

A  
BRIEF HISTORY  
OF THE  
REGULAR BAPTISTS,  
PRINCIPALLY OF  
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS,  
BY  
ACHILLES COFFEY.

TO WHICH AN APPENDIX 18 ADDED BY  
THOMAS J. CARR.

“I will also leave in thee midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord.”—Zeph. 3: 12.

PADUCAH, KY.:

MARTIN & Co., STEAM PRINTERS AND BINDERS.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1877, by  
ACHILLES COFFEY.

in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.



BIOGRAPHY OF ELDER A. COFFEY.

HAVING been intimately acquainted with Elder A.Coffey for the last forty years, and believing that it will not be amiss, I will therefore give a short history of his life.

He was born in Wayne County, Kentucky, July the 30th, A. D. 1806. In the year 1813, the time of the British war, his parents moved to the territory of Indiana, Jefferson County, and settled four miles from the fort. Here they suffered many privations and fears, insomuch that they remained only one year. Thence they removed to Washington County, and settled near the town of Salem, where they remained three years. In the fall of 1817, they moved back to Wayne County, Kentucky, but stayed there only the short space of one year. In 1818, they went to Alabama, where they remained two years. On 30th July they started for Illinois, and in the fall of 1820 landed in what is now Sangamon County, where they were again among the Red Men. Here they stayed two years, and then moved to what is now Saline County, Illinois, which was then a very wilderness country. During all this time they were almost entirely destitute of any means of education.

It may seem rather strange that a man who has been raised among the savages and wild beasts, could write a history, but when we consider that the most talented and useful men have been what is termed self-made, the mystery is solved. Elder Coffey took a great deal of pains to gain an education, and is a tolerably fair scholar. He made a profession of religion in his youth and attached himself to the Baptist Church before the division on the Missionary question. Believing the Bible and the Bible alone to be the only rule of faith and practice, and being utterly opposed to the inventions of men in the affairs of religion, he stood firm on the principles upon which the church was founded. And by his unswerving fidelity to the Apostle's doctrine, he rendered much service to the Regular Baptists of this country. Taking the Bible alone for his guide, and finding that the church of Christ was set up on earth and was to stand forever, his inquiring mind led him to search history to find out where she had been in the dark ages, and the Baptists having such implicit confidence in him, have repeatedly requested that he write a history of the Baptists, principally of Southern Illinois, which he with a great degree of reluctance consented

to do. Having examined his manuscript, I, with all my heart, recommend his little volume to the Regular Baptists, and to all enquirers after truth.

There is no man that stands higher among the Regular Baptists than does Elder Coffey, not only among them, but he is a man of good report with them that are without. Having labored to the best of my ability in the same gospel field for the last thirty years, I know whereof I speak.

Respectfully,

RICHARD FULKERSON. Golconda, Illinois, January 1, 1877.

## **PREFACE.**

SINCE there have already been so many histories of the Baptists written, and are now before the public, it might be asked,—“Does the author think he could write a better history than has heretofore been published?” He would answer that such has neither been his intentions nor aspirations. In his old age, he truly feels himself inadequate to the task of writing a history. But while this is true, he feels himself under obligations to the many requests of his brethren, to favor them with a history of the Baptists of Southern Illinois, and since they desire to have his personal knowledge of the division on the missionary question submitted to writing, he has given it, in connection with the records pertaining to the same subject, to the best of his ability; and cherishing the hope that it will meet the approbation, and in some degree be beneficial to them, this little volume is respectfully inscribed by the Author.

## **CONTENTS.**

### **CHAPTER I.**

Two bodies of Baptists in Southern Illinois—Necessary that a true History of Baptists be written—The Author an eye witness to the division—Baptists not sticklers for name—Quotations from Ray examined — Concord Association—Modern Missions introduced among the Baptists—Regular Baptists abhor human inventions in affairs of Religion

### **CHAPTER II.**

Founders of the first Baptist Churches in Southern Illinois—Division of Muddy River Association—Circular letter—Bankston's Fork Church — Three classes of preachers—Wolf Creek Church — Bethel's Creek Church — Middle Fork Church—Big Bay Church—Bethel's Creek at her May term in 1837—Ministers belonging to Muddy River Association at time of the division—Young ministers raised up about time of the division of Muddy River Association—Division of Bethel Association — Elder Jones' article examined—Prof. John Washburn — Modern missionism the cause of the division of Bethel Association—The records show the Regular Baptists to be the legal descendants from the Ancient Baptists—The records show the United Baptists to be the excluded party—The Franklin Association of United Baptists—The final act of Bethel Association in regard to the division—Ministers who belonged to Bethel Association.

### **CHAPTER III.**

The Regular Baptista, that sect everywhere spoken against— Misrepresentations introduced; their utter falsity shown— Missionary societies; their manner of sending Missionaries Quotation from Baptist circular—The contrast drawn.

### **CHAPTER IV.**

Ray's Seven Pillars examined—Ninth Pillar, as laid down in Theodosia Earnest, examined— The United Baptists proved to be an apostate body—Quotation from Mosheim—Ray examined—Quotation from Orchard—Regular Baptists and Paulicians the same people—Misgivings of the

### **CHAPTER V.**

The Union of Separate and Regular Baptists in 1787—Most historians justify the act—The Author thinks it was an unholy marriage—An unadulterated channel of Baptists outside the union of 1787—Neither all the Regulars nor Separates went into the union of 1787—Descendants from both these bodies in their separate state, in Kentucky, in 1801—Separate Baptist Association formed in Illinois, in 1856—The Author’s personal knowledge of Separate Baptists in Illinois from 1820 to the present time—Channel of Regular Baptists outside the Union in 1787 shown

## **CHAPTER VI.**

The Regular Baptists have ever maintained the principles of true democracy—Our Republican form of government taken from the discipline of a Regular Baptist church—Regular Baptists will not hire a preacher—History necessary since the close of Inspiration—The Philadelphia Association the first in America, founded in 1807—Articles of faith of Philadelphia Association—Tenth and eleventh articles of faith of the Waldenses —Third set of abstract of principles sent to the king—The first Baptist Church founded in America—The Roger Williams organization not a true Baptist church—Regular Baptists not dependent upon Clarke’s nor William’s churches for their line of succession —Welch Tract church—Dr. Howell’s letter to Dr. Watson examined—Three articles of faith of the Kehuku Association —Elder Gano —North Carolina Baptist State Convention —Money hunters not confined to North Carolina—Two classes of United Baptists in Southern Illinois at the time of the division—Seven reasons why the Missionaries have the majority at present—Aged members belonging to Bethel’s Creek,

## **CHAPTER VII.**

The old Illinois Association—The New Design Church organized—Elder David Badgley—The New Design Church declared an unfellowship with slave holders—Division of Illinois Association—Fourth Item—Quotation from Benedict—Ninth Item—Appointing a Committee to examine records — Report of Committee — The report shows the Emancipation Baptists to be a rent-off party—Thirteenth Item—The Emancipation Baptists form an important element in the present United Baptists’ ranks—Circular letter —Elder M. J. Jones—Dissolution of Illinois Association....

## CHAPTER VIII.

Elk River Association—Twelfth Item—Abstract of principles —Two hundred and twenty-eight members excluded in 1827—Members leaving County Linn Church—Jonathan Floyd—Minute of Grand Pier in May 1830—Garrison Fork Church—Heavy rent—Extract from W. S. Montgomery's letter—Extract from Eld. Jeremiah Stephens' letter..

# HISTORY OF THE REGULAR BAPTISTS.

## CHAPTER 1.

Two bodies of Baptists in Southern Illinois—Necessary that a true History of the Baptists be written—The Author an eyewitness to the division—Baptists not sticklers for the name—Quotations from Ray examined—Concord Association—Modern Missions introduced among the Baptists — Regular Baptists abhor human inventions in affairs of religion.

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; from such withdraw thyself.”—1<sup>st</sup>. Timothy. 6: 3, 4, 5.

It is a well-known fact that there are two bodies of Baptists in Southern Illinois, differing materially both in doctrine and practice, and both claiming to be the legal successors to the Apostolic, and descendants from the Waldensian, Baptists. It is evident that both these bodies cannot be in that succession. While this is true, it is also evident that the Missionaries have taken great pains, and have used every exertion in trying to establish their claims to that succession; and in their essayings, or efforts to set up their claims, we honestly believe they have greatly misrepresented the Regular Baptists, which to my mind makes it absolutely necessary that the historic facts in relation to the division be brought to bear, and in their proper light be placed before the eyes of the people that all may be prepared to judge for themselves.

Let it be remembered that I was an eye witness to the division in this country, and am, perhaps, the only man now living that was in all the counsels and debates which led to the separation. It would not, therefore, be unreasonable in me to say that I know as much about the causes which led to the division, as any person, and as an honest man. I propose to give a true statement of the whole affair; nor shall I screen either party where I consider it in error.

The strifes and contentions that caused the division, were in progress from 1832 to 1840, before the final separation was complete. Although it is contrary to my natural

disposition, yet, in giving the history of separation, I shall be compelled to come in collision with other historians. Let me state just here that the mere name of a body does not amount to much, but the principles upon which it is founded are the characteristics by which it should be known as an organization. Ray, the historian, justly remarks that the Baptists have never been sticklers about their name, (Ray, p. 20) yet he makes considerable ado concerning the name at last, and seems quite unwilling for the Regular Baptists to bear the appellation of Old School, preferring rather to award to them the name New School. We will not even complain at this, if we can succeed in proving succession from the Apostles to the present time, still when we speak of, or write about, two parties differing in character, it becomes necessary to have some manner of distinction so as to be understood when we allude to either. In the progress of this work, I shall generally apply the names the two orders have been accustomed to calling themselves in this portion of the country since the split. The distinguishing titles are Regular Baptists, and United Baptists.

Mr. Ray frequently calls the Regulars “Hard Shells.” If that appellation is proper, it would seem fitting to apply the term “Soft Shell” to their opponents, which appellation I may occasionally use in relation to them, and should I call them Missionaries at any time, I wish to be understood to mean the modern system of missions, or men-made institutions, and not bible missionaries.

A quotation just here from Ray in regard to the name: He says, — “According to Elder S. Trott, there was no body of Baptists in the world calling themselves Old School, prior to the year 1832.” (Ray p. 25.)

I remark that there was no body of Baptists in the world calling themselves Missionaries, prior to the year 1832. Neither was there any body of Baptists in the world calling themselves United Baptists, prior to the year 1787. Hence, if we should endeavor to prove Apostolic succession by or through the mere name, we would fall far short of accomplishing the end.

Benedict, the historian, says: “Old School and Primitive Baptists are appellations so entirely out of place, that I cannot even as a matter of courtesy use them without adding so-called or some such expression.” Now to my mind, there can be but two reasons for such deep concern about the name of a people with whom they have no fellowship. It is either to cast a blemish upon the character of a respectable body of

Baptists, or from fear of its popularity; since numbers of their members are getting tired of their men-made and monied institutions, and are coming over to the Regular Baptists.

On pages 22 and 23, Ray, the historian, says: “But of late, some of less information or candor contend that the ‘Missionary Baptists’ broke off from the ‘Old School’ or ‘Hard Shell Baptists’ about thirty or forty years ago, and the Anti-Mission brethren even call the Missionaries the ‘New School Baptists.’ And some even tell us that they can remember very well when the Missionaries started. Now all that is necessary in order to settle this question of the priority of the Missionary or Anti-Missionary parties among Baptists, is to appeal to historic facts and documents.”

We will notice these “historic facts and documents.” The historian’s ‘appeal’ is to the statement of three men, from which he infers that they admit that the secession was on the part of the Regulars, or Hard Shells. We will here give the statements, in order, of the three men just alluded to: “ Elder S. Trott, an Old School Baptist of distinction, says of the separation: ‘This brought brethren, churches and associations that had been groaning under the burdens of human inventions and impositions in religion, to separate themselves, some sooner and some later, from the whole mass of the popular religion and religionists, and to take a stand as a distinct people upon the Old Baptist standard.

The holding of the scriptures as the only and a perfect rule of faith and practice, and Christ as the Foundation, the Head and Life of the Church, the only source and medium of Salvation. This separation occasioned the splitting of several associations and many churches. We took, as a distinguishing appellation, the name ‘Old School Baptists.’” (p. 24.)

The above is one of the “historic facts” to which Mr. Ray appeals in order to prove the priority of the Missionaries. Surely, he must be sorely pressed for testimony, that he would strain the language and misconstrue the meaning of Elder Trott’s statement, in order to establish his position. While the proper interpretation goes to confirm the fact that the Old Baptists applied the Sacred rule, and withdrew from them that walk disorderly, thus getting rid of the burdens of human inventions and impositions in religion, under which they were groaning. Ray’s next “historic fact” is a quotation from Dr. John M. Watson, which quotation is as follows: “After our

painful separation from the Missionaries in 1836, a number of churches, in the bounds of the Old Concord Association, met together and formed the Stone River Association. We had then, as was generally supposed, a strong and happy union; but alas! there was an element of heresy incorporated in that body as bad, if not worse, than that from which we had just withdrawn.” (p. 25.)

From the above quotation, Mr. Ray contends that Dr. Watson admits that the Old Baptists separated or withdrew from the Missionaries. Suppose this to be true. What was it but withdrawing from them that walked disorderly? The Regular Baptists have ever regarded the inventions of men in the affairs of religion an unspeakable abomination before God; and it has always been their custom to withdraw from any disorder, either in doctrine or practice. The “element of heresy” alluded to by Dr. Watson, was doubtless the doctrine of non-resurrection, and they withdrew from that disorder as well as from the modern missionary heresy.

The third “historic fact” to which Mr. Ray ‘appeals’ is as follows: “Elder Beebe of New York, the Anti-mission editor, admits, in substance, the truth of the above position that the Old Baptists seceded or withdrew from the Missionary Baptists.”

Ray fails to give the language of Elder Beebe, from which his inference is drawn; hence, there is no testimony in that “document,” other than the bare statement of the historian. Elder Beebe is now living, and can answer for himself, which he does in the following manner: “MIDDLETOWN, N. Y., April, 1877.

“ DEAR BROTHER CARR:—I have examined the passages to which you called my attention in Mr. Ray’s History, and were I less familiar with the cunning craftiness by which the self-styled Missionary Baptists lie in wait to deceive the simple, on the subject of church history, especially when laboring to show the antiquity of their Missionary hobby, I might be surprised at the manner in which they labor to shift the issue in dispute between themselves and the Primitive, or Old School order of Baptists. Much of the labor and argument of Messrs. Ray, Howell and Benedict has been directed evidently to mislead their readers as to the real grounds of difference which occasioned the separation between the Missionary and Anti-Missionary Baptists in 1832, by attempting to prove many things which were not at that time, nor subsequently, the subjects of controversy between the separating parties. Thus, setting up a man of straw to show how easily they could demolish it, and then with

a tremendous shout raise a cry of victory.

“I am the only surviving ordained minister that attended and took part at the meeting at Black Rock, Md., at the time when the separation there took place; but the records of that meeting, and the Address which was then prepared, adopted and published, setting forth the grounds of disfellowship, are extant, and may be found in the early volumes of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. Missionism was but one of a large brood of isms and unscriptural institutions which had occasioned the discord among the Baptists, against which the brethren of the Black Rock Meeting protested, as being at that time practiced among the portion of the Baptist denomination which at that time were known as Fullerites.

“It was a matter of perfect indifference with the members of the Black Rock Convention how old any or all of those unscriptural institutions were, as long as no example or precept could be found in the New Testament to authorize or sustain them. That there may have been impurities, irregularities, disorders, and even heresies, in the Baptist Church in ages past, was neither debated nor denied; but the great point considered was, were these institutions of heaven or of men? Were they instituted by Christ, and enjoined upon the disciples of Christ by the apostles of the Lamb? If they were, then we who rejected them, have departed from the order of the gospel, and have no right to claim recognition as the church of Christ. But if no precept or example can be found for them in the scriptures, though they or any of them may have been practiced from one day after the apostles fell asleep, they who practice them as religious institutions, are unknown to the bible as disciples of Christ. In the primitive organization of the church at Pentecost, they that gladly received the word were baptized and received into the church. And they continued steadfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. —Acts 2: 42. If in any of these essential points we, the Primitive, or Old School Baptists, have departed, let Mr. Ray or his friends show us wherein, and we will regard them as friends for so doing. But suppose we add a few things to these recognized traits of an apostolic church, and render the text, And they continued steadfastly in forming, patronizing and supporting Missionary Societies, Sunday Schools, Colleges and Theological Seminaries, Tract Societies, and a thousand other humanly invented organizations, as auxiliaries to the church of Christ, would we not

be adding to the words of the book of this prophecy? See Revelation. 22: 18.

“The argument of Mission Baptists, as they are pleased to call themselves, is: These institutions, as auxiliaries to the church, or something nearly akin to them, have been of long standing with Baptists of former ages. Well, suppose this, though doubted, be admitted, can not the other denominations adduce the same argument for their perversions of baptism? Cannot the Catholics show their invocation of saints, their purgatory and their triplecrowned pontiff, to be institutions and traditions of many centuries, with as good a grace?

“But we do not admit the claim that Missionary Societies, as distinct organizations from the churches, with presidents, vice-presidents, directors, treasurers, collectors and executive boards have been known, either in our country or any other, for ages past. The cases which they have cited in England and Wales, do not show that they were separate from their church organizations, or such Missionism as we have and do repudiate and protest against.

“There is an evident design to mislead the readers of Ray's History, in the statement of their third and fourth propositions on page 23, namely: “From the days of the apostles to the present time, the true, legitimate Baptist Church has ever been a missionary body.” And, “The churches founded by Christ and the apostles, were Missionary Churches.” If by Missionary Churches Mr. Ray means only that these churches were, as churches, engaged in the dissemination of the gospel, through the gifts which God bestowed upon the apostles, evangelists, pastors and teachers which He himself raised up, called and qualified, “For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ,” then we challenge him to show wherein we, the Old School Baptists of the present day, have, or do differ from the primitive order. Without any Missionary Society or Board outside of the organization of the church of God, to guarantee a salary, without purse, scrip or two coats, the Old School Baptists have to-day more gospel preachers of this description in the field, than all the professedly Missionary Baptists in the world can honestly claim.

“But if Mr. Ray means to convey the impression that the churches organized by Christ, patronized Missionary Societies, outside of her church membership, composed of members admitted at a specified price, organized with presidents, vice-

presidents, directors, and a multitude of salaried officers, to employ men, appoint them their field of labor, and pay them their wages, then we demand proof from the scriptures that any such institutions were known or tolerated in the primitive churches.

“If the primitive churches founded by Christ and His apostles were Missionary Churches, then so are the so-called Old School Baptists of the present time; for they occupy the same ground, observe the same order and ordinances, and refuse to practice or patronize any religious order other than such as are clearly authorized by the precepts and examples of Christ and His apostles, according to the record of the New Testament. It matters not what were the practices of the Baptists of five hundred or a thousand years ago. We have the laws of Christ as given in the New Testament, for our rule, and the apostles of Christ as expounders of the laws of Christ to us. What they have bound on earth is bound in heaven, and what they have loosed on earth is loosed in heaven.

“Brother Carr, when I became a member of the Baptist Church, in 1811, no religious institution was known or patronized to my knowledge, in connection with the Baptists of the United States. Not a College, Theological Seminary, Sunday School, Missionary or Tract Society existed in our country. Not long after my membership, the heresy of Andrew Fuller, of England, began to be promulgated among us, and his proposition to change the condition of the Baptists, and to raise them from the “dunghill” to a position of respectability, and his theories were eagerly embraced by all the Arminian elements which had long been hidden among us. Soon after this, Dr. A. Judson and Luther Rice, who had been educated for the ministry by the Presbyterians, were by their denominations sent as missionaries to the East Indies, and on their way on shipboard, they agreed to change their profession, and on their arrival in Burmah, they were immersed by Dr. Carey, a so-called Baptist missionary from England, and Rice returned to originate a missionary spirit among the Baptists of America. He made a tour through our States, and soon originated the American and Foreign Missionary Societies, with numerous auxiliary societies, both Foreign and Domestic, in almost every State of the Union. It was claimed for Judson and Rice that they, while students at College, prayed the mission spirit down. The rapidity with which these movements were followed by the introduction of

Theological Schools in which to teach young men the science of preaching, Mission Societies to find employment and pay for these men-made ministers of Fuller's gospel, together with all the machinery of Sunday Schools, and a host of other equally unscriptural inventions, produced such discord and turmoil among the Baptists as could not be reconciled. The old veterans of the cross who had long born with minor innovations, now being thoroughly conscious that a separation was inevitable, called a convention at Black Rock, in 1832, and published a solemn protest against all the newly introduced innovations upon our former faith and order, and proposed, in a public circular, to the advocates of the new departure, that if they would renounce their newly adopted, unscriptural inventions, and return to the order from which they had departed, we would still walk together, and hold them in denominational fellowship. But if they persisted in their departures from the distinguishing doctrine and order of Christ and His apostles, we should drop them from our fellowship, and recognize only such as continued steadfast in the apostles' doctrine, as the Apostolic Baptist Church of Christ.

