down with the prayer upon his lips, "Lord have mercy upon me for Christ's sake." At the same time he determined within himself that if ever he got on terra firma again, he should never rest till he found out the truth of the matter, that he might no more be found in such an uncertain state of mind.

After the twelfth rebound, the captain's efforts to get the vessel's head round to sea, being aided by a change of wind, were successful, and ecstatic cries rose from every part of the ship, "She rides! She rides!" The words, however, were scarcely out of their mouths when



the ship again struck the ground with a crash that made every plank tremble. This was her last and worst collision with the ground, and for the moment, destroyed all hope that they would be saved. She immediately rose on the waves, but it was every moment expected she would settle down and founder. The pumps were ordered into action, lights were called for, and the ship was examined, when it was found that the stern-post was started, and that the water was rushing in at various points. Something was done to repair the damage, but the leakage could not be entirely stopped, and the pumps had to be kept at work constantly during the remainder of the voyage. At the end of ten days, during which the weather continued more or less boisterous, the ship arrived safely in New York harbour, having occupied eight weeks in the passage.

Having cleared the ship, the Dr went to a boarding-house in the city, and his astonishment may be imagined when, on third day, his father presented himself at the door. He had lost patience after the Dr's departure, and throwing up his situation, had resolved to commit himself and fortunes at once to the emigration scheme, without waiting for the report of his son. He started three weeks after the Dr, and arrived only three days behind him.

#### CHAPTER 4

ARRIVED on terra firma, the Doctor did not forget the resolution he had formed to seek for the truth. He had received a letter of introduction and recommendation from the Rev Henry Foster Burder, DD, to a divine of the Presbyterian order in New York, and he thought he could not do better than begin his explorations by listening to the latter. He accordingly went and heard him the following Sunday, but at once came to the conclusion from what he heard that it was no use hearing him any more. He next made use of letters of introduction which his father had brought from home, to the Rev Archibald Maclay, late president of the Baptist Bible Society, of New York, and the Rev Mr Foster, another Baptist preacher. Mr Foster asked him where he was going? The Doctor replied that he was going to Cincinnati, where he had a letter of introduction to a gentleman. Mr Foster remarked that the western people were very hospitable but very much infected with "reformation". The Doctor was struck with the remark, which was the first allusion to the system of Campbellism with which he was destined to have so much to do. Mr Foster tried to induce him to remain in New York. Adhering to his purpose of going to Cincinnati, Mr Foster gave him a letter of introduction to a Rev Mr Lynd, a Baptist preacher there, and also to Dr Stoughton, professor of surgery in the Ohio Medical College. His father resolved to accompany him, and they set out together in the month of September. There were no railroads at that time, and the route was rather tedious. Nothing of note occurred on the way.

Arrived at their destination, they went to the house of a man named Brown, director of one of the Cincinnati Banks, to whom they had a letter of introduction from his brother, Col Brown of London. This indirectly resulted in the Dr's introduction to Campbellism. The day after their arrival, the fact became known to a gentleman living opposite, named Major Daniel Gano, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, whose interest was excited by the announcement that a Baptist minister and family had arrived from England. This Mr Gano was a gentleman, who, as the result of presiding at a debate between the Rev Alexander Campbell and Mr Owen, embraced the views of the former with a sincerity, illustrated by the fact that he incurred a forfeit of 500 dollars lying upon a horse which he

had entered for the races at Lexington, Kentucky. Mr Gano gave the Dr and his father an invitation to dinner which they accepted, and the Doctor had not been an hour in this gentleman's company when he called the Doctor's attention to the New Testament, and commenced talking with him about what he styled "the ancient gospel and order of things". The Doctor thought this a very strange as well as unfashionable proceeding, but supposed it was the custom of the country to talk about such things – a supposition in which he afterwards found he was greatly mistaken. The Doctor out of respect to his entertainer, paid due attention to his representations, Major Gano quoted the 38th verse of the 2nd chapter of the Acts in the course of conversation, and used the word "immerse" instead of "baptise". This aroused the suspicions of the Doctor, who at once said that he had never heard of such a passage in the Bible before. Major Gano replied that truly the word "immerse" was not in the verse as rendered in the English version, but that the Doctor must know that "immersion" and "baptism" meant the same thing. The Doctor responded with the remark that he never did think it a matter of very little moment. Major Gano on parting, gave him a pamphlet on the remission of sins, published by Mr Alexander Campbell, which he told him would inform him all about the subject. The Doctor out of respect, accepted the pamphlet, but determined in his own mind not to read it, lest he should become biased in his independent search after the truth, and get astray. In a few days the Doctor called again, and the Major gave him another pamphlet (subject – "The Holy Ghost") written by the late Walter Scott, the original founder of Campbellism. The Doctor accepted it in the same spirit as the other, and for the same reason, on his return home, he laid it with the other on the window sill.

On the following Sunday, this Mr Walter Scott was to preach the funeral sermon of a person who died of cholera; and the Major invited the Doctor to go and hear him. The Doctor replied that he was searching after the truth, and intended to hear all the preachers in Cincinnati, and he would hear Mr Scott in due time, but not just then. The Major replied that that was all very well, but he might as well begin with Mr Scott, which out of respect, the Doctor consented to do. This was the incident that introduced the Doctor to Campbellism.

When Sunday arrived, the crowd was so great (the place being a private house) that they could not get in. The Major, therefore, concluded that he would invite Mr Scott to go home with them, so that the Doctor might get the full benefit of the occasion. So, after the discourse, they all returned in a carriage together. A pleasant evening was spent at the Major's house. Mr Scott introduced religious topics, addressing himself more particularly to the Doctor. He spoke of Daniel's four empires, which the Doctor only knew as much about as he had read in Rollin's Ancient History, and of which Mr Scott, it struck the Doctor, knew no more. After a considerable amount of conversation, Mr Scott remarked to the Doctor that they seemed to agree very well in the particulars. "What hinders that you should be a Christian?" The Dr replied that he did not know but that he was as good a Christian as anybody. "Well," said the Major, "have you been baptised?" The Dr answered that the only baptism of which he had been the subject was the baptism administered when he was a baby. Mr Scott was then at some pains to show that that baptism did not avail anything; that, in fact, it was no baptism at all, but only a conventional and valueless ceremony, which had no foundation in Scripture. At the conclusion of his argument, he asked him if he believed in Jesus Christ. The Dr answered that he could not tell the time when he did not believe in him, as he had been born and brought up in that belief. Mr Scott asked what

hindered, then, that he should be baptised? Oh, said the Dr, that was a different thing. He thought it was all very well for preachers to be immersed who had to baptise others, but he did not see any necessity for anybody else being immersed, "an answer which," said the Dr afterwards, "manifested my ignorance." But he told Mr Scott that he was seeking for the truth, and if he could show him a case from the Scriptures in which a man was baptised as soon as he believed, he should give up his opposition. The Dr, in his ignorance, thought himself well entrenched in that position. Mr Scott at once accepted the issue, and directed his attention to the case of the eunuch (Acts VIII, 27-39). "There," he remarked, "you see that, as soon as he believed, they went down into the water, and the eunuch was immersed. Now," said he, "I would suggest you do likewise."

The Dr, a little taken aback at the suddenness and strength of the issue, said that, to be candid, he must admit that Mr S had established his point; but, as to being baptised, he had not come that evening to be immersed, nor was he prepared, as to change of raiment, and so on. "Oh," said Mr Scott, "that will be no obstacle in the way. Here is our friend, Major Gano" (who was present during the conversation, along with other persons,) "who will furnish us with everything requisite in that respect." The Major chimed in very promptly with the assurance that he should be happy to facilitate the operation to the fullest extent of his power.

There was no escape. The Dr was obliged to give in his adhesion, and the necessary arrangements being made, a move was made towards the Miami Canal, which passed the front of the house, on the opposite side of the road, and there the Dr was immersed, by Mr Walter Scott, "for the remission of sins," in the presence of a number of witnesses, at ten o'clock at night, by the light of the moon.

## CHAPTER 5

THE incident recorded in the closing sentences of the last chapter, was the Dr's introduction to Campbellism, the inauguration of the career which, by slow and certain steps, terminated in the repudiation of every form of popular faith, and the adoption of "The Truth," as found in the writings of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles. He was, however, himself unaware of the nature and consequences of the step he had taken. He thought he was merely obeying a divine precept without identifying himself with any ecclesiastical organisation. He had studiously sought to avoid such a thing, and had no idea of having departed from his resolution, and united himself with a sect; yet so it was. On going to the meeting with Major Gano, the first time after his immersion, he was greeted on all hands as "brother Thomas". He was surprised to find himself thus introduced to Campbellism, in spite of his resolution to steer clear of all parties. It proved a providential occurrence, as the sequel shews. The following remarks on the subject occur in "Reformation in Richmond," Apostolic Advocate, vol iii p 87.

"Previous to our baptism into Christ, we were almost altogether misinformed about Mr Campbell and 'this reformation'. All we knew about him was from the pen of Mrs Trollope. We had heard in New York of a sect denominated 'Campbellites', but of the doctrine of Mr Campbell and his followers, as they were termed, we knew nothing and cared not to know. On leaving our native country, we had denounced all connection with sectarianism, and had determined never to be entrammelled by its bonds, nor to wear a party badge. This resolution was strengthened by an escape from a watery grave. Threatened with shipwreck

off the Nova Scotian shore, and experiencing upon that trying occasion the worthlessness of our religious principles as a basis for a sure and certain hope of salvation, we determined, if we were ever permitted to tread the soil again, not to rest until we found the true way to immortality. But our way of seeking the truth proved not to be the way of God. We commenced a tour of sermon-hearing. We first visited the Presbyterian and then the Baptist temples, and here we stopped, or rather, were stopped by the word of God. A private conversation of about three hours, as to what was truth, with brother Walter Scott, resulted in our baptism into Christ by moonlight that same night. By this act, we considered ourselves in fellowship with all and every name who had believed and obeyed the same things. We were invited to connect ourselves with the Church in Cincinnati, with which we found brother W Scott in fellowship. We observed we should have no objection, provided it pledged us to no sect or party and upon being assured that it would not, we joined, and thus found ourselves in fellowship also with Mr Campbell.”

After his immersion, Major Gano invited the Dr to make his house his home, and the Dr, availing himself of the invitation, resided with him during his stay in these parts. Previous to this, his father had accepted the call to a Baptist congregation in Cincinnati, and was at the time engaged as their preacher. On hearing next day of the Dr’s baptism, he was full of wrath, but afterwards his wrath abated, and he himself embraced Campbellite principles. The Dr resided in Cincinnati seven months. His original idea was to settle there. On this point, he says, in the article quoted above: “Cincinnati was our destination when we left England. We purposed to settle there and practise our profession, but found the prospect of success more flattering in the distance than on the spot it proved to be. The city was crowded with physicians, and we determined to leave it for one of the Atlantic cities. Previous to our departure, however, brother W Scott had often exhorted us to commence the practice of speaking in the cause of truth. He thought if we would only break the ice we should easily get along. But we steadily persisted in refusing. We used to tell him that we thought it out of character for one who had but just become a Christian to set up for a teacher of that religion in the face of older and abler men, who ought rather to teach us. But he seemed to think that no objection, as there were many old Christians who knew but little. He proposed our going to Carthage, where he would introduce us, and pave the way, as it were, for our commencement. But, no; our scruples could not be overcome.”

In April 1833, or thereabouts, the Dr left the West and returned to the Eastern States. On leaving, Major Gano gave him a letter of introduction to Dr Richardson, of Wellsburg, Virginia, and one to Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, both of whom he had to pass on his way. On landing at Wellsburg, he was welcomed by Dr Richardson, who informed him that Alexander Campbell was in the town, and would shortly be at his house. Dr Richardson had been an Episcopalian, but was converted to “the Reformation” as it was called, and immersed for the remission of sins. Latterly it was said he became a Spiritualist.

About an hour after the Dr’s arrival, Mr Campbell was seen coming up the street, and Dr Richardson called the Dr to the door and pointed him out as he approached. The Dr was very much surprised at the appearance of the man. The ideas he had formed of a parson or preacher were of course derived from his acquaintance with the “profession” in this country, where broad-cloth, silk, and fine linen are badges of the craft. What was his surprise, therefore, on seeing a shabbily dressed, farm-labourer-looking man, in an old drab coat and slouching white hat. But though Mr Campbell presented a rough exterior, the Dr afterwards found him to be a very pleasant and agreeable companion. On the arrival of

Mr Campbell at the house, Dr Richardson introduced the Dr to him, and the Dr also presented the letter of introduction he had received from Major Gano. This was the commencement of the Dr's acquaintance with Mr Campbell, which proved another important circumstance in the development of his subsequent career.

In the course of their interview, Mr Campbell invited the Dr to go home with him and spend a little time at his establishment. The Dr consented, and a second horse having been provided, the two set out together for Bethany. Mr Campbell at that time was the owner of 2,000 acres of rich Virginia soil, on which there grazed 1,000 head of sheep. The hills on his estate were full of coal, for which it was only necessary to dig horizontally for a few yards to get to a bed. His establishment comprised a post office, a printing office, a store, a mill, and a stone meeting house, besides his residence. But notwithstanding the opulence of his circumstances, Mr Campbell lived in a very plain and unostentatious style.

On a certain Sunday, shortly after the Dr's arrival at Bethany, he went with Mr Campbell to Wellsburg, where the latter had a preaching appointment. On the way to the meeting in the afternoon, Mr Campbell (who had spoken in the morning) said to the Dr that he should call upon him to speak that afternoon. The Dr told him that he must not by any means do so, as he had never spoken in public on religious matters in his life, and should have nothing to say if he did get up. Mr Campbell replied that that did not matter; he should certainly call upon him, for he liked to try a man's mettle. This was said with so decided an air that the Dr saw there was no escape, and remarked to Mr Campbell that if he did intend to call upon him, he (Mr Campbell) must occupy the time as long as he could, so as to give him a little chance of preparation.

Having arrived at the meeting house, the Dr took up his Bible while sitting in his seat, and began to turn it over in search of something as a foundation for remark. He went from one end to the other without being able to fix upon anything, when at last it occurred to him that he knew Rollin's interpretation of Daniel's four empires, and that the 2nd chapter which treats of them, being a long one, the reading of it would give him time to accustom himself (before commencing to speak) to standing head and shoulders above the people. The Dr was called upon in due course, and proceeded with the reading of the chapter. Having got through it, he fixed his eyes upon the doorpost, and delivered himself of all he knew upon the subject without venturing to look his audience in the face. Having occupied about half an hour, in which time he completely emptied himself, he concluded by a sudden stop and sat down. He said he was astonished to hear afterwards that the people were taken by his discourse.

On the following Sunday, as he was walking with Mr Campbell to Mr Campbell's own meeting house in the morning, Mr Campbell remarked to him that he should call upon him to speak again in the afternoon. As there was the prospect of a considerable time to think over the matter, the Dr did not object. He was, however, again taken by surprise: for Mr Campbell occupied from half-past ten till two, and then concluded the meeting with the remark that they would have a recess for a quarter of an hour, after which Dr Thomas would speak to them. The Doctor had calculated upon a considerable interval between the morning and afternoon meeting, and was taken aback at finding he had only a quarter of an hour to prepare. He had considerable difficulty in fixing his mind upon anything to say, but at last decided to speak on the Apostacy, of which he had read something. He occupied the afternoon with this subject, speaking as afterwards transpired, to the satisfaction of those who heard.

The meeting over, the Dr determined within himself that this sort of business must stop. He felt that he was being entangled in a work for which he was utterly unqualified, and entirely opposed to his tastes, and he determined to get out of the way as fast as possible. He decided to proceed to Baltimore, by way of Washington, in Pennsylvania.

Communicating his intention Mr Campbell, the letter arranged to send him on as far as Washington, Penn, and gave him a latter of introduction to Mr Postlethwaite, Somerset House, Pennsylvania, and another to Mr Carman, of Baltimore. In due time he bade farewell to Bethany, after spending an agreeable month in Mr Campbell's company. The Dr makes the following remarks on this occasion, in the Apostolic Advocate, vol i, p 88.

"We were much gratified with his acquaintance. We became much attached to him; and though before our interview and subsequent to our baptism, we had read much of his writings, and highly approved of them, yet we never advocated him. Our visit to Bethany, however, excited in our hearts a friendship for him, which we exceedingly regret should have terminated so unpropitiously; but so it was. For Mr Campbell, we would have laid down our life if called upon; so much greater was his personal than his literary influence over us.

During our stay at Bethany we accompanied Mr Campbell to three or four of his appointments. Wellsburg was one. On returning to the meeting house in the afternoon, he observed to us: "Brother Thomas, I shall call upon you for a word of exhortation." As may be supposed, we were electrified at this announcement. We expostulated. We urged the suddenness of the call; our unpreparedness; our not having spoken on the Christian religion before, and so forth. But all to no purpose; he would take no denial, but insisted, observing that he liked to try what sort of mettle people were made of, or words to that effect. We have often smiled within ourselves on reflecting upon this incident. Mr Campbell has had abundant opportunity of trying our mettle since! Finding there was no escape, and disdaining the imputation of cowardice in a good cause, we went forward and did as well as we could. He again took us by surprise at another of his meetings, which, added to the foregoing, hastened our departure from Bethany; for, thought we, we never can stand such impromptuism as this.

From Bethany, we travelled eastward, by way of Somerset Court House, in Pennsylvania. To some brethren at this place, we had letters of introduction from Mr Campbell. We remained with them sixteen days. \* \* \* \* Nothing would satisfy the brethren but that we should speak on every occasion. A disposition to oblige induced compliance, though sorely against our inclination; for we did not travel as an evangelist, but simply to find a place of settlement in our peculiar way of life; besides the labour of public speaking was very great, owing to a want of previous preparation, and the violence it did to our disposition, which is naturally reserved, and gratified by an abstraction from the noisy and busy haunts of men. But the things we have least sought after are the very things we are most engaged in. Our constant desire was to obtain an honourable living by our calling in as quiet a way as possible. But this desire, in the way we had marked out, has been completely thwarted; and we find ourselves tilling the soil in the retirement of a country life at home, but, when absent, buffeting the waves of a stormy sea. We never sought the engagements of an editor, nor of a public speaker; and from the time that Mr Campbell put our mettle to the proof until now, we have never addressed the people from inclination, but always from a sense of duty, and at the earnest solicitation of others. Many have been the times that we would rather have travelled thirty miles from than five miles to an appointment. We mention these things to

shew that our public labours have been disinterested and superimposed; if they have not resulted in the applause of those who have called us out, it is because, though called out contrary to inclination, we have always determined to do our best in speaking according to the oracles of God, or not to speak at all. A public life is not a life of our seeking, but if we must engage in its concerns, we will strive to direct our course by no other rule or standard of expediency than that of the Word of God. We plead for no man but "The Man Christ Jesus"; for no sect but that "everywhere spoken against" of old, and we are resolved to hold no man's person in admiration for the sake of advantage, even should it result in our falling back upon the much-loved solitude of private life. Our wants are few and simple. Mankind have nothing in the way of honour, glory, or renown to bestow that we think worth contending for. We ask the world for nothing. We neither fear its frowns nor court its smiles. If a nobleman of old would receive nothing at its hand lest it should be said that it had made Abraham rich; neither would his descendants."

At Somerset Court-house, the Campbellites requested him to settle among them as their preacher, a proposition which the Dr could not for a moment entertain. His object was not to become a preacher but to get into medical practice. He told them so, and that he must at once push on to Baltimore, where he was informed the most intelligent congregation of the Reformationists was situated, and where, therefore, he presumed they would be able to do all the speaking for themselves, and leave him to quietly attend to his medical duties. He arrived at Baltimore on Sunday evening, and to his dismay, (his approach having been signified by his Pennsylvanian friends) he was at once solicited to address the congregation. He wished to decline the engagement, but they would take no denial: and he spoke. Having heard him, nothing would satisfy them short of taking the public hall (Scottis' Hall) and calling the public together to hear the new preacher. The hall was engaged for a week, and every night in the week the Dr addressed the public on "The ancient faith", which he considered the faith promulgated by Mr Campbell to be.

## CHAPTER 6

THE Dr, after a week's stay in Baltimore, determined to break away from the preaching career which was being forced upon him. He told his Baltimore friends he must be off to see Philadelphia before going to Richmond, which was his ultimate destination. "Well", said brother Carman, "I will give you a letter of introduction to brother Hazlett, who is deacon in the congregation in Philadelphia, over which brother Ballantyne presides." The Dr thought it would be better to have friends to go to, than to arrive in Philadelphia a complete stranger, and therefore accepted the letter, though not without some misgivings as to the consequences.

On arriving at Philadelphia, he found deacon Hazlett, who expressed great satisfaction at his having come, saying that they wanted some one to speak to them, and to relieve the tediousness of their meetings, as brother Ballantyne who presided, was "very old and very dry". What could the Dr do? He was the guest of brother Hazlett, and he felt he could do nothing less, as a sort of return for their hospitality, than yield to their request and speak to them. This he did for three weeks. At the end of that time, they proposed that he should remain among them altogether, promising that they would do their best to get him practice, if he would be content to speak to them on Sundays. Getting accustomed to speaking, the prospect of a settlement in his own profession disposed him to fall in with the suggestion,

which after due consideration, he did.

The arrangement did not work favourably for the Dr's professional objects, though conducing highly to the work which providence had assigned to him. As the Dr remarks in the article in the Advocate, already quoted from: "Had we devoted ourselves to medicine, as we did to the things of the kingdom, we might probably have succeeded; but the fact is, that having to address the public continually, our time and energies were absorbed in preparing to acquit ourselves, from time to time, as a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. Ever since leaving the West, our spiritual pursuits have been clashing with our temporal, until we have been obliged of necessity to place our profession in abeyance." His friends in Philadelphia fulfilled their part of the contract, so far as finding medical practice was concerned; but preaching practice, which was exceedingly distasteful to him, necessitated an amount of scriptural study which interfered with his professional occupation, but which was destined to pave the way for great results.

The Dr's mind was eminently fitted, by constitution and condition, to be the subject of a simple and pure illumination by the Word. This comes out in what the Dr makes "Tomaso" say in a Dialogue between three Friends on Men and Things (Apostolic Advocate, vol iii p 28). He (the Dr) was never, says "Tomaso", "cursed with the poison of a theological education. His early years were spent in a private boarding school in England, and from his seventeenth to his twenty-fifth year, among physic bottles, lecture rooms, and dead bodies. He knows nothing (and counts it his happiness) about the writings of popular divines nor did he ever trouble himself much about divinity of any kind till about three years and a half ago (this was written in 1836), when he obeyed the gospel of our divine Master. Since that time, he has addicted himself to the incessant study of the Scriptures. Not having had his mind perverted by human tradition, it just takes whatever impression the Word may make upon it, like a blank sheet the impression of the printer's types".

The Dr's stay in Philadelphia did not last longer than eleven months. During this time, two important events transpired: 1, he married a wife; 2, he commenced his editorial career. A third even was the arrival of his father from England, to which his father had returned after the Dr left Cincinnati. His father now settled with a Baptist congregation in Philadelphia, for whom he preached. Father and son were preaching simultaneously in the same town, but not the same doctrines.

## CHAPTER 7

THE career of the Dr as an editor is that in which the circumstances leading to progress were mostly prominently developed. There need, therefore, be no apology for dealing with it in considerable detail. His entrance upon this career was itself an apparently accidental matter.

It came about in the following way: a member of the Philadelphian congregation, named Brindley, who had been a shipbuilder in England, but was then an agent for Morrison's pills, went to Mr Ballantyne, the pastor (for although the Dr preached, he was not "pastor",) and suggested that a paper should be started to advocate the principles of the Reformation, intending, as afterwards transpired, to have an advertisement of his pills on the back of each number. After seeing Ballantyne, Brindley called on the Dr in reference to the same project, but did not acquaint him with the fact that he had been to Ballantyne. He talked the matter over as if it had not been suggested to anyone else, and asked him to devise a name,



and write out a prospectus. The Dr, knowing nothing of the quackery part of the project, which Brindley was careful to conceal from him, approved of the suggestion, and drew out a prospectus of the proposed publication, calling it the Apostolic Advocate.

Afterwards he was witness of the pastor's indignation at Brindley for having requested the Dr's co-operation in the scheme, on which the Dr offered to relinquish all part in it. This did not pacify the old gentleman, whose anger caused Brindley to take no further steps to forward the publication. Brindley's abandonment of the scheme led to a restoration of peace between Brindley and Ballantyne, and Ballantyne resolved to start the periodical himself; but illness overtaking him, the scheme fell into abeyance.

On his recovery, Mr Ballantyne sent for the Dr and told him he had come to the conclusion that he (Mr Ballantyne) was too old to enter upon such an enterprise as the conducting of a monthly magazine, and that he (the Dr) had better take it in hand and go ahead. This surprised the Dr, but scarcely left him a choice. He concluded to proceed with the undertaking, without reference to Brindley, whose objects he had come to understand. Thus he found himself in a position he had never desired and never contemplated. He issued the prospectus, of which the following is a copy:-

#### PROPOSALS,

By John Thomas, MD, of Philadelphia, for publishing by subscription, a  
Monthly Periodical: To be entitled

#### THE APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE.

"We (the apostles) are of God: he who knows God, hearkens to us; he who is not of God, hearkens not to us. By this we know the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error." – (1 John iv 6) – Macknight's Translation.

"Be mindful of the words before spoken by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us, the apostles of the Lord and Saviour." – Macknight.

#### PROSPECTUS

This work shall be devoted to the ancient Gospel and the original constitution of things as proclaimed and appointed by the apostles. Never was there a time since the days of William Penn, when this and adjacent cities required such an "advocate" as at this present. The voice of the apostles is stifled by the clamour of sectarian declamation. It is true, indeed, they are talked about and their statues adorn cathedral parapets and steeple walls; it is also true that the commercial marts of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York, abound in religious establishments, each and every one of them amply furnished with all the gorgeousness and splendid trappings of temple worship; they can boast, too, of an erudite, courtly, eloquent, and right reverend priesthood – the depositaries of wisdom and sacred knowledge – whose fertile ingenuity illustrates, sustains, and fulminates the dogmas of creeds for the deglutition of an unsuspecting and too confiding laity. But all these things, however adored, may be easily unmasked and resolved into their ultimate constituents; the devices, traditions, and commandments of men, and will be proved to be no part of the religion of Christ or of the traditions and teachings of the holy apostles. The Advocate, therefore, will unroll his brief against the corruptions of Christianity: and while he pays all respect to persons that is due, he will use every honourable and scriptural means to

disabuse the minds of his fellow citizens of the philosophical dogmas and christianised Orientalisms palmed upon them for the glorious gospel of the blessed God. In subserviency to this end, the following, among other subjects, will be attended to.

The non-identity of all popular religions with the religion of Christ.

The defence of the holy Scriptures against all creeds, "Confessions of Faith", commentators and system makers.

The objects proposed by the proselytising spirit of the age, as developed in the so-styled "benevolent institutions of the day," incompatible with and contrary to the predictions of the ancient prophets.

The modern dogmas of physical and spiritual operations not the doctrines of the Holy Spirit taught by the apostles.

The fates and fortunes of the kingdoms of the world foreshown by prophecy.

Religious, moral and literary varieties, with essays on various interesting and important subjects in relation to the kingdom of Christ. The Advocate will glean from the fields of Christian literature whatever is calculated to illustrate the magnificent and sublime politics of the Messiah's reign. He will endeavour to do justice to all who may oppose and differ from him; his object being to convince, not to condemn. Audi alteram partem – hear the other side – shall always vibrate on his ear; for having neither sympathies nor antipathies to gratify – having no gift, or "sacred office" of pecuniary emoluments to blind the eyes, to pervert his judgment, or to distort his mental vision – being interested in upholding no religious dogmas, in sustaining no sect, in pleading for no sectarian creed: the Advocate will strive to exemplify the apothegm, fiat justitia ruat cœlum (let justice be done though the heavens fall). Let the opponents of the ancient gospel go and do likewise.

This prospectus, which indicates the remarkable tone of the Dr's mind so early as 1834, was published by Mr Campbell with favourable remarks. The first number of the Advocate appeared in May; 1000 copies being printed and entirely disposed of. It was composed almost entirely of the Dr's original contributions. We publish the first as illustrative of the quality, as to which the discerning reader will agree with the verdict of the People's Friend, an American paper, published at the time in Philadelphia: "Style chaste, reasoning close; takes high ground; treats all human authority very unceremoniously; appeals directly to the Scriptures, and contends for their supremacy over all councils and edicts, ancient and modern; shews he has bestowed much attention upon the subjects of which he treats." These sentences were

descriptive of a pamphlet, at that time published by the Dr, entitled New Catholic Controversy: a mirror for dogmatic religions, in a Letter, &c; but are equally applicable to the Apostolic Advocate, of which the first article is entitled.

## THE THEOLOGY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

IF one proposition be more self-evident than another, it is this: that the religion of the disciples of Christ cannot be found among any of the popular religions of the 19th century, which divide among them the realms of the demesnes of Christendom. The religion of Christ is a religion of faith and obedience, the one being as essential and important as the other; they are, in truth, one and indivisible. The popular religions, on the other hand, are

religions national and speculative in their nature, based on opinions and upheld by systems of abstract definitions, composing creeds, confessions, and articles of faith. With each religion, the fundamental and essential doctrines of the gospel are the leading and characteristic dogmas of their individual creeds. Whatever is not contained in the creed is non-essential, especially if the omission be the diagnostic of some more humble and less popular faith. Popular faith is feeling magnified into confidence, and inasmuch as it produces violent and convulsive action of that important organ of the animal constitution, it is very emphatically termed "faith in the heart". It is a kind of sanguineous principle, yielding from the several organs through which it passes, copious effusions of tears, mucus, and saliva. Hence that foaming of the mouth, suffusion of the eyes and cheeks, and running at the nose so conspicuous in the subjects of revival, camp meetings, and protracted conventional excitements. Popular faith is lunatic in its phases, being now new, then old, now gibbous, and then rotund, and following the ocean of life in all its ebbs and flows. The opinions of the people's instructors determine the complexion of their faith, and hence that riddle-like proposition that "Faith is not the belief of testimony"\*. It is true the popular faith is not the belief of testimony, and no wonder that, like the priests, the people should maintain it; for well do they know, both the teachers and the taught, that their religious faith is not founded on the testimony of the apostles and prophets, but on the traditions, devices, and commandments of men. What need we marvel, then, at the diversified and contradictory faiths that chequer the ecclesiastical chart of the christianised world? We need not be surprised, I say, that Divine Doctors of the popular faith should insist on a faith christened orthodox with holy water, which does not require testimony to produce, seeing that they are not accustomed to prove their positions either by reason or Holy Writ. Indeed, where is the necessity of proof? Have not their flocks conceded to them their demands in full as to their ambassadorial and holy character, their divine calling and sending, and their claims of succession to the apostles? If these high pretensions be granted, shall we, the laity, presume to ask the Reverend Clergy for their proofs? Absurd in the extreme would it be to concede to them apostolicity without proof, and then to demand a reason for what they affirm! Let them prove the first, and we, for one, in subordinate affairs, will obey implicitly, and for ever after hold our peace. But, as to their divine rights, credat Judæus apella non Ego? – The following will be a fair illustration, both as to believers, the manner of faith, and the effects of popular faith. On the 1st day of March, 1834, an infant first breathed the breath of heaven, and raised its eyelids to the solar beams; unused to this mode of existence, it cried and sobbed and squalled so lustily as greatly to disturb the equanimity of a maiden aunt. Her soured temper could not endure the provocation, and though it was a sacramental week, she tartly reprobated the uncouth noise, and sinned through anger most unchristianly. The original sin and total depravity of the babe were beyond doubt, and as its looks did not promise life beyond four-and-twenty hours, humanity and religion dictated the propriety of saving its soul from hell. A reverend divine was accordingly sent for, who being stimulated by the importance of the occasion, and a zeal in his Master's service, came with as much despatch as comported with the dignity of the clerical gait. "Go ye," says the Great Teacher, "unto all the world, and proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation: he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be condemned." Acting under this commission, then, this reverend successor of the apostles and

ambassador of Jesus Christ, arrives at the house of mourning for the purpose of imparting salvation to the puny babe. Accordingly, he dips his holy hands into water consecrated by prayer, and with the subject of faith in his left arm, raises, with uplifted eyes and becoming grace, his bending arm with palm supine. The period of grace hovers over the face of the infant – awful moment! The infant scarcely breathes. The sacred drops at length begin to trickle from the holy digits of his reverence; they reach the face, and, with an emphatic sprinkle, the magic words, “Selina! I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost – Amen!” fall on the sealed ears of the expiring child, who, with a struggle, now gives up the ghost.

This instance, and a very common one it is, is a fair illustration of the subject, mode of impartation and effects of the most fashionable popular faith. Its subject is, for the most part, a babe of eight days old, endowed with all the faculties of mind and body in a dormant, undeveloped state; it sees, but it discerns not; it hears, but it understands not; it has a brain, but on the tablet of its mind, no images of thought are there. How then is faith imparted? Let the reverend clergy – so skilled in metaphysics, in all the magic of the Chaldeans, in all the learning of the Egyptians, and in all the mythology of the Pagan world – explain, for I cannot. But the effects of this popular faith, what are they? Scepticism, delusion, death! Common sense contemplating the proud, ambitious priest, discerns in his religious practices and demeanour, the usurpation of supernatural powers, and the impiety of a man who lies in the name of God. Disgusted at such exhibitions of mockery, and acquainted with no other Christianity than that under the form of the religions of the day, the minds of men, with the light only of reason and common sense to guide them, run into the fatal extreme, and denounce all religions as false. Hence, in France, in Italy, in Portugal, and Spain, when occasion offers, they not only avow their scepticism, but deny even the being of a God. Nor are things, in reality, much better in Protestant countries; for though Atheism is not so recklessly proclaimed there, hypocrisy, indifference, latent and avowed scepticism, in all their subtle, specious, open and disguised forms, extensively prevail. Even in these United States, where religion is supposed to flourish, it is not difficult to see the downfall, not very remote either, of all its sectarian establishments. At this very moment, infidelity, like a worm that dieth not, gnaws their vitals, and a numerous and parasitical priesthood is permitted to exist out of courtesy to the ladies, in whose case is verified the prediction of the apostle, for which see 2 Tim iii, 1-7. We rejoice, however, to know, on the testimony of the apostles and prophets, that all these human establishments will be overturned, and the glorious dominion of the Great King, returned victorious and conqueror over his foes, and leading captive at his chariot wheels, kings whose many diadems will deck his brow, will rise paramount and be established on the wreck of empires, immovable as the everlasting hills. Kings and sacred bards have tuned their harps prophetic of this Golden Age. Then will the Prince of Peace reign in his Holy Hill of Zion, and rule the nations with a law of love. No kingly or priestly tyrants then to disturb the world’s repose; no anti-Christian or sectarian rivals then to divide the empire with the King of Saints; no Popes, no Councils, no General Assemblies, Synods, and Presbyteries, with their bulls, and canons, and orthodox confessions to disturb the world. No! These disturbers of the public peace, these social bandits, then will be bound in captive chains in the dark abyss for a thousand years. Such, then, will be the death of all delusion until the last apostacy foretold in time; when Satan shall go forth to deceive the nations which, at that period will inhabit the four quarters of the earth. (Rev xx 7, 8)

The second article is on the Church of England, which he describes as “one of the daughters of a large family, descended from a parentage flagrant in crime, drunken with the blood of Christian heroes, and gorged with the spoils, and the woe, and the slaughter of men.” He finds her origin in “the Man of Sin, and his adulterous consort, the Mother of Harlots and of all the abominations of the earth;” epithets which he says are applied by the Holy Spirit of purity and truth to all the “mystery” of political, civil, and ecclesiastical iniquity that exists in every part of the world; a state of society, the rise, progress, and consummation of which, he says, were foretold by Jesus through his beloved disciple, at a time when it had only begun to work.

The third article, “On the kingdoms of Europe,” deals with the bearing of the Book of Revelations on European events. The following extract is too good to be lost:

A grand defect in the thousand papers of these United States is the meagre record of events, daily transpiring in the empires and kingdoms which exist beyond the limits of the New World. In reading the journals of the day, one would think the past had never existed, that the future would never dawn, and that the present was of little import beyond the limits of domestic trifles. To philosophise on their contents, it would seem as though the intelligence of the country was bounded by the horizon of the Bank, the limits of the Constitution, or the jurisdiction of the head of the States. To this, however, we cannot agree. The human mind is excursive, and cannot, whether in America or Europe, be restrained within the narrow confines of domestic rivalries and party strifes. It must expand. The Atlantic ocean and lesser seas, the rivers, lakes, and mountain chains, may mark the bounds of kingdoms, states, and empires; they may determine the “hitherto but no farther” of neighbour nations; they may do this and more, as regards the bodies of men, but to the empire of the mind, they offer no proscription. The mind, with the rapidity of the lightning’s flash, sweeps over the demesnes of nature, and visits in its course the Alps, the Andes, the mountains of Himalaya, and the Arctic Sea; it retreats to the birth of time, and penetrates into the abyss beyond. What folly, then, how trifling too, to dream of feeding the public mind with the puerilities of party, state witticisms, mountebank delineations, anecdotes, old wives’ fables &c. &c. Sentiment, sentiment! Facts, and veracious testimony, are the mental food for man, whether they pertain to morals, politics, or religion. But, it may be objected, people have ceased to think, thought being too laborious, and therefore they must be entertained with trifles, or papers would become dead stock – many vendors, but no readers. Food to this man is poison to that; therefore, seeing that thinkers are few, sentiment is scarce, and the supplies must be always according to the demand, both in quality and quantity. This, we believe, is the philosophy of the thing, and but too characteristic of the age. Extension without depth is the order of the day, in relation both to the effusions from the press, and the rhapsodies from the “sacred desk”. Instruction seems to enter but little into the compositions of religious declaimers or religious editors. Notwithstanding all the faults of the political leaders, it is our opinion the world, for intelligence and upright dealing between man and man, is far in advance of “the Church,” as the popular system of the day is egregiously miscalled. The world, in some sort, discerns the changes attended with commotions and bloodshed coming upon society; but the Church, like a rickety old dame, is doting about a spiritual beatification of a thousand years, in which she, in all her unconscious deformity, is to reign over the souls of men! Her millennium two hundred three score and sixty days, be it known to the Right Reverend crazy Doctors who uphold

her crutch, is fast expiring; her reign is almost consummated; for there is One just at the door, coming upon her as a thief, ready to let the kings of the earth upon her, who, in their hate, will eat her flesh and burn her with fire. This is his sentence which he has appointed political executioners to enforce.

