

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Church Advocate

Stone-Campbell Archival Journals

7-1831

Church Advocate, Volume 2, Number 10 (1831)

Daniel Parker

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

CHURCH ADVOCATE.

VOLUME II.] *Truth is powerful.* [NUMBER 10

VINCENNES, JULY 1831.

Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; inso-much that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.
MATTHEW, CH. 24, VS. 23, 24.

The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up. JOHN, CH, 2, v. 17.

It is true that my enemies will have greatly the advantage of me and the truth, as the close of the Advocate will give them latitude to say what they please, fearless of contradiction; yet I am unwilling that falsehood should assume the place of truth, to the reproach of the church of God, without bearing testimony against it, so long as I stand on my periodical watch-tower, as an advocate on the part of the church against her enemies. It is true, I had thought as I presented to view in my 4th No. 2d Vol. that until Mr. Peck manifested more of the spirit of truth and candour, I should think him unworthy of further notice; but I shall now notice some few things, by which the candid observer may see more fully the corrupt wickedness of the mission spirit which as "three unclean spirits like frogs, came out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, for they are the spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty." These three unclean spirits, I understand to be the spirit of lying wonders to deceive. The spirit of blending the church and the world together in wealth, wisdom, and ecclesiastical power. The spirit of envy and persecution against the truth and its supporters. Some of my readers are no doubt apprized of the dark insinuations thrown out in the Pioneer against the Illinois association.

We will now let her speak for herself in her minutes of September, 1830.

"The reference from the Richland Church relative to a certain publication over the signatures of the publishing Committee of the Rock-Spring and Edwardsville Churches, published in the Pioneer of Feb. 6, 1830, directed to the Western Baptists, taken up and answered as follows: Whereas the Edwardsville and Rock-Spring Churches have accused the Illinois Association of exercising power over churches and individuals, and have cast a stigma on the churches and association in saying they were influenced by a few leading brethren, we think those churches have been mistaken in their views. The churches composing the Illinois association have always considered themselves to be independent and influenced by none: and the general contents of former Minutes were their united voices, through their Messengers; and they never felt a disposition to remonstrate against their former proceedings—firmly believing those pretended liberal institutions of the present day, to spread the gospel, to be without any license from the word of God: and as the love of money is the root of all evil, we fear they will only tend to sap the foundation of both our civil and religious liberties. We therefore advise our brethren of the different churches to be aware of their stratagems."

CIRCULAR LETTER.

DEAR BRETHREN: Once more, through the dispensation of a kind Providence, we are permitted to meet together in an associated capacity; and feel induced, by a union of pleasure and duty, to address you on a subject of great importance. Perhaps the apostolic injunction, "to content earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," never lay with a more imperious obligation upon the followers of the Lamb, than at the present time, when errors both in principle and practice exist to an alarming degree. Amidst the multiplicity of unscriptural opinions afloat in the world, one of the most prominent, and perhaps most destructive, is, the denial of the special influence of the Holy Spirit, in reclaiming the sinner from the error of his ways. In raising our feeble voice in support of the truth, we are fully aware that we encounter a formidable opposition, consisting of men possessed of great natural and acquired abilities.

fies, and fully capable of clothing their system in all the charms of bewitching sophistry. But trusting in the durability of truth, and more fully in Him who is able to bring to nought the wisdom of the wise, and the understanding of the prudent, we have ventured to give you our opinion.

And, in the first place, we are led to this conclusion from a certain knowledge that the scriptures do represent, in language too plain to be misunderstood, that man by nature is blind to his own interests, and not only blind, but, in disposition, averse to holiness. Here arises the absolute necessity of an operating agent, to enlighten and influence; which agent has been manifested in all ages of the world, since the first divine communication ever made to fallen man; but more eminently displayed in the fulfilment of that gracious promise made by Christ to his responding disciples: John 14th chapter, and 16th and 17th verses: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him"—and verse the 26: "He shall teach you all things." Chapter 15 and verse 26: "He shall testify of me." Again, 16 and 8: "and when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment." The objector may say, this was the miraculous display of the Holy Ghost referred to; but the days of miracles have passed away. We admit that the days of miracles have passed, but has not Christ promised that he will be with his disciples unto the "end of the world?" He is not personally with them; He must be with them, then, in the power and demonstration of the Spirit. But the objector continues: Since miracles have ceased, the Spirit is alone to be found in the world. But if the mere letter is sufficient now for the recovery of fallen man, it would have been sufficient in former ages; and that it was insufficient in former times, is evidently set forth in the conversion of Saint Paul. For who had a better knowledge of the word than him? and not only that, but he heard the eloquent address of Stephen, and saw his face as the face of an angel; and beheld with what christian fortitude he submitted to his fate, praying for his enemies with his latest breath. Yet this disciple of Gamaliel, believing himself in the service of God, breathed out threatenings and slaughters, until he was arrested by the

