

DANIEL PARKER'S DOCTRINE OF THE TWO SEEDS

DANIEL PARKER'S DOCTRINE OF THE TWO SEEDS

---

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School  
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Theology

---

by

O. Max Lee

June 1962

SOUTHERN BAPTIST  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY  
2825 LEXINGTON ROAD      LOUISVILLE, KY.

APPROVAL SHEET

DANIEL PARKER'S DOCTRINE OF THE TWO SEEDS

O. Max Lee

Read and Approved by:

James Leo Barrett - (Chairman)

Tomorgan Patterson

C. P. St. Amant

Date June 29, 1962

122  
THESES  
Th. M.  
L514d  
ORIGINAL

TO  
MART

## PREFACE

## PREFACE

Significant clues sometimes lurk in unlikely places. More specifically, the first clue in locating three supposedly nonexistent writings of Daniel Parker was found in a reference to a thesis in an unpublished bibliography included in a microfilm copy of the manuscripts submitted for the publication of the Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists.

A reading of the thesis itself disclosed quotations from the three supposedly nonexistent writings. In addition, the thesis indicated that the three writings were owned by Mr. Benjamin Parker, a great-grandson of Daniel Parker living in Elkhart, Texas. A telephone call for Mr. Benjamin Parker revealed that he had died several years earlier, but additional efforts indicated that some of his relatives still lived in Elkhart. A visit with several of these relatives led ultimately to Mr. Armistead Parker, who possessed a copy of the three writings by Daniel Parker.

Without the thesis by Small, the whereabouts of the Parker materials would have been unknown. Without the permission of Mr. Armistead Parker, the use of the material would have been impossible. Consequently, I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Guy Small and to Mr. Armistead Parker whose contributions made this thesis possible.

I should like to acknowledge also my indebtedness to

the following people who have contributed in various ways to the writing of this thesis: Dr. G. Hugh Wamble, sometime professor in Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, under whose teaching I first came to love American Church History; Dr. John L. Loos, professor in Louisiana State University, whose historical bibliography seminar was invaluable in locating rare materials for this thesis; Dr. Leo T. Crismon, Librarian, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, who made available necessary research materials; Dr. Charles P. Johnson, Librarian, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, who also helped to secure necessary research materials; and Miss Betty McCoy, Circulation Librarian of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, who obtained numerous materials through Inter-Library Loan.

In addition, I wish to express my appreciation to the Theological Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for granting a time extension which enabled me to complete this thesis and to Emmanuel Baptist Church, Houston, Texas, for granting leaves of absence which permitted me to utilize the time extension. In like manner, I am indebted to the Rev. Hoyt D. Greer and the Rev. J. E. Barnwell, successive pastors of Emmanuel Baptist Church, who encouraged me, as the assistant pastor, to complete this writing.

To Dr. C. Penrose St. Amant and Dr. W. Morgan Patterson, members of my committee of instruction, I am

indebted for guidance and encouragement. Dr. James Leo Garrett, chairman of my committee of instruction, merits my especial appreciation for suggestions and counsel during the writing of the thesis.

I am indebted to Mrs. Wendell Arnett for her meticulous care in typing the completed thesis.

O. Max Lee

Louisville, Kentucky

June, 1962



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	3
Approach to the Problem . . . . .	4
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	5
II. TRADITIONAL VIEW OF PARKER . . . . .	6
Tireless Enemy of Missions . . . . .	7
Author of "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination" . . . . .	11
Hyper-Calvinism . . . . .	12
Theological Basis of Anti-Missionism . . . . .	13
III. PARKER AS VIEWED FROM HIS WORKS . . . . .	15
The Man . . . . .	16
His Early Acquaintance with the New Mission Plan . . . . .	18
A Friend of Missions; an Enemy of Mission Societies . . . . .	20
Author of "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination" . . . . .	25
A Doctrine of the Non-Elect . . . . .	26
A Moderate Calvinism on Predestination . . . . .	30
A Separate Doctrine from His Anti-Missionism.	33
IV. THE CONCEPTS OF THE TWO SEEDS . . . . .	36
The Sovereignty of God . . . . .	38
The Origin of Evil . . . . .	40
The Origin of the Non-Elect . . . . .	43
The Non-Elect in Biblical History . . . . .	48
The Doctrine of the Church . . . . .	51
The Relationship of Christ and His Church . . . . .	55
V. REASONS FOR MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT PARKER . . . . .	58
Criticisms of Parker . . . . .	59
Controversy over Two-Seed Views . . . . .	62

Chapter	Page
Misunderstanding of Parker's Predestination . .	66
Nature of Parker's Writings . . . . .	69
Scarcity and Unavailability of Parker's Writings . . . . .	75
Reliance of Historians on Secondary Materials .	76
John Mason Peck . . . . .	76
R. B. C. Howell . . . . .	77
VI. SUMMARY . . . . .	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	90
APPENDIX . . . . .	96

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Primarily responsible for the Baptist anti-mission movement of the early 1800's were three men: Alexander Campbell, John Taylor, and Daniel Parker. Campbell did not remain either a Baptist or an anti-missioner.<sup>1</sup> In his later years, Taylor seemed to regret his anti-mission writing, Thoughts on Missions.<sup>2</sup> Of the three, Parker alone consistently maintained his anti-mission position.<sup>3</sup>

Parker was known also for his doctrine of the "two seeds." As its author, he was the unintentional founder of the "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists."

Despite his importance as an anti-missioner and as the originator of a new Baptist sect, Parker has received scant attention from the American church historians. In their writings about Parker, they have quoted primarily from secondary sources.

---

<sup>1</sup>Anti-missioner, as used in this thesis, refers to anyone who objected to the mission plan of "The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions," popularly known as the Triennial Convention. For information about this organization, see footnote 5, Chapter II.

<sup>2</sup>Leo Crismon, "John Taylor," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958), II, 1347.

<sup>3</sup>For a biographical sketch of Parker, see Chapter II.

### Statement of the Problem

This thesis was originally to have been entitled Daniel Parker's Theological Basis of Anti-Missionism. The basis for such a study was supposedly to be found in Parker's Views on the Two Seeds.<sup>4</sup> It soon became evident that no secondary sources made a direct use of this writing. Instead they had relied, as noted earlier, on secondary sources.

This reliance upon secondary sources has been prompted by the assumption that the majority of Parker's writings were nonextant. In searching for copies of these writings, this writer had the good fortune to locate Mr. Armistead Parker, one of Daniel Parker's great-grandsons, who had stored in his trunk a copy of three of Parker's writings. Bound in one cover, they were (1) Views on the Two Seeds, (2) A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds, and (3) Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds.<sup>5</sup>

A quick reading of these materials indicated that Parker's anti-mission effort and two-seed views had been misrepresented and misunderstood by the majority of the church historians. This impression was further confirmed by

---

<sup>4</sup>William Warren Sweet, The Baptists, 1783-1830, Vol. I: Religion on the American Frontier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 75.

<sup>5</sup>So far as this writer knows, this is the only available copy of the Supplement and the Second Dose.

a reading of Daniel Parker's Author's Defence and Church Advocate (II), neither of which had received adequate attention from the church historians.<sup>6</sup> Using these primary sources as a basis, this thesis will attempt to clarify and to explain some of the major distortions which have developed about Daniel Parker.

#### Approach to the Problem

It is the purpose of this thesis to portray (1) Parker and his works as they have been understood traditionally; (2) Parker as he is to be understood through his writings; (3) the two-seed views as seen through Parker's own writings; (4) the origin and the development of the current misconceptions about Parker and his doctrines; and (5) a summary of these findings.

Because Parker's works have been quoted so rarely in the past, lengthy quotations from these works will frequently be cited in this thesis. Such a plan is mandatory for this study, because often it was the impact of Parker's style and logic, rather than the substance of his writing, which prompted many of his readers either to accept or to reject his arguments. These quotations will be verbatim with no attempt being made to correct spelling, grammar, or

---

<sup>6</sup>For the location of the extant writings of Parker, see the appendix.

punctuation.

Chapter III is designed to portray Parker as he actually appeared in his writings in contrast with the traditional view. Consequently in that chapter only that part of his two-seed views will be considered which is directly related to Chapter II. An elaboration of the doctrine of the two-seed views will be undertaken in Chapter IV.

Within each chapter, the first footnote citation of a work will appear in full form. Later footnote citations in the same chapter will be in short form.<sup>7</sup>

#### Limitations of the Study

The restricted scope of this thesis precludes any lengthy considerations of some important related problems such as (1) the relation of the two-seed views to heretical Christian thought; (2) the effectiveness of Parker's misunderstood two-seed views as actually used in anti-missionism; and (3) the diversity and evolvement of the two-seed views as the basis for present-day Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptist churches.

---

<sup>7</sup>Kate L. Turabian, A Manual for Writers (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 45.



CHAPTER II

TRADITIONAL VIEW OF PARKER

## CHAPTER II

### TRADITIONAL VIEW OF PARKER<sup>1</sup>

#### Tireless Enemy of Missions

Daniel Parker is perhaps best known as the foremost of the anti-mission leaders of the early nineteenth century. After debating the mission issue with Parker for five hours in June, 1822, John Mason Peck said that he had "never before met with so determined an opposer to missions in every aspect."<sup>2</sup> Fifteen years later a circular letter from the organizational meeting of the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky stated that "the Anti-Missionary spirit owes its origin to the notorious Daniel Parker."<sup>3</sup> In 1845, shortly after Parker's death, R. B. C. Howell credited Parker with setting in motion the means that overthrew missions in Tennessee.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Church historians have agreed generally in their descriptions of Parker and his doctrines. The word traditional, as used in this writing, refers to this agreement.

<sup>2</sup>Rufus Babcock, Memoir of John Mason Peck (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1864), p. 174.

<sup>3</sup>"Circular Letter to the Baptist Churches and Associations in the State of Kentucky," Minutes of the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky (Louisville, 1837), p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>R. B. C. Howell, "Missions and Anti-Missions in Tennessee," The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record, IV (November, 1845), 306.

Wherever Parker traveled, he opposed the mission system of the Triennial Convention.<sup>5</sup> Whether in Tennessee, Illinois, or Texas, he had a reputation for being a vigorous anti-missioner and an unforgettable preacher.<sup>6</sup> He was serving as moderator of the Concord Baptist Association (Tennessee) in 1815 when a circular letter was received from Luther Rice, the first missionary appointee of the year-old Triennial Convention. The following year Parker promised to "burst the

---

<sup>5</sup>"The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions" was organized in May, 1814, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania as a national missionary society. Because its meetings were held once each three years, the organization soon came to be known as the Triennial Convention. Each local and state mission society was entitled to send two delegates to this convention, contingent on its having contributed a minimum of one hundred dollars each year to the missionary fund of the convention. See Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1950), pp. 267-68. The responsibility for executing the missionary work of the convention and for transacting business ad interim was given to a board composed of twenty-one members who were called "The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States." Parker's anti-mission attacks were levelled against this "Baptist Board of Foreign Missions," probably because he had seen one of its annual reports.

<sup>6</sup>Parker evidently made a vivid impression on his hearers. James Ross recalled in Life and Times of Elder Reuben Ross (Philadelphia: Grant, Faires & Rodgers, n.d.) hearing Parker preach only once. "On rising in the pulpit to speak, he soon gave us to understand that he meant business--pulled off his coat and vest, laid them deliberately on the pulpit near him, and unbuttoned his shirt collar. After this preparation it is almost incredible with what ease and fluency he spoke. He seemed full of his subject, and went through it in a way that was truly wonderful" (Pg. 145). Grimes said that Parker was a man "with a wonderful degree of magnetism" who "drew large crowds wherever he went" (J. H. Grimes, History of Middle Tennessee Baptists [Nashville: Baptist and Reflector, 1902], p. 402).

Association"<sup>7</sup> if it did not drop its correspondence with the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions and if it did not cease its missionary operations. At the next annual association meeting (August, 1817), a collection for foreign missions was taken after Luther Rice had preached. Parker stated that his reason for making no contribution to the offering was that he had no counterfeit half-dollars and that he certainly would not "throw away good money for such an object."<sup>8</sup> When the Baptist pastor-pioneer Z. N. Morrell arrived in Texas in 1835, he could hear of but one preacher: Daniel Parker.<sup>9</sup>

Although Daniel Parker was well-known in his day, he is known primarily today through two interpreters, R. B. C. Howell and John Mason Peck, both of whom were Baptist preachers who fought Parker's anti-missionism and two-seed views. The secondary sources have frequently borrowed from Peck's description of Parker.

Mr. Parker is one of those singular and rather extraordinary beings whom Divine Providence permits to arise as a scourge to his church, and as a stumbling block in the way of religious effort. Raised on the frontiers of Georgia, without education, uncouth in manners, slovenly in dress, diminutive in person, unprepossessing in

---

<sup>7</sup>John Bond, History of the Baptist Concord Association of Middle Tennessee and North Alabama (Nashville: Graves, Marks and Company, 1860), p. 26.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>9</sup>Z. N. Morrell, Flowers and Fruits in the Wilderness (St. Louis: Commercial Printing Co., 1882), p. 32.

appearance, with shrivelled features and a small piercing eye, few men, for a series of years, have exerted a wider influence on the lower and less educated class of frontier people. With a zeal and enthusiasm bordering on insanity, firmness that amounted to obstinacy, and perseverance that would have done honor to a good cause, Daniel Parker exerted himself to the utmost to induce the churches within his range to declare non-fellowship with all Baptists who united with any missionary or benevolent (or as he called them, new fangled) societies. He possessed a mind of singular and original cast. In doctrine he was an Antinomian from the first, but he could describe the process of conviction, and the joys of conversion, and of dependence on God with peculiar feeling and effect. This kind of preaching was calculated to take a strong hold on the hearts and gain the confidence of a class of pious, simple-hearted Christians, of but little religious intelligence and reading. He fully believed, and produced the impression on others, that he spoke by immediate inspiration. Repeatedly have we heard him when his mind seemed to rise above its own powers, and he would discourse for a few moments on the divine attributes or some doctrinal subject with such brilliancy of thought and force of correctness of language, as would astonish men of education and talents. Then, again, it would seem as though he was perfectly bewildered in a mist of abstruse subtleties.<sup>10</sup>

According to R. B. C. Howell, Parker was ambitious to be a writer and sent articles for publication to the Columbian Star in Washington City. "His essays, setting forth his own peculiar opinions, were rejected by that paper, and his doctrines ridiculed as equally immodest and preposterous."<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>John Mason Peck, "Historical Sketches of the Baptist Denomination in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri," The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle, I (July, 1842), 198. See also "Parkerism in Indiana," The Baptist Encyclopedia, ed. William Cathcart, II (1880), 883; William T. Stott, Indiana Baptist History, 1798-1908 (Franklin, Indiana: William T. Stott, 1908), p. 56; Walter Brownlow Posey, The Baptist Church in the Lower Mississippi Valley, 1776-1845 (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1957), p. 68.