By way of introduction to a record of the events now transacting in the benighted realms of Europe, we shall present our readers with an analysis of that chapter of the Revelations from which we have selected the passage affixed to this article.

This article suggests the thought that there is something wonderful in the Dr's comprehension of the Apocalypse so early as 1834, the more so as his interpretations were independent of the theories in previous writers. He did not re-hash what he found in books. He read and thought for himself, and gave readers the result of original ideas. This feature cannot be better illustrated than by quoting the following sentences from an article on the Apocalypse, appearing in the ninth number of the Advocate:

“As to the Apocalypse, I firmly believe if Christians would study its contents, it would, if they be honest persons in the profession of truth, cure them of the ridiculous and spurious charity they are in the practice of exercising towards ‘other denominations of Christians’, which are in reality the anti-Christian ‘abominations of the earth’. I affirm further that a due attention to the prophecy of this book would convince many who living in a treacherous security and entertaining a delusive hope that they are Christians, expect to enjoy the heavenly beatitudes – that no time is to be lost in escaping from the dominions of Babylon the Great, and taking refuge in the Eternal City of our God. As all have not the leisure, and fewer the inclination, to unravel the mysteries (for they are mysterious to those that are ignorant) of this book, I shall, as opportunity may serve, present my readers with illustrations of its contents. “They who censure and dissuade from the study of the apocalypse,” says Newton, “do it for the most part because they have not studied it themselves, and imagine the difficulties are greater than they are in reality. It is still the sure word of prophecy to which we do well to take heed; and men of learning and leisure cannot better employ their time or abilities than in studying and explaining this book.” Sir Isaac Newton observes that, “amongst the interpreters of the last age there was scarcely one of note who had not made some discovery worth knowing,” and I flatter myself that I shall not have laid before my readers the result of my humble efforts, without having substantiated my claim to the discovery or solution of certain problems in the Apocalypse, which have hitherto baffled the ingenuity and learning of some of the most celebrated illuminati of the religious world.

In saying this, I do not mean to arrogate to myself any superior talent or discernment, for a man may have all the wisdom that human science and philosophy can afford; his mind may be of a Newtonian order, and equal to enterprises of the sublimest character; he may be the personification of intelligence, and yet fail to unravel the symbolical representations of the providence of the Supreme in the affairs of men. In the absence of that wisdom which God revealed to the apostles by His spirit, all our views in relation to religion are mere speculations, and the failure of the “great and the good men” since the days of Luther, is not owing to a lack of natural talent and discernment, but to that love of speculation and subserviency to system in which they have so freely indulged. Be it observed, however, that there is not a single speculation in the religion or doctrine of Christ, in my investigation,

and therefore, I have renounced speculation and substituted, according to the suggestion of Lord Bacon, the simple narration of historical facts. If there be such a thing as prophecy and truth in historical detail, and if history be indeed nothing more than a summary of prophecy fulfilled, which every believer admits, then certainly the natural method of prophetic illustration is simply to place in juxtaposition the predictions and facts of history, and see what a breach the Christian makes in the defences of the infidel by such a plan as this. Our most celebrated historians have been infidels and Papists; as though God had chosen them to record the fulfilment of His word, and so to condemn their unbelief and apostacy out of their own mouths. My dates and facts I have taken from Gibbon and Mosheim, the one an infidel and the other a Lutheran. They are faithful historians, and acknowledged as authority both by Christians and anti-Christians. Gibbon is impartial, though styled the apologist of Paganism.

Article No 4, sets forth a narrative of an evangelistic visit made by the Dr to Rockdale, in Pa. The rest of the number is made up of miscellaneous features, from which we extract the following editorial notice as characteristic of the man:

“TO OUR PATRONS.

Nothing is more gratifying to the feelings, or more calculated to arouse the dormant energies of genius, than the patronage of the intelligent and the good. Every man has genius of some kind; too often, however, perverted to purposes beneath the dignity of a rational man. We lay claim to no high order of mental faculty, but are happy in knowing our own powers, which have no pretensions to anything inaccessible to mediocrity of talent. This we believe to be the most useful to society generally, and best adapted to meet its exigencies. The small share we possess we are determined to devote to the service of Him who gave it. May our resolve be duly seconded. No means, no end, is the law of the kingdom of nature, grace, and glory. In the nature of things then, no money, no types, no type setting, no paper, no printing, no Apostolic Advocate. This is an immutable law of nature. Our patrons, therefore, will take it in good part when we hint the importance of a due attention to “condition 2” of the Prospectus. Receipts will be acknowledged in our next.”

## CHAPTER 8

BEFORE the publication of the second number of the Advocate, the Dr decided to leave Philadelphia, and carry out his original project of going to Richmond. On learning of his decision, the members of the Campbellite meeting in Philadelphia, among whom a coolness had for some time prevailed, nearly all withdrew their subscriptions to the Advocate, which strengthened the Dr’s determination to go. On his way to Richmond, he stopped for several weeks at Baltimore, where the second number was issued. Six weeks after leaving Philadelphia, he arrived in Richmond, where he had been for a long time expected, Mr Campbell having, twelve months before, sent word that he was on his way. The meeting in Richmond had no preacher, and the Dr was called upon to occupy the pulpit, from which there was no escape. The congregation offered him a salary, but he refused to accept it. He remarks thus on the subject in the Apostolic Advocate, vol v, p 93: “The securing of our services as an evangelist was agitated among the brethren. But concerning this, our mind was and is made up. If any community of brethren ‘desire to be at charges with us,’ we

should not so much object to receive the donation, but to become a hireling, and to have our pay, and so forth, discussed at co-operation meetings, at the bar of the church and the world, being unscriptural and degrading, we cannot away with it. His ideas had been expressed in the following remarks, in the *Apostolic Advocate*, vol i, p186: "A man who devotes his time and energies to proclaiming the good, has an apostolic and scriptural right to be supported. Common reason testifies the same thing. To preach to live is one thing; to live to preach is another; and this constitutes all the difference between paying a clergyman and a preacher of the gospel. It is as much the duty of every Christian man to preach the gospel as brother A or any other proclaimer. But all have not the ability. Then those who feel so little interest in, and know so little about the cause they profess to love and serve that they cannot open their mouths to plead for or recommend it, and who from natural incompetency are incapable of doing as they would, are bound by the principles of honour, justice, and Christian virtue to minister of their substance to those who can. The congregation of the Lord is the 'pillar and the support of the truth'. The weekly fellowship was instituted to supply this body with funds. The poor saints, the aged widows, the apostles, evangelists, &c, depended upon these funds for their relief, sustentation, and travelling expenses. If the gospel, therefore, remains unknown to the regions round about us in Eastern Virginia, it is to be attributed to apathy; nay, rather, to the criminal delinquency of the congregations of disciples of this section of country relative to these matters. We do not say that this is their character, but if they do not do their duty in sounding out the gospel, the least that can be said is, they will deserve it."

The Dr told the Richmond Campbellites that he would rather live on bread and cheese, and maintain his independence of thought and action, than submit himself to the power of committees and trustees. He commenced the practice of medicine in Richmond for his own support, at the same time carrying on the *Apostolic Advocate*. During the first year, his receipts afforded a comfortable livelihood; but in the second year, they fell off greatly, in consequence of the frequency of his absence in various parts of the country, to which he was invited to speak.

The troubles that ended in the Dr's disconnection from Campbellism began soon after his arrival in Richmond. The foundation of these troubles may be said to have been laid in the publication of an article (by himself) in the sixth number of the *Advocate*, entitled *Anabaptism*. In this article (an extract from which we shall give directly) the Dr contended that no immersion was valid that was not based on an intelligent faith on the part of the subject of it at the time of the immersion. Among the Campbellites, who at that time numbered many thousands, were large numbers who had been Baptists, and who were received into the Campbellite communion without any further immersion. Many of the preachers also had been Baptist ministers. The Dr's article, which was only a consistent application of Campbellite principles, proved very offensive to this class, and even to Mr Campbell himself, who saw in this stringent doctrine a great barrier to denominational development. The following are the leading portions of the article in question:

#### THE CRY OF "ANABAPTISM"

"ANABAPTISM is a compound Greek word. It is constituted of *ana*, which, in composition signifies iteration or again, and *baptisma*, baptism. Used as a verb, it means to baptize again, or to rebaptize (*anabaptizo*). Anabaptism, in the strict etymological and scriptural import of the term, is unjustifiable and highly to be deprecated. There is a case, however, in



which reimmersion can not only be justified, but is really and obviously a duty. In the foregoing definition, I have purposely left undefined the much-disputed term baptism. With Schrevelius' Greek Lexicon before me, I discover it means an immersion, a dyeing. Hence the idea conveyed to my mind is a dyeing by immersion. This is what logicians would call a profound idea. By further research, I find that the dyers among the Greeks, both ancient and modern, use the words baptized and baptism when speaking of stuffs that had been dyed. To dye by immersion is to baptize anything dipped in a coloured medium. The term is confessedly a dyer's word. If you were to dip, plunge, or immerse a piece of white linen in clean water, and then present it to the Greek dyer, he would tell you it was ionized, bathed, dipped, or washed, but not baptized or dyed; but if you were to take the same piece of linen, and dip it in a bright scarlet-coloured fluid, he would then tell you it was not only dipped but dyed. Hence the English word immersion only conveys half the idea intended by the word baptisma. There is no single word in the language that exactly conveys the idea of baptisma. Immersion is but one half of baptism. A man may be immersed, and yet not baptized; a man, however, cannot be baptized without being immersed. The fluid into which he is plunged must be tinged of a bright scarlet colour. Let me not be misunderstood. It is not supposed that this tinge is obvious to the natural eye, but the eye of faith can see the crimson dye flowing from the pierced side of Jesus into all the baptismal waters. If a man confess Jesus to be the Son of God, and apprehend his bloodshed for the remission of sins, and he be immersed in the waters of the Potomac, Rappahannock, Mattaponi, Pamunky, or James rivers, the eye of faith can see those waters dyed around him with the blood of Jesus. The eye of faith, however, must be open in the person baptized or dyed, as well as in the dyer or baptizer. A dyer accustomed to look upon coloured fluids may imagine water in his vat to be so; his imagination, however, will not dye the cloth; so may an administrator of baptism imagine that the subject recognises the blood of Jesus, but his imagination will not supply the defect thereof. No! the subject must believe and confess for himself, or his dipping will be mere immersion and not baptism.

"The best definition I have met with of the word baptisma is an Arabic one. The idea occurs in the Koran, where it is represented by the compound word seb-gatallah, divine dyeing, or the dyeing of God. Hence divine baptism may be distinguished from human baptism, by the matter of faith with which the water is dyed. The divine dye is the blood of Jesus; the human dye is frames and feelings, sounds and sights, dreams and visions of hobgoblins, ghosts and spirits damned. The former is believed on the divine testimony of prophets and apostles; the latter is manufactured by rhanting, text-weaving and the fanatical exhibitions of the clergy. Take an infidel and immerse him over head and ears in water: that man has not been dyed with the dyeing of God; take an unbeliever and dip him into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: such an one is not dyed with the divine dyeing; take a babe and immerse it in the name, &c: such an one is immersed but not baptized; take an adult, who having given in his "Christian experience" to an Episcopal, Romish, Methodist, Presbyterian, or Baptist community, and immerse him into the name of the Father, &c: such an individual has been immersed into his own experience, in obedience to the Thirty-nine Articles; the Missal, the Book of Discipline, the Westminster Confession, or the Baptist Creed, but not into Christ; but take an infidel and convince him of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment by the arguments, &c, which the prophetic and apostolic testimony supplies, and, believing with his heart or understanding divinely convinced by the word, let him confess with his mouth before men that Jesus is Lord to the

glory of God the Father; let him glorify God in his body (1 Cor vi 20) by being immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: and that man, and such an one alone, is dyed with the dyeing of God; his baptism is a divine baptism: he has been baptized with the true ancient apostolic and "one baptism". Such a man can draw near to God "with a true heart and full assurance of faith, having had his heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and his body washed with pure water," he can indeed say, "I am built upon the testimony of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner stone:" and such a man alone is entitled to the name of Christian.

"Such a baptism may well be esteemed an ordinance for the purification of sin. "There are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one" witness. There, in the baptismal institution, are the water and the blood; and he that comes to this ordinance is led hither by the witness of the Spirit contained in the sacred writings concerning Jesus. "He" (the Spirit) said Jesus, "shall testify of me, and shall take of mine and shew it unto you," my apostles. What the Spirit dictated to these holy men concerning Jesus, they have recorded for the conviction of the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement. Such is the baptism proclaimed by the apostles for the remission of sins – a baptism which embodies in it faith in the blood of Jesus and immersion.

"Hence, then, two things are essential to constitute baptism, namely, blood and water. Four things are likewise necessary before a person can enjoy the benefits which flow from blood and water. First, belief; second, repentance; third, confession; and fourth, immersion.

Neither belief alone, nor repentance alone, nor immersion alone, will suffice to put men in possession of spiritual blessings. The testimony of the Holy Spirit in the Word must be believed, sins must be repented of, the name of Jesus must be openly confessed, and God glorified in the immersion of the body in water. The Father Himself confessed Jesus before men; "this", said a voice from the excellent glory, "is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." We must do so too. Jesus was revealed as the Son of God by water; "that he may be made manifest to Israel am I come baptizing in water," said John. And so must we, if we would be manifested as the sons of God. With the heart of understanding and affections, man believes unto righteousness; and with the mouth, confession is made to salvation.

"Faith in the blood of sprinkling, unfeigned sorrow for sin, confessing that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the Son of the living God, are essential and indispensably necessary to constitute immersion in water baptism. "Converts" who "believe" without testimony (if such a thing be possible), repent without reforming, confess without confessing Jesus, and although immersed, are not baptized.

"Divine baptism is truly a dyeing process, and the subject of it acquires a moral hue. His robe of righteousness is washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb – (Rev vii 14). He puts on this dyed garment when he puts on Christ by the "one baptism". As a sinner, he is a foul spot in the creation of God. His iniquity, transgression, and sin are upon his own head. He is a citizen of Babylon, under the dominion of Baalzebub, a rebel against God his Creator. He is dyed in sin. Taught by the Holy Spirit, speaking through prophets and apostles, he at length repents of his misdeeds, and resolves to reform his life, and to glorify God in his body. The Holy Spirit, through Paul, Peter, and Ananias, commands him to "confess with his mouth the Lord Jesus", to "repent", and to "be baptized and wash away his sins, invoking the name of the Lord". He obeys the words of the Holy Spirit, he repents, he confesses Jesus, and is immersed into the name of the Father, &c. Who that knows anything of the true

genius and spirit of the gospel of Christ, as it stands exhibited on the faithful page of revelation, will say that the application of the blood of Jesus, in the holy ordinance of divine baptism is not adequate to the remission of sins? He that says it is not, gives the lie to the Holy Spirit, who declared by 1 Peter iii 21, that "we are saved by baptism". A truly baptized believer, then, "is purged from his old sins;" he is dyed white in the purifying blood of Jesus; "he has purified his soul by obeying the truth; he is renewed by the Holy Spirit in an appointed way. Instead of hunting and fishing after vanities, he seeks after that wisdom which is first pure and then peaceable.

"But is it to be wondered at that the Baptists and other sects should deny that a sinner receives pardon in baptism? Would it not rather be marvellous that they should confess that we are baptized for the remission of sins? I think so. Look at their black and white members: how many in a thousand have been immersed upon a confession of the faith? I do not mean on a confession of their faith, but of the faith. I would say, perhaps, five. Now, it is agreed, I believe, on all hands, that water alone does not impart remission, but water and blood. What is there in Baptist baptism to make it an ordinance for the purification of sin? Nothing! For no Christian will contend that a sinner's experience can make water purifying. I, therefore, do not believe that sins are remitted by popular baptism, which is itself a sin that needs to be repented of. Nothing but the "one baptism" can impart remission, and that "one baptism" is very rarely practised by the sects. There are a few exceptions, and exceptio probat regulum, the exception establishes the rule.

The discussion to which this article gave rise, was greatly stimulated a few months afterwards by the publication of a letter from the Dr to the church at Baltimore, from which the following is an extract:-

#### JUSTICE TO THE TRUTH

"Brother Ware, of Howler's Essex, Virginia, one of the Rappahannock brethren tells me he has paid you a visit. Both he and brother P are delighted with what they witnessed. I learn from these brethren that our sister Church in Baltimore, receives none from the 'Old Baptists' who do not confess Jesus publicly at the time of admission into her fellowship. I cannot express the satisfaction this intelligence affords me; for in this practice the Church of Christ in Baltimore recognises the principle I have contended for in my writings as well as addresses, which many brethren can testify. I rejoice not because what I contend for is admitted; but because the church in its practice is doing justice to the truth, which it is high time to do in the face of a frowning world. The principle is this - that the terms of admission into the Baptist Church are not adequate to a reception into a Church of Christ. But my satisfaction is not without alloy, for it appears to me, and with all deference I state the conviction, that the church has not carried out the principle according to knowledge. Illustrative of the matter I would respectfully submit the following queries to the candid and unflinching examination of the brethren:

1. Wherefore do you demand a confession of a Baptist? If it is because none has been made by him before, then of what value was the immersion of such a candidate, unconnected with the confession that Jesus is the Christ, whose blood cleanseth from all sin?
2. Is a Christian built upon immersion, or upon the confession made by Peter (Matt xvi 16)? If on the confession, then, as the foundation is always laid before the building is raised, the confession ought to come first and the immersion after; but by acknowledging the

immersion valid without the confession (which the church does in practice, by requiring confession of Baptist candidates long after their immersion), the immersion is made the foundation and not the rock or confession that Jesus is the Christ.

3. Is immersion unconnected with belief in the written testimony of the Holy Spirit concerning Jesus, baptism in the estimation of the church? If it is (which I do not for a moment believe), then it is the water and not the blood of Christ that purifies and washes away sin.

4. Would the church immerse a man first, and then proceed to convince him that Jesus is the Christ? If she would, why does she now receive persons into her fellowship who have been immersed first and are required to confess afterward?

5. If it be necessary for these to confess, why are they not required to be immersed again, in order that they may be baptized for the first time? Confession is not baptism, neither is immersion without confession.

6. Can the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven be administered validly by aliens, and therefore beyond the territories of the Great King; and independently of the church of Christ, which is the pillar and support of the truth?

If, brethren, we admit the premises, by all that is sacred in the truth, do not let us flinch from the conclusion, that, in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of one thousand members of popular Baptist Churches, both confession and re-immersion are necessary for their admission into the Church of Christ. Illustrative of this necessity, take the following exhibition of the way in which Baptists get religion?, and then say if the religion they get be not superstition, their faith credulity, and the whole a strong delusion sent them by God, that they should believe a lie, because they believe not the truth, but take pleasure in iniquity (2 Thess ii 12). It is taken from the Religious Herald, whose editor has copied it approvingly from the American Baptist. Michael Quin, the writer, says he came to Cape May, as a missionary, under the patronage of some anti-christian body, called 'The New Jersey Baptist State Convention'. \* He found things in great confusion, and proceeded to institute measures for the renovation of the Church, which he says he performed, not by the word of God, as we would expect; but by the assistance of a council from sister churches. This is the means of renovation generally adopted by his holiness the Pope, Mr Michael Quin's master. By the end of the year he says, he baptized thirty-one persons. Now mark the preparation for this Baptist baptism. The question with this missionary's flock was 'what can be done?' 'The church solemnly agreed to meet on the first week in February'. 'Those of us', says Mr Michael 'whose business it was to preach would try to do so, and those who could pray and exhort would do so; and those who could do neither would weep before the Lord for the slain of the daughters of our God's people!' Five whose business it was to preach began their operations. A general movement of the spirit was discernible from the beginning, but it appeared on the Monday evening as if the Lord had let down the Holy Ghost in His powerful influence so as to affect the whole congregation!' Here is the preparation for the immersion of thirty-one persons. An alleged state of things, which if the Scriptures be true, is the grossest falsehood, the merest old wife's fable of all the fictitious tales ever published in a religious paper. How was the movement of the spirit discernible? Was it seen or heard? What does this Michael Quin mean by the Lord letting down the Holy Ghost? Did a single man, woman, or child in this assembly work a miracle, speak with tongues, or had they luminous appearances on their heads? If not, where was the power of

the influence in converting to the Baptist religion thirty-one out of one hundred who asked 'for an interest in the prayers of God's children?' Is this what the Baptists call the powerful influence of the Holy Ghost? What a discrepancy in the power exerted at Cape May and on the Day of Pentecost! Of the remaining sixty-nine, some are asking what they must do to be saved; and others profess to have obtained a trembling hope.

Now, brethren, suppose these thirty-one immersed, but deluded votaries of superstition, were to present themselves for admission into the Church over which you preside, could you conscientiously receive them upon a simple confession? If you could, then I see no cause why you should not fraternize with every devout pœdorhantist in the land, upon a simple confession that Jesus is the Christ. But, brethren, I am too well acquainted with your

intelligence to believe you would receive such persons with these facts before you, without requiring them both to confess and to be re-immersed. The true Church of Christ is thus spoken of by the apostle: 'Christ also loved the congregation and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it with a bath of water with the word (not separate nor distinct from, but with the word) that he might present it to himself glorious, a congregation not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it might be holy and without blemish.' (Eph 5 26). Can it be said of Michael Quin's thirty-one converts - can it be said of Baptist churches generally, that they have been cleansed by a bath of water conjoined to the word of truth? Are they sanctified? No; for in their prayers they confess they are full of wounds and bruises, and putrefying sores; that they are sinners in the hope, the 'trembling hope' of pardon, and that if they get to heaven at all, they must get there as sinners. Paul teaches us we must get there as glorious, immaculate, unwrinkled, holy, and unblemished saints. But Michael Quin and the populars know better than Paul. If they yield obedience to one precept of the divine law, it is the obedience of bondsmen and not of sons. If a church of Christ receive such into its fellowship, can it be said to be without spot or wrinkle? The apostle exhorts us to 'examine ourselves, whether we be in the faith'. Let us do it, therefore, even if it should bring us to the conviction that we ought all to be re-immersed, that we may be for once baptised. If we are wrong at the foundation, all the rest is a mere rope of sand. My conviction is that all among us who have not been immersed upon the confession that Jesus is the Christ, and who did not understandingly appreciate the value of his blood, had better be re-immersed upon that confession; and that all, from this time forth, who may wish to join us from the Baptist denomination (a few excepted, who can shew just and scriptural cause for exception) be required to make an intelligent confession, and to be re-immersed.

These things I submit to you, brethren, in your presbyterial and congregational capacity, as matters of superlative importance to the well being of us all, and of those who may prayerfully declare for the truth. The church - the highly-favoured church - in Baltimore, is the pillar and support of the truth in that city. It behoves you, therefore, to scrutinise dispassionately this matter, which, if carried into practice, will be the purification of the churches. None will object who have embraced the principles of the Reformation from a love of the truth. Had I not good testimony, or rather the testimony of a good conscience, purified by faith in the blood of sprinkling, this day's sun should not go down before I put on Christ intelligently. Let us act nobly in these matters, for the very perfection of the Christian nobility is, when we discover our errors, to abandon them, even at the peril of liberty, of prosperity, and of life."

The leaders of the Baltimore church replied to their letter; and to this reply the Dr made a rejoinder. Their reply and the Dr's rejoinder appear in the Apostolic Advocate for September, 1835, p 97. The Baltimore letter on one point refers to Mr Campbell's periodical (Millennial Harbinger, vol v extra, page 411) for explanation. In the Dr's response to this, appears the first public symptom of disagreement between him and Campbell; and it also contains a clear indication of the Dr's knowledge of the kingdom at this early date. He says, "The reference to the 'extra' is not satisfactory. It is a hazardous affair to set one's judgment in opposition to such a giant as our beloved brother Campbell; but in this instance, I cannot help it." He says, "The whole earth is the present territory of the kingdom of heaven" but this is contrary to fact. China, India, the Mohammedan countries, Europe, Africa, and America, are all the territorial and actual possessions of the rulers of the darkness of the world. Jesus does not possess a foot of land that owns his undisputed sway. He will possess all these countries, but he will have to conquer them first."

The breach incipiently visible in these words was destined to widen, notwithstanding a manifest effort on both sides to avoid it, or the appearance of it. Some Campbellite professors in Fredericksburgh, who had been Baptists, and received among the Campbellites without re-immersion, called Mr Campbell's attention to the Dr's letter to the Baltimore church, quoted in the foregoing, and asked him what he thought of the Dr's statement that the majority of Baptists should be re-immersed? Mr Campbell replied: "It was with no ordinary feelings of regret and mortification too, that I saw, a few weeks since, an intimation in the Apostolic Advocate, to the church in Baltimore, that they ought to re-immense all who came over to them from the Baptists. That the Baptists are greatly degenerate and fast immersing themselves into the popular errors of the age, I am sorry to confess, is my sincere conviction in the presence of God; but among these hundreds of thousands, there are some tens that have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal, and are as worthy citizens of the kingdom of the Messiah as any of our brethren. Some few persons in this country have, under the impulse of their new discoveries, been re-immersed, but they generally were immersed at night or in secret. But in the ardour of our young brethren in Va, and in their zeal for truth, they have not only re-immersed in open day, but published to the world the prevalence of these symptoms, and registered the converts. I need not tell you that I have not only a very great esteem for brother Thomas and brother Albert Anderson, but a most ardent affection for them; but had they made these bold and, at best, doubtful measures matters of privacy, I could not have been induced either to have inserted your letter, or to have published this reply to it. But much as I love and esteem these two brethren, I esteem and love the twelve apostles and the cause of my Lord and Master more; and, therefore, I must say, that the preaching up of reimmersion to the citizens of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, for the remission of their sins, is wholly ultra to our views of reformation, and, in our judgment, wholly unauthorised by the New Testament." This letter appeared in the Millennial Harbinger for September, 1835, and was re-published and answered by Dr Thomas, in the Advocate of the following month. The Dr heads his reply with the following quotation from Campbell's own works, which is itself a sufficient answer to the objections sheathed in Campbell's letter: "We have always said, and we say it again, that persons who were without faith in Jesus as the Messiah, on believing, should be immersed into his death. THEY DIFFER NOTHING FROM IMMersed INFANTS; and if a person has been immersed solely into his own experience or conceit, instead of into Christ,

as we believe sometimes happens, then, indeed, as respects Christian immersion, that person is as one unimmersed.” – Millennial Harbinger, vol vi, number 9, page 420. In the reply which follows the Dr repels the charge of “re-baptising the baptised” as unfounded. He says: “I admit that I have baptised the immersed, and continue to do so still, but cannot the readers of the New Testament discern the difference between an immersed and a baptised person? If they cannot, then with them I have no fellowship as Christians; for with doctrinaires of such a mould, who maintain that water washes away sin, I cannot fraternise. The Scripture teaches ‘baptism’ and not water ‘for the remission of sins’. This is what I contend for, and what I preach to the immersed and unimmersed. But what surprises me more than anything else, is that brother Campbell, upon such a vague testimony as ‘Susan’s’, should have penned the second article, and which contains his reply to this writer. Mr Susan says he believes so-and-so, because he was told it! Is he in the custom of believing everything he is told? To believe what is told us without examination, is credulity. Susan has credulously received a report, and our beloved brother C has credulously adopted it. I ask Mr Susan, did he ever read in the pages of the Advocate, with his own eyes, or hear from my own lips, with his own ears, that I ‘preached up re-immersion to the citizens of the kingdom of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins?’ I ask brother C did he ever? I unhesitatingly affirm that there lives not the man, the woman, or the child, that ever heard or read such a sentiment from my lips or pen. If there be such a person living, let him come forward, and not only affirm, but attest the charge. “Again, we wish it to be known that, in all things, it is our intention to act openly, and in the face of day. If it is right to re-immersion privately and by night, it is equally so to do it publicly and by day; that is, if it may be done at all, it ought to be done openly; and if a necessity exist for re-immersion, it ought to be made known for the information and consideration of others. I agree that the ‘notion of re-baptism is wholly out of the ‘Record’ in all cases except one, Acts xix. With the exception of this case, so is re-immersion. There is but ‘one baptism’, and that ought not to be repeated. It is for the ‘one baptism’ I contend, in opposition to the many immersions of the sects: the Greeks, Russians, Baptists, Mormons, &c, &c, &c.”

## CHAPTER 9

SUCCEEDING to this reply, the Dr addressed a series of communications to Mr Campbell, which it will be useful to reproduce, as they illustrate the bearings of the controversy at this early stage, and exemplify to some extent the characteristic and style of Dr Thomas as a young writer, and also constitute a valuable exposition of the important subjects of which they treat. The letters were published in the Apostolic Advocate, in which we obtain access to them.

### LETTER 1

“Richmond, September 19, 1835

“DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL, - In the foregoing article, I have confined myself to a running criticism upon ‘Susan’ and upon ‘reply’. I have done it in the finest humour and best feeling. I am obliged to commend myself lest the feeling of my remarks should be misinterpreted. I am not unconscious of an apparent ‘bitterness and severity’ of style which my opponents are very glad to lay hold of as real, to my disadvantage. It is but apparent, however, for I can honestly, in the presence of an All-seeing eye, affirm that I have no bitter feelings, no not an

atom of animosity in my heart against a single member of the human race. I make this remark lest an expression should have escaped me that may seem like resentment. I am aware that what might seem very mild and conciliatory to me might appear 'harsh' to one of a different temperament. I disclaim, therefore, everything of this sort; and hope you will just receive it in the spirit of the intention. This is one item of reformation: to confess our faults and forsake them.

"In the document alluded to, I denied the charge in general, but I have not descended to particulars. I shall now, therefore, detail to you and my readers the views I hold, and leave you to judge of their accordance with the Scriptures.

"Just before our Royal Master ascended to the right hand of God, he gave a commission to the eleven apostles, the witnesses of his resurrection. The four writers of the testimonies concerning Jesus give different versions of this commission, but all of them agree in this, that the labour of making known the way in which mankind might obtain remission of sins was entrusted to them. Two of these writers record the means by which remission or pardon may be enjoyed; a fourth, the effects of their adoption. Matthew says he told them to 'go and convert or disciple the nations' and tells us how; by 'baptizing them into the name of the Father', &c. This writer says nothing about faith, for this simple reason – because it is implied in the word baptizing. But Mark does, to show that without faith, condemnation awaits us. He says, 'He who shall believe and be baptised shall be saved, or pardoned; but he that shall not believe shall be condemned', showing that immersion without faith is nugatory. Luke differs from both, phraseologizing the commission (if I may so express myself) by recording the effect of belief which is repentance, and of baptism which is the remission of sins, to wit: 'Thus it is written and thus it behoved the Messiah to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that reformation and the remission of sins should be proclaimed in his name among all nations, commencing at Jerusalem'.

"To understand the meaning of repentance in this place, and its dependence upon faith, I am in the custom of listening to Peter on Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius, and to Paul at Athens, Ephesus, or Corinth. I prefer attending the lectures of these two apostles, because the one was the apostle to the uncircumcision, the other to the circumcision, who together constituted the entire population of the Roman world. I do not forget to call in history to my aid, that I may learn the actual state of these classes of men at the time when the gospel, or reformation, was first announced. This is necessary in order to learn what they were to repent of, or reform from; and by knowing the gospel, it was easy to tell what they were immediately to do.

"Well, then, to the Jew first, and then to the Gentile will we go. When John the Baptist began to proclaim 'the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,' all classes of Jews had forsaken the law of the Lord, and had corrupted the institutions of Moses. This unhappy state of things had been superinduced by the introduction into the Jewish economy of a class of men unauthorised by God, and unknown to the nation before the Babylonish captivity. These 'clergymen' were styled 'scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers,' whom our Saviour so severely denounced as a race of vipers, hypocrites, devourers of the widows' houses, whited sepulchres, &c. They had made of none effect the word of God by their traditions, so that it was in vain that they and the people worshipped God, as all their worship was the mere observance of the commandments of men. The minds of the people thus perverted by the Jewish clergy were blinded, and their hearts hardened, so that, having no relish for the truth, seeing they did not perceive, and hearing they did not



understand. Their morals were likewise depraved, and violence and extortion filled the land. When multitudes of these characters flocked to John, and asked him what they were to do, did he command them to beat their breast and cry, as an evocation of 'sorrow for sin?' 'Bring forth the proper fruits of reformation', said he. 'Let him that has two coats impart to him that has none, and let him that has victuals do the same. Exact no more than what is appointed you. Injure no man, either by violence or false accusation, and be content with your allowance.' The proper fruits of reformation, then, were good actions flowing from a belief of those things announced by John.

"But to the long catalogue of crimes that might be exhibited against the nation, the Jews superadded the climax of their wickedness, by rejecting him whom God had sent to them, and putting him to death. The repentance for sins, which the apostles proclaimed, had respect to the murder of Jesus, which John's proclamation, in the nature of things, could have had no regard to. The Jews by the apostles, as the instruments of the Holy Spirit, were to be convinced of sin, because they believed not on Jesus, but put him to death. They were so convinced, on the day of Pentecost, by Peter; and what were they to do? They were to repent. But some may say they did repent, and, in consequence of repentance, exclaimed, Men and brethren, what shall we do? But not so. This inquiry was the result of conviction, and not of repentance, for when they heard these things (see the foregoing part of Acts ii) they were pierced to the heart, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, What shall we do? They were commanded to repent or reform. How were they to do this? By being baptised, as Matthew records, in the name of him whom they had murdered. This command, they who received it with readiness obeyed that very day. It is, therefore, obvious that the way in which these Jews returned to God, from straying after human tradition, was by immediately putting themselves under the authority of Jesus Christ, whom God had appointed a Prince and Saviour, to give reformation to Israel and the remission of sins; and this was by being baptised into his name. This was the first proper fruit of reformation.

"Let us now accompany Paul to Athens. Standing in the middle of the Areopagus, and surrounded by Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, and in the presence of the archdeacons of a city 'exceedingly addicted to the worship of demons', what is the burden of his proclamation? Reformation towards God and faith in Jesus. Hear him, then, in an assembly of Pagans wholly devoted to human traditions, reason with them on the absurdity of idolatry, or, their dependence upon one God for life and breath and all things, calling upon them to reform towards God, unknown, indeed, to them before, but now declaring His willingness to look over the past, and announcing Jesus as the righteous Judge of the world. What astonishing demands these, on the faith of Pagans that were to forsake their gods, their philosophy, and their wisdom, in which they prided themselves, and to return to the unknown God, now heralded to them by a wandering Jew. They heard, and what was the result? As there was but one proclamation, those who were convinced by what they heard, did what other Pagans did, namely, were baptised. Thus it was affirmed of the Corinthians, that, "hearing, they believed and were baptised". Some of the Athenians jested, but others consorted with Paul. Reformation, then, in relation to a Pagan, was to renounce idolatry, and immediately to be baptised. This was its first proper fruit, and evinced reformation towards God and faith in Jesus Christ.

"As Cornelius was a circumcised Gentile, a discourse on the treasonableness of idolatry would have been out of place. Hence his reformation did not imply renunciation of the

gods, any more than that of the Jew. It evinced itself, however, in the same way, viz, by being baptised. This event gave rise to the passage in Acts xi where it says that they glorified God, saying then has God given to the Gentiles reformation to life, and in chapter v there is one like it in relation to the Jew, viz, 'Him has God exalted at His right hand a prince and a Saviour, to give reformation to Israel, and remission of sins.' In these passages then, reformation is said to be given to both Jew and Gentile. How is this? some may say. I explain it thus. Faith, reformation, baptism, religion, &c are terms expressive of things rendered necessary because of man's having fallen from God's favour by breaking His laws. Man is the offender, God the party offended; and as God is man's supreme in every respect, it is for God, and not man, to dictate how the breach shall be healed up. Whatever appointments God makes, then, according to which He will receive man into His favour, are His gifts to man. In this sense, everything pertaining to the several dispensations of true religion, since time began, is the gift of God. Reformation is God's appointment. There is but one way of repentance towards God acceptably, and that is by doing what He has commanded. The first act of reformation is to be baptised into Christ. A Jew might have beat his breast like the publican, and have called upon God all day to have mercy upon him; he might have done anything else that suggested itself to his mind as good and evidential of repentance; but all this, after the Day of Pentecost, would have availed him nothing as the fruits of reformation. A Gentile might have renounced idolatry, and afterwards have led a very moral life; he might have patronized the Christians, and have defended them from the rage of their persecutors; but all this would have availed him nothing as repentance towards God; and why? Because God had not required it at their hands. God has set up the standard of reformation; He has given and appointed the way, and to this we must conform if we would obtain His approval. Reformation implies baptism, and baptism the remission of sins; so that he who shall believe and be baptised, shall be saved or pardoned. A baptised person in the apostles' days, was a reformed person in the Scripture sense of reformation. When God, therefore, is said to have given reformation to the Gentiles also, it means that He had permitted them to enjoy the same privileges as the Jews upon the same terms, viz, by being baptised into Christ.

"But in ancient days, some who had reformed towards God, fell into grievous offences. How then, say some, were they forgiven? By being re-baptised? The question as well as the practice under such circumstances would fully denote the ignorance of the Scriptures by all concerned. There are two institutions for the remission of sins appointed in relation to aliens and citizens – the world and the Christians. For aliens, the one is baptism into Jesus Christ; for citizens, confession. The apostle John says 'If we confess our sins, He (God) is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' – (1 Ep i 9) And again, 'If any one has sinned, we (Christians) have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Just One; and he is a propitiation for our sins'. (ii 1)

"The conclusion from the whole is this, that in the days of the apostles, God caused a proclamation to be made to all the inhabitants of the Roman Empire, calling upon them to abandon the traditions of men, and to return to Him from whom they had departed, and that every one who obeyed the call, submitted to Jesus Christ, the future Monarch of the world, by being buried with him in baptism; that every one who was so buried was pardoned, adopted into God's family, and made an heir of endless life, and none else. That such persons had reformed with a godly reformation, and that for them, the institution of confession was appointed if they should commit sin.

“Thus much, then, for the present, concerning the reformation of ancient days. In my next, I shall consider it in relation to the times in which we live. The insertion of this, and the preceding article, in the Harbinger, will much oblige your sincere and affectionate brother in the hope of a glorious and never-ending life.” JOHN THOMAS

## LETTER II

“Richmond, October 10, 1835.

“DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL – In my former epistle, I glanced at the state of the Jews and Gentiles, at the several periods when ‘repentance and the remission of sins or salvation by Jesus Christ, was proclaimed to each of them by the apostles, the chosen witnesses of his resurrection. I shewed that ‘the circumcision’ evinced their repentance towards God, by transferring their obedience from the law of Moses, and the law of human tradition, to the ‘law of faith;’ that ‘the uncircumcision’ proved theirs, by renouncing the vanities of Paganism for the realities of truth; and that both these classes of men were manifested as ‘living stones’, ‘a holy and royal priesthood’, an ‘elect race’, ‘a holy nation’, ‘a purchased people’, in short, were made known to the world under a new character, even that of a Christian’ and that this manifestation was effected by an indiscriminate immersion of every believer into Jesus Christ. This was the sole and only possible way in which Jews and Gentiles could become Christians at the period under consideration. An immersed believer of the testimony which God had given of His Son, was the only truly reformed character in those days of apostolic purity and simplicity; he alone was truly repentant; his sins, or actual transgressions, were alone remitted; he alone was sanctified or made holy; he alone had received the salvation of his soul. Such characters of the apostles addressed as ‘qualified for a portion of the inheritance of the saints in light’; as ‘delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God’s beloved Son’; as ‘having redemption, even the remission of sins’; as characters ‘to whom it has pleased God to make known what the riches of the glory of this secret among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you (by faith), the hope of glory’, as ‘circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the sins of flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, having been buried with him in immersion, by which also you have been raised with him through the belief of the strong works of God, who raised him from the dead; for you who were dead on account of trespasses, and by the uncircumcision of your flesh, he has made alive together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses’; as ‘having put off the old man with his practices, and having put on the new, who is renewed by knowledge, after the image of Him who created him’; as ‘heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ’”, in whom the glory hereafter to be revealed transcends all human conception. Such, then, was the state of a Christian, and such, too, was the only way in which a Jew or Gentile could enter therein. No one out of Christ had any right to these privileges; and in the apostles’ days, there was but one way of getting into Christ, and that was by being immersed in water into his name.

“I would here beg leave to observe, that when once reformed, it was the practice of these Christians to conduct themselves holily, unblamably, and unrepovably, in the sight of God. There were exceptions. It is not of these I speak. I refer to those who walked worthy of their high calling. To some of these worthies, of whom the world was not worthy, were distributed the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Those of them who received these gifts were called ‘spiritual men’. These endowments were bestowed for the qualification of certain of the Christians for the service and edification of the body of Christ – the Christian community –

and ceased when that body attained to 'the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God'; which it did when the knowledge and matter of faith, distributed among the spiritual men, were united and rendered permanent in the writings of the Holy Scriptures. Since the days of the apostle John, we have no credible testimony of the bestowing of a single gift of the Holy Spirit. The gifts of the Spirit, however, are to be distinguished from the fruits of the Spirit. The gifts were, 'the word of wisdom', 'the word of knowledge', 'faith' to remove mountains, 'gifts of healing', 'operations of powers', 'prophecy', 'discerning of spirits', 'kinds of foreign languages', &c &c; the fruits, 'love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance'. The former are the result of inspiration; the latter flow from the truth believed and obeyed. These fruits are the signs by which true Christians may be discovered and discriminated from hypocrites, I mean those who profess to know God, but in works deny Him.

"The practices of these reformed characters were required to be such as would 'adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things'. Jesus is the true image of God – the perfect model of the new man. He was perfection personified, and his true and only portrait is to be found in the sayings and doings recorded of him in the holy oracles. 'He suffered for us, leaving us a pattern, that we should follow his footsteps'. Was Jesus holy? So must his followers be. Was he unconformed to the principles and practices of the world? His followers must be so too. Did he bear arms for the destruction of men? Did he mingle as a political agitator in the paltry questions of human policy? Although he ate with sinners, did he make the swearer, the fornicator, the debauchee, the companions of his solitude? Did he degrade the image of God by such conduct as this, by corrupt communications, by unholy deeds? Neither must the Christian, if he would be an acceptable 'imitator of the Good One'.

"Such, brother Campbell, appears to me to be the outline of 'reformation' and of the Christian character in the days of ancient times. It is, I believe, the outline sketched by the inspired artists. The light and shade might easily be thrown in by a few more touches; but this must suffice at present. The facts and doctrines of 'reformation', 'remission of sins', and 'eternal life' are all comprehended and condensed in the phrase 'glad tidings' or the term 'gospel'. Every other doctrine, message, tidings, word, or proclamation in the world that does not correspond, in all its parts, to the gospel delineated upon the page of the New Testament, the outline of which I have transferred to these letters, is 'another gospel', concerning which Paul writes as follows: 'I wonder that you (Galatian Christians) are so soon removed from him (Paul) who called you into the favour of Christ to another gospel, which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and wish to pervert the gospel of Christ. But if even we (the apostles) or a messenger from heaven declare a gospel to you which we (the apostles) have not declared to you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so now I say again, if any one declare a gospel to you different from what you have received, let him be accursed'.

"Now, I would ask every candid, every honest and well-informed man, are the proclamations made from week to week by the several clergy of the 'four great denominations of Christians', as they are called, one and the same with the proclamation made by the apostles on the day of Pentecost and afterwards throughout the Roman Empire? This is certain, that the apostles all proclaimed one and the same thing, and this is equally sure, that the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist apostles all declare different things. If then they do not agree among themselves, how can they be said to agree with the apostles of Christ who knew nothing of any such sects as these? Seeing, then, that

these denominational gospels do not agree with that recorded in the New Testament, and seeing that things different cannot be the same, it follows that they are 'other gospels', or pervertings of the gospel of Christ; and, therefore, both the clergy who preach them and the gospels themselves, are 'accursed' in the sight of God.

"Take the following example of an accursed gospel. It is from the pen of a writer named Warren Woodson, under the patronage of that bundle of weekly fables, the Religious Herald. I would just inform you that the writer had imbibed a smattering of your opinions, and thus became a 'Campbellite'. For anything I know to the contrary, he is a well-disposed youth; but I suspect somewhat spoiled in the Virginian factory of priests, near this city. Our 'Rev' friend as we have said, became a 'Campbellite', but his mental soil being rather thin, and the loss of popularity a trial too severe to be endured, he soon wanted both the energy and the inclination to discover the truth, and consequently, as requiring the least effort, offered a penitential oblation to his former patrons through the columns of the Herald, and thus relapsed into the traditions of Baptism. Well, then, to his gospel. I shall put down its parts in the form of items. 1 'The Holy Spirit accompanies the truth in the conversion of the sinner'. This dogma is confirmed by an appeal to his 'own experience'. 2 Conversion is a change of heart, and a consequent change of life. 3 The sanctification and cleansing of the body of Christ with the washing of water by the word, does not refer to baptism; but means 'the cleansing influences of the Holy Spirit, comparable to water, who uses the truth as the instrument'. 4 That as a sword is in the hands of a man, so the word of God is in the hands of the spirit. 5 John iii 5; Titus iii 5; 1 Cor vi 11, refer to the regenerating, sanctifying and cleansing influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart. 6 'A man is justified, pardoned, adopted, and saved prior to baptism, and when he believes in the Saviour and sincerely loves the Lord, though he may not be baptised, yet, he is now in a state of salvation secured by him'. 'Repent and be baptised for the remission of sins', and 'arise and be baptised and wash away the sins', signify that in baptism we openly avow Christ – that we submit to an ordinance which is emblematical of our salvation through him – that our faith is led to Christ as our Saviour and we have a livelier view of that glorious salvation through the Redeemer's mediation'.

"These seven items constitute an important part of the gospel of the Baptist sect, as taught in their schools. The sixth is notoriously the burden of their proclamation to the world. Although Paul says, that we must enter Christ by being baptised into him, yet these speculators maintain and teach that a man is saved although he shall not have put him on! Do you discover the chicanery of this dishonest tradition? It enables the Baptist to fraternise with the other sects, and to provide a way to heaven for their new-hatched acquaintances as well as for themselves. Thus they have immolated the trust of God upon the altars of popularity, hypocrisy, and pseudo-charity. Can you imagine anything, than the interests of party, to prevent the coalition of the Baptists with the other denominations? If they can pray with them, preach with them, sing with them – nay, but unite with them in every religious exercise upon earth, and expect to meet them in heaven, what by all the rules of reason and common sense, prevents them breaking bread together? And if they agree to do this, is not their coalescence with anti-Christ complete?

"Now, brother Campbell, what redeeming qualities do you see in these four great and leading sects of 'Protestantism', when reviewed by the New Testament? Protestantism, in whole or in part, is not the religion of Jesus Christ. It is nothing else but modified Popery. It is one of the horns of the beast which John saw ascending out of the earth, lamb-like in its

appearance, but of dragon-speech. (Rev xiii 11). It is a system of deception, and constitutes in the aggregate a part of that 'strong delusion' which Paul predicted God would send upon men, 'that they might believe a lie, in order that all might be condemned who have not believed the truth, but have taken pleasure in iniquity'. (2 Thess ii 12). Take the whole world, and what do you behold? Precisely the same state of things as obtained in the days of John the baptiser: the whole population of the globe (a very small fraction excepted) in abject subjection to human tradition. Varieties will be found between the first and nineteenth centuries; still they are traditions – human traditions. Turn we to China, to Hindostan, to Turkey, to Italy, to England, or to America, and in each of these countries we shall find the traditions of a Confucius, a Brahma, a Mohammed, a Pope, a King Harry, a Calvin, an Arminius, a Wesley, a Knox, a Fuller, a Gill, &c, &c, &c' all severally making of 'none effect the word of God by their traditions'. If the Jews had their Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and lawyers, with their commandments, and the Gentiles their Platonic, Epicurean, and Stoic philosophers, with their speculations and their priests with their mysteries, we also have ours with their abominations, 'every name and denomination of them embodied in the order of the Clergy'.

"The Jewish is the type of the anti-Christian clergy. The former were the enemies of all true righteousness – the righteousness of God, while they compassed sea and land to establish their own. They perverted the right way of the Lord as set forth in the prophets and the law, and while those 'bodies of divinity', the Talmud and Mishna, pretended to unveil the Mosiac mysteries, they only served to make darkness visible. It was the Jewish clergy, the Scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers, the blind guides of Israel, who used long prayers for a disguise', that taught the people to err, and urged them to the betrayal and murder of the Just One. The ignorance of the people was attributable to them, 'for they carried off the key of knowledge, not entering themselves, and those who were entering, they hindered'. 'Yes', says Peter 'there were also false prophets among the people (Israel) even as there will be false teachers among you (Christians), who will privately introduce destructive sects, denying even the Lord who bought them, bringing on themselves swift destruction. And many will follow their lewd practices, on account of whom the way of truth will be evil spoken of. And through covetousness, they will make merchandize of you by fictitious tales' (spurious and accursed gospels). 'These indeed', says Paul, 'are they who go into houses and lead captive silly women laden with sins'. And 'Such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ. And no wonder; for Satan himself transforms himself into a messenger of light. Therefore, it is no great wonder if his ministers also transform themselves as ministers of righteousness'. 'These are wells without water, clouds driven by a tempest, for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever. They promise their disciples liberty, while they themselves are slaves of corruption.'

"Such are the descriptions given by the apostles of those who have arisen since their day, as 'successors of the apostles', 'called and sent of God' to proclaim that sins are pardoned and sinners adopted into his family without being baptised into Jesus Christ!!! These are the 'accursed' false teachers of 'another gospel', who are the blind guides of the Gentiles, making merchandise of them by fictitious tales, and 'on account of whom the way of truth is now evil spoken of'. Brother Campbell, do you candidly believe that anything good and acceptable to God can come out of the denominational Babylon over which such a fraternity presides, unless it be purified with a bath of water in connection with the Word? No; God

hates the garment spotted by the flesh.

“I expected to close our correspondence with this letter, at least for the present, but I perceive I must still tax your patience for another month. This epistle, then, may suffice to show that the body politic of our world is still labouring under the same moral or spiritual disease as in the days of Tiberius Cæsar; and this disease is, obedience to human tradition. We have seen that the remedy prescribed at that day was a proclamation of ‘reformation for the remission of sins’. In my next I shall consider the propriety of prescribing the same system of spiritual therapeutics. The insertion of this in your paper will further oblige your fellow-traveller to the realms of light. JOHN THOMAS.”

### LETTER III

“DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL – Once upon a time, a husbandman planted upon the mountainous barrens of his plantation two trees, both olives, the one good, the other indifferent, which, therefore, he permitted to become wild. The former he dressed and tended with the greatest care. The root and stem were healthy, as evinced by the fatness of the fruit, and for a time, put forth branches of the most luxuriant and promising growth. The period came, however, when the olive cast its fruit, and some of the branches lost their perennial freshness, and at last withered away. The root retained its vitality, and consequently its power of sustaining its accustomed branches yielding fruit. The husbandman, therefore, lopped off the dead branches and with exquisite skill, ingrafted some of the branches of the wild olive into their place. Thus restored to a sound and healthy state, he continued to cultivate it with the greatest attention. As to the withered branches, he did not destroy them, as they were not entirely past recovery, only he pruned off and burned such parts as he found wholly sapless. This ingrafted olive tree, with the necessary culture, continued to yield its fruit for many years; but the time at length arrived when it ceased to recompense the labour bestowed upon it by the planter. Some of the ingrafted branches lost their vigour, they began to droop, to fade, and at last they died. At this period, the natural branches, which had been cut off, began to freshen. The cultivator, therefore, deemed it advisable, for the preservation of the root, to remove the branches that had decayed, and to re-ingraft the natural branches. This he did with so much dexterity, that the good olive was effectually relieved of all symptoms of decay, and for ever after yielded fruit abundantly from its perennial boughs. This is the parable, the following is the interpretation thereof.

“The husbandman is Jehovah, to whom the earth and its inhabitants belong. The two trees are two nations or classes of men – the one, the Jewish; the other, the Gentile. The Jewish nation is the good olive; the Gentiles the indifferent, or wild olive. Jehovah for many centuries bestowed the greatest care upon the house of Israel. He had, yes, and still has, the greatest affection for them on account of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, whose God He is. He cultivated them by kindness; He pruned them by judgements, not that they might be destroyed, but that they might bring forth much fruit to His praise and glory. The fine olive was yielded when Messiah was born, and after his resurrection and ascension, the good olive yielded abundant fruit in the thousands of Israel who obeyed the gospel of Messiah. Soon after this, Israel became barren and ceased to produce believers in Jesus as the Christ. On account of their unbelief, therefore, the Jews were broken off from the national compact, by the Romans, as Jehovah’s pruning knife, and cast out from his plantation, the land of Judea, for a time. But, branches from the wild olive, or believers from

among the Gentiles, were grafted in or naturalized as Jews and descendants of Abraham, and therefore, a constituent part of the Israelitish nation; because being inducted into Christ, by faith they became his brethren, and therefore Jews; for Abraham has two kinds of descendants, first, those who are his descendants according to the flesh, or natural birth; second, those who are his descendants according to promise, or by baptism into Christ. 'And if you are Christ's, certainly you are of Abraham's seed (Jews), and heirs according to the promise' made to Abraham; that the Almighty Jehovah would be a God to him and to his seed after him; and that He would give to him and to the seed, the land wherein he was a stranger, ALL THE LAND OF CANAAN, for an everlasting possession – (Gal iii 29; Gen xvii 8). This promise was sealed by the mark in the flesh called circumcision 430 years before the law of Moses was given. Jesus was circumcised according to the Patriarchal law, so that every Gentile who believes and is baptised into his name partakes thereof, having been circumcised with the circumcision of Christ (Col ii 11, 12), and so ingrafted into the stock of Abraham, or true house of Israel; and therefore, with Christ, as heir to the land of Canaan (in Asia) for an everlasting possession. This is what is meant in the parable by grafting branches from the wild olive into the good olive tree. The Gentiles stand by FAITH, evinced by obedience, not by immersion into an experience, as a constituent of the good olive tree, or true Israelitish nation. If faith fail among the Gentiles, which is signified by the grafted branches losing their vigour, drooping, fading, and at last, dying, they also will be cut off by terrible judgements, and they who are Jews outwardly – the natural branches of the good olive – will be re-ingrafted, or restored to Canaan, and possess it, in company with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with all the true Israel, consisting of all Patriarchs, Jews, and Christians, who shall be honoured 'to share in the resurrection and the other age' – (Luke xx 35, 36). All these will sit down with Jesus, their descended King, at his table in the kingdom of God, or the millennial reign – (Matt viii 11, 12; xxvi 29). This is what is meant by the good olive yielding fruit abundantly from its perennial boughs.

"This parable, you will perceive, embodies the illustration of the apostle as recorded in the 11th chapter of Romans. I have introduced it here to show that as the natural branches of the good olive were broken off because of unbelief, so will the Gentiles, for they only 'stand by faith;' and, says the apostle, 'all Israel shall be saved', for blindness in part only has happened to them 'till the fullness of the Gentiles come in'. When, therefore, this fullness shall have come in, the wild olive branches, or Gentiles, will have become sapless, withered, faithless; and, therefore, destitute of the principles by which they stand unvisited by the terrible judgements of Jehovah. But as some of the Jews, in the days of the apostles, obeyed the gospel, and lived in obedience to Jesus as Messiah, when their brethren of the flesh were cut off, so there will be some of us Gentiles who believe at the time, when 'the vine of the earth shall be reaped', or the wild olive branches of our class shall be lopped off. But we Gentiles now must be on the same foundation as the believing Jews were in the days of Paul; otherwise 'the severity of God' will fall on us as upon the rest of the world; for it is only by FAITH, the belief of testimony, and not by CREDULITY, an assent without testimony, we stand in the favour of God. Now, I wish to impress your mind with this conviction, that there is a real difference between faith and credulity; and that this distinction obtains between the 'faith' of the immense majority of professors of this age, and that of the apostles and disciples in their day; and, consequently, that what goes current for faith now is not the principle recognised by the Scriptures, and by which alone the Gentiles can stand in God's favour. Look at Spain; does not every orthodox Spaniard say



that he believes in Jesus Christ? Do he and his faithful countrymen stand in God's favour? Look at the state of Spanish society, and let that speak as to the estimation in which God holds the faith of that people. Look to France; look to enlightened England, Ireland, and Scotland: in these last-named countries, you will find millions who will tell you they believed in Jesus as the Christ! But how does God estimate their faith? Let the famine, the pestilence, poverty, the progressive destruction of the Church, the disorganization of society, and national burdens – let them reply. Look to the communities of Oriental 'Christians', who say they believe, nay are even immersed in the name of the Father, &c, how is their faith estimated? Let the grinding despotism of the Autocrat, the Egyptian, and the Turk reply. Look to the States, which compose this Union, where 'faith' is abundant as mosquitoes, and how is it esteemed by heaven? Let the pestilence, the tornado, the popular tumults, the civil, religious, and political discords – let these answer the question. The fact is, their 'faith' is nothing more than credulity, on account of which the judgments of God are pouring out upon all nations of the earth. Now, I would ask, where is the difference between the 'faith' of the Baptist Gentiles, and of the Spanish and French, English, Irish, Scotch or Oriental 'believers'? Look at the practices of these 'believers', and you will find thousands – yes, I was going to say myriads of them – who have worn better in their morality than multitudes of those immersed into the Baptist church. Nay, there are those who maintain that Jesus was no more than the son of Joseph, and believe in a universal salvation, whose moral conduct – unless the immorality of insulting the parentage of our Lord be maintained – is unexceptionable. If we are to take the morale of a man's life as the sole, or even the chief criterion of his standing by faith in God's favour, we must conclude that all who say they believe in Jesus and lead a moral life, are of the right faith and in a sure way to immortality. But who that understands the Scriptures will venture to affirm this? Surely there are some immersed people, called Baptists, who truly believe in the Lord Jesus Christ! Verily; and they may be known as true believers by being found in the practice of holiness, ie, keeping the commandments and ordinances of the Lord as delivered by the apostles. It has been truly observed by Thomas Hartwell Horne: 'Vain men value themselves on their speculative knowledge, right opinions, and true belief; but no belief will be of advantage which is separated from the practice of holiness'. Now, no practice is holy unless it is approved of God; and nothing is approved by Him which He has not ordained. He may permit a thing to be done, but this is no proof of His approbation. The Baptists as a community, insult Jesus, by setting aside the worship he has ordained, and substituting their own, which is nowhere to be found in the Scriptures, either in the form of precept or example. How far God will exonerate individuals from the transgressions of their denominations to which they give their countenance, I know not; but as a denomination is made up of individuals, I suspect they will find themselves grievously responsible. The ordinance of baptism they have corrupted, so that there exists not among them a means by which the polluted may be cleansed from their iniquity. It is a very good rule to judge of a man's faith by his moral actions, but then the deception is that the morality of an action is, for the most part, determined by a human and not a divine standard. The only true standard of morality is the New Testament, under the Christian Dispensation, and the Old, under the Mosaic. The ordinary standard now is the common consent of mankind, a consent, for the most part, to consecrate as holy or moral that which God condemns. A professor who lives in conformity to the world, or who, in his personal or congregational capacity, does not live in conformity to apostolic teaching, although he may injure his

neighbour in nothing, nor offend the customs of society, is, to all intents and purposes, an immoral or an unholy man, in the sense of Scripture, according to which he will be judged, and either acquitted or condemned.

“Seeing that things are in this state, and with the premises now before us, in answer to the question, What ought to be done? I would lay before you the following suggestions in relation to the ‘Reproclamation of Reformation and the Remission of Sins’. Lay the truth, facts, testimonies, and practices of the New Testament before the minds of all, both immersed and unimmersed, with a view to convince them of sin, of unrighteousness, and of judgement to come. If we succeed in this, and the unimmersed enquire What are we to do? To them we must reply, in the words of the apostle, ‘Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins’ – (Acts ii 38). But if the immersed be convinced that they have not been living according to the truth, and they also enquire, What are we to do? I would reply to them all ‘Examine yourselves, and see if you be in the faith’; and let that examination be conducted in the spirit of candour, and by the light of the testimony of the apostles and prophets. If upon a review of the past, some of them find that instead of being in the faith, they are in the experience, opinions, feelings, or conceits, and, therefore, in their sins, I would call upon such to be re-immersed for the purpose of being baptised for the first time. And if others of the unimmersed, upon due examination, become convinced that they are in Christ, but that, since their baptism, they have not lived according to the truth, then I would say to them, you must publicly confess your delinquency, and join with the congregation of the disciples in prayer to God, to forgive your derelictions, for He has promised to cleanse us from all unrighteousness, through Jesus, in this way, if we have previously become Christians. But if they will not examine? Then such are not fit for a society which professes to be preparing itself for the reception of the returning Bridegroom. They ought not to be received. These three classes, the immersed, the re-immersed, the supplicants (for distinction sake), should then be collected together into ‘one body’, or added to one already formed, and placed under the supervision of proper persons, competent to teach them the duties of their subsequent lives, and to drill them into good soldiers of the cross.

“Now, in relation to our societies already formed, I appeal to you and to my readers, to say if you really believe they are ‘founded upon the testimony of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone?’ How can they candidly answer this in the affirmative, with their knowledge of the destitution of the Baptist churches, from which so many have come out of the apostolic and prophetic testimony? Does not their practice, now, in condemning their late Baptist brethren, condemn themselves? Or have the Baptists only sunk into utter darkness, since they lost the light of their brethren, the ‘Reformers’? They who are upon the right foundation, have great reason to rejoice, and to sing for joy; but those who are based upon their opinions, or who stumbled into the Baptist community during some mad frolic of a revival, have nothing to look for but ejection from the everlasting kingdom, having on the ragged garments of their own righteousness, instead of the pure, white, and resplendent vestment provided for all who are invited to the Marriage Supper of the Lamb.

“In my next, I shall consider certain objections that have reached me. Till then, I subscribe myself your brother, in hope of redemption from the bondage of a perishing state,  
JOHN THOMAS”

#### LETTER IV

“Richmond, Va, Dec 20th 1835

“DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL – The subject of re-immersion appears to me of much importance. This conviction does not arise from any abstract reasoning, but from a calm and deliberate view of society as it exists. The religious social compact of the world is the field of vision, brought up ‘in bold relief’ before my mind, by the light, not of popular opinion, but by the light, the strong light, of apostolic and prophetic testimony. I see, by the naked eye, a concourse of men and women, composed of the most fashionable, the most indifferent, listless, thoughtless, harem-scarem characters, now ecstatic with fanaticism, now absorbed in the levities of life, deeply immersed in the world, and profoundly skilled in the knowledge and practice of every vain thing, but grossly ignorant of the word of God. I see them full of the lust of the eye and the pride of life; in fellowship with the world, having a form – a flimsy form – of godliness without the power, and compassing heaven and earth in their opposition to the gospel of Jesus Christ, as set forth by the apostles. I see, I say, this diverse and motley crowd, and ask, Whence, and what are these? A reply informs me that they are professors of religion, who ‘got converted’ at a camp meeting or revival, and upon giving in an experience of the feelings they had felt, the sights they had seen, and the voices they had heard – by all of which they were assured their sins were forgiven – were immersed by a clergyman into the Baptist denomination’. And I advance towards them, and inquire, ‘Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world?’ ‘Of course, I do’, is the thoughtless and universal response. Is belief in the singular, remarkable, astounding facts and testimonies of the gospel so contrary to ordinary experience a matter ‘of course?’ As an intelligent Christian, you will answer ‘No!’ Yet such is the ‘matter of course faith’ of the multitude. Brother C, I would say emphatically, that since the camp meeting and revival system has been adopted by the Baptists, this is the character of their converts; and that these bear a proportion of ten to one of those who have remained faithful to the Word of God. And why is the disproportion so great? Because few converts only are made by appealing to the understandings of men, while thousands may be added to any craft by working upon the passions, as the blind guides of ‘orthodoxy’ do upon the people of this day. Now to those who object to the agitation of this subject, I say that this view of facts it is which moves me to it. For my own part, I desire to belong to a pure body of Christians, and therefore, I cannot rest without raising my voice, however weak it may be, against the corruption within, and the source of it from without. I am not to be led away by the utopian speculation of converting the world in an enlarged sense, with our feeble means; we have not yet arrived at that period; the proclamations of the ‘everlasting gospel’ will do that at the appointed time. But we live in a day of thrilling and momentous interest to every right-hearted believer: a day of preparation for the reception of the returning bridegroom. The business of our lives, therefore, ought to be, to clothe ourselves, and persuade others to do so, individually and congregationally, with the resplendent robe of righteous actions, compared to linen pure and white, in Rev xix. It is a small minority only of mankind whose taste is suited to this employment. The self-denial is too great. We must, then, purge out the old leaven from among us, by a strict and righteous discipline, and be careful how we admit persons into our communities from the Baptist denomination. A revival-made Baptist is not a Christian Baptist, in other words, a Christian; and therefore, if such characters exist among us, and they be really desirous of being on the right foundation, they ought first to become convinced of the truth, and then re-immersed.

Their own eternal weal ought to stimulate them to do so; and instead of murmuring at us for agitating the question, they ought to thank us heartily for rousing them to self-examination. I say that the horde of revival-made carnal professors, who crowd the ranks of the Baptist denomination, is the source from whence much of that corruption to be found among us, emanates. A love of novelty and change, a cheap religion, and an expectation of living, uncontrolled, according to the impulse of their instincts, are too often the inducements which operate the translations of these professors into our infant communities. They are not benefited, and we are disgraced. Others, again, will attend a 'big meeting', and there, under the exciting influence of singing, and the mellifluous voice of some oratorical adept, give in his adhesion to the reformers, with a mind as barren, a head as empty, and a heart as apathetic, as the worst enemy of the truth of this. In the absence of preaching, his religion departs. He has no taste for the worship of God and the reading of the mere word of truth; he forsakes the assembling of himself with the disciples, and, being admonished, is astonished at the liberty with a 'free man'; thus he rebels, and thus develops the genuine and native hue of his ungodly character. Woeful experience verifies this state of things. The error, I fear, lies with those who are entrusted with the instruction of the congregations. They labour more for the enlargement of the church, than for its edification. The weakness of any army consists in large undisciplined numbers; and so does the inefficiency of the church. A church with little Scripture intelligence is more injurious to a neighbourhood than its utter destitution; for ignorance generates disorder and corruption, to the serious prejudice of the best causes. This anxiety for numbers has been the bane of the church in all ages. It compromises principle, paralyses discipline, and breaks down the landmarks of the truth. We ought, then, to be as firm against the influx of corruption, as rigid in its exclusion. And, as we all admit the existence of vast numbers of immersed fanatics in the Baptist denomination, we ought to be rigidly averse to their admission without an intelligent induction into Christ, by a re-immersion in water, upon a belief of the truth. I do not contend that this would exclude all corruption, but it would go far to exclude a great deal, and that, too, on the most scriptural grounds.

"Again, it is objected that my broad assertion, that 999 out of 1000 of the Baptists ought to be re-immersed, is unfounded in fact, and owing to a want of acquaintance with them. To this I would reply, that no individual man's acquaintance with them can disprove the position. What is the value of one, two, or twenty men's knowledge of a sect of 500,000 people? To become acquainted with a denomination, we must study it in the mass. We must observe their public acts and monuments, familiarise ourselves with the writings of their recognised scribes, and compare their proceedings with the New Testament. As to the specific numbers above-mentioned, I use them indefinitely, to convey the idea of the disproportion now existing between revival-made Baptists and the Christians of the denomination. In Scripture, nothing is more common than this mode of speech, namely, to put an indefinite for a great number; for example, the concourse in the Revelation which no man could number. My remark concerning the numerical disproportion applies to the Baptists now, that is, since the prevalence of the revival, camp-meeting, and anxious-bench system among them, which has deluged them with a most incongruous horde of religionists. That there are many intelligent, worthy, and excellent people belonging to the sect, who disapprove, nay, are disgusted at the bedlamitish proceedings now sanctioned by authority, there can be no doubt; but these, at this day, constitute the minority, a minority so small that its voice is but a whisper, inaudible to the 'Rev Divines' who are the fiddles of

the religious-mad frolics of the times. I say, then, that whatever the Baptists were twenty-five years ago, matters not as regards the present controversy. We have to do with our generation; and he who avers that the Baptists were twenty-five years ago, matters not as regards the present controversy. We have to do with our generation; and he who avers that the Baptists made by the popular measures of the day are Christians, in my opinion knows nothing at all about the way in which they were made by the apostles of Jesus Christ, and had better look to his own state, for if his foundation be no more apostolic than theirs, he will never attain to the resurrection of the justified.

“Again, difficulties have arisen in the minds of some, as to the administrator. They misunderstand me as contending for a re-immersion where the administrator turns out to be a deceiver, false brother, or otherwise. Now, my position concerning this is as follows: namely, that no administration of a Christian institute can be acceptable to God which is enacted by a clergyman or lay person of any other congregation than that in which is to be found the Christian Ordinance of Purification for sin; that is, the Jews might just as lawfully have appointed a Moabitish Priest of Moloch to administer the Great Annual Sacrifice of the Atonement, as the Christians recognise the immersion of a Sectarist by a clergyman of the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Romanist, or any of the ‘names and denominations’ of the anti-Christian world. The sanctifying effect of baptism does not flow from the administrator, but from the blood of Jesus Christ, to which the subject has access by faith AND immersion in water, which together constitute baptism. But, on the other hand, where a denomination once Christian has abandoned practically the testimony of the apostles and prophets, and has substituted the text-weavings of a clerical head-loom; the remission of sins by a voice, feeling, or sight; the haremscarem madness of the camp, the bench, or the altar; and is ruled by clerical or denominational instead of apostolic constitutions, there – that is, wherever such practices prevail, their faith is credulity; their institutions an abomination; and their administrators, as Paul calls them, the ‘accursed’ preachers of ‘another’, and therefore diabolical ‘gospel’. Immersion by such administrators, and in such a church, I contend, is as invalid as the Jewish sacrifices after the propitiation of Messiah.

“Again, there are those who (in effect) say that immersion in water, abstractly considered, is baptism, and that as there is but one baptism, and not two, immersion ought not, therefore, to be repeated. Now, these persons profess to believe in baptism with their immersion for the remission of sins; hence, they must suppose that water washes away sins, which is, of all absurdities, the most absurd! ‘The garment spotted by the flesh’ is purified or washed white in the blood of the Lamb, not in the water abstractly regarded. Such objectors need to be taught the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, for, assuredly, they who plead thus against re-immersion, never knew the truth. Immersion is not baptism, neither is re-immersion re-baptism, if they can possibly understand the difference, which one would suppose self-evident to the merest tyro. It is the candidate’s firm assurance that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin, and that he rose again from the dead, that makes his immersion in water baptism: if he does not believe this – and he can only believe it on divine testimony contained in the Scriptures – he is, doubtless, immersed, for that is a matter of fact, but he is not baptised, for that is a matter of faith. Do not let me be misunderstood here: no one can be baptised, if he have all the faith in the universe, unless he is immersed in water; and one may be immersed and re-immersed fifty times, but if he be destitute of faith, as the thousands of the immersed fanatics of the Baptist denomination are, he is uncleansed, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted,

unsaved, and because he is unbaptised. Re-immersion, therefore, ought to be repeated in the case of such, provided always that they have that assurance of which they were destitute at their first time, and not a re-baptism, as some erroneously imagine.

“Again, there are some who admit that re-immersion is justifiable, and that, too, on Scriptural grounds; but they object to its publicity, because, say they, ‘of the cry of anabaptism, in all ages most odious and injurious to the truth, which would, on the slightest grounds, be raised against us’. Now, this objection comes from one of the most valiant and uncompromising defenders of the faith in the region round about. But let me ask my worthy friend if this be not a lapsus pennæ? He is not one of those who thinks that the prosperity of the church of Christ depends upon the multitude of its members. States intrinsically small are generally strongest – the little island of Great Britain, to wit – so is the little state or kingdom of Jesus, when well regulated, disciplined, and instructed, under the provisional economy of this age of the world, in his estimation. He knows that all the slander, all the hues and cries, all the rage of the arch-fiend and his legions, in combined attack upon this kingdom, little as it is, cannot shake it; but, on the contrary, like the trees of the forest, when shaken by the tempest, only makes it take root deeper and firmer in the earth. He knows this. Why then need he mind the ‘cry of anabaptism?’ Suppose the cry is raised against us by the ‘orthodox’, what need we mind? They did the same against our fathers of ancient times, and need we, if we contend for the truth, expect better treatment than they? The Christians of old were called ‘Atheists’ because they had no visible God, and ‘Ass-worshippers’ because a cry was raised against them that they worshipped that docile animal! But should they have set up images or forborne to ride the ass because of these ‘orthodox’ cries? Yes, they did set up images to meet the prejudices of the heathen: hence all that iconoclasm of the Romish Church. Let the ‘orthodox’ raise the hue; can any cry be ‘more odious or injurious to truth’ than that of ‘Campbellism’? The applause of ‘orthodoxy’ is treacherous. Timeo Danaos dona ferentes – I fear the Greeks bearing presents. Truth has nothing to fear but from the unscriptural practices of its friends. Save me from my friends, says she, and I’ll take care of my foes. The Christian Institution knows no secrets in its administration. It courts investigation; it claims the observance of the world. ‘What has been whispered, proclaim on the house top’. If then re-immersion is justifiable, and can be defended on scriptural grounds, it is right and expedient, therefore, to do it in the glare of day, and to make it known, far and wide, that there exists a body of people who have first purified themselves ‘by a bath of water with the Word’, who are determined, as a band of brethren, to live in absolute subordination to the precepts and examples of the New Testament alone; to vocalise on the house tops the testimony of the apostles and prophets against that grand apostacy which sits brooding, like an incubus, upon the intellect of the world; who are preparing themselves to meet the returning bridegroom; who have raised the midnight cry, ‘Behold he comes’, ‘Come out of Babylon’, for the avenger is at hand; and who are resolved to admit none among them unless they can shew scriptural pretensions to the Christian name; and, if not, unless they submit to immersion or re-immersion, upon an intelligent assurance of the truth.

“Again, another class of objectors reason thus:- ‘We are prepared to say that our opinion is, and it is but an opinion, that infants, idiots, and some Jews and Pagans, may, without either faith or baptism, be brought into the kingdom of glory, merely in consequence of the sacrifice of Christ; and, we doubt not, that many Pædo-baptists of all sects will be admitted into it. Indeed, all they who obey Jesus Christ, through faith in his blood, according to their

knowledge, we are of opinion, will be introduced into that kingdom. But when we talk of the forgiveness of sins which comes to Christians through immersion, we have no regard to any other kingdom than that of grace. We repeat it again, there are three kingdoms: the kingdom of law, the kingdom of favour, and the kingdom of glory. Each has a different constitution, different subjects, privileges, and terms of admission. And who is so blind in the Christian kingdom, as not to see that more is necessary to eternal salvation, or to admission into the everlasting kingdom, than either faith, regeneration or immersion? A man can enter into the second kingdom by being born of water and the Spirit; but he cannot enter the third and ultimate kingdom through faith, immersion, or regeneration. Hence, says the judge, Come you blessed of my Father, and inherit the kingdom of glory. Because you believed? No. Because you were immersed? No. Because you were born again by the Holy Spirit? No; but because I know your goodness, your piety, and humanity. I was hungry, and you fed me, &c'. This, I say, is the sentiment of a large class. Where they learned it from, I leave them to tell; for myself, I have never seen the like in the whole revelation of God. I shall designate them by the initials CB. Well, CB entertains this sentiment. It enables her to extend the right hand of fellowship to every sincere sectarist, and rids her profession of much unfashionable odium. Why? Because she has opened a door into heaven for those who do not choose to go her way; and thus she can get along without giving offence, and so 'doing harm'. I do not say this is CB's motive, but this is the working of the thing. Now, as infants, idiots, Jews, Pagans, and many Paidos of all sects, can get into heaven without baptism, re-immersion appears to CB unimportant, especially as the grand thing is 'to obey Jesus Christ through faith in his blood, according to a man's knowledge; hence she objects to the agitation of this question as calculated 'to do harm', ie, in plain English, to diminish the numbers of the converts to their denomination, or 'Zion', as the sects call their parties. Now, to CB I would observe, that, if I could believe her doctrine, I would give up the Scriptures as an unintelligible jargon, a misrepresentation of the character of God. It charges God with injustice; it nullifies the Sin Purifying Ordinance of the Christian Religion; and stultifies Jesus and his Apostles. To confer immortality on infants and idiots, unconscious of existence, and to deny it to the mass of intelligent adults of the world! But these inconsistencies, to give them no harsher term, come of the popular notion that immortality can be attained by other means than those appointed by God in His several dispensations. This doctrine evidently results from the hereditary immortality of the sects. If the Scriptures be true, not a single man, woman, or child, will attain to immortality, in the kingdom of glory, who does not submit to His ordinances during his life on the earth through all generations. To whom will the Judge say, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom of glory?' I reply, To his disciples, and to those who have kept his Father's laws under former dispensations. And who are his disciples? Not those who obey according to their knowledge, because if they happen to have no knowledge, there will be no obedience; but they 'who persevere in His doctrine', and 'produce much fruit' – (John viii 31, 15, 9). Now, to persevere in the doctrine of Christ, we must become his disciples; and, to do this there is no other way than to be baptized into him. The feeding the hungry, and clothing the naked, &c, will not be received as a substitute for obedience; they will be commended in the disciples, not in the disobedient. It is true we shall not be pronounced blessed on account of faith, immersion, or regeneration, nor shall we be, without them; for no one, since the apostle's days, can enter the kingdom of glory, unless through the kingdom of favour There is no by-way to glory. The road is a royal one, ie, we

must follow the King. Could the High Priest enter the Most Holy without passing through the Holy Place? Neither can we enter heaven without passing through the Church of Christ. We must believe, be immersed, persevere in well-doing, die, and be raised from the dead before we can enter the kingdom of glory. This is the true and only way: 'the straight gate and narrow way' travelled by very few. To win the prize we must start fair, and run according to the rules of the race. To be immersed first and to believe after, is the wrong start. Such a person may run according to the after-rules, but not having begun right, he will be like a thief and a robber who enters not by the gate into the sheep-fold, but climbs over the fence. CB's objection, then, has no weight, and may now be dismissed.