“To distinguish those who retained the apostolic doctrine, from those who departed from it, we consented to be known by a name which had been given us by our opponents, viz: Old School Baptists. This appellation we agreed to accept, with the express understanding that it referred only to the School of Christ, and not to any humanly devised system, of scholastic divinity. It was not that we had changed in any wise from what we had always been, either in faith or order, but simply to distinguish us from those who had changed and still chose to be called by our name to take away their reproach.

“If Mr. Ray had established his claim that the New School or Missionary Baptists are a regular, unbroken succession from the Primitive Baptists of the apostolic age, upon the ground that they were largely in the majority when the division took place in 1832, will he please tell us why the claim of succession made by the Catholics is not equally clear and valid? When Constantine established the Christian religion by law, and flooded the church with graceless converts from the Pagans, those who refused to mingle in the desecrations of the sacred name of Christianity, were greatly in the minority, and the true church was driven by the violence of persecution into the wilderness; but did she surrender her identity as the true church, because she

refused to walk in fellowship with the majority? Christ has commanded His people to come out of Babylon, and to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, and even to withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly. The King of saints has given this distinguishing mark by which we are to know them that are His: “If ye love me keep my commandments.” And He has commanded them to come out and be separate, and touch not the unclean thing. But He has also told us that except we deny ourselves and take up our cross and follow Him, we cannot be His disciples.

“The Old School Baptists never did consent to any of the anti-christian doctrines and institutions of the new order, even when mixed up with them in denominational connection; they protested against any practice for which there was no “Thus saith the Lord,” and after laboring to reclaim the disorderly until they found their labors were unavailing, they withdrew fellowship from them.

“Mr. Ray has told us that our Lord Jesus Christ was sent, or missionary, of the Father, and that the Holy Ghost was sent by the Father and the Son, a missionary, &c. Is this the kind of Missionism that the Old Baptists dispute or object to? It is a mere play upon the word missionary, as meaning sent. We have never disputed that God sent His Son into the world, or that Christ sent His apostles, and that He still sends laborers into His vineyard. Neither have, nor do we, as Old School Baptists, deny that the primitive church set apart to the work of the ministry, such as the Holy Ghost has called and qualified for and unto that work. Nor that the church gave to such the right hand of fellowship to go to whatever field the Holy Ghost directed them. Nor do we dispute that the churches and the saints were commanded, as stewards of their temporal things, to contribute of their earthly substance as the Lord had prospered them, to the support of God’s sent ministers. In all their scriptural researches, Mr. Ray and his compeers have found nothing of Missionism in the New Testament that is not to be found in our Old School Baptist Churches. But they have utterly failed to find example or precept for anything like a modern Missionary Society outside of the organized church of Christ. The blessed truth that God has sent His son into the world, and that the Holy Spirit has been sent from heaven to dwell in the saints, and that Christ as Head of His church has sent His ministers into all the world to preach His gospel; but although the church of Christ has recognized

this prerogative of the King of saints, it affords no authority for men to assume the right to transfer the exercise of the authority which is vested alone in Christ, to a Missionary Society composed of members admitted to membership for money, and to places of distinction for more money, and organized in parliamentary form, as the modern Missionary Societies, both Foreign and Domestic, are.

“It is admitted that Christ has power on earth to forgive sins; but does it therefore follow that the Pope of Rome or the Popish priesthood have that power? Their claim is equally as good as the claim that modern Missionary Societies adduce for their presumptuous, if not blasphemous assumption of the prerogatives of the Lord of Life and Glory.” GILBERT BEEBE.

The above letter to Bro. Thomas J. Carr shows not only what “the Anti-Mission Editor of New York admits in substance,” but it shows plainly that Elder Beebe was an eye witness to the division; that the modern Missionary Societies etc. did not exist when he joined the church in 1811; that the old veterans of the cross solemnly protested against the introduction of them; that the present order of Missionary Baptists have departed from the original faith and practice of the Primitive Baptists; that the Black Rock Convention, in a circular, told this “new departure,” that if they would renounce these isms, they would still hold them in denominational fellowship. But their utter refusal to comply, made it necessary for those who adhered strictly to the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, even the Old School Baptists, to withdraw fellowship from them.

I leave the above letter without further comment, to the reader, hoping he will give it a fair and careful perusal.

“Other authorities,” continues Mr. Ray, “might be adduced in confirmation of the same. It has already been fully shown that in the separation, the Anti-Mission Baptists were the seceding party.” Would any intelligent, unprejudiced person believe, from the “historic facts and documents” which Mr. Ray has introduced, that he has “fully shown” the Regular Baptists to be the seceding party? Is it not obvious that he has put a wrong construction on the language and meaning of those “historic facts,” when official records show to the contrary? Had the whole history in relation to the quotation from Dr. Watson in regard to the Concord Association been introduced, it would have been seen at once that the testimony was against the United

Baptists.

Benedict, the Missionary historian, uses the following language in regard to said Concord Association: “The Concord Association split on doctrine about twenty years past. Both bodies called themselves Concord. The Calvinistic party claimed to be the first, and the Arminian division was accounted the second. About ten years since, the first Concord split again, on the missionary question, and formed a new association called Stone River. Thus, this once flourishing body of churches was severed into three parts. \* \* The two Concords, however, came together about four years past.”

Let it be remembered that Benedict is intensely opposed to the Regular Baptists, and from his language as above given, we see that the Missionary party that went off from the Regulars, united with the Arminian division, soon after the separation. Since Benedict has given but a synopsis of the said Association, I will give a more extended account, which will throw some additional light on the subject. The Concord Association split about ten years prior to the Missionary strife getting among them. An Arminian wing went off, and formed themselves into a body upon the Arminian plan. The party, from which this Arminian division split off, had no fellowship with the said split-off Arminian wing after their rending from the Concord Association. When the Missionary difficulty, in regard to the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, and all its various branches arose, the first Concord Association again split. The manner of that separation was that the Association passed an act of dissolution, and after the dissolution, eleven churches—a majority of all the churches belonging to said Association—met and formed the Stone River Association on the Old Baptist standard; upon the same articles of faith of the Old Concord Association; hence, the Stone River Association must be the genuine Baptists. But the Missionary party, after the separation of the Concord Association, joined the Arminian wing that had previously gone off from the Concord Association; they cannot be the original stock of Baptists.

As further testimony of what I have already written upon the subject of the division of the Baptists in the bounds of the Concord Association in Tennessee, I submit the following letter written by Elder Thomas Spain, who is a man of truth and undoubted veracity.

“HAMILTON County, Illinois, January 18th, 1877. “ELDER A. Coffey :

“Dear Brother: —In compliance with your request, I send you this brief outline which is according to my best recollection at this remote date. I was personally acquainted with the Concord Association of Baptists in Tennessee prior to, and in the time of the division on the Mission question in that body. I am not certain about dates, but think it was about 1836 that this Missionary division occurred. There had been a small rent in this Association prior to the above-named separation, on account of the doctrine advocated by the former body. This split-off party called themselves Free Will Baptists. They claimed the associated name Concord. The Old Concord was then in peace among themselves, having no correspondence with this rent-off party. A few years after this, the Missionary spirit crept into the old order Baptists by men from the East saying that the Baptists were right in doctrine, but very deficient in practice, and that they must needs form a Tennessee Baptist Convention. The Regular party charged those who favored the said Convention, with being unsound in doctrine, which charge they denied. However, they got advocates enough to, and did organize, the said Convention. Although the majority of the members were opposed to the Convention, yet the Missionary minority assumed authority over the majority, and did organize the said Tennessee Baptist Convention, as before stated. This gave rise to a great deal of controversy and contention in the Association. Year after year they met in council with no better results. Finally, they appointed a call meeting of the body, and after a long session, agreed to dissolve the Association, referring the same to the churches for their action thereon. In this the churches acquiesced. Being now no longer together in an associated capacity, those churches that were opposed to the Missionaries, shortly after repaired to Ridge Church, where and when they were organized into an Association called the Stone River, upon the same abstract of principles and rules of decorum that they had stood upon for many years, and adding: ‘We declare a nonfellowship with the Tennessee Baptist Convention, and all men-made institutions? It appeared by this time, that the Missionaries had lost sight of the doctrine they at the beginning advocated, and very soon they and the Free Will Baptists came together as one body, upon the principles of the Free Will Baptists. A few years after this, the Missionaries wrote a letter and appointed bearers to the Old Order of Baptists, requesting a committee to be

appointed to meet in committee, in order to try to affect a union again. They came with the letter. The answer to the letter was, ‘Tell your people if they wish to return to us, they will find us just where they left us.’

“Previous to the introduction of the Mission system into the bounds of the Concord Association, Elder John Bond, the pastor of the church to which I belonged, took great pains to caution his brethren against the approaching evil, saying that it was at work in the East, and was causing division among the Baptists; that it was progressing toward the West, and would be upon them. He entreated the brethren to have nothing to do with said Mission system; but when those men came from the East, and introduced it into the Association, he changed his position, and began to advocate it, and finally went off from those who took his first advice.

“Your brother in the bonds of the Gospel,

“Thomas Spain.”

The following is an extract from a letter written by Elder Jeremiah Stephens, in regard to Elder Bond: “When the division took place with the Baptists in this country, Elder John Bond lived in Wilson County, Tennessee, and I suppose he was forty-five or fifty years old at that time. I was requested to meet him at a Brother Pates, where and when he (Bond) informed me that he was authorized by the Missionary Board to employ me to preach for them, and that he would give me so much a day and hire a hand to work in my place. I told him I did not believe their doctrine and would not preach it. \* \* \* \* Elders Heath and Pates joined Bond in trying to get me to leave these old ignorant, superstitious, unpopular and then known and acknowledged old Regular or Primitive Baptists. They said they did not want me to stay with them, that I could not be popular with the world, and that I could not be supported if I remained with these Old Baptists.” From Elder Spain’s letter we see that Elder John Bond at first advised his brethren to have nothing to do with this approaching evil—the Mission system. But when it did approach he (Bond) went off into it. And from Elder Stephens’ testimony we see that Bond was authorized by the Missionary Board to hire Elder Stephens to preach for them. Since that time Elder Bond has written a “history” of the Baptists, and when trying to establish their claims to priority, the Missionary Baptists of Southern Illinois make Bond their main historian. I recollect of having delivered a lecture on church identity several years

ago, down in Pope County. I was replied to by a Missionary Baptist, and all the history he drew on me was Bond's.

Ray, the historian, in speaking of the opposition to the Mission system by the Regular Baptists, calls it a new feature among Baptists. Perhaps some might infer from such language that the Baptists had all been engaged in the system till the division occurred, and that the Regular party broke off from the Missionaries. But the real facts in the case are that the system advocated by the Mission party, was not introduced into the Baptist Church until recently, and of course no opposition was necessary till the "approaching evil" manifested itself among the Baptists. It is a "new feature" among the Baptists—in the Baptist Church—but no newer than the system itself. They both came among the Baptists simultaneously. The new schemes were introduced by the Mission party, and utterly opposed and fended off by the Regular party. Let this fact be understood, and our historian has gained nothing by his ingenuity, only what deception may be palmed off on the innocent and unobserving public.

Ray several times refers to the Philadelphia Association in order to prove that to be a missionary body; but what do those quotations amount to? They only show the introduction of what caused the division among Baptists, as the following quotation from Belcher will show:

"A century ago comparatively little activity, or concern for the extension of the Christian cause, distinguished the Baptist denomination in any part of the world. Jonathan Edwards, in this county, and Andrew Fuller, of England, were raised up in the providence of God to excite increased attention to the theology of the churches, while George Whitfield and John Wesley, like 'sons of thunder,' awoke up many thousands, on both continents, to serious thought. As this work spread there grew with it a vastly increased desire that men, everywhere, should become acquainted with religion and Sunday Schools, and missionary, bible and religious societies, to accomplish this purpose, rose up, in rapid succession throughout Christendom; and no man will deny but that, they have accomplished great results. It was scarcely to be expected, however, that so vast a change could take place without some degree of opposition; and the Baptist body was soon found to present two contending parties. One of these maintained that the commission of the

Redeemer to preach the gospel to all nations, and the conduct of the Apostles in teaching that God had commanded all men everywhere to repent, made it imperative on the church to seek the evangelization of the world, and for this purpose they formed missionary and other kindred institutions. The other party, however, insisted that the accomplishment of the divine purpose did not depend on the efforts of man, however zealous, and that as all these societies were of human origin, they were a departure from Baptist principles and offensive to God.” Belcher, p. 243.

The foregoing lengthy paragraph is here introduced for the purpose of showing the reader that those human inventions and institutions have not always been among the Baptists. The Missionary historian, as above quoted, shows beyond a doubt, that they were introduced into the church within the last century, and came up in such rapid succession that he does not marvel at their being strong opposition to them. But why should there be a “party” to contend against these human institutions? Because God Almighty will always have a people “owing subjection to Him as the King whom He hath set upon His Holy Hill of Zion; evincing their allegiance to him by an implicit obedience to His laws, institutions and ordinances; and rejecting the doctrines and commandments of men.” (Jones, p. 50;) and since “The genuine spirit of religion has been, and will be preserved by those only, who dissent from all establishments devised by human policy,” (see Orchard, p. 52) it is, therefore, to be expected that they will “hold in abhorrence all human inventions as proceeding from anti-Christ, which produce distress,” &c. (see Jones p. 326.)

When these human inventions manifested themselves among the Baptists, those wishing to preserve the “genuine spirit of religion,” abhorred and utterly opposed them, while those favoring them formed missionary and other kindred institutions. Thus, were the “two contending parties” manifested, which finally resulted in the separation of the Baptists. Now, gentle reader, turn your attention, if you please, for a moment to these two parties—these two bodies of Baptists, and you will see at once that the Regular Baptists stand opposed to all those inventions “devised by human policy;” that they regard the inventions of men in the affairs of religion an unspeakable abomination before God. While this is so the United Baptists have their Sunday Schools, Missionary Boards, Tract and Temperance Societies as aids in the salvation of sinners. Hence, it is obvious Hence, it is obvious that the Regular

Baptists maintain the original doctrine and practice; that they are the genuine Baptists, and are entitled to that succession claimed by the United Baptists.

## CHAPTER 2.

Founders of the first Baptist Churches in Southern Illinois— Division of Muddy River Association—Circular letter—Bankston Fork Church—Three classes of preachers—Wolf Creek Church—Bethel's Creek Church—Middle Fork Church—Big Bay Church—Bethel's Creek Church at her May term in 1837— Ministers belonging to Muddy River Association at time of the division—Young ministers raised up about the time of the division of Muddy River Association—Division of Bethel Association—Elder Jones' article examined—Prof. John Washburn — Modern Missionism the cause of the division of Bethel Association—The records show the Regular Baptists to be the legal descendants from the Ancient Baptists— The records show the United Baptists to be the excluded party—The Franklin Association of United Baptists—The final act of Bethel Association in regard to the division—Ministers who belonged to Bethel Association.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.”—Romans. 16: 17.

I NOW come to the subject which so much interests the Baptists of Southern Illinois, and will give a true history of the split in Muddy River and Bethel Association. Elders Stephen Stilley, Wilson Henderson, John Ren and Isaac Heron were the founders the first churches in this part of the country. They were old men at the time the gathering of these churches, and from some cause did not have exact uniformity either in regard to name or in relation to their confession of Faith. Some of these churches were constituted Regular Baptist, others, United Baptist. Some were founded on the same Articles of Faith upon which the Association was established, while the fifth article of others read, — “We believe in the doctrine of unconditional election.” I desire that this be borne in mind, as I shall have special use for it in the future. Whether this discrepancy was on account of difference of opinion, or for want of regular forms, I have no means of knowing. They were men of great piety and zeal, and were the early pioneers of this then wilderness country. I may say more of them and their labors, hereafter, but will leave them for the present, and proceed with the history of Muddy River and Bethel Association, commencing where I saw the first signs of division.

On my return home in 1832, from the Black Hawk war, I became deeply concerned in matters of religion. And having declined any further aspirations to office, either civil or military, I availed myself of the first opportunity of visiting an association. On Saturday preceding the third Sunday in October, A. D. 1832, the Muddy River Association convened at Wolf Creek meeting house, Gallatin (now Saline) county. Although I had not then become a member of the Baptist Church, yet I visited and gave my whole attention to the proceedings of said Association. The letter handed in from Big Creek church, read, "We, the Regular Baptist," etc., when a minister by the name of George Waggoner, hastily arose and objected to said letter being received, saying that "it was out of order, and that that church was trying to slip in edgeways." When on resuming his seat, Elder Charles H. Clay arose, stating that "they are not an 'edgeways' people, but they are above-board people, —a Regular Baptist Church, —and if Regular Baptists were not admitted, they would not intrude themselves on the Association." After a brief explanation by Elders Stilley and Henderson, the said Big Creek Church letter was received.

I saw nothing else at said meeting of the Association that had the appearance of division other than some discrepancy in the preaching at the stand. The Association appointed corresponding messengers to Little River Association, when convened at Mt. Pleasant meeting house, Trigg County, Kentucky, on Saturday before the fourth Sunday in August, A. D. 1833. At said meeting, the association split on doctrine, and formed two separate bodies; the majority taking the name Original Little River, the other party calling themselves the Little River Association.

Both these bodies appointed messengers to the Muddy River Association, when held at Big Bay meeting house, Pope County, Illinois, commencing on Saturday before the third Sunday in October, A. D. 1833. I will now leave this subject to be disposed of hereafter, and since Elder John H. Gammon has written a circular letter concerning this, I will here insert it that the reader may have a knowledge of the whole affair.

#### **CIRCULAR LETTER.**

"The Original Little River Association of Predestinarian Baptists, now in session with the church at Dry Creek, Trigg County, Kentucky, to the several churches which she represents, to our corresponding associations, and to all who

love our Lord Jesus Christ in Spirit and in Truth, wishes Grace, Mercy and Peace:

“Dearly Beloved in our Lord Jesus Christ: —According to the resolution of the last Association that we publish, a Circular Letter upon the subject, ‘showing the causes that led to the division of the Baptists in 1833, with a short account of the history of this Association.’ We approach the subject with a full sense of its importance, when we recollect that over a generation has arisen since that event took place, and many in the present day are unaware of the true causes that led to that division. True, our enemies have given their version of the matter, at different times, in which they have endeavored to show that the original part of this Association were nothing but a faction, that they are the original body. For this cause, many of our brethren have desired that we may be set right in this matter by publishing the facts in the case, and in doing so, dear brethren, we are bound to go back and look at the condition of the Baptists before the organization of this Association. Previous to the year 1806 there were no organized associations in this part of Kentucky. True, there were some churches, and many members, who did not belong to any regular church, from the fact of the sparsely settled condition of the country. There were but few Baptist preachers among them, and most of the members had been baptized by visiting ministers from Virginia and the Carolinas. But in the years 1804 and 1805, there was a great emigration of Baptists from the Kehukee Association, of North Carolina, and from the Kectocon Association, of Virginia. These brethren gave notice to those scattered in the adjacent counties, that they intended to form an association north of the Cumberland river. Accordingly, they met at what was then called Fort’s meeting house, in Montgomery County, Tennessee, and organized the Red River Association. This was constituted on Saturday before the second Sunday in August, 1806. Their boundary line then included all of Southwestern Kentucky, Western Tennessee, Southern Illinois, and it even extended into what is now the State of Missouri; emigrants kept pouring in from the older settled States, and in the course of a few years the Red River became so numerous, and the churches occupying such a large extent of territory, it was deemed advisable to form a new association; consequently, the Little River was formed in the year 1813. It will here be remembered that they were constituted upon the Articles of Faith of Red River. Nothing particularly occurred in the history of this Association until the year 1825,

at which time the Red River Association divided upon what has ever troubled the Baptists in this country; we allude to the modern missionary system, together with its brood of institutions, such as Bible Societies, Sunday School Societies, Tract Societies, Temperance Societies, Theological Seminaries, &c., all of which are without a divine warrant. This heresy first made its appearance at Red River Association, in the year 1816, when Luther Rice made his appearance as a Messenger from the Philadelphia Association with a bundle of Missionary documents asking them to become auxiliary to that body, which was agreed to by some of the churches, but four churches remonstrated against their reception. So, it went on until 1825, when they divided upon that issue. From that time some of the leaders of Little River endorsed the same principles that led to the division in Red River, and in connection with this, likewise endorsed the very popular doctrine of Universal Atonement; for, they very wisely saw that to carry on their mission system, they must also advocate the whole Arminian creed, otherwise their system would not work! This was contrary to the principles upon which they were constituted, but as popularity and personal aggrandizement was at the bottom of it, they thought it would make no difference to overleap the Constitution. Here, then, it was very plain that there were two parties in this Association from 1825, until they divided in 1833; at which time the Association met at Mt. Pleasant meeting house, Trigg County, Kentucky, and was organized by choosing Elder Wm. Buckley, Moderator, and John Draper, Clerk. The original body (we mean by this, those who held the Constitution and Articles of Faith sacred and wished no innovation either in faith or practice) knowing that there were two parties among them, first made the following motion, viz: 'I motion that all who cannot fellowship the doctrine of general atonement and universal operation of the spirit, manifest it by holding up their hands.' On this vote there was a majority declared that they did not fellowship the above doctrines, and a large minority voted that they did. Then a second motion was presented, viz: 'I motion that all those that cannot retain in fellowship those that preach and believe the doctrine of general atonement and universal operation of the spirit, manifest it by rising to their feet and collecting themselves together, and organize themselves as the Little River Association, to the exclusion of those that believe the above doctrines contrary to the Constitution.'