<sup>11</sup>Howell, "Missions and Anti-Missions," p. 306.

The Star favored the missionary enterprise and ministerial education. Howell concluded that Parker's rejection by that publication caused him to have the most implacable hatred for these men and all their pursuits.<sup>12</sup>

Author of "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination"

Parker is as well-known for his two-seed views as for his anti-missionism. He published Views on the Two Seeds in 1826. The following year he published the Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds.<sup>13</sup> Described as a modification of ancient Manichaeism,<sup>14</sup> these two works attempted to prove that the two existing spiritual principles of good and evil were eternal and self-existing.<sup>15</sup>

Vedder's brief description of the two-seed views is

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>The title page of the Second Dose lists 1826 as the publication date. However, Parker did not conclude the writing until February, 1827. (Daniel Parker, The Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds, Dealt Out in Broken Doses Designed to Purge the Armenian Stuff & Dross Out of the Church of Christ and Hearts and Heads of Saints [Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1826], p. 83.)

<sup>14</sup>J. H. Spencer, A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885 (Cincinnati: J. R. Baumes, 1885), I, 576; William Warren Sweet, The Baptists, 1783-1830, Vol. I: Religion on the American Frontier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 75.

<sup>15</sup>Spencer, History of Kentucky Baptists, I, 577.

representative of the traditional interpretation.

Parker taught that part of Eve's offspring were the seed of God and elect to eternal life; part were the seed of Satan and foreordained to the kingdom of eternal darkness. By the divine decree all events whatever, from the creation to the final consummation, were fore-ordained, so that nothing can interfere with or change his plans.<sup>16</sup>

Hyper-Calvinism. Such a doctrine has traditionally been called "fiercely Calvinistic"<sup>17</sup> or "hyper-Calvinistic."<sup>18</sup> The justification for such a description is to be found in the exaggerated radical emphasis on predestination which supposedly is the central emphasis in the doctrine of the

---

<sup>16</sup>Henry C. Vedder, A Short History of the Baptists (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907), p. 389. See Peck, "Historical Sketches," pp. 198-99; A. H. Dunlevy, History of the Miami Baptist Association (Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard and Co., 1869), p. 79; Spencer, History of Kentucky Baptists, I, 577-78; H. K. Carroll, The Religious Forces of the United States, Vol. I: American Church History (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893), pp. 49-50; Justin A. Smith, A History of the Baptists in the Western States East of the Mississippi (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896), p. 124; B. F. Riley, A History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898), pp. 356-57; Sweet, The Baptists, p. 75; Frank S. Mead, Handbook of Denominations in the United States (New York: Abingdon Press, 1951), p. 44; Jesse L. Boyd, A History of Baptists in America Prior to 1845 (New York: The American Press, 1957), p. 131; Lynn E. May, Jr., "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, ed. Norman Wade Cox, II (1958), 1433; Clifton E. Olmstead, History of Religion in the United States (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 273.

<sup>17</sup>Vedder, A Short History, p. 389.

<sup>18</sup>William Warren Sweet, Religion in the Development of American Culture, 1765-1840 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 274.

two-seeds.<sup>19</sup> One's destiny to salvation or to damnation is unalterably fixed by the seed from which he sprang. God has predestined that His seed will receive eternal life and that Satan's seed will receive eternal damnation.

Theological Basis of Anti-Missionism. John Taylor had objected to the fact that the mission movement was not church-centered. He had also objected to its money-making tactics. Alexander Campbell had contended that the missionary plan of the Triennial Convention was unscriptural. But it would seem according to the traditional understanding of Parker's two-seed views that no mission plan whatsoever was needed. If God would save His own children, and if the children of Satan were predestined to eternal punishment, any kind of mission plan would seem ridiculous. Because of this understanding of the two-seed views, Parker has been charged with elaborating the theological basis for anti-missionism.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>Cf. Peck, "Historical Sketches," p. 199; Howell, "Missions and Anti-Missions," p. 306; Dunlevy, History of Miami Association, p. 79; Carroll, Religious Forces, p. 48; Smith, History of the Baptists, pp. 123-24; Riley, A History of the Baptists, p. 356; Sweet, The Baptists, p. 67; John F. Cady, The Origin and Development of the Missionary Baptist Church in Indiana (Franklin College, 1942), p. 46; Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1950), p. 279; Mead, Handbook, p. 44; Boyd, A History of Baptists, p. 131; Walter Brumlow Posey, The Baptist Church in the Lower Mississippi Valley, 1776-1845 (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1957), p. 71; May, Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1433.

<sup>20</sup>"Circular Letter to Kentucky Baptists," Minutes of



By way of summary, Daniel Parker has been portrayed traditionally as a slovenly, uneducated, rejected, powerful, persevering zealot. Having this conception of Parker, modern writers have pictured him as an eccentric, effective, anti-mission leader motivated by a heretical, hyper-Calvinistic two-seed theology.

J. M. Carroll, aware of this traditional view, noted what seemed to be an inconsistency in Parker's theory versus practice. He stated that Parker's work in Texas was a direct contradiction to his teaching, for Parker, at his own expense, was repeatedly preaching everywhere within a radius of a hundred miles. And furthermore, Parker and his "anti-missionary" church organized nine different churches in a ten-year period. Carroll observed that this was "truly a wonderful record for an anti-missionary church!"<sup>21</sup>

---

the General Association, p. 11; Sweet, The Baptists, p. 75; Cady, Origin of the Missionary Baptist Church, p. 50; A. B. Rutledge and W. Fred Kendall, "Daniel Parker," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1071.

<sup>21</sup>J. M. Carroll, A History of Texas Baptists (Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1923), p. 116.

CHAPTER III

PARKER AS VIEWED FROM HIS WORKS

## CHAPTER III

### PARKER AS VIEWED FROM HIS WORKS

#### The Man

Daniel Parker was ever on the move--from Virginia to Georgia to Tennessee to Illinois and finally to Texas. Born in Culpepper County, Virginia to John and Sarah Parker on April 6, 1781, Daniel was taken as a lad to Georgia by his parents. Daniel's father was responsible for moving from Virginia to Georgia; Daniel's own restless, energetic spirit was responsible for moving to the other three states. His home in Georgia was a wilderness disturbed only infrequently by hunters, both white and Indian.

His only education consisted of learning to read from the New Testament and learning to shape letters with a pen.<sup>1</sup> In an autobiographical sketch he said that he had never examined an English grammar for five minutes and knew not one rule in arithmetic.<sup>2</sup>

Parker joined the Nail's Creek Baptist Church, Franklin County, Georgia, by baptism in January, 1802. In June,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Church Advocate, II (May, 1831), 183. Daniel Parker edited this periodical through two volumes, 1829-1831. As far as is known, only Volume II is extant.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., II (August, 1831), 259.

1803, he, his family, and several other families left for Tennessee where they stopped at Turnbull's Creek in Dixon County. In May, 1806, he was ordained by Elders Garner McConnico, John Record, and John Turner.

Parker's next move was to Sumner County, Tennessee, where he joined the Hopewell Church on Bledsoe's Creek. Since the area had no Baptist preachers, Parker had ample opportunity to preach. It was here where he first encountered the new mission plan of the Triennial Convention. To provide support for his growing family he purchased some poor farm land on the "Ridge."

In December, 1817, Parker moved to Crawford County, Illinois, where he launched his major attacks on the mission plan of the Triennial Convention. It was here also where Parker did almost all of his writing. In 1820 he wrote A Public Address to the Baptist Society in which he outlined his attack on the mission plan. His Plain Truth was published in 1823, followed by The Author's Defence (sic) in 1824. Views on the Two Seeds and A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds were published in 1826, followed a year later by Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds. From 1829 through 1831 he published a monthly religious periodical, The Church Advocate.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Some additional facts about Parker not found in his writings help to give clearer insight into his personality,

## His Early Acquaintance with the New Mission Plan

Daniel Parker was a pastor in Concord Association (Tennessee) when first he heard of the mission plan of the Triennial Convention. Even though he was one of the young pastors in the association, he had already come to a place

---

ability, and reputation.

J. H. Grime described Parker thus: "Elder Parker was a man with a wonderful degree of magnetism and drew large crowds wherever he went. He paid no attention to conventionalities. Once, when preaching in the city of Nashville to a crowded house, in warm weather, he laid aside his coat and vest and neck-tie, as he was wont to do in rural districts, and yet the people hung on his words as though nothing unusual had occurred. At the close of his discourse, one very prominent and cultured man pronounced him the greatest preacher in the State" (J. H. Grime, History of Middle Tennessee Baptists [Nashville: Baptist and Reflector, 1902], p. 402).

According to William Henry Perrin (ed.), History of Crawford and Clark Counties, Illinois (Chicago: O. L. Baskin and Co., 1883), Parker was "termed one of the ablest men ever in Crawford County" and served as a state senator in the Third and Fourth General Assemblies of Illinois (p. 90).

In 1833 Parker left Illinois with the newly-formed Pilgrim Regular Predestinarian Baptist Church and traveled by ox-cart to Texas. He had learned a year earlier while visiting in Texas that no Baptist church could legally be organized in that Mexican colony. Consequently, he decided to organize the church in Illinois and bring it intact to Texas. Such was the origin of the first Baptist church in Texas. (J. M. Carroll, A History of Texas Baptists [Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1923], p. 46.)

Shortly after coming to Texas, Parker served as a member of the Council of the Texas Provisional Government and later was elected to the first Congress of Texas. (J. M. Dawson, "Missions and Missionaries," Centennial Story of Texas Baptists [Dallas: Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1936], p. 21.) He also traveled a preaching circuit whose territory was later divided into twenty counties. He died on December 3, 1844, and was buried in the cemetery of the Pilgrim Regular Predestinarian Baptist

of prominence and leadership.<sup>4</sup> Writing in 1824, he described his reaction to the new plan of spreading the gospel.

I commenced the Ministry in the year 1802--my doctrine was considered perfectly consistant [sic] with, and supporting of, the Baptist faith and practice. I enjoyed sweet fellowship and union, without a jar, (as to anything I know of,) until about eight or nine years ago. I was then a member of the Baptist church, at Hopewell meeting house, on Bledsoe's creek, Sumner county, Tennessee. About that time the mission system, in its beautiful colours, (not in its true light) was presented to the view of the Baptists in that country, and their patronage ...icited<sup>5</sup> for its support; at the first sight I was taken, like the young man whose passion of love is so taken with the beauty, and fine dress of the damsel, that he forgets to consider the real merit, or virtue of the person. But in a short time I was brought to a reflection, and as I came to understand the plan, and try it by the word of God, I was constrained to fear it was a speculative plan, of mans [sic] invention, and not the Lord's work.<sup>6</sup>

After praying about the matter, Parker became firmly convinced that the plan was of Satan and not of God. About the same time the plan was referred to the churches of the association. Parker was then attending four of these churches,

---

Church in Elkhart, Texas. His burial site is marked by a Texas centennial monument erected in 1936.

The best biography of Parker is Guy Small, "The Life of Daniel Parker" (unpublished Master's thesis, East Texas Baptist College, Marshall, Texas, 1954). Parker's valuable autobiographical sketch is in the August and September issues of the Church Advocate, II (1831), 259-88.

<sup>4</sup>Grime, History of Middle Tennessee Baptists, p. 331.

<sup>5</sup>The beginning letters of the word were obscured in the text.

<sup>6</sup>Daniel Parker, The Author's Defence (Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1824), pp. 3-4.

before which he "laid the case impartially before them."<sup>7</sup>

The vote on the mission plan showed that only three members in all the four churches favored the plan. Since Parker believed the will of the Lord could be found among His people, his mind was made up.

Now for the first time, and compelled under a sense of duty, I drew the sword against the error, which produced a sharp contest before I was able to defeat the system. From that time to this, I do not hesitate to say my life has been sought, perhaps as close as Saul pursued [sic] David.<sup>8</sup>

The remaining twenty-eight<sup>?</sup> years of Parker's life were to be spent in opposing this plan of missions which he considered inconsistent with the teachings of the New Testament.

#### A Friend of Missions; an Enemy of Mission Societies

Parker was happy for the gospel to be taken to more people, but he was unhappy with the proposed plan of sending out missionaries by the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions. He made a sharp distinction between the mission object to be accomplished and the method of its accomplishment.

But no, there is a vast difference between a plan, and the object said to be accomplished by it; the present mission object held forth to the public view is good, while the plans to effect it are sinful, being mans [sic]

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

work, and not God's order.<sup>9</sup>

In what possibly is Parker's latest extant writing, a letter addressed to David Benedict in 1843, Parker made a distinction between the mission plan of the Triennial Convention and the plan which he favored.

Of course there are two missionary spirits in the world, one of God, and the other of the devil, both claiming the bible [sic] on their side, and to be the worshipers of God, and to do good to be their object, with equal apparent zeal. . . . Now which is of God? The present 'mission effort spirit,' reduced to a system unknown to the Bible, as pertaining to the gospel, without church authority, or us, anti to that course of things, who are contending for scriptural ground, church authority, and gospel order, in sending or spreading the gospel.<sup>10</sup>

Parker felt justifiably that his critics had failed to make clear his distinction between the mission object and the mission goal.

The artful enemy has so arranged things, that a man cannot well show the corruption of one part of the product of the mission principle, without being reported as standing opposed to every thing that is going on by acts of benevolence, and thereby he meets the hot displeasure of the influence of every department of the mission system.<sup>11</sup>

Parker also voiced his displeasure at the misrepresentations made by the proponents of the mission plan.

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>10</sup>David Benedict, A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and Other Parts of the World (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman and Co., 1856), p. 788.

<sup>11</sup>Church Advocate, II (March, 1831), 129.