mighty power of God, and brought to the knowledge of the truth, as it is in Jesus. If the word alone was sufficient, why were the disciples so ignorant about the call of the Gentiles, Christ's resurrection from the dead, and many other subjects, when the scriptures spoke so plainly of all these events, if they could have understood them. Therefore the conclusion is irresistible, that the Holy Spirit is necessary, first, to enlighten the dark understanding of the mind, and in the second place, to quicken and influence those who are dead in trespasses and in sins, (see Ephesians, 2d and 1st,) and guide the wandering pilgrim in the path of truth and safety, and comfort his weary mind while travelling to the Canaan of eternal rest. No one doubts our being commanded to pray; yet if the foregoing idea be true, our devotions are a solemn mockery of God, an insult to the divine Majesty. Why should we pray for forgiveness of sins, more faith, more love, more zeal, when there is no way of communicating the facts unto us, if even the Lord grants us our petitions? Would it not be better to employ all this time in searching the scriptures, and not in offering insults to Jehovah? But if we would know the benefit of the Spirit in prayer, let us listen to Saint Paul: Romans 8, 26 and 27, "Likewise the Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercessions for us, with groanings that cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the heart knoweth the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." We would ask our opponents whether the great reformation from Popery, and the many happy revivals with which we have been blessed, were owing to the extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, or were they not rather owing to the influence of that gracious Spirit, that enforced the truths of the gospel upon the mind of the sinner? To the latter, doubtless. Yet we would not be understood to oppose the searching of the scriptures—God forbid. We would recommend them to be studied, and studied in a becoming way, looking unto God, by prayer and supplication, to grant us the influence of the Holy Spirit, to lead us into the mysteries of his word. Dear Brethren: We would not exhort you to be uncharitable, but would only admonish you to try the spirits, and listen neither to the law here, nor the law there, but follow no man, no, not an Angel

from Heaven, further than they follow the Lord Jesus; and may the blessings of the Father, the love of the Saviour, the communion of the Spirit, rest upon you all, and bring you to the land of peace. Farewell!"

While it evidently appears that this Illinois association speaks like other old sound Baptists, the reader should understand that the Rock Spring and Edwardsville churches not being able with their principles, and views of things to obtain union and fellowship with the Baptist Union in Illinois, are two out of three of the churches which now compose what is called the Edwardsville Baptist association, and who are now engaged in bringing about a union among the people called Baptist in the state of Illinois. Will it not appear evident to every candid observer, that if these young churches had not intended to have sought an occasion to slander the old Baptist in the state, or to prevail with them to sacrifice the principles held so sacred by the Baptist, that these churches could not obtain fellowship with them; that these new churches would have so corrected their own heresies or disorder that they could have come into the Baptist union without the sacrifice of truth or conscience, and when we understand the course of Mr. J. M. Peck, on the mission subject, and his doctrine on the atonement, as lately brought to view in what he calls the Western Baptist, and that the said Mr. Peck is warmly advocating the course pursued by these three churches in their associated compact, the whole matter is at once unfolded. The overthrow of the predestinarian doctrine, held sacred by the Apostles of the Lamb, and by the church of God from that day to this, with the rights and true order of the gospel church, is evidently the object, for it is impossible for those churches to succeed in their objects but by a sacrifice of those things, that the church heretofore rather than do, has resisted unto blood, and the attempt to bring about a union, by making a compromise between truth and error, is not one whit better than the act of the Devil, when he offered the Saviour all the kingdoms of the world to fall down and worship him. I have heretofore said that error has nothing to lose by attempting to mix with truth. Thus we may understand the thing. It would be a strange thing in nature for a virtuous woman to request of her husband that another man might have equal privileges with her, with himself; and it would be equally as strange a thing

in grace, for the church of God to pray to her husband to make such a compromise between truth and error, that the supporters of each might unite in christian union. The church of God should certainly be much on her guard these last times, and not suffer that woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce the Lord's servants to commit fornication. I have long since brought to view that the war in the religious world is between the principle of works and the principle of grace. Could the Devil unite in union, that principle brought in by the serpent, and the principle which God has revealed from Heaven, then he would accomplish his object in the overthrow of the great God, as God must cease to exist in his divine character, or he will save his kingdom pure from iniquity. Thus we need not think strange of the hypocritical apparent friendship of the Devil, nor of his friends and the supporters of his religion, getting mad, and making lies their refuge, when the iniquity of their father, the Devil, is exposed. Let those missionary adulterers and adulteresses unite among themselves, and let the bride, the Lamb's wife alone, and I will venture to say that she will never trouble them for a union, but will be content with her own husband, as they should be with theirs.

Mr. Peck, in the Pioneer of May 4th, 1831, informs us thus:

A Baptist brother and preacher in the state of Tennessee, thus writes, April 14th, 1831.

"Dear Brother Peck: I hope you will not think me a flatterer, when from a sense of duty, I say that I am still better pleased with your publications, particularly your remarks on the "Two Seeds," and doctrines inculcated in the Church Advocate. I am still the more convinced of the propriety of enlarging your work. Your answer to D——P——, in one of your December numbers is enough. We are plagued more with P——'s antinomian doctrines here, than any other error, as Campbellism is not doing much in this quarter."

Had Mr. Peck given us the name of this preacher, it might have removed some doubts as to his being entitled to the right of being called a Baptist, for this is very doubtful, not because he is not reconciled to my views on the two seeds, but because he has fellowship with the course

and doctrine of Mr. Peck, which no man can do, and be a Baptist of the old stamp, neither could a sound Baptist be so easily reconciled with Mr. Peck's answer to my address to him, when he has failed to establish any of his particular remarks, in truth, or to refute any of the charges I have exhibited against him, but passing by all his misrepresentations, most of which had been answered by a statement of facts, before now published by him. I will take the liberty to ask this Tennessee preacher if the old predestinarian Baptists of that state are like Mr. Peck, in denying the immediate aid of the divine spirit, in enabling a man to preach? This I had charged Mr. Peck with doing, and he has not, nor I think will not, venture to deny it, while the Church Advocate is progressing. This crime alone would have excluded a preacher from the Baptist union, when I was preaching in that state many years past, and if it will not do it now, it is because they have fallen from that steadfastness in the spirituality of the gospel ministry, which departure from the faith renders them unworthy to be called the gospel, or Baptist church. I am well apprized that, although the Devil formerly hated the name Baptist, so that he could persecute them to *death*, yet now, in order to carry on his iniquitous policy, he can cheerfully take the name of *Baptist* upon himself.