“Here it will be plainly seen that the party now known as United Baptists and claiming the name of the Little River Association, in that division did depart from the original principles upon which they were constituted, and as held by all sound Baptists. It may here be noticed that they still hold to the Articles of Faith, but at the same time not one in twenty of them believe those Articles; nay, we have heard them publicly denounce them from their pulpits, and those Baptists who do hold and believe them are represented by their leaders as schismatics. We have before remarked that it was the introduction of Missionism, with all its concomitants, that produced this division. Now, dear brethren, we desire to look into the introduction of this modern innovation and see whether it has any authority in the word of God, and whether it ever formed any part of the doctrine of God, our Savior, and whether it was even known among Primitive Baptists? The first account we have of modern Missionism was in the rise of the first beast. (Revelation. 13: 1.) This beast plainly represented Papal or Roman Catholic anti-Christ, and was the first professed religious body that ever sent out missionaries, and the result of their efforts in evangelizing the world is a very true picture of what sort of an institution it is. Let the fires of Smithfield and all the horrors of the Inquisition bear witness. The very first martyr burnt in England by the missionary power of the first beast, was a Baptist, and a humble minister of God’s word; his name was Wm. Sawtre, and he was publicly burnt at Smithfield in the year 1401. So much for the Mission spirit under the first beast.

“Let us now look at its workings under the reign of the second beast (or Protestant anti-Christ.) [Revelation. 13: 11.] No sooner had Luther commenced what was called the Reformation than we see that the same Missionary spirit manifests itself in his system; they overrun Germany, England, &c., and while Roman Catholic anti-Christ had its medicant friars, Protestant anti-Christ had its begging ministers; and even at the present day, even among a people called Baptists, they yet carry around the hat! Protestant anti-Christ persecuted the Baptists as well as the Catholics, for the persecution against the true church of God lasted in England alone a period (under the reign of both beasts) of 210 years, and the last martyr burnt in England under that pious King, James I, (who endorsed the Missionary principles as much as any of our modern Baptists) was Edward Wightman, a minister of the Baptist Church.

This was in the year 1611. So that the true church of God hath led the van, and brought up the rear in the bloody crusade that was made against her by this Missionary spirit. Thus, we see that all the different denominations of professed Christians endorsed the modern Missionary system, except the Original Baptists, who have ever opposed it from its introduction under the first beast down to its adoption by the professed Baptists of the present day. Thus, we see, dear brethren, that Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and even Mormons and Modern Baptists all have endorsed this modern innovation. Let us now examine its rise among the Baptists. The first account we find of it among them, was among the English Baptists; it took its rise in the Nottinghamshire Association in the year 1792. It met with very little success at that time, but in the year 1796 it made its appearance in London and soon found supporters, as many plainly saw that in its money operations the prospect of getting rich without labor by collecting off their dupes! Hence we find that Dr. Ryland Jr., Andrew Fuller and Mathew Carey were its first supporters among the English Baptists. In that year they ordained Mat. Carey as a missionary to proceed to India to convert that rich country. What his and subsequent co-workers' efforts in subduing that country have been, has already been seen. The late horrible revolution among them proves that they were perfectly destitute of a knowledge of Christianity. The first association that adopted it, in the United States was the Philadelphia Association; they, at their meeting in 1816, appointed Luther Rice to proceed to the West to enlist the associations in that part of the country in their cause. Here, then, we see its first introduction among the Baptists in this country, and, as before stated, caused the division. The Original, or old order of Baptists, still adhering to the Primitive Faith and Order of the Gospel, as given by their divine Master. True, they have become popular; they have the world's ear and means on their side; truly, 'they are of the world, and the world heareth them!'

“Having given the rise and progress of Missionism historically, we will now proceed to try it by the Word of God. It has been claimed by that party that not only Missionism but all the different societies which have germinated from it, have divine authority; but they have ever failed to prove it, and ever will, from the fact that not one passage in God's word favors such abominations! The text mostly relied upon

by Missionists to prove their system is found in Matthew. 28: 19-20: ‘Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world, Amen.’

“It will here be plainly seen that this command was given by our divine Lord to His chosen Apostles; it was never delegated to a missionary board; it was never given to any such characters to send His Gospel; for He says in the preceding verse (18th) ‘All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.’ If the power then is reserved in His hands, and He alone can send His ministers, how, we ask, can any humanly devised missionary board assume such power? They certainly cannot, according to God’s word. Again, they were to teach nothing only what He had commanded them. We ask them, then, did He teach them to introduce into the church all the different isms now known among them, such as Sunday Schools, Bible Societies, Tract Societies, General Associations, Conventions, Mass Meetings, Temperance Societies, in fact all the Idol Gods for which they are noted? We understand that God alone has the power to qualify His ministers, and send them in His power and providence, as the whole of the New Testament teaches. Again, it is said, that the Apostle Paul was a missionary preacher; if he was he did not believe the modern missionary doctrine. For proof of this we quote Galatians. 1: 15-17: ‘But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother’s womb and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the brethren; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me.’

“No qualification was necessary to enable him to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ among the heathen, except the sovereign tuition of God Almighty, which alone can qualify any of His ministers. Again, God had determined that the Gospel should be preached at Rome. Were the churches called on to provide what they call a missionary, to equip him and give him a large salary for that purpose? Not one word of the kind in the book of God. But, on the contrary, we find that the Lord appeared to the Apostles in the night, after he had appealed unto Caesar, and told ‘Saying, Fear not, Paul, thou must be brought before Caesar.’ (Acts. 27: 24.) Here

the providence of God appears in the matter: He not only designed the Apostle to go to Rome but actually took him there at the expense of his enemies, and when the Apostle reached there did he ask the brethren for a stipulated salary, that he might preach? No. But he tells them, like an honest minister of God, ‘That as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you that are at Rome also,’ (Romans. 1: 15) believing that the same Providence that had put it into the hearts of the people would take care of him; as has always been the case in the propagation of the Gospel. But modern Missionism acts contrary to the Divine rule; they must be hired before they will take the care of what they call the Church. Have they any account of this in the Scripture? Have they any account of it in the Acts of the Apostles? which is the best Church history the Baptists ever had. Our Lord Himself cautions His people against these characters; these modern hirelings. He says ‘The hireling fleeth because he is an hireling?’ (John. 10: 13.) How do these modern preachers flee? From place to place in search of the greatest salary. We contend most solemnly that the true preacher of the Gospel cannot be hired; the world has not money enough for that purpose, and yet we believe that it is the duty of God’s people to take care of their ministers as the word of God lays it down.

“Again, to show that the preaching of the gospel was not of a hireling character, the Apostle tells us ‘For though I preach the gospel I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel!’ (1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians. 9: 16.)

“Again, to show the freeness thereof, He says: (1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians. 9: 17-18:) ‘For I do this thing willingly, I have a reward, but if against my will a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me. What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel.’ We think, dear brethren, that we have shown enough to prove the order of the Primitive Church in this matter, or at as far as we can, in the confined limits of a Circular Letter. The true believer in Christ can see at a glance what was the original order and arrangement of God in the propagation of His divine gospel among His people.

“Our Lord Himself tells us that ‘This gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. (Matthew.

24: 14.) How different a course from modern Missionism! They tell that the world has to be converted, and that it cannot be done without their effortism and instrumentality; hence, Missionism is ever on the alert, holding their protracted meetings and collecting money off of their dupes without one single warrant in the word of the Lord for it! Again, the word of the Lord speaks in very pointed language against these characters, who, for the sake of gain and popularity do pervert His divine truth, and 'Who changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator.' (Romans. 1: 25.) The Prophets, by divine inspiration, predicted or foretold of these characters as well as the Apostles, the immediate followers of our Lord. We will now proceed to show, both from the Old and New Testament, what God has said against the false teachers of our day. We refer you particularly to the 23d chapter of Jeremiah, in which the Lord brings to view the doings of the Prophets, and their abominable perversions of His divine command; 16th verse, God commands His people not to hearken unto them ; 21st verse, 'I have not sent these Prophets, yet they ran ; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied;' 25th and 26th: 'I have heard what the Prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the Prophets that prophesy lies? yea, they are Prophets of the deceit of their own heart.'

“Ezekiel. 34: 2-3, where the Lord again brings to view the deceitful nature of these characters, under the name of shepherds: 'Wo be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed; but ye feed not the flock.' The Lord then denounces these false shepherds, and tells them what judgments He will bring upon them for their abominable practices. To so great an extent did they carry their false religion in the days of the Prophet Micah, that the Lord directed that Prophet to expose their falsehoods and their hypocrisy in the third chapter, which is devoted entirely to that subject, and from which we have room only to make a few quotations, 9th, 10th and 11th verses: 'Hear this, I pray you, ye heads of the house of Jacob and princes of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the Prophets

thereof divine for money; yet will lean upon the Lord and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us.'

"We now come to the New Testament and will notice the denunciations of our Lord against these false teachers, (Matthew. 23: 14-15:) 'Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayer; therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves.'

"Can anything be more plain to the Christian mind than what our Lord here brings to view, and does it not apply to the Scribes and Pharisees of our own times as at any other? Who, we ask, are they that devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayer? Who are they that compass sea and land to make one proselyte? Surely it must refer to those who are engaged by their efforts to what they call evangelizing the world! Again, we read of one that thought that the gift of the Holy Ghost could be purchased and he offered the Apostle money for that purpose, but did he accept it? Would he have money upon any such a principle? Does he not reply to him in these words: (Acts 8: 20:) 'Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money.' Again, the Apostle Paul left an important charge to the Elders at Ephesus: (Acts 20: 28-29) 'Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock.' (Acts 20: 30.) 'Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.'

"Modern Missionary Baptists departed from the original faith and practice of the Church of God. They endorsed, like Protestant anti-Christ, all the idols for which the religious world (falsely so called) is noted. They claim that it depends upon their efforts whether the world is saved or not, thus denying the power of the Almighty God in the work of salvation; throwing it into the hands of Boards, Councils, General Associations and all the paraphernalia of Missionism. Hence, their preachers, like the begging friars of Catholicism, carry round the hat for contributions! They modestly tell the people that the work of the Lord cannot be carried on without it.

How false! How different does the Apostle tell us: (1st Peter. 1: 18) ‘ For as much as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold;’ 19th verse: ‘But with the precious blood of Christ.’ Now, dear brethren, did our limits admit, we could fill a volume, with authority from God’s word, showing the unscriptural position of modern Missionism.

“We set out with the object of showing the causes that led to the division of the Baptists in 1833. We think we have clearly shown that ‘they went out from us, because they were not of us.’ They became adulterated in faith and practice, and what was left for the original body to do but withdraw their fellowship from them according to the divine rule? But notwithstanding their boasted numbers and their great means, have they carried out the promises they made to convert the world? We well remember, thirty years ago, one of their champions declared that in ten years from that time, by their united efforts, they would have the world converted; and we know that multiplied thousands of dollars have been collected in that time for the avowed object , and where are we now? Dear Christian reader, after (according to statistics recently published) expending in missions by the whole of so-called Christendom the immense sum of ninety-five millions of dollars annually, where, we again ask, are we to-day? In the midst of sin, ruin, vice and blasphemy! Is this not enough to prove, to every unprejudiced mind, the falsity of the system? For, as one said of old, ‘If this thing be of God you cannot overthrow it!’ Missionism has now been among the people called Baptists, even in this country, for over fifty years, and we again ask, what has it accomplished ? It has failed in India, in China, in Africa, in short, in every place where it has been introduced, which of itself, proves the falsity of the system, without any more comment. Even in our land were it not for their money operations, where would they be to-day? Where would be their preachers to propagate their false gospel? For truly, in the language of the inspired Apostle, they preach another gospel ‘which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.’ (Galatians.1: 7.)

“The doctrine of the Modern Missionary Baptists, is general atonement and general operation of the Spirit, for which purpose, for the carrying out thereof, they hold protracted meetings, have anxious benches and all other appliances for manufacturing converts, which we contend are of natural origin. Is it any wonder,

then, that the Primitive, or old order of Baptists, should stand aloof from them, when they have departed from the faith and order of the Original Baptists? When they have left the plain and simple track of God's truth and 'teach for doctrines the commandments of men!'

"The Original Little River Association stands precisely on the doctrine she was constituted upon and which she maintains to this day, while the others departed therefrom, and endorsed all the isms herein stated.

"The Original Baptists have ever held that 'The word of God is a sufficient rule of faith and practice' for them, and we find that in the history of the Church of God, in all ages, that they have ever been tenacious of those principles; how it subjected them to the most awful persecutions under the reign of both beasts, as before stated, even as early as the days of the Apostle Paul, for he tells us, in his epistle to the Hebrews. 11: 36, 37, 38: 'And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment: They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (Of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth!' Farther, trace their history down to the present day and they fulfill the words of the Prophet: I will leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord.' Look at our ancient brethren, among the Waldensian Baptists, how they declared unfellowship for the Missionary power of the first beast. Moreover, say these old Baptists: 'We hold in abhorrence all inventions of men in matters of our religion as proceeding from anti-Christ; producing distress and prejudicial to the mind.' This was in the year 1100, and we ask, do not the Old Baptists stand upon the same ground to the present day? Even in the settlement of our own country they suffered more persecution for their adherence to the great truth of the gospel than any other people! This was under the Missionary power of the second beast, or Protestant anti-Christ. Then, dear brethren, in reviewing the history of Original or Primitive Baptists, we ought to rejoice that we are counted worthy to suffer the reproaches of wicked and ungodly men, and even nominal professors, for the cause of our divine Master. Remember the exhortation of the Apostle: Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, for He

is faithful that promised. We now proceed to draw a parallel line to shew the difference between The True Gospel, and The Missionary Gospel.

Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. — David.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God. —Paul.

Elect according to the foreknowledge of God. — Peter.

For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. —Paul.

It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.  
—Paul.

Of his own will, begat he us, with the word of truth. —James.

No man can come unto me, except the Father,

All men are born pure and holy.

We need a new revision.

No man is elected until he repents and believes.

There are no gifts and calling of God, until you repent.

It is of him that willeth, and of him that runneth, that he may obtain mercy.

Of our own will we embraced religion.

All may come, if they will, and obtain religion.

History of the Regular Baptists,

which hath sent me, draw him. —Jesus.

If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God. —James.

Take the oversight thereof—not for filthy lucre. — Peter.

Take neither purse nor scrip, nor two coats. —Jesus.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God —Jesus.

Must send them to college, to learn them to preach.

I will preach for \$500 a year.

Take all the purses and scrip you can collect.

Except a man use the means in his power, in order that he may be born again, he cannot be saved.

“Many other such parallels might be drawn did our limits admit it, but we think that we have shown enough to prove the distinction between the Original and the Modern Baptists; those that serve the Lord from a pure desire, and those that profess

to do it for the wealth and the popularity of this world. And now, dear brethren, we will conclude with a few words of exhortation to those that we believe hold the truth of God—we mean the Church of the Living God—which is the ground and the pillar of the truth! The old order of Baptists are the only people that hold to the Ancient Landmarks, that preach the truth, that earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints, the only religious body that stands disconnected from the different isms that abound among all other professions. Then, brethren, in view of these things, let us endeavor to prove our faith by our works, let us prove the reality of our profession by walking soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present evil world; you will be subjected to the scoffs and the derisions of this world, your name will be cast out as evil; recollect the words of our Lord, ‘You shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake.’ The fiery trials that you are called to go through here are but for a season, the days of your pilgrimage will soon pass away; you can say with the great Apostle, ‘That these light afflictions, which are but for a moment, work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.’ While we are in our Tabernacle let us fulfill our vocation, let us attend to our duties in the house of God; as members be ready to every good word and work which the Lord commands in His word, and the time will soon arrive when you will get your discharge from the troubles and commotions of this Godforgetting and Christ-defying world, when you shall reach the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, among the redeemed of our Father's family, there to gaze upon the beauties of God and the Lamb forever and ever. In conclusion, dear brethren, may the God of all grace be with you, and guide you into all truth.

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the Sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect to do His will; working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

I will now leave the above Circular Letter without comment, and proceed with my history. In 1833 Elder Wilson Henderson had the pastoral care of the following named churches: Bankston’s Fork, Wolf Creek, Bethel’s Creek, and Middle Fork of Saline. In the summer of said year, he, by his influence, prevailed on those churches to change their fifth Article of Faith so as to read, “We believe in the doctrine of election by grace.” He admitted the former article to be true, but thought it was not

so easily sustained by the Bible. He next used his influence to have those churches prepare their letters to the Association, requesting the same to become constituted in accordance with the changed article, or else dismiss them that they may become a little body to themselves. But the last three named churches refused to send such request to the Association. Elder Henderson then had his home church, the Bankston Fork, to prepare another letter leaving out the above request; but at that time, he was acting both Moderator and Clerk. He was taken sick a few days previous to the sitting of the Association, and, therefore, could not go; but when handing the letter to the other delegates, he, by mistake, gave them the one first prepared. Said letter, of course, was read in the Association. The Association, at that session, requested those churches to retain their former articles faith, or be constituted on the articles of the Association, by calling a presbytery for that purpose. That it may be seen that I cannot be mistaken on this subject, I will insert the act of the Association as it stands upon record:

Query. — “Is it good order for any church belonging to this Association, within herself to alter her abstract of principles on which she was constituted and received into this union?” Answer. — “We are of the opinion that it is not; and as it appears that Bankston’s Fork church has altered her fifth article of the abstract of principles on which she was constituted and received into this Principally of Southern Illinois.

Association, we consider her in error with regard to her power to alter or amend any article which would be inimical to the Constitution of the Association, and we would sincerely recommend that she adopt her former fifth article in the room of the present one, and as an advisory council to sit with her at her next June meeting, we appoint Brethren James Womack, Wm. Bourland, Joshua Tague, John Lockhart, Jonathan Floyd, Jacob Braden and Wm. Allen, and that this delegation report to our next Association.” This was promptly attended to. I was present at said June meeting, and being present also at said session of the Association, witnessed the whole affair, and will show from the records what was done at the next meeting of the Association, which was held at the North Fork meeting house, Hamilton County, in the year 1834.

Item 9. “The committee who were appointed at our last meeting to sit as an advisory council with the church at Bankston’s Fork, made their report, which was received and ordered to be embraced in the committee’s arrangement for Monday.”