"Much akin to CB is another, whom I shall call AR. This worthy brother in an observation appended to a 'discourse', says, 'We are far from believing that no unbaptised persons go to heaven. All persons who obtain all the spiritual light they can, who act in accordance with all the light which they obtain, use all their ability to obey God, will, we think, go to heaven, whether they have or have not advanced so far in the divine light as to understand the New Testament doctrine concerning baptism!! From this, one would suppose it a wonderful progress in divine light to understand the doctrine of baptism, which Paul calls one of the 'first principles'. This may be called baptismal nullification, and comes of systematizing the gospel and sin, and of segregating them into six points! Another, whom I shall name BWS, says, 'If I never enjoyed Christian experience, and remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit before baptism, I have never enjoyed them at all;' and says further, that he would be 'shut up in desperation!' I would ask BWS whether he can find such a character in the New Testament, after the day of Pentecost, as an unbaptised Christian? Were any in those days pardoned persons who were not Christian men or women? And can a man have the experience of a Christian before he becomes a Christian? Then had he lived in apostolic times, he would have been joyless of Christian experience and remission; nay, even 'shut up in desperation'. This comes of the doctrine of 'obeying Jesus Christ through faith in his blood according to our knowledge'. What an anomalous obedience! What a fallacy in terms!

"1 - If unbaptised persons go to heaven, what is the use of baptism?

"2 - If a person cannot enter the kingdom of favour without remission of sins, how can he expect to enter the kingdom of glory without?

"3 - Can a person whose sins are not remitted on earth enter heaven? If so, where does the Scripture teach this? One example will suffice.

"4 - Can a man love God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, and not obey their Commandments? Now, as baptism is a very first command, can an unbaptised person be an obedient one; and if not, can he be said to love God, his professions to the contrary notwithstanding? And can a lover of God in theory, but not in practice, enter the kingdom of glory?

"5 - If baptism be God's appointment for imparting remission, as you and all intelligent Christians believe, and there be no other way of pardon for unbaptised persons, as we all admit; and if what Jesus says be true, that 'IF YOU DIE IN YOUR SINS, WHERE GOD IS YOU CANNOT COME', how comes it that some of our prominent brethren dare to teach that the unbaptised, and, therefore, unpardoned, may and do enter the kingdom of glory? I wait for a reply.

In conclusion, is there any reason or just cause of offence to anyone in the agitation of this important question? Let those who are on the right foundation be thankful, and remain so; those who are not should also be thankful that someone is disinterested and kind enough



to endeavour to arouse them from their carnal security to a sense of the false position in which they stand. I should esteem him my best friend who manifested his regard for me by shewing me the truth. If a man is an honest reformer, he will labour first to reform himself, and then his neighbours. Does reformation, or coming out of Babylon, or preparing to meet the bridegroom, consist in nothing more than changing one's place of worship, and in breaking a loaf weekly? And yet this is about the amount of reformation we see practised in many places.

"And now, brother C, I have brought to a close my views upon this matter. You and my readers can judge whether the Word of God is for or against me. I write not for applause but for truth. An eternity of weal or woe is staked upon our uprightness or demerits here. In view of this, I have not calculated on the approbation or displeasure that may accrue to me for the position I have maintained. I cannot but express my confidence that you will meet what has been said fairly in the Harbinger. You certainly owe me reparation for the unintentional misrepresentation of my practices, which you have published to the four winds of heaven. Let it not, then, remain on record, uncontradicted, that there lived in the metropolis of Virginia one who contended that the citizens of the kingdom of heaven should be re-baptized, and you will much oblige your brother, in the good hope to be revealed at the coming of our common Lord, JOHN THOMAS."

## CHAPTER 10

THE opposition to the principles advocated in these letters became bitter and general, headed up as it was by Alexander Campbell. A few were faithful. To this class belonged Albert Anderson, from whom we find a letter addressed to Alexander Campbell couched in the following terms:- "Some of our brethren appear to look upon the present time of the reformation as big with evil. May the Lord deliver His people from all from which they need to be delivered, and establish them in all in which they need to be established, for His great name's sake, Amen!

"Thanks to God our Father, that He has made our beloved brother Campbell a great means of removing much rubbish from the foundation of the prophets and the apostles; a great means of bringing our eyes to see, our hands to lay hold on, and our hearts to enjoy the true foundation. Will brother C become the means of averting our eyes, our hands, our hearts, from the beautiful, and firm, and perfect foundation? Thanks to God, that He has made brother C a great means of teaching us, in a better way, to use the armour of God! Will brother C become a means of unteaching us to use this fit, and bright, and glorious armour of God? God has made you, very dear brother, a great means of enlightening our minds on many subjects. One of them is baptism. Our attention has been called to the Book, and fixed upon it. We cannot, must not give up the Book. Let us attend to it as children of God. This lays before us the will of our Father in Heaven. To honour the Son is to honour the Father. To honour Him is to obey His word. He said to his Apostles: 'Go throughout all the world, proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation. He who shall believe and be immersed, shall be saved; but he who shall not believe shall be condemned'. Is not baptism for the remission of sins a part of the glad tidings? Let the Holy Spirit, by Peter, on the day of Pentecost, answer this question. Then, he who believes, believes the glad tidings, a part of

which is baptism for the remission of sins. God forbid that we should take anything from His word, or add to it, or change its order! He said to his apostles, 'Whose sins soever you retain, they are retained.' Now, whose sins were remitted on the day of Pentecost? And whose retained? For whom did the Lord institute baptism? For those whose sins are already remitted, or for those whose sins are not remitted? Certainly, for those whose sins are not remitted. Then, the Baptists have taught and do teach an immersion which is not the Lord's. They teach an immersion for those whose sins are already remitted, according to their own language. As they do not teach the Lord's institution of baptism, they teach a human institution, and, therefore, a vain one. 'In vain they worship me, while they teach institutions merely human.' It pleased God to give immersion connected with its design, as on the day of Pentecost. The word of God nowhere says that immersion, unconnected with its design, is acceptable to God. It appears to me, beloved brother, awfully hazardous to separate what God has joined. The Baptists have done this; therefore, to me it is sin to remain satisfied with their immersion. There appear some few exceptions among them. Some of the 'Pædobaptists' have the design of baptism, but they have not immersion. We hesitate not to baptise them. I am as much opposed as brother C to putting off Christ in order to put him on. But will not brother C join with me in urging him who never has put on Christ, to put him on?"

The Dr urges the Campbellites to be consistent with their principles, in a short and pithy article, which we subjoin.

#### RISING WITH CHRIST IN BAPTISM

How are we raised with Christ in baptism – is it by the abstract act of emergence from the water after submersion?

"No; we are raised with Christ in baptism 'through the belief of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead.'" (Col ii 12) That Jesus is the Christ can only be believed as true by a belief of the testimony of the Holy Spirit contained in the sacred Scriptures. The belief of the resurrection of the Christ depends upon the same testimony. It is necessary that that testimony be of the strongest character, for the fact is contrary to all human experience since the days of the apostles. It may be assented to as a matter of convenience, but it cannot be believed without such divine testimony, and that too confirmed by miracles. To test a person's belief of this astounding fact, it is only necessary to demand his proofs. If he cannot adduce divine testimony, that is, the testimony of the apostles and prophets, he cannot, he does not, believe it. Prophetic testimony is necessary to show that the King whom Jehovah would anoint was to suffer death as a propitiation for iniquity, and afterwards to rise from the dead; apostolic that Jesus was that Anointed King, and that he rose from the dead according to the Scriptures. There are certain axiomata, or first principles, adopted by 'Reformers', which are immutably and eternally true. First, that faith is the belief of testimony; second, that where there is no testimony there can be no faith. We say, then, let 'Reformers' be consistent; let them not fear to face the inevitable conclusions of the premises they have adopted. In this age of apostacy, men do not search the Scriptures, for the simple reason that they do not think to obtain by them eternal life. The men and women of this day are either masked or overt infidels; and, if the former, surrendering themselves, body, soul, and spirit, understanding and judgment, nay, even their eternal destinies into the hands of clerical conscience-keepers; their souls are

bartered for gain by these spiritual merchants who teach them to esteem the Scriptures as a dead letter which kills them; although they inculcate their total depravity and stony deadness, they rarely, if ever, attempt to prove the resurrection of Jesus, because, say they, 'every body knows that;' and thus they discourage the people from searching the Scriptures. Seeing that this is the fact – a fact proved by the observation of every First Day's ministrations in the temples of the antichrist, by social intercourse from day to day with 'professors of religion' – how is it possible that 'reformers' can admit the allegation, in the very teeth of their own principles, that the faith of the people is true and genuine, that is the belief of the apostolic and prophetic testimony? All Christendom, from the Pope to the gravedigger, assents to this great fact; but will 'reformers' say they believe with 'faith unfeigned?' The assent of Christendom is credulity, or faith without testimony, if I may be permitted the solecism. Our inference is this, that the vast mass of all the 'denominations', and a great majority of the Baptist sect, since the introduction of religious rioting in all its puerile, ridiculous, and anti-christian forms amongst them, which said clerical devices and inventions have superseded and silenced the testimony of God for the most part – the former, we infer, are superstitious and credulous, and the latter, although immersed, have not been raised with Christ in baptism, through the belief of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead, and are, therefore, unjustified, unreconciled, unadopted, unpardoned, not saved. The application of our inference is this, that none ought to be admitted into a community, professing to be based upon the testimony of apostles and prophets, Jesus the Christ, the foundation corner stone, unless they (having been previously to application for admission immersed-revival-made Baptists only) be re-immersed upon an intelligent confession and belief of the truth. Strange to tell, there are those who admit our premises, nay, even our inference, but from fear of the world, or of hard names, or some other imaginary evil, start with the utmost repugnance from the application."

Subsequent to this, an article by Mr Campbell, of seven pages and a half, appeared in the Millennial Harbinger, against the practice of re-immersion. On this the Dr, after introductory remarks, speaks as follows: "I may be 'illogical', 'playful upon words', 'sport with language', a 'young convert', a 'stripling in the kingdom', 'ardent', 'sanguine', &c: but with all this, the question remains untouched as to the necessity of the members of the 'BAPTIST APOSTACY' being cleansed by a bath of water in connection with the word, on their coming out of that district of Babylon. As to the tout ensemble of the article aforesaid, I am authorised by brethren within the range of my acquaintance, who have not been re-immersed, to observe that it is unsatisfactory, because calculated rather to divert the reader's attention from the point than to convince the judgment. It is as dust to the eyes: it may blind, but it cannot enlighten. For my own part, I see below the surface a something which the writer contemplates with much alarm. What the apparition may be, our brother, who deems the agitation of the subject 'inexpedient at this time, best knows. But the same premises not being before my mind that are before his, he must excuse me if I follow my darkness visible rather than his latent light.

"I would make some very brief remarks on a few particulars in this article. I do not inform my readers that those re-immersed by me and others 'were unbelievers until about the time of their re-immersion.' At the time of their first immersion, their faith, or rather assent, outstripped their evidence; and if they assented to the proposition 'I believe in Christ', they knew not why. At that time, they assented to the 'doctrine of men', which had

transmuted the gospel into 'another gospel', like to which, they have since discovered, none is to be found in the Scriptures of truth; that into a Christ, and on any assent to a gospel, they had been immersed; but having subsequently had their minds directed to the true Christ, and to the one only true gospel as announced by the apostles, by brother Campbell (and may his memory be ever held in grateful remembrance for this same thing!) they determined (and who would not?) to embrace it as far as they could. They accordingly came out of the 'Baptist Apostacy', but with 'the body of the sins of the flesh' adherent to them. Their consciences became uneasy as to their first immersion, but a few comforting remarks in the Harbinger tranquillised their fears, until the Advocate aroused them from their slumber, and induced them to bury 'the Old Man' in the watery grave of sin. This is a brief history of their journey from Babylon to Jerusalem, and of their putting off Antichrist, that they might put on Jesus as the Messiah. Notwithstanding all that has been said against it, they stand unshaken and rejoicing in the hope of immortality, to which they expect to attain by walking worthily hereafter. It is asked if the agitation of this question is for the purpose of rendering 'our cause as unpopular as possible, by making it appear to be all about water'. This is not quite ingenuous. Surely, there can be no mistake as to what we are contending about! The question should have been worded by making it appear to be all about faith. It is against the value of water we plead, unless that water be used in connection with faith in the blood of Jesus, ie a belief of the testimony of the Holy Spirit, concerning the shedding of the blood of Jesus for the remission of sins. As to the popularity of our cause, I believe if it becomes so now, it will be at the sacrifice of purity and truth; for these divine gems now are of little value in the religious world. It has always been the fate of the religion of Jesus to decline in efficiency as its name became popular. That it will be popular in a few years, there is no doubt. It will not be by our efforts though. Physical displays of Jehovah's omnipotence, by overturning the kingdoms and ushering in Messiah, called the making bare His arm, the prophets show will be the efficient cause of its ascendancy. The work before us is plainly set forth in Rev xix. It is THE PREPARATION OF THE CHURCH TO RECEIVE HER RETURNING LORD. This is too much neglected for the business of proselytising. And if our dear brother feels called to the work of converting the world, at this late period of 'the times of the Gentiles', he will allow me to use his words and say that I feel 'called to the work' of contributing my humble efforts to the conversion of those who pretend to have been 'converted', and of building up the faithful in their most holy faith. We should depend more upon the body for the increase of itself. If a church of one hundred adults were well grounded in the faith, and were to demean themselves as becometh saints, they could not fail, in ten years, to treble their numbers; but while the labours of the brethren are expended on the world, the numbers are in full retreat to the chambers of night.

"The trust, if known, digested and believed, will produce feeling; and that feeling will be chastened by its influence and duly developed in prescribed acts of devotion to God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ; and of beneficence to our neighbour, be he alien or citizen of the kingdom. I am as much for feeling, in its proper place, as our feeling brother, though perhaps, I may not be so fortunate or exuberant in its expression as he. But lest I show too much feeling in relation to these feeling insinuations, I will pass on.

"I would ask, 'Is an immersed Atheist baptized?' If he is baptised, then he is 'in Christ', ie, a Christian. Who will venture to affirm this? Then baptism is something more than immersion, or immersion is something less than baptism. What is wanting, then, to the

baptism of such a person? A belief in a Messiah? Something more than this. A belief that the shedding of blood is necessary to remission? Something more than this. A declaration that he 'believes in Jesus?' We say something more than this; for a man may affirm that he was indeed the Christ that was to come, the Son of God, in a certain sense, but nothing more, in reality, than the son of Joseph and Mary. Now, as this is contrary to Scripture evidence, it is clear that in whatever Jesus he believes, it is not the Jesus whose witnesses were the apostles. What, then, is wanting in the case? We reply a full assurance of faith that Jesus, the Nazarene, is the Christ, the Son of God, the Living One; that he died for (his blood being shed for the remission of) our sins, according to the Scriptures; that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. And this assurance must precede and not follow, to make it baptism. A man, I conceive, may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, in the Scripture sense, and that he rose from the dead, and, upon this belief, be immersed, and yet not be baptised. For, if there be 'no remission without the shedding of blood'; and seeing that so much stress is laid upon his blood by Jesus himself and his apostles, it is clear that there is one thing lacking yet, if a belief in the sin-remitting efficacy of the blood of Jesus be wanting. Well, then, belief in this is absolutely necessary to constitute an immersed person a baptized one, who has had his heart or moral faculties sprinkled from an evil conscience by 'the blood of sprinkling'.

"I must notice a sophism even in the reasoning of our logical brother. He quotes from the Advocate thus: 'If unbaptised persons can go to heaven, what is the use of baptism?' In his remarks, there are four notes of astonishment. He endeavours to show that the enquiry would, in its operation, go to abolish the Lord's Supper as useless, because we may be saved without having once eaten thereof. Now, I am tempted to put a note of astonishment after this, but 'I forbear'. Brother Campbell's interrogations are not parallel with mine. Had Jesus said, He that believes and partakes of my supper shall be saved, the answer to my enquiry would be equally applicable. He that maintains that, under this dispensation, sins are or may be remitted to the world without baptism, in effect, says that pardon is granted independent of the blood and water which are united in that institution. Now, if this be so, 'baptism for the remission of sins' is a mere conceit, and therefore superseded.

And as to the supper, if it had been put in the place of baptism for salvation, and men had treated it as they have baptism, upon their premises, it would be a mere conceit, and, therefore, useless. And so of the other inquiries, I am afraid, my good brother's 'confidence in my good sense' will be shaken here, for I confess myself still blind to his refutation.

"Brother C says he has 'not told the half': nor have I. I shall leave the other half for another time. We will, however, that our respected brother's memory may be refreshed, and our readers informed, quote a few of the many excellent remarks\* to be found in the Christian Baptist on the subject to baptism. I take this work with the more confidence, as the publication of a revised edition, within a few months, makes it oracular as to his present views. 'To the strength of this conviction' (of pardon), 'upon their putting on Christ, is attributable the great difference in the converts of Jesus Christ, and the converts of the various creeds and sects now so numerous. There is something so impotent in an assent to

mere opinions in forming a sect, in becoming a Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian, that it makes no sensible difference in the affections towards heaven, and therefore fails to purify and elevate the heart of the proselyted'. Speaking of the true gospel and modern ones, he truly saith of the men of this age: 'Indeed, few profess to believe the same gospel. Many of the preachers repudiate the forgiveness of sins through the obedience of faith in immersion. They ridicule it; they nickname it, like Mr Brantly, 'baptismal regeneration;' they hold it up to derision. How, then, can those led by them experience any great felicity from that which their spiritual guides ridicule? They cannot. ? THE POPULAR IMMERSION IS NO BETTER THAN A JEWISH ABLUTION. It is a mere rite, a ceremony, an ordinance, &c. I will now assert it, and leave it for philosophers, and historians to disprove it if they can, that he who is immersed for the remission of his sins, in the full belief that he will receive remission in the act, will enjoy more of the life and joy of Christianity, and not be half so likely to apostatise, as he that is immersed for any other purpose, I care not what it be. This I have proved by observation; I was going to say by experience, too. 'May the Lord deliver us from the ghosts and spectres of an untoward generation!' See the quotation in full, page 656. Now, reader, here brother C and I heartily shake hands and say Amen! Reader, are you the subject of this Jewish ablution? If you are, do you honestly believe that by means of this 'mere rite', you have the remission of sins? I leave you to your own reflections.

"Now, stripping the subject of all adventitious matter, it is all resolvable into this: Brother C has re-immersed and so have I, and for the same reasons. Why, then, this difference? I answer, we are at issue on the expediency of doing publicly what we agree is scriptural. He maintains that it ought to be done with all available privacy, and I that, as there are no secrets under the reign of heaven, and as truth, either in theory or practice, never suffers by publicity, that it should be freely canvassed and practised openly, for the good of all. It is a question of expediency then; and who is to be the judge of this among us? Brother C will join with me and unhesitatingly say, THE BOOK. And how is the meaning of the book to be determined? Let every man judge for himself according to the evidence in the case. The evidence of the book shines like the sun, and will dispel the darkness of the minds of all who will examine with an indifference to every name and thing but truth. But enough for to-day's fight.

"The 'stripling' has slung his stone in as good and courteous a spirit as that in which Goliath has provoked the combat. He doubts not but 'the esteem and confidence of all brethren will be greatly heightened'. All the balsam I ask for my

wounds is fair play and equal ground. Let brother Campbell, then, do me the same justice as he has done to a Waterman or a Meredith – and I am sure he will – and permit me to speak for myself to his more numerous readers, by the insertion of this in the next number of the Harbinger.

## CHAPTER 11

I

BEFORE the controversy on re-immersion had advanced to the stage reached in the last quotation, another and far more fruitful source of contention had come into operation.

Other and deeper questions had engaged the cogitations of the Dr. "The constitution of man, and of the things to which he stands related here and hereafter, as God has constituted him and them," had received his attention "primarily (as he informs us in the 3rd volume of the Advocate, p188) by the necessity he was under of replying to certain queries bearing on the topics embraced in this general design; as well as by the difficulties presenting themselves to his own mind when reading the Scriptures. Not then having arrived at conclusions, he determined to seek the aid of others." We glean the following information from the Herald of the Future Age, vol iv, p 125, as to the steps he took to obtain this aid:- "In writing to our father in London, who has been all his life an intense and laborious student of 'divinity' and college lore, we commenced to propose a few questions for his consideration, in hope that he would answer them, and thus furnish us additional matter and variety for the pages of the Advocate. One question suggested another, until the list grew to upwards of thirty. When we had finished, the thought occurred, if these questions were also published in the Advocate, they would, perhaps, elicit examination of the Scriptures; and replies, which might likewise furnish 'information' on their divers subjects. We adopted the suggestion, and copied them out forthwith. The original was mailed to England, and the copy appeared in the next number of our paper." The following are the questions which appeared in the Advocate for December 1, 1835, under the heading of

#### INFORMATION WANTED

- "1 - Is there any other difference between man and the inferior animals, than their organization, ie, does not the essential difference between them consist in their susceptibilities?
- "2 - What was the state of our first parents, in relation to eternal existence, before God said, 'Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it,' &c; ie, was it any other than a state in which they were susceptible either of mortality or immortality?
- "3 - Is man naturally and, therefore, necessarily immortal, ie, is he an 'immortal soul', because he is man; or is immortality a gift consequent upon the due observance of certain conditions proposed by God, at certain periods of the world's age?
- "4 - If the former, how can 'life and incorruptibility' be said 'to be brought to light by Jesus Christ in the gospel'?
- "5 - If the latter, can idiots, infants, pagans, and unbelievers of every grade, with Scripture propriety, be called 'immortal souls'?
- "6 - If immortality be a gift, is that gift conferred as soon as a man dies, or does he wait for it, in unconsciousness, 'till the revelation of Jesus Christ', at his second advent, when he will descend from heaven to ascend 'the throne of his father David'?
- "7 - Can any person living be said to be immortal, except by anticipation of his resurrection from the dead?
- "8 - If, as soon as the breath is out of a man's body, he be instantly translated to heaven or hell, how can he be said to be dead, and to rise again from the dead? Is a man in heaven or hell, dead and alive, at the same time? If so, where do the Scriptures teach this?
- "9 - Do the Scriptures teach that men, women, and children come from heaven and hell, when they rise from the dead; or do they not rather teach that men's mortal bodies will be

made alive, ie, re-animated by the spirit, ie, the power of God, as the body of Jesus was?

"10 – If immortality, or perennial bliss or woe, be conferred upon men as soon as they die, ie if they be even sent direct to heaven or, contrariwise, to hell, pray what is the use of the judgment, which all say is to be at the end of the world?

"11 – Is the 'second death' eternal life in torment?

"12 – If instant perennial bliss or woe has obtained through all ages, at death, consequent upon the alleged possession of an hereditary immortal principle, is not the gospel nullified, seeing that Paul says it brings life and incorruptibility to light?

"13 – Are not 'the great recompense of reward' and 'punishment' consequent on the rejection of God's proclamation, or offer of immortality, on the terms of the gospel?

"14 – If so, and if God have never made the offer of 'life and incorruptibility to Pagans, say the Chinese, will they be raised again from the dead to suffer punishment, and to be involved in a common and fierce catastrophe with those who have heard it and yet refuse to obey it?

"15 – Does not God's distribution of judgments on the nations, show that he makes a difference between those to whom His message has been sent and those to whom it has not?

"16 – Is not the term 'unjust', in the Scripture sense, limited to those who have rejected God's way of justification; as the term 'just' is confined to those who have accepted it under his several dispensations?

"17 – Does not 'the resurrection of the just and of the unjust' exclude Pagans who have never heard the messages of God, infants, idiots, and insane, ie, do not these at death fall into a state of unconsciousness, from which they will never be delivered?

"18 – When it says, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and RE-plenish the earth,' &c, does it imply that the earth was inhabited before the creation of Adam; and that the earth being without form and void, and darkness upon the face of the deep waters which pervaded it, was the result of a catastrophe, by which its former inhabitants were destroyed?

"19 – May not these inhabitants be 'the angels who kept not their first estate, but left their proper habitation, whom God has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, to the judgment of the great day' (Jude 6), 'the angels that sinned whom He spared not, but with chains of darkness, confining them in Tartarus, delivered them over to be kept for judgment (2 Peter ii 4), the angels whom Christ and the saints are to judge' (1 Cor vi 3), may not these inhabitants of a former world on earth be the demons whom God in ancient times permitted to possess man, the chief of whom is Satan\*, and who cried out, saying, 'Ah! Jesus of Nazareth, what hast thou to do with us? Art thou come to destroy us? I know who thou art, the holy one of God' (Mark I 24); and 'what hast thou to do with us, Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us BEFORE THE TIME? – (Matt viii 29)

"20 – Is not the word 'heaven', in Scripture, synonymous with dispensation, state of society divinely constituted and governed, in opposition to that composed of institutions merely human?

"21 – Does not the phrase, 'heaven and earth', signify an age in reference to its governmental and subordinate relations?

"22 – Does not the phrase, 'a new heaven and a new earth', simply import a NEW dispensation of ages, in relation to a former one which had become old?

"23 – Are not dispensation, state, age, and world, often and for the most part synonymous terms in Scripture?



“24 – Does not the solid material earth composed of hills, mountains, oceans, rocks &c, bear a similar relation to dispensation, state, age, and world, that the permanent stage of a theatre does to the shifting scenes?

“25 – Does not the Scriptures teach that three ‘heavens’, or Divinely constituted states of human society, are to obtain upon the earth; and that the third is to remain through all eternity?

“26 – Are not these three heavens, first, the kingdom of heaven, or the church of Jesus Christ; second, the millennial age; third, the eternal dispensation? Is not the first illustrated

in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists; the second in Isaiah lxxv 17-25; Ezekiel xxxviii 21-28; chaps 40-48 &c; the third in the Apocalypse, chaps 21, 22 to v5: And was it not the third heaven, or eternal age, which is also called Paradise, to which Paul was suddenly conveyed away in vision, when he heard unspeakable things?

“27 – Does not the promise made to Abraham, Gen xvii 8, confirmed by the institution of circumcision, v 9-14, - in which those who are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands by the circumcision of Jesus Christ, having been buried with him in baptism, are interested – refer to the possession of Canaan, in Asia, under the personal reign of the Messiah?

“28 – Will not the faithful of all past dispensations be put in possession of Canaan in Asia, and of the government of men of all nations, by a resurrection from the dead; and will not the faithful on the earth at the time undergo an instantaneous change from a state of mortality to one of incorruptibility; and will not all this be consequent upon the descent of Jesus to the Mount of Olives?

“29 – Is not the subject of God’s promise to Abraham synonymous with the ‘Kingdom of God and of Christ’; and is it not when Jesus enters on the possession of the land of Canaan that the apostles will sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of (the restored) Israel, that he will partake of the Passover which will be accomplished in the kingdom of God; that he will drink of the product of the vine with the apostles, new in his Father’s kingdom; that many will come from the east and west, and will be placed at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, &c.

“30 – Does not the present animal constitution of things bear the same relation to the millennial and eternal ages as a mass of bricks, stones, timbers scaffolding, mortar, &c, do to a palace about to be built, or rather being built from their materials; and may not all but the true believers, be aptly compared to the refuse or rubbish, after the palace is built, fit only to be burned, destroyed, or cast out, and trodden under foot of men?

“31 – Will not the inhabitants of paradise restored, or the eternal age, symbolised by John in the Apocalypse, as the new, not the restored, Jerusalem, be the TRUE ISRAELITISH NATION – a nation, every member of which will be an immortal, incorruptible, or spiritual, as opposed to an animal or mortal man; a nation, constituted of the descendants or children of Abraham according to the promise?

“32 – Is not restoration, and not destruction, the ultimatum of all God’s dealings in relation to man; and does not the restoration relate to the earth, which was cursed on man’s account, as well as to its inhabitants? If so, why look for heaven in some unknown, unrevealed, remote region of immensity? And cannot the hell of the wicked be scripturally discovered in the renovating and purifying flames latent in the bowels of the earth, to be brought into operation for judicial and physical purposes?

“33 – Are not ‘the court of the priests’, ‘the holy place’, and ‘the most holy place’ types of the Jewish, Christian, and millennial states of society under Divine rule?

“34 – Are not these interrogatories worthy of the investigation of all who desire to add to their faith, knowledge? Are they not calculated to stimulate us to search the Scriptures?

And if the hints contained in these questions be valid, what becomes of the popular notions of immortality, heaven, hell, baby-rhantism, circumcision by modern Jews, funeral sermons, modern psalmody, immersion into experience, obituaries, salvation of Pagans independent of the gospel, untypical sectarian churches, &c, &c; and would not their scriptural elucidation remove many obstacles at present in the way of objectors to revelation, on account of the supposed incompatibilities and incongruities?

The reception accorded to these questions was of a very unfriendly and hostile character.

The questions were construed into a declaration of the Dr’s convictions on the various points raised, and they were denounced as a new and infidel creed. Letters breathing this sentiment came from all parts of the country, and some readers at once discontinued their subscriptions to the Advocate. “We asked bread”, says the Dr, “but our contemporaries gave us a stone. Our mind was not made up on any of the questions. We wanted light. Instead, however, of some one condescending to instruct us, we were beset on every side.” The din of war began. The artillery of “the present reformation” played from the heights of Bethany. Discharges of small arms were levelled at him from divers points. Discontinuances came in from various quarters. No one ventured to touch freely and candidly on a single point or suggestion contained in them. On the contrary, they vented their ill humour. And why? Is it because it is a criminal thing to ask for information? Did Jesus brand the disciples with infamy when, in their simple ignorance, they asked questions for information? And yet we have asked many who profess to tread in his footsteps to impart to us their views in candour and honesty on certain things which have been suggested to our own mind, and instead of, in a gentlemanly and Christian-like manner, attempting to enlighten our darkness, or to direct us in the way of truth, they turn round upon us, and cry aloud earnestly, with a pretended zeal for orthodoxy, Infidel, infidel!”

The hue and cry raised against the Dr was, however most beneficial in its results. As he himself says: “Had no notice been taken of these questions, it is exceedingly probable we should have thought no more about them.” The abuse showered upon him from various quarters “failed”, he says, “in its desired effect. Instead of intimidating or putting us to silence, it only roused our determination to comprehend the subject; if wrong to get right, and when righted, to defend the right, and to overthrow the wrong or perish in the attempt.”

Much of the opposition manifested, owed its virulence to the Dr’s attitude in the controversy on re-immersion. On this point the Dr expresses himself thus in the Herald of the Future Age, vol iii p 125: “We do not say that the war began; it had commenced several months previously. The question which began the strife was, Does immersion, predicated on ignorance of the doctrine of remission impart to the subject remission of sins? Mr Campbell had already published, that ‘the popular immersion was no better than a Jewish ablution;’ and he had declared to us in a letter, that he had himself re-immersed individuals, but always upon their own application, and ‘with all attainable privacy’, because of the cry of Ana-baptism, which had always been injurious to the truth, and that there was no difference between us on this subject except as a matter of expediency.

“After such admissions as these, it was obviously impossible for Mr C to maintain

successfully his opposition to us on this ground. He had subjected himself to 'expediency'; we, however, acknowledged no such lordship; our rule being, that it is proper to advocate whatever is true. But Mr Campbell was the champion of a squad of preachers whose baptism, from their own protestations against their former co-religionists, was evidently no better than a Jewish ablution. They preached a baptism they were not themselves the subjects of; and there was no one to disturb their drowsy consciences on this matter but the editor of the Apostolic Advocate. They could not silence him by Scripture or argument, and to the time of the thirty-four questions, they had failed to affect him by clamour. Hence, these questions came as a god-send to these preachers, who preached baptism for the remission of all men's sins but their own. Our correspondent has caused us to turn our attention to the question concerning infants, Enoch, Elijah, Moses, &c. "The article thus elicited was as a spark to the ecclesiastical electricities whose combination shook the heavens with its thunder. The questions were magnified into a creed and test of fellowship; others fancied they saw in them infidelity and Atheism; some declared them to be untaught questions and speculations; and others consequently prophesied that we should be an infidel in six months! Henceforth, they said very little about re-immersion, being but too glad to find something to fasten upon by way of a foil to that. They now appealed to material prejudices, and raised a clamour about materialism, soul-sleeping, and no-soulism. This process not being sufficiently rapid, they attacked our character, and denounced us for everything villainous and unholy. All this failed in its desired effect. Instead of intimidating us and putting us to silence, it only roused our determination to comprehend the subject; if wrong, to get right; and when righted, to defend the right, maintain the right, and overthrow the wrong, or perish in the attempt. "The battle being thus forced upon us, not upon a field of our own selection, but on ground chosen by the adversary, we were involved in a discussion of minor and comparatively unimportant points, such as the destiny of infants, idiots, and pagans, the last end of the wicked, &c. These are details, or consequences, resulting from a great principle, not the principle itself. The opposition strove to keep this out of sight, and to make it appear, if possible, that what we contended for was the non-immortality of the soul, the non-resurrection of infants, idiots, and pagans, and the annihilation of the wicked, 'as the pith and marrow of the gospel!!' Here is where their hypocrisy, dishonesty, or ignorance beam forth as the meridian sun. We were long detained campaigning in the chapperal of these diminutive growths from the parent stock; nevertheless, we gradually acquired experience in the art of war; and came to understand well the character and capacity of the men with whom we had to do. Their attacks compelled us to defend points which might have been neglected. The result of the whole has been that, from being the assailed, we have become the assailant; and, without boasting, the facts show that, having driven in their outposts, their camp is now besieged, and they are put to it to prove that they are upon apostolic ground at all. This makes some exceedingly mad; others are disposed to meet the crisis calmly and dispassionately; while others seem to be dumb with astonishment at the turn which affairs have taken."

One or two correspondents, whose letters appear in the Advocate for February, 1836, treated the Dr's queries in a candid and reasonable mood. One of these, "A R Flippo, Caroline," "found many valuable considerations embraced: some of which were entirely novel to him." Nevertheless, he saw difficulties which he duly presents, viz, the cases of Enoch and Elijah, the thief on the cross, Stephen's dying words, "Spirits of just men made

perfect," &c. From the Dr's answer to these, we make the following extracts:

"The thirty-four queries were propounded as interrogatories merely, and not as things proved. But I will assume that they are true and inconfutable, and in their behalf, proceed to combat your antagonistic positions.

?First, then, as to your adopted phrase, 'the spirits of just men made perfect'. I suspect you have fallen into the common, and therefore very orthodox error, of applying this phrase to a congregation of disembodied spirits in some remote and indefinite region of immensity, called by earthlings Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, - a city to which all 'the ghosts of all defunct bodies fly'. But what is the meaning - the untheological, and therefore unsophisticated, meaning of the members of this sentence? Let us see. The spirit of a just man or person; in the Greek, to pneuma dikaiou. Is the subject of such a phrase only to be found remote from earth? Are there no justified spirits upon earth; none in the church of Christ, that we must go to some astronomical heaven in search for them? What is the significance of to pneuma? Shrevelius, in his lexicon, tells me it means spiritus meus humana; sensus animi in Latin; and Ainsworth says the spiritus is adopted into English to represent certain ideas current among us, such as 'breathing, air, wind - a smell, stench, vapour, or steam; life, spirit, soul; as sound, the human mind, or the affections thereof, such as ambition, courage, spirit, haughtiness, &c. Also when used in the singular number, a man or person.' Now which of these meanings shall we take? Oh, says orthodox theology, we will take spirit, for that comes nearest the vulgate sanctioned by the Council of Trent, and it accords with the true theological dogma of man existing without a body in the heavenly region of ghosts!! Pneuma spiritus, spirit; certainly this conveys a fund of information to the unlettered man. Spiritus means spirit, and spirit means spiritus! This is truly orthodox! But, my brother, gospel phrases must be interpreted by gospel doctrine, and not by theological dogmas. Man is spoken of in the Scriptures as 'body, soul, and spirit, the whole person.' It requires body, blood, and breath to make a whole or living man. Breath, abstracted from body and blood, is not man; blood abstracted from body and breath is not man; neither is body abstracted from blood and breath, man. When we speak of these, we say the body of a man, the blood of a man, the breath of a man; but when we find them all three combined, we speak of the individual so composed as a man. You will remember the Scripture is not given to teach language, but is so ordered as to take the language of men as it finds it; and in that language and in the common, and for the most part erroneous ideas of man to convey to men, illustratively, things unknown to them before. Hence the Holy Spirit has adopted the common lingo of the world, not because the ideas signified are correct; but because, unless he were to inspire them with an entirely new and divine language, it is the only way judged fit to communicate to them things unknown concerning the present and future state of being, called 'the world or age to come'. Well, then, God has made use of the terms body, soul, and spirit convertibly for man - living man. Hence we are told to 'Glorify God with our body', that is, with our whole person. Three thousand souls (psuchai) were added to the disciples; that is, living persons, or spiritus, spirits - see last definition of Ainsworth above. The philosophy of the use of these terms as applicable to man is founded in nature; they are adopted, as various forms of expression relatively to man, because of the absolute necessity of the things they signify to his existence. Man cannot exist without breath or spirit, blood or soul, and body, or an assemblage of organs for the development of functions, manifested by the action of air and blood upon them. The how these functions were evolved, especially those of the brain,

being inscrutable to the ancients, as to a certain extent it is to us, they infused a ghost into the cavernous si of the body, where they kept it a prisoner until liberated by the veritable kidnapper death! This is truly Pagan, Papistical, and Protestant; a real tradition of the devil. Having thus tenanted the body with a ghost or spirit, they made him president of the corporeal republic, the immortal shade of mortal substance. Thus enthroned, all mental, moral, spiritual, or intellectual operations were attributed to him; all other functions to the body. Although as a doctrine false as the source from which it emanates, it answers the purpose of human speech; and as there is the promise of a period when we shall be physically and morally perfect, the phraseology engrafted on the terms soul and spirit, will do very well to explain our moral state and attributes anterior to the momentous epoch, and during our existence under the present provisional dispensation or age.