It is deeply impressed upon the minds of the public, that the preachers, churches and associations, who stand opposed to the present mission plan, are opposed to the spread of the gospel, to itinerant preaching, and the support of the ministry; all of which are false statements or insinuations. I know not of one in the union, that stands opposed to these things, if done in an orderly way.<sup>12</sup>

Parker's opponents had also charged him with opposition to acts of benevolence, such as the translation and distribution of the Scriptures.

The Bible societies, the propriety of preparing men to translate the scripture into different tongues, the acts of benevolence, and all these sort of things, are directly brought to view, as though these were the points in controversy; when perhaps, not a man among us would stand opposed to circulating the Bible, nor to forming a society on proper principles, for that purpose, if needed; neither to educating and preparing translators of the scriptures in a proper manner.<sup>13</sup>

What is this orderly way and proper manner of which Parker speaks? Very simply it is that all mission activity should center in and be controlled by the Church.<sup>14</sup> Christ

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., II (November, 1830), 39.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., II (March, 1831), 129. In an earlier issue of the Church Advocate, II (October, 1830), 10, Parker addressed the following words to John Mason Peck. "If you intended to be understood, that I stood opposed to the mission given by the Divine Spirits [sic] to God's ministers, and to the benevolent acts of Christians, in an individual or church capacity, you are as wickedly wrong, as if you had burnt your shirt, and then said somebody had stolen it, and thereby taken grounds for begging in order to support the present mission system in which you are now engaged."

<sup>14</sup>As will be seen later, Parker insisted that there was but one church. Sometimes he wrote the term as the Church; at other times he wrote the church.

had given the role of evangelizing the world to the Church, not to a society separate from the control of the Church.

If the old baptists [sic] are right in believing the church to be the highest ecclesiastical authority upon earth, that God rules and reigns in and over her; and that the ministers of the gospel are gifts given to her for her benefit, God's use and glory over which Christ her king, has made it her duty to rule, use and attend to, as her servants--then certainly I am not wrong in my former remarks; and whatever is to be done for the support and furtherance of the gospel, by the use of a society, should be done by the church herself, as she is the only society on earth, to which God has given such rights and power, and has not authorised [sic] her to transfer her duty, rights, and power to any other society or set of beings on earth.<sup>15</sup>

In his writings Parker consistently asserted that all mission activity should originate from the Church. To form a society separate from the Church was to indicate a deficiency both in the Word of God and in the power of the Church.<sup>16</sup> A good summary of Parker's insistence on control by the Church is found in a letter to John Mason Peck.

I am appointed advocate for the mission given by the spirit of God, and by the legal authority of the gospel church, (as given to her by Christ her head and husband) and that the church is and should be, a benevolent institution; while I stand equally and as pointedly opposed to every other mission plan and benevolent operation, appearing under the name of the church of God, while they are not under its government, viewing such "mission" plans and benevolent operations to be anti-christian [sic]; and now Mr. J. M. Peck, you can begin

---

<sup>15</sup>Church Advocate, II (November, 1830), 41.

<sup>16</sup>Daniel Parker, Views on the Two Seeds (Vandalia, Illinois: Robert Blackwell, 1826), p. 19; Church Advocate, II (October, 1830), 12; ibid., II (December, 1830), 64.

to see the dividing ground between you and I [sic].<sup>17</sup>

Parker was not content merely to condemn the mission plan then in existence; he offered a plan which he thought would be both scriptural and effective.

Could the church fall on some plan to bring about something like itinerant preaching, or an interchange of the ministry among them, I have no doubt but they would be much benefitted thereby. The best plan in my judgment [sic] to accomplish such a thing is, for each church to do its duty in loosening the hands of their [sic] ministers, so that they can follow the weight of their minds in visiting sister churches and destitute settlements.<sup>18</sup>

It has been observed earlier that this plan, when tried by Parker in Texas, culminated in the organization of nine new churches. Perhaps the words of J. M. Carroll are worth repeating at this point: "Truly a wonderful record for an anti-missionary church!"<sup>19</sup>

But seven years before Parker moved to Texas, he

---

<sup>17</sup>Church Advocate, II (October, 1830), 10. For some lengthy excerpts of A Public Address, Parker's first anti-missionary writing, see B. H. Carroll, Jr., The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism (Louisville: The Baptist Book Concern, 1902), pp. 108-22.

Four years after writing A Public Address, Parker gained another evidence which further proved to him that the new mission plan was of the Serpent. The trustees of Columbian College, a religious college with which Luther Rice was vitally related, petitioned Congress for a \$50,000 loan. This seemed to indicate to Parker a coalition between church and state. (Parker, Author's Defence, pp. 15-16.)

<sup>18</sup>Church Advocate, II (November, 1830), 41.

<sup>19</sup>J. M. Carroll, A History of Texas Baptists, p. 116.

developed a doctrine which became equally as famous as his anti-mission activities. It was in 1826 that he published his Views on the Two Seeds, a book which made him a new set of enemies and made him a heretic even in the eyes of many of his friends.

Author of "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination"<sup>20</sup>

It disturbed Parker to think that a creature made by God might suffer eternal punishment. Baptists believed, so Parker contended, that God chose his elect in Christ before the world began.<sup>21</sup> But what about God's relationship with the non-elect? Surely God would not condemn those whom he had created in his own image.

As Parker continued to ponder the problem, a possible solution presented by an "old brother" continued to come to him, only to be rejected each time as heretical.<sup>22</sup> The scriptural basis of this possible solution was found in Genesis 3:15: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." Was it possible

---

<sup>20</sup>As indicated earlier in the approach to the problem, Chapter III is not concerned with the complete two-seed views, but rather with that part which is in relation to or in contrast with Chapter II. For a fuller explanation of the two-seed views, see Chapter IV.

<sup>21</sup>Parker, Views, p. 4.

<sup>22</sup>Church Advocate, II (September, 1831), 279.

that two kinds of offspring were implicit in the verse? Could it be possible, then, that those who were eternally punished were not God's creation after all, but were a product of Satan?

When Parker became convinced that such was the case, he marveled that this scripture had been used so infrequently by preachers. As he read other scriptures, it seemed obvious that there were two eternal principles, good and bad, as seen in God and the Devil. The two seeds in Genesis must indicate the two lineages from which had originated the people of the earth. Thus, the elect, God's children, came from God's seed, which resided first in Adam and later in Eve. Satan's children, the non-elect, sprang from Satan's seed which also came through Adam, but only after God had multiplied Eve's conception that she might bear the non-elect in addition to bearing the elect.

A Doctrine of the Non-Elect. Parker's concept of the two-seeds, then, is a doctrine of the non-elect. But instead of contending that the children of Satan are eternally damned, as has been charged, the doctrine teaches that they may come to salvation.

For the non-elect stand on the same ground that the Armenian<sup>23</sup> [sic] says the whole world stands on, for

---

<sup>23</sup>Parker's customary spelling for Arminian is Armenian.

Christ rejects none that comes to him for salvation on gospel terms, and those that seek shall find.<sup>24</sup>

And since the non-elect may come to Christ for salvation, their condemnation, if they are condemned, will be their own responsibility.

They will be justly condemned, not because they are the serpent's seed, or that God had reprobated them to destruction before they were born, but because of their sins and acts of wicked rebellion against God, for they shall be judged according to their works.<sup>25</sup>

In order that the non-elect might be without excuse, Parker urged every Christian to witness to the lost.

And notwithstanding the doctrine of election is true, it is the duty of christians [sic] to exert themselves to show sinners their need of Christ, as though it was in their power to do it--while they should engage at a throne of grace, that God may bless their labors, for God works through and by his people; and all that christians [sic] can do is to obey. . . . And the preachers of the gospel should realize that it is their business to preach Christ, the Saviour of sinners, and urge the necessity of repentance towards God and faith in Christ. . . . And each saint, though ever so small, should know that there is something for them to do in the church of Christ; if they cannot preach they can pray--for the preacher is wholly dependant [sic] on the Lord for the success of his labor.<sup>26</sup>

Then if children of Satan may be saved, and if the preachers are urged to exhort sinners to repentance, what good has election done? Parker answers very simply, "It has

---

<sup>24</sup>Parker, Views, p. 14.

<sup>25</sup>Church Advocate, II (June, 1831), 210.

<sup>26</sup>Parker, Views, p. 38.

saved thousands. . . ."27

Another obvious question arises. If both the elect and the non-elect may be saved, what is the difference, if any, in the process of salvation for the two groups? The difference is that for the elect, God prompts their hearts to repentance through the working of his Divine Spirit. This Spirit is brought to bear on the life through the medium of the preached word. God not only ordained that the Divine Spirit would work on the individual heart; he also ordained that the Divine Spirit would gain its entrance to the heart through preaching.<sup>28</sup> The non-elect receive no such prompting, however, from God's Spirit.

As they were the product of sin, and not included in the covenant of grace, the sovereignty of God is not bound to bring them to the saving grace in Christ, but consistent with his divine perfections, can let them alone under the common calls of the gospel.<sup>29</sup>

The question then arises, "Will the non-elect be saved, even though their salvation is possible, if God's Spirit does not prompt them to repentance?" Parker would answer that they follow the will of their father, the Devil.

Now if they (the non-elect) will, they may come, and it is their duty to obey the gospel and come; and if they will not, they are justly condemned, for God is as

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

willing to save them, as they are to be saved, by Christ. Then why should they complain of injustice in God, when the fault is in themselves. But will they come? What is their will, but the will of their father, the Devil? And God is not bound to bring them, but consistent with his divine perfections--can let them alone to fill up their cup of wrath, against the day of wrath, etc. And thus let alone, their will is to follow their father, which they do.<sup>30</sup>

However, being a child of Satan does not, of itself, bring condemnation.

As the non-elect spring into existence by the power of God through the express creation of God, although they are the seed of the serpent, yet they are human beings, and no less accountable to God, nor no more doomed to eternal wo [sic], than if they had been the express creation of God in the display of his sovereign goodness, and not elected or chosen in Christ. . . .<sup>31</sup>

In contrast with the failure of the non-elect to come to Christ for salvation, the elect will be brought by God to salvation so that not a single one of them will be lost.<sup>32</sup> Eternal life will be enjoyed by all the elect; eternal punishment will be endured by all the non-elect. This destiny of the non-elect was not determined by a decree

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>31</sup>Daniel Parker, A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds (no publication data available, the title page seemingly having been removed before this work was bound with a copy of Parker's Views), p. 2.

<sup>32</sup>Daniel Parker, The Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds, Dealt Out in Broken Doses Designed to Purge the Armenian Stuff & Dross Out of the Church of Christ and Hearts and Heads of Saints (Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1826), p. 15.



of God which foreordained each of them in particular to condemnation; rather it will be self-imposed in that each of the non-elect will refuse to believe in Jesus Christ. By such an explanation, Parker provided what to him was a logical and biblical understanding of the elect and the non-elect.

The question then arises, "Why should Parker travel such a circuitous route--positing that there was a seed of Satan, the non-elect, who might come, but who never did come, to salvation--to explain the origin and destiny of the non-elect if he were a hyper-Calvinist as has been charged?" It will be shown that Parker's two-seed concept was not an attempt to create a hyper-Calvinistic theology; on the contrary, it was a creative attempt which sought to modify the extremes of hyper-Calvinism.

A Moderate Calvinism on Predestination.<sup>33</sup> Boettner observed that "in the minds of most people the doctrine of Predestination and Calvinism are practically synonymous terms."<sup>34</sup> It might also be observed that hyper-Calvinism in the minds of the majority of the American church historians is the doctrine which states that God predestined the

---

<sup>33</sup>Moderate Calvinism is used here to signify a type of Calvinism less extreme than hyper-Calvinism.

<sup>34</sup>Lorraine Boettner, The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1932), p. 7.

non-elect to eternal damnation in such a way that they are forever precluded from coming to salvation.<sup>35</sup> Although Calvinism has many facets, it is the predestination portion of the doctrinal system, at least for the purposes of this thesis, which has been subject to the label "hyper."

John Calvin had declared that God elected some to salvation. Furthermore, he had declared, without apology, that God predestined others to death.

God is said to set apart those whom he adopts into salvation; it will be highly absurd to say that others acquire by chance or obtain by their own effort what election alone confers on a few. Therefore, those whom God passes over, he condemns . . .<sup>36</sup>

. . . . .  
 God knows what he once for all has determined to do with us: if he has decreed salvation, he will bring us to it in his own time; if he has destined us to death, we would fight against it in vain.<sup>37</sup>

Coming through a lineage of Regular Baptists, who were Calvinistic in theology as contrasted with the Arminian<sup>7</sup> theology of the Separate Baptists, Parker was well-versed in

---

<sup>35</sup>See footnote 16, Chapter II. Boettner, The Reformed Doctrine, p. 129, states that a "high Calvinist" is one who holds the supralapsarian view. However, but few of the church historians writing about Parker have made this point clear.

<sup>36</sup>John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, Vols. XX, XXI: The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John T. McNeill (26 vols.; London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1960), XXI, 947.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 960.

this Calvinistic doctrine of election.<sup>38</sup> However, he had misgivings about crediting God with condemning the non-elect, particularly if they were made, as were the elect, in God's image.<sup>39</sup>

Parker believed that his doctrine of the two-seeds provided the answer which would glorify God in the condemnation of the non-elect.<sup>40</sup> That God called his elect and brought them to salvation in his own time was agreed upon by both Parker and Calvin. But on the doctrine of the non-elect, Parker and Calvin disagreed sharply. Parker could never bring himself to say that God was responsible for condemning to eternal damnation any creature made in God's image. Consequently, in his views of the two-seeds, Parker stated that the non-elect were the children of Satan and might come to salvation if they so wished. Furthermore, that the non-elect might be without excuse, Parker urged that the gospel be

---

<sup>38</sup>Church Advocate, II (November, 1830), 32. For a discussion of Regular and Separate Baptists, see Robert G. Torbet, A History of the Baptists (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1950), pp. 241-78.

<sup>39</sup>Parker also feared that to credit God with creating all things in existence was to make God the author of evil. It is indeed interesting to note that some two hundred years earlier Jacobus Arminius "would not follow a doctrinal development which made God the author of sin and of the condemnation of men" ("Jacobus Arminius," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, I, 297).