Item 16. — “Took up the report of the committee who were appointed by the last Association to sit with the church at Bankston’s Fork, at their June meeting, as an advisory council, to counsel with and advise that church to adopt her former fifth article of her abstract of principles, on which she was constituted and received into this union. The committee report that they met agreeable to appointment, and after due labor with the church on the matter in question, the church gave the committee to understand that they had held a conference meeting the day History of the Regular Baptists, previous and predisposed of the matter in question by declaring an unfellowship with the Association. For the satisfaction of our brethren, we annex the official act of that church by a copy of their record which speaks as followeth: ‘We declare an unfellowship with the Association for her dealing with us contrary to the Constitution of the Association, and not taking the gospel as directed in Matthew, xviii.; and for rejecting Block House Creek church from the union, and for dropping the correspondence with Little River Association in Kentucky and adopting a correspondence with what is called the Original Little River Association.’”

We will here give the answer of the Association to the above charge:

“We will endeavor to answer the four exceptions as set forth in the above declaration. With regard to the first exception, we feel fully of the opinion that the Association acted in accordance with her Constitution in appointing a committee to sit with that church as an advisory council. We believe that every candid person will be ready to acknowledge, after a perusal of the third article of the Constitution of the Association, that no other step could be taken against an offending church, but that of an advisory council, to counsel her to retract from what the Association considered a breach of fellowship with her sister churches in the union.”

“In relation to the second exception, the Association found, on an examination of the abstract of principles, as set forth in the petitionary letter from Block House Creek church, that she was not orthodox and orderly. In consequence of which the Association acted in conformity with the sixth article of her Constitution, which reads thus: ‘If upon examination the church applying for admission is found orthodox and orderly, she may be received.’ ”

“ As touching the third and fourth exceptions, as charged in the declaration of dropping the correspondence with the Little River Association and adopting one

with the Original Little River Association, we have only to observe that the Muddy River Association neither dropped nor adopted a correspondence at the last sitting, as may be seen from her minutes, that she continued her correspondence as formerly, with the Original Little River Association, finding her occupying her old land marks that she was constituted upon, and the seceding party occupying a different one, which this Association do not feel disposed to fellowship. We have endeavored in as brief a manner as possible to show the inconsistency of the acts of this church. We think that every rational person who is acquainted with the circumstance will be ready to say that the Association would be acting consistent with order to withdraw from this church, but as this church has withdrawn and declared an unfellowship with this Association, it supersedes the necessity of a withdrawal on the part of the Association and by her act can be considered no more of this body. This church may say that she offered an acknowledgment at this meeting, but like Ananias and Sapphira of old, they kept back part of the price. The only acknowledgment made by them was that they “did not aim to declare an unfellowship against the Association, only against the four acts of the Association,” as above alluded to. We think the official records as above given are sufficient to convince every unprejudiced mind that the Muddy River Association did right in considering said Bankston Fork church no more of that body. But we wish the reader to understand that Elder Henderson did not intend going off with the Missionaries. He was intensely opposed to them, and soon came back to Bethel’s Creek, made acknowledgments, and lived and died belonging to said church. It might not be amiss to state just here that the ministers belonging to the two Associations under consideration, differed in doctrine. For the sake of convenience, I will divide them into three classes. The first advocated the doctrine of limited atonement; the second, general atonement and limited application of the spirit, while the third class held to the doctrine of a general atonement and universal operation of the spirit; consequently, there was considerable strife on doctrinal points as well as upon the Missionary question, by which fellowship became impaired, and the breach widened from year to year.

Wolf Creek had not as yet taken the advice of the Association, but still retained the altered fifth article of faith; therefore, at her sitting in 1834, the Association

appointed Brethren George Hamilton, Joseph Wathen, Wm. Allen, Wm. Baker, John Lockhart, John Hamilton, Robert Johnson, James Hamilton and myself, as an advisory council to sit with said church at her October meeting next, to advise with her to reconsider her act in altering their fifth article of her abstract of principles on which she was constituted and received into the union. Should she feel disposed to adopt the original articles on which this Association is constituted, by calling a presbytery for that purpose, it shall be the duty of the council to transmit a copy of the adjustment to the residue of the churches composing this Association, notifying them that the above-named church is in good standing. Should she feel to remain as she is she will be considered in disorder, and the council will report accordingly at the next sitting of the Association, which session was held at Bethel's Creek meeting house, Gallatin County, Illinois, in 1834, where and when the committee appointed at the last Association to visit and confer with Wolf Creek church made their report, which was referred to the Committee on Arrangements.

“Took up their report of the committee who were sent to the church at Wolf Creek, as an advisory council, and it appearing from said report, that she was still in difficulty, appointed Brethren C. H. Clay, Wm. Gholson, J. Womack, J. Floyd and myself to visit them on Friday before the third Sunday in October next, to sit with them as an advisory council as heretofore, and report to the next Association.” The next session of the Association was held at Little Spring church, Hamilton County, Illinois, beginning on Saturday before the second Sunday in September, A. D. 1836, and among other transactions, “called for the report of the committee who were appointed at our last sitting to visit the church at Wolf Creek, as an advisory council. The report was made and received. The Association are gratified to learn that that church has adopted the abstract of principles on which this Association is constituted.” (See item 7.) Be it remembered, however, that some of the members of said church church did not consent to the advice of the committee (the clerk among them,) so the records of the church were lost. There were also two licensed ministers that remonstrated against the act of the church, but we will leave them and the Bankston Fork church to be disposed of hereafter, and proceed to show the conduct of the two remaining churches that had altered their fifth article of faith.

Bethel's Creek church took the advice of the Association, and immediately

readopted her former fifth article. The church at Middle Fork of Saline readopted her former fifth article by the time of the meeting of the Association in 1834, as item 29 of the minutes of the Association for said year, which is as follows, will show: “The Association congratulates the brethren of the Middle Fork church for their stability in readopting their former fifth article.”

There was no remonstrance in the last two named churches. The next church to be disposed of is the Big Bay, who refused to represent herself in the Association. She was therefore dropped. I have now given a history of all the split that occurred in the Muddy River Association with the exception of a few individual members who were excluded from Bethel’s Creek church for the following causes:

On my arrival at the said church at her May term in 1837, I saw a stranger to whom I was introduced as a minister of the gospel. I invited him into the stand and also requested him to preach. I took no exceptions to his doctrine that day, but at night he preached at Brother George W. Burkhart’s, when it was ascertained that he was a Missionary; and on arriving at the meeting house next day I found that I would hurt feelings should I invite him to preach. I also learned that it would be hurtful to some if I were not to invite him. Being young in the ministry I was loth to take the responsibility upon myself. So, the plan I adopted was to take five or six of the oldest and most prominent members of the church, lay the case before them, leave the matter with them, be governed by their verdict, and act accordingly. But since they could not agree among themselves they concluded to take the voice of the church. This being done it was found that a majority of the members was opposed to his preaching. The result may be seen by referring to the records of the next meeting — the June term—in 1837, from which record I will here insert the third item:

“Fellowship inquired for and not found. Brother Wm. Thomas laid in a charge against Brother and Sister Burkhart for disorderly conduct at last meeting, viz: ‘That after it had been left to the church to decide whether a majority of them wished the traveling preacher, Mr. Alcot, to preach on that day, and a majority of the church members had voted against his being invited, that Brother and Sister Burkhart said publicly in the presence of the congregation that the reason the majority voted against Alcot’s preaching, was that they (the majority) did not want to hear the truth preached.’ The church proceeded to consider the case, and after due investigation,

Brother and Sister Burkhart are considered as no longer members this church.”

There were four other members excluded, for joining an arm of Bankston Fork church that had been raised up of those excluded members previously alluded to by Elder Wilson Henderson.

We have given a full account of the division in Muddy River Association, and from the records it may be seen that the causes which led to the separation were neither directly on doctrine nor the Missionary question, but there is no doubt but both had something to do with it.

I will just here give a short account of the ministers who belonged to this Association at the time of the split, beginning with the oldest men and founders of the first churches in Southern Illinois. Elder Stephen Stilley was instrumental in gathering some of the first. On the 19th day of July, A. D. 1806, he and Elder Wm. Jones constituted the Big Creek church. This was about thirty years before the split, and by reference to the records of the said church book, it will be seen that this church was founded upon the same articles of faith that Muddy River Association was established on—the articles of faith upon which the Regular Baptists stand to-day—and yet our Missionary fraternity are trying to make it appear that the Old Baptists did not exist prior to 1832.

On the 29th day of October, A. D. 1827, Elders Stilley and Wm. Rondeau constituted the Grand Pier church, upon the same articles of faith of Big Creek. This was nine years prior to the split. Said church stands to-day upon the same articles of faith on which she was founded, and at present numbers about ninety members.

Elder Stilley took his letter from Big Creek and informally joined the church at Island Ripple, requesting the church to let him keep his letter, which was agreed to. He had the pastoral care of said church at the time; but when the strife arose he seemed loth to take either side. So, he absented himself from the church, refusing at the same time to surrender either his letter or credentials, for which offense he was finally excluded. He, in all probability, took sides eventually with the Missionaries, since he, in 1840, assisted in the founding of Mill Creek church upon articles of faith, which, in substance, are the same as those of the present Big Saline Association of United Baptists, as I am informed by the Clerk of said church. Elder Stilley died shortly after the founding of Mill Creek church, much esteemed by all who knew

him, and we indulge the hope that he has gone to reap a rich reward.

Elder Wilson Henderson was also an early pioneer in this then wilderness country. He zealously labored and assisted in the constituting of some of the first churches in Southern Illinois. He was especially gifted in experimental religion. He died in the triumphs of a living faith. Just before he expired he requested that the author of this work preach his funeral, which he did, to a large congregation at a stand erected for that purpose, in the shade of his beautiful orchard. This untiring pilgrim was usually known by the appellation of Daddy Henderson, and as I have already referred to him in a former article, will only add that he was dearly beloved by all who knew him.

I will next speak of Elder Adam McCool. In 1832, at the April term of Big Creek church meeting, the following query was asked: "Is it agreeable to the word of God to fellowship a preacher that is called a brother, when denying our faith?" Answered, "not right." During the same year several charges were preferred against Elder McCool. Among the rest he was charged with having denied their articles of faith and the doctrine of special atonement. He was called upon to answer to those charges, plead guilty, and the church finally excluded him. About the time of the division among the Baptists, he joined the Reformers, or Campbellites, and preached for them as long as he remained in this country.

Elders Charles H. Clay and John Morse were ministers in Grand Pier, Pope County. They were able and useful men and remained steadfast in the doctrine and practice of the Regular Baptists until their death. They are greatly missed among the Baptists. Elder Moses Pearce and his nephew, Elder John Pearce, were among the early ministers in this Association, and very useful men. John is still living, and is a strong advocate of the Regular Baptist cause, as was Moses up to his death.

Elder Wm. Gholson, of North Fork church, was another one of our early ministers. He was a peculiar man, possessed with more than ordinary zeal, and was particularly gifted in the Old Testament scriptures. When preaching every nerve seemed to be exerted, and when the people became most anxious to hear, he would stop. So, they were always desirous to hear him again.

Wm. Laswell belonged to Rector Fork church. He advocated the doctrine of general atonement and limited application of the spirit, but was intensely opposed to the modern Missionary and men-made institutions. He had considerable influence

among the people.

Marvel Brown and Aaron Suttan were licentiates. They both belonged to Wolf Creek church. Brown went off with the United Baptists, but never arose to any degree of eminence. Suttan, after the division, was called upon for his license, but refused to give them up, saying, "God has called me to preach, and man shall not stop my mouth." He afterwards went to Sangamon county, married there, and joined the Campbellites. He soon returned, denying the call of the ministry. He pretended to be making preparations for moving his family down, but failed to do so. He after a while "took up" with another woman, and had to leave the country for adultery. Sometime after he attempted to return, had an appointment to preach on the way, and while preaching his bowels gushed out, which caused his sudden death.

Just before, at the time of and soon after the division, there were quite a number young ministers raised up the bounds of the Muddy River Association, whose names are as follows: James Gholson, Joseph Tucker, Jeremiah T. F. Lewis, John Gibson and Thomas Vicars, all of North Fork church; Wm. M. Marrow, Thomas P. Moore, Thomas Coffey and the author, all of Bethel's Creek church, and John Braden, of Rector Fork church. All these proved faithful to the Regular Baptist cause except John Braden. He went to the United Baptists. There are only two of these ministers now living, viz: Wm. M. Marrow, who now resides in Scio, Linn County, Oregon, and myself. But it has pleased the Lord to raise up others, so that he has not left himself without witnesses.

Attention is now called to Bethel Association, the history of which we propose now to give. Be it remembered that this Association was organized on ten churches, principally from Muddy River Association. The convention met for the purpose, and on Saturday preceding the fourth Sunday in October, A. D. 1829, at the Middle Fork of Muddy River meeting house, Franklin County, Illinois, organized the said Association, giving it the name of Muddy River Bethel Association, without any prefix, such as Regular, United, or even Baptist. I have their articles of faith and rules of decorum before me, and I find them to correspond with those of the Regular, or Primitive, Baptists generally. At the commencement they appointed a Secretary, whose duty it was to keep on file a copy of the minutes for inspection, when called upon, but owing to deaths and removals three are lost, but to their credit they now

have a fine book wherein the records are neatly kept.

In 1832 they met in the name of Bethel Association of United Baptists. Whether this name was assumed without an act of the Association I have no means of knowing, since the minutes of 1830 and 1831 are among the lost. At their sitting, in 1832, they rejected the Gun Prairie church on account that she presented herself in the name of Regular and neglecting to exhibit her constitution and articles of faith, but in 1833 she was received into the union under the name Regular. The Association, however, still bore the name United until 1839.

Just here I wish to notice a document lately published, in which the name of Bethel Association is made a part, and, we think, grossly misrepresented. The alluded to essay was written by Elder M. J. Jones, of Saline County, Illinois, and was inserted in the Baptist Banner (a sheet devoted to the United Baptist cause, published from Ewing, Illinois) July 7, 1875. My acquaintance with Elder Jones, from his childhood, and my regard for him as a citizen and neighbor, admonish me to deal tenderly as well as faithfully with him. I shall not attempt to answer all the errors that I consider set forth in the said article, because the most of it is quotations from Benedict and Ray, and since this work is designed as a refutation of the misrepresentations of those historians, it therefore supersedes the necessity. The portion I propose to answer is what I understand to be his own production.

He says: "The breach of covenant of Union, so far as a change of name is concerned, occurred in Southern Illinois about the year 1836, when by an act of Bethel Association, the name United was dropped, and the name Regular adopted, which was done by a small majority, and was one of the first steps that led to the unhappy division of the churches and Associations that soon followed."

From the above quotation it may be seen that Elder Jones says that the Bethel Association passed an act about the year 1836, to change the name. But the fact is, said act was not passed until in the fall of 1839. Hence, it is not true that Bethel Association changing the name, was one of the first steps that led to the unhappy division of the churches and Associations. All well-informed historians know that "the unhappy division" occurred in Virginia and some of the old States in 1832; in Kentucky in 1833; in Tennessee in 1836, and in Muddy River it was progressive, commencing in 1834 and ending in 1837. The separation that took place on the

subject of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions and its various branches was nearly complete all over the United States before Bethel Association passed the act above referred to. The Ferrels and their party were excluded and the division determined upon before the passage of the said act. It is probable that Elder Jones did not know any better, and to that extent is excusable for giving publicity to the above statements; nevertheless, a person is not justifiable in making positive statements when he doesn't know as to the veracity of them, especially when they are calculated in their nature to mislead the people and do irreparable injury. When writing upon the subject of division why not give the real causes which led to that division, rather than offer some subterfuge?

For the benefit of those interested, I will give the cause which "led to the unhappy division" of Bethel Association. By reference to the records of the sitting of this Association in 1838, the following may be seen: "Received a request from Salem church, requesting this Association to refer the subject of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions and all its various branches to the churches of this Association." "This Association requests the churches to say in their next letters to this Association whether they fellowship the system, yea or nay." (See Association book, page 40 and item 20.)

Now turn to the records of next year and the following item may be seen: "Took up the inquiry of Middle Fork and Salem churches, which was in the following form, viz: 'What shall be done with those churches, if any, refusing to answer the request of the Association respecting the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions?' In answer to them, we say it is a breach of good order." (See Association book, page 43 and item 8.) Now turn to Benedict, page 854, and you will find the following language: "This new interest came out from the Bethel Association on account of her opposition to the benevolent operations. The reasons for this secession from the mother body are thus expressed by my correspondent for this young interest: 'We withdrew on account of her anti-Mission principles and the absurd doctrines of Daniel Parker to enjoy the benefits of freedom and to join with our brethren in the benevolent enterprise of promulgating the gospel in our own and foreign lands.'" I wish it distinctly understood that the doctrine of Daniel Parker was not before this Association.

But another quotation just here from Elder Jones' essay. He says: "But our party (the United Baptists) have ever proved true to the covenant of Union, retaining the name, the faith, and the old Missionary landmarks of our ancestors."

As to the United Baptists "retaining the name," I see quite a disposition in some of them to adopt the name Regular Baptist; and Elder Jones himself, in his essay, applies the name Regular to his party; I would ask, if it was a breach of the covenant of Union in 1840, and also "one of the first steps that led to the unhappy division of the churches and Associations," how is it that it has of late become so harmless? It must be that an innocent people have worn it till it has become inoffensive. It is very true that the name United was appropriate when applied to *that portion* of the Baptists who entered into the "covenant of Union" that took place in Virginia and Kentucky while they remained together, but after the separation it was no longer relevant.

Let us examine the faith and see whether the United Baptists have really proved true to and retained it. The covenant of Union was based upon the confession of faith of the Regular Baptists, under which they lived as one people until the division, when a party broke off, or in their own language, "seceded from the mother body," and adopted entirely new abstracts of principles, while the other party—the Regular Baptists—retained the original confessions of faith,—the abstract of principles under which both parties had so long lived. Now, if throwing away the articles of faith upon which the covenant of Union was based, and adopting others differing materially from them, is "retaining the faith," I candidly confess that I do not understand the import of language. As to the United Baptists retaining the ancient Missionary landmarks of their ancestors, may be true, since their institutions do resemble those of their Roman sires, especially the Alexandrian school for the training of youths; and other Missionary operations, such as Baptist Boards, State Conventions, life membership and life directorship, all of which is without the authority of God's word, and differs very much in sentiment from the following article of faith of the Waldenses: "We hold in abhorrence all human inventions as proceeding from anti-Christ which produce distress, and are prejudicial to the liberty of the mind." (Jones' History, p. 333.)

But again: Elder Jones, in the second chapter of his essay, in speaking of the Old

Baptists, says: “Who call themselves Regular,” and then parenthetically adds, ‘we would say rather, ‘Irregular.’”

If baptizing members coming from other denominations to our communion, is irregular, then of a truth it might be said that the Old Baptists are “Irregular.” But if the receiving of immersed Methodists, Campbellites, General Emancipation, and even Old Baptists, is irregular, then it would seem fitting and appropriate to apply the term “Irregular” to the United Baptists. Elder Jones will surely recollect that he himself was baptized by a Regular Baptist minister, and in the fellowship of the Regular Baptist Church at Bethel’s Creek, and that, too, long since the division. He undoubtedly will not forget that he has not received any other baptism since his exclusion therefrom. Now suppose he should succeed in proving the Regular Baptists to be an apostate body, what of his baptism? What of those he has dipped since his exclusion from the Old Baptists? Neither his nor theirs in this case, is valid. But suppose the Regular Baptists are the legal descendants from the Apostles—and I’ve no doubt of it—while his own baptism is valid, since he received it from proper authority, those that have been dipped by him since his exclusion are no more baptized than if they had never seen water. While upon this subject I will introduce the case of Prof. John Washburn, Principal of Ewing High School, Franklin County, Illinois:

He was not only baptized by the Regular Baptists, but was also ordained a gospel minister by them, and that too long since the division on the Missionary question. He, after his exclusion from the Regulars, joined the United Baptists, and *is now acting alone on the ordinances received from the Regular Baptists!*

Now if the Regular Baptist is not the church of Christ, but the “split-off,” “irregular,” and as said by some of the modern Missionaries, to be “anti-Christ,” how in the name of sense are their baptism and ministerial credentials valid? This is a serious question, and one too, that Elders Jones and Washburn would, in all probability, rather say but little about.

