

ty of murder?" "So God said to Adam, 'in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.'" "Die and go to hell?" "No!" So, when Elder Seely was put up to preach he openly denounced Elder Parker's doctrine as two-seed heresy. There was a general excitement and confusion, words were passed from pulpit to congregation, then at Trinity River Association (a small organization led by Elder S. Clark; formerly of Illinois, and also an occasional correspondent to the *Primitive Baptist*. In the following Fall the same kind of confusion existed; so being convinced that such a state of affairs could not continue with any good result, Elder Seely and myself made an effort at the Session of 1870 to get a voice from the Churches of the Association on the subject, but a majority being two-seeders, we were defeated. So, in February following Elder Seely told Union Church that the time had come to call her Preacher for the coming year—and that he wished to know if she intended to call him—that he declared a non-fellowship for "Parkerism." When one Brother moved that we dissolve, another seconded it; the vote was taken, the Church was dissolved. I was not there on Saturday, but on Sunday I consented to what the Church had done. The vote for a dissolution was unanimous, not a dissenting voice till this day. It will be remembered that Elder Seely did nothing but take the vote, and then consented to what was done. So those of us who wish to live in a Church capacity agreed to be constituted into a Primitive Baptist Church and for this purpose called Elder G. W. McDonald (Moderator of Concord Association, and a very able man of 40 years experience in the Ministry) and Elder J. Beaver, (now dead,) who, after learning the "facts" in the case, proceeded to constitute us into a Church, and also ordained the writer at the same time. We have remained to ourselves because of the distance to orthodox Associations being so great. Elder McDonald has visited us occasionally, he came recently and assisted in the ordination of my brother, S. C. Deman. Elder I. M. Duke also visited us while he was here. But the Lord, as I hope, has taken him to California. I recommend him to California Baptists as a good man, and a sound Minister. May the Blessings of High Heaven rest in and upon my dear brother. I love him dearly. I have, in the mean-time held correspondence with the Ministering Brethren in other Associations, and "if the Lord will," I expect to meet Elders Price, Robinson, Morris, and others of like precious faith soon. Elder Seely has been seriously afflicted for two years—so he could not travel—and I, a faithful disengaged ex-Confederate soldier, and very poor withal—so that we have not been able to travel upwards of 1,200 miles the last past Summer and Fall. No, we have not been able to do so for several reasons, one is be-

cause the Macedonian cry: "Come over and help us"—is not so remote as to require extensive traveling—it is near us. I have seen people go abroad for comfort, while others who attended to their own business had it at home.

I will now proceed to give some other items not yet mentioned: Soon after we withdrew from Union Association, I met Elder Parker and had a long argument with him in which I proposed, for the benefit of those who had not understood the real difference, that we publicly discuss the subject. He would not consent, but hearing afterwards that I had stated publicly, that I had made such a proposition, and that he refused to accept of it—his champion pride was stirred. But, let me here remark, that I have been, and am yet ashamed of this act of my life, chiefly because it had the appearance of presumption. I mention it because it is absolutely necessary, in order to bring us to "facts." Elder Parker wrote me a letter stating that he would meet me and discuss the subject, so I drew a form for debate. Here it is:

*First*, God created all things, Satan not excepted, and that all men fell in Adam and all are alike related to him—Election, predestination and adoption make the only final difference—Denton affirms, Parker denies.

*Second*, That the seed, or children of God, were created in eternity, and actually received grace in him as their seminal-head, and that in like manner as Christ is the seminal head of this seed, so also is Satan the seminal-head of his seed—Parker affirms, Denton denies.

Elder Parker objected to the form and proposed the following:

Strike out the *first* proposition all after the words—"Satan not excepted,"—and I will accept. And in the *second* proposition he spoke as follows: "If you will just change it as follows—"That the seed, or children of God existed in Christ in Eternity, and actually received grace in him as their seminal-head, and that in like manner as Christ is the seminal-head of the seed of God, so also, is Satan the seminal-head of his seed, or, the children of the devil."—Parker affirms, Denton denies.

I give these "facts" that there may be "nothing covered up" but that "everything may come to the light."