<sup>40</sup>Parker, Views, p. 14.

preached to all, both elect and non-elect. As a result, the non-elect, not believing on Jesus because they did not so desire, would themselves be responsible for their own condemnation. Therefore, as to the responsibility for the condemnation of the non-elect, the crucial issue in hyper-Calvinism, Parker and Calvin were diametrically opposed. Being so far removed from the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination of the non-elect and believing that he had been biblical in arriving at such a position, Parker was convinced that he had answered the major difficulty in the doctrine of Calvinism.<sup>41</sup>

It is indeed ironic, then, that Parker's two-seed views, designed to be a substitute for hyper-Calvinism, should itself have been labeled, and that erroneously, the most extreme form of hyper-Calvinism.

A Separate Doctrine from His Anti-Missionism. It has been demonstrated in this chapter that Parker opposed the mission plan of the Triennial Convention but that he favored mission activity itself when it was under the auspices of the churches. It has also been shown that Parker's concept of the two-seeds sought to absolve God from the responsibility

---

<sup>41</sup>Parker carefully avoided using the term Calvinism. See Church Advocate, II (June, 1831), 216. He preferred the term Predestination.

of condemning the non-elect. In addition, it should be indicated that these two areas, Parker's anti-missionism and his two-seed views, were never intentionally related to each other by Parker himself.

In 1827, Parker listed his publications which were directed against the mission plan of the Triennial Convention. This list of works--A Public Address (1820), Plain Truth (1823), and The Author's Defence (1824)--nowhere mentioned Views on the Two Seeds.<sup>42</sup>

Furthermore, the motivation for the two areas was different. The goals of Parker's anti-mission writings was to warn the public against the evils of the Triennial Convention's mission plan.<sup>43</sup> The writing on the two-seeds doctrine, however, "was for the express purpose of benefiting the Church of Christ, by what I believed to be the true meaning of that line of God's word."<sup>44</sup>

Even the enemies of the two areas of writing were different. Parker stated that the enemies of his anti-mission writings and the enemies of his two-seed views came from two different "streams or sources."<sup>45</sup> By 1827, however,

---

<sup>42</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 49.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 70.

these two streams, both having their origin in the Serpent,<sup>46</sup> had united in one effort against "the true faith of the gospel."<sup>47</sup>

Although it is clear from Parker's works that his anti-mission writings and his two-seed writings were not directly related, some historians, particularly some of the modern historians, have so blurred these distinctions that they have charged the two-seed views with providing the theological basis of his anti-missionism. The explanation of this misconception will be attempted in Chapter V of this writing.

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 70-71.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONCEPTS OF THE TWO SEEDS

## CHAPTER IV

### THE CONCEPTS OF THE TWO SEEDS

A systematic presentation of Parker's two-seed views would be anomalous, for Parker himself was not systematic. He wrote as he felt the Spirit of God moved him. Although the Spirit moved him from point to point in his doctrine,<sup>1</sup> the Spirit did not always prompt him to write systematically or clearly.

Parker's actual writing of the two-seed views came after his anti-mission efforts had been successful in both Tennessee and Illinois. While declaring the certainty of God's election and while preaching against the mission efforts of the day, he became increasingly dissatisfied with the current doctrine of the non-elect. How could it be honorable for God to condemn some of his own creation to eternal damnation?

While seeking an answer to this question, Parker heard of a strange doctrine called the two seeds. First hearing of the two-seed doctrine from an unnamed brother in Tennessee,<sup>2</sup> Parker vacillated between acceptance and rejection of the doctrine, coming at last to believe that God had revealed it

---

<sup>1</sup>Church Advocate, II (September, 1831), 271.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 279.



to him for some special purpose. Having come completely to accept the doctrine, he determined "to proclaim on the house top, that which had been revealed to me in secret."<sup>3</sup>

Parker's basis for his two-seed views was the Bible, which he interpreted in two different ways. At times he held that one could not go beyond what was written.<sup>4</sup> Thus, use exactly what the Bible says--neither more nor less. At other times, he contended that one could learn of the unknown by observing the known.<sup>5</sup> Hence, from what the Bible says, one may infer certain truths which are not explicit in the text. With such an arbitrary view of biblical interpretation, Parker found it easy to explain his views of the two seeds.

These views can best be understood by grouping together some of their main elements, the first of which is the sovereignty of God.

#### The Sovereignty of God

Parker was a staunch believer in the sovereignty of God. God is all-powerful; he has no equal. All things exist either by God's express purpose or by his permission. God

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 280.

<sup>4</sup>Daniel Parker, Views on the Two Seeds (Vandalia, Illinois: Robert Blackwell, 1826), p. 15.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

"is never disappointed in his designs. . . ." <sup>6</sup>

As an expression of sovereignty, God elected or chose his people in Christ before the world began.<sup>7</sup> Before they had an existence in the world, these members of Christ's Church, his body, were chosen.<sup>8</sup>

As an additional expression of sovereignty, God created Adam in His own likeness, in His own image. Adam as created "stood with his wife and seed in him."<sup>9</sup> As such he was "the complete figure of the Lord Jesus Christ with the church in him, before all world was [sic]. . . ." <sup>10</sup> God then took Eve from Adam so that she was separate from him, yet bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh.<sup>11</sup>

God's creation to this point was good.<sup>12</sup> God said so. But this happy state of creation was short-lived. Eve sinned by partaking of the forbidden fruit; Adam likewise sinned.

---

<sup>6</sup>Daniel Parker, A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds (no publication data available), p. 1.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Daniel Parker, The Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds, Dealt Out in Broken Doses Designed to Purge the Armenian Stuff & Dross Out of the Church of Christ and Hearts and Heads of Saints (Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1826), p. 9.

<sup>9</sup>Parker, Views, p. 4.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

Thus it was evident that evil existed. The presence of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was an indication that God was aware of its presence. But how could such exist if God's creation were good? What was the origin of this evil which brought the fall of Adam and Eve?

### The Origin of Evil

Parker believed that good and evil had two separate sources.

There are two causes or sources from whence causes and effects do flow, these two causes are opposite, one to the other, both are mysteries, and we have no knowledge of either, only as they are revealed and made known to us. One is the mystery of Godliness, and the other the mystery of iniquity. And neither can produce anything opposite or contrary to its own nature.<sup>13</sup>

As the personification of the mystery of iniquity, Satan, the Serpent, was responsible for every sin which has been committed.

The serpent, or enemy of God, has been the cause of all, and every particle of sin, sorrow, pain, distress and death, that has ever taken place in God's good created world, not a sin committed at any time, by even one of God's elect, but what the corrupting enemy is the cause of it; not a pain, a groan, nor a distress of mind or body, but that the enemy is the cause. . . .<sup>14</sup>

Parker emphatically declared that God did not create Satan. Furthermore, he stated that Satan was self-existent:

---

<sup>13</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 14.

<sup>14</sup>Church Advocate, II (August, 1831), 244-45.

"There is an existing opposite to Jehovah, which never did receive its origin from God, the fountain of perfection."<sup>15</sup> If the Devil were not self-existent, Parker held that God must have made him; if such were true, Parker said that he "would as soon believe that there was no god."<sup>16</sup> To hold that God was responsible for the creation of Satan, Parker surmised, would make God the author of both good and evil.

Should this really have been the case, God must be much amused, to see both of his principles or natures so fully in action in the world which he had created as a theatre for them; and as both parties are the product of himself, it would be hard to determine on which side of the contest God would be best pleased with the victory.

. . .<sup>17</sup>  
 . . . . .

If the Devil, or body of corruption, be the product of the power and perfections of God, then of course all the progress and power of sin, (for sin is certainly a power) from the fall of man until now, has flowed from the same perfections of God. Now how will the glory of God appear in destroying the works of the Devil, it being but a power of his own production [sic].<sup>18</sup>

Parker argued that if the Serpent were made by God, he was put under the dominion of Adam.

Now if the serpent was a being that God had made, it was certainly put under Adam; and if the greater or superior can be influenced, deceived, and overthrown by the lesser, or inferior, and this serpent was a being which was put under Adam, and did by his lying craft,

---

<sup>15</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 21.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>17</sup>Church Advocate, II (February, 1831), 113.

<sup>18</sup>Parker, Supplement, p. 7.

deceive the woman, and by that means bring Adam down, with himself, and all other things which were put under Adam, . . . there is yet a strong probability, that some inferior something, which is put under Christ in the plan of redemption, may, and will, by some lying art, bring about some way by which Christ (the antitype of Adam) and his kingdom will be completely overthrown.<sup>19</sup>

Having proved to his own satisfaction that Satan was self-existent, Parker insisted that Satan, although powerful, was not equal with God.

I cannot view the Devil as only a bare immaterial spirit, dodging here and there, ashamed or afraid to show himself--no, I view him a mighty power, (not almighty) "the prince and power of the air that works in the children of disobedience [sic]," who, by some means got the world and creatures God had made, into his possession, and was permitted to make use of them to answer his purpose. . . .<sup>20</sup>

Only one deficiency, the lack of ability to create, made Satan less powerful than God. If Satan had held the power of creation, he also would have been almighty.<sup>21</sup> But Satan was only self-existing and not self-subsisting,<sup>22</sup> by which Parker meant that Satan, although not created by God, existed by God's permission. God possessed power to prevent the activities of Satan; consequently, Satan could only do

---

<sup>19</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 19. The complete sentence from which this 117-word excerpt is drawn contains 300 words. Many such lengthy sentences occur in Parker's writings.

<sup>20</sup>Parker, Views, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>22</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 26.

what God permitted him to do.<sup>23</sup> Hence, in Parker's doctrine, Satan was not equal with God. "Some suppose that I make a God of the Devil; but they are mistaken, for I only prove that he is a father, and therefore has children. . . ." <sup>24</sup>

In Parker's thought, these children of the Devil were the non-elect.

### The Origin of the Non-Elect

Parker's perplexity about the non-elect<sup>25</sup> in the early years of his ministry was reflected subsequently in questions which he directed to the opponents of his two-seed views.

. . . 2d. How can it be consistent with the glory of God for him to suffer the Devil to take and keep from him the creature or creatures which he had created in his image, after his likeness, under the expression of his divine power, in goodness and holiness? . . . 6th. Is there, was there, or will there be any part of Christ (by and for whom are all things) lost, neglected, rejected, or ever appear imperfect, or a surplusage? 7th. How can it be consistent with the divine perfections of God in creation, to create man in his image, after his likeness, and a figure of Christ, and yet in that display of divine power and goodness under his holy and divine nature, create and ordain the existence of the non-elect, which has no part in Christ, being not chosen in him, nor given him in the covenant of redemption? 8th. Was there any part of God's creation which was not created by and for Jesus Christ, the great antitype? 9th. How could the non-elect be created by and for Jesus Christ, and yet have no part of eternal life in him? 10th. If the

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>25</sup>Parker, Views, p. 10.

non-elect were created in Adam, the image and likeness of God under the expression of his divine holiness, will not Satan have whereof to glory in his victory, in capturing and retaining in his possession eternally, a part of the product of God, which were created as a figure of Christ?<sup>26</sup>

Although Baptist preachers, particularly the Regular Predestinarian Baptist preachers, had been able exponents of the doctrine of election, they had faltered at the doctrine of the non-elect.

The doctrine of election is a glorious theme to the Church of God. . . . The preachers of the cross have long been sounding the gospel of Christ, in the truths of the sovereign grace of God to his elect, the word of eternal truth furnishing them with evidences of the truth of God's sovereign grace. But as yet (to my knowledge) have never been able to satisfy themselves, nor the Church of God, as to the complete glory of God, in the condemnation of the non-elect, and if the word of God gives us no account of the origin of the non-elect (by which his glory appears in their condemnation) different from that of the elect, then we have no business to inquire after it; but if God has revealed it in his word, then it is intended for his glory, and it is our duty to search after it; and as I believe that God has declared the facts of the existence of the two seeds, the elect, and non-elect, in his revealed word, I find it my duty to declare the whole counsel of God.<sup>27</sup>

In discharging this duty by elaborating his views on the two seeds, Parker began with two presuppositions.

1st. That God never created a set of beings, neither directly nor indirectly, that he suffered to be taken from him, and made the subject of his eternal wrath and indignation; (think how could this be consistent with the Divine Creator.) 2d. That God, as God, in no case

---

<sup>26</sup>Parker, Supplement, pp. 5-6.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

possesses more love and mercy than power and wisdom. If he does, oh think, the pain and distress the great I AM must feel and bear, to see the objects of his love and mercy sink to woe and misery for the want of power and wisdom in himself to save--(where would be the glory now?)<sup>28</sup>

Building on these presuppositions, Parker showed the Serpent's role in the fall of Adam and Eve. Before she sinned, Eve "had a considerable conversation with this subtle Serpent . . ." <sup>29</sup> She became convinced that God was attempting to keep her and Adam in a state of ignorance.

Thus the woman not only disbelieves God, and believes the Serpent, but really possesses a thirst for a higher station than what her God had made, or placed her in; and now begins to believe that instead of dying, as her God had said, that she, by eating of that fruit she was to become greater, wiser, and more noble, than what God had made her.<sup>30</sup>

Being convinced by the Serpent, Eve sinned by partaking of the forbidden fruit. This, Parker contended, was the entrance of the principle of "works or doing."<sup>31</sup> From that time man has sought to fulfill the demands of faith by substituting instead works or "doing."

After Eve had sinned, Adam, not actually being deceived himself but having such a great love for her and

---

<sup>28</sup>Parker, Views, p. 4.

<sup>29</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 28.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 29.



knowing that he could not be happy without her, also partook of the forbidden fruit.<sup>32</sup> As a result of their sin, God told Eve, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (Genesis 3:16). It was this multiplication of conception which enabled the Serpent's seed to have a natural existence.

Parker then explained the logic of such a plan. God's curse on the ground (Genesis 3:17, 18) enabled it to bring forth thorns and thistles. But had not this very ground, as well as all other parts of creation, been good before sin entered the world?