Another correspondent from a northern county in this state, writes thus, April 19th.:

"Brother Peck,—You know there are many people about me who will not give a *bit*, for a Bible, nor 50 cents for 500 pages of tracts, and they think it sinful to encourage missionaries. But they can go to see wax figures exhibited, and give 25 cents for a sight. They can attend theatrical amusements and pay 50 cents, and think it no harm to look at old Punch and the Devil, and all those foolish things, which are the unfruitful works of darkness. I would be glad that you would give us your opinion about these things in your next paper.

THE ANSWER.

"We shall certainly not refuse to comply with the request of our brother who is a pious and useful preacher of the gospel, and whose soul is so often vexed with the unchari-

table and unchristian spirit, and impropriety of conduct on the part of some who are called Baptists.

Those who strain at knats, uniformly swallow camels. It is perfectly consistent for preachers and professors who shut their doors against orderly Baptists of unimpeachable standing, and refuse them fellowship in the church, calumniate their characters, and denounce them from the stand where the gospel ought to be preached, *because* they show favour to missionaries, Sabbath schools, &c.; it is in perfect keeping for those who compel the poor to whom a Bible is given, to give it back, or be turned out of the church;—we say it is altogether *consistent* and perfectly natural for such professors to pay 50 cents to see old Punch dance. We see nothing very strange or unnatural in it. We suppose a sight of the image of the Devil would be far more gratifying to such persons than the sight of a missionary. We only add seriously that such professors are most lamentably deceived. God is not to be mocked. *For all these things He will bring them into judgment."*

Why has Mr. Peck withheld this writer's name from us, but to evade the united contradiction of the Baptist in the state of Illinois who stand connected with the Baptist union? He tells us this man is a useful preacher of the gospel. He may think so, but can it be supposed that it will be thought so by the Baptist, who for the sake of truth and gospel order, reject Mr. Peck himself from their pulpits, not believing him to be a useful preacher of the gospel, as he is not taught to be dependant on the aid of the divine spirit, and of course does not preach, nor cannot consistently pray like the old Baptist. It is our business to expose error, that the church may be guarded against it, and although Mr. Peck is too well known to do the Baptist here much harm, yet we shall notice something of the iniquity here manifested.

First. This writer does not say that these bad people among whom he lives are Baptists, but Mr. Peck presents them as being preachers and professors of the Baptist order. So between the two they slander the Baptists, not in saying that we do not encourage tracts and missionaries, but in charging us with attending such shows, &c.; and this charge should be considered false, until the accuser and the accused are both made known, for although some Baptists may have been guilty, yet these things are

not tolerated by the Baptists of my acquaintance in the state, and I do think that this occasion sought against us, should cause every Baptist to be more on his watch, as the wicked are disposed to feed upon the sins of God's people.

Second. It is here insinuated that the Baptists think so little of the Bible that they will not even give 12½ cents for it. This must be designed, and not ignorant wickedness, for it is certainly well known, that no people have so great use for the Bible in maintaining and defending their religion as the Baptists have, particularly when they have to contend against the mission errors.

Third. Mr. Peck presents that the soul of this writer, had been often vexed by the uncharitable and unchristian spirit, &c. An unchristian spirit is one who refuses or neglects to imitate or obey Christ, and as Christ has no where, by precept nor example, enforced on us, that which we are now called on by the mission spirit and principle to do, a rejection of what a missionary may call acts of charity, cannot in truth be said to be an unchristian act or spirit, therefore this charge or insinuation is false.

Fourth. While Mr. Peck's unqualified remarks, respecting straining at knats and swallowing camels, are no doubt designed to criminate the whole Baptist connexion who stand opposed to the mission system, among whom he has long sought to creep in with his errors, He would present the mission principle and practice (if errors,) as but knats, and the attending shows and places of vain amusement, as camels. Although God's children should turn their eyes away from beholding iniquity, and not be guilty of those vain things, to the dishonor of the Redeemer's cause, yet there is no just comparison between the iniquity of those vain things, and that of the mission spirit and principle. The one has no pretensions to any thing but natural amusement, and though it animates the carnal mind, yet it does not implant or increase the Devil's religious principles in the human heart, in opposition to the truth and government of Heaven, nor does it seek law authority to force its way. The other claiming itself to be the religion of the Saviour, creeping into law authority, forcing its way by the wealth, wisdom and spirit of the world, to the sacrifice of the true spirit of the christian religion, while manifesting a greater thirst for money than the wicked show-masters, should be

considered by us more dangerous to our liberties, both religious and political, and therefore be more boldly withstood. Should Mr. Peck be disposed to dispute with me on this ground, let him fairly lay before his readers the course pursued by missionaries to get money, such as selling indulgencies or titles, getting life members into their societies, for money, and selling pictures, and I will ask him if the report is not true which says, that in some of the eastern states there are regular shows presented in their Sunday schools, and for the sight of which, each attending person, children and all, have to pay their money, and if even the image or picture of the Saviour has not been presented there in showing for money? If these things be true, what may we look for next? Will not the missionary show-masters exceed all the rest the Devil has ever sent, in pleasing the people, and getting their money?