But to proceed with the history of Bethel Association. It is a well-established fact that the Missionary question caused the division of said body, which occurred in the year 1840, and the members and churches that went off with the Missionaries were the first to remonstrate against the system. I once had a letter in my possession from

Mt. Pleasant church to the Bethel Association, informing them that they had declared an unfellowship with the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, and all its various branches, and requesting the Association to advise the rest of the churches to do the same; and I find in the minutes of that body, for the year 1832, the following record: "Inasmuch as the most of the churches of this Association have declared non-fellowship with the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, we therefore advise all of our churches to do the same." (See Association book, p. 16 and item 11.) This was prior to the split; but by the influence of money-hunting ministers the strife and excitement was raised to such a degree that the Association thought best to refer the subject to the churches, requesting them to say in their next letters to the Association whether they fellowshipped the system, yea or nay, as has already been stated. This was in the year 1838; and in 1839, when the Association met, eight churches out of thirteen answered that they did not fellowship it. Two churches were not represented, but were the same in faith, while three churches refused to answer the request. The Association at that sitting, decided that a refusal to answer was a breach of good order. Those churches refusing to answer the request of the Association were Ten Mile Creek, Mt. Pleasant and Unity; and in 1840, about three weeks previous to the time appointed for the meeting of the Association, those three churches met at Mt. Pleasant church and formed what they called the Bethel Association United Baptists, but said organization did not last a year. Elder Vance, previous to the time of their next session, came to this country. He was a zealous Missionary, and, withal, a considerable revivalist, and as Elder Robert Moor could not bear a rival, he and Elder Vance got at variance, which resulted in the splitting of Mt. Pleasant church. In 1841, the church at Ten Mile Creek, and a part of Mt. Pleasant, and a small party that had been excluded from the Bethlehem church (of which we will give a full history hereafter) met at Old East Fork, and organized the Franklin Association of United Baptists. Eight or ten of the most permanent members of Ten Mile Creek, be it remembered, did not go with the Missionary party. The Unity church and the other part of Mt. Pleasant church formed what they called the Bethel Association of United Baptists; but by others they were called the Moor party. They have retrograded, however, and gone out of existence. I believe they retained the same abstract of principles upon which the Old Bethel Association was constituted, and were utterly

opposed to the modern Missionary system. Some of their members finally returned to the Regular Baptists.

From the above it may be seen that ten churches out of thirteen stood firm on the doctrine and practice of the Regular Baptists, while one and a-half, and the excluded party from Bethlehem church, went off with the Missionaries and formed the Franklin Association, and one and a-half went off with the Moor party.

We will now proceed with the history of the Bethlehem church, the Ferrels and their party. In the fall of 1839 there were sixty-one members belonging to said church; and when the vote, in relation to the Missionary question was taken, a large majority voted that they did not fellowship the system. The Ferrels and their party, which consisted of about twelve or fourteen in number, remonstrated against the act of majority and utterly refused to be governed by it. In order to settle the pending difficulty, the church solicited aid. Being present I was appointed Moderator. Two tedious days were spent in the trial which resulted in the exclusion of the Ferrels and party on charge of rebellion.

Having given the history in relation to the division of both Muddy River and Bethel Associations, we think the records show very clearly that the Regular Baptists are the only legal descendants from the Ancient Baptists, seeing they have retained the original abstracts of principles and adhered strictly to the doctrine and practice of the Apostles. The records also show that the United Baptists stand as the excluded party; their articles of faith show that they repudiate the original ones; their many human inventions, such as Sunday schools, Bible Societies, Missionary Societies, etc., show that they are not content with the Bible alone as their only rule of faith and practice, and yet they are making every exertion, using every argument, in order to establish their claims to priority.

As I have spoken of the Franklin Association of United Baptists, it might be proper to say something more concerning its organization. At its commencement—it bears date from 1841—there were seven churches, to wit: Ten Mile Creek, Benton, East Fork, Liberty, a part of Mt. Pleasant, Concord, and the Ferrels and party, who called a presbytery from Tennessee, viz: Elders Elija Madox and John Boren, for the purpose of, and by which presbytery, were constituted into a church, made the number. (Elders Madox and Boren belonged at this time to the Arminian party that

had previously seceded from the Regular Baptists.) There were also eight ordained ministers, viz: C. Carpenter, J. Browning, T. M. Vance, H. Vice, S. M. Williams, Wm. Ferrel and his two sons Wilerford and Hezekiah.

This Association was soon joined by Union church, situated in Raleigh, Saline County, Illinois, and was first gathered by Elder Wilson Henderson, and was composed of those members who were excluded from Wolf Creek. Those excluded from Bethel's Creek and the Bankston's Fork churches, also soon joined the Franklin Association. In fact, the most of the churches and members that went off from the Muddy River and Bethel Associations, either directly or indirectly joined the said Franklin Association.

Elder Barbaree—an Emancipation Baptist—founded one or two churches in Saline County, which churches also joined this Association.

I recently called upon the Secretary of that body, requesting the liberty to examine their records. He politely handed me a file of their minutes. I suppose that is the manner in which they keep their records. Elder E. T. Webb and myself carefully inspected them, but could find no traces of constitution, preamble or any such thing. The only information we could get in relation to their history was the names and number of their churches and the locality of some of them. I had previously been informed by Elder Moses Neil that they had no regular constitution, but that they had merely come together and called themselves the Franklin Association of United Baptists. I came to the State Illinois in 1820, have traveled all over the same, lived in different parts of it, have an extensive acquaintance in it, a tolerably good knowledge of the state of society through it, and I now give it as a result of my best judgment that at the first organization of the people now called Missionary Baptists, in this State, the majority was Emancipation, Free Will and Separate Baptists. It is true there was a small number of excluded members from the Regular Baptists, that joined them.

In one respect there was a material difference between the Muddy River and Bethel Associations. While a majority of the ministers the former adhered strictly to the doctrine and practice of the Regular Baptists, a large majority of the ministers of the latter were strong advocates of the modern system of Missions and the doctrine of Arminianism. Hence, the reason she was last to rid herself of this heresy. I have

already given the names of the eight who left and joined the Franklin Association. There were three that went with the Moor party, to wit: Charles Lee, Isaac Herron and Robert Moor, leaving only five ordained ministers in the Bethel Association, whose names are as follows: John P. Madox, John Manis, Wm. Davis, S. Godard and Noble Anderson.

Elder C. Carpenter was absent from the country at the time of the division. He returned about the time of the organization of the Franklin Association and went with them, but soon returned to the Regular Baptists, and was restored. He preached for them twenty odd years, making the whole of his ministry upwards of forty years. The remaining seven continued with the Missionaries until their death or to the present time.

Elder Milton Carpenter, son and only child of Chester Carpenter, belonged to the Bethel Association. He was a zealous Missionary and withal a man of extraordinary talent. He was several times elected to the Legislature and was finally appointed Treasurer of the State. He went to Springfield and remained there until he died, but was not connected with the Franklin Association.

Elder George Stacy also belonged to the Bethel Association. He was a strong advocate of the new institutions. From the foregoing statements we see that, first and last, thirteen Elders went off, while only five remained in the Bethel Association.

Those who went off were advertised (or most of them) as holding their credentials and preaching in disorder. I now give one more quotation from the records of Bethel Association, which will show the final result of the division of said body. It is as follows: "Took up the case of Unity, Mt. Pleasant and Ten Mile Creek churches for not representing themselves in this Association. And finding to our satisfaction that they have gone into disorder, we therefore drop them from our Union." (Association book, p. 45, and item 7.)

The "disorder" above referred to was the meeting of those three churches in advance of the regular time of the meeting of the Bethel Association, at a different place than that designated, and for forming what they termed the Bethel Association. Their apology for thus acting was that the Association had changed its name, at the last session, from United to Regular, and for this reason they could not meet them. They wrote to all the churches requesting as many as felt so disposed, to meet and

go with them into the new organization. But when they wrote to their historian, Mr. Benedict, they gave it as the reason for their secession from the mother body that they opposed benevolent operations; but the real cause was that the Association opposed all men-made or humanly-devised schemes in religious proceedings.

I will here remark that Elder Vance did not belong directly to the Bethel Association. He came to this country just after the separation but in time to assist in the organization of the Franklin Association.

Having given an account of some of the ministers of Muddy River Association, I will close this chapter by referring to some of those who belonged to Bethel Association. I will first speak of the lamented John P. Madox, who was a Tennessean by birth and son of Elder Elijah Madox. I first became acquainted with him while in the army at the time of the Black Hawk war. He had considerable law knowledge, and for several years was Justice of the Peace in Franklin County, Illinois. At the time of the great struggle on the Missionary subject he was chosen Moderator of Bethel Association and distinguished himself by confining all parties strictly to parliamentary rules. He possessed a deep and penetrating mind. The last few years of his life he was afflicted with consumption and when on his death bed and dying, he requested Elder Moses Neal to get the Bible and read for him. After reading awhile he laid the Bible down to assist his dying friend to turn in bed, when Elder Madox took the Bible in his hand, clasped it to his bosom, then moved it to his mouth and kissed it, staying that he thanked God for the gift of the Bible; that it revealed the plan of salvation.

Elder Moses Neal was an able and bold defender of the Regular Baptist cause. He was specially gifted in discipline and church government. His death was occasioned by a fall from an apple tree, which so affected him that he died in about three weeks afterward. He bore his afflictions with great fortitude, retaining his right mind. After making the necessary arrangements for the welfare of his family, he departed this life in the triumphs of a living faith. I know of no man that has been missed among the Baptists more than he.

Elder Joseph Hartley was also a zealous advocate and able defender of the doctrine of the Regular Baptists. He moved to Oregon about the time of the late war, and died in the far West.

Isaiah Youngblood was also a member of Bethel Association. I was not intimately acquainted with him, and have not been able to obtain any items of his history. I believe he was never ordained. Perhaps his gift was more in exhortation than otherwise. He was esteemed by his brethren as a faithful and useful minister. I am personally acquainted with two of his sons, and although they were left orphan boys, yet they have by their energy and industry become eminent lawyers. I remember the names of Elders Manis and West. They were said to be able ministers. I am not able to give any historical account of them. There were others that belonged and have passed from the walks of men that I cannot give any account of. The Lord has still raised ministers to supply the vacancies occasioned by the removal of those he has taken to himself. There is still an able and faithful ministry in the bounds of Muddy River and Bethel Associations, with a great degree of oneness and harmony in doctrine and practice.

### CHAPTER 3.

The Regular Baptists, that sect everywhere spoken against — Misrepresentations introduced; their utter falsity shown — Missionary Societies—Their manner of sending Missionaries— Quotation from Baptist circular—The contrast drawn.

“But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect, we know that it is everywhere spoken against.”—Acts. 28: 22.

SINCE it is a well-known fact that the Regular Baptists are everywhere spoken against and withal greatly misrepresented I will, in this short chapter, adduce some of those misrepresentations and evil-speakings which have been and are yet being made against them as a people:

Benedict, page 855, uses the following language: “Bethel Association was formed from the one last named, in 1829. Its minutes for 1844, the latest I have received, exhibit it in such a condition of feebleness that I should place it in the sub-head list were it not for its age and pedigree.”

The Muddy River is “the one last named,” and the date of the organization is correct, but on page 956 he says that Bethel Association was organized in 1829, had only four churches, three ministers, and that W. Jordan was Moderator in 1844 and W. Hindman, Clerk. Now the facts are that Bethel Association was organized on *ten* churches and has never had less than eight or nine churches at *any* time since its

formation. Ten churches were History of the Regular Baptists, were represented in 1844; *the very minutes from which his table was taken* show this to be true. And instead of their being only three ministers, there have never been less than five. As for Jordan being Moderator, he never belonged to that Association in his life, and, of course, never was Moderator of it. W. Hindman has not belonged to it since the split, nor acted as Clerk. By such misrepresentations as the foregoing, many honest people who take an interest in history, are misled. Hence the necessity of their confutation. Another quotation from Benedict, page 935: "The anti-Mission movement, must, of necessity, be a short-lived one. It has within the elements of its dissolution, and before my stereotyped pages could reach the different parts of the country, to say nothing of remoter regions, it will be among the things that are past and forgotten."

The above quotation manifests his prejudice and shortsightedness. But Benedict is not the only person to thus prophesy. It has been the prediction of quite a number of the opponents of the Regular Baptists, that they will all soon be gone; that they would live to preach their funeral. They have been sneered and scoffed at; taunted and ridiculed; called "Hard Shells," "Iron Jackets," "Old Fogies," "Whisky Baptists," "Jug Baptists," "Forty Galloners," and other opprobrious epithets. I presume that Benedict's "stereotyped pages" have long since reached the "remoter regions," yet this "anti-Mission movement," as he is pleased to term it, is not "among the things that are past and forgotten." The Regular Baptists still remain, are on the increase, and we are of the opinion that they will be perpetual; that the gates of hell shall not prevail against them. There is no danger that the Missionaries will preach their funeral. They were accused of being drunk on the Day of Pentecost and they have been accused of being drunkards ever since; hence, it is no marvel that they are today called "Whisky Baptists." Christ himself was, while on earth, called a winebibber, but He says to His disciples "blessed are ye when men shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake." A quotation just here from Ray, page 26. He says: "But our anti-Mission brethren tell us that they are not opposed to Bible Missions but only to the modern Missionary system. Actions speak louder than words. If the modern Baptists, who claim to be the "Old School," or "Primitive" Baptists, have ever sent out a Missionary either to the home or foreign field, I have

not been informed of the fact. What “Hard Shell” church has ever employed a Missionary upon the Bible or any other plan? They are emphatically “anti-Mission Baptists.”

I have no personal acquaintance with the learned historian just quoted, and no knowledge of him other than that I have gained from his “Baptist Succession.” It may be that he is an aged man, and, for aught I know, may have been to Birmanah or itinerated some extensive field. But I should judge that I would have but little to fear in measuring arms with him, the salary excepted. I entered the ministry July, 1834, have labored therein upwards of forty years, and have traveled more than any Missionary Baptist I have any knowledge of in this country. My field of ministerial has been Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri and Kansas. In 1856-57 I spent three months in the last-named State, while it was yet bleeding, and in 1859-60 I spent eighteen months in said State. Bethel’s Creek church clothed me with authority to receive and baptize members and constitute churches if necessary, and in company with Elder Chester C. Taylor, constituted the first Regular Baptist church in the State south of the Kansas river. I have been at the constitution of nine churches and yet it seems that our historian cannot learn that any “Hard Shell” church has ever sent out a Missionary to the home or foreign fields. I remark just here that my travel has been quite limited when compared with some of my brethren. If these “anti-Mission Baptists” had formed a society and called it a Baptist Board, if they had sold life memberships and life directorships, thus connecting the church with the world; if they together had hired me at five or six hundred dollars a year; if they had appointed the field of labor, then perhaps the historian might say the “Hard Shells” had sent or employed a Missionary. But since this manner of sending Missionaries is without the authority of God’s word, the “Hard Shells,” as a matter of course, will not consent to it. For this they are called anti-Missionaries; and are charged with being opposed to the spread of the gospel.

In order that the reader may have a knowledge of some of the proceedings of the Missionary Societies, their manner of sending out Missionaries and the results, I will quote from a Baptist circular published from St. Louis, Missouri: “The best of men stand waiting; only the money is wanting.” This shows that they must have the money before they start, and in order to get the “wanting” money, an appeal is made

which is as follows: “Dear Brother in Christ. If you made a donation to the Society last year, please enlarge it this year, and if you did not make one, we entreat you in Christ’s stead, and for His sake, to give something this year to help enlarge this good work. We plead, not for ourselves, not for the Society, but for the sake of perishing souls, for the sake of the Lord Jesus ‘who loved us and gave Himself for us.’ For His sake do not lay this appeal aside until you have sent something to extend His work in behalf of the perishing.”

In giving the results of what the “Society” has already done, the circular says: “Many volumes might be written and not the half be told. These men of God have visited over six hundred and twenty-four thousand families, have left behind them, by sale and gift, over six hundred and fifty-six thousand volumes and six and a half million pages of tracts. In school houses and in destitute churches they have preached seventy-seven thousand sermons and made nearly fifteen thousand addresses, and held forty-six thousand prayer meetings. The record of this work is easily made and read; but its remote and final influence for good, not even an angel can compute. The immediate results reported are the baptism of over twelve thousand five hundred, and the conversion of about as many more; the organization of four hundred and forty-eight churches, and the formation of three thousand Sunday schools. And all this is only the first installment of the grand results of this humble work. Surely God has greatly honored the Society and made it instrumental in accomplishing a vast amount of good. Those who have given money to it have not given in vain, but have laid up much treasure in heaven.”

The foregoing quotations show some of the workings of the Missionary Baptists. And because the Regular Baptists oppose all this machinery they are called anti-Missionaries. While the Missionaries have “the best of men waiting; only the money is wanting,” to carry on their operations, the Regular Baptists like their Primitive brethren, go without funds, single-handed, not counting their lives dear, so that they could promote the cause of their Redeemer. (See Orchard’s History, p. 139.)

Ray, the historian, not only tries to make the impression upon the minds of the public that the Regular Baptists are anti-Missionaries, and that they are opposed to the spread of the gospel, but he would also make it appear that they are opposed to ministerial education and to education generally. The charges are false and must

have been made through deep grounded prejudice. There is no people more in favor of education than the Regular Baptists, or Ray's "Hard Shells." But while the Missionaries' plan is to select hopeful young men and educate them for the ministry, the Regular Baptists are in favor of educating all and letting the Lord select just such as He may want; if a learned man He knows where to find him; if He be disposed to make choice of an unlettered man, thus making His power known, which is not uncommon, it is His privilege. I have no language to express my utter disapprobation to such misrepresentations. Shall we attribute it to a want of better knowledge? No; that will not do; for men that possess such wonderful ability to trace the Baptist channel through the dark ages of Popery, surely cannot fail to have a knowledge of modern history.

#### CHAPTER 4.

Ray's 'Seven Pillars' examined—Ninth pillar, as laid down in Theodosia Earnest, examined—The United Baptists proved to be an apostate body—Quotation from Mosheim—Ray examined —Quotation from Orchard—Regular Baptists and Paulicians the same people—Misgivings of the Regular Baptists.

“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people,” etc.—Daniel. 2: 44.

RAY has laid down seven pillars, or peculiarities, which he thinks distinguish the Baptists from all other societies. I will consent to be governed by those pillars since I understand them to be in accordance with the Scripture. I aim to prove that the United Baptist cannot be the church of Christ; and at the same time show that the Regular Baptist is the only denomination that will bear those tests.

We will here introduce those peculiarities as given by Ray, page 19:

*The Baptists, as a church, or kingdom, recognize Jesus Christ alone as their founder and head.*

*The Baptists regard the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice.*

*The Baptists perpetuate the Bible order of the commandments; they teach repentance, faith, baptism and the Lords Supper.*

*Baptists immerse or bury with Christ in baptism only those who profess to be dead to, or freed from, sin.*

*Baptists recognize equal, rights or privileges in the execution of the laws of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.*

*Baptists observe the Lords Supper at His table in His kingdom.*

*Baptists have never persecuted others; but have themselves always been peculiarly persecuted and everywhere spoken against.*

We will now take them up, one by one, and see if the United Baptists possess those characteristic features:

“The Baptists, as a church or kingdom, recognize Jesus Christ alone as their founder and head.”

Since neither the Missionaries nor the Regular Baptists would acknowledge any other head or founder than Jesus Christ, we will, therefore, admit the former to as much advantage of “pillar” number one, as the latter.

“The Baptists regard the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice.”

Now we do not pretend to say that the Missionary Baptists do not so regard the Bible. But we do know that they do practice different from the Bible. Where in the Bible do we find the practice of Missionary Societies, Tract and Bible Societies and Sunday schools as aids and nurseries to the church? Now when they are practicing these human institutions are they considering the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice? Do they not recollect that the ancient Baptists regarded human inventions in the affairs of religion an unspeakable abomination before God? Where in the Bible is the authority for life membership and life directorship? Is it not a fact that it is not regeneration—not even moral character—that gives such members the right to church privileges? but that it is the purchase money? Then our Missionary brethren fail to possess the second “pillar,” which wonderfully racks their fabric.

“The Baptists perpetuate the Bible order of the commandments; they teach repentance, faith, baptism and the Lord’s Supper.”

I have no comment to make on number three.

“Baptists immerse or bury with Christ in baptism only those who profess to be dead to, or freed from, sin.”

Now in the reception of immersed Methodists and Campbellites—which to my certain knowledge the United Baptists have done—they certainly violate the fourth

peculiarity, since the Methodists sometimes immerse at the end of six months' probation without a death to, or freedom from, sin. And the Campbellites immerse in order to the remission of sin.