“I perceive that you believe, that what your side of the question calls spirits of just men’ are, by the death, separated from the bodies of just men, and by some means, ‘on angels’ wings,’ perhaps, immediately wafted away to what orthodoxy calls ‘heaven’. Well, suppose we grant it, seeing that the Scripture speaks of body, soul, and spirit, and seeing that the body returns to dust, pray tell me, my dear friend, what becomes of the soul? You have provided a place for the body, and a home for the spirit, but you have left the poor soul a wanderer without a habitation in some ‘undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveller returns’. You will say perhaps, that soul and spirit are significant of the same thing. I admit that they are so used, and I claim the benefit of the admission for the term body, as equally significant of the whole man, comprehending within it the other two. Hence, where you have placed the spirit and soul, the body must be, or if you consent not to that, where fact places the body, there the spirit and soul must be at rest, till the trump of God call them forth from the grave to a new and eternal life. Now, why not be contented with the apostle’s illustration of this matter? He compares man – a whole, not one or two-thirds of a man – when deposited in the grave to a grain of wheat, or any other grain sown or planted in the earth. Turn now to 1 Cor xv and mark well his reasoning upon this beautiful analogy ‘What you sow is not made alive, or reproduced, except it first die.’ Now, in sowing, you do not sow the body that is to be produced; you do not take a sheaf of wheat under your arm, and scatter each body of wheat, comprised of root, stem, ear, and grain in the ear, over the field; no, but you sow broadcast the naked grain, previously separated from the ear. Just so is the resurrection of the dead. They are sown animal bodies, they are raised spiritual or incorruptible bodies. Permit me to inquire, Is not grain under certain conditions, resolvable into body, soul, and spirit? The body is the grain as threshed from the ear; the soul, the germ, the spirit, that which is produced by distillation. Would you call whiskey, rye? No, but is not the whiskey contained in the rye? Yes. Cut out the germ, the blood, or soul of the grain, would you call that the grain? No, deprive the grain of its spirit and germ, would you call what is left the grain? You perceive then, in order to constitute a grain of wheat, the body, the germ, and the spirit are all necessary. Well then, a perfect whiskey is perfect rye. Would you send an imperfect man – that is, the third part of a man – to heaven, where you acknowledge that no imperfection can enter? Again, Paul says, and all botanists know he is correct, that the grain will not be reproduced except it die. Will you say that the spirit and soul of the grain leave the body, and that when they rise again above the ground, a re-union of body, germ and spirit takes place, in order to produce that effect? No. Well, it is just as unscriptural, and therefore irrational, to say that a similar re-union is necessary to the resurrection of the dead. Before a corruptible animal can be made incorruptible, he must,

like a grain of wheat, first die, and having lain dead the appointed time, then, like a phoenix, if I may so say, arise out of his ashes to an unending life. What is it that causes the resurrection of the vegetable world every year? Is it not the power or spirit of God, operating by second causes which He has appointed? Assuredly. And what do you think will be the cause of the resurrection of the animal human world, when the spring time of human existence shall arrive? Do you suppose it will be caused by myriads of disembodied ghosts rushing from heaven to earth, to search each one for his old clay tenement!! Ha! Ha! my dear friend, what a Papistical conceit you have fallen upon! What a scramble will there be among the ghosts to get out of hell, purgatory and heaven, to look after their old mortalities! What a whooping of fiends, what a squalling of sprinkled babies, what a gabbling of old wives and priests, - why methinks when the gates of the Protestant and Papal shades are flung open, the road from these umbrageous regions will present to the calm, unimpassioned observer, perhaps the most vivid picture of a protracted revival that ever was witnessed on earth, either among the howling dervishes of Mahomedanism, or the equally riotous devotees of Protestant camp meetings, &c!

"I proceed to the consideration of the cases of Enoch and Elijah. The former of these was a type to the "sons of God" of the patriarchal age, and the latter to the same characters of the Mosaic, of that transformation which is to take place in relation to men. It is recorded of Enoch by Moses, that he walked with God; that is kept His ordinances and statutes as far as they were made known in that day - and he was not. for God took him. Upon this remarkable incident, Paul has the following observation: 'By faith Enoch was translated, that he might not see death, and was not found, because God had translated (or taken him away); for before his translation it was testified that he pleased God' (walking with him). For a moment, allow me to enquire what was Enoch's faith concerning? See Heb xi 5, 40. Concerning what God hath promised - a promise which must have been notorious in his day, Jude tells us that Enoch was a prophet, for says he, he prophesied saying, 'Behold the Lord comes with his myriads of holy messengers, to pass sentence on all, and to convict all the ungodly among them of all their deeds of ungodliness, which they have impiously committed; and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him' (the Lord). Jude's epistle runs chiefly on two things, namely, 'the common salvation' and certain false teachers who had crept in privily among the brethren. The common salvation is that deliverance from the grave, called also the great salvation, which is common to all who fall asleep in Christ. This constitutes the most interesting and exhilarating portion of the subject matter of the faith formerly delivered to the saints, either anterior or posterior to the resurrection of Jesus. Enoch prophesied concerning this common salvation when he declared that, 'The Lord comes with his myriads of holy messengers'. We know that this coming relates to the resurrection of the just, as well as to the passing sentence on the ungodly, because Jesus, Paul, Peter, David, Daniel &c have testified the same thing, but more circumstantially. Now this promise of salvation being the subject-matter of Enoch's strong faith, what more consistent than that Enoch should be made an illustration of his own belief to his contemporaries? This remarkable event, then, was designed to illustrate the change that would be operated upon men, and not the place to which they were to go, for of this they remained in ignorance, because the natural eye could not follow Enoch beyond a few thousand feet. The case of Enoch to the Antediluvians is similar to what that of the believers who are alive at the coming of the Lord will be in relation to the rest of the world. The true believers at that epoch, like Enoch, are not to see death. They are to be

changed, as he was, in the twinkling of an eye, and, like him, to be caught up into the air, there to remain until the plague of the hailstorm – which is to destroy great numbers of men – shall have subsided; and then they will descend, with their Sovereign Lord, and so remain for ever with him.

“The change on Elijah was similar to that on Enoch, although the attendant circumstances varied. The Scripture nowhere says that they were “taken up into the presence of God,” who, indeed, dwells “in light inaccessible, whom no man hath seen or can see.” “No man hath seen God at any time,” says Jesus: hence, neither Enoch nor Elijah, though absent from our globe, have seen God in any other way than His stupendous works display Him. Now, you will observe, that they were not Enoch’s and Elijah’s spirits that were taken to heaven, but the men themselves, and, in Elijah’s case, clothes and all – save his mantle, which fell off – went to heaven with him. The phrase, spiritual body, seems to have misled you. You seem to attach to the words the popular ideas concerning spirit. Now, a spiritual body is as substantial and material as an animal or natural body. If you would have a tangible definition of a spiritual body, allow me to refer you to the body of Jesus after his resurrection. Before this event, his body was an animal or natural body; but after he rose, the same body, having been purified by death and a re-animation, became a spiritual body. As a spiritual body, he ate fish, he travelled in company with ordinary men, was composed of flesh and bones, could be seen and handled, had the same marks or scars as the animal body, in the hands, the feet, and side; he recollected all past events, recognised his apostles, and they him, conversed in the language of men, was clothed, breathed, &c, &c. This spiritual body is also called his most glorious body, into a like form with which our humbled body will be transformed. – (Phil iii 20). All Jesus was and did as a spiritual body, we shall be and do when we enter heaven, ie, the heaven of holy writ. The word spiritual, in relation to body, is synonymous with incorruptible, glorious or splendid, powerful. This is the antithesis of the word animal. Animal, in relation to body and ‘living soul’ are the same; spiritual body and ‘vivifying spirit’ are their antithetical synonyms. The first Adam was the type of a living soul; the last Adam, after his resurrection, of a vivifying spirit; and because the faithful look for him from heaven, he is called ‘the Lord from heaven’, ‘the heavenly’. Now, Paul confirms my affirmation, ‘For’, says he, ‘as we have borne the image of the earthy (or animal Adam), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly’ (or Lord from heaven). I will here offer an opinion; you can receive it or let it alone as you please. I think that the grand essential difference between an animal and a spiritual body is this, that the primary and necessary essential ingredient of the former is the blood, but that the spiritual body is entirely free from this fluid. The blood is by physiologists termed the *pabulum vitæ*, or food of animal life. Sir Ashley Cooper, Bart, calls it ‘the storehouse of the human system’. It is, in fact, the fluid from which all the organs of the body eliminate their secretions, and by which they are stimulated and continued in functional operation. An animal body is flesh and blood, and therefore corruptible; a spiritual body, flesh and bones, and therefore incorruptible. Now, ‘flesh and blood cannot enter heaven,’ but flesh and bones cannot enter the kingdom of God; neither can corruption (into which an animal body is resolvable) inherit incorruption’ (contrary to which the kingdom of God and all that pertains to it, has no tendency). Now, to change the animal into a spiritual body is the work of a moment – Enoch and Elijah to wit. ‘We shall not all die’, says Paul. No, we who are alive when Messiah comes again will be ‘changed in the twinkling of an eye’. But we are not to anticipate those who are already dead, for ‘the dead in Christ are to rise first’, and then the living disciples

are to be changed (1 Thess iv 13-18). Yes, says Paul, 'the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible' (bodies). He does not say the spirit shall be re-embodied, but the dead who were buried shall be raised, 'for this corruptible (animal) body must put on immortality' (at the epoch).

"You enquire if Enoch and Elijah obtained immortality before the judgment, why may not all who die under gospel favour? To this I might briefly reply that God has not so appointed it. But I will explain. I use the word judgment in its popular acceptance – the truth of which I do not believe. I do so to show in striking colours that the common notion of immortality destroys the sectarian judgment. Judgment must be considered in its bearing on the righteous (or just) and on the unjust... Now, if these persons when they die go straight to heaven or direct to hell, what is the use of this judgment? Does not the notion stultify the Scripture, where it says that the time comes when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice (as Lazarus did) and "shall come forth – they that have done good shall arise to enjoy life, and they that have done evil shall arise to suffer punishment.' How can persons already in heaven be said to arise from the dead to enjoy life? Do they not enjoy life in heaven? Or how can persons already in hell, suffering torment, be said to arise to suffer punishment? Do they not suffer punishment in hell? On the contrary, is it not obvious from this passage that it is necessary to arise from the dead to enjoy life as well as to suffer punishment? My inference is that second life and second death do both begin at the first and second resurrection and not before, except in such cases as Enoch and Elijah, which are exceptions to the rule, and therefore, establish it. Ergo, it follows that an immortality of existence, beginning at the era of temporal death, is a fable unworthy of belief. Immortality is not hereditary, but the gift of God who only has it, and which He confers conditionally on mankind. The condition under all dispensations is the same, viz to believe and do, and persevere in whatever God commands. 'Our (eternal) life is hid with Christ in God; when Christ, our life, shall appear. then shall we appear with him in glory' (Col iii 4). 'David is not ascended into heaven' (Acts ii 37). Shall we get there before him? Nor had Jesus ascended when Mary saw him in the garden after his resurrection (John xx 17). Is there any revelation exempting us from the process to which Jesus was subjected? The brutes have 'souls' as well as men. You start at this, but reflect. The word soul in the Greek is psuche, and signifies the animal life. Now, is not animal life common to men and brutes? Certainly. Well, then, the soul or animal life, which Moses calls the blood, does not 'distinguish the man from the brute creation. I will tell you the grand difference. **MAN IS SUSCEPTIBLE OF IMMORTALITY CONDITIONAL ON OBEYING GOD.** The brute creation is not. Let this proposition be refuted if it can. As for Addison, let him not be mentioned for a moment in relation to topics of Christian import. He had the name of a Christian, it is true, but deserved it no more than they who conferred it when they signed him with the sign of the cross. True, the soul, or animal life, is annihilated, but not the man. A spiritual body composed of flesh and bones does not require a soul or blood. Animal life and a spiritual body are quite incompatible. The one would vitiate and destroy the other. You have heard talk of 'religion in the soul': Well, the true meaning is fanaticism in the blood. This puts me in possession of the philosophy of the word for the fanaticism of the day. Do you not know that a man is most 'religious' when he is most drunk? This is owing to the rapid circulation of his blood. The religion of the blood frenzies the brain, and enables the subject to see sights and hear voices, and feel feelings of the most remarkable kind. Reason and Scriptures have nothing to do with such religion. To fever the blood is the true secret of



getting up a revival.”

The appearance of this reply to Flippo only added fuel to the fire. Mr Campbell was bitterly chagrined that a co-worker in “the Reformation” should promulgate ideas so ultra-heterodox, and so calculated to jeopardize the rising popularity of the movement. To counteract their effect, he published an article, in conversational form, entitled “Conversation at Thomas Goodall’s”. In this conversation the Dr’s articles on the mortality of man were freely canvassed. A Mr Wickliffe (supposed to represent Mr Campbell) acting the part of the Dr’s confuter, and a Mr Payne undertaking to explain the views to be confuted – a duty for which his part in the conversation shewed him to be unqualified. Catching up the idea, the Dr, by way of reply, published a

#### DIALOGUE BETWEEN THREE FRIENDS ON MEN AND THINGS

(from which the following are extracts:)

Alethes – My absence has been indeed long; but as for tidings, I have none of importance to communicate. I thank you for the pleasure you express at seeing me again. I reciprocate your kindness, and trust that the blessing of God will rest upon you, and upon all the faithful followers of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Phil – I thank you, Alethes. – Pray what is that you hold in your hand?

Alethes – It is the April number of the Harbinger, which I have just obtained from the Post Office.

Philo – Does it contain anything of interest?

Alethes – Yes, indeed; the Editor, you know, is always worthy of being read.

Philo – Read the table of contents, if you please. [Alethes reads]. There, friend Alethes, stop! Turn now to the Conversation at Thomas Goodall’s. Read it, if you please. [Alethes reads it through deliberately, and Philo pays profound attention]. Who is he whose writings seem to be the subject matter of conversation there?

Alethes – Mr Payne calls him his “English friend;” I judge, therefore, that he refers to an individual who edits a paper in Richmond. I am the more strengthened in this opinion, because I have some recollection of having heard the quotation which appears to have concussed Father Goodall’s aged nerves so violently, cited as coming from him. I know that he is from England.

Philo – Then you do not read Mr Payne’s friend’s writings?

Alethes – No; as yet I have not. But the manner in which the Harbinger has recently noticed several of his articles has excited my curiosity. I like to read both sides of a question; and to read a man’s defence of his own sentiments, which I confess the Harbinger has not enabled me to do in relation to this “shrewd gentleman’s” writings, as it calls him. I intend to take his paper, and judge for myself.

Philo – I coincide with you in this matter. The whole conversation appears to be a very one-sided view of the subject, written in a style calculated to catch the multitude. For my own part, I cannot learn the views of this half-christian, half-sceptic, as he is represented, from the Editor’s exhibition. He reminds me of the textuaries, who dislocate a sentence from its connexions, and declaim for an hour or so upon it, like men beating the air; when they are done, no more is known of the author’s meaning or views than when they began weaving their theological web. So it is with this conversation in relation to me; I am still ignorant of this “learned” and “grave preacher’s” views.

But here comes Tomaso, perhaps he can assist us in our review of this conversation at Father Goodall's.

Tomaso – Good morrow, brethren! May I enquire the subject matter of the discourse in which you seem so earnestly engaged?

Alethes – We have been commenting upon a conversation in the last number of the Harbinger. I suppose you have read it, for I know you are a reader both of it, and of the Advocate published at Richmond. Are you acquainted with their respective editors?

Tomaso – Yes, I have a personal knowledge of them both. He of the Harbinger is a very excellent man; of fascinating manners, and most esteemed by those who know him best.

Philo – Can you tell us the reason there is so much difference on many subjects between your two friends?

Tomaso – With the greatest ease in the world and no offence to either. The history of the men's lives solves the whole mystery if there be any. My friend of the Harbinger, you must know, is by birth an Irishman, and by education a Scotch Presbyterian. He was educated in a University in Scotland, the land itself of ghosts and witches, in all the mysticism of that gloomy sect. Hence he imbibed all their traditions, with which his mental constitution became thoroughly imbued. He is most accurately instructed in the "divinity" of John Owen and other mystics, and I have heard him lament the time he lost while transcribing the scholasticisms of these Rabbis. Now, what I much admire in him is, the successful effort he has made in forcing his way through so many obstacles in order that he might occupy the kingdom of heaven. He has clearly set forth to the men of this age what is the true worship of God, and what the means he has appointed for the remission of sins. These things he has clearly proven. But as he has himself remarked, I think, concerning others, "he still smells of the old cask." He has not succeeded in emancipating himself from all his popular divinity; hence every now and then, but more frequently of late, you find him standing up as the champion of human tradition, without indeed knowing it. He seems to manifest an undue sympathy with the sects of the Anti-Christian world, so that I have reason to believe he is rising in their estimation; at least, in these parts. Notwithstanding this, he is a man of great merit and devotion to the truth as far as he knows it, and therefore, deserves our unfeigned gratitude for what he has done and may yet do. As for my other friend of the Advocate, he has never been cursed (shall I say?) with the poison of theological education. His early years were spent in a private boarding school in England, and from his seventeenth to his twenty-fifth year among physic bottles, lecture rooms, and dead bodies. He knew, and he counted it his happiness to know, nothing about the writings of popular divines; nor did he ever trouble himself much about "divinity" of any kind, till about 1832, three years and a half ago, when he obeyed the gospel of our Divine Master. Since that time, he has addicted himself to the incessant study of the Scriptures. Not having had his mind perverted by human tradition, it just takes whatever impression the word may make upon it: like a blank sheet the impression of the printer's types. This is the true cause of the difference between them – the teacher of the one is the word of God alone; the teacher of the other is compounded of popular divines and the word. You need not marvel then that they come to such different conclusions.

Alethes – What is your judgment concerning this conversation at Thomas Goodall's?

Tomaso – In the general, I think that my friend of the Harbinger has not done his reputation as a reasoner justice. He has descended to gossip, instead of conversing, as a man of his superior attainments ought to have done, in an enlightened and dignified manner. He

appears to me to have written for the unthinking multitude, rather than for those who think for themselves, and who can be swayed only by Scripture reasoning. In this design, no doubt, he will succeed. Indeed, he might have saved himself the trouble of writing at all, for he has their credulous assent to begin with. My friend of the Advocate has a very unequal battle to fight, and nothing but the sheer force of truth will enable him to overcome. He has not only a powerful opponent to contend with, whose hints are laws to hundreds – (though, this must be said, it is contrary to his wish that it should be so; nevertheless, such is the fact, to a great extent, within the range of my acquaintance and that of others) - but he has the prejudices of all Christendom, Mohametdom, and Pagandom against him. The Romanist to whom the Holy Scriptures are denied by his ghostly advisers, will condemn him; the Protestant, who contends that “the Bible alone is his religion,” and yet scarcely studies a chapter in twelve months, will condemn him; the Mohammedan, who believes in the instantaneous translation of the “spirit” to paradise, will condemn him; the worshippers of wood and stone, who have a paradise of their own peculiar formation, to which their spirits immediately depart on the extinction of life, will condemn him; the poor Indian of the forest, whose spirit goes, with the velocity of lightning, to a community of warriors, and to the fair hunting fields of his elysial abode, would tomahawk him, were he to question the sudden transfer of his ghost from the prairies and wilds of earth to the country of deer in heaven; and thus he would prove to him in a summary manner that he was not only unfit to be “admitted into Christian company,” but that he was unworthy of the society of the wildest Seminole. I say, all these my friend has to contend against, and all these enlightened religionists, my excellent friend of the Harbinger has to shout “Amen” at his back! Were I a caricaturist, I would sketch a “stripling”, with a sling and stone, on the one part, and I would have a giant, with a double-edged Spanish blade, encased in iron, having a huge crusader’s lance in rest, and followed, at full charge, with a rout of Italians, Hollanders, Turks, Chinese and Indians, honourable representatives of their respective faiths. You may easily guess what sort of chance my stripling would stand.

Alethes – It is, indeed, as you say; the believers in an instantaneous translation of what they call the “immortal soul” to heaven, are, with few exceptions – your friend of Bethany, one of these, of course – the unthinking world.

Philo – The immortality of the soul! Pray, Tomaso, shew me where this is taught in the Scriptures of truth. The multitude believe it; but I never yet had much faith in the soundness of the opinions of even the majority, much less of all the world. As far as I am informed, they have never been right yet on religious faith and practice.

Tomaso – I suppose you will except Noah’s family after the flood. As to the immortality of the soul, in the popular sense of that phrase, it is nowhere taught in the Bible. It is a dogma of the Pagan philosophers, especially of Plato. It was adopted by Origen, and other corrupters of the Christian church, as a revealed truth. The notion having been previously instilled into the minds of the Pagans by their priests and philosophers, when they became nominally Christian, they found the dogma in the Catholic church in a new dress. They took it for granted that it was all true, and so perpetuated it from generation to generation, until the reformation of Popery, or rather the breaking up of Popery, in certain countries, into new and adverse forms, called in the aggregate, Protestant Sectarianism. The sects forming this new ecclesiastical system adopted this tradition of their mother Pagan-Christianism, alias Romanism: and thus we find it among us, at the present day, the almost universal belief of the Christian and anti-Christian worlds – to such an extent has the poison of Pagan

philosophy diffused itself! The doctrine of the Bible, on the contrary, is THE CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY OF MAN. This is easy to be understood by those whose minds have not been poisoned by human tradition, and who are content to learn the religion of the Holy Spirit, as He has taught it in the Word.

Alethes – Mr Payne is but a lame defender of your Richmond friend, Tomaso! He does not seem to understand the matter at all. I would advise him, as well as the rest of the company, to make themselves better acquainted with both sides of the question before they set up for critics, or presume to be so lavish of their unfledged opinions. Mr Payne says, absurdly enough, that the Advocate “distinctly affirms that soul, body, and spirit all go down to the grave, and sleep there to the resurrection.” This, I undertake to say, must be a most unfounded assertion, for, as I understand him, it is man’s inanimate material that goes to the grave; to say that he went there body, soul, and spirit, would be to affirm that men are buried alive! There are but two conditions in which a man can be in relation to this matter – either dead or alive. And this is what he seems to contend for. Am I right, Tomaso?

Tomaso – You are; and as to the rest, I must say I incline very much to the same judgment. The spirit of the family circle is to seize hold of the most vulnerable sentence, and, by an unfavourable construction, to prejudice all to whom their sentiments may come. The proper course for these good folks to have adopted would have been to let the author of the obnoxious articles speak for himself. They have plenty of room in the vehicle of their opinions. They have devoted ample space to criticise, satirise, and to hold him up to public reprobation. The least, therefore, they could have done in equity would have said nothing at all. If they proceed in the way they have begun, they will cause their hearers to judge an unrighteous judgment concerning my friend at Richmond. My motto is, let justice be done though the heavens fall.

## CHAPTER 12

The next stage in the conflict is marked by the appearance of the following in Mr Campbell’s paper: “As well might they charge us with the doctrine of Anabaptism or Materialism, because one of our brethren has avowed these sentiments. And I must be permitted to express my regret that it is so. I am sorry, truly sorry, that any one who can wield as able a pen as our brother of the A- A- will turn away from the good work of pulling down the Babel of Sectarianism and building up the temple of the Most High to any speculations. Again: “Our beloved brother Dr T- has lately given some views which I think are calculated to remove both the torment of fear and the fear of torment; for if they should not be wholly relieved from their alarm by re-immersion for the remission of sins, he has by means of opinions effectually barricaded all the avenues to the unseen world, whether by the pons asinorum, or through the air on angels wings; and can by an extra dose of heterodoxy (an old fashioned antidote for orthodoxy), make all who are nervous or uneasy sleep so sound that they shall not even dream of purgatory. But I am doubtful whether you would like church dormant any more than church patient; and in the meantime, lest I should cause you to imagine either doctrine true, and put you to sleep, or ‘torment you before the time’ by too long a letter, I will close for the present.

Again Mr Campbell tells his readers, in commenting upon an extract from the letter of ‘a man of business’, that it is ‘more worthy of being embalmed than ever was the body of an Egyptian king’. This extract is said to be composed of certain ‘apposite and practical reflections’. They are the following:- ‘I have read your conversation at Father Goodall’s, and

approve it. I am no Sadducee. I believe in both angel and spirit. I think that God is the Father of the spirits of His saints, and earth the mother of their bodies. I am therefore agreed to give to my mother earth all she can rightfully claim – namely, all that is corruptible; and having done so, I stand ready to be clothed upon with my house from heaven – namely, my spiritual body; and in the meantime, I have no idea of remaining torpid or asleep. I am contented to go to Paradise or Abraham's bosom. I am willing to be with Christ wherever he is; if in the grave, why well. But we know that he is not there; and therefore I feel a deep repugnance against being confined in the grave. If the grave has charms for any one, I can assure you it has none for me. I wish not to be reserved in chains of darkness. I wish to live, and I feel confident that while Christ lives those who trust in him shall live also. I have no idea of dying – Jesus has died for me, and therefore death has no claims upon my life."

On these, the Dr makes the following remarks:

"It will be seen from these 'obviously practical, useful, and apposite reflections', that the Harbinger represents me to its readers (without affording them an opportunity of judging for themselves, or doing me the justice of self-defence) as a heretic of the deepest dye. If I believe and teach the things insinuated against me in the foregoing documents, the brethren who edit and write for that able work, are culpable and truant to the cause of truth in fellowshipping me as their beloved brother. I am accused of Anabaptism, of Materialism, of having turned away to speculation, of having ceased from the good work of pulling down the apostacy, of forsaking the building-up of the temple of the Most High, of teaching re-immersion for the remission of sins, of barricading the avenues to the unseen world, of being a Sadducee, of affirming that the grave is the only Paradise, and I know not what else beside. I need not say to those who read the Advocate unbiassedly, or who hear me speak, that these insinuations are founded only in the distempered views of my dissentient friends. When I obeyed the gospel, I knew nothing of the 'Reformation', or the topics of conversation between it and its numerous opponents. Having been thoroughly disgusted with Sectarianism in England, I determined to maintain my independence of all religious sects in America; and in this resolution I find myself this day. Christ, and not the Reformation, is my Lord. The spirit of liberty, based upon the law of faith, is the spirit of Christ; and this Spirit all the sons of God are privileged to possess, and having it, to breathe. I claim the right of exercising this privilege, as well as my contemporaries; and I require of them that they should do to me as once they loudly required others to do to them. If I have turned away from the faith, as some of the insinuations charge me, I am amenable to the law of Christ, and to the congregation in this city. I ought not to be represented to the brethren at large as guilty until proved so; and this proof can be received only as a matter of fact, and not as matter of opinion. Having purified my soul (life) by obeying the truth, I assumed the truth as my sole instructor. By the truth, I understand the Holy Spirit speaking in the writings of the apostles and prophets. All other writings are subordinate to these. None are infallible save the Scriptures. The opinions of the world, that is of mankind, whether readers, writers, or Editors, are none of them so sacred but they may be examined and discarded or retained, as evidence may determine. For some time, I thought this was the golden attribute of the Reformation, but I must confess myself deceived. I find that liberty is granted to discuss everything under certain conditions, which, in truth, nullify the privilege, or rather right, in toto. You may discuss all topics, except some, and these are called speculative, if they happen not to have come within the range of popular view. A

thing is speculative in a bad sense when it happens to jeopardize the integrity of my opinions! You may 'prove all things', but you may not 'hold fast that which is good', unless we say so: You may have more light than all men, but not more than we! The zig-zag of our belief is to be the bound of your liberty! You may do and say what you please, only don't condemn us. This is the spurious liberty with which Christ did not make his people free; I fear it is the liberty of this reformation to a considerable extent. The treatment I have experienced from various sources, satisfies me that this is true. I once thought that the errorist was to be silenced by argument: Paul acted thus, but not so my brethren. The Harbinger seems to act as though it thought that its opinion was the authority by which all controversies among us were to be resolved; and subscribers to our periodicals who succumb to this, deign not to convince us of our error, but summarily attempt to put us down by withdrawing their subscriptions. This is the argument of force, not the force of argument. One instance of this we put on record, another occurred in which we received a letter notifying the discontinuance of twenty-seven subscribers, and assigning as the cause, the agitation of the 'sleeping question', ie, the state of the dead. Now, if I loved my subscribers' money better than what I believe to be the truth, I should be afraid even to allude to that or any other unpopular subject, lest I should lose a subscriber. Have I found the key to rule 1? Would it be of 'practical utility' to silence the Advocate? If it would, certainly the most 'obvious' way would be to do as the Harbinger is doing – prejudice the minds of its readers so that they shall be deterred from yielding it their support. This would be a short way, and save the trouble of much argumentation. But I can assure my brethren none of these things move me. The 'sleeping question', as it is called, is not disproved by the loss of twenty-seven subscribers, nor can the Advocate be silenced by authority. Our subscription is increasing; our paper is read with avidity; and if we succeed in our proposed arrangements, we shall go on more vigorously and securely than heretofore. While I regret that justice to myself and to truth requires me to speak thus of some of the brethren, it affords me pleasure to bear testimony to the free and noble spirit of liberty breathed by other brethren, who are for free inquiry on every subject relating to the destiny of man, come good come evil from the Church or world. Many of these brethren were once Baptists, and have not been re-immersed. They prefer eccentric truth to consistent error and expediency. May it be my happiness to have my lot always cast with brethren of such principle.

To say a man is a Materialist is to pronounce him as worthy of death at once in the estimation of some wise people. To give him a name that few know the meaning of, is an ingenious device to prejudice the world against him. I affirm that I have never read a single page of a book, except the Bible, on the subject called Materialism. I once assented to the traditions of men on the spirit, the soul, the state, and the destiny of the dead, simply because I was nurtured in these absurdities; but the truth has made me free, and I believe with the Apostles that the dead are truly dead, asleep, and will so remain until THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE shall call them forth from their graves to enjoy life or to suffer punishment. Is this doctrine 'calculated to remove the fear of torment'; is this 'blocking up the avenue to the unseen world', Bro Richardson?

My time is as much devoted as ever to the pulling down of Babel and to the building up of the temple of the Most High. Many can bear testimony that I labour more than any in these parts at this very work. I have neglected my own affairs to a considerable extent, since I submitted to the government of Jesus Christ, that I might attend to those very things. But I

expect no thanks from the many; my reward is reserved in heaven. God is the judge – it is not true that I am turned to speculation in a bad sense. It is the church and the world that are speculating about ghosts and airy heavens. I am endeavouring to bring them back from these serial conceits to the grave and substantial matters (materialism, if you will have it so) taught by the Holy Spirit in the Bible.”

We next learn from the Advocate that a series of articles were published in the Harbinger, by Mr Campbell, on “Materialism”, with the object of checking the influence of the Dr’s arguments, but without directly debating with the Dr. The articles attacked Dr Priestley, making only occasional reference to Dr Thomas. While these articles were in progress, we find the following editorial notice in the Advocate for November 1836.

“As the reader is already informed, I am at present much engaged in settling my family in a new abode. The setting-up of a printing establishment, in addition to this, consumes much additional time. I am therefore, prevented, for the time being, giving that attention to things published concerning me and my views, which the respect due to the writer, if not to his sayings, demands. My regard for brother Campbell, as a man and a brother, is undiminished, notwithstanding his proceedings against me. He has done and is doing himself more harm than me. The only impression his pieces have made upon my mind, is to make me indifferent to his hard speeches hereafter. I was at first a little sensitive; but sensitiveness has yielded to indifference. He has denounced me as ‘unfit for Christian society’. He can do no worse. The hardest speech hereafter is oil and balsam compared to this. If I have hurt his feelings, in self-defence, I am sorry for it, and sincerely regret it. The injury has been done unintentionally. My feelings are hurt only by the truth contained in the sayings against me. He has not hurt my feelings, though some may think his remarks severe. They may be in the estimation of our friends; but I can assure them, I am still whole, skin, wind, and limb. If they think me tortured, let them bear me witness that I bear it patiently.

“These remarks are elicited, by way of notice, by the last Harbinger. Brother C is still monstrous busy ‘wiping the escutcheons of the Reformation’. Somehow or other they seem to have become wonderfully unclean; for the wiping process seems to take a mighty long time. When he has done, they will no doubt be singularly pure from all material contamination. We shall not hereafter interrupt his labours until he has finished, when we shall inspect his work and see of what excellence it is.

“Will some king-at-arms be pleased to describe to us these heraldic devices? What are these escutcheons of the Reformation? We should like to know.”

On the same subject is a short article headed, “Matter and Manner”, appearing in the Advocate, for September 1836, reading as follows:-

“As to the matter and manner of the ten pages and a half of typography, published in the last Millennial Harbinger concerning me, I have, this month, time only to observe that never did one poor mortal more egregiously misrepresent the sentiments of another, than has Brother Campbell mine in that portion of his paper. I do not intend to insinuate that he has wilfully misrepresented me; I merely state the fact: and I take this opportunity of disclaiming his inferences, and the version he has given of my sentiments. Those who read my paper and his, well know that his version and my views themselves are not one and the same; those who read his exclusively are incapable of giving a correct judgment in the case. As to the manner in which our worthy brother has treated me, it is obvious to more than myself that it is not only unbrotherly, but unfriendly, and calculated to place me in an

odious and ridiculous light before his readers, which is an unjust and false position. Till now, we had supposed, that as far as 'this reformation' was concerned, opinions were free, and that we were free to discuss all principles to whatever religious subject they might appertain. But we discover our mistake. Bro C says No! and has assumed the unenviable office of an arbitrator as to what may and may not be discussed; as to what is taught and not taught in the word; as to what is speculative and what not. But Brother C may thank himself for all the trouble brought upon him by me and many others. He has taught us to call no man master, and has directed us to search the Scriptures independently for ourselves. He has given an impulse to our minds (and we thank him for it) which neither he, nor any other man, however superior to us in age, experience, character, learning, or renown, can control. I have always studied to treat Bro C with respect; the least return I expected was that he would use me civilly. If he has called me a stripling, I took it in good part, supposing I was so named in the spirit of good humour; and, in the same spirit, I took up the allusion, and named him the giant. The primary allusion was his, not mine. I do not wish to deprecate our brother's opposition to what we have published. It is public property, and as such he may do with it as he pleases. As opposing counsel we court the antagonism since he is opposed) of all his superior talent, (and we most readily admit his superiority); but we decidedly object to him as a judge in the case at issue. The brethren must judge

between us, and give their verdict according to the evidence as set forth in the Advocate as well as in the Millennial Harbinger. To enable his readers to do this, Bro C must cease to substitute his versions and inferences for my own connected essays. He must either (to do me justice, forbear to oppose, or concede me the same privilege (not to say right) that he has granted to aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. Our brother has devoted whole pages of his work to the republication of the speculations of a Waterman; of Brougham, a worldly philosopher; and of the abusive declamation of a Meredith and others. If I am worthy of being opposed, am I not, as a brother, worthy of equal privileges with them? Why should our brother conduct himself with more impartiality to aliens than to me, whom he recognises as a brother? Let him remember the royal precept – Do unto others as you would they should do to you. Had I attacked Bro C as he has me, I would have republished all he had said that I intended to controvert. Would Bro C like me to treat him in this respect as he has treated me? I think not. But enough for the present.”

In due time, Mr Campbell's articles completed their appearance, and then the Dr made them the subject of exhaustive replies. We make the following

#### EXTRACTS

“The close of the year has at length arrived; and, with its demise, the Harbinger has finished his work of washing, scouring and wiping the escutcheon' of 'the present reformation' from the foul stain with which the Advocate has sought to offuscate and contaminate it. The clogs are at length dissevered that 'oppressed' it, and caused its chariot wheels heavily to drive. How fair, how beautiful, how clean must 'the present reformation' appear, in the eyes of its patrons, now that its heraldic 'quarterings' stand 'in bold relief', upon an ætherial 'field', without a 'material' spec or spot. All sprite no substance, then, is the wretched motto of 'reform!' If true, so let it be; but if, perchance, hereafter it appear, that body, substance, matter, be the substratum of all God's Institutions, then, adieu to the dogmas of our friend;



God's will and way are best.

"Materialism!" So the Harbinger terms the doctrine, that he only who has the Son hath eternal life; in other words, that man is not naturally and, therefore, necessarily immortal; but, that the immortality of his life is a gift of God to that portion of the race who obey His Institutions. This is the true point at issue; a proposition which the Harbinger in all the thirty pages of typography he has appropriated to 'Materialism', has not ventured to encounter. If immortality be conditional, which the Advocate affirms, then the dogma of abstract human spirits or ghosts vanishes into air, thin air. If it be unconditional as the abstract spiritualist maintains, then eternal life and immortality or incorruptibility is not the gift of God by Jesus Christ; for abstract spiritualism maintains that man ever since his creation has possessed an immortal spirit or soul, capable of existence separately and independently of his matter or body.

"The Advocate calls upon the Harbinger to meet this intelligible proposition, or all his labour of 'wiping off the escutcheon of the present reformation' will be lost, irretrievably lost.

"But, what a singular course has the Harbinger taken in maintaining his own traditions, and in opposing the 'dogmatism' of the Advocate. How unlike his wonted cautiousness and sagacity – how unlike himself! What polemic would think of encountering an opponent before he had the subject at issue fairly and fully before him? And who would dream of confuting one heretic by arguing against the traditions of another entirely different one? And yet, such has been the unfortunate tactics of the Harbinger in combating what he terms 'materialism!' Would it be believed that so dexterous a polemic has been for many moons past practising the cuts of literary warfare against the Advocate, by attacking Dr Priestley and the materialism taught by him! The Advocate studiously avoided the consultation of the work of any author upon 'materialism', in order that what he believed on the Constitution of Man, on the external world, and on the ultimate destiny of both, might be the result of an unbiased study of the book of Revelation.\* He has affirmed this again and again; yet the Harbinger,

waywardly bent on his own policy, continued his pursuit of a phantom, as if determined to listen to nothing tending to disenchant his cerebrum of the gratifying hallucination!