Fifth, Mr. Peck implicates the Baptists in Illinois as being guilty of shutting their doors against orderly Baptists. In this I venture to contradict him, and now call on him to make good his insinuating remarks, or retract them, to the relief of the Baptist character. Had he charged us with shutting our doors against missionaries who called themselves Baptists, we should not have complained against that truth, but we do deny that missionaries on this man-made plan are orderly Baptists, therefore gospel order requires us to shut our doors against them, as enemies of the truth and church of God.

If Mr. Peck has scriptural evidence to prove the present mission plan to be God's plan, let him produce those evidences, they will do his cause more good than all the boast of the wonders now doing by missionary operations. We do not deny but that Mr. Peck, and perhaps other missionary preachers who have been denied the right of church privileges among the Illinois Baptists, may have some colour of claim to a connexion with the Baptist union in some place, but the validity of that claim we deny, because they have departed from (if they ever had it,) that faith and order which entitles them to it. Mr. Peck, perhaps, might remove some grounds of suspicion, which stand against himself, as to this colour of claim, by letting us know why it is that he still keeps his claim to church-membership in St. Louis, and how it is that there appears in the minutes of the Missouri association, as though there was an exist-

ing church in St. Louis with which he stands connected; and yet it appears by facts, (the truth of which may be found in the Baptist church at Springfield, Illinois,) that a church cannot be found in St. Louis to give letters of dismission to members who formerly stood related to him as members there.

Sixth, and last. The truth of Mr. Peck's insinuation respecting compelling the poor to give back their Bibles, is doubted, and will be until he gives us the true statement of the case, who and where, for such a circumstance is unknown to me, and I have no doubt but it would meet the disapprobation of all the Baptists with whom I am acquainted. But the unreserved declarations of Mr. Peck, "It is perfectly consistent for preachers," &c.; "It is in perfect keeping," &c.; "We say it is altogether *consistent*, and perfectly natural for such professors to pay 50 cents to see old Punch dance," &c., are the most daring abuse of truth, when noticing the subject to which they stand connected, and the object designed to be accomplished by them, that I have ever observed from the pen of any man who had any pretension to religion, truth, or honesty. These expressions, if true, would prostrate all the religion in the world, but the religion of the mission principle, as having a *natural* tendency to lead men to vanity and sin, and thus the church of God, in all ages, when withstanding, in the mother of harlots, and her daughters, the kindred spirits to our modern missionaries were but a set of vain wicked mortals: and now Mr. Peck, I am the very man who stands opposed to missionaries and Sabbath schools, &c., &c., and therefore refuse to allow you or any other supporter of these mission plans and spirit, church or gospel privileges with me. I am now rising fifty years old, and have never yet seen "old Punch dance," the wax figures, nor the theatrical amusement, and the prime cause has been because I believed it to be a sin to sacrifice to, and worship idols, and so far as I know, the Baptists stand with me in believing such crimes deserve the rod of discipline.

And now, Sir, upon a fair view of the whole subject, I have to say, in justice and honor to the truth and church of God, that if your religion and friendly protectors can swallow, protect, and fellowship such wicked perversion of the truth, to the abuse of the church of God, it is sufficiently proven to every honest mind, that your religion belongs

to the works of darkness, and sprang from the mystery of iniquity, and that it can only prevail at the destruction of truth, and the overthrow of the Redeemer's kingdom, while there is sufficient cause manifested why you and your mission protectors are shut out from the Baptist union, as not protecting that faith and practice which has long suffered under the hand of Popes and merciless money-hunting priests. All these things may appear strange, but the scriptures must be fulfilled, the names of God's children must be cast out as evil; the cup of the wicked must be filled, but the arm of the Lord will ere long awake in the defence of Zion; then woe to the wicked!

Since writing the foregoing, (except some small corrections,) the May number of the *Western Baptist* (so called,) came to my hand, in which I find Mr. Peck has really given me a tolerable close passing notice, and it is a little amusing to see how close he struck when he was so afraid that he stood so far from me that he could not be certain whether he hit me or not. However, I suppose we must excuse him for being so unwilling to be brought into contact with such men as me. Seeing that we being unshackled by the armour of human wisdom, are expert in war, holding our swords girt upon our thigh; and he being unskilled in wielding the sword of the spirit, having the wisdom of the world in place of the spirit of God, and depending on a puff of noise in place of the weight of truth, has made a lucky escape by this turn of wit.

Perhaps Mr. Peck did not observe that he was so much confirming the truth of my essays on the *Two Witnesses*, when he was bringing to view the extensive strength in the old states on his own side, and I suppose he had forgotten my kindred spirits in the *Kehukee* association, when he made his bold unreserved assertions on that subject, but we must look over that mistake, as he attempted to tread on holy ground without taking his man-made shoes from off his feet, and belongs to that class which is much alarmed at the sword of the Lord and of Gideon.