Now if the ground, being the feminine gender, as well as woman, could be made susceptible of a curse for man's sake, and bring forth to him an extra production, which was not formed in his bowels in his creation . . . I say, is it not reasonable as well as scriptural, to believe that the woman, when she had sinned against her God, had received the serpentine nature, was made, by this act, with the curse, susceptible of the Serpent's seed (through the means of her husband, who had partook with her) and thereby conceive and bring forth an extra-production, the seed of Satan, the Non-Elect, enemies to God?<sup>33</sup>

The worldly existence of this extra production, the seed of Satan, was made possible by the sin of Adam and Eve, for "if sin had never come into the world, . . . the serpents [sic] seed, or non-elect, would never have had an

---

<sup>32</sup>Parker, Views, p. 5.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

existence in the world."<sup>34</sup> Such was God's plan, for His command to multiply and to replenish the earth (Genesis 1:28) had been given to the elect only, not to the non-elect.<sup>35</sup>

Eve received the seed of the Serpent through Adam; she did not receive it directly from the Serpent. Hence, Adam was "the medium through which the Serpent's seed was, and is communicated to the woman . . ."<sup>36</sup>

Although the Serpent's seed, the non-elect, were the children of the Serpent, Parker distinguished between the Serpent's begetting children and creating children.

I am apprized that the unbelieving critic will try to believe (notwithstanding what I have said on that subject) that agreeable to my view the Devil has created a great set of beings: this is not my view, for if the Devil had the power of creating, he would be almighty. There is a great difference between creating and begetting. A man may beget, but he cannot create. . . . The power of creating beings, alone to God belongs, therefore he is God.<sup>37</sup>

Parker likewise distinguished between God's creation of the non-elect and His creation of the elect.

The non-elect, or serpent's seed, are the creation of God's power, but not created as an expression of his sovereign holiness, in his image, after his likeness,

---

<sup>34</sup>Parker, Supplement, p. 3.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Parker, Views, p. 7. Parker never explained how Adam was able to be the medium of the Serpent's seed.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

but they are an expression of his sovereign truth and just perfections.<sup>38</sup>

These non-elect differed not only in the origin of their creation but also in the origin of their wicked nature.

Did the serpent's seed, or non-elect, stand or fall in Adam? I say no. The elect of God only was created, stood, and fell in Adam, partook of the serpentine nature, and were, by nature, the children of wrath, even as others; and therefore the original sin is in, or entailed on them, while the serpent's seed [sic]. Although they did not receive it by the fall of man, yet they received this wicked nature immediately from the same corrupt source which had involved the elect of God; thus in the nature of the two seeds no difference appears; for Satan had wholly captivated the elect, and engraved his image on their hearts. And though Satan's seed had not fell in Adam, with the elect, under the curse of the divine law, yet they were sin in the abstract, flowing from the fountain of corruption.<sup>39</sup>

In brief, the elect received their wicked nature from the fall of Adam; the non-elect received their wicked nature directly from their father, the fountain of corruption.

As a proof that his two-seed views were scriptural, Parker traced some of the elect and non-elect through biblical history.

#### The Non-Elect in Biblical History

When Cain was born, Eve called him a man from the Lord, but she did not claim him as her seed. "And John, 1st

---

<sup>38</sup>Parker, Supplement, p. 3.

<sup>39</sup>Parker, Views, p. 13.

Eph. chap. 3d, v. 12, when speaking of the manifestation of the children of God, and of the Devil, tell us that Cain was of that wicked one."<sup>40</sup>

On the contrary, Eve claimed Abel as her seed and stated that God gave her Seth as her seed to replace Abel, who was slain by Cain. Seth then occupied the place, in relation to the elect, similar to that occupied earlier by his father, Adam.

I now view Seth, like Adam while the seed and woman was in him, before sin had conceived or brought forth; for Seth now stands with the Elect in him, distinct from the Serpent's seed; and I have no doubt but his offspring (separate from Cain's) was those said to be the sons of God, while the daughters of men, spoken of, were Cain's offspring. And thus we view the two families. And when the sons of God took them wives of the daughters of men, this was a great evil. The two families now unite and mingle together--their children become giants [sic], or mighty men of renown.<sup>41</sup>

Canaan's curse by his grandfather proved him to be of the non-elect. Ishmael also was of the non-elect, for he was not an heir with Isaac.<sup>42</sup> Even more vivid as an illustration were Esau and Jacob, "for they struggled together while in the womb, and God could let the mother know that two nations were in her womb . . ."<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

Similarly, Parker found examples of the elect and non-elect in the New Testament.

Christ calls Judas the son of perdition, which proves him to be the seed of the Serpent: and tells the Jews that they were of their father the Devil, and his lusts they would do. And again, Christ saith that he was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: and when speaking of the seed of Satan, he calls them a generation of vipers. . . . The parable of the tares and good seed is pointed. For Christ explains this himself, to the exact point, and tells us that "the sower of the good seed, is the Son of Man"--the field is the world, the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the childree [sic] of the wicked one.<sup>44</sup>

That God might distinguish the elect from the non-elect, He called Abraham and promised him the land of Canaan. By means of a covenant of works, God made circumcision the "distinguishing signal" of the proper heirs of the land.<sup>45</sup> The covenant was renewed with Isaac and Jacob from whom came the twelve tribes of Israel. These twelve tribes were God's nation of people whom he claimed for his own. Thus God manifested his seed in a "national point of view."<sup>46</sup>

Even as the natural seed of Isaac were the only legal heirs of the inheritance of the covenant of works, so the spiritual seed of Christ were the only proper heirs of the covenant of grace.<sup>47</sup> To know who are these heirs of grace

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 15-16.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

is impossible until God works a change in their hearts,<sup>48</sup> whereby they become a member of the Church of Christ.

### The Doctrine of the Church

These elect constitute the Church of Christ, given to Him before the foundation of the world.<sup>49</sup> The security of their being elected should not prompt them, however, to continue in sin.

It is wicked presumption to say, that if I am elected God will bring me in, in his own good time, and yet go on to sin and rebel against God, for we should notice in particular, that instead of God electing his people to Heaven in their sins, that the whole scope of the New Testament, in declaring the doctrine of election, or appointments of God, it is to obedience, sanctification of the spirit, belief of the truth, etc.<sup>50</sup>

The true Church is but one; consequently, the various sects and societies are not part of Christ's Church, even though they contain saints.<sup>51</sup> Speaking of the first-century Christian churches, Parker stated that distance between

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>49</sup>Satan also had a church. "Thus Satan, who was always trying to deceive the elect, (because of his enmity against God)--and for that purpose, do something as near like the Lord's work as he could--now pushes his church or body into a similar existence, which is the Pope of Rome, the mother of harlots. The church of Christ is called his body and his wife; so the Pope of Rome is the body and wife of Satan" (Parker, Views, p. 17).

<sup>50</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 14.

<sup>51</sup>Parker, Views, p. 18.

church members created the churches; Christ himself had established but one Church.

Could they all have met together in one place, it would have been the same church, and but one, united in the gospel, of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism; we now view the churches planted by the Apostles; and every one planted from that time until now, by the same legal authority which Christ gave to his church, through the instrumentality of his Apostles, as so many incorporated particles of the gospel church.<sup>52</sup>

Furthermore, this one Church was visible, not invisible.

I am apprised that some will contend that the saints, in all these different sects, compose the true invisible church. This may be the fact; but it is simplicity for us to argue this way, for the support of the religion of the different sects. . . . We have nothing to do with an invisible church, and there is no such thing; for Christ's church is visible to him, be the members whom they may; and although we may have no knowledge of some of the members of his church, yet he has revealed a church to us which is visible to the world.<sup>53</sup>

To this one, visible Church, Christ gave his authority.

All the rights, privileges, powers, and authority belongs to the church or house of God, and none else. . . . There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism: there is but one right way, while there is many false ones: there is one Holy Ghost, while there are many false spirits gone out: there is but one true gospel, and but one gospel church, it is not divided.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>Daniel Parker, The Author's Defence (Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1824), p. 22.

<sup>53</sup>Parker, Views, p. 19.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 44. As stated in Chapter III of this thesis, the concept of the authority of the Church was the basis of Parker's greatest opposition to the mission system.

For Parker it was obvious that the "old fashioned baptists," some eighteen hundred years old at the time of his writing, were the Church which Christ had built upon the rock.<sup>55</sup> Since all the truths contained in various sects and societies were to be found among the Baptists, the saints of God from these sects and societies should join the Baptists. In doing so, they could enjoy the truth and "get rid of their Popish errors."<sup>56</sup>

Although Parker admitted that some truths were preached in non-Baptist churches, he found their errors to be more numerous than their truths.

I have no doubt but there are a number of precious truths preached by other societies besides the Baptist [sic]. When they tell the sinner the necessity of repentance, of conversion, faith in Christ, etc. these are solemn truths, with the necessity of an orderly life; these things are not what I oppose--but setting up separate societies from the church of God, their Armenian [sic] stuff or works of the law, such as placing their exertion in the place of the Divine Spirit, or aiming thereby to influence God; admitting members into their body who cannot give a reason of their hope in Christ; their infant baptism, and sprinkling instead of baptism; criticising on divine truth, instead of obeying it; denying scriptural and experimental doctrines, and supporting error in lieu thereof; refusing the government or discipline of the church of Christ, seeking her hurt instead of her prosperity, etc.; which are all marks of the best [sic].<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>Church Advocate, II (October, 1830), 11; Parker, Views, p. 18.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.



Because the Baptists were Christ's Church, Satan made every effort to weaken and to compromise their position. Many of the false societies had become more concerned about warring against the Baptists than fighting Satan--"more joy at catching a Baptist than converting a sinner."<sup>58</sup> Some of the Baptists themselves were responsible for weakening their position by calling themselves Calvinistic Baptists.

The words so often used, "The Calvinistic Baptist," or Baptist principles being of a "Calvinistic cast," etc., certainly is expressive that the Baptist [sic] or their principles did in some way originate in, or spring from Calvin. These very words go to destroy the true existence of the Baptist church, for if they be facts, it is at once proven that the Baptist church is not the true gospel church set up at Jerusalem by the Apostles, as predicted by the prophets.<sup>59</sup>

The relationship of Christ and his Church antedated even the establishment of the church at Jerusalem, however.

---

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>59</sup>Church Advocate, II (June, 1831), 216. See also Parker, Views, p. 19: "And although I admit the reformation under Calvin and Luther, and that they were great lights in that dark time, yet their anti-christian [sic] and wrong principle or spirit appears in their setting up and establishing their societies, for the church of Christ had still remained through all this dark and worst of times, suffered the rage and awful persecution of Satan's kingdom. And now, Calvin and Luther, instead of uniting with the suffering church of Christ, which had ever lived and remained the light of the world, (though weak and contemptible) they formed other societies, which were that moment the body of anti-Christ, or daughters of the old mother Rome, because they were anti, or opposite to the church of Christ, and have remained the enemies of the church ever since."

## The Relationship of Christ and His Church

According to Parker, "the nature and certainty of the relationship or union which exists in Christ with his Church"<sup>60</sup> was a crucial issue in his two-seeds doctrine. Parker said that an eternal oneness existed between Christ and His Church.

I wish to be understood as believing, and now aiming to prove, that Christ and his Church are one; and if they are now, or ever will be one, that, that oneness has existed as long as Christ has existed, as it is as impossible for a head to exist without a body, as for a body to exist without the head.<sup>61</sup>

This oneness or union, while existing prior to God's creation, was demonstrated in the creation itself.<sup>62</sup>

It is now to be remembered that "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him. Male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created." Notice, they are first spoken of in the singular, and then in the plural number, and the woman was called Adam, as well as the man, and it must be because they were one. And when she was taken out of man, and appeared separate from him, the same relationship still existed, for Adam said [sic] "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh;" all this goes to shew Christ and his Church one; Adam, with the woman in him, shews Christ, and the Church in him, before the Church was spoken into existence, and the separating of the woman from the man, shews the Church being spoken into actual existence in the

---

<sup>60</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 4.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

world, and both being called Adam, shews that Christ and his Church is one . . .<sup>63</sup>

Having come into the world, the Church sinned. Adam, who stood with the Church (the elect) in him,<sup>64</sup> partook of the forbidden fruit, causing him and the Church to deserve God's wrath. But because of Christ's union with and love for the Church, he married her human nature,<sup>65</sup> assumed her debt of sin, and redeemed her from the curse of the law.<sup>66</sup> Such a manifestation of love, while having no equal, was a logical outgrowth of the eternal union which existed between Christ and his Church.

As the woman bears the name of her husband, so the Church bears the name of Christ, her husband; and as the husband is chargeable with the debt of his wife, and it is consistent and just for the husband to pay the debt of his wife; so Christ, the husband of the Church is chargeable with the debt of the Church his bride; and thus the consistency and justice of Christ suffering for his Church appears.<sup>67</sup>

No such relationship or union existed, however, between Christ and the non-elect. Unlike the elect, the non-elect did not stand in a "flesh and blood relationship"

---

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Parker, Views, p. 5.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., pp. 5-6.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>67</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 9.

with Christ.<sup>68</sup> "Not created in Adam, nor yet given to Christ in the covenant of redemption,"<sup>69</sup> the non-elect received from God's Spirit no prompting to repent. Hence, they followed the will of their father, the Serpent, by refusing to believe in Jesus Christ and thereby received their just condemnation. With this conclusion, Parker's stated goal of the two-seeds doctrine was achieved.

---

<sup>68</sup>Parker, Supplement, p. 2.

<sup>69</sup>Parker, Views, p. 28. Taken out of context, two passages in Parker's writings seem to indicate an inconsistency in his doctrine of the atonement. (1) "Thus Christ, by the grace of God, has tasted death for every man" (ibid.). (2) ". . . And thus he (Christ) is the Saviour of all men, but especially of them that believe" (ibid.). The context indicates, however, that Parker was not speaking of the salvation of the non-elect. Rather he was speaking of the temporal blessings they received in a world which God blessed for the elect's sake.

CHAPTER V

REASONS FOR MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT PARKER

## CHAPTER V

### REASONS FOR MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT PARKER

Previous chapters of this thesis have shown some of the disparities between Daniel Parker as described by tradition and as described by himself. This chapter will sketch some of the major reasons for these disparities.

#### Criticism of Parker

Among the anti-Parker writings, there is surprisingly little criticism of Parker's doctrine. Instead, the criticism is leveled primarily at Parker himself. One of Parker's opponents noted that many of Parker's critics manifested such an entire ignorance of Parker's doctrine that they only showed their incompetency rather than disproved his doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Richard Newport,<sup>2</sup> who held some reservations about the truth of the two-seed views, contended that if Parker wished to make proselytes to his views, his best method was to keep his opponents writing and preaching, for Newport observed that his opponents avoided grappling with Parker's two-seed

---

<sup>1</sup>Church Advocate, II (August, 1831), 252.