"The opinion of the Advocate on a review of all the articles penned by the Harbinger on 'Materialism' is, that they have done more damage to his reputation as a defender of the faith, than all the attacks he has had to sustain from the most practised and skilful opponents in the ranks of the Apostacy. The labour of confutation will be light to the 'dogmatical' Advocate, inasmuch as the dogmata of the Harbinger, in the estimation of the discerning wayfarer, are amply sufficient to confute themselves. Instead of reasoning with the Advocate, as Paul did with the Jews, 'out of the Scriptures', he has carped at him out of the vain and speculative philosophy of Ex-Chancellor Brougham, and of the author of the 'Natural History of Enthusiasm; as if the opinion of these gigantic aliens were anything but vanity, when the conditionality or unconditionality of eternal life was the subject in debate! Look at their practice, and what are their opinions worth on the question before us? They have neither wisdom nor knowledge enough to take the first step to immortality. They are of the gods of this world, whose minds are blinded by the Master of Evil. And yet such are the aids brought into the help of the Harbinger against 'a stripling', and 'a very young man!' Mighty are the powers brought to bear against a feeble object truly! Unworthy allies of a

worthy man.

“The Advocate considers that a seriatim reply to the Harbinger is irrelevant and uncalled for. Indeed, were he to follow the advice of many friends to both parties, he would pass over the whole matter unnoticed. This he would do, but for certain considerations. Misrepresentations must be corrected, justice must be vindicated, and perversions of Scripture exposed. And this the Advocate will do, time and opportunity fitting. It is irrelevant, and would be uncalled for, were he to enter upon a defence of Priestleyism. He cannot defend the Dr, being ignorant of his doctrine, knowing neither his strong nor his weak points. The Harbinger seems to know all about the matter: he will, therefore, leave ‘the bold ghost’ of Priestley to defend his, her, or its (I know not the gender of a ghost) opinions against the Harbinger, or his abstract spirit, when they shall both meet in the doubtful ‘region prepared for abstract spirits, good or evil.’

“When the Advocate penned his first article, having allusion to the things debated, he had a controversy with no individual. The Harbinger became the voluntary champion of the human opinions he opposed. This was mighty kind; and doubtless much to the gratification of all spiritualists. Could Plato’s ghost but re-enter its mortal tenement, it would probably move a vote of thanks to the Harbinger for his able mystification. But this cannot be. However, to proceed, the Advocate neither desires nor labours to add any doctrines to ‘present reformation’. The Harbinger affirms that this is his desire – page 399, vol vii. It is a mistake. He labours for no denomination; it is for the truth as he believes it, independent of all sects or parties, he pleads, whether by writing, speaking, or acting. The party he belongs to is a church of Christ composed of but few persons, who assemble every first day of the week in a little village in Virginia, that they may worship God in spirit and in truth according to His word, and not according to the dogmas of this or that reformation or denomination. Can an advocate for the truth upon such independent principles as these, be sustained by those who profess to acknowledge no Lord but Jesus, and no sect or party but his? The experiment is making; we have yet to see.

“Well, then, the Advocate labours according to the light he has, to show to his readers what the Scriptures teach; he desires neither to add to, nor to take from the things they reveal. His labours may not please contemporary labourers, but he cannot help it. He does not wish wantonly to offend them. They labour according to their opinions of what is right; but he would observe that their opinions may be a rule for them, but not for him. The Advocate must judge for himself, and leave others to do as they please.”

“‘He’, that is, the Advocate, says the Harbinger ‘complains of my not re-publishing almost the last volume of the Apostolic Advocate in the pages of the Harbinger... This is censuring me for my kindness – for my not injuring him! I positively affirm that I was actuated by kindness and personal esteem for him, as much as by a due regard to the edification of my readers, in not transferring his speculations to my pages, and obtruding them on the attention of those who were comparatively uninterested, and never to be edified by them; and who, in my opinion, would think more of the author the less they read of his writings.’

“About the beginning of the sixteenth century, there lived a man whom the Scriptures term ‘The Man of Sin’, but whose name, on the pages of history, is recorded as Leo X. He was considered, in the estimation of his friends, as ‘superior in age, learning, character, and general attainments’, to all the world. Contemporary with him, there lived a monk, named Martin; more notorious, albeit, by the name of Luther. He was a mere ‘stripling’ and ‘a very young man’, in the Catholic life, compared to ‘His Holiness’, who is said to be the great

father of the faithful. Father Leo had a wonderful affection for his son Martin, who of all the sons of his mother, the Church, turned out to be a very naughty and unruly boy. As he grew apace, the insubordinate and rebellious Martin, had the presumption, among other things equally wicked, to deny the existence of purgatory and its pains, or as Protestants term it, an intermediate state. Father Leo, or as we would call him, Father Goodall (for he professed to be good to all), believed all these things, and pleaded for them very sincerely, by opinionative assertion, perversion of Scripture, and ecclesiastical thunders. These were all brought to bear upon poor Martin, out of 'kindness' to him, in order to save him from the pains of the purgatory he denied, and the worse ordeal of fire and faggot in reserve for all heretical sons who persist in living and dying contumacious. Father Leo invited him to Rome; but Martin refused to go. Finding that all the inducements he could offer failed in bringing him thither, he determined to proscribe him as unworthy of Christian society, being almost, if no altogether, worse than an infidel. Now, Martin had written a good many things which Father Leo thought ought not to have been written, inasmuch as he conceived them calculated to 'unsettle the minds of the brethren', who 'were comparatively uninterested and never to be edified by them.' Accordingly, out of great 'kindness and personal esteem' for Martin, as well as out of a 'due regard to the edification' of the faithful, he determined to prevent 'his speculations' being 'obtruded on their attention'; being also convinced in his own mind, that all good and orthodox Catholics 'would think more' of son Martin and himself, 'the less they read of his writings'. To this end, he prohibited the reading of his books, as the Harbinger has in effect done those of his 'dogmatical' friend, the Advocate.

'It will be remembered by the readers of the Harbinger, that in one of its replies to Mr Jones, of London, it styled the Advocate 'a chosen vessel'. Down to this period, nothing, we believe, had appeared in the Advocate which the Harbinger calls 're-baptism' and 'materialism'. It was not then his opinion that people would 'think more of the author the less they read of his writings.' Why was the Advocate at that time a 'chosen vessel?' Was it because he was thought to be the echo only of the voices that issued from Bethany, and reverberated among its hills? Has it since been discovered that man-worship is no trait in his character, and that, though he may respect a brother, he will obey none, however learned or accomplished, as a master? If this be not the reason of the change in the Harbinger's opinion, we are at a loss to conceive the cause: for the style of the Advocate is the same now as it was then. It is concluded, then, that an independent examination of truth, and a free discussion of the 'whys' and 'wherefores' of Scripture topics, if that examination and discussion transcend the bounds prescribed by the Harbinger, is displeasing to him, and, if practised, obnoxious to his ecclesiastical thunder. But, as Harry VIII said of the Pope and himself, 'Verily, he hath the wrong sow by the tether.' Be it known to the Harbinger, that if he approve not of 're-baptism' or Materialism, or any other subject, and he want to retain his well-earned reputation and influence, and he determine to oppose said topics, he must be less personal and vituperative – employ *ad captandum vulgus* policy less – and use arguments to the point more. If an angel were to argue with Satan, he would not attempt to expose his errors by calling him nicknames, as the Harbinger has the Advocate. The Advocate, as he has often said, asks no favours; he supplicates his opponents in argument for no verbal demonstrations of 'kindness and person esteem'. Let it be forgotten who the writer is; and if what he writes be ridiculous or heretical, let these properties be displayed for the benefit of the reader. But, if the

Harbinger, in designating the Advocate a chosen vessel, be admitted to have had the gift of discerning spirits, and to have spoken truly, may not the Advocate in having written so much on 're-baptism' and 'materialism' be doing the very work his 'earthen vessel' was 'chosen' to do? Let the Harbinger ponder well on this singular illustration of his own vaticination."

## **DR THOMAS: HIS LIFE & WORK**

### **Part 2**

#### **CHAPTER XVII.**

Anonymous slanders begin to circulate against the Dr.—They cause him to abandon an intended tour in Southern Va.—Afterwards makes the tour, and is cordially received everywhere—Friends beseech a reconciliation between Mr. Campbell and himself—He goes to Richmond to meet Mr. Campbell for this purpose—Hears him preaching—Talks with him three hours on a railway bridge—Afterwards letters pass between them—They have a second meeting, at Paineville—Friends propose a discussion between them—The discussion takes place, after which, there is a reconciliation—The reconciliation is short-lived.

THE alienation between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Campbell was now complete, and became aggravated by the circulation of anonymous slanders against Dr. Thomas's character. Against these the Dr. fully vindicated himself in the pages of the Advocate. It is not necessary now to specify the slanders or publish their refutation, as the death of Dr. Thomas has relegated both to a jurisdiction which mortal cannot touch. It is sufficient to refer to them as incidents of the situation, which they contributed to modify. As the result of them, the Dr. abandoned an intended tour in the southern counties of Virginia, in the early part of 1838. Their effect, however, was only short-lived.

Perceiving toward the close of the year, indications of a friendly disposition on the part of those intended to be visited, the Dr. left home on Friday, September 14th, 1838, for a visit to Louisa, Spottsylvania, Essex, King William, and Hanover. At these several places he was cordially received, and, after explanations, was exonerated from the charges which had been circulated against him in printed form by certain friends of Mr. Campbell. The tour is interesting, more particularly for what came out of it. The parties visited were friends alike of Dr. Thomas and Mr. Campbell. The effect of the Dr.'s visit was to remove prejudice from the minds of many persons, to gain several new friends for him, recover old ones, and confirm such as had not become disaffected. All of these expressed a strong desire that the differences between himself and Mr. Campbell might be terminated and friendly co-operation renewed. The Dr. expressed his concurrence in this desire. Mr. Campbell was about to visit Richmond shortly, and the brethren pressed the Dr. to go and meet him there, and have their difficulties adjusted if possible. The Dr. agreed to the desirableness of a reconciliation and consented to make the attempt to bring it about. Accordingly, he

went to Richmond, in October, 1838, at the time appointed for Mr. Campbell's visit. Arrangements had been made for Mr. Campbell to preach, and the Dr., accompanied by

several others, went to hear him, by way of breaking the ice. Mr. Campbell preached for two hours, against "Speculations and untaught questions," a phrase in these days generally applied to the subjects agitated by the Dr. In the course of his remarks, he said that Dr. Thomas was "fit only for such society as Tom Paine, Voltaire, and that herd." While the sermon was proceeding, the Dr. asked the individual who sat next him whether he should get up at the close and ask permission to reply, but received an answer to the effect that he had better not, as he was in the midst of his enemies, who might charge him with disturbing the congregation, if he took the course suggested. When the sermon was over, a gentleman came up to the Dr. and said he was not aware before that he was such an important person, as to be made the text of a two hours' discourse by so great a man as Mr. Campbell.

Another (Mr. Albert Anderson) said he was sick at heart at the course things were taking.

Before the final dispersion of the congregation, the Dr. elbowed his way to Mr. Campbell, and saluted him in the usual way, by asking him how he did. "Ah, is it you?" responded Mr. Campbell. "Yes," replied the Dr., "and I am none the worse for the dose you have given me this morning." Mr. Campbell said he was very glad. After further talk, the Dr. said to him he should be very well pleased to have a meeting with him, in some private place, where they could talk over these matters. "Very well," said Mr. Campbell; "on condition that what passes shall not be published." By which the Dr. understood him to mean that he (the Dr) should not publish in the Advocate. Having that understanding of his request, the Dr. rejoined, "Yes, provided you do not publish what passes, either." To this Mr. Campbell agreed, and a meeting was appointed to be held that afternoon, upon a railroad bridge, in the vicinity of the town.

For three hours, standing on the bridge, the two talked over the differences between them. At the close of their interview, Mr. Campbell asked the Dr. what he proposed. The Dr. replied, "I propose this, that you write upon whatever you please, and advocate whatever you please, I will do the same, and leave the public to judge: without you attacking me or me attacking you." "Oh, but," said Mr. Campbell, "that won't do; you cease to write upon these things altogether"

The Dr. replied, "If you have nothing else to propose or suggest, there can be no further understanding between us." As they were parting, Mr. Campbell said, "Well, write to me, and state what you will do." The Dr. said he had no objections, and accordingly did so, repeating in writing what he had said in conversation.

In the meantime, a committee, consisting of Dr. Johnson of Nottoway, Mr. Albert Anderson, and Mr. Doswell, of Lunenburg, waited upon Mr. Campbell to expostulate with him on the course he was pursuing toward the Dr., and to express the dissatisfaction which many of the brethren in eastern Virginia felt thereat. He replied, that God had called him, not by an audible voice, but by His providence (as he had called Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Wesley), to become supervisor of "this reformation," and that he, therefore, had a right to say who should be his co-labourers. Acting on this imaginary right, he rejected the Dr., whose stem and unswerving regard to the truth enunciated in the Scriptures, regardless of

party results, disqualified him for co-operating in the project of building up a new popular ecclesiastical system.

The Dr. was on the point of leaving Richmond, to return home, when a letter was placed in his hands from Mr. Campbell. The letter was a closely-written document of eight pages. Having read it, in the presence of the two messengers who brought it, he said he did not feel disposed to trust himself to reply under the influence of the feelings excited by its perusal, but would do so when he got home, and send the answer to Mr. Campbell, at a place forty miles beyond where he (the Dr.) lived, where he was to hold a meeting. Accordingly, on reaching home, he fulfilled his promise, and despatched a special messenger with the letter, to the place in question. Next day, the messenger returned with a verbal acknowledgment to the effect that Mr. Campbell had concluded, contrary to his original intention, to visit Paineville, eight miles from the Dr.'s residence, and would see him there.

On the day appointed, the Dr. went, and met Mr. Campbell at the house of a friend. Mr. Campbell was surrounded by many who had come from a distance to hear him. In the course of conversation, one named Coleman suggested that, instead of a discourse from Mr. Campbell, the meeting should be organized for a debate between him and the Dr., on the subject of immortality. The Dr. objected to the proposal on the ground that he had not come for debate, but to hear Mr. Campbell discourse. The proposition, however, was pressed with Mr. Campbell's consent. Ultimately, the Dr. decided to agree

to the arrangement, and make the best of it, although the encounter was necessarily an unequal one, Mr. Campbell being then a practised debater, in his fifty-fifth year, and the Dr. being only thirty-five, and but recently introduced to theological life.

At the appointed hour, they all adjourned to the meeting-house, where a large audience had assembled to hear Mr. Campbell. The change in the arrangements -was made known to them, and moderators having been chosen, the

#### DISCUSSION BETWEEN DR. THOMAS AND MR. CAMPBELL

Commenced upon three several propositions, in relation to the mortality of man, the resurrection of the dead, and the state of the wicked after their destruction. We reproduce the Dr.'s account of the debate:—

"Many brethren desired that the proposed debate might be put on record ; but brother Campbell expressly stipulated that it should not be reported. I am not at liberty, therefore, to communicate to my readers the arguments adduced pro and con. Suffice it to say, that we discussed our subject until the third day, about two o'clock. Till that time, we were still upon our first proposition, with but little prospect of agreement on either side. Nevertheless, we can both appeal with confidence to the candour of our brethren and the public, to say if ever they witnessed a debate, between two who had been years in opposition, conducted with such propriety, equanimity, and good-humour. Rarely,

we believe has it been known, that variant theological disputants have concluded their discussions with opposite conclusions, and have yet become, not only better friends than they were "before, but even brethren by a mutual recognition. Yet, such has been the consummation of our debate, to the surprise and mortification, perhaps, of those who know not the influence of the truth, and who fatten upon the feuds of this present evil age.

"About two o'clock, a recess was agreed to, that the congregation might refresh itself. During the interval, the brethren got together, and discussed among themselves the propriety of continuing the debate. They considered that there was much on both sides worthy of grave investigation, but that the points themselves, though important, ought not to be made matters of public debate and misunderstanding between brethren; who should, as they conceived, devote their time, talents, and enterprise, to a mutual co-operation in the great and highly important things upon which they were agreed; and seeing we were

as unshaken in our belief of the matters in dispute as at the beginning, and consequently no nearer agreed than when we began, that it would conduce to the harmony and good feeling of all if the debate were discontinued. Accordingly, we were requested to close the discussion that evening. We consented and agreed that, on the re-assembling of the audience, I should address them on some general topic, as long as I thought proper, and afterwards brother C. should do the same. I then read 1 John v., and brother C. the fourth and fifth chapters of the Apocalypse, from which we spoke some hour or so apiece, and then dismissed.

"During the recess, and after we had agreed to close, brother Campbell inquired of me, through certain brethren, what I had to propose by which our difficulties might be settled? In reply, I observed that I had already made proposals by letter to brother C, but that as they appeared to have failed, I was willing to leave it to the brethren to say what we ought to do; at the same time, reserving to ourselves the right of accepting, rejecting, or modifying the proposals, as we should think fit. They thought this was 'noble, and that nothing could be fairer. It was submitted to brother C., who forthwith gave in his assent.

"In pursuance of these things, the brethren met and entered upon the discussion of the matter. After much debating, which consumed about five hours, the brethren whose names are subscribed, at last came to an understanding as to what should be proposed to me, and that upon my accepting their proposition, brother C. ought to give in his adhesion. It had been urged that 'certain things in relation to' man's mortality, resurrection, and punishment, taught by me, were calculated to weaken the restraints of the Christian religion, and to excite prejudices in the minds of some against our views in general; and that, consequently, I ought to be requested to forego their formal discussion, especially as I admitted that their truth or otherwise did not affect the faith or hope of the Christian. These 'certain things,' deemed so obnoxious, inexpedient, and dangerous in their tendency, are well known by all to consist of the non-resurrection of infants, idiots, and a portion of the Pagan world, termed by me 'the third class;' and of the absolute destruction in hell, in the strictest sense, of the unjust, who shall be raised to suffer the punishment of the second

death. These 'certain things,' which flow from the unqualified mortality of man, I have taught, discussed, and do still most assuredly believe. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the belief of these items of the truth affects either the destiny of the third class or of those

who believe them; \* and as I have never hitherto discussed them, I think, unless stimulated thereto by others, my brethren, at that meeting, concluded that there would be no difficulty in obtaining my consent to hold them in abeyance for peace-sake. Besides, it had been represented that there would be a division predicated upon the propagation of these 'certain things.' But who, having a right understanding of the spirit and genius of the new institution, would dream, much less plot, the dis severance and alienation of the disciples of the 'one Lord,' upon a question as to the final destiny of an idiot, or of the unqualified destruction of 'the destroyed?' Such a thought never entered my head, nor should anything short of a surrender of principle be too great a sacrifice to prevent so 'untoward an event.' This sentiment I had over and over again expressed to the major part of the brethren who composed the meeting on Thursday night.- If, unfortunately, division be forced upon us by any, let that separation be for principle, and not for unimportant details.

These things, then, being so, brother William Stone, of Lunenburg county, embodied them in the resolution subjoined, which, upon some further discussion, were passed unanimously.

" ' We, the undersigned brethren, in free consultation met, at the house of brother John Tinsley Jeter, at Paineville, and, after frankly comparing our views, unanimously agreed upon the resolution subjoined, and submitted the same for the consideration of brethren Campbell and Thomas ; and brother Thomas agreeing to abide the same, all difficulties were adjusted, and perfect harmony and co-operation mutually agreed upon between them.

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

" ' Paineville, Amelia, Va., November 15th, 1838.

" ' Signed by—Wm. A. Stone, Thomas E. Jeter, R. H. Degernette, Thomas Arvin, James M. Jeter, John T. Jeter, Langstone Arvin, R. L. Coleman, Thomas J. Homer, James A. Watson, H. G. Hardy, James F. Price, William Arvin, jun., James W. Poindexter, James

\* On this point the Dr. afterwards altered his mind. See his " Confession and Abjuration," in a subsequent part of this work.

W. Goss, James M. Wootton, Charles May, James Chappel, J. C. Booker, Jesse Smith, Samuel S.



Henley, Cephas Slielburn, Silas Shelburn.'

"The resolution being agreed upon by the brethren, brother C. and myself were requested to appear before them. The result of their deliberations was reported to us; we acquiesced in the recommendation after a few words of mutual explanation; and having recognised our Christian fraternity, the brethren gave in their names to brother Stone, to be appended in the order affixed.

"Thus has been happily composed and, I trust, extinguished for ever, the misunderstanding which has so long subsisted between us."

The hope with which this account concludes was not destined to be realised. The breach, closed for a second time, was, after a while, re-opened as an impassable gulf, which no further direct attempt was made to bridge.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

The Dr. depressed -with the backward state of everything in Virginia—A letter from the to spy the land, before making up his mind—Sets out on a ride of 900 miles on horseback—Amid the difficulties of the way, cogitates on the power of the "letter" which had taken him from home—Comments on the popular dogma that the word of God is a "dead letter"—Occupies twenty-three days in the journey—Inspects a sublime piece of scenery, which stirs his emotions—Carries no means of defence—Is unmolested—Arrive at Illinois, is satisfied with the country, purchases nearly 300 acres of land at Longrove, and decides to remove to it.—Returns to Virginia, and winds up his affairs—At the end of five months, sets out for Illinois with his family, in a four-horse waggon—Occupies two months in the journey—Meets with an accident nearly fatal—Arrive at their destination in a storm of sleet—In due course, has a house built and commences farming—Suspension of the Advocate—Cultivates medical practice, while a man does the hard work on the farm—A fall in the price of wheat makes farming unprofitable—The Dr. finally dispenses with hired labour, and takes to working the farm himself—Ploughing, harrowing, milking cows, too hard work—Resorts to laboursaving expedients, ingenious but amusing—Finally decides to give up farming—Removes to St. Charles, to start a paper, leaving a man in charge of the farm till he should sell—Opens a printing office, which is burnt down immediately after—The office re-opened with money advanced by townspeople—Commences the publication of a weekly paper—A paper incident.

IN a few months after the Paineville discussion, the Dr. was brought unexpectedly to entertain the idea of removing to another part of the country. The backward state of affairs in Virginia—religious, social, and commercial—had depressed his mind. He had concluded, in the first instance, that it was not possible to disentangle himself from

the position, and had resolved to make the best of what could not be helped. But a relative in Illinois, in what was at that time known as the "far west," wrote to a member of the Dr.'s household, setting forth the advantages to be derived from a removal to the rising western district. The Dr. was so impressed with the notion that his situation was next to

inextricable, that upwards of a week passed before he would read the letter, supposing that it might unsettle him, and so make him restless, without the possibility of being able to gratify his new desires. At length, however, after much persuasion, he perused its contents. The result was to awaken new ideas. He compared the flourishing north-west, rapidly advancing in population and improvement, with the deteriorating and retrograding countries of the south. He began to converse about Illinois with pleasure. His eyes were opened. He, however, did not come to a decision without a thorough consideration of the matter. He determined to go and see for himself. He thought it possible that the account of things in Illinois might be overdrawn, from a desire on the part of the writer to get friends out there, and he accordingly decided to go and spy the land before breaking up his farm in Amelia and moving his family. But going to spy the land was no light matter. The distance was 900 miles, and there were no railways. The journey had to be performed on horseback.

Having put his affairs in order, he set out on the third of April, 1839. The way was toilsome, but the prospect stimulated him to endurance. His friend's word by post had not been a "dead letter" in its effects upon his mind, upon reference to which, he makes these characteristic remarks in the Advocate, vol. v. p. 425 : "In travelling, from day to day. I often thought how absurd and impious was the dogma of antichrist, that the word of God is a dead letter. Here, thought I, when picking my way among the mud holes of the black swamp in Ohio, and into which my horse would plunge breast deep, here am I, a living illustration of its mendacity. Why am I toiling, day after day, over mountains, through swamps and the newly-opened wilderness, existing upon everlasting eggs and bacon, half-baked dough, and home-made coffee? What power has moved me to exchange for these labours and hoosier dainties, the ease, tranquillity, and comfort of home? What, but the word of man? Can his word, then, excite to these things, for a few brief enjoyments, and cannot the word of God excite His creatures to encounter the difficulties of the way of righteousness, that they may attain to glory, honour, incorruptibility, and eternal life; a prize incalculably more

estimable than the possession of all Illinois, or the celestial universe for a temporal estate ? I concluded that such traditionists were either cracked, bewitched, or both."

The Dr.'s route lay by Liberty, Fincastle, the Sweet Springs, the White Sulphur Springs, Lewisburg, Charleston, &c, to the Ohio river, by Point Pleasant. From Gallipolis, in Ohio, he travelled to Chillicothe, and thence to Springfield, about seven miles from which he halted at the house of a friend. After leaving Springfield, he passed through Urbanna, Sydney, and Fort St. Mary, in Ohio; Fort Wayne, Goshen, Mishawaka, South Bend, and Michigan City, in Indiana; and Chicago, Illinois, which, at that time, contained but 6000 inhabitants. South by west of Chicago, he crossed a prairie of nine miles, to Widow Berry's Point, whence he travelled westward through the region watered by the Du Page and Fox rivers, where he spent three weeks inspecting the country.

He occupied twenty-three days in the journey. His object in performing it on horseback was that he might see the country through which he passed; for the Dr. was a great observer, and possessed an extraordinary taste for the sublime in nature. To gratify this taste, he made it in his way to visit the Hawk's Nest, as it is called, a kind of immense gorge, fifty-four miles from Lewisburg. The spectator stands on the verge of a precipice, 700 feet above the

bed of a river, which runs in the depths below. On the other side of the river, is a mountain whose base it washes in its onward course, and on either bank are spurs of the Gauley mountain. On viewing this magnificent specimen of the Creator's handiwork, the Dr.'s eyes filled with tears, which trickled down his cheeks, while, with profound veneration, he exclaimed, u Great and wonderful are Thy works, O Lord God Almighty; righteous and true are Thy ways, Thou King of saints. Who would not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy name, for Thou only art perfect?"

The Dr was unprovided with arms or other means of self-defence, but got through his long and solitary journey unmolested.

The result of his visit to the north-west was to convince him of the advantage of removing thither from Virginia. His mind on the subject he thus expresses : " Were my advice asked by friends in the south, I would say, dispose of your property to the best advantage for all concerned, and clear out to Illinois; and did the Christianity I profess allow me to desire the misfortune and the distress of my enemies, I would say, By all means, stay where you are, for compared with that country, poverty, famine, and jeopardy stare you in the face."

The Dr. on his return, passed through Juliet, across the Des Plains, Kankakee, Iroquois, and Wabash, to Lafayette, in Indiana; from thence to Indianapolis, and thence by Shelbyville and Napokon to Laurenceburg, at the embouchure of the Big Miami, and then some twenty miles along the Ohio to Cincinnati; then by Lebanon and Xenia to Springfield. At Springfield he rested a few days, and then went forward by Covington, the Natural Bridge, and Lynchburg, to Amelia, where he arrived home after an absence of nearly three months.

He proceeded to wind up his affairs, with a view to removal. The process occupied four or five months. He reached home in the beginning of July, and by the end of November, the establishment was broken up, the farm sold, and everything packed for transfer to Illinois. This transfer was formidable undertaking, as may be imagined, in days when railways had not been generally introduced. They set out on the first of December, 1839, with a waggon and four horses, and a one-horse carry-all, on a journey which it took two months to complete. During all this time, they camped in the woods at night, with the exception of a few days they spent in Ohio, where they halted to refresh themselves and their horses, and to visit some friends in Cincinnati. Shortly after they started from Cincinnati, the Dr. had a narrow escape of being killed by a gun accident. He had with him a smooth bore rifle, which he used for the purpose of shooting game on the route, to replenish the larder of the party. On the occasion referred to, his brother, in loading the rifle, had overcharged it, and when the Dr. raised it to his shoulder to fire fit some pigeons resting on a neighbouring tree, the gun burst, and a fragment of the shattered stock struck him on the face, which the next moment was black with powder and streaming with blood. His cap was on fire, his thumb was wounded, and it was discovered that a piece of something had passed through his cap three inches above his forehead. The barrel of the gun was thrown over his head, and alighted on the ground six feet behind him. For ten days after the accident, the Dr. suffered severely from its effects. Sparks of light danced before his eyes, and his hearing was entirely suspended. This was the second accident of the kind that had befallen him. The first occurred some years before, while on his way from Cincinnati to Cleveland. His

brother was about to shoot at an eagle, when the Dr., thinking his brother would be sure to miss, asked him to let him have the gun, which he did. The Dr. took the gun, and as he was creeping along toward the tree on which the eagle was perched

the trigger caught in the skirt of his coat, and the gun went off, discharging its contents upwards, past the side of his face, scorching the breast of his coat, but fortunately not inflicting any wound.

The party arrived at their destination (Longrove, thirty-three miles from Chicago), in the midst of a November storm of sleet and wind, &c. It was a dull beginning to the new enterprise. The land which the Dr. had purchased consisted of 288 acres, and had to be entered in order to obtain a title. There was nothing in the shape of a house on the land, but three or four empty oat stacks, one of which was built over and enclosed with fence rails, forming a sort of shed-shelter from the weather. On consideration, it was decided to store the goods of the party into this contrivance of agriculture and yielding to the pressure of necessity, it was resolved that some of the party should spend the night, rough as it was, under the same fragile roof. By a little arrangement of the baggage, tolerable quarters were provided for the Dr.'s brother, the man servant (half Indian, half negro), and the boy; while for the Dr. and his wife and daughter, temporary accommodation was secured at the house of an English labourer who lived in the neighbourhood.

With as little delay as possible, the Dr. proceeded with the building of a house, for the accommodation of himself and family, on the 288 acres which he had purchased. While the house was building, he lived at Naperville, a short distance from Longrove. On the completion of the new house, farming became the Dr.'s occupation. The publication of the Apostolic Advocate was suspended, and no other publication for the time took its place. The Dr. had brought with him the printing press and office material used in the production of the Advocate, but he did not find immediate use for them. Afterwards, they came to be of considerable service, and, in fact, supplied a link in his future career. Meanwhile, he devoted himself to his farm. He hired a man to do the laborious part of the work, leaving himself at liberty to attend to any medical practice that might come in his way. Things went well till a fall in wheat, from a dollar and a half to fifty cents per bushel, upset the Dr.'s calculations. This made farming by hired labour, at sixteen dollars a month and board, an unprofitable arrangement, and decided the Dr., after a little cogitation on the subject, to farm the land on shares, he providing the land, farming implements, and seed, to one who should furnish the labour and allow the Dr. half the proceeds. The partner in the concern was to have his board on condition of doing what, in that country, is called "the chores," that is, cutting wood,

drawing water, and attending to the stock. The man engaged was exceedingly disagreeable, and the Dr. was beginning to regret the new arrangement, when he was relieved of the man's presence, before the year was out, by his requesting to be released from his engagement, as he had an offer from some one else, which he considered a better one. The Dr. acceding to his wish, made up his mind to do all the work on the farm himself. Having built a barn, thirty feet by forty feet, into which the produce of the year had been stowed, he thought, everything being now under cover, he should be able to get along by himself. He

accordingly turned to and devoted himself to Wood cutting, water drawing, stock tending, ploughing, harrowing; sowing, mowing, and the general offices of farm life. These were laborious and exhausting enough for a man of the Dr.'s slender organization, but, for awhile, he persevered.. He adopted various labour-saving expedients, some of which were amusing. One of them particularly excited the merriment of passers-by. The Dr. had found it very fatiguing to walk after the harrow, over the ploughed land, and he resolved to make some arrangement by which he could ride and drag the harrow after him. He accordingly removed the upper frame of one of the waggons, and attached to the centre of the hind axle, a long pole, to which he harnessed the horses in front; he then passed the chain round the axle to the corner of the harrow, and having placed a cushion to the top of the axle, he took his seat, and raising his feet against the forepart of the contrivance, he drove along, and completed his work. The contrivance, though rather clumsy and awkward-looking, relieved the Dr. of a great deal of walking, and lightened his toil. The Dr. also found mowing a great demand upon his strength, and only managed to get through it by resting at the end of every seventh row, lying at the end, under the shadow of a haycock, until sufficiently rested to renew his labour. By this slow process, he was enabled to cut fourteen tons of hay which he housed in the barn. In addition to these labours, he had to take care of a Durham bull, five horses, two colts, and half a dozen hogs, and to milk two cows night and morning. He had never milked cows before, and he found the process exceedingly disagreeable. One of the cows was a kicking animal, a propensity which, the Dr. thinks, was doubtless aggravated by his awkward mode of performing the dairy-maid's office. He always found it necessary to tie the hind legs of this animal before beginning lacteal operations, so as to escape being knocked down if the cow should attempt any pranks. Six months of this sort of work brought the Dr. to the conclusion

that, though gentleman-farming might be very fine, the real work of farming for a livelihood was an abomination. It can hardly be conceived that, with such onerous duties, and in the absence of all help (his wife being unable, from sickness, to give him any assistance, and his daughter being too young), the Dr. had any time for literary pursuits. By way of recreation, on Sundays, he used to visit the neighbourhood, four or five miles round, and speak on the subject of what he considered Christianity; but these labours were attended with little present result.

In due season, the severe winter of the north-west arrived in all its rigours, and the Dr. resolved to leave the farm, and to engage some one to live on the land, allowing him the reaping of the crops and the use of the house and ground, for his trouble in looking after things in the Dr.'s absence, till he should succeed in selling the whole concern. This determination being known at St. Charles, a town about twenty-five miles up the Fox River, where it was desired to establish a weekly paper, to advocate the town and neighbourhood as an eligible location for emigrants, and to supply a medium for the circulation of advertisements and general , the Dr. was invited to settle there, and to set up his press and open a printing-office. Having accepted the invitation, he set out for St. Charles on Christmas Day, 1841, the country being all under snow. He started with his wife and daughter, in a sledge drawn by a pair of horses. When they had got about a mile from home, the vehicle broke down in the midst of the prairie, and they would have been in an uncomfortable plight, but for the neighbourly offices of a settler, who brought them

another sledge, and conveyed them to his house, where they remained till their own was repaired. In a day or two, they arrived at St. Charles, and made preparations for commencing their new operations. Before the first number of the projected paper was issued, however, the building in which the Dr. had opened his office, and in which were his books and medicines, as well as printing materials, caught fire and was burnt to the ground. Intelligence of the conflagration was brought to him at three o'clock in the morning. The messenger who roused him, told him the place was destroyed, with its entire contents, and wished him to come to the spot at once. The Dr. told him that, if everything was destroyed, he could do no good by coming out at that hour of the morning, and he went to bed again. When it was light, he got up and went to the place, and found it a heap of ashes. The Presbyterians rejoiced at the calamity, for they had

been greatly disturbed by the Dr.'s anti-sectarian notions. They said it was a judgment from heaven upon him for his infidel sentiments. The difficulty, however, was soon got over, by the principal proprietor of the town offering him a loan for the purchase of another office, which he accepted to the amount of 340 dollars, with which a new office was purchased, at the town of Henepin, on the Illinois river. Here the Dr. commenced the publication of the weekly paper already referred to.

About this time, a Dr. Richards, residing in the town, invited him to become President and Lecturer on Chemistry in an institution called the Franklin Medical College, which was chartered by the State of Illinois. This appointment the Dr. accepted. Dr. Richards was Lecturer on anatomy and surgery, and provided bodies for dissection through the enterprise of his pupils.- On one occasion, a body was missed from a neighbouring cemetery, and suspicion was at once fixed upon the college students. The incident created quite a sensation. The Dr., in his capacity of purveyor of , reported the circumstance in his paper, and strove to allay the excitement by remarking upon the necessity of dissection to the qualifications of surgeons, and the groundlessness of the alarm which prevailed. This was construed as identifying the paper and its Editor with the sacrilege (as it was called) which had been committed, and the Dr. became exceedingly unpopular. The excitement, however, died away, and the matter was forgotten. Some years afterwards, however, in the same town (after the Dr. had left it), on the occasion of a similar case, a mob attacked the residence of Dr. Richards, and fired into his house, wounding himself in the shoulder, and killing one of his pupils.

## CHAPTER XIX.

The Dr. disliking paper associations, gives up the paper and starts a religious monthly magazine, the Investigator—Preaches the word as lie has opportunity—Fills a vacancy in a Universalist meeting house—A Mormon preaching at the same place is opposed by the Dr.—A two days' discussion follows—The Dr. re-visits Virginia, on business—On the way, calls at Pittsburg and sees Mr. Walter Scott, who complains of Mr. Campbell—At Frederiksburg, was objected to by the Campbellites who, however, decided by a majority to hear him—Is invited by the Campbellites to various parts of East Virginia, but finds enemies multiplied—Has various offers to settle, but declines and returns westward—Calls at Louisville, where he makes up his mind to leave Illinois —The of this decision

precipitates business calamities at St. Charles—The Dr. is left penniless and in debt.

THE Dr. did not long continue in connection with the paper. He had no relish for the associations which its publication brought him in contact "with, and he readily, at a convenient opportunity, transferred the paper to a Dr. Waite, who was a Campbellite. In 1842 the Dr. commenced, and now confined himself exclusively to, a monthly magazine, styled the Investigator, which he started as the representative of the Advocate, about two and a half years after the latter had been suspended. The writer of this narrative has, unfortunately, been unable to obtain access to this publication, of which twelve numbers were issued, ten at St. Charles and two at Louisville. Concurrently with the conduct of the Investigator the Dr. gave himself to the public teaching of the word, as far as he understood it. In this, he embraced all opportunities that presented themselves. These opportunities were of frequent occurrence.

Nearly opposite the house in which the Dr. lived, on the other side of the street, stood the meeting-house of the Universalists, to whom the Dr., from his position in the town, was known. It frequently happened that their preacher was absent from home, and, in such cases, the congregation were in the habit of sending for the Dr. to occupy his place. The Dr. agreed to officiate on condition of being exempted from the preliminary worship. He did not recognise them as Christians, even on Campbellite premisses, and refused to countenance their devotional proceedings. They consented to have his services on this footing. The Dr. spoke in opposition to their principles, which consist of the belief that all men will be saved, and that there is no punishment for evil-doers beyond the present state of existence. The congregation never directly attacked his positions, but they indirectly assailed him, by inviting a Mormon elder from Chicago to visit them, and preach in their meeting-place.

This Mormon elder accepted the invitation, and made an appointment. He discoursed on the fourth of Ephesians, and preached a very orthodox Campbellite discourse, proclaiming baptism for the remission of sins; but his Mormonism leaked out in a concluding remark to the effect that baptism was not valid unless administered by an official of the true church, and that the only true church was that with which he was connected, which, he informed them, had the prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, mentioned by Paul in his text.