And again, Mr. Peck has helped me very much in confirming the fact, that the war between God and the Devil is manifested in the controversy between *grace* and *works*, he, (as I understand him,) presents A. Campbell and myself to be the two extreme troublesome fellows. There is some truth in this, for Campbell has got nearly to the ex-

tent of the work plan, and Mr. Peck being a little behind, is muttering at him, but still following on, and I am a settled Predestinarian, contending for salvation by grace to the glory of God; and so Peck hates me worse than he does Campbell, and I certainly should have thought Mr. Peck entitled to credit, could his principles have admitted of so much candor as to have let his readers know that his great object was to make a way of escape for the mission principle by killing the old Predestinarian Baptist, and therefore he had presented Parker's views on the Two Seeds, in the blackest colours *his* power of language could do, (having no scriptures that he dare touch *fairly* on the subject,) in order to put all the ugly doe-faces on the Predestinarian doctrine in his power, (regardless of truth,) hoping thereby to alarm *very much*, the old women and children, though men might see through the thin veil of ignorance. And now, (as he dare not meet Parker's views on the Two Seeds upon fair Bible ground,) that in order more effectually to answer his purposes, he wished all the Armenians and missionaries to protest against Parker's doctrine, under the apparent name of Baptist and church authority, in the darkest colours, that he might publish it abroad: but I acknowledge this would have manifested more candor than could be expected from a missionary, therefore we must excuse him on this ground; but I should be glad if he would let his readers know what church in Fulton county has done this mighty thing, and to what union of Baptists they belonged, and who was at the bottom of the thing, for it is quite likely with me that there is a Mr. Clark there, a kindred spirit of his, who some years past, in attempting a similar course on the Wabash, destroyed his standing as a preacher, in a great degree, left the country, and perhaps has never since regained a fair standing in the Baptist union.

In conclusion of the whole matter, it really appears as if Mr. Peck is very much alarmed, having no scriptural evidences by which he can defend himself. He, like Demetrius of old, when calling the workmen of like occupation, saying, Sirs, ye know that by this *craft* we have our wealth, begins to cry out, help! help!! our craft is in danger, our wealth will fail, ye men of like occupation gather together in bands, counsel together, extend your loudest protests against those men, who are like to destroy the way of our *gains*, by turning our worldly religion upside down.

Ho, ye! ho, ye!! old states, ye monied and missionary institutions of worldly wealth and wisdom, Help! help!! our craft is in danger. Stop, stop, Mr. Peck, what in the world is the matter? Matter, indeed!! our craft is in danger; there are a few unlearned men in this western country that we cannot subject to our craft of missions, and old Daniel Parker is one of them, and he has published something about two seeds, which is so fatal to our craft, that without help there is great danger of losing our way of wealth, and it is true that there are several wise learned editors in the west, but this old fellow, unlearned as he is, has a way of managing his Bible on the doctrine of the two seeds, that we never learned in our theological study, and although he has often urged on us to meet him on the plain Bible doctrine of the Two Seeds, yet none of us dare do that thing, and now the only way to save our *craft*, is to drown him and all those stubborn wretches, by doing what little we can at home ourselves, and getting a flood of wisdom and wealth from the old states. Therefore, oh! ye old states, although we have been here so long, and done all we could, is there not "more necessity for Baptist missionaries" (so called,) "being sent into these dark corners of our own land, than to Indians or Burmah." Help, our craft is in more danger here than any where else. Send us your missionaries, (not those the Lord has prepared,) wealth and Sunday school apparatuses, &c. &c. Having been more lengthy than was intended, and being in a hurry, we shall leave Mr. Peck crying to his God for help, while we turn our attention to see what the Editor of the Chronicle is about, for it is likely that he has taken an alarm, and is seeking some way for dodging. Adieu,

[EDITOR.]

Well, Mr. Chambers, after looking over what you have seen proper to say to and about me, and the doctrine advanced by me, in your June No., I believe I have but little to say to you; however, a few things are necessary, as we are about to part, perhaps forever. I am truly sorry that you have not given some better evidence of christian candour, as grounds to hope that the Chronicle may still prove a blessing to the Baptists.

You may rest contented as to any thing appearing from me but under my own proper signature. When I have laid

truth before the public in its proper colours, I feel contented as having done my duty. What has passed between you and I, is now before the people, let it go for what it is worth. Let them judge as to the connexion between my supposed errors, as to doctrine, and your misrepresentations for your own advantage, to my injury, and then say, have you made a justifiable shift to avoid a fair investigation of what is Bible truth, in order to settle disputed points. It is true, that I had expected you would try to shift out some way, but hardly could have supposed that you would have sought shelter under your own wrongs. You, by assailing the truth, and publishing false things, had implicated myself and the Baptist with whom I stand connected, and when you were corrected, and requested to set things right before the public, that each of us might stand on the grounds that rightly belonged to us, you have now made a pretext of that thing, as though I had offered you an insult, and wished to seek a quarrel with you, and have thereby laboured to cover your former errors, from which you, as a christian and a gentleman, should have retracted, you have also made this an excuse to get clear of me. No wonder, sir, that you are tired of me, if this is your way of doing business. Now let every candid mind decide on the thing; who has the cause to complain, you or I? You have assailed that precious truth, honour and cause of the Redeemer, that I feel more dear to me than all the world calls good and great, and in the defence of which I have spent the most of my days, (though in a weak hobbling way,) labouring with my own hands to support a helpless family, making the gospel without charge, bearing more than usual difficulties in attending to my ministerial duties, yet of all my hard struggles through life I complain not, but of you, who would by your course toward me, prostrate all. Now Sir, what have I done? Can you tell? My crimes are before the public; let them be examined. Have I done any thing worse than plainly to lay before you what you had done, and what was now your duty to do? Should this have offended an honest man? Surely not. Had you disputed any part of my complaint against you, and thought it perhaps not correct, why did you not call on me to explain or establish it? But no, you cautiously avoid an investigation with me, on every disputed point between us. I will now ask, would any honest man wish to establish the maxim that the most sacred