Another "fact," Sulphur Fork Association at her last Session drew up resolutions for non-fellowship with Union Association "because of the prevalence in her body of the two-seed or Parkerite doctrine." But, Elder I. B. Martin being present, and serving as Spokesman for Union Association and answering affirmatively, a catalogue of doctrinal questions propounded by a Committee composed of Elders C. A. Parker, Robinson, C. Stebbins, and Blackman, prevented his Association from being dropped. I wrote a short communication for the *LANDMARKS* last Fall, in which I said there was a division going on among the Bap-

tists in Texas. I now repeat it.—Two-seedism has formerly held an influence here that is rapidly giving way, and its advocates, unless they recant their principles, must go down with it. Several Churches in Pilot Grove Association have drawn up resolutions of non-fellowship for it. The action of Sulphur Fork shows how she stands. Concord and Providence Associations stand entirely aloof from it. Little Hope Association seems to be in fellowship with Union, but I believe it is more for the want of a knowledge of "facts" than from congeniality of Spirit. Her Moderator, Elder Jefferson Stringer, came from the Primitive Western Association in Georgia, and is, if I may judge from hearing him preach once only, a specimen of Georgia's Old School Baptists. Two-seedism is a reproach to our denomination. Many people in Texas regard the Old Baptists as being of this stripe, because two-seed preachers couple us in with their heresy by such expressions as "We old folks, we Old Baptists," &c. I once heard one of them say "Here is where we Old Baptists differ from the religious world, we deny the immortality of the soul!" Many such things as this have I heard from them. *I will not, I can not* be responsible for such things.

I will now close. Much is yet untold. If the discussion, if it is such, is continued, other Ministers besides myself will doubtless take a part.—Elders Seely and McDonald are able to take care of themselves. They don't need my puny arm. I owe Elder Parker no ill will, wish him well, but I would like it better if he would boldly assume the two-seed doctrine as he really holds it; for, in so doing he would not commit himself so much in trying to establish it. I do not charge Daniel Parker with being a bad man at heart, simply because he advocated heresy. I hope I will not be compelled to write in this manner again—but, dear Brother Gold, if you admit me as an humble correspondent, you must allow me to refer to two-seedism just as I do to Arminianism, or any other "isms."—In much love to you and your readers, I subscribe myself,

Your Little Brother,

JAMES C. DENTON.

MEXIA, TEXAS, July 7th, 1873.

REMARKS ON BENJAMIN PARKER'S LETTER.

Having given a statement of "facts," I will now notice that portion of his communication that has no reference to me but to the doctrinal points so much in dispute. The staple thing of objecting to the position that "Jesus Christ was in his human nature alike related to all men" simply implies a belief in a fleshly two-seed doctrine. But until some one else object to the position I will not labor to prove it. Two-seeders argue against adoption on the ground that it does not, commonly speaking, make one of blood-relationship to the adoptor. I readily admit

that adoption does not, and cannot bring about blood-relationship. But, are we to measure the power of the infinite Jehovah? He has the power and will to take the sons of Abraham into a spiritual union and relationship with himself! How is it done! By adoption! For the first Adam was of the earth, earthly—and so are all his progeny. The beginning of the actual existence of the earthly Adam and all his progeny was "in the beginning when the Lord God created them." Adam nor any of his children actually existed in Christ Jesus or anywhere else before time.—One says they all existed in Christ Jesus as their seminal-head, and were infused into Adam that they might fall and be redeemed. Another says a part only of Adam's children existed in Christ, and that the others are reprobates. This is no better, for it makes a constitutional difference in men—it gives to some a divine seed in nature that others do not have.—The scriptures teach that all are "children of wrath." One has no more claims to have an inheritance in the eternal heavens of immortal glory, than another. God alone makes one to differ from another, and this he does by adopting and regenerating GRACE! "By the grace of God I am what I am" says Paul. By "the Spirit of adoption" sinners are "made partakers of the divine nature. Men, women, and children, are "sons" and "children of God," not because of eternal creation, or generation in Christ Jesus, but by adoption.—"Adam was the son of God" by creation, because he had neither father or mother naturally. His posterity was in him, not by grace, (it was taken from another mode of existence and placed in Adam, but by creation.—But not so with the seed or children of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven." They were chosen in him. According as he has chosen us (sinners) in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be (not were) holy and without blame before him in love. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved." Elder Parker does not answer my question. I will now put it again as a standing question to all who deny the adoption of any part of the Adam man but the body only. If adoption cannot bring the soul into union with Christ in regeneration, how can it bring the body into union with him in the resurrection? I hold that "regeneration" and "new birth" are substantially the same.—For a full expression of my views on this subject, see the article in *regeneration* appended to Elder Vanmeter's pamphlet—"Walking about Zion."—"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of Heaven," and therefore the motto of flesh and blood relationship is left out. "The (second) word was made flesh," was one with his children in that respect, that they