When he sat down, the Dr., who was present, rose and remarked that the prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers of Paul's day were able to prove their mission by divine attestation in the miracles they were enabled to perform, but that, in our day, none of the pretenders to the successorship of the apostles were able to give any proof of the validity of their professions, He remarked that, till such evidence was forthcoming, the audience that had listened to the statement of the Mormon elder, ought to withhold their credence to the high claim he had put forth in respect to the officials of the sect to which he belonged.

Next day, certain of the Universalists called on the Dr., and urged him to debate the question with the Mormon elder, who, they said, was willing and anxious to hold the discussion. The Dr. agreed to meet him, and arrangements were made for the discussion to come off, two days afterwards, in the Universalists' meetinghouse. During the short

interval, the Dr. supplied himself with a copy of the book of Mormon, by means of which he acquired a knowledge of the system to be attacked. Thus armed, he went into the debate, on behalf of the truth, against the blasphemous and ignorant assumptions of Mormonism.

The debate lasted two days, at the end of which the Mormon elder became exceedingly abusive, denouncing the Dr as an infidel, a heathen, and a devil. After this demonstration, the Dr made his final address to the audience, and declined any further dealings with his antagonist. The latter at once apologised for his vulgarity, and concluded by privately saying that he would be much obliged to " brother Thomas " if he would make a collection for him, as he was out of funds. The Dr. told the people the request that had been made to him, and remarked that, on the express understanding that he was no brother of the Mormon's, he had no objection to say that, if they were disposed to give the Mormon anything, they could do so on their own responsibility. The hat was passed round, and

the subscription returned, as expressive of the congregation's sense of the Mormon elder's services, amounted to three shillings and sixpence and an old button. The number of people present would be about 500.

At that time, Mormonism was a very important political faction, not so much on account of its numerical force (for its voters did not exceed 2000 in the total), but from the fact that the whig and democratic factions were so nearly balanced, that 2000 became of the utmost importance at an election. The consequence was, there was a good deal of political coquetting with the Mormons. The unprincipled and truckling character of the politicians disgusted the Dr. by their utter disregard of all religious principle in the matter. It became evident they would patronise any abomination to obtain a political majority. Both parties complimented the Mormon elders in the Chicago papers; but the Mormons of Nauvoo were not to be imposed upon by their flatterers, and gave it to be understood they would vote for that party which would promote their views. In the end, the democrats secured their votes, and elected Harrison. Soon after, the arms of the State apportioned to the district in which the Mormons had settled, were deposited at Nauvoo, and this enabled them to organize a show of resistance to the State Government; but the power of the Government was brought to bear and broke up their organization, compelling them to vacate the country, whence they emigrated to the Salt Lake.

The Dr. had published the tenth number of the Investigator, when demands of a pecuniary nature made it necessary for him to visit Virginia, to see after some 300 dollars that were still owing to him on the farm at Amelia. To accomplish this, he borrowed of the man who had advanced the, money for the press an additional sum of forty dollars, by which he became indebted to him to the amount of 380 dollars. Having left his affairs at St. Charles in the hands of an agent, he started with his wife and daughter on his return to Virginia, intending to come back again to St. Charles, when the money owing to him was collected. On arriving at Cincinnati, he confided his wife and daughter to the care of Major Gano, and went on to Pittsburg, in Pennsylvania.

Here he met his old friend, Mr. Walter Scott, the original founder of Campbellism; He stayed with him a day, and had a good deal of conversation with him about the troubles of the



past. Mr. Scott was then editing a paper called the Protestant Unionist, the object of which was to advocate the union of all Protestant

sects, on Campbellite principles. In speaking of Alexander Campbell, he said, "Brother Thomas, you have no idea what trouble I have had to get along with that man. He is a most unfair man. When he was publishing the Christian Baptist, I used to write letters to him on the ancient gospel and order of things, and my remarks he would take and throw into the form of essays, and, without acknowledgment, publish them over his own signature, and thus he would obtain credit to originality to which he was not entitled. I used to tell him, in talking with him upon the course he pursued towards you, that it was most unjust, and that he acted more like a man who sought your destruction than your redemption."

From Pittsburg, the Dr. went to Fredericksburg, in "Virginia, where he arrived on Sunday morning, about eleven o'clock.- Here there was a Campbellite meeting-house; he went direct to the place, and went in, and took his seat about a third of the house from the door. He instantly became an object of scrutiny and whisperings, till one, who could restrain his curiosity no longer, came up to him and asked him if his name was not Thomas? On being informed that it was, he told the Dr. he was very glad to see him, and invited him to come forward. The Dr. afterwards learnt that, though, personally known almost to the whole congregation, no one knew him again, from the change that had taken place in his features during the interval that had elapsed since he last appeared before them in the pulpit. The hard work of practical farm life, and the general exposure to which he had been subject, during his changes from place to place, had furrowed his face, and given him an appearance of age.

When it was known that Dr. Thomas was present, the question was agitated whether he should be invited to speak. Some were for, others against the proposal. One man named Parish, who afterwards went to California, to wash the gold sands for filthy lucre's sake, was particularly fervid in his opposition to the Dr. However, on a vote being taken, a majority decided that the Dr. should be invited to speak. The Dr. spoke, and the result was a division of the meeting, which, as a matter of course, was attributed to the Dr.'s evil influence.

From Fredericksburg, the Dr. went to Richmond, and met with a cordial reception at the hands of old friends. On its becoming known that he had returned, he received invitations to speak in different parts of Eastern Virginia, and placed himself at the service of all who preferred truth to mere denominational interest. In

keeping his appointments, however, the Dr. found that, things had changed in Virginia, and that his enemies had greatly multiplied. This was not encouraging, in one point of view, but it did not deter him from plainly stating what he conceived to be the teaching of the word of God. This course he continued to pursue, wherever He went, determined to "buy the truth, and sell it not" for any man's good graces. He was invited to take up his residence at Richmond, and offered the proprietorship of a farm in another county, eighty miles to the south-west of Richmond, as a "material guarantee." He also received the offer of another farm in another direction, if he would go and settle there; but his desire to maintain his

independence in all religious matters was still predominant, and he declined both offers, and left his future course open, to be determined by contingencies.

The 300 dollars, in quest of which he had come to Virginia, he found to be unattainable, the parties owing it being unable to pay, and he determined to return to Illinois. Previous to his departure, a brother, who was building a large house, said to him the house would be too large for his own immediate necessities, and that if the Dr., on any future occasion, thought of returning to Virginia, he would be welcome to both board and lodging for himself and family, in his house, for any length of time he might please to stay. The Dr. promised to take the proposal into consideration.

On his journey westward, the Dr. called at Louisville, Kentucky. Here he made up his mind to leave Illinois, and sent word to his agent to sell his farm, stock, and furniture, and send the proceeds to him at Louisville. On these instructions becoming known at Louisville, the man to whom the Dr. owed 380 dollars, levied an attachment on the farm for his money, and had it knocked down to himself for the sum owing, although it cost the Dr. 2000 dollars, or eight times the amount! The Dr. would have lost the entire property, if it had not been for a law of Illinois, to the effect that the debtor, in such a case, shall have a year to redeem the property, and if not redeemed within that time, the sale shall be recorded. The Dr. raised the sum of 400 dollars, and sent the money to his agent to redeem the farm. Upon this, a worse hitch than all occurred. The agent sold the farm for something like its value, and, having paid off the detaining creditor, absconded with the balance of the money and the 400 dollars besides. The Dr., on hearing of it, wrote at once to the bank at New York, on which the cheque for the money was drawn, instructing them not to cash

it; but he received an answer by return, to the effect that the cheque had been cashed just the day before the arrival of his letter, and that they had no further control over it. Thus the Dr. was left in the unenviable position of not possessing five dollars in the world, with a debt of 400 dollars hanging over him.

## CHAPTER XX.

The Dr.'s stay at Louisville—Preaches to the Campbellites—Holds a week's debate with a Universalist—Offers to show the Adventists they were wrong in expecting the Lord in 1843—Article written by him for the purpose on the world's age, with interesting prefatory remarks—Acts as paper editor pro tem—Writes an article on the nature and tendency of Popery, which excites public indignation—Starts the Herald of the Future Age—After the issue of a few numbers, returns to Richmond, where the Campbellites object to receive him—First organic separation of the truth from Campbellism—The Dr.'s progressing studies.

THE Dr. remained in Louisville about a year, residing alternately with the two elders of the Campbellite Church, who were his personal friends. By them, he was occasionally invited to speak in their meeting-house, with the effect of developing intrigue in the congregation to prevent it. To shut up the pulpit against him, they invited a man from Cincinnati, named Barnet, to be their hired shepherd. Just before the arrival of this Barnet, the Dr. had a

week's debate with a Universalist preacher in the Campbellite meeting-house. The audience each night consisted of about twelve hundred persons, and considerable interest was excited, but of course in the Dr.'s then state of ignorance, little or no impression was made in favour of what he subsequently advocated as the great salvation. Something, however, was done to modify the asperity otherwise existing toward himself, on account of his growing perception of the truth as he afterwards held it. Having at this time his residence with Mr. Craig, a Campbellite friend of Millerite tendencies, he was led closely to investigate the principle of that (at that time) large and increasing section of believers in the second advent. Mr. Craig took in the publications of the sect, so that the Dr. had access to them, and was thus introduced to the system of chronology drawn out by the Rev. W. Miller, the founder of the sect, and which was the basis of the prophetic calculations in currency among them. These chronological tables

were published in the principal magazine, with a note by the editor, Mr. J. V. Himes, to the effect that Mr. Miller was willing to stake the accuracy of his calculations on the conclusion that the world was 6,000 years old in 1843. This was a narrowing down of the controversy, of which it occurred to the Dr. to take advantage. He thought that if he were able to show that the world was younger than Mr. Miller's theory assumed, it would be on Mr. Miller's own admission a complete refutation of his prophetic arithmetic. The Dr. accordingly set to work and wrote an article upon the world's age, in which he showed that several important mistakes had been made by Mr. Miller. This article appears in the second and third numbers of the Herald of the Future Age, vol. i. About the same time he wrote a letter to the editor of a leading Millerite paper, which he afterwards republished in the Herald, with interesting prefatory remarks. As both will be read with interest, we reproduce them:

"It is well known that the editors of the periodicals of that section of the ecclesiastical community styled ' Millerite' (I use this term, not as a reproach, but to distinguish the party from other religious denominations) have very boldly challenged investigation into their premisses and conclusions, no doubt feeling that they were based upon the rock of eternal truth ; for it is a consciousness of this which inspires a man with a courage which knows no fear, and cannot be subdued. Taking for granted, in the present instance, that a sect had sprung up, whose principle of action was to prove all things, and to hold fast only what was good, because proved to be true, we could not find it in our heart to oppose them ; although in much we believed them to be mistaken. We therefore coincided with them where we could agree, and concluded to await the arrival of the Ides of March, 1844, as an epoch which, in the disappointment of their expectations, would do more to open their eyes, than the most laboured argument we could elaborate against their hypothesis. Nevertheless, we were in hopes that, before the time expired, as the end of this dispensation, as Mr. Miller had expounded it, we might succeed in speaking to the understandings of his fellow believers. We were glad to see them take so much interest in the second coming of Jesus Christ, in the belief of whose near approach we fully coincide with, them, though not so instantaneously as they imagine. But, we believe we could discern a very radical oversight in their policy with respect to the future age. It is well to believe in the approaching manifestation of Messiah, hut it is better to believe that, and to be prepared for him too. We perceived that a belief that he

will soon appear, accompanied by a moral (termed by some, ' a pious life,' if the morality be mixed up with an attendance on preaching, prayers, &c.) deportment, made up the preparation for his coming; which, however, by no means reaches the standard of a scriptural preparation. We determined, therefore, to open a correspondence with the Western Midnight Cry, published in Cincinnati. Accordingly we forwarded the subjoined epistle, in hope that it would prepare the way for others, in which we should have directed the attention of its readers to the purification which can be derived only from a belief and obedience of the gospel preached by the apostles, and without which the belief of the coming of Jesus, instant, however confident that belief may be, will be of no avail as a ground of acceptance with him ; for ' every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself (' by obeying the truth') even as He (the Lord) is pure.'—(1 John, iii. 3.) We mailed it to the editor, and waited patiently for two or three weeks, expecting its appearance, but it was never permitted to see the light." The following is the

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE "WESTERN MIDNIGHT CRY."

" LOUISVILLE, KY., February 13th, 1844.

"MR. EDITOR,—Your Midnight Cry, of February 10th, is before me. From it, I perceive you profess to be acting under a ' commission' to cry with, a loud voice, 'Tear God, and give glory to Him,' &c. This is a good -work. Obey the exhortation of the prophet, 'Cry aloud, and spare not' But, first, be sure you are right,' and then ' go ahead,' courting neither the smiles, nor eschewing the frowns, of this faithless and disobedient generation, "Allow me, though not ' a Millerite,' to say that the great truth, to the propagation of which your paper professes to be devoted, is the grandest, most comforting, animating, and soul-stirring in the whole Scriptures of truth. The cry, 'Behold! He cometh!' when believed, is truly terrific; but to whom? To them who are unprepared; to them whose treasure, instead of being in heaven, is vested in stocks, merchandise, lands, houses, colleges, &c, &c, and whose hearts are where their treasure is; to them ' who receive honour one of another,' and who love to be called rabbi. To such worldly minded professors as these, slaves as they are to ' the world, the flesh, and the devil,' to them, I say, the cry, ' Behold ! He cometh!' falls on their ears as the death-knell of all they esteem great and good. But to him who has obtained 'a right and title' to eternal life, the cry is as 'life from the dead.' And why? Because he knows that his 'life is hid with Christ in God; and that 'WHEN he who is our life shall appear, THEN shall we appear with him in glory:' because he knows that 'WHEN he shall appear, we shall be like him;' because he knows that an unfading crown of righteousness will be given to him at his appearing. Yes, the cry 'Behold! He cometh!' is as life

from the dead to the "believers, because the day of his coming is the day of the -world's redemption from the tyranny of unrighteousness in church and world; and the grand era when all the obedient ' in Christ' will put on incorruptibility and life ; when they will' be crowned with glory and honour,' as the reward of a 'patient continuance in well-doing.'

"Though I differ with Mr. Miller in some of his conclusions, I sympathise with him, because he is traduced and misrepresented. I believe he is both candid and honest; which is more, I think, than can be said of some of his opponents with whom I am acquainted. If ever so

much mistaken, he deserves much credit for having aroused the attention of so many of this truly, infidel generation of religionists to the study of the holy prophets. I have read both sides to a sufficient extent to be enabled to judge without prejudice; and I am perfectly satisfied that his main arguments are untouched by his opponents. No man who has any regard for his reputation for rationality and intelligence ought to deny that the Seventy "Weeks are a part of the vision of 2300 days. This can be proved beyond a doubt, independently of all Greek and Hebrew. They must, therefore, have a common origin; and, therefore, the 2300 days must end in 1843, though it can be by no means proved that, because they end in that year, the world will, therefore, come to an end with them. This, however, by the way.

"I would call your attention, further, to this; namely, that the data of Mr. Josiah Litch's calculations are fallacious with respect to the Ottoman Power. He argues that 'the hour, the day, the month, and the year,' for which they were prepared 'to slay the third part of men,' were expended August 11, 1840. But the massacre of the Nestorians to the number of 50,000, in 1843, sufficiently refutes this. The 391 years and thirty days ought certainly to be calculated from the political death of the Greco-Roman Empire, which took place as signally by the capture of Constantinople, the Capital, and the death of Constantine XV., the last of the emperors, as did that of the Mosaic Kingdom, by the destruction of Jerusalem; or that of the Western Roman Empire by the dethronement of Augustulus and the capture of Old Rome by the Goths. I contend, therefore, that, the 391 years and thirty days should be calculated from May 29th, A.D. 1453, which will cause them to end June 29th, 1844, which is only three months and eight days after the supposed termination of the 2300 years in March, though some say June. The time is near, so that you will soon be able to verify or confute this calculation by the facts in the case. But I affirm that, after June next, you may expect to hear of political movements, on the part of the Great Powers, in connection with the Porte and its sovereignty over the Sanctuary or Holy. This, in the journals of Europe, is styled THE EASTERN QUESTION; and by Sir Robert Peel, (the Question of questions;' and well he may say so, for upon the turn this may take rests the destiny of the British power in India, and consequently the fate of the Jews and of the world at large.

"On the first column of page 66, you have given us a new translation and paraphrase, by Dr. Hales, of Daniel ix. 27. How can the abomination of desolation be said to stand on the pinnacle or battlement of the temple, until the consummation of the 2300 days, seeing that the temple has been

non-existent for the last 1774 years of that period? This translation is condemned, when tried in the court of common-sense, by the facts in the case. The original, without the points, is ' uol caneph, shiutzim meshimem trod cede; unecliaretze tathac ol sukmem,' which is literally rendered, 'and unto the extremity, abominations of desolation, even until the accomplishment; and, then the decreed shall be poured out upon the desolator.' The word 'caneph,' which Dr. Hales has rendered 'pinnacle,' 'denotes,' says Parkhurst, 'extremity, outermost, or farthest from the middle.' Now, the prophecy is speaking of the invasion of the Holy Land, and destruction of the Holy City and sanctuary, or temple; hence, the context sustains the version I have given, that the desolation would spread over the land, to the extremity, or ' farthest from the middle,' or metropolis, which is the mother

city, and generally situated as near the middle of the country as circumstances will allow. Again, 'shi kutzim,' which he has made singular, is plural, and should be rendered 'abominations.' Hence, you will perceive that it was not one abomination of desolation that was to pervade the Holy Land to the end of the vision of 2300 days, but a plurality, which accords with the history of the case. Thus, there were the Pagan-Roman Abomination of Desolation; the Greco-Catholic Abomination; the Saracenic Abomination, the Latin Catholic, or Papal, Abomination, during the Crusades and Kingdom of Jerusalem; the Mamlouk Abomination; the Mogul Tartar Abomination; and the Ottoman Abomination of Desolation, which is still 'the Desolator' of 'the glorious holy mountain' (Dan. xi. 45) upon whom the Sixth Vial has been dripping, and now pouring out abundantly for the last thirty-six years, as the facts of history plainly show. 'And then,' the end of the Vision having come, the pouring out of the Vial, which contains the things 'decreed,' will be rapidly exhausted in the consummation ; when the Great Battle of Armageddon shall be fought between the Almighty and the kings of the world.

" If you think it will tend to the illustration of the truth, or assist in confirming the faith of the genuine disciple of the Lord Jesus, you will, perhaps, insert this in your next; if not, you can return it to my friend, Major Gano, who will put it in my hand at some convenient season.

"Yours truly, JOHN THOMAS."

The Dr. remained at Louisville several months. During his stay, a characteristic incident occurred. The Editor of the Louisville Tribune, with whom the Dr. was acquainted, being absent on a trip, the Dr. was requested to write a leading article for the paper. The Dr. agreed to do so out of consideration for the Editor. It was at the time of the great Presidential election, which resulted in the election of Dallas. Riots were prevailing to an alarming extent in Philadelphia in consequence of the popular indignation against the Romanists. These riots suggested to the Dr, as the subject of his article, the nature and tendency of Popery in a Democratic Republic. He showed that Popery was a venomous serpent, and that its patronage was fruitful of danger to a free country, and calculated

to destroy the vitals of society. This excited the unmeasured indignation of the political factions, with whom it was an object to secure the support of the Jesuit influence, which was strong in the neighbourhood of Louisville, owing to the existence of a Jesuit College, at a place called Bardstown, not far off. One of the candidates for the State Legislature came into the office greatly excited, and asked what they were about? The foreman replied they were publishing the Tribune. "Oh," said he, "I know that, but what are you publishing in it?" The foreman replied, "The truth, as far as we can get at it." "Yes," said the candidate, "but it does not do to preach the truth at all times. Your article on the Catholics has lost me 200 votes. The candidate then asked if they would publish him some cards to counteract the impression. "Yes," said the foreman, "if you pay for it." The candidate then paid down his money and wrote his card, in which he highly complimented the Catholic priests, having known them, as he said, from his earliest days, and always found them gentlemen. He was getting on in such flowery terms about the excellencies of the Catholics, that he found it necessary to cut short, lest it should be thought by the Protestants that he was himself a

Catholic. He, therefore, finished his card by saying "I am a Protestant," which no one would have discovered from his card, if he had not said so. Torchlight processions were organised in glorification of the candidates, and when the procession came opposite the office of the Tribune, groans were given for the paper in consequence of the anti-Papal sentiments expressed in the leading article referred to.

At the end of several months, the Investigator being suspended, and having no particular work on hand, the Dr. favourably received a suggestion made by Dr. Bodenhamer, with whom he was residing, that he should re-commence the publication, of a periodical. Acting on this suggestion, he started the Herald of the Future Age. He adopted this title because he had come to see that the truth of the gospel was identified with the approach of the age of Messiah's reign on the earth. After the issue of a few numbers, he decided to return to Richmond, Virginia, and continue the publication there. Carrying out this decision, he left his wife at Cincinnati, and with his daughter, took up his abode with the friend (Mr. R. Malone) who invited him to share with him the accommodation of a large new house.

On the first Sunday after his arrival, an incident took place which led to the first organic separation of the truth from

Campbellism. Mr. Malone, who was in fellowship with the Campbellites at Richmond, took the Dr. to a Meeting-house at Bethesda, ten miles from Richmond, where was accustomed to meet a Campbellite congregation. Being known among them, he was invited to address the people, very much to the annoyance of their preacher, who was known as "Parson Talley." This old gentleman not only refused to stay to hear the Dr., but gave vent to his aggrieved feelings in a very lugubrious style. "Dr. Thomas," said he, in the presence of the company, "why do you come here to trouble us? We don't want you, sir! We have no use for you, sir! We have no more fellowship with you than with an infidel!" Upon which he left the house, boiling over with indignation. On their return to Richmond, the incident was made an accusation against Mr. Malone. It was noised abroad that he had gone out with Dr. Thomas to Bethesda, broken bread with him there, and had procured speaking facilities for him. This offence, in process of time, was charged against him by the authorities of the Richmond "church," and made the ground of his expulsion, and also of a resolution, duly passed and recorded, that any member having anything to do with Dr. Thomas in a friendly way, should be excommunicated—the peculiarity of the situation being that the Dr. himself had never been excommunicated. This, of course, made little impression upon Dr. Thomas, who had been accustomed to that sort of thing for a considerable time; but it had the effect of causing the Dr. and a few others to commence a meeting on non-Campbellite principles.

This may be said to have been the first organic manifestation of the truth in the present age. Previous to this the truth had been rankling and germinating in the bosom of Campbellism, but had never taken form separately from Campbellism; now, through the force of circumstances, it became the basis of a distinct ecclesiastical organization, though not in its pure and ultimate form. The Odd Fellows' Hall was offered and accepted for the delivery of an introductory discourse. There was a considerable audience. The Dr. laid the case before the meeting; he defined their principles, and explained their purpose for the future, intimating that thenceforth a few of them would meet every first day in the week at

Mr. Malone's house. The number who did so was four or five. They crept along slowly for awhile, till they resolved to come out more publicly by hiring the Temperance Hall for a meeting every Sunday. This step resulted favourably to the truth, along with other agencies at work.

The Dr. continued to publish the Herald of the Future Age, at his office in Richmond, subscriptions and contributions barely paying the expenses of publication. Though barren in a financial point of view, however, this period was rich in spiritual results to the Dr.'s mind. His editorial duties in connection with the Herald imposed upon him an amount of scriptural research which, otherwise, would not have been attempted; and being unencumbered by secular occupation, though not unburdened with the anxieties incident to the provision of food and raiment, those labours in the mine of Divine truth, introduced him to many an undiscovered vein of treasure, and formed a link of no small importance in the chain of circumstances that led him from the darkness of the Apostacy to the full blaze of the light emanating from the oracles of the Deity.

## CHAPTER XXI.

A lull in the controversy between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Campbell. The lull terminated and the war resumed—Mr. Campbell's misrepresentations corrected by one who knew—A Campbellite congregation's protest against Mr. Campbell's treatment of the Dr.—Peculiar position of the Dr.—unexcommunicated yet rejected—The Campbellite question, "Do you belong to us?"—The Dr.'s answer—Another proposed reconciliation between the Dr. and Mr. Campbell—The Dr.'s response—Failure—The last attempt—The Dr. weary of Campbellite inconsistency—Speaks out in defence of an uncompromising apostolic testimony, and repudiation of the apostacy from which Campbellism had professed to have come out.

COLLISION with Campbellism continued to be the exciting cause of the Dr.'s advances in the knowledge of the truth. During the interval elapsing between the suspension of the Advocate in 1839 and the commencement of the Herald in 1844, the controversy between the Dr. and Mr. Campbell, which had been composed at the Paineville debate, slumbered, so far as active manifestations were concerned. "I was so silent," says the Dr., during this time, "that many of my friends knew not whether I was dead or alive." After the Dr.'s return from the Far West, this state of slumber did not long continue.' The Dr.'s friendly reception at Louisville by Dr. Bodenhamer and other leading men in the Campbellite congregation, seemed to have excited murmuring on the part of others, and a reference to Mr. Campbell, who, in response, published in his periodical, the Millennial Harbinger, an article entitled "Narrative of my last interview with Dr. Thomas." In this narrative, Mr. Campbell, describing the Paineville debate,

represented it as a complete humiliation of Dr. Thomas, resulting in a covenant on his part to abandon the advocacy of his views "which," says the Dr., "I would rather have suffered the loss of my right hand than have assented to." The narrative was also blended with damaging insinuations against the Dr.'s character. This misrepresentation greatly galled the friends of the Dr., who were parties to the debate and resolution. One of them (Dr. May,



of Lunenburg, Va.), addressed the following letter to Campbell on the subject;—

"LUNENBURG, VA., JUNE 19th, 1843.

"BROTHER CAMPBELL.—DEAR SIR,—I saw a few days since, in the Millennial Harbinger, your ' Narrative of my last interview with Dr. John Thomas,' in which you state your understanding of certain things that transpired in Amelia. Now, as a member of the committee referred to in the piece, I may presume to know something of that matter ; and being, to say the least, as disinterested an observer as yourself, I hope you will, in justice to 'the Dr. and his friends,' give equal publicity to my version as to your own- "You say: 'On perusing it ('the large pamphlet from the pen of Dr. Thomas') I immediately visited Painville, Amelia, for the purpose of exposing its sophistry in the presence of the Dr. and his friends. I left it to them to choose the way. They preferred a public discussion. We met in their meeting, house, and occupied some ten hours in examining some of its representations. Before we commenced, I distinctly stated my objection to any publication of the conference, on account of the scandal to the cause of Reformation, which I apprehended from the publication of the Dr.'s views and arguments. The brethren, desirous of saving the Dr. (as I understood the matter), and being fully satisfied with the discussion, interposed, and proposed to settle the difference in some other way. They proposed reconciliation on the broad principles of Christian forbearance and forgiveness. Believing, as I most certainly did, that they were fully satisfied with the development made, and that Dr. Thomas was truly humbled, and desirous of a restoration of Christian harmony and co-operation, I responded to the brethren that I was ready to hear such proposition as they might deem expedient to offer,' &c, &c.

"Now, I would ask, what idea is conveyed in this language, and indeed throughout the 'Narrative?' "Why, that the 'Dr.' acknowledged himself beaten, that the Dr.'s ' friends' acknowledged him beaten, and that the ' Dr. and his friends' had given in their adherence to the popular dogma of 'The Immortality of the Soul,' and that these admissions constituted the basis of the 'reconciliation.' This I conscientiously believe to be a just inference from your language in the above extract, and, indeed, throughout the narrative.

"If this be indeed the impression on your mind, I must, with all due deference to your talents and age, say that I am extremely surprised that a man of Alexander Campbell's acuteness of intellect should be so much at fault.

"I mixed with the Dr. and his friends' freely at Paineville, both in public and private, and can testify (to a negative, it is true,) that I never heard any one of them express any wavering in his belief in the main point

at issue—the mortality of man, and the consequent doctrine, the conditionality of Eternal Life.

"To the best of my knowledge—and I am personally acquainted with all the members of that committee, with many of them intimately—about sixteen out of the twenty-three have rejected the 'Immortality of the Soul,' as a doctrine diametrically opposed to the teaching of

the Holy Spirit. " So the 'reconciliation' was not effected in consequence of brother Campbell's convincing 'the Dr. and his friends' of holding erroneous views.

"Besides, what says the 'resolution?' It states that to remove the cause of 'offence to many brethren,' and to avoid 'a division amongst us,' we recommend to brother Thomas ' to discontinue the discussion of the same, unless in defence when misrepresented.'

"Here we see with what Christian forbearance 'the Dr. and his friends' acted, in order to remove every cause of ' offence,' and to avoid schism in the body of Christ, and this, too, after brother Thomas had, in their estimation, ably and successfully defended what they esteem scriptural doctrine against the attack of the renowned polemic, A. Campbell.

"You speak of the Dr.'s being 'duly tamed and humbled,' 'much dejected and humbled;' but, if we were to judge from the circumstances of the case, we should be compelled to fasten, if anywhere, the being duly tamed and humbled on another person, seeing that you, unless I greatly mistake, non-fellowshipped brother Thomas for holding sentiments which, after the discussion, as the 'Resolution' shows, you allowed him to hold, giving him the right hand of fellowship, simply on the understanding that he should discontinue the discussion of the same.

"How the ' covenant' could be ' broken, in the very annunciation of it by brother Thomas reaffirming his unshaken confidence of the truth of his own views of those litigated opinions,' is, I must freely confess, beyond the reach of my mental vision.

"We, in this part of the country, can appreciate the charges issued, at your instance, from Philadelphia and Richmond—for they and their refutation have been before us; and, moreover, the fact that you received brother Thomas into fellowship, after the accusations referred to were made, and without, at least so far as I know, any expression of contrition on his part, plainly evinces what estimation you yourself placed on them.

"If you know anything against the Dr.'s moral or religious character, whilst in Amelia, I have no doubt ' the Dr. and his friends' would prefer to know the charges to hearing insinuations. As to Dr. Thomas' moral deportment whilst in Amelia, allow me to say that I never heard anything against it, even as coming from his enemies, the sectaries; and I resided in that county ten months of the year subsequent to that in which you visited Paineville. And, as regards his religious character, he was, at the time of his removal, as he ever had been, in fellowship with all the congregations.

"His standing cannot, I presume, be quite so low in Illinois as your anonymous correspondence would imply, since his fellow citizens—clergymen, too, among the number—have unanimously elected him president of Franklin College.

"I have given the Paineville matter as I understood it, and I have no doubt the majority of the council understood it, and, as it appears to me, every

one must understand it, who will consult the resolution as it is on page 226, Mill. Harb., for

May, 1843.—Fiat Justitia ruat caelum.  
Yours truly, CHARLES MAY."

The following is a companion document, though of earlier date. It had been drawn up by the Campbellite congregation at Dundee, Kane Co., 111., in answer to disparaging remarks made in the same periodical at the time of the Dr.'s removal to the West.

[CERTIFICATE.]

"Whereas, in the fifth number of the Millennial Harbinger, p. 240, it is written by the Editor that ' if he is not greatly mistaken, the Dr. has set out for a new party, founded on the annihilation of the wicked, infants, idiots, pagans, and Jews. Infants, idiots, and pagans will never rise from the dead; "and the unjust hearers of the gospel, when raised, shall be judged and literally destroyed, or reduced to everlasting insensibility. To this gospel, the Dr. is now devoted, and, of course, will regularly assail us, and all who will not succumb to his speculations."

"Now, this is to certify, that in consequence of misrepresentations, which, we believe, originally emanated from Bethany, we formerly regarded the said Dr. Thomas as a ' thorn in the flesh,' 'a factionist,' a disturber of the peace of the churches, and a setter forth of strange and heretical doctrines; and, consequently, when he removed to this State from the Old Dominion, and it was proposed by one or two of our brethren to invite him to come among us, we were afraid to comply with the suggestion, not doubting but he would do more to retard the progress of the truth than ' a dozen good men could do to carry it ahead.'

"But we were deceived, and freely confess that we did him injustice in arriving at such a conclusion, upon no other testimony than upon the interested and garbled report of his opponents. We have now been acquainted with him a considerable time, and having conversed with him abundantly, heard him discourse often and read his writings attentively, we feel ourselves qualified to testify to the uprightness of his character, and to the things he inculcates for faith and obedience.

"We, therefore, without hesitation, pronounce that there is not a vestige of truth in the above extract, which we cannot but regard as a gratuitous calumny upon him. He is devoted to no such gospel, and but rarely even converses upon the destiny of infants, &c, unless the question is broached by another. The gospel to which he is

devoted is the gospel preached by the apostles Peter and Paul. He maintains the necessity of that gospel being understood and believed as a pre-requisite to the reception of remission of sins by baptism. This is the principle which characterises his teaching from that of those who denounce him; a principle which if acted on in the beginning would have caused ' this reformation' now to present a more scriptural aspect than it does.

"As to the Dr.'s assailing the Editor of the Harbinger, 'and all who will not succumb to his speculations,' we can testify that our experience contradicts the truth of this intimation, He assails none but the assailants of the faith and hope of the gospel. He pleads for the Word of

Life, and lays no stress upon matter of doubtful disputation.

"In relation to the Dr.'s character, we are happy in being able to rebut the falsehood which would hold it up to reprobation. There is no man in Kane County whose character stands fairer; for while we admit that his religious opinions are detested, we know that the breath of calumny has not yet affected the repeatability of his standing in the estimation of the respectable portion of our fellow citizens."

Signed by elder John Oatman and fifteen others.

For awhile the discussion of these personal matters occupied attention perhaps unduly, but not unnaturally. The Dr.'s position in relation to Campbellism was such as to give him a hearing among many of the members of the Campbellite body. He had never been expelled from their midst by the only process which was recognised by them, viz., exclusion by the congregation of which he was a member. The Richmond congregation refused to receive him, but this was not because any of their congregations had excluded him, but because they adopted Alexander Campbell's antipathies, in their giving effect to which they clearly acted in an unconstitutional manner. Hence the question, 'Do you belong to us?' was one which met the Dr. at several points. It was propounded to him in this specific form by the editor of the Christian Journal, in a letter dated June, 1844, which appears in the Herald of the Future Age, vol. i. p. 85.

"DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF ONE OF US

As connected with the great reforming movement of this century, which has for its object the establishment of Christianity as it was in the beginning? Do you consider yourself one of this brotherhood?—

a brotherhood united in the belief of the facts of the gospel, and not in opinions ; or must the brotherhood embrace your opinions (or your faiths if you prefer that word)—those opinions which have created present difficulties between you and them—before you can recognize them as brethren ? " The following is

THE DR.'S ANSWER.

"With the calumny (for such I consider it) afloat against my name before you, it is for you to say whether I am one of what you term 'us' in your letter. I believed the gospel, and do still believe and rigidly contend for it as Paul preached it; I have obeyed it; and do most earnestly avow my most full and perfect conviction that there is no salvation, but by an intelligent obedience of it. This is the foundation corner-stone of my 'heresies.' Those that are best acquainted with me can testify that I 'persevere in well doing,' notwithstanding all the obstacles thrown in my way by those who ought to know better. I can fellowship anyone who is 'in Christ.' Can you do more? If you can, I cannot: but I do not believe you can. If by the term us, you mean all who are 'in Christ,' then most certainly, regarding myself as in Christ, I consider myself as ONE OF his disciples; but whether others are willing to consider me as such remains with them to say. You will also be able to determine

whether I am connected with 'the great reform movement of the century,' by what you read in the Herald I sent you, and by the fact that I labour without compromise for an entire and complete return to, first principles in theory and practice, as a preparation to meet the Lord when he appears, which I believe is not far off. A brotherhood to be spiritual must be united on something more than 'a belief of the facts of the gospel.' When you reflect you will, doubtless, agree to this. That Jesus died is a fact; so did Abel: that he was buried is a fact; so was Abel: that he rose again is a fact; so did Lazarus. But what makes these facts in relation to Jesus of more interest to the world than the same facts in relation to Abel and Lazarus? Is it not the meaning, truth, or doctrine of the facts? The truth is, ' he died for sins,' or ' was delivered for our offences,' and ' rose again for our justification.' The facts and the meaning of the facts, I regard as making up the truth or gospel. I consider myself as one of a brotherhood united on a belief of the gospel as a whole and as defined; and who have been baptised into Christ in that belief. Is it an opinion that Christ died for sin; that he rose for our justification, that immortality, glory, honour, and eternal life are the reward of the righteous: and if so, belong not to the wicked? Is it an opinion that the wicked are destroyed, that Jesus will come again in person, that the dead in Christ are raised, the living believers changed at his coming? . . . . If these are opinions, then what is faith? I believe and teach these things; but I GIVE LAWS TO NONE. I recognise all who are in Christ, and walk worthy of the gospel, though in some things, such as ' the immortality of the soul,' 'the destruction of the wicked,' the 'visible manifestation of Jesus soon, or ' the destiny of infants, idiots, and pagans,' we may differ. The mottoes of the Christian Baptists are leading principles with me: first, 'Call no man Rabbi,' &c.; and secondly, 'Prove all things

bent of my judgment and ability, and trust I shall be enabled to do so even till the end. My friends will, doubtless, be ready to sacrifice anything for peace, BUT truth, liberty, equal rights, justice, and character; and this we know how to defend as ' the apple of the eye.' The word of God requires no sacrifice of these for the sake of peace. For myself, I have weathered the storm when the tempest raged the fiercest; I do not think my barque will founder now that the wind has lulled, and the heavens are disposed for peace."

The letter to which this was part of the answer, proposed to "open a correspondence for the purpose of ascertaining if there existed a probability of a reconciliation of all past difficulties between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Campbell." In answer to this the Dr. said:

""What has originated the difficulties since 1842? A spontaneous and unprovoked attack upon me by friend Campbell.