thing a man may possess may be assailed by the tongue or pen of a slanderer, and yet he must hold his peace, never seek for redress nor relief, or be counted the guilty person? If not, where are my wrongs? And now Mr. Chambers, you may think of my "attitude" as you please, and whether I have written till all is blue, black or white, I wish not to injure you, but to relieve the truth from reproach, and until you are willing to do that, I wish as little to do with you as you possibly can with me, and let the candid mind judge between us; I consider I have but done my duty, and if you can live under these things, and be protected in good conscience before all men, live on, but it is vain for you to hold out to me the loss of patronage, or the threats of my patrons. I esteem those at Georgetown equal with others elsewhere. Should they all forsake me, this is no reason why I should forsake the truth. The world is not what I am after in any respect. Had this been my object, I should have taken a very different course. I expected to meet with opposition; I have not been disappointed, except from an unexpected quarter. And now I have to say in the close between us, and near the close of the Church Advocate, that I am coming off with a more easy, clear and decided victory than I had anticipated, particularly as it relates to the doctrine of the 'Two Seeds.' I had wished an investigation of that doctrine in Bible truth, knowing that in myself I was but a poor imperfect being, and hoping that if I were deceived, and in an error, that by hearing what could be said on the other side of the question, in a way to show the Bible to be a chain of consistent truth, I might come to a sight of my errors, and retract from them, believing that if truth was on my side, that God had, by his spirit and word, taught me that truth, and would enable me to defend it. But no one has attempted to meet me in the Bible fairly on that subject. This makes me believe that the doctrine is so confirmed in Bible truth, that no one could see their way out, so as to authorize them to make a fair attack on me, for an impartial investigation of the subject.

It is true that some of you Editors have given my views on the Two Seeds a passing notice by way of abuse, but when I have reined you up to the Bible, you have shifted some way to get clear of the fair investigation of the subject. This makes me think you are afraid of it, and when wise men (commonly speaking,) abuse and misrepresent

the doctrine by great swelling words, of man's wisdom, I am still more confirmed in the truth of the doctrine, supposing they have done the best they could with their side of the question, and it is a fact, that in all cases which have come to my knowledge, where my opponents have attempted to mark out their line of opposition, they run into Universalism, or make God the author of sin and iniquity, and sometimes both, and it appears that my opponents cannot progress but at the sacrifice of some part of the Bible and gospel doctrine held sacred by the Baptist. I have no pretensions to being a scholar, and may have used some improper language in communicating my views of the subject, but it is a bad mark of a christian who is a scholar, to act the part of a Buzzard, live on the stinking meat and have no use for the sound, and upon the whole, it appears to me, that my opponents have done as much in establishing the doctrine of the Two Seeds, (as brought to view by me,) in the candid mind, as what I have done: I have laid the doctrine before the public, as Bible truth, and they have confirmed that truth, by manifesting an opposition to it, and yet being unable to meet it open and plain in the word of divine truth.

Thus the Lord has given his truth the victory, through a poor unlearned (as to worldly wisdom) instrument, to the glory of his name, and the confuting of the wisdom of the wise; then let God have the glory, while the instrument patiently bears the reproaches of the learned for his ignorance. [Ed.]

P. S.—Some no doubt, will blame me for taking up so much room in this number, in controversy, or exposing the errors of others. My reader what else can I do? There is now no way to shun controversy, but by letting error progress uninterrupted. This I cannot do, while under my present responsibility. I have long borne testimony against the corrupt lying spirit in the mission system, and cannot now stop, because the iniquity has abounded until too many are captured by it. Shall I suffer the truth and church of God, with the vitals of religion to be assailed, and yet hold my peace, lest I fall under the displeasure of the wisdom and religion of the world? I cannot, I will not. You that love the world more than the Saviour, go with it at your

own risk, but let me be found with the afflicted few, bearing testimony in defence of Zion's cause, against error.

[EDITOR.]

Extract of a letter from Elder William Hays, West Tennessee, Weakly County.

"If you can find room in the Church Advocate to give your views on the following queries, I should be gratified, as they pertain to the church.

1st. Are the first 17 verses of the 13th chapter of the gospel by St. John, to be considered as giving us an example to be observed by the church? If so, at what time should it be attended to?

2d. Were the Gentiles under the moral law, at the coming of Christ? If so, why did St. Paul say that the Gentiles, having not the law, are a law unto themselves?

3d. What is the difference between the general atoners, and the Universalians? and if a general atonement were made, is it not consonant to the will of God? therefore if all are not saved, does it not argue that there is a *defect* in power?

4th. Is the sinner justified in time, or virtually in eternity?

5th. Do you believe that this earth will be entirely annihilated, or are we to expect it to be revolutionized? If annihilated, where is your evidence?

6th. Did Adam possess a spirit in his created state superior to animal? As I understand the soul and spirit to be different, dear brother, be pleased to answer these queries, as they are matters of considerable moment to me."

THE ANSWER.

DEAR BROTHER,

I consider your points of inquiry worth particular attention, and of deep interest to the church; and being unwilling to express my opinion on interesting subjects without bringing to view my reasons and evidences, I regret that the want of room forbids me to do that justice to those points that their merit demands. However, having in my opinion, answered in merit some of your points of inquiry, in essays written before your queries came to hand, I shall proceed in conjunction with what I have already said, to

make a few remarks on the different points, as expressive of my understanding therein.