<sup>2</sup>Richard Newport was described as a heavy drinker, an eloquent orator, and the beloved pastor of Concord Church in Clark County, Illinois (William Henry Perrin [ed.], History of Crawford and Clark Counties, Illinois [Chicago: O. L. Baskin and Co., 1883], pp. 386-89).

views. Instead of explaining the meaning of the scriptures which Parker had used to develop his two-seed views, they concentrated on belittling Parker by sarcasm and ridicule.<sup>3</sup>

Uriel Chambers, a constant antagonist of Parker through the medium of the Baptist Chronicle, was an effective user of such sarcasm and ridicule. A typical example occurred in the November, 1830, issue of the Baptist Chronicle.

Elder Daniel Parker.--The age of this individual, and the station he occupies as a preacher of the gospel, together with other considerations, have hitherto restrained any animadversions from us on his wild and peculiar notions in theology. At length, however, he has sought occasion to present himself before us in such a commanding attitude, that we are almost compelled involuntarily, to turn and look at him and ask him what it is that he desires! . . . But since he has chosen virtually to invite us to take a passing notice of him, we will beg leave to inform him, that it has not been because we have considered the doctrine of the "Two Seeds" harmless in itself, that we have not noticed it; but because we have considered it less baneful as at present wielded, than that which has claimed our more immediate attention. . . .<sup>4</sup>

In other issues of the Baptist Chronicle, Parker was frequently quoted; then followed "remarks" from Chambers, as below.

4. In your 2d No. 2d Vol. you present the doctrine of the "Two Seeds," advanced by me as "high-keyed, Antinomian sentiments;" that it goes to destroy the

---

<sup>3</sup>Church Advocate, II (August, 1831), 252. It will be observed later that Parker also was a frequent user of sarcasm against his opponents.

<sup>4</sup>The Baptist Chronicle and Literary Register, I (November, 1830), 172.

(idea of the) responsibility of a certain part of the human family to God for their conduct;" that it dooms them, by a decree of God, to irrevocable, endless perdition, and misery, irrespective of their personal conduct as a controlling cause."

Remarks.--We thought so then, and we think so still--and we have as good a right to think as other men.<sup>5</sup>

Richard Newport admonished Chambers for this misrepresentation of Parker's doctrine.

If you never had read Elder Parker's "Views on the Two Seeds," you certainly committed yourself too far as a public editor, to throw out to the public such things concerning them, merely from common fame. If you had read them with attention, I am utterly at a loss to know how, or upon what principles you could "rationally" draw the conclusions you did from any proposition he has laid down, unless you could think it rational to conclude that an author does not believe that which he asserts again, again, and again, to be his unshaken belief; for had you read, you must have observed that one of the primary objects of the writer was to show the consistency and certainty of all men's being accountable to God, and that every rational creature is under an obligation to render a rational obedience to God, the governor of the universe. Another very prominent object of the writer was to show that the doctrine of election does not necessarily drag reprobation at its heels.<sup>6</sup>

Newport continued by citing Peck and then urging Chambers to answer Parker by using the same group of scriptures.

Mr. Peck, in one place, compares it<sup>7</sup> to Mahomet's night tour on Gabriel's mare, etc. and in another admirable piece, he concludes, that, in the old states Parker would be condemned as an "incorrigible heretic. . . ."

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., III (February, 1832), 26.

<sup>6</sup>Church Advocate, II (August, 1831), 255.

<sup>7</sup>The two-seed doctrine.



How much better it would look for men to be candid, and let their readers know that Parker had written a couple of pamphlets, containing his views on the Two Seeds, spoken of in Gen. iii. and 15, and numerous other scriptures. If they differ, let us know why and wherefore, by giving their views on the same train of scriptures, if they have got any opinion about them, if not, they should hold their peace. This, brother Chambers, is what was asked of you. Not for your views on Elder Parker's views, for this was unimportant, but for your views on the word of God in this case. This request was reasonable, inasmuch as you had condemned Parker's in a very censorious manner.<sup>8</sup>

Parker insisted that Uriel Chambers and John Mason Peck take the same scriptures used by him and give the proper meaning.<sup>9</sup> Their failure to do so was a further indication to Parker that his views were correct.

The only extant attempt to refute the two-seed view was written by John Watson in 1855.<sup>10</sup> However, this refutation was not of Parker's two-seed views; instead it was the refutation of a distorted form of the two-seed views as embodied in certain churches.

#### Controversy over Two-Seed Views

Of all the secondary sources, Watson's description of the two-seed views most nearly coincided with Parker's actual

---

<sup>8</sup>Church Advocate, II (August, 1831), 257.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., II (October, 1830), 9; ibid., II (November, 1830), 46.

<sup>10</sup>John M. Watson, A Refutation of the Manichaeo-Parkerite Heresy (Nashville: Republican Banner Press, 1855).

writing. However, it reflected many of the misunderstandings current in the 1850's.

In seeking to refute the two-seed views, Watson understood the doctrine to include (1) the denial of the resurrection of the bodies of the just and unjust,<sup>11</sup> (2) the absence of souls in the non-elect,<sup>12</sup> and (3) the rejection by God of the use of any kind of means to bring about salvation.<sup>13</sup> Parker had explicitly taught the opposite in his two-seed views.<sup>14</sup>

Some groups which held generally to the two-seed views rejected certain portions of the doctrine. One such group, the Old School Baptists of Bethel and Muddy River Associations (Illinois), strenuously denied that the proclamation of the gospel had anything to do in bringing sinners to a knowledge of the truth.<sup>15</sup> Daniel Parker had declared just

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>14</sup>Daniel Parker, The Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds, Dealt Out in Broken Doses Designed to Purge the Armenian Stuff & Dross Out of the Church of Christ and Hearts and Heads of Saints (Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1826), p. 36; Daniel Parker, A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds (no publication data), p. 8; Daniel Parker, Views on the Two Seeds (Vandalia, Illinois: Robert Blackwell, 1826), p. 46.

<sup>15</sup>W. P. Throgmorton and Lemuel Potter, The Throgmorton-Potter Debate (St. Louis: Nixon-Jones Printing Co., 1888), p. 38.

as strenuously that God used such means to bring sinners to repentance.<sup>16</sup>

Such misunderstandings had begun simultaneously with the publication of Views on the Two Seeds. Shortly after this writing was published, Parker was amazed to learn that his two-seed views had not been correctly understood. He had not expected the doctrine to be accepted universally, but he had expected it to be understood correctly.<sup>17</sup> In less than a year after its publication, Parker learned that not only the "enemies of the gospel" but also some who were "friends to truth" had misunderstood his teaching.<sup>18</sup>

Shortly after the publication of Views on the Two Seeds (1826), Elder Thomas Kennedy, one of Parker's close friends, showed a violent opposition to the doctrine contained in the "two-seed" book. After having several interviews with Parker, Kennedy agreed on the doctrine but differed as to how it should have been expressed.<sup>19</sup> In an effort to clarify the points which had disturbed Elder

---

<sup>16</sup>Parker, Views, p. 46.

<sup>17</sup>Parker, Supplement, p. 1.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 59. Perrin said that Elder Thomas Kennedy "used to often cross swords with Daniel Parker upon church government and relations. . . ." (Perrin, History of Crawford and Clark Counties, p. 184).

Kennedy, Parker wrote A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds, only to learn that Kennedy had, in the meantime, changed his mind about the points on which they had agreed.

As an additional complication, Parker's own church investigated his teaching on the two seeds and, as a result, asked him to retract his views.<sup>20</sup> So from its very beginning, Parker's two-seed views were both misunderstood and rejected by some who were close friends of its author.

That churches and individuals should exhibit such varying degrees of understanding and acceptance of the two-seed views is not surprising, for there was no agency or person except Daniel Parker to give uniformity and cohesion to the two-seed views. Parker had not intended to begin a new church sect. Furthermore, he had not made acceptance of these views a test of fellowship.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly, the articles of faith of the Regular Predestinarian Baptist Church, organized by Parker in 1833 and removed to Texas in 1834, included no mention whatever of the two-seed views.<sup>22</sup>

If, then, the two-seed views were not understood when

---

<sup>20</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 60.

<sup>21</sup>Church Advocate, II (September, 1831), 282.

<sup>22</sup>Guy W. Small, "The Life of Daniel Parker" (unpublished Master's thesis, East Texas Baptist College, Marshall, Texas, 1954), pp. 76-80.

published, and if, in addition, they were rejected by numerous individuals and churches, the current misunderstanding and rejection of the two-seed views has a precedent of one hundred thirty years.

An additional factor in the current misunderstanding of Parker is the misunderstanding of Parker's use of "predestination."

#### Misunderstanding of Parker's Predestination

Observing that Parker's doctrine was called Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination and lacking access to Parker's writings, historians frequently have drawn the conclusion that Parker taught an extreme form of predestination.<sup>23</sup> And in Parker's writings, the term "old predestinarian Baptist" is used without definition or explanation as though it were a common term.<sup>24</sup> Parker's only indication of what he meant is found where he listed the works of the mystery of iniquity.

The first thing I shall notice, is, that some odds of twenty years ago, the Predestinarian Baptists of Kentucky was<sup>^</sup> courted by the Armenian [sic] Baptists, and finally agrees<sup>^</sup> to lay down the names of distinction, and be known by the name of the United Baptists, and at the same time suffer this cunning enemy to slip into the terms of the treaty or marriage, these few words. "That the preaching

---

<sup>23</sup>See footnote 19, Chapter II in this thesis.

<sup>24</sup>Church Advocate, II (November, 1830), 32; ibid., II (December, 1830), 63; ibid., II (January, 1831), 95-96.

that Christ tasted death for every man, should be no bar" (or words to about that amount).<sup>25</sup>

Parker referred here to the "Terms of General Union" (1801) adopted by the Regular and Separate Baptists of Kentucky, who merged to become known as "United Baptists."<sup>26</sup>

Parker called himself both a Predestinarian Baptist and a Regular Baptist, both terms describing a member of the one Church established by Jesus Christ. In contrast with the Predestinarian Baptists, who were doctrinally sound, the Arminian Baptists were responsible for preaching "any and every kind of doctrine."<sup>27</sup> The chief error of the Arminians,<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 44. The sentence immediately following this quotation reads: "Although this is Scripture language, yet I have but little doubt but that it was brought into this improper place, with about the same design, that the Devil tempted Christ with the Scripture; and the winds subtilty, and enmity of the Serpent has oftentimes visibly appeared in the Baptist Church in consequence of that unlawful marriage" (ibid., p. 44).

The exact text from the "Terms of General Union" reads: "And that the preaching Christ tasted death for every man, shall be no bar to communion" (Hugh Wamble, "Co-operation: Terms of General Union in Kentucky, 1801," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists [Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958], I, 317).

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.; see also William L. Lumpkin, "Regular Baptists," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1137-38; and William L. Lumpkin, "Separate Baptists," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1190-91.

<sup>27</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 44. Parker made the following comparison: "An Armenian in the Church of Christ, is something like the rotten rail in the farmers [sic] fence, where the bad cornfield hog is apt to creep in at . . ." (ibid., p. 45).

<sup>28</sup>Parker seldom distinguished between the Arminians

however, was "in mixing grace and works meritoriously together, and bringing the sovereign predestination of God to turn upon the agency of the creature, and thereby making salvation more to depend on the soft, pliable nature of man, than the riches of Divine Grace."<sup>29</sup> Parker explained this error more specifically when telling of the relationship which existed between Christ and his Church.

I am apprised that the Armenians' [sic] believe in the doctrine of election and union between Christ and his Church, but that all take place when the soul is converted, therefore instead of the purposes of God standing firm, as being purposed in himself, they have to turn upon the agency of mortal beings, and I had about as leave have no God as such a one as that.<sup>30</sup>

For Parker, then, predestination was the antithesis of Arminianism. His use of predestination was synonymous with what is usually called Calvinism, a term that Parker believed should not be used to indicate the character of Baptist doctrines.<sup>31</sup>

In conclusion, predestination for Parker had no reference whatsoever to a double-edged decree of God. Indeed, as demonstrated earlier, Parker wrote his two-seed views to

---

of other denominations and the Arminian Baptists, preferring to use the one term Arminian as descriptive of all groups with such theology.

<sup>29</sup>Parker, Views, p. 3.

<sup>30</sup>Parker, Second Dose, p. 6.

<sup>31</sup>Church Advocate, II (June, 1831), 216.

refute such a doctrine. Nevertheless, the traditional understanding of Parker's use of "predestination" has been a factor in Parker's being labeled a "hyper-Calvinist."

Parker's own contributions should be included among the reasons for the misconceptions about Parker. Hampering objectivity and understanding by interpreters were Parker's own polemical writings which were sprinkled with ridicule and sarcasm.

#### Nature of Parker's Writings

Tact and diplomacy were foreign to Parker, for he considered himself a "man of war."<sup>32</sup>

I did not sheath my sword to let any error pass that came in the way, but with what I called my old Jerusalem Blade, which had two edges, and cut every way, I laboured to cut off everything that was aiming to touch the crown on the Redeemer's head, or remove the rights and foundation of the church of God.<sup>33</sup>

In addition to his "Jerusalem Blade," Parker's "periodical watchtower,"<sup>34</sup> the Church Advocate, was a strategic weapon in fighting the mystery of iniquity. His crusade against error was reflected in the scriptural motto of the Church Advocate.

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., II (September, 1831), 272.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., II (July, 1831), 217.



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; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. (Matthew 24:23, 24)  
 The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up. (John 2:17)<sup>35</sup>

Ever mindful of his limited formal education, Parker tended to assume that righteousness and truth were on the side of the uneducated and that wickedness, falsehood, and worldly wisdom were on the side of the educated. Parker frequently reminded Uriel Chambers that the educated were often mistaken.

You may think me beneath your notice, and feel yourself greatly insulted to be called to an account by an old backwoods hunter; but, sir, the righteous are as bold as a lion, and truth, (though roughly handled,) will cut its way through the thin veil of worldly wisdom, in spite of all the learned can do . . .<sup>36</sup>

This truth<sup>37</sup> had reference primarily either to the two-seed views or to the anti-mission effort. In the eyes of Daniel Parker, the chief distorter of this truth was John Mason Peck, whom Parker described as a preacher "manufactured in some of the eastern man-made manufacturing machines . . ."<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., II (October, 1830), 1.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., II (March, 1831), 135-36.