"If I have guessed right that he is disposed to bury the past for the sake of peace, I would remark that, however much disposed, it is not in my POWER to make peace. Peace upon Bible principles is very desirable ; and that is the only peace I will be a party to. I have tried peace based upon compromise, and experience teaches me that no good comes of it. I am anxious and ready to promote peace based upon truth, liberty, equal rights, and justice. If the ' principal brother' and ' Virginian brethren' are prepared for this, then I, and the brethren who are my friends (and without them I make no treaty) will all doubtless be ready to bury the tomahawk and

smoke the pipe of peace. "

Allow me to remark that an overture for peace with such a character as 'the Virginia Brethren' are labouring in speech and print to make me, greatly astonishes me, and suggests the inquiry, can I without a profound suspicion of their want of 'good faith' and honesty consent to peace with them? And should I not commit sin before God in being reconciled to them? Consider for a moment the crimes and heresies with which I am charged! They denounce me as an 'Arch factionist,' 'a reviler of the brethren,' 'a splitter of every church with which I have had to do,' 'a hypocritical rascal'—[Coleman's saying] 'a wolf [A. Campbell's]; a denier of the divinity of Jesus, a Materialist, a Sadducee, who denies the resurrection of all the dead; I am compared to an unclean beast; disinherited of the kingdom of God, and therefore not fit for any church; one whose principles subvert the foundation of all religion, a liar, &c, &c. Behold the use made of my name at Lexington, and in the Charlottesville Intelligencer, and the arbitrary proscription of the brethren who will not join in the proscription against me. These are not old, but current, denunciations just issued from the press; yea, brother F, some of them even since the date of your letter. Now, this is either my true character, or it is not. If I am what they represent me to be, then they would perpetrate a high crime and misdemeanor against high heaven in being at peace with me; if they believe their own charges (for I am to-day what I was three months ago), and in that faith they offer peace, I would as soon be at peace with Satan, for it would "be a fellowship of rank iniquity—such faith and fellowship will not suit me; and if they have been moved to this overture by the unfavourable attitude Mr. Rice has placed them in by their unholy course

towards me, I cannot consent to hush up the matter to extricate them from a dilemma; upon the horns of which they have suspended themselves. Did I believe a man to be such an one as they profess to regard me, I would wage war against him till death, unless he reformed. This is their duty with respect to me, if they believe the truth of their own charges."

As may be supposed, reconciliation was not assisted by this correspondence. It does not appear that any further attempt was ever made. The Dr. grew less and less in sympathy with a system of things professing to be a return to apostolic simplicity, but lacking consistency and earnestness, and coquetting with the denominations which in theory they condemned. His mind on the subject comes out clearly in a notice of a Oampbellite address at Louisville, which appears in the first vol. Herald of the Future Age, p. 120. He says:

"During his sojourn in this city, brother Fanning addressed the public in the 'Christian Chapel.' We regret that, on Tuesday, night, the house was not full to overflowing. There was, as usual in the week, but a small audience. The Church ordinarily assembling in the house is said to amount to about 300; but of these and strangers together, there were just sufficient to make a speaker miserable at the prospect before him. He addressed us on the Remission of Sins, and filled the hearts of several, styled 'factionists' and 'heretics,' by professing formalists, with joy and gladness at the simplicity, clearness, and force with which he presented the subject. He delivered to us the truth, and it delights us to commend

him for it; and if all who pass current for 'Proclaimers of the Ancient Gospel,' would exhibit the truth in the same scriptural, emphatic, dignified, argumentative, and uncompromising manner, there would be, we think, a happier and a healthier state of things than at present can be gloried in. We say not this to flatter brother F.; we speak only of what we heard: but Louisville has been favoured with so little preaching other than GOSPEL NULLIFICATION, that when one appears who fears God more than man, or the loss of popularity, we cannot but commend him, and bid him God speed. We are sick, Oh heartily sick, at the yea-and-nay gospel of the day! Men tell us to obey the Pentecostian Gospel for remission of sins, and almost the next respiration, preach 'Christ the Saviour of ALL men,' and proclaim the 'great and good men' of the apostacy, such as Luther, Dwight, Adam Clark, and, perhaps, the 'divine Plato,' and Socrates, and a host of other unwashed sinners, to be now hymning the praises of God around His throne! And for such stuff as this, under the misnomer of Ancient Gospel, people calling themselves 'Reformers'

have been paying a thousand per annum ! Yet, in Kentucky, this passes current for the doctrine of the Reformation; yes, indeed, in this state, a 'proclaimer' can stand before his brethren and say of men, that,

'Between the stirrup and the ground,  
He pardon sought and pardon found!'

And yet be countenanced as a teacher in good odour with reformers. All we have to say more, on the present occasion is, that the advice of the apostle John should be followed in relation to such prophets, and we trust that the day is not far distant when many voices will be lifted up against them."

Another illustration of the same thing is to be found in the following comments upon a visit of a certain Campbellite preacher (Mr. Johnson) to Charlottesville, in 1846.

"We sincerely hope that the truth may yet insinuate itself among them, and cause a great shaking among the 'dry bones,' which at present are 'very dry.'

"One of the crying sins of 'this Reformation' is the mutual puffs and flatteries of its leaders and, partizans. The overweening vanity, conceit, and self-adulation of some of them is truly fulsome. Whoever joins them, especially if he is rich, is heralded forth as highly intelligent, and most respectable ; but if he discover that 'the whole truth and nothing but the truth' is not with them, he is then denounced as weak-headed and spoiled, and accordingly proscribed as pestilent. This same James is very guilty of this offence against good taste, good manners, and truth. He says to 'Dear Bro. Kendrick' of the Chr. Jour., 'You have a fine population, greatly Virginian in its character; in general refined, and always companionable. This to an Englishman who has by choice become a Virginian by adoption, and who admires the land of his preference because it retains the good and ennobling manners of English life, is always delightful and gratifying wherever found.'

"We more highly respect the Christian artizan who works at the last in the week, and does what he can to edify the church when convened, than those salaried shepherds 'who,

feeding themselves and not the flock,' are too idle or too proud to work. This used to be practised in 'this Reformation;' and when James lived in Baltimore, the principles of the church there confined him to this wholesome regulation. Reformation went ahead in those days; but its wheels are locked now. A non-working and hireling priesthood has sprung up, which is creating calls for itself by societies of divers kinds. It is creating a cry for pastors, whose work will be to build the walls of their Babylon, extinguish lay enterprise, and proscribe the truth under the name of heresy. This is the working of the system in the best organised and most orderly congregation known to Mr. Johnson. Their pastor has closed their eyes and shut their ears against everything but the lust of the flesh, lust of the eye, pride of life, and his own traditions. How long they will continue shut up to the truth heaven only knows. If we can get them to read, there is

hope. It is a singular fact, but true, that when they used to listen to OUT voice, they cried out against our severity upon the apostacy: it would do harm ; it would drive the sectarians away, and they would not come to hear ! But what is the fact now ? These very ' sectarians' constitute the great bulk of our audiences, and the exception to the rule is to find a Reformed Baptist among them. When people are themselves apostatizing they sympathise greatly with the apostates. The ' Evangelists' and ' Pastors' have closed their ears ; for well they know that if their flocks are permitted to hear and read without molestation, their deadening influence will be dispelled, lay enterprise rekindled, and themselves sent back to the workshop and the plough. "This flattering of the 'fine populations' of the world emanates from a man-pleasing spirit; it is a part of the popularity-hunting mania with which Christianity is cursed in this age. These fine populations are the incarnations of sin, and thereby subordinate to ' the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, is not subject to His law, neither indeed can be.' Do not flatter, but tell these populations the truth. God's word does not flatter or compliment the world. It deals plainly with it. It tells its ' fine populations,' that they are lying under the wicked one; that his spirit works in them as the children of disobedience ; tell them not of their ' refined and companionable' qualities : but tell them truthfully that they are Godless and Christless, living without God and without Christ in the world; and that because they are all this, and sowing to the flesh, they will of the flesh reap condemnation, corruption, and the second death. O, James, doff the Englishman and the Virginian, with their ' delightful and gratifying companionable refinements,' and become a new man in Christ Jesus, if it be possible! This is heaven's gentleman, 'good and ennobled' by the word of God; a pilgrim and a sojourner here, but an heir of .that country promised to Abraham under a constitution from the ' Possessor of heaven and earth.' "

The leaders of Campbellism became more and more hostile in their attitude towards the author of such plain speaking. Writing of the efforts of one of these (a Mr. Samuel Ayres, in the Christian Journal), the Dr. places on record the following

PRAYER.

"O Lord God in heaven above, merciful and gracious Father, what can we render to Thee for Thy goodness? Thou hast appointed a day in which Thou wilt judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ! Blessed be Thy holy name. We shall all be judged before his



tribunal and not man's. Then the hidden things of men shall be brought to light, and their secret thoughts shall be unveiled, to their justification or reproof! Thou God seest us all, for all hearts are open before Thee! If Thou beholdest any thing in me displeasing in Thy sight, let me fall into Thy hands, and not into the hands of those who thirst for my destruction! Grant me patience to endure their unrighteousness, and by fidelity and perseverance to overcome the iniquity of their doings; and may

the word of the truth, concerning the hope of the glorious gospel of Jesus be established in these countries; and may those who now oppose it, in ignorance and unbelief, find mercy of Thee, repenting of their waywardness, and purifying their hearts by faith, that they may be accepted when the Lord comes ! ' Forgive them, for they know not what they do ; ' and may we all at length find an abundant entrance into the kingdom of the future age, to the glory of the great Immanuel's name ! Amen! Amen! "

On this he remarks:

"Such is the standing petition, which we record as expressive of our suspirations to the Eternal Throne, when called upon to review the effusions of bigotry, of prejudice, and misrepresentation, which, from time to time, flit phantasmically across our point de vue. Though perfect strangers to each other, though Mr. Samuel Ayres is as ignorant of our writings as we are of his, though he neither knows nor understands our views in whole, or even in part, correctly; nevertheless, the first article we have seen from his pen, concerning us, which is in this number, teems with the unhallowed spirit of ' the supervisor,' which is insulting, mendacious, and perverse. How soon a man is led captive of the spirit of faction! Here is Mr. Samuel Ayres, without provocation on our part, rudely and wantonly attacking us. Is it necessary to declare war against us to maintain peace and credit with the advocates of Spiritualism? So it would appear. Then be it so, if thus it please you. We are willing to reason with you, if you will argue like civilised men, without denunciation, ridicule, or reproach; but, if the contrary be your election, then leaps our trusty weapon from its sheath; we hurl the scabbard to the winds, and asking no quarter we give none; for the truth asks no favour from its foes, and will accept of peace only on the ground of unqualified surrender. Mr. Samuel Ayres has committed an ungentlemanly assault upon us; this is disgraceful and injurious only to himself; he is for war, not we; but, being compelled on every side to defend the right, we lift the gauntlet, and with glowing heart, do battle for the truth to victory or death."

## CHAPTER XXII.

A Campbellite editor visits the Dr., and afterwards reports the interview in his paper—Speaks of the Dr. as a curiosity and a dangerous man—The Dr. replies at length in a letter to the Editor—The Dr.'s explanation of the motives which actuated him in his apparently bootless opposition to the state of things around him.

AN interesting incident occurred about this time, which was the visit to Dr. Thomas of Mr. Fanning, editor of the Christian Review (Campbellite paper), and that gentleman's remarks on the visit in his paper,

together with the Dr.'s reply. Mr. Fanning's report was as follows:— ':

"Friday, the 14th, I travelled nearly fifty miles to Louisville, and spent the night with brother James Trabue, merchant of that city. Saturday, the 15th, I spent the day in visiting the city, renewing acquaintances with old friends and forming new ones. Among the rest, I became acquainted with Dr. John Thomas, who is at present publishing the Herald of the Future Age, in Louisville. As Dr. Thomas has been the cause of some difficulty amongst the disciples of Christ, both east and west, I hope a few reflections on his course, and the course of others towards him, will not be considered derogatory to the objects of a religious journal. I found the Dr. a pleasant gentleman of about forty-five years of age, much devoted to the study of the Bible, and one who thinks very intently on all subjects which engage his attention. My own opinion is, Dr. John Thomas wishes to do right, but he labours under considerable embarrassments. Although he is an intelligent man, he is certainly very speculative—is an abstractionist in the fullest sense—is devoted to his friends, but has no mercy to such as he esteems his enemies, I shall not pretend to enter into the merits or demerits of the Dr.'s religious career. Suffice it to say, he may be an injured man, and he has in turn injured, in my judgment, every one who has come under his influence. His position in reference to the necessity of; persons understanding the nature of baptism to enjoy its benefits, IMMORTALITY being a subject of promise in the New Testament, and the anti-christian character of sectarianism, may doubtless be sustained by the Bible. Still, on all these subjects his language is generally too strong, or rather of a character to embitter those who love it more than pious instruction. His notion of the nonresurrection of infants, idiots, and pagans, and annihilation of the wicked are certainly subversive of all the benevolence of God, and contrary to the Scriptures of truth; yet he admits these things constitute no part of the Gospel of Christ; I regret, with this admission, the Dr. persists in such unprofitable speculations. From the Dr.'s peculiar organization and temperament, and the unmerciful opposition which some of his views have met, he has become emphatically a man of war, and always uses dangerous weapons. In the heat of conflict, he not unfrequently knocks out the eyes and commits other damages on his best friends. Hence the idea that 'his hand is against every man,' and every man's hand is against him. The evils resulting from his course have not been so much from what

he has pleaded as from the STYLE of his teaching. His admirers generally possess the same spirit as the Dr. While I blame the Dr. I can but love him, and regret that his organization and the circumstances which have governed him have been such as to render his best efforts worse than useless in the cause of Christ. I separated from the Dr. with the conviction that if he could forget Alexander Campbell, would quit studying and writing upon his speculations, and could be thrown into pious society, where he would be told plainly his errors, by genuine friends, he might become a good and useful man."

The Dr. replied to Mr. Fanning's remarks in the following letter, addressed personally to himself :—

DEAR BRO. FANNING.—Your periodical for this month has come to hand. I am glad to find

from it that you have arrived amid your domestic circle in good condition and prepared for new 'Themes of Discussion.' In this epistle I address you as 'brother' without intending any offence. I would not "knock out your eyes," or 'commit other damage' upon you, by any means. Perhaps you may inquire, ' why suppose that I should be offended at your claim upon my fraternity?' I will tell candidly. On page 194 of your paper you have introduced me to the notice of your readers in a style such as a showman would describe some new individual of his menagerie, not as yet described by naturalists! 'You nominate me about nine times, and in every instance you style me either ' Dr. John Thomas,' ' Dr. Thomas,' or 'Dr.' Now, in looking over the whole article of ' Notes on a Tour,' I find you mention many other 'brethren' with whom you met for the first, or more times ; and among these also 'doctors,' or, at least reputed ones. Thus, for instance, we have 'Dr. B. F. Hall,' &c. Now, if I had looked no further, I should have concluded that there was nothing meant in the appliance to my humble self of the oft repeated 'Dr.:' but on glancing at a subsequent paragraph, I there perceived this same ' Dr. B. F. Hall,' who sings:

' Between the stirrup and the ground  
He pardon sought and pardon found'

Spoken of as brother Hall. And, furthermore, you speak of fifteen or sixteen other individuals, all of whom you style 'brother;' and in particular one of whom you write 'brother doctor W. D. Gordon.' Besides these, I find certain doctors ' of the world' named; and of them you speak in the same style as of me. Thus you class me (perhaps justly in your opinion)—with the 'sinners;' while our deacon-patron of dancing in Louisville, and 'Dr. Hall'—of whom—(but I forbear)—who pardons sinners 'between the stirrup and the ground' (!)—you put among the saints;' from these considerations, I say, I conclude that you deemed me unworthy of your fellowship when at home, and that, if I addressed you as ' dear brother,' it would be offensive to you. But when I recollect that you spent a considerable time with me, frequently repeated, in the most social, friendly, and fraternal manner, and without qualification or hesitation, styled me 'brother Thomas,' I thought I might venture upon the present occasion to return, what I hope was not a mere compliment (for I do not like such compliments), and address you as ' Dear Bro. Fanning ' without offence.

"Now, don't let this 'knock your eyes out' (I quote your own phrase); but the truth is, I every now and then meet with individuals in private who call me 'brother,' who, when they speak or write of me in the hearing and seeing of 'brother Campbell, brother Challen, brother Hall, brother this and brother that,' only know me as one of the profession of medicine in general. Is this honest in the sight of men? If their conviction is that I am 'an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, an unpardoned sinner,' and therefore not of the ' One Body,' then let them be honest and say so. They will not offend me; but let them, I pray, cease to act two parts towards me: the one when no eye sees us but God's; the other, when to fraternise with me might jeopardise their popularity with A., B. and C!

"I perceive that, in the Review, you have devoted nearly a page to 'Dr. John Thomas;' in the exordium of which you say, ' I hope a few reflections on his course, and on the course of others towards him, will not be considered derogatory to the objects of a religious journal.'

Well, I suppose your readers won't object to these upon that score; for I presume my course and that of my opponents have, at least, as much to do with 'the objects of a 'religious journal,' as the ' Mammoth Gave,' 'compact limestone,' ' gypsum,' and 'eyeless fish,' of which you write on p. 193. For my own part, I have no objection, provided you prove yourself an exception to Reform Editors of my acquaintance, who 'knock out the eyes, and commit other damages,' upon the brethren, as concerns their estimate of my ' course and character,' and refuse to allow me or my friends ("whose 'eyes' have not been 'knocked out') to prescribe for their relief, as becomes practitioners of the healing art. In a word, my good brother, I expect you to give insertion to this letter in your Review, as an antidote to the fatal 'love' you have therein revealed towards the 'pleasant gentleman' you formed an acquaintance with in this ' fashionable and luxurious city.' "You say, ' I found the Dr. a pleasant gentleman, of about forty-five years of age, much devoted to the study of the Bible, &c.' First, you are mistaken as to my age. My looks may have deceived you, I am not yet forty; but let that pass. You are right as to my devotion to the study of the Scriptures. I believe you generally found me so engaged. The things they reveal are my study day and night. I study them by the midnight oil that I may discover the ' wondrous things in God's law,' that I may shew them forth to the faithful, who desire to know all the Scriptures teach concerning 'Christ in us the hope of glory,' and 'the one hope of our calling.' These things 'engage my attention,' and, as the world would say, too much for my own interest; for, you know, I am not a salaried religionist. You say, I think 'very intensely ' on these things: that your 'opinion is, Dr. T. wishes to do right,' and that he is ' an intellectual man.' Now, permit me to ask, if this be true, do you not think that intense study of the Bible, by an intellectual man who wishes to do right, would be very apt to develop things from that book which would appear 'new' and ' speculative' to a generation immersed in the world, whose intense thoughts are concentrated upon the means of accumulating wealth for many years? The result of my application is, that I have come to conclusions which, you admit, 'MAY, DOUBTLESS, BE SUSTAINED BY THE BIBLE.' These are: the necessity of persons understanding the gospel before immersion can be any benefit to them; that

'immortality and life,' being matters of promise in the New Testament, to be bestowed at the resurrection, they constitute no part of the animal man; and that sectarianism is anti-Christian and, therefore, cannot produce Christians. If these things, among others, be sustainable by the Bible, they are true; and, by this admission, you tread upon the position I hold in opposition to Mr. Campbell, who rejects them as ' speculative and untaught' in the Bible. But, I no sooner think I have a co-operator in you, than you suddenly retreat behind a 'still' (no double entendre here) 'his language is generally too strong.' But, if the things be true, can language be too forcible to express the truth? If we would soften the truth, we must, doubtless, select the softest words, and construct our sentences with the least possible precision. We shall thus preserve our character for sweetness and piety; for truth is bitter to the errorist when unmistakably expressed.

"You say, my dear brother, 'Although Dr. T. is an intellectual man, he is certainly very speculative, is an abstractionist in the fullest sense.' Now, this reading would imply that speculative men were not intellectual men. I should like to see a man who speculates without intellect; he would be quite a curiosity. Well, I admit that I speculate; and will you tell me, brother Fanning, how a man can think without speculating, or speculate without

thinking? I speculate thus; I regard the Bible as a speculum or mirror, into which I look, and there I behold, as in a glass, the image of God, to which He requires me to be conformed. I think, I reflect, I look, or, if you will, I speculate upon this image, and I behold the pattern of immortal men. I see in this speculum that this archetype became immortal by the resurrection of his mortal body from the dead; and I see it averred that all his brethren who do his will shall become like him, perfect and complete, when he shall appear in glory. Yes, I am an Abstractionist' also. I abstract myself as much as possible from the world, 'hating the garment spotted with the flesh.' The industrious and busy bee is an abstractionist; it sips the nectar and abstracts the honey from every flower: the word is the nectary I sip, and its 'unadulterated milk' the saccharine juice from which I abstract the nutriment of my faith. Avaunt this folly, my brother, and cease to pander to popular ignorance, by stirring up prejudice against a man for being guilty of the noblest exercise of intellect, that of speculating and abstracting the heart-cheering promises, and teaching of the word of God.

"You say, 'Dr. Thomas has no mercy on such as he esteems his enemies.' Believe me, I regard men personally as my opponents; mostly as opposing what they do not understand, and, therefore, their leaders excepted, as 'not knowing what they do.' These leaders are hostile to me; and yet, if their 'unmerciful opposition,' as you term it, were confined to my views, I should not complain; but they assail my character, and seem to lack only the power to extinguish me from religions and social existence. I am not their enemy; but I am their invincible and interminable opponent, till they cease to 'pervert the right ways of the Lord.' My weapon—my 'dangerous weapon,' as you style it—is truth; I seek to take no unfair advantage of them; I do not circulate through the country, trumping up charges against them as they do against me; but when they attack, I expose falsehood, intrigue, and malevolence, and, in an avalanche of refutation, make it recoil upon their

own pates. If this be merciless, then be it so; and if they would spare themselves the mortification of defeat, let them beware how they tempt me to unshield the sword. If they will repent and do right, I will forgive them. I do pray for them, that the eyes of their understandings may be opened; that they may become honest men, and cease to pervert the truth; that they may act up to their old professions, and take their stand upon principle, and no more presume to dictate even to their inferiors, as they may suppose them, what they may see in the Scriptures, and what they may publish as contained in the word of the Lord. Let them attend to their own studies, and if they do not agree with the results of other people's, let reason and testimony prove theirs the better; and let them remember that Christ's freemen understand the liberty with which he has freed them from the yoke of bondage, too well to permit them to lord it over their rights and consciences. I have 'no mercy' upon what I believe to be their perversions of the gospel, neither do I crave mercy; as men, peace be with them when they shall prove themselves worthy of it by having conquered.

"Again, you say, 'he has injured, in my judgment, everyone who has come under his influence.' "Well, this you give merely as your opinion. The assertion is a very broad one. You do not say wherein the injury I have done them consists. You ought to have been more explicit; for though you have a right to express your opinion, you have no right to injure me in vaguely exercising that right. You are not, I think, a competent judge in the case, because

you are not acquainted with ' every one who has come under Dr. T.'s influence.' You only know a few, a very few; and if they have been injured, 'in your judgment you have no right to judge by the rule, ex uno disce omnes.\* If you have, so have I ; and I could, from a few cases, not difficult to find, shew where they had become immoral after imbibing 'brother' Campbell's opinions. Should I not, then, do him injustice in saying that he has injured ' every one,' &c, because some whom he had influenced had become renegades? Did all the troubles you have been mixed up with for the last few years originate from my influence? By whatever spirit they were actuated it could not be traced to me; they were ' brother' Campbell's especial friends ; but I argue nothing against him upon that account, any more than I argue against the doctrine of Jesus as injurious because of the impiety of multitudes of his disciples and professed friends. Be more impartial and reasonable in your conclusions.

"Again, 'his notion of the non-resurrection of infants, idiots, and pagans, and the annihilation of the wicked, are certainly subversive of all the benevolence of God, and contrary to the Scriptures of truth.' This is an imprudent declaration of yours. You ought to have said, ' subversive of all rabbinical views of the benevolence of God, and contrary to their interpretation of the Scriptures of truth.' By the Rabbis in this case, I mean the teachers of the orthodox opinions of the destiny of infants and pagans; and of course you among the number. I do not use the term derogatively, but as best suited to express my idea. Can you perceive no difference between your views of God's benevolence and His benevolence itself; or do you conceive your

\* From one case learn all the rest.

benevolence and His, your interpretations and Scripture itself as identical? "Now, I admit that my ' notions' are 'subversive' of your views ; but I deny, and it is for you to prove, that they are ' subversive of all the benevolence of God,' and ' contrary to the Scriptures of truth.' " But I affirm that they are neither, and I put you and all your side of the question to the proof. I affirm that my ' notions,' as you style them, are in harmony with God's benevolence, and the plain, ungarbled letter of the word. I invite you to take up my review of Campbell and Rice's Debate about infants, &c, in Nos. 4, 5, and 6 of the Herald of the Future Age, in all its several points, methodically; I invite you to grapple with the grand principle therein developed, and to annihilate the testimonies of the spirit adduced. I invite you to take it up candidly, chivalrously, honestly, and without fear, and see what you can do with it: and permit me to say that until this work is accomplished, it will be prudent for you to be sparing of your criticisms upon my 'notions' concerning- pagans, &c, as subversive of anything but the traditions of men.

"As prejudice may prevent many of your readers from perusing the Herald of the Future Age, I present the following for their especial benefit, on the presumption that you will do me the justice to insert this epistle.

"I do not use the word ' annihilation' in speaking and writing; but, as my opponents force it upon me for effect, I will say a few words about it. It is derived from two Latin words—AD,

to, and NIHILUM, nothing, which in combination are used to signify a reducing to nothing. Abstractly, this conveys more than I believe; because I believe the wicked will be reduced to dust, which is something; but, in the sense that their organization, or that they, as men, will be utterly demolished, or reduced to no men, as there was no man before Adam was formed from the dust, in that sense they may be said not to be, or to be 'annihilated.' Now the question is, do the Scriptures teach that the wicked shall not be? On page 205 of the Review, you say, 'speculations are not wanted, but the teaching of the Holy Spirit.' "Well, here it is. I believe you noted down the passages when I delivered them to you in my office. Job, speaking of his brethren, who had dealt deceitfully and forsaken the fear of the Almighty, says, ' the paths of their way is turned aside; they go to nothing (ad nihilum) and perish.'—(Job. vi. 18.) ' Thou hast destroyed the wicked; Thou hast put out their name for ever and ever.'—(Ps. ix. 5.) A name represents something which exists; to put out a name is to put out of existence the thing for which it stands. 'The wicked shall perish; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away as the fat of (the sacrificial) lambs.'—(Ps. xxxvii. 20.) Can any destruction be more complete than this? It comes as near to ' annihilation,' as you style it, as words can express. Man that is in honour and understandeth not, is like the beasts which perish.'— (Ps. xlix. 20.) What do you term the destiny of beasts? Call it what you please; such is the destiny or end of the wicked. 'As a snail which melteth, let every one of them (the wicked) pass away, like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun.'—(Ps. lviii. 8.) "What is the end of an abortion? Has the Holy Spirit yet convinced you of the ' annihilation,' as you call it, or of the destruction of the wicked, as the Scriptures term it; or do you need greater and plainer testimonies ? 'In the mouth of two or three witnesses,' saith the Scripture, ' shall every word be established;' but

here are five; must I add the climax ? Here, then, is the sixth witness. 'Consume them in wrath,' saith Messiah in prophecy; 'consume them that they may not be.'—Ps. lix. 10.) When they are in a state of not being, will you tell me, my brother, how much of the wicked, save dust, remains? Again, 'let them be blotted out of the book of the living.' —(Ps. lxxix. 28.) When blotted out of this book, are they living or dead? Again, ' when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyED forever—(Ps. xcii. 7.)—not destroying for ever, but just as it reads. Do you still think something of the wicked remains, when they are consumed into smoke away, and cease to be ? Well, then, here is the last passage I will quote, and if that will not convince you, you must pursue the path of your own waywardness. ' Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked BE NO MORE.'— (Ps. civ. 35.) This is triumphant.

"Is it 'contrary to Scripture' to affirm that a portion of the pagan world will not arise again from the dead, to undergo the same punishment which shall hereafter be inflicted upon those who, knowing God's law, have refused to obey it ? I will give you one passage, and when you have put that out of the way, I will give you more. Read the whole of Isaiah xxvi., beginning 'IN THAT DAY shall this song be sung in the land of Judah.' In what day? See the context of the two preceding chapters, and you will find the answer to be, ' in that day when the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously;' in that day when he shall on that mountain ' make unto all

people a feast of fat things.' 'When he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail of strong delusion:' 2 Thess. ii. 11) that is spread over all nations; when 'he will swallow up death in victory,' THEN 'shall be sung in the land of Judah this song.' This song occupies the whole of chap. xxvi.—a song of victory which will be sung by Israel then become, by eminence, 'THE RIGHTEOUS NATION.' Having ascertained the time when and the choir by which this song shall be sung, we are prepared to appreciate the sentiments of the glorious melody. What are these as bearing upon the question before us? Let us see.

"The subjects of the song are the exultation of Jerusalem; the overthrow of the 'lofty city;' the destruction of the wicked (parallel with 2 Thess. i. 81; the Non-resurrection of Israel's oppressors; and the resurrection of the Lord's dead men, at his appearing 'to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity.' "

"Now open your eyes, brother Fanning, if they are not 'knocked out,' and read what the Spirit saith about the 'non-resurrection of pagans' (verse 12), 'Lord Thou wilt ordain peace for us (Israel), for Thou also hast wrought all our works in (or among) us. O Lord, our God, other lords besides Thee have had dominion over us: but by Thee only will we make mention of Thy name. They are dead; THEY SHALL NOT LIVE; they are deceased; THEY SHALL NOT EISE; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish,' "

"Answer me, now, who are these 'other lords?' Are they not those who have had dominion over' Israel from the first until this song of triumph shall be sung by them in the land of Judah, when the Restitution of all things'

to Israel shall come to pass? Lords or rulers who have 'deceased' under times of ignorance' which 'God winks at?' What else can you make of it? But, behold the contrast in versa 19, where it was written, 'Thy dead men SHALL LIVE, my Dead Body SHALL ARISE. In view of this, the prophet joyously exclaims, 'Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for Thy dew (O Lord) is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead,' like dew from the womb of the morning.'—(Ps. ex. 3.) "Where do the dead dwell? 'In the dust!' What dead shall the earth cast out? 'Thy dead men, O Lord!' Then they are neither in Heaven, Paradise, nor Hades, but dead and sleeping in the dust! Is this 'language too strong?' Is it 'rather of a character to embitter those who love it?' Do you condemn this instruction as destitute of piety? Is this what you style 'unprofitable speculations?' Or is it not rather a glowing theme, and a satisfactory vindication of the justice, benevolence, and abounding goodness of God? Ah! brother Fanning, there are more soul-expanding speculations, more ennobling developments, than have yet 'entered into the hearts' of the editors; or have yet been displayed in the pages of the periodicals of this reformation. You seem all of you to be colleague against the truth by raising a stupid cry against speculation and untaught questions! Be more modest, I beseech you all, and confess that you have as yet scarcely peeped into 'the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him,' and which He hath revealed by His Spirit to His apostles.—(1 Cor. ii. 9.)

"Again, you say, 'Dr. T. admits that these things constitute no part of the gospel of Christ.'



But, my brother, does the New Testament treat only of the gospel? Does the Old Testament treat only of this? You say, I believe that 'the Bible is your rule of faith and practice;' well, does it testify of nothing but gospel or glad tidings? Does it not treat of the destiny of man, as righteous or otherwise; or does it assign all men to one destiny? You must admit that it treats of pagans, of the wicked under law, as well as of the sinners without law; as I have shown, it also treats of resurrection and non-resurrection, and a multitude of other things beside. I propose to explain, as far as I am able, whatever comes to hand. The Bible also is your rule of practice. Why do you not follow that rule? Paul offered the gospel to all men. When they rejected it, he preached damnation to them. The apostacy has dishonoured God in the misrepresentation of His dealing with the condemned; I propose to vindicate His character from its aspersions, by shewing the true doctrine of the word, if I can; and I believe I can. What possible objection can there be? Truth is dangerous to nothing but error; have you or others any beloved traditions they fear to lose? I hope not.

"Again, you say, 'the Dr. has become emphatically a man of war, and always uses dangerous weapons.' Well, what is the use of weapons to a soldier unless they are 'always dangerous?' You would not have him encounter Satan's troops with a lath, would you, my good brother? I wield a sharp two-edged sword, but only against the perverters of the truth, as I believe it. My opponents have the same weapon within their reach, if they have valour and chivalry enough to use it according to the rules of fair and honourable warfare. Why don't they slay me, if my views are so very ridiculous? Surely, it is easy done! Is my weapon kept in too

good order; is its edge too sharp, its point too piercing; does it chill their timid hearts to look upon it? They can shoot poisoned arrows from behind hushes; my corselet, helmet, and shield are sticking full of them, but they have not reached the skin yet. Thanks be to God, who gives the victory, I have seen nothing in them yet to excite dismay. They are crying 'peace and 'let him alone,' and he will die away. These are the words of the 'fearful and unbelieving,' not of the conqueror who fights for a kingdom, a sceptre, and a crown of life.

"But, assuming that you are correct, what objections have you to a Christian being 'a man of war?' Can a man be a conqueror without being a man of war? "What do you call that man equipped, with girded loins, a breastplate, shield, helmet, and sword? Is he not a very warlike person? Oh, but,' you say, 'his weapons are not always dangerous; they are not carnal.' I admit they are not carnal; they neither defend his flesh from wounds nor doth his sword draw blood from the flesh of his opponents. His defensive armour is spiritual; it is constituted, not of brass and steel, but of truth, righteousness, faith, hope, and the sandals of a genuine gospel preparation: his weapon is not a Damascus blade, or 'Toledo trusty,' but the word of God. Is not such a man, clad in 'the whole armour of God,' a warlike looking character? A soldier, who 'knocks out the eyes and commits other damages' upon Satan's troops, whether friends or foes, good, bad, indifferent, or 'best?' If my 'best friends' are found fighting with the aliens against the truth, I exceedingly deplore it; and if they get their 'eyes knocked out/ and sustain 'other damages' in the affray, I am very sorry for it.

"But, brother Fanning, men are mistaken in supposing that 'the times of the Gentiles' were,

in any portion of them, to be the times of peace to the soldiers of Christ. THE PRESENT AGE (by this I mean the interval between the ascension and future advent of Messiah) is essentially a period of war: war for principle against the apostacy in all its forms. Disciples obtain peace in this age in proportion as they are indifferent to principle. We are not to expect peace and enjoyment; and if we are faithful we shall be certain not to get it. I hear men sing

'Must I be carried to the skies  
On flowery beds of ease;  
While others fought to win the prize,  
And sailed through bloody seas?

Are there no foes for me to face?  
Must I not stem the flood?  
Is this vile world a friend to grace,  
To help me on to God?

Sure, I must fight, if I would reign;  
Increase my courage, Lord,' &c, &c.

"I say Yes, there are foes enough for you to face, if you will contend for the faith without adulteration. Try it, brother F; defend the 'position' I have taken against the opposite, and which you admit is sustainable by the Bible, and you will find foes start up against you like dragons' teeth, who will take care not to allow the angels to carry you to the skies on flowery beds of ease! But, let men be indifferent to everything that interferes with their worldly advantage, and they may sing for foes for ever, but they will

and none for the devil feels so sure of them, that he will destroy the wretched factionist, if he can, who shall dare to disturb their schemes of peace, prosperity, and aggrandisement, for so very ridiculous an affair as principle.

"If it be true, how can I help being Ishmaelish, if every man's hand is against me? If they are determined to treat me as Ishmael, they must expect a sharper sword than Ishmael's to cleave them to the dust. You love me, brother Fanning? Ah, how can I persuade myself of this? Would a lover shew up his beloved in such a style as you have exhibited me to your brethren and the public? Is it the part of one who loves another to treat him thus? Reserve your regrets, my dear friend, for other times. You express them too early by twenty years. You will, perhaps, then see no cause to regret, but rather to rejoice at our present position. I have no regrets, save the straitness of my means: but this may be overcome. My 'organisation' is suited to what lies before me, amidst the 'circumstances which have governed me,' though they may have rendered my 'best efforts worse than useless,' in your opinion, in promoting the worldly policy of a certain class of reformers. We will, with your leave, defer a final judgment in the case of how much I have abused 'the cause of Christ,' until he shall come and settle all disputes.

"You greatly err in supposing that a remembrance of A. Campbell disturbs the tranquillity of my mind. It is true, from the nature of things, that I do not forget him. So long as he returns his present ground, and I mine, we must necessarily be in opposition. I am sorry he has not more chivalrousness of disposition; if he had, he would not persist in what he knows to be wrong. You understand me; and it does appear to me, that a man of his intellect must know better than he acts. I hope I do him no wrong in this opinion. If he would study demonology less and Christology more, he would not be so tyrannous in his opinions; and could he be thrown into a less parasitical ('pious' though it be!) society than that which surrounds him, he would be prepared to discuss the truth with less arrogance and self-sufficiency, and have a better opportunity of becoming acquainted with his own foibles, from the testimony of 'genuine friends,' who, like brother Fanning, in the case of Dr. John Thomas, might shew him up on the pages of the Christian or some other Review !

"Finally, my brother, if you do, you ought not to love me (unless as an enemy, and that is evinced by heaping coals of fire upon his head). Indeed, I do not see how you can love me, for you say I am neither 'good nor useful;' seeing, you say, that 'under certain circumstances, I might become a good and useful man;' which is plainly declaring that, in your opinion, I am neither one nor the other.

"Wishing you better measure than you have meted out to me, I subscribe myself, without intending to offend you, your brother in Christ,  
JOHN THOMAS."

The Dr. thus expresses the objects which actuated him in his apparently bootless opposition to the state of things around him. "Our object in bringing these things to light is to put such 'reformers' to shame, and to let good men see the deception which is

practised upon them, when they are called upon by interested partizans to uphold such a system of things under pretence of its being sacred and apostolic! We yearn for such a state of society as will reflect the principles of God's Word, where His testimony is the delight and glory of the people. We love the truth too well to allow mankind to be imposed upon with counterfeit metal instead of the pure gold. 'This reformation' in Eastern Virginia, is a mere apology for apostolicity. It is sound neither in doctrine nor morality. It began with a show of zeal for truth and liberty, but it has ended in establishing a new form of human authority and tradition. If it were not for the truth's sake, do you suppose, with our means of doing better, that we would subject ourselves to reproach, to defamation, to the vexatiousness of a great enterprise with scantily furnished means, to the labour of body and mind, &c, which we have to undergo ? Is the carnal mind of so purely a philanthropic constitution as to toil for the everlasting weal and glory of its contemporaries, with no other recompense than these things? No, reader, indeed; this is more than human nature, unimpressed with God's truth will subject itself to. We labour for that reward that is laid up for us in the heavens, and but for this, we should long, ere this, have bid you learn the things of the Spirit as you best could; for ourselves, we must, long ago, have imitated the pious of 'this reformation,' and have devoted ourselves to covetousness and fleshly lusts. Our self-denial, while it will redound to our glory at the coming of the Lord, will be

condemnatory of those who add to our difficulties by their proscription, or by a lukewarm and inefficient co-operation. Often, in retirement, do we sigh over this misguided and grovelling generation, and fain would we, if our race were run, or the day of Christ were arrived, that we might find deliverance. But, courage, O my soul, with patience we must wait for it!"

All Books/Booklets, Editorials, and Articles are FREE and can be downloaded without permission