“Baptists recognize equal rights or privileges in the execution of the laws of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.”

Then why do the Missionary Baptists have life directorships, or life directors? And have they no more privileges than other members? If not, why charge them an initiatory fee?

“Baptists observe the Lord's supper at His table in His kingdom.”

We have already shown that the Missionary Baptists have repudiated the original abstract of principles and have set up on articles differing materially from the original ones. We have also shown that they seceded from the “mother body;” that they stand to-day the excluded party. They, therefore, cannot be the church of Christ; and do not “eat at His table in His kingdom.”

“Baptists have never persecuted others; but have themselves always been peculiarly persecuted and everywhere spoken against.”

The United Baptists have so changed the doctrine and practice from that of the ancient Baptists, that the unconverted world appears to take no exceptions to them, and, hence, speak in favor of rather than against them. But this kingdom, which is to be different from all other kingdoms, is the one that is everywhere spoken against; and notwithstanding the United Baptists use every argument they are masters of in trying to prove, and to wrest it from them, yet the Regular Baptists have the word of God, that it shall not be left to other people. From the above examination of those tests laid down by Ray, we find that the Regular Baptists fill them to a jot and tittle, whereas the United Baptists fall far short of coming up to them, or, in other words, are weighed in a balance and found wanting.

The author of *Theodosia Earnest*, whom I understand to be a Missionary Baptist and an acknowledged defender of their cause, points out nine tests for the purpose of trying the churches. His ninth test reads: “No apostate church can be a church of Christ.” The argument made to sustain that test is that if the church from which they break off is a true church, and in possession of the gospel ordinances, the rending party forfeit those rights. It is also according to their own argument that if the church

from which they rend off, is wrong, it cannot communicate those ordinances, seeing it does not possess them itself. These arguments are logical, to be sure. The said author argues at considerable length and very conclusively, too, that any church lacking any one of the nine tests laid down by him cannot possibly be a true church of Christ, or even a church at all. Benedict and Ray both agree with him that the act of refusing the baptism of other orders or denominations, is a true sign of the true church. Now if the above be true, and no doubt it is, the United Baptists, in receiving members from the Regular Baptists without baptizing them, certainly either shows that they (the United Baptists) are an “apostate” body, or else they recognize the Regular Baptists as being “a true church of Christ.” Which horn of the dilemma will the Missionaries take? If the refusing of the baptism of other orders is a true sign of the church, then it is a logical conclusion that the receiving of members from orders on their baptism is a “true sign” that the body that does so is not the church. Should the Missionaries take this horn of the dilemma, it will be seen at once that it proves them to be an apostate body or church. If they should be disposed to acknowledge that the Regular Baptists are a true church of Christ (and they certainly do this when they receive their baptism as valid) it also shows the United Baptists to be an apostate body.

We promised further proof of the correctness of the Regular Baptist claims to Baptist succession. In speaking of the Baptists who were called Mennonites, Mosheim, the historian says:

“It may be observed in the first place that the Mennonites are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobusians and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth in times of general darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, Wickliffites and Hussites had maintained, some in a more disguised and others in a more open and public manner, viz: “That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which He established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence

suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.” (See in Ray’s History, p. 100.)

In commenting upon the above quotation from Mosheim, Ray says: “This is very important testimony, borne by the learned Mosheim, a Lutheran, who was intensely opposed to the Baptists, and lived in Cotteangen in Germany.”

We, too, think “this is very important testimony borne by the learned” Ray of Kentucky, who is as much opposed to the Regular Baptists as Mosheim was. He here acknowledges that the church or kingdom of Christ ought to be exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform the transgressor. Then is it not strange that Ray would introduce such testimony as this in trying to prove the priority of the United Baptists? Does he not know that the United Baptists are not exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity? Will he not recollect that the Sunday schools are suggestive of “human prudence” as a means for the purpose of “winning souls to Christ?” Will he not also recollect that the Missionary Board is a society the United Baptists have for the purpose of raising “means” to save “perishing souls?” Does he not know that said Society “pleads for the sake of the Lord Jesus,” to “aid in behalf of the perishing” by throwing in their money to assist in this “great and good work.” And will he not recollect that said Society tries to console those who have given of their money, that they “have not given in vain but have laid up much treasure in heaven.”

A quotation just here from Orchard, the historian, page 139. The language is as follows: “Here we may be permitted to review the apostolic character and exertions of this extensive body of people, while we may express our surprise of the virulent opposition, the cruel measures used, and the extensive sacrifice of human life for successive ages, on the alone ground of religious views. A special instance of divine grace was displayed in this people’s rise and early success; and we must attribute their preservation and enlargement to the exercise of the same compassion, an evident mark of apostolic spirit possessed by this people must be admitted by all. Without any funds or public societies to countenance or support the respective churches, the Paulicians fearlessly penetrated the most barbarous parts of Europe and went single-handed and single-eyed to the conflict with every grade of

character. In several instances they suffered death or martyrdom, not counting their lives dear, so that they could promote the cause of their redeemer.”

The above quotation is a strong point in favor of the Regular Baptists. While they go without funds, not counting their lives dear, so they can promote the cause of their Redeemer, the United Baptists “have the best of men waiting, only the money is wanting.”

This kind of controversy is unpleasant to me. It is not my intention nor desire to widen the breach that, exists between the two societies. Perhaps no person regretted the division more than I, believing as I did, that there was a separation among the Lord's people. While this is, I know for myself, being personally present at the separation, that the United Baptists are the split-off, and stand as the excluded party. I am not so vain as to think the Regular Baptist passed through such a heated controversy without some misgivings on their part. While contending against the other party in relation to their extravagance, they doubtless rushed toward the other extreme, not distinguishing between extravagance and the system taught in the Bible as they should have done. This no doubt has caused some of our brethren to take the liberty of neglecting their obligation to their ministers, while others seeing this neglect, have done and do their duty and even more than their duty; but, taking it all together, there has been much neglecting on the part of our brethren. O, Brethren, let me entreat you for the Lord's sake, do not be remiss in duty sake, do not be remiss in duty to your ministering brethren. Let not the extravagance of others awe you from your obligation to Zion's watchmen. Perhaps no one knows the trials of a poor minister, only those called of God as was Aaron—these who have entered the field of ministerial labor. Being requested by his brethren to come and preach for them, he ventures the appointment, the time rolls around for him to go, he sees something absolutely necessary to be attended to for the comfort of his family; he must either make a disappointment or leave them uncomfortably situated. With a throbbing heart and eyes bathed in tears he bids his wife and children farewell, goes to the place of appointment, proclaims the gospel of the Son of God, feels himself aided by the Spirit, and at the solicitation of his brethren he leaves another appointment. With much fatigue he starts home, remembering that his family have still been neglected or denied some of the comforts of life. Oh! how it pangs his poor heart!

But the neglect of duty to the ministers is not all the error the Regular Baptists committed. In these continued debates at the time of the separation, there was some extravagance used by them as well as by the Missionary party. I remember to have heard a Missionary minister in one of his speeches, say that he thought he could see a GREAT MONSTER a long way off. He was replied to by a witty Regular, as follows; “If Brother Henson does see a great monster a long way off, I judge it is a muley monster.” I heard an old minister compare himself to the old rat that discovered the cat in the meal. He thought he could see mischief.

But as he was a very old man, he was not replied to. As might be expected, in such long and heated discussions, there were some misgivings among the Regular Baptists; and the Missionary party appeared to be wonderfully alarmed from fear the Regulars would run into Antinomianism, and they became so badly scared that they ran away themselves, while the Regulars remained steadfast, where I hope they will continue to stand even in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free.

## CHAPTER 5.

The Union of Separate and Regular Baptists in 1787—Most historians justify the act—The Author thinks it was an unholy marriage—An unadulterated channel of Baptists outside the union of 1787—Neither all the Regulars nor Separates went into the union of 1787—Descendants from both these bodies in their separate state, in Kentucky, in 1801—Separate Baptist Association formed, in Illinois in 1836—The Author’s personal knowledge of Separate Baptists in Illinois, from 1820 to the present time—Channel of Regular Baptists outside the Union in 1787 shown.

“Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”—Ephesians. 5: 11.

There is an important period in the history of the Baptists that I wish to notice. In his chapter on Virginia, Benedict has given at length the history of the union that took place in said State between the Regular and Separate Baptists in 1787. I believe he, and in fact all the historians that I have read, justify the act, but to me it has always appeared to be an unholy amalgamation; and I am of the opinion that if there is an unadulterated channel of the Baptist current, it must be outside of that union. I am, however, willing to admit that there was not a sacrifice of doctrine made by the Regular Baptists in entering into that union, but there certainly was of order. But it

is our intention now to see if we cannot find our intention now to see if we cannot find that channel which has not been connected with that unholy union. No history that I have seen pretends to give a legal succession of baptism among the New England New Lights or Separate Baptists. It is my understanding that Subal Sterns and Daniel Marshal came from the East, Marshal with his Pedobaptism only. They were the founders of the Separate Baptists in Virginia and the Carolinas, and remained separate from the Regulars until 1787, when a union was effected in Virginia between the Kettocton Association alone, on the part of the Regular Baptists, and a delegation from six associations on the part of the Separate Baptists. It is evident that both of these two Societies in their separate condition could not be in the direct line of Baptist succession, and I am satisfied of the fact that the Regulars have the preference both as to doctrine and practice, also to a direct lineage from the English and Welsh Baptists. It is evident that neither all the Regulars nor Separate Baptists went into the union, as will be shown hereafter.

Let it be remembered that this union which was effected in Virginia in 1787 (Benedict, page 652) was between the Kettocton Association of Regular, and six Associations of Separate Baptists.

Now when our historian comes to the history of Kentucky he finds the descendants of both parties in their separate condition, in the year 1801—fourteen years after the union in Virginia. This shows that all the Baptists did not go into that union for the first fourteen years. The next step will bring us down to 1836. Benedict gives the following information respecting the Separate Baptists.

The Separate Baptists. He says: “Separate Baptist Association was formed in 1836. It is located in the counties of Morgan and some adjoining ones. I have none of its minutes nor any items of its history. I suppose it is the same kind of people which were found in Kentucky, who claim a descent from the old Virginia stock, who kept up the name as a matter of tradition and agreeable reminiscences.”

I will state here that there were some bodies of that description in the State of Illinois, to my certain knowledge, from 1820, and they have remained in that separate state till the present time, and are scattered over different parts of the State. I came to this State in 1820 and have been more or less acquainted with them till the present time; and just so certain as the Separate Baptists have remained in their

separate state, the Regular Baptists have done the same. This being true there is certainly a legal line of Baptist succession outside of that unscriptural union of 1787. This not only takes the Regular Baptists back beyond the Missionary separation of 1832, but beyond the Virginia union with the Separate Baptists. From the above it may be seen that there is a channel of Regular Baptists outside of the union of 1787. But, notwithstanding the warnings of the Apostle Paul, yet it seems that the Kettocton Association of Regular Baptists did allow herself to become entangled in the unfruitful works of darkness by consenting to, and uniting with the Separates in that unholy marriage of 1787.

## CHAPTER 6.

The Regular Baptists have ever maintained the principles of true democracy—‘OUR Republican form of Government taken from the discipline of a Regular Baptist church—Regular Baptists will not hire a preacher—History necessary since the close of Inspiration—The Philadelphia Association, the first in America, founded in 1707—Articles of faith of the Philadelphia Association—Tenth and eleventh articles of faith of the Waldenses—Third set of abstract of principles sent to the king-The first Baptist Church founded in America —The Roger Williams organization not a true Baptist church—Regular Baptists not dependent upon Clark's nor William's churches for their line of succession—Welch Tract church—Dr. Howell's letter to Dr. Watson examined—Three articles of faith of the Kehuku Association----Elder Gano—North Carolina Baptist State Convention— Money hunters not confined to North Carolina—Two classes of United Baptists in Southern Illinois at the time of the division —Seven reasons why the Missionaries have the majority at present—Aged members belonging to Bethel's Creek.

“But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that he should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.” 1st Peter 2: 9.

The Regular Baptists have ever maintained, at the hazard of property and life, the principles of true democracy, civil and religious liberty. No denomination that I have any knowledge of is as much united upon these points as are the Regular Baptists.

President Jefferson gained his knowledge of civil government from the usages of

their church.

A quotation just here from Cox, page 527. He says: "Mr. Jefferson declares that he obtained his first notions of a Republic from the government and discipline of a Baptist church nearby that he used to visit with his father, when quite young, which resulted in throwing off British tyranny and forming the purest Republic, politically, that has ever been formed."

Ray, page 229, upon the same subject, says: "It is an interesting fact that the true idea of a free constitution for the American government was derived from the Baptists. We have the following account of the impressions made on the mind of President Jefferson, by attending a Baptist church: The late Revelation. Dr. Fishback, of Lexington, Kentucky, a few years since, made the following statement which he received from the late Revelation. Andrew Tribble, who died at about the age of ninety-three years. Mr. Tribble was pastor of a small Baptist church near Mr. Jefferson's residence, in the State of Virginia, eight or ten years before the American revolution. Mr. Jefferson attended the meetings of the church for several months in succession, and, after one of them, asked the worthy pastor to go home and dine with him, with which request he complied. Mr. Tribble asked Mr. Jefferson how he was pleased with their church government. Mr. Jefferson replied that its propriety had struck him with great force and had greatly interested him: adding, that he considered it the only form of pure democracy which then existed in the world, and had concluded that it would be the best plan of government for the American colonies."

Another peculiarity of the Regular Baptists, is that their ministers have always declined any salary offered them by the different governments, believing that Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and hence does not need the support of the civil authorities. They are of the opinion that any society that depends upon worldly means to promote the interests of the Spiritual kingdom, is that far departed from the original principles of the true church. They, therefore, oppose every attempt to connect the church with the world; should this be effected it would be an easy matter to connect the church and state; and when done we may consider our civil and religious liberties far spent. This is one reason why the Regular Baptists have always opposed those schemes the Missionary Baptists have in operation to effect their purpose.

The Regular Baptists will not hire a preacher to come and preach for them, neither will a minister accept a salary, since they believe there is not enough money in the world to hire one gospel sermon preached. This peculiarity belongs only to the Regular Baptist denomination. They believe in the spread of the gospel, but upon the Bible plan; hence they utterly oppose all schemes and plans devised by human policy, such as Missionary Boards, etc., for this purpose. And rather than have all these schemes for the raising of funds; rather than have the “best of men waiting, only the money is wanting,” they prefer to go as directed by the Holy Ghost, “single-handed, without funds, not counting their lives dear, so that they can promote the cause of their Redeemer.”

In this the Regular Baptists manifest a characteristic feature, peculiar only to them.

They are firm in the belief that “the *extension* of the pure church and kingdom of Jesus Christ can be traced only where \*\*\* all human ceremonies are repudiated, and where the law of Zion alone regulates.” (Orchard, p. 99.)

The Apostles were told to go, first, to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. They were commanded to take neither purse nor scrip; but after the commission was extended to all the world they were then instructed to take a purse, if such they had. What a nice place to have slipped in the begging system in case they had no purse, if it had been right; but nothing of the kind occurs.

I should close this little production were it not that our people are so destitute of a historical knowledge, and it is possible that this may reach the hands of some who have but a limited opportunity of perusing history, generally.

The Regular Baptists have always had such implicit confidence in the entire sufficiency of the Bible that they have generally taken but little interest in other books. History is important information, more especially since the close of inspiration, and hence I deem it highly necessary that our members should have a knowledge of what has transpired since the days of the Apostles, in order that they may know that the predictions of Christ and the Apostles are being fulfilled, that the true church is still in existence, and under the fostering care of its Head and Founder, Jesus Christ, who is the only Law-giver in Zion.

The Sacred Scriptures are a sufficient history until the canon was complete; since that time many events that are important for the followers of the Lamb to know, have

occurred. They should understand that their martyred brethren suffered for Christ's sake and not as rebels and outlaws; that they have always advocated civil and religious liberty, &c.

We will now introduce the subject of the Philadelphia Association. It appears to have been the first institution of the kind in North America, and was properly organized in the year 1707. I have not the information of its present condition, neither as to doctrine nor practice. They probably are modern Missionaries. But it does not matter what it now is. It is only necessary to know what it was when organized. It is a well-known fact that both churches and associations retrograde and often go out of existence or become annihilated. The church at Rome, for instance, which terminated in the man of sin or son of perdition, was once right, but afterward formed that rugged beast with seven heads and ten horns. That all may see that that Association was the same as the Regular Baptists of to-day, we will quote from Benedict, page 606: "In 1775 an application was made for the Association to ordain an itinerant minister to officiate among them; but so cautious were they of doing anything which could be construed into an assumption of power, that they declined."

The above quotation shows very conclusively that the Philadelphia Association in 1775, was the same in practice that the Regular Baptists are to this day; and in order that the reader may have a knowledge of the principles upon which such Association was founded, I here insert the confession of faith adopted in the year 1742, which confession was adopted by over one hundred congregations, whose delegates met in London in 1689. The Philadelphia Association, in 1742, indorsed the said confession:

First. — "The Holy Scriptures are the only sufficient, certain and infallible rule of all-saving knowledge, faith and obedience, the supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men and private spirits are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest."

Second. — "The Lord our God is but one only living and true God, infinite in being and perfection. In this divine and infinite Being, there are three subsistences, the Father, the Word (or Son) and the Holy Spirit of one substance, power and eternity."

Third. — "Those of mankind that are predestinated to life, God, before the

foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love; without any other thing in the creature as a condition or cause moving him thereunto. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so He hath by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto, wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified and kept by His power through faith unto salvation.”

Fourth. — “Although God created man upright and perfect, and gave him a righteous law, yet he did not long abide in this honor, but did willfully transgress the command given unto him in eating the forbidden fruit, which God was pleased according to His wise and holy counsel to permit, having purposed to order it to His own glory. Our first parents, by this sin, fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, whereby death came upon all; all becoming dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root, corrupted nature was conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation, being now conceived in sin, and by nature the children of wrath.”

Fifth. — “Man having brought himself under the curse of the law by his fall, it pleased the Lord to reveal the covenant of grace, wherein He freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in Him, that they might be saved; and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto eternal life His Holy Spirit to make them willing and able to believe.”

Sixth.—“The Son of God, the second person in the Holy Trinity, being very and eternal God, the brightness of the Father’s glory, of one substance and equal with Him who made the world, who upholdeth and governeth all things He hath made, did when the fullness of time was come, take upon Him man’s nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin; so that two whole, perfect and distinct natures were inseparably joined together in one person, which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.”

Seventh. — “The Lord Jesus, by His perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself, which He through the Eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of God, procured reconciliation and purchased an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him. To all those for whom Christ hath obtained eternal redemption, He doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same; making intercession for them, uniting them to Himself by His spirit; revealing unto them, in and by the word, the mystery of salvation; persuading them to believe and obey; governing their hearts by His word and spirit, and overcoming all their enemies by His almighty power and wisdom in such manner and ways as are most consonant to His wonderful and unsearchable dispensation; and all of free and absolute grace, without any condition foreseen in them, to procure it.”

Eighth. — “Man, by his fall into a state of sin hath wholly lost all will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself or to prepare himself thereunto. When God converts a sinner and translates him into the state of grace, He freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by His grace alone enables him freely to will and do that which is spiritually good.”

Ninth. — “Those whom God has predestinated unto life, He is pleased in His appointed and accepted time effectually to call by His word and spirit out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace of salvation by Jesus Christ.”

Tenth. — “Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth; accounting and accepting their persons as righteous, not for anything wrought in them or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone.”

Eleventh. — “All those that are justified God vouchsafed in and for the sake of His only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of grace of adoption, by which they are taken into the number and enjoy the liberties and privileges of children of God.”

Twelfth. — “They who are united to Christ, effectually called and regenerated, having a new heart and a new spirit created in them, through the virtue of Christ’s death and resurrection, are also further sanctified, really and personally, through the same virtue, by His word in them.”

Thirteenth. — “The grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the spirit of Christ in their hearts and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the word.”

Fourteenth. — “Saving repentance is an evangelical grace whereby a person being by the Holy Spirit made sensible of the manifold evils of his sins, doth by faith in Christ humble himself for it and self-abhorrence.”

Fifteenth. — “Good works, done in obedience to God’s commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and living faith.”

Sixteenth. — “Those whom God hath accepted in the beloved, effectually called and sanctified by His Spirit, shall certainly persevere therein to the end and be eternally saved.”