<sup>37</sup>Three words, "Truth is powerful," shared the date-line of each issue of the Church Advocate. See ibid., II (October, 1830), 1.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., II (October, 1830), 7.

Through the pages of the Western Pioneer, Peck wrote avidly for the mission cause. A regular reader of the Pioneer, Parker searched for misrepresentations of himself and his doctrine. However, he rejoiced to find that they agreed at least on the theory, if not the practice, of associations and churches.

While I admire and esteem the most of your views respecting the use, and limited power of associations, and the high ecclesiastical authority of the church of God. [sic] I am much surprised that your faith, in this respect, has not been proven by your works; and had such been the case, you would not have been engaged in establishing what you call, institutions for religious purposes, separate and distinct from the church. But the nearer you can come to the truth, and miss it, the better chance to deceive the elect of God.<sup>39</sup>

Parker's chief disagreement with Peck concerned alleged misrepresentations of himself and his doctrine.

Your wilful errors respecting the doctrine advanced by me, in publishing some short sentences without their explanatory remarks, and in your own declarations on the Two Seeds, which you seem to wish the public to view as mine, I have not room to notice, nor indeed do I conceive it necessary, as I presume no instance can be produced, where the mission principle has ever called its advocates to an account for wilful lying, in its defence or support, although often proven upon them. I suppose they think like the Roman Catholics or Jesuits, respecting the Holy Massacre, The good in the end will justify the course pursued. If true religious consists in known misrepresentations, the mission principle is well off, but if not, wo! wo! to its supporters.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., II (August, 1831), 241-42. See also ibid., II (October, 1830), 8; and ibid., II (March, 1831), 130. Some months earlier, Peck had evidently asked some of

Parker believed that his most effective weapon against such misrepresentations was his "periodical watchtower," the Church Advocate. In the Western Pioneer, Peck indicated his hope that Parker had thrown away the two-seed views. Peck also promised to note errors in Parker's doctrine, whereupon Parker urged him to answer quickly while Parker had access to his Church Advocate press.

And, sir, as you have informed the public that you "find principles there (Church Advocate) equally subversive of the baptist faith and church government," (referring to my Views on the Two seeds) "which" you say, "we shall notice in due time," I hope that you will think it "due time" to notice these things while I have the benefit of a press, or ever thereafter hold your peace; for as printing costs money, and plain truth these times is very dull sale, while well polished error seems to stand tolerably high in market, it is highly probable that your work will be progressing, when I shall be compelled to stop; and I hope that you will not take the advantage of me, or the truth on this ground; for it is evident, that error in all ages, has demanded more money than truth. This may be one cause why you are found on the money side of the question, seeing that unconverted men, (generally speaking) would rather have error at a high price, than truth for nothing.<sup>41</sup>

---

the Western Pioneer readers to send him a copy of Parker's Views on the Two Seeds, for Parker had written:

"As Mr. Peck has requested some one [sic] to send him forthwith the 'two seeds,' if I thought he had no Bible, I would try hard to send him one; not that the Bible is the 'two seeds,' but because that book evidently proves the existence of two seeds; and should he request me, I would be willing to send him my views on that subject, and also the "Second Dose," etc. but as only a bare smell of the medicine, has so affected his stomach as to produce such corrupted matter, and not knowing the consequence, should he take the whole of the medicine, I am unwilling to administer any further except by special request" (ibid., II [January, 1831], 96).

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., II (October, 1830), 10.

Parker was convinced that there was one major reason for frequent misrepresentation of him and his doctrine: "in order to sink my character, with a design no doubt, to destroy my influence against the mission system."<sup>42</sup>

Parker thought that his Public Address to the Baptist Society (1820) was the first attack on the errors of the newly-formed mission system.<sup>43</sup> From the time of this publication until his death, Parker continued to attack what he considered to be errors of the mission system, distinguishing, at least in his early writings, between "missions" as encouraged in the Bible and "missions" as a specific plan proposed by the Triennial Convention.

There is some evidence, however, for believing that Parker was not always so cautious to make such distinctions. In a letter to David Benedict, Parker called himself an "anti-mission baptist."<sup>44</sup> It is doubtful if either a "missioner" or an "anti-missioner" would have seen Parker's qualifying remarks in the same letter, for in the struggle

---

<sup>42</sup>Daniel Parker, The Author's Defence (Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1824), p. 3.

<sup>43</sup>B. H. Carroll, Jr., The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism (Louisville: The Baptist Book Concern, 1902), p. 108. Parker seemingly was unaware of John Taylor's Thoughts on Missions, published a year earlier.

<sup>44</sup>David Benedict, A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and Other Parts of the World (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman and Co., 1856), p. 787.

between the friends and foes of the mission plan, one was either "for" or "against."

Parker felt that he stood almost alone in his struggle against the errors of the religion of the world, which included the mission plan.<sup>45</sup> This feeling of isolation frequently crystallized into a feeling of being persecuted, as scattered references in his writings indicate.

From that time to this,<sup>46</sup> I do not hesitate to say my life has been sought, perhaps as close as Saul pursued [sic] David.<sup>47</sup>

.....  
I have been at some loss to know which hated me worst, the Devil, the Armenian [sic], or the Missionary; but as they are so near one, as to their religion, I need not trouble myself much about that. . . .<sup>48</sup>

.....  
The world is nothing; my life in the world is worth nothing when the Lord is done with it. Persecutors do your best; your time is short, and I regard you not. The controversy is kept up for the truth's sake, and not for yours. It is true, that in a short time no doubt but necessity will compel me to lay down my pen, and the daughters of Babylon will rejoice that they have the periodical field all but uninterrupted, but I hope still to be found on the Lord's side.<sup>49</sup>

.....  
I have but done my duty, and feel as if I have left the world without excuse, (let the blind lead the blind,)

---

<sup>45</sup>Church Advocate, II (March, 1831), 121.

<sup>46</sup>The year 1816 when Parker opposed the mission plan in Concord Association (Tennessee).

<sup>47</sup>Parker, Author's Defence, p. 2.

<sup>48</sup>Parker, Second Dose, pp. 57-58.

<sup>49</sup>Church Advocate, II (April, 1831), 157.

yet my very soul often mourns when viewing the world left without a religious periodical, but is warped off into the popular current of the world. Poor Zion must mourn a while longer in her sackcloth.<sup>50</sup>

. . . . .  
 I have precisely met what I anticipated in my out set [sic], abuse from the religion of the world, and enemies of the truth.<sup>51</sup>

Such tenacity of purpose from this self-styled martyr and man-of-war must have spurred his opponents to redouble their efforts against him.

However, because of the scarcity and unavailability of Parker's writings, relatively few readers have seen these or any other quotations from Parker. Indeed, the longest quotations of Parker to be found in an extant secondary source are excerpts from his Public Address included in The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism by B. H. Carroll, Jr.<sup>52</sup>

#### Scarcity and Unavailability of Parker's Writings

Religious historians have used but few of Daniel Parker's writings. B. H. Carroll, Jr., writing in 1900, thought that Mrs. B. D. Spencer had the only copies of the Daniel Parker pamphlets available in the South.<sup>53</sup> According

---

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., II (September, 1831), 285.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 286.

<sup>52</sup>Carroll, Genesis of American Anti-Missionism, pp. 108-22.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

to Byron Lambert, whose excellent account of the rise of the anti-mission Baptists was completed in 1957, the Church Advocate (II) and the Public Address to the Baptist Society remained the only two writings of Parker which were extant and available for a study of Parker's doctrines.<sup>54</sup> Because of such a supposed dearth of primary materials, historians relied on existing secondary sources.<sup>55</sup>

#### Reliance of Historians on Secondary Sources

It was noted earlier that Parker is known today primarily through two interpreters who were also Parker's contemporaries. The interpreter first in importance is John Mason Peck.

John Mason Peck. The classic description of Daniel Parker was written by Peck for the July, 1842, issue of The

---

<sup>54</sup>Byron C. Lambert, "The Rise of the Anti-Mission Baptists: Sources and Leaders, 1800-1840" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Division of Humanities, University of Chicago), p. 274.

<sup>55</sup>J. H. Spencer, A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885 (Cincinnati: J. R. Baumes, 1885), had access to some of Parker's writings as evidenced by short, undocumented, direct quotations from Parker. However, Guy Small was the first writer to make extensive use of Parker's Views, Supplement, and Second Dose. Interestingly, Small, whose concern was biographical rather than theological, used Frank S. Mead, Handbook of Denominations in the United States (New York: Abingdon Press, 1951) as his authority for concluding with tradition that the two-seed doctrine was an anti-mission theology. (Small, Life of Daniel Parker, p. 10.)

Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle.<sup>56</sup> Some of its phrases, for example, "uncouth in manners, slovenly in dress, diminutive in person, unprepossessing in appearance," made indelible imprints on the minds of its readers. Peck also contributed to the present understanding of Parker by describing him as the most determined opposer of missions whom Peck had ever met.<sup>57</sup>

The second major interpreter of Parker is R. B. C. Howell.

R. B. C. Howell. R. B. C. Howell's explanation of Parker's anti-mission motivation was published in November, 1845, less than a year after Parker's death.

Mr. Parker set in motion the means that overthrew missions in Tennessee, and to which he was induced by the following considerations.--He was ambitious to be a writer, and sought, as the medium of his communications with the public, the columns of the Columbian Star, then published in Washington City. His essays, setting forth his own peculiar opinions, were rejected by that paper, and his doctrines ridiculed as equally immodest and preposterous. This was too much for a man of his unbounded pride and self-confidence tamely to endure. The offence given him was unpardonable. The conductors of the Star he knew to be associated in the conduct of the missionary enterprise, and of ministerial education. From that hour he conceived the most implacable hatred against

---

<sup>56</sup>John Mason Peck, "Historical Sketches of the Baptist Denomination in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri," The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle, I (July, 1842), 198.

<sup>57</sup>Rufus Babcock, Memoir of John Mason Peck (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1864), p. 174.



the men, and all their pursuits.<sup>58</sup>

This explanation of Parker's inducement to anti-mission activity, regardless of its source, was an inexcusable distortion of facts. Parker's chief publication against the mission system, A Public Address to the Baptist Society, was two years old when in 1822 the first issue of the Columbian Star was published in Washington, D. C. Parker's vocal opposition to the mission system had begun in 1816, six years before the birth of the Columbian Star. Although it is highly possible that Parker sent communications to the Columbian Star, any rejection that he might have received would have come several years after the beginning of his anti-mission activities. This erroneous explanation by Howell has been the source of another misconception about Parker.

Pivotal for a relatively recent misconception about Parker is the circular letter in the minutes of the organizational meeting of the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky. Written in 1837 and addressed to the Baptist churches and associations in the state, the circular letter indicted Parker as the origin of the anti-missionary spirit.

---

<sup>58</sup>R. B. C. Howell, "Missions and Anti-Missions in Tennessee," The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record, IV (November, 1845), 306.

Another cause that has greatly contributed to the declension of the Baptist interest, has been opposition to missions, to the circulation of the scriptures, and other benevolent enterprizes of the church. The Anti-Missionary spirit owes its origin to the notorious Daniel Parker. He was the first person called Baptist that lent a hand to the Infidel and Papist in opposing the proclamation of the Gospel to every creature, and to the translation and circulation of the Scriptures in all languages and among all people. . . . The grounds of his opposition to missions were--that the devil was an eternal "self subsistent [sic] being," (to use his own phrase;) that though God created all, yet the devil begat a part of mankind; that those begotten of the devil, were his bona fide children, and to their father they would and ought to go; and of course, sending them the gospel and giving them the Bible, were acts of such gross and supreme folly that no Christian should be engaged in them! On the other hand, he taught that the remaining portion of the human family were the actual sons of God from eternity, and being allied to Jesus Christ ere 'the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy,' by the nearest and dearest ties of consanguinity, being no less than "particles" of his body--bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, the Redeemer would, nolens volens, take them to mansions prepared for them in bliss: And hence Mr. Parker very wisely concluded, that if such were the case, the Lord had very little use for Bible or Missionary Societies!<sup>59</sup>

But more important than making Parker the origin of the anti-missionary spirit, this circular letter linked Parker's two-seed theology with the basis of his anti-missionism, an association which Parker never made in his

---

<sup>59</sup>"Circular Letter to the Baptist Churches and Associations in the State of Kentucky," Minutes of the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky (Louisville, 1837), p. 11. The sentence immediately following this quoted material reads: "No sooner was this strange doctrine propagated, than strait [sic] there arose divers zealous advocates for the rights and prerogatives of his Satanic Majesty, who charged the friends of missions with designs of endeavoring by juggling and legerdemain, to introduce into heaven some of those sooty sons of the bottomless pit!" (ibid., pp. 11-12).

extant writings. Although this interpretation lacked popularity for many years, it acquired vogue after 1930, primarily through the writings of William Warren Sweet.<sup>60</sup>

Included in Chapter VI of this thesis will be an attempt to answer why the various misconceptions about Parker have so long remained unchallenged.

---

<sup>60</sup>William Warren Sweet, The Baptists, 1783-1830, Vol. I: Religion on the American Frontier (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931), pp. 75-76. See also footnote 20, Chapter II.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

Daniel Parker has traditionally been described as the epitome of a hyper-Calvinism which expressed itself theoretically as an extreme doctrine of predestination and practically as radical anti-missionism. Integrally related to this description of Parker has been his two-seeds doctrine, supposedly formulated as the theological basis for anti-missionism.

However, an examination of Parker's writings reveals, contrary to the traditional view, that Parker was not opposed to missions. Rather, he was opposed to any mission plan which was not under the government and direction of the churches, an example of which was the societal mission plan of the Triennial Convention. Parker's opposition was against this plan of the Triennial Convention and not against missions proper.

As a substitute mission plan, Parker advocated itinerant preaching and organization of churches where they were needed. Following this plan, Parker's own church organized nine new churches in Texas.

Parker's opposition to the mission plan was ten years old when he published Views on the Two Seeds (1826), a doctrine which put its author at variance with an additional

number of his Baptist contemporaries. He had come to develop these views after several years of struggle with the Calvinistic doctrine of election.

As a Regular Baptist preacher, Parker was well acquainted with the Calvinistic doctrine of election, which taught that God decreed eternal life for some of his creation, but for the remainder he predestined death. To say that God selected some of his creation for life and others for death seemed inconsistent with Parker's concept of God's justice.