1st. I have no doubt but that the Saviour gave an example as recorded in the 13th chapter of John, which should be observed by his church. The *Pope*, the *Priest*, and the *Pedo Baptist*, by their claiming the right of power as belonging to the clergy, expresses that they believe that the instructions given by Christ to his Apostles belongs alone to the ministerial department of the church, and indeed nearly every sect except the Baptist, by their government, expresses something like the same belief. But I understand by the name of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb being in the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem, and by other similar passages of divine writ, that they are spoken to or of, as being the instruments by which the gospel church is set up and organized in the world, and therefore the instructions given to the Apostles are to be understood as instructions given to the church as a body, including all the members with their several gifts and graces of the spirit. Thus when Christ is speaking to Peter as giving him the keys of the kingdom, he is thereby showing the power with which the church is clothed, and even so, in the chapter under consideration, the Saviour was giving and leaving an example which should be strictly observed by the church. Much is unfolded or expressed, in the seventeen verses under consideration. The reader would do well to examine them close, while I make a few remarks on the subject matter presented therein.

The knowledge of the Saviour that he was about to leave the world, and go to the Father, together with his great love to his own that was in the world, appear to be the moving cause of the transaction which took place. This is sufficient to show that the Lord intended the example to be of a lasting use and benefit to the church, while it further appears that in consequence of all things being given into the hands of the Saviour, he proceeded into the transaction. By this we are taught that the Saviour exercised the rightful authority belonging to him as head of the church and king of Zion, when laying this example for his followers. The Saviour's rising from supper and laying aside his garments, and girding himself with a towel, leads me to view the great love wherewith he loved his church, which caused him to lay aside his heavenly garments and gird

himself with the girdle of humanity, that he might reach our case. The pouring water into a bason presents to view the great plan of salvation in which is treasured up the stores of grace, the reviving, cleansing quality of which is so often represented by the element of water. The washing of the disciple's feet, and wiping them with the towel wherewith he was girded, brings to view the grace of God by which we are washed from our sins, by means of the towel or girdle of humanity, while we are taught great humility indeed, when viewing the Saviour stooping so low as to reach the extreme low defiled members of the body, by which we may learn that the lowest or most doubting, trembling member of the church, his body, is not forgotten, or neglected by the Saviour, and of course should not be by us.

The Saviour's taking his garments, and sitting down again, presents to view, that after he had obtained eternal redemption for us, he took his heavenly garments and sat down on the right hand of God, from whence he makes the heart-searching inquiry, "Know ye what I have done to you"?

This inquiry of the Saviour should certainly penetrate the heart of every saint with the soul-reviving inquiry into what the Saviour has done for them in the work and wonders of redemption, which had been so lively set forth in the Saviour's washing his disciple's feet. The Saviour then brings to the view of his disciples, that they rightly own him as their master and Lord, and upon this acknowledgment on their part, he enjoins on them the duty of washing one another's feet, letting them know that he had given them an example that they should do as he had done unto them, and that as they were the servants, and he their Lord, they should not consider themselves greater than he, while he lets them know that their happiness did not consist in a bare knowledge of duty, but in the performance of the same.

Now the plain fact is, that those who do not acknowledge the Saviour to be "Master and Lord," should not attend to the example of washing one another's feet, but those who do acknowledge that fact, are bound by that declaration, and the injunction of the Saviour, to attend to washing each other's feet. I am well apprized of the many excuses and objections respecting this example, and if room would

admit, I should not feel at a loss in answering them all. At what time this example should be attended to, forms another point of inquiry.

This has been a point that in years past I have examined with the closest attention, and my final conclusion is, that the example of washing feet was never intended to stand so connected with the sacrament of the Lord's supper, that at that particular time it should be attended to. The example itself is the injunction, and the *time* is to be consulted by christian prudence and conveniences, and should brethren, at their meetings, or when visiting each other, attend to the example, I believe it is right, or should they make an appointment for that purpose, it is well. The churches in this country make it a standing rule to attend to the example on the Saturday night of their sacrament meetings, mostly because there are apt to be more brethren together at such times.

My particular reasons for sitting down with this view of things, are: The sacrament was administered while eating the Passover. The Passover was eat at the hour of midnight. According to the record of Saints Matthew and Mark, the Saviour designated who should betray him before he administered the supper, and by St. John's account, not until after he had washed his disciple's feet. These things, together with what is said in the first verse of this chapter, ("Now before the feast," &c.) leads me to believe that it was perhaps but a common supper in the forepart of the night, that the Saviour rose from when he washed his disciple's feet, and thus the example took place before the sacrament; be that as it may, St. John's giving us no account of the Saviour's administering the sacrament, is sufficient to prove to me, that he did not consider the example of washing feet connected with the sacrament, as to the time when it should be attended to.

2nd. By the moral law, we understand the ten commandments, five of which enjoins on us our duty to our God, and the other five our duty to our fellow mortals. Thus the Saviour sums the whole up in two points, one to God, and the other to our neighbour. What this law requires is the great object of the christian religion; by this law is the knowledge of sin. This law is not done away, but magnified and made honourable by the Saviour. This is the law that the Saviour did not come to destroy, but to fulfil. This

law is not a *shadow*, but a substance, yet there was a "shadow" belonging to this law. By this *shadow*, I understand the law has a covenant of works, including the national code and Levitical priesthood, containing carnal ordinances.