Seventeenth. — “The moral law doth forever bind all, justified persons as well as others, to the obedience thereof, and that not only in regard to the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God, the Creator who gave it; neither doth Christ in the gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen its obligation.

Eighteenth. — “The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church, in whom by the appointment of the Father, all power for the calling, institution, order, or government of the church, is invested in a supreme and sovereign manner. In the execution of this power the Lord Jesus calleth out of the world unto Himself, through the ministry of His word, by His Spirit, those that are given unto Him by His Father, that they may walk before Him in all the ways of obedience, which He prescribeth to them in His word.”

Nineteenth. — “A particular church gathered and completely organized according to the mind of Christ, consists of officers and members; and the officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the church, are bishops or elders and deacons.”

Twentieth. — “The work of pastors being constantly to attend the service of Christ in His churches, in the ministry of the word and prayer with watching for their souls, as they that must give an account to him, it is incumbent on the churches to whom they minister not only to give them all due respect, but also to communicate to them of all their good things according to their ability.”

Twenty-first. — “Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by

Jesus Christ to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with Him in His death and resurrection, of his being engrafted into Him, of remission of sins, and of His giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life. Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience to, our Lord Jesus are the only proper subjects of this ordinance. The outward element to be used in this ordinance, is water, wherein the party is to be immersed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”

Twenty-second. — “The supper of the Lord Jesus was instituted by Him, the same night wherein He was betrayed, to be observed in His churches unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance and showing forth the sacrifice of Himself in His death.”

Twenty-third. — “The bodies of men after death return to dust and see corruption; but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them; the souls of the righteous being then made perfect in holiness, are received into paradise, where they are with Christ and behold the face of God in light and glory waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell where they remain in torment and utter darkness reserved to the judgment of the great day.”

Twenty-fourth. — “God hath appointed a day wherein He will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father; then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fullness of joy and glory, with everlasting reward, in the presence of the Lord; but the wicked who know not God and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments and punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power.”

It should be borne in mind that the foregoing confession of faith was gotten up by ministers and messengers from over one hundred congregations in Europe, which Assembly met at London in 1689. Citations of scriptural proof were added to each article. The said confession, as had already been stated, was, in 1742, endorsed by the Philadelphia Association. If this Association is now what it was in 1742, it is evident from her abstract of principles that she occupies the same ground or position the Regular Baptists do; yet Ray, the Kentucky historian, and Elder Jones, of Illinois,

both quote from the records of the said Association for the purpose of making the impression upon the minds of the people that she was a Missionary body from the beginning; but they fell very far short of proving it to be of the same kind of Missionaries the United Baptists are.

Benedict, in speaking of said Association, says that they were so cautious of doing anything that could be construed into an assumption of power that they declined ordaining an itinerant minister to officiate amongst them when the application was made. But what of the Missionary Baptists? Have they not salaried itinerants, both in home and foreign fields? Have they not “the best of men waiting, only the money is wanting,” in order that they can also itinerate these “best of men” who “stand waiting?” While these men are “waiting;” while their hearts are “yearning” (?) for, and while they are ready to engage in, the work of saving souls, the society is pleading “for the sake of perishing souls;” “for the sake of the Lord Jesus,” to send “something to extend His work in behalf of the perishing.”

Now, kind reader, compare—contrast rather—the workings of the Missionary Baptists, as above shown, with the Philadelphia confession of faith, as also above given, and see whether the characteristic features of the former are similar to those of the latter. Now compare the articles of faith of the Regular Baptists, their doctrine and practice, with the articles of faith of the Philadelphia Association, and you will discover at once that the abstract of principles set forth by said Association are in harmony with those of the Regular Baptists; hence, it may be seen that the Regular Baptists of to-day occupy the same ground the Baptists did in 1689. Since this carries us back to Europe, I will give the tenth and eleventh articles of faith of the Waldensian Baptists, which are as follows:

Tenth. — “Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in the affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God.”

Eleventh. — “We hold in abhorrence all human inventions as proceeding from anti-Christ, which produce distress and are prejudicial to the liberty of the mind.” (See Jones, p. 333.)

The date of these articles just quoted is fixed by John Paul Perrin, at 1120. And they show forth a characteristic peculiar to the Regular Baptists only.

By a reference to Jones' History of the Baptists, it may be seen that they have put

forth three sets of abstracts of principles. Those as above given, are from the first. The third was set forth about the time of the Reformation, or in 1544, the time of great persecution by the French government. This third confession was sent to the king in order to manifest their innocence of the many charges against them. Their confession is as follows:

First. — “We believe there is but one God, who is a Spirit, the Creator of all things—the Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all, who is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth—upon whom we are continually dependent, and to whom we ascribe praise for our life, food, raiment, health, sickness, prosperity and adversity. We love Him as the source of all goodness and reverence Him as that sublime Being who searches the reins and trieth the hearts of the children of men.”

Second. — “We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son and image of the Father—that in Him all the fullness of the Godhead dwells, and that by HIM alone we know the Father. He is our mediator and advocate; nor is there any other name given under heaven by which we can be saved. In His name alone we call upon the Father, using no other prayers than those contained in the Holy Scriptures, or such as are in substance agreeable thereunto.”

Third. — “We believe in the Holy Spirit as the Comforter proceeding from the Father and from the Son, by whose inspiration we are taught to pray; being by Him renewed in the spirit of our minds, who creates us anew unto good works and from whom we receive the knowledge of the truth.”

Fourth. — “We believe that there is one holy church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful, that have existed from the beginning of the world, or that shall be to the end thereof. Of this church the Lord Jesus Christ is the head; it is governed by His word and guided by the Holy Spirit. In the church it behooves all Christians to have fellowship. For her He (Christ) prays incessantly and His prayer for it is most acceptable to God, without which indeed there could be no salvation.”

Fifth.—“We hold that the ministers of the church ought to be unblameable both in life and doctrine; and, if found otherwise, that they ought to be deposed from their office and others substituted in their stead; and that no person ought to presume to take that honor unto himself but he who is called of God as was Aaron—that the

duties of such are to feed the flock of God, not for filthy lucre's sake or as having dominion over God's heritage, but as being examples to the flock, in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith and in chastity."

Sixth. — "We acknowledge that kings, princes and governors are the appointed and established ministers of God, whom we are bound to obey (in all lawful and civil concerns) for they bear the sword for the defense of the innocent and the punishment of evil doers; for which reason we are bound to honor and pay them tribute. From this power and authority no man can exempt himself, as is manifest from the example of the Lord Jesus Christ, who voluntarily paid tribute, not taking upon Himself any jurisdiction of temporal power."

Seventh. — "We believe that in the ordinance of baptism, the water is the visible and external sign, which represents to us that which, by virtue of God's invisible operation, is within us, namely, the renovation of our minds and the mortification of our members through (the faith of) Jesus Christ. And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, previously professing and declaring our faith and change of life."

Eighth — "We hold that the Lord's supper is a commemoration of, and thanksgiving for, the benefits which we have received by His sufferings and death—and that it is to be received in faith and love—examining ourselves that so we may eat of that bread and drink of that cup, as it is written in the Holy Scriptures."

Ninth. — "We maintain that marriage was instituted of God, that it is holy and honorable, and ought to be forbidden to none, provided there be no obstacle from the divine word."

Tenth. — "We contend that all those in whom the fear of God dwells, will thereby be led to please Him and to abound with the good works (of the gospel) which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them, which are love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, gentleness, sobriety and the other good works enforced in the Holy Scriptures."

Eleventh. — "On the other hand we confess that we consider it to be our duty to beware of false teachers, whose object is to divert the minds of men from the true worship of God and to lead them to place their confidence in the creature, as well as to depart from the good works of the gospel, and to regard the inventions of men."

Twelfth. — “We take the Old and the New Testament for the rule of our life, and we agree with the general confession of faith contained in (what is usually termed) the Apostles' creed.” (See Jones, pages 334, 335, 336.)

The foregoing abstract of principles of the Waldenses, shows very conclusively that they ever stood opposed to the inventions of men in affairs of religion; that they held such as proceeding from anti-Christ; an unspeakable abomination before God and prejudicial to the liberty of the mind. They also set forth the duty of ministers to be that of feeding the flock of God; and the Old and New Testament for the rule of their lives. What denomination of to-day is founded upon and contends for these principles other than the Regular Baptists? Simply none. Then they, the Regular Baptists, are the only people who regard the inventions of men in affairs of religion as an unspeakable abomination before God; the only people charged with “feeding the flock of God,” and the only denomination who take the Old and New Testament *alone* for their rule of faith and practice, hence they are that peculiar people spoken of at the heading of this chapter.

My researches of history have thoroughly convinced me that begging money and selling titles into society for religious purposes, are the inventions of men and ought to be disapproved by all Christians. The Bible taught me the same lesson many years ago; and I have conscientiously been led to oppose all such plans and schemes for the support of the ministry. The New Testament is plain upon this subject. It fixes all rules, regulations and laws necessary, and any change or modification of them, is not only a violation of God's law but a contempt on his divine and holy character!

Since there does not appear to be much controversy between the United and Regular Baptists upon ancient history, we do not deem it necessary to trace the Baptists further back than has already been done; we will, therefore, return to the Baptists of our country. The first Baptist church founded in America was at Newport, Rhode Island. This church was constituted by Dr. John Clarke in 1638 and is still in existence. We will here give the epitaph engraved upon his tomb. It is as follows:

**TO THE MEMORY OF DOCTOR JOHN CLARKE,**

*One of the original purchasers and proprietors of this island, and one of the founders of the First Baptist Church in Newport; its first pastor and munificent benefactor. He was a native of Bedfordshire, England, and a practitioner of physic in London. He, with his associates, came to this island from Massachusetts in March, 1638, O. S., and on the 24th of the same month obtained a deed thereof from the Indians. He shortly after gathered the Church aforesaid and became its pastor. In 1651 he, with Roger Williams, was sent to England by the people of Rhode Island Colony to negotiate the business of the Colony with the British ministry: Mr. Clarke was instrumental in obtaining the charter of 1663 from Charles II. which secured to the people of the States free and full enjoyment of judgment and conscience in matters of religion. He remained in England to watch over the interests of the Colony until 1664, and then returned to Newport and resumed the pastoral care of his Church. Mr. Clarke and Mr. Williams, two fathers of the Colony, strenuously and fearlessly maintained that none but Jesus Christ had authority over the affairs of conscience. He died April 20, 1676, in the 66th year of his age, and is here interred.*

Perhaps some of my friends might think it proper and right that I should acquit my brethren of the false charge brought by our opponents—that Roger Williams was the founder of the Baptists in America, thus breaking our line of succession. I remark that this has already been very satisfactorily done both by Elder Jesse Cox, of Tennessee, and Ray, of Kentucky. I need only state the fact that both these historians have shown very clearly that Williams, very soon after his informal baptism, not only renounced it, but all church organization and joined the Seekers.

The date given in the engraving on the tomb of Dr. Clarke shows the Newport church to be one year in advance of the “thing like” a church gotten up by Roger Williams. But we are not dependent upon either for our line of succession. We have a number of ministers and members who came from Europe and established churches in this country. The Welsh Tract church was organized in Wales in 1701 and emigrated therefrom, in church capacity, and settled in Pennsylvania where it remained two years. It then finally settled at Welsh Tract, in the present State of Delaware, in 1703. This church was organized on sixteen members, with Thomas

Griffith its pastor, and sailed from Wales to America on board the ship James and Mary in 1701 (the same year it was constituted) and kept up her church meetings while on board said vessel. Said organization yet exists and still maintains the doctrine and practice of the Regular Baptists. While this is so, it seems that Ray would try to bias the minds of the public and prejudice them against this church by stating that it “has taken sides with the anti-Mission party and has thereby impaired its usefulness.”

In his letters to Dr. Watson, Dr. Howell says: “But first, if you please, turn to Benedict’s History of the Baptists, Vol. II, p. 99, etc., and you will see that in 1753—that is eighty-four years ago—the Philadelphia Association sent Elder John Gano as a Missionary to the churches in North Carolina, which were soon after formed into the Kehukee Association. The next year, 1754, the Association sent two other Missionaries to assist him—Elders Benjamin Miller and Peter P. Vanhorn—by the instrumentality of whose united labors these churches, previously deranged and nearly what Campbellites now are, were reclaimed and set in order and many sinners were converted. Yes, my brother, even the KEHUKKEE Association, now distinguished for its bitterness and proscription of Missionaries, was collected by Missionary labor.” (See Ray, p. 27.)

Were these “Missionaries,” Gano, Miller and Vanhorn, of the modern type? Were they “the best of men waiting only the money is wanting” to enable the “Board” to send them? and were they sent at a stipulated salary by life directors? Or did not the Philadelphia Association, on receiving the intelligence of the deplorable condition of some of the churches in Virginia and North Carolina, request the above-named ministers to visit them? and did they not “go ye” upon the Bible plan; and, like the ancient Baptists, “single-handed, without funds, not counting their lives dear, so that they could promote the cause of their Redeemer?”

If upon the former, they were *sent* after the modern Missionary plan, if after the latter, they *went* in accordance with the Bible plan, and according to the plan of the Baptists of the twelfth century.

Now if either one or all those Elders were instrumental in constituting the Kehukee Association, they certainly set forth a code of characteristics or abstract of principles by which to be known and governed. And it does seem to us that when these

“deranged” churches “were reclaimed and set in order,” was a most excellent time to declare their principles, or if declared, to subscribe to them. Having three of the articles of faith of said Association before me, I will here insert them:

Fifth. — “We believe that God, before the foundation of the world, for a purpose of His own glory, did elect a certain number of men and angels to eternal life; and, that this election is particular, eternal and unconditional on the creature’s part.”

Sixth. — “We also believe that it is utterly out of the power of men, as fallen creatures, to keep the law of God properly, repent of their sins truly, or believe in Christ, except they be drawn by the Holy Spirit.”

Seventh. — “We believe that in God’s own appointed time and way (by means which he has ordained) that the elect shall be called, justified, pardoned and sanctified; and that it is impossible they can refuse the call, but shall be made willing by living grace to receive the offers of mercy.”

The foregoing articles are the result of “Missionary labor,”—the founding of the Kehukee Association on Old Baptist principles, the very platform upon which the Regular Baptists stand even to this day! But let’s suppose for a moment; that Elder Gano was a Missionary of the modern sort, sent out to North Carolina by the “Missionary Board” at a stipend, as an instrument in the hands of God, for the purpose of saving souls. When he gets to these churches he begins to preach thus: “Sinner, I am come down here, an instrument in God’s hands, to save souls from eternal ruin. Now let me say that hell is gaping to receive you. Oh! will you make your bed in that awful lake of fire! Oh! let me entreat you, seek the Lord; put it off no longer; now is the accepted time—to-morrow may be too late. Jesus is ready and willing to save you. His arms are extended to you. He is begging, beseeching, wooing, striving to save you. Then, sinner, close in with the overtures of mercy.” While thus ranting, he is suddenly brought to a halt, and begins to think that he was instrumental in collecting the Kehukee Association ; that the articles of faith set forth declare that “ We *believe* that God *before* the foundation of the world, for a purpose of His own glory did elect a *certain* number of men and angels to eternal life, and, that this election is *particular*, eternal and *unconditional on the creatures part*,” while here I am offering salvation upon certain *conditions* to be performed by the creature, and trying to add to that certain number. It also occurs to his mind that “in

God's own appointed time and way, the elect shall be called, justified, pardoned and sanctified; and that it is *impossible* they can *refuse* the call," and here am I trying to get them to come now and not put it off longer, till it is too late; that Jesus is begging them to be saved, and yet they refuse the call. At this juncture he is well convinced of the fact that his preaching is not in accordance with the declaration of principles set forth by the churches "reclaimed," "set in order," and "collected" into the Kehukee Association "by Missionary labor." The churches---quick to discover a discrepancy in preaching, a departure from the faith---notifies him that his services are no longer desired.

Kind reader can you think for a moment that Elder Gano was a Missionary of the modern kind? The Regular Baptists have always been in favor of the spread of the gospel but they believe in the spreading of the gospel upon the Bible plan. Neither the Kehukee nor any Regular Baptist Association is opposed to the spread of the gospel upon the Bible plan. But the United Baptists may be assured of the fact that the Regular Baptists utterly oppose the modern Missionary system. They may brand us as being "distinguished" for our "bitterness and proscription of Missionaries," notwithstanding.

The North Carolina Baptist State Convention, in speaking of their condition, said that their most talented men were seeking that support in other States that they could not get in their own. Elder Joshua Lawrence in reply does not seem to regret the loss of them, seeing the support was their main object. I remark that these money hunters were not confined to North Carolina alone. They were (and are still) in the State of Illinois. In their speeches they manifest a wonderful zeal on account of sinners going to hell for want of the gospel. They cry and tell how they bathe their pillow in tears; and some of them, after preaching a while with great zeal, got able to buy a few goods and went to merchandising, when it seems that their zeal became quite cool and but little attention paid to sinners, which proved to me that money was and is their only object. But the Regular Baptists, believing that Jesus Christ came into this world to save His people from their sins; that He, by His sufferings and death, cancelled all their sins; that in His own appointed time and way, He will call, regenerate and sanctify them, in short, manifest Himself to each and every one of them, and that it is impossible they can refuse the call, did not manifest such anxiety

from fear that sinners would be lost. They are still promulgating the gospel for the purpose of the edifying of the body of Christ; for the perfecting of the saints.

At the time of the division in Southern Illinois, there were two classes of United Baptists. The one contended that if the Regular party knew just what the Mission system was, they would not oppose it; the other class contended that they were not going to have anything to do with the Missionaries. They only disapproved of the doctrine advocated by the Regulars, but they have been led step by step till the most of them have come out in favor of the system. The Regular party contended that if the Mission system had been taught in the Bible, they would have had as much knowledge of it as the other parties, having made the Bible their study instead of Missionary tracts, &c.

Notwithstanding I claim for the Regular Baptists a majority at the time of the separation in this part of the State, yet I am frank to admit that the Missionaries outnumber them at present, and there are several causes for it.

Their system of doctrine is such that unregenerated persons understand and believe it.

Human efforts have been extensively used to excite human passion.

Relaxed discipline has done much to increase their numbers. Sunday schools have done a great deal toward influencing the minds of the youth in that direction. Tracts have done their part.

The receiving of the baptism of other denominations, which has been a common practice among them. (Though I see a growing disposition among them of late to abandon the reception of the baptism of other denominations.)

The great pains taken to misrepresent the Regular Baptists, obscure their system and prejudice the minds of the people against them.

There was quite a number of aged members belonging to the church where I had my membership, at the time of the division, who had an extensive acquaintance with Baptist usages, and among others was my grandfather. He joined the Baptists many years before my birth; was a man of extraordinary mind, and lived to be about ninety-six years of age. He was living in this country at the time the division commenced, but died before the separation was complete. I had many interesting interviews with him. He spent a portion of his time among the Baptists in Virginia and North

Carolina, but principally in Kentucky and Illinois. His name was Thomas Lane. I also had another source of information. My great grandmother Coffey, who lived to the advanced age of one hundred and twelve years, and who was said by the friends to have made a profession of religion at the age of twelve. She joined the Regular Baptists and lived in said church one hundred years, and it was said by the older ones of the connection that no charge was ever brought against her during that time.

I make these statements more for the benefit of my family relations than otherwise, believing at the same time, that it will not prejudice my history of the Baptists.

### CHAPTER 7.

The old Illinois Association—The New Design Church organized —Elder David Badgley—The New Design Church declared an unfellowship with slave holders—Division of Illinois Association—Fourth Item—Quotation from Benedict—Ninth Item— Appointing a Committee to examine records—Report of Committee—The report shows the Emancipation Baptists to be a rent-off party—Thirteenth Item—The Emancipation Baptists form an important element in the present United Baptists’ ranks —Circular letter—Elder M. J. Jones—Dissolution of Illinois Association.

“But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master’s use, and prepared unto every good work.”—2nd Timothy. 2: 20, 21.