Being dissatisfied with such a doctrine of election, Parker struggled with the two-seeds doctrine, which he had condemned previously as heresy. As he sought in his Bible for refutation of the two-seeds doctrine, he found instead proof for himself that the doctrine was biblical. He found, furthermore, that it answered other theological problems.

In Parker's two-seeds doctrine, all God's created world, including Adam and Eve, were perfect. That evil existed, however, even prior to this perfect creation was indicated by the presence in the garden of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the fruit of which was forbidden to Adam and Eve. ✓

Self-existent, being uncreated by God, this evil had its source in the mystery of iniquity which was personified variously as Satan, the Serpent, and the Devil. Although this mystery of iniquity was powerful, it was not equal with ✓

God, for it lacked the ability to create.

The mystery of iniquity, as personified in the Serpent, tempted Eve, who sinned by partaking of the forbidden fruit. Adam likewise sinned. To this point, only the elect existed, for within Adam was the seed of all the elect chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. Consequently, when Adam sinned, all the elect sinned and fell.

Because of the sin by Adam and Eve, God multiplied the conception--not the seed--of Eve, enabling her to bear an additional offspring. Eve then received the seed of the Serpent from Adam, who had received it in some unexplained way from the Serpent, and bore the children of the Serpent.

These offspring, the non-elect, had not been chosen in Christ; neither had they fallen when Adam sinned, for their seed had no physical existence at that time. But by virtue of receiving the same earthly blessings--sun, food, shelter--as the elect, the non-elect owed their allegiance and obedience to God. Accordingly, if these non-elect come to God in repentance and faith, he will save them, for Christ said that he would cast out none who came to him in faith. Theoretically, then, Parker's doctrine makes possible the salvation of the non-elect, a possibility untenable in the hyper-Calvinistic predestination with which Parker has been charged. However, because the non-elect have the will of their father, Satan (the Serpent), they do not want to

come to God, who leaves them alone to make their own decision.

Lest these non-elect have an excuse for their unbelief, Parker urged that the gospel be preached to men everywhere, including the non-elect. Their refusal to repent, which brings their condemnation, is their own responsibility, the crucial issue in Parker's doctrine of the two-seeds. Hence, the condemnation of the non-elect is not because of a previous reprobation by God as in hyper-Calvinistic predestination; rather it is because the non-elect, in their freedom of choice, reject God's Son.

In contrast with these non-elect, the elect are Christ's Church, chosen in him before any visible creation existed. Because of this relationship existing from eternity, God will bring his elect to repentance so that not one will be lost.

To this one Church, God gave his authority. Consequently, all God's work, including the evangelistic and missionary endeavors, must be under the government and control of the Church. Primarily because of this concept of the authority of the Church, Parker believed that the societal plan of missions advocated by the Triennial Convention, being governed from without the Church, was evil. Accordingly, Parker gave his life to the attempted overthrow of the Triennial Convention's mission plan.

This one Church exists visibly in the world as hundreds



of Baptist churches. Each such individual church, composed of Baptists of that particular area, is a particle of the one Church.

Earlier, it has been shown that, contrary to the traditional view, Parker was not opposed to missions and was not the author of a hyper-Calvinistic predestination intended to be the theological basis of anti-missionism. There are various reasons for these misconceptions.

One such reason is that Parker's critics ordinarily attacked him instead of his doctrines. As a result, Parker was belittled, while his doctrines remained relatively unknown. As a consequence, many churches and individuals had different interpretations of the two-seed doctrine. Similarly, Parker's term "predestination" was understood by many to refer to the extreme predestination of hyper-Calvinism.

Parker contributed to his own misunderstanding by resorting to sarcasm and ridicule, particularly in the pages of the Church Advocate. Feeling alone and persecuted in his crusade for truth, he often made harsh criticisms of his opponents, who replied with misrepresentations of Parker.

Contributing also to the misconceptions about Parker have been the scarcity and unavailability of his writings, which has forced a reliance on men such as John Mason Peck and R. B. C. Howell, both of whom opposed Parker's anti-missionism. A circular letter from the organizational meeting

of the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky (1837) contributed an additional misconception by citing Parker's two-seed views as the basis of his anti-missionism.

The foregoing survey of reasons for the present misconceptions leaves unanswered an obvious question: Why has the traditional view of Parker been accepted so unreservedly? Two suggestions will be offered.

First, the descriptions of Parker and of his anti-mission motivation presented by Peck and Howell respectively have discouraged further investigation. Peck was a respected preacher who had debated the mission issue with Parker for five hours. Peck's face-to-face encounter with Parker should have enabled him to describe accurately both Parker and his beliefs on missions. Similarly, Howell's respected position has in itself given some credence to his explanation of Parker's anti-mission motivation.

The vivid terms of these descriptions, in addition to the respected positions of their authors, have also discouraged further investigation. If, as stated in these descriptions, Parker's zeal bordered on insanity, and if his implacable hatred of missions was prompted by a rejection of his writings submitted to a periodical, one receives the impression that Parker was, or bordered on being, an unstable man. Having come to this understanding of Parker, one readily accepts the descriptions and explanations of two

respected preachers without seeking to find what Parker actually said or wrote.

It should be added that the foregoing statements do not necessarily impugn the motives or honesty of either Peck or Howell. Indeed, their accounts of Parker also included references to his ability, industry, and influence. Church historians have been very selective, however, in drawing from the accounts of Peck and Howell. The observation that church historians generally have selected facts from Peck's and Howell's writings which tended to disparage Parker, while ignoring the more complimentary facts, has prompted the second suggestion concerning the reason for the unreserved acceptance of the traditional view of Parker.

The church historians' favorable bias toward missions has discouraged further investigation of Parker's writings. The majority of the American church historians have assumed that the principle of missions was taught by Christ. Likewise, they have assumed that a mission plan which implemented this principle was good. Going even further, some church historians have assumed that the principle of missions and the plan of missions were inseparable. Perhaps an excerpt from the Columbian Star, dated August 3, 1822, summarizes best the unspoken consensus of these church historians:

And shall not they be termed enemies of the Redeemer's cause, who employ every method to thwart the schemes

which his saints have adopted, to diffuse the knowledge of his gospel . . .<sup>1</sup> ✓

Learning from the writings of Peck and Howell that Parker opposed the mission plan of his day and assuming that such opposition made him an enemy of God's cause, American church historians have assumed also that further investigation of Parker was unwarranted.

---

<sup>1</sup>Columbian Star, I (August 3, 1822), 3. The remainder of the quotation reads: ". . . and who industriously misrepresent the actions, and implicate the motives of the promoters of missions."

*• Inconsistencies in capitalization of pronouns referring to God*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Armitage, Thomas. A History of the Baptists. New York: Bryan, Taylor, and Co., 1887.
- Babcock, Rufus. Memoir of John Mason Peck. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1864.
- Benedict, David. A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and Other Parts of the World. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman and Co., 1856.
- Boettner, Loraine. The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1932.
- Bond, John. History of the Baptist Concord Association of Middle Tennessee and North Alabama. Nashville: Graves, Marks and Co., 1860.
- Boyd, Jesse L. A History of Baptists in America Prior to 1845. New York: The American Press, 1957.
- Brand, Edward P. Illinois Baptists: A History. Bloomington, Illinois: Illinois Baptist State Convention, 1930.
- Cady, John F. The Origin and Development of the Missionary Baptist Church in Indiana. Franklin College, 1942.
- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Vols. XX, XXI of The Library of Christian Classics. Edited by John T. McNeill. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1960.
- Carroll, B. H., Jr. The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism. Louisville: The Baptist Book Concern, 1902.
- Carroll, H. K. The Religious Forces of the United States. Vol. I: American Church History. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893.
- Carroll, J. M. A History of Texas Baptists. Dallas: Baptist Standard Publishing Co., 1923.

- Cathcart, William. The Baptist Encyclopedia. 2 vols.  
Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1880.
- Christian, John T. A History of the Baptists. 2 vols.  
Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist  
Convention, 1922.
- Dawson, Joseph Martin. A Century with Texas Baptists.  
Nashville: Broadman Press, 1947.
- Dunlevy, A. H. History of the Miami Baptist Association.  
Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard and Co., 1869.
- Elliott, L. R. (ed.) Centennial Story of Texas Baptists.  
Dallas: Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention  
of Texas, 1936.
- Grime, J. H. History of Middle Tennessee Baptists. Nash-  
ville: Baptist and Reflector, 1902.
- Hassell, Sylvester. History of the Church of God. Middle-  
town, New York: Gilbert Beeve's Sons, 1886.
- Keith, Ben F. History of Maria Creek Church. Vincennes,  
Indiana: A. V. Crofts and Co., 1889.
- Masters, Frank M. A History of Baptists in Kentucky. Louis-  
ville: Kentucky Baptist Historical Society, 1953.
- Mead, F. S. Handbook of Denominations in the United States.  
Revised and Enlarged. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Minutes of the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky.  
Louisville, 1837.
- Morrell, Z. N. Flowers and Fruits in the Wilderness. St.  
Louis: Commercial Printing Co., 1882.
- Newman, A. H. A History of the Baptist Churches in the  
United States. Vol. II: American Church History. New  
York: The Christian Literature Co., 1894.
- Olmstead, Clifton E. History of Religion in the United  
States. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,  
1960.
- Parker, Daniel. The Author's Defence. Vincennes, Indiana:  
Elihu Stout, 1824.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The Second Dose of Doctrine on the Two Seeds, Dealt Out in Broken Doses Designed to Purge the Armenian Stuff & Dross Out of the Church of Christ and Hearts and Heads of Saints. Vincennes, Indiana: Elihu Stout, 1826.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds. (No publication data available.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Views on the Two Seeds. Vandalia, Illinois: Robert Blackwell, 1826.
- Perrin, William Henry (ed.). History of Crawford and Clark Counties, Illinois. Chicago: O. L. Baskin and Co., 1883.
- Posey, Walter Brownlow. The Baptist Church in the Lower Mississippi Valley, 1776-1845. Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1957.
- Riley, B. F. A History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898.
- \_\_\_\_\_. History of the Baptists of Texas. Dallas: Privately printed, 1907.
- Ross, James. Life and Times of Elder Reuben Ross. Philadelphia: Grant, Faires and Rodgers, n. d.
- Smith, Jesse Guy. Heroes of the Saddle Bags: A History of Christian Denominations in the Republic of Texas. San Antonio: The Naylor Co., 1951.
- Smith, Justin A. A History of the Baptists in the Western States East of the Mississippi. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896.
- Spencer, J. H. A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885. 2 vols. Cincinnati: J. R. Baumes, 1885.
- Stott, William T. Indiana Baptist History, 1798-1908. Franklin, Indiana: William T. Stott, 1908.
- Sweet, William Warren. The Baptists, 1783-1830. Vol. I: Religion on the American Frontier. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Sweet, William Warren. Religion in the Development of American Culture. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. A



- Taylor, O. W. Early Tennessee Baptists. Nashville: Executive Board of the Tennessee Baptist Convention, 1957.
- Throgmorton, W. P., and Potter, Lemuel. The Throgmorton-Potter Debate. St. Louis: Nixon-Jones Printing Co., 1888.
- Torbet, Robert G. A History of the Baptists. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1950.
- Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Vedder, Henry C. A Short History of the Baptists. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907.
- Watson, John M. A Refutation of the Manichaeo-Parkerite Heresy. Nashville: Republican Banner Press, 1855.

#### Articles and Periodicals

- The Baptist Chronicle and Literary Register, I (1830).
- The Columbian Star, I-V (1822-1826).
- Crismon, Leo. "John Taylor," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1347. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.
- Garrett, James Leo. "History of Baptist Theology," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1412-13. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.
- Howell, R. B. C. "Missions and Anti-Missions in Tennessee," The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record, IV (November, 1845), 306.
- "Jacobus Arminius," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, I, 297. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1951.
- Lumpkin, William L. "Regular Baptists," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1137-38. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Separate Baptists," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1190-91. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.

May, Lynn E., Jr. "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1433. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.

Rone, Wendell H. "General Association of Baptists in Kentucky," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, I, 723-28. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.

Rutledge, A. B., and Kendall, W. Fred. "Daniel Parker," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, II, 1071. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.

Wamble, Hugh. "Co-operation: Terms of General Union in Kentucky, 1801," Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists, I, 317. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.

#### Unpublished Material

Edwards, Lawrence. "The Baptists of Tennessee." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, 1940.

Lambert, Byron C. "The Rise of the Anti-Mission Baptists: Sources and Leaders, 1800-1840." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1957.

Small, Guy W. "The Life of Daniel Parker." Unpublished M.A. thesis, East Texas Baptist College, Marshall, Texas, 1954.

## APPENDIX

APPENDIX

KNOWN LOCATION OF WRITINGS BY DANIEL PARKER

Writing	Location
<u>The Public Address to the Baptist Society</u> (1820)	Virginia Baptist Historical Society University of Richmond Richmond, Virginia
<u>The Author's Defence</u> (1824)	Indiana Historical Society Indianapolis, Indiana
<u>Views on the Two Seeds</u> (1826)	(1) Illinois State Historical Library Springfield, Illinois  (2) Mr. Armistead Parker Elkhart, Texas
<u>A Supplement or Explanation of My Views on the Two Seeds</u> (1826)	Mr. Armistead Parker Elkhart, Texas
<u>The Second Dose of Doctrine</u> (1827)	Mr. Armistead Parker Elkhart, Texas
<u>The Church Advocate</u> (II) (1830-1831)	Indiana State Library Indianapolis, Indiana

## BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

Name: O. Max Lee

Born: July 5, 1931, El Dorado, Arkansas

Education: Elementary School, Smackover, Arkansas  
Graduated, Harvey Couch High School, Magnolia,  
Arkansas  
B.A. Degree 1955, Louisiana Polytechnic  
Institute, Ruston, Louisiana  
B.D. Degree 1959, Southern Baptist Theological  
Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky  
Graduate Study in American history, 1959-1960,  
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge,  
Louisiana

Experience: 1955-1959, Music Director, Audubon Baptist  
Church, Louisville, Kentucky  
1960-1962, Assistant Pastor, Emmanuel Baptist  
Church, Houston, Texas

Family: Parents--Mr. and Mrs. O. R. Lee  
Marriage--August 16, 1957 to Martha Elizabeth  
Perritt, Arcadia, Louisiana  
Son--Alvis Robert, born December 7, 1961