This law, as a covenant of works, the Gentiles were not under, but the law being spiritual, holy, just and good, its work could be written in the hearts of the Gentiles, which I understand to be the one talent, the conscience or monitor that is in every man's breast, which teaches men to fear judgment, but does not give them hearts to love God. Thus the Gentiles had not the law, yet were a law unto themselves, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another, according to the moral virtues performed among them agreeably to their understanding of morality.

3rd. It is difficult to distinguish between two points of error so nearly related to each other. If the advocates for the doctrine of the general atonement believed the truth as revealed in God's word respecting the purity of the atonement, and the certainty that all for whom it was made, would be bro't to the Saviour, as being given to him, they would adopt the Universalian principles in toto; but if the Universalians believed the truth of God's word respecting the punishment of the wicked, and cause of condemnation, they certainly would reject both their own principles and the doctrine of the universal atonement. Thus about all the difference between them is, the one believes the atonement was equally for all, yet God having respect to the act of the creature in making the atonement effectual to his salvation, all who fail to act their part will be lost. The other believes the atonement was made equally for all, and consequently God will lose nothing, but will finally save all that Christ redeemed. The balance of this point being so fully answered in my 6th and 7th Numbers, 2d Volume, I shall pass on.

4th. If I understand you, your object is to know whether God's children are justified before they are converted, or when they receive the evidence of their sins. This interesting subject requires that much should be said, but I must be short. In order to understand this subject correctly, we should carefully examine the following facts.

First. God's children had two standings, one in Adam

their natural head, in which they sinned, fell and came short of the glory of God, the other in Christ, their spiritual head, in whom they are complete.

Second. When were God's children secured in Christ, in time or in eternity? If in time, their justification is in time, if in eternity, their justification is in eternity.

Third. We should observe with attention that justification is a *law term*, and that God is the justifier.

Fourth. A correct understanding of the difference between justifying a transgressor and the pardoning of a sinner, will almost explain the whole matter. The purity of God's law and justice by which it is maintained, will not admit of mercy's being extended in the pardon of sins, where the law still holds a demand against the sinner. If the person against whom the law holds no demand is not in a justified state in the eye of the law, I do not understand the use of language; and if the Saviour has redeemed his church from under the law, and from its curse, having obtained eternal redemption for us, the church is certainly in a justified state. She was virtually so before the Saviour died for her sins, and rose again for her justification, and since that she is actually so, the justice of the divine law having met all its claims in Christ her head and husband, it has no demands against her. This is the cause why grace can be extended, sinners bro't to repentance, and that the Saviour has power on earth to forgive sins, while God can be just, and the justifier of all them that believe in Jesus.

God first reconciled the world unto himself before he committed unto us the words of reconciliation. The forgiveness of sins cannot take place by a simple act of mercy at the expense of the *truth* and justice of God. Thus the sinner receiving the pardon of his sins, is the evidence of his justification, a fact which existed before he knew it, for if Christ had not redeemed the sinner from the curse of the law, he never could have been delivered from the power of darkness, and received the forgiveness of his sins. A man to be *condemned* and *justified* at the same time, is a *paradox* in the view of many. This can be solved, when we remember that in Adam, our natural head, we fell, and that we are continually condemned sinners, when viewed as standing related to him; but in Christ, our spiritual head, we are complete, and that we are continually righteous or justified, when viewed as standing related to him. Thus the sinner can be convicted for sin, feel the weight of his

guilt, viewing himself justly condemned by God's righteous law, as standing connected with his natural head, and at the same time stand completely justified in Christ, and the very moment that the divine spirit witnesses to the penitent soul, the fact that Christ is his Saviour, and in him he is justified, that moment the burthen of guilt is removed. The soul never feels condemnation when viewing itself as standing related to Christ, nor is the revealing this *fact* to the soul the creating of the *fact*; the fact existed before, and if God chose his people in Christ before the world was, the fact existed before the world was, God being the justifier, and justification a law term.

Fifth. As to what will be the situation of this earth after the resurrection of the dead, when the work of redemption is completed, and God has removed corruption entirely from it, I am at present unprepared to express a satisfactory opinion, (it will all be right,) and I have not room to bring to view the different points of divine writ upon that subject, and show the proper conclusion, therefore I will pass this point by, believing that it will be unfolded to the church in its time.

Sixth. Adam was certainly a natural being, and not a spiritual one, when created, and as the term *animal* may be used in distinguishing between natural and spiritual things, it will suitably apply to him in every property he possessed, yet I have thought, that what we call the *animal* spirit, is a product of the fall, and not a property of man in creation. The animal spirit is but the product and instrument of the carnal mind, which is not reconciled to God. This animal spirit is that which loves earthly things, and is often substituted in the place of true religion, and when roused into action, produces almost every act of wickedness committed in the world. It is the medium through which the enemy distresses God's children, and often leads them astray. This animal spirit will be lost in death, and never rise to trouble God's children any more. There is a controversy as to which is the existing part of man, the *soul* or *spirit*, and I have no doubt but that both terms are used in the word of truth, as expressive of that part of man, which will eternally exist, but I think you will understand me as to that part of man which I have been pointing out, and as to any thing farther on this subject, I refer you to my answer to some inquiry which you will find in the 8th No.

Your brother in tribulation, DANIEL PARKER.