THE Old Illinois Association was the first organization of the kind in the State. It was established in the year 1807, on five churches, having a sum total of sixty-two members. It has been the nursery of a great number of able ministers and Baptist institutions; but has recently come to a dissolution. Having the records of said Association before me. I have thought proper to give the reader a few items of its history as they are set forth in the Association book, believing they will be both interesting and instructive. It has been the mother of seven other Associations, four of which were formed in Illinois and three in the State of Missouri. She has had many difficulties as well as refreshing revivals. From the records it appears that Elder David Badgley visited Illinois, arriving at the Mississippi River, near St. Louis, on the fourth day of May, 1796, where and when he found a number of people

inquiring the way to Zion, and during the same month baptized fifteen persons; and with the assistance of Elder Joseph Chance—a lay Elder—constituted a church on twenty-eight members, calling it New Design. This was the first Baptist church in the State. Badgley soon after returned to Virginia, and the next Spring moved his family to Illinois, took the pastoral care of the New Design church, and with the assistance of Elder Wm. Jones established several other churches, but they remained in their isolated condition until the year 1807, not without some difficulties, however.

Among the records of the old Illinois Association I find a biographical sketch of Elder Badgley, written in pamphlet form, by Elder Wm. Jones, who states that he was intimately acquainted with him the last seventeen years of his life, and was correctly informed of his early history. Elder Jones states that Elder Badgley was born November 5th, 1749, and that he belonged to the Association when the covenant of Union took place between the Regular and Separate Baptists in Virginia. He, of course, was a United Baptist. Elder Jones informs us that Badgley had an indisposition of body for several months, and during that time the New Design church changed a rule they had previously adopted—that of working by a oneness, — agreeing to work by a majority and to commune with the Methodists. This caused much distress among them, and when Elder Badgley’s health returned he was called upon to administer the Lord’s Supper to the said New Design church, but refused, believing it to be contrary to the sentiments of the United Baptists to commune with other orders; in consequence of which he was taken under dealings by a number of the members, but a majority sustained him. He then took his letter and put his membership in the Mississippi Bottom church. This was in the year 1800. The New Design church soon declared an unfellowship with slave-holders, which caused another breach of fellowship among the churches; but by renewed efforts fellowship was restored.

About the year 1807 some emigrants came from Kentucky having a traveling constitution, prepared for them by Jacob Locke and Robert Stockton, who resided within the bounds of the Green River Association. These new comers settled near those other churches, and two other Baptists that were regularly dismissed from the Beaver Ridge church in Tennessee also came to the same neighborhood, one of them

an ordained minister, the other an active lay member. They held a kind of counsel meeting on the 9th and 10th of January, where and when they agreed to meet at James Downing's, in the Ridge Prairie, on the third Friday, Saturday and Sunday in June, 1807, for the purpose of forming an Association. The records show that they met at the time appointed, regularly organized, and agreed to meet again on the 9th of the following October. They held their Associations semi-annually for several years, or to the year 1809, when they had the unpleasant scene of division among them. The records for that year show "that the Association split asunder," also that the party desiring to support the general union of United Baptists at large, being assembled, chose Brother Win. Jones, Clerk. Letters from five churches were read and their messengers' names enrolled.

The party which rent of called themselves "The Baptist Church of Christ Friends to Humanity," but by others they were called "Emancipating Baptists."

The records of the Illinois Association give no account of the proceedings of the seceding party, but I should judge they had some kind of an organization, similar perhaps to an Association, since more than one church went off. Some historians have stated that the separation was occasioned by a refusal of the Emancipation Baptists to open a correspondence with the Kentucky Baptists on the account of slavery, but the records show no such thing. They had no correspondence at that time, neither did they make application for any, until the year 1817, at which time they obtained a correspondence with the Wabash District Association.

By examining the book of the Illinois Association, it may be seen that its pages are not numbered, neither are their sessions; hence, I am necessarily compelled to refer to the year wherein anything was transacted for my quotations. They progressed several years without having their minutes printed, though they had them regularly recorded in a book. They also made it the duty of the Clerk to furnish each church with a copy, allowing him twenty-five cents each.

In the year 1815 they agreed to have their minutes printed. In the year 1809 the fourth item reads thus: "We believe it right not to commune with those that have left the general Union at large," which is as much as to say, we believe it is not right to commune with those Emancipating Baptists that have rent off and left the general Union of the United Baptists.

Now in order to show conclusively that the old Illinois Association is the genuine stock of Baptists, and to show that my statement in this, as well as in the former chapter, is correct in relation to the party that compose the Missionary Baptists, I will here quote from Benedict, page 853, the following:

“South District Association bears date from 1810; it holds the second rank as to the amount of its membership among the Illinois institutions. The old Illinois Confederacy was its maternal parent; the circumstances of its origin are hinted at in Mr. Peck’s narrative and are more fully explained by him and another correspondent whose name appears in the note below. They together have given the history of the Friends of Humanity, also the definition of this singular appendage to a few religious bodies in this particular location; it ought, in my opinion, now to be laid aside. Mr. Peck, in a late communication, has described this whole family of associated Confederacies in the following manner: ‘The South District Association Friends to Humanity originated by a division of the old Illinois B. Association in 1809. For several years the churches had a sort of annual mass meetings, not by regular delegation but by voluntary attendance.

“ ‘In 1820 they first printed minutes with the above names.

“ ‘The principal ministers of this body are and were the Lemen family, consisting of a father and four sons in the ministry.

“ ‘In 1829 the body divided into three parts, called South, North and Missouri districts, but published only one set of minutes.

“ ‘The Saline Association was formed from the South District in 1834.

“ ‘The Vandalia Association was formed from the Saline in 1840.

“ ‘The Nine Mile and Franklin Associations and some others grew wholly or in part from this associational family alliance.’ ”

The above quotation from the Missionary historian shows, in the first place, that the Emancipating Baptists were a rent off party from the old Illinois Association; secondly, that the Saline Association was formed from the South District in 1834; thirdly, that the Vandalia Association was formed from the Saline in 1840; and lastly, that the Nine Mile, the Franklin, and some other Associations, grew wholly or in part from this associational family alliance. Our Missionary friends well know that they did not fellowship the Emancipation Baptists until after they had broken

off from the old United Baptists, but since that time they have amalgamated and become one people.

Among the records of the Illinois Association for the year 1830, we find the following: “Ninth item: The reference from the Richland church, relative to a certain publication over the signature of the Publishing Committee of the Rock Spring and Edwardsville churches, published in the Pioneer of February 6th, 1830, devoted to the Western Baptists, taken up and answered as follows: ‘Whereas the Edwardsville and Rock Spring have accused the Illinois Association of exercising power over churches and individuals, and have cast a stigma on the churches and Associations in saying they were influenced by a few leading brethren, we think those churches have been mistaken in their views. The churches composing the Illinois Association have always considered themselves to be independent and influenced by none, and the general contents of former minutes were their united voices through their messengers, and they never felt a disposition to remonstrate against their former proceedings, firmly believing those pretended liberal institutions of the present day to spread the gospel to be without any license from the word of God, and as the love of money is the root of all evil, we fear they will only tend to sap the foundation of both our civil and religious liberties. We, therefore, advise our brethren of the different churches to be aware of their stratagems.’ ”

Will the United Baptists of 1876 endorse the above act of the United Baptists of 1830? I am quite sure they will not. And why? Because *they are not of the same stock of Baptists*. Will the Regular Baptists of to-day endorse the said act? Surely they will. And why? Because *they are of the same stock of Baptists*.

Among the records of the Illinois Association for the year 1831 the following may be seen:

“Whereas, perceiving by the minutes of those people calling themselves the Baptist Church of Christ Friends to Humanity, &c., &c., and setting forth things we believe to deceive the public into the belief that they have not rent off, or separated themselves from the Union of Baptists as formed in this country which did compose the Illinois Association which was founded on the principles of the United Baptists, therefore believing it to be our duty to give a fair and impartial statement of these things as they are, and as they were then transacted, we have appointed Brethren

Wm. Kinney, Wm. Jones, Sr. and Wm. Ogle to extract from the records of this Association and also from the records of such churches as may have any records relating to this circumstance, and when by them so taken to be annexed to the minutes of this Association.

“Signed by order, and in behalf of this Association.”

The following is the report of the committee appointed by the Association: “We, the undersigned, being appointed by the Association to extract from the records of this Association and such church books as may be relative to the situation or standing of the people calling themselves the United Baptist Church of Christ, &c., do find that they went out from us is abundantly evident as appears from records, as also it appears from the records that this is the oldest Association west of the Ohio river, and was formed by the conjunction of three churches, in 1807, which three churches have been constituted on the principles of the general Union of the United Baptists, one of which traveled with her constitution from Kentucky; and this Association, formed by those churches, was also constituted upon the principles of the United Baptists, from which have since emanated seven Associations, four in this State and three in Missouri. At the first meeting of this Association, which was in June, 1807, in adopting her rules the twenty-second question and answer was as follows: ‘Does this communion extend throughout the Union?’ Answered, ‘It shall extend throughout the Union.’

“James Lemen, Sr., (now dead) who, it is well known, was the leader and founder the people called Friends to Humanity, was a member of the Association when the above rule was adopted. All things appeared to be peaceable and in order until 1809, when said Lemen gave distress to the brethren of Richland Creek church, in which he was a member, and was taken under dealings by said church which then belonged to the Association; and while the church was investigating the several charges against him he rent himself from the church and refused to be dealt with by her, and drew a part of the members with him, some of whom now are known and ever have been amongst the leaders of that people. And as further evidence that they went out or rent off from us, we quote the following extract from the records of said church: ‘The Baptist church of Christ at Richland Creek, met according to appointment on Saturday the 9th of September, 1809, Brother Best Moderator.

“First. — The business of this day to choose delegates to the Association.

“Second. — To exclude Brother James Lemen, Sr., for rending himself from the church and drawing a party with him, and other accusations too tedious to mention, and lay under censure all those who justify his conduct.

Signed by order of the church.        ‘JOHN PHILIPS, Clerk.’

“ ‘The Baptist Church of Christ met according to appointment on the second Saturday in October, 1810. Brother Samuel Best, Moderator. We the members of Richland Creek church have been accused of excommunicating Brother Lemen for the principles of emancipation, and in order to show the world and to convince him and the rest of the members that went off with him that we did not, we lay the excommunication of Brother Lemen down and set him on the same footing that he was before—that is, we hold him under censure for some distress which is not occasioned by the aforesaid principles which have not been removed. Signed by order of the Church,

‘WILLIAM KINNEY, Clerk.’

“There are no records to show as we can find that a restoration of James Lemen, Sr., and those that went off with him ever took place, to the fellowship of the church. The same distress which took place, as above, together with that of emancipation, entered into the ensuing Association held October, 1809, and there caused a division by drawing off a part of the members, who attached themselves to James Lemen, Sr., and those that rent from the church with him, which appears to be the cause of the Association making the following record: ‘We believe it not right to commune with those who have left the general Union.’ The next Association, as appears from records, appointed a committee to attend the churches and inquire into the nature of the distress occasioned by members leaving them and joining the Lemen party, as it was then called. This committee recommended that the churches should, when they excluded any of those that rent off, write as follows: ‘They went out from us, and therefore, they are no more of us,’ and the next Association says, on the records, ‘We approbate the proceedings of the committee chosen at the last Association to visit the churches.’        “William Jones, Sr.,

“William Kinney,

“William Ogle.”

Those men appointed by the Illinois Association for the purpose of examining the records the said Association and churches were men of reputation as ministers of the gospel and Governor Kinney had a reputation as a statesman and politician. Their extracts show the Emancipation Baptists to be a rent-off party and that the separation took place in 1809. These people spread over the State and quite a number in Missouri. It appears that they divided into three districts, North and South in Illinois, and one in the State of Missouri. They published only one set of minutes. I will leave them at present, and in order to show that the opposition of the United Baptists to the Missionary system did not commence in 1831, will turn back to the year 1824, and quote some resolutions passed by the United Baptists at that session, which resolutions are as follows: “Item 13th. *Resolved*, Unanimously by this Association that we view the general conduct and proceedings in this country of those preachers, and especially that of John M. Peck, patronized by the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, to have been distressing to the brethren and prejudicial to the cause of Christ amongst the Baptist churches in this Union.

“*Resolved*, Further that no preacher who has been or shall be patronized by the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions shall here History of the Regular Baptists.

after have a seat in this Association unless he shall have withdrawn himself from their patronage and service.”

The above resolutions were *unanimously* adopted by the United Baptists in 1824. This was prior to the split on the Missionary question, and the people now known as Missionary Baptists were as much opposed to the Emancipating Baptists as were the Old United Baptists and as far from fellowshipping them; but since the separation the Emancipation Baptists form the most important element in the Missionary Baptist ranks, particularly in Southern Illinois. Should the reader desire additional evidence as to the claims of the Old United Baptists, or what is now known as the Regular Baptists—for they are the same people—we have it at hand. The Illinois Association generally added a circular letter, each year, to their minutes and since those letters exhibit their faith and practice, I will therefore present one as a sample of their faith in the year 1831. It was written by Resden Moore and indorsed by the Association, and is as follows:

## CIRCULAR LETTER.

“DEAR BRETHREN: We are glad we have another interview in an associated capacity, and that there are so many that proved faithful in those trying times when anti-Christ by his miraculous power has gained such an ascendancy over the hearts of so many of the citizens of our free country; that he has drawn many by his silver cords and a great number of his servants are traveling through every part of our country as well as other nations, to establish the different religious institutions, falsely so called. A number of editors are sending their papers into every part to secure their labor, persuading the people that Missionary institutions, under the pretense of spreading the gospel of God, such as learning young men to preach the gospel and sending them forth under perpetual pay, Bible, Tract and Temperance Societies, &c., and, lastly, above all, the Sunday school union, by which we think they expect to get the reins of government in their own hands by training parents and children by their Sunday school books and papers, persuading them to believe that it is a heaven-born institution, and that it is a great thing to be a member of that institution, and to tread down Zion under their feet, and to cause her members to pay tax to support their institutions.

“Already some of those misguided bigots say, In a little time the Old Baptist preachers will have but few hearers, if any.’ Thus the enemies of the church expect shortly to gain the victory over her.

“It is much to be lamented that so many are already led away by their wicked devices, therefore, brethren, be aware of the signs of the present evil day. The Holy Scriptures tell us of false prophets and false Christs that should come; and that evil seducers shall wax worse and worse, that many should depart from the faith and follow their pernicious ways, which should cause the truth to be evil spoken of; by their fruit they are easily known by all lovers of the truth. Money and power and human accomplishment seem to be their chief aim; therefore they do not belong to the visible church of Christ; for the church of Christ consists chiefly of the poor of this world, whom God chose, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom. But anti-Christ’s kingdom belongs to this world, therefore the world runs after it. The rich, the honorable, the mighty, and the greater part of the aspiring community that wishes to make a fair show in this world, are flowing into it. The framers of the great

Mission plan, with her multitudes of the institutions of her auxiliaries, how full of boasting they are; that they are doing miracles by their means in causing Emperors and Kings with their subjects to bow to them, and that for their labor. God will give them great crowns of glory. But remember, brethren, the time is fast hastening that they shall wonder whose names are not written in the Lamb's Book of Life from the foundation of the world. And our Lord says: 'Many shall come in that day, saying Thou hast taught in our streets and in Thy name we have cast out devils, and in Thy name done many wonderful works,' but He will say, 'I never knew you; depart from me ye workers of iniquity.' Therefore fear them not. With *them*, we fear there is nothing but an anti-Christian spirit and an arm of flesh, but with *you* we trust in the living God, to defend you against the wicked one. Christ has promised to help His Zion right early, and may the Triune God and eternal life sustain you against all the false Missionaryisms, Campbellism, Pede-Baptism, and all the false isms that are afloat in the world; and may He deliver you from the power of the beast—His mark the number of His names and all that worship Him. Dear brethren, pay strict attention to church meetings; do everything decently and in good order; try to bring up your children in the fear of God and beware of false teachers that are perpetually laying every scheme in their power to get money. The Word tells us the hireling fleeth when the wolf cometh, because he is a hireling and careth not for the sheep, therefore no dependence is to be put in him. Behold the difference! The ministers of Jesus Christ, we trust, are willing to attend upon you as much as in them lies, not for filthy lucre's sake, but of a ready mind, because they care for the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers. Dear brethren, let us take the Scriptures for the man of our counsel, and may the great Head of the church give us a perfect understanding in them and save both you and us from all those false religions and traditions of men that are so prevalent in the world.

“Dear brethren, there are alterations made in these texts in the New Testament, and perhaps many more in holy writ. One in Matthew 28: 20; one in Acts 10: 2; and one in 1st Timothy iv. 16, which we think were done by false designing men to answer some purpose for the advancement of anti-Christ's kingdom; therefore, brethren, let us pray that the stone that was cut out of the mountain without hands, which broke in pieces the silver and gold, might roll and fill the whole earth, and that the head

stone may be brought with shouting, crying grace, grace unto it!

“May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all, Amen.       “Wm.

JONES, SR., Moderator.

“Wm. Ogle, Clerk.”

Now let our United Baptist friends of the present day examine these records, resolutions, and the Circular Letter of the United Baptists in the early history of this country, and then let them ask themselves whether they would endorse them. They certainly would not, since the present order of United Baptists are the people, the denomination that are identified and connected with Tract, Temperance and Missionary Societies, Sunday schools, etc. They are the very denomination that has “the best of men waiting, only the money is wanting” to send them to itinerate some home or foreign field, indicated demonstratively by life directors.

Since the split on the Missionary question the Emancipation Baptists, or Friends to Humanity, and the Missionaries, or United Baptists, have merged into one party and to-day are the people that the Old United Baptists warned the brethren to beware of their stratagems; “firmly believing those pretended liberal institutions of the present day to spread the gospel, to be without any license from the word of God,” and fearing “they would only tend to sap the foundation of both our civil and religious liberties.” But can we not find a people, — a denomination, that will indorse those records, resolutions, and the Circular Letter above alluded to? We surely can. The Regular Baptists heartily and cheerfully approbate them; and hence it is evident to every unprejudiced mind that the Regular Baptists are the same people the United Baptists were in the early history of our country. They are yet warning the brethren to beware of the stratagems of the Missionaries, their Boards, Tract, Temperance Societies, etc.

They are warning the brethren, and telling them that those Missionary pretended liberal institutions to spread the gospel, to be without authority from the word of God. They are yet contending that human accomplishments, human inventions in affairs of religion, an unspeakable abomination before God.

In writing the biography of Elder David Badgley, Elder Wm. Jones, among other things, says of him: “About this time (1818) he united with the Baptist Missionaries about one year, but finding, as he believed, that they were not acting according to

the gospel plan and that it was a speculative plan they were on, he forsook them.”

Elder Badgley lived to the year 1824 and continued to oppose the modern Mission system up to his death, still being a member of the old Illinois Association; but of course, he did not witness the division on the subject of Missions, since it occurred after his death.

It comes in place just here to again refer to Elder M. J. Jones’ essay, published in the Baptist Banner, as has already been stated. He says: “This connection completes the succession and identifies Franklin Association with the first organization of associated Baptists in America.”

Surely our historian must be near-sighted, that he has not discovered the broken links in his chain of succession. He certainly knows that the people calling themselves the Baptist Church of Christ Friends to Humanity were a rent-off party from the old Illinois Association. He must also know that three churches out of thirteen rent off from the Bethel Association in 1840, and formed what they called the Bethel Association of United Baptists. He surely has not forgotten that the *same body split again the same year*, the Unity church and a part of Mt. Pleasant going with what was called the Bob Moore party and the Ten Mile Creek church, and the other part of Mt. Pleasant, together with some churches lately gathered, formed the Franklin Association, which has since united with the Friends to Humanity. “Completes the succession,” indeed! Isn’t it passing strange that a man would make and publish to the world such sad misrepresentations, when the records show to the contrary?

I will now give the cause of the dissolution of the Illinois Association:

First, the division in 1809 by the Friends to Humanity, which, of course, weakened that body. Second, by the setting off of so many other Associations, her bounds became quite limited. Third, the rent on the Mission question had a tendency to weaken her, and fourth, since the Germans now have the ascendancy in that portion of the State, the Americans, especially the Baptists, are still receding from that vicinity. This left the Association too weak to keep up their order. The remaining churches joined other bodies. The records were given to the Secretary of Bethel Association for safe keeping. Elder E. T. Webb has the charge of them at present. The pretension on the part of the Missionaries that the change of name from United

to Regular was one cause of the division, is a mere subterfuge. The Illinois Association did not change her name until the year 1859—nearly twenty years after the final separation on the Missionary question. The Regular Baptists have never made the name a bar of fellowship; it is the *faith* and *practice* they contend for. They have assumed and been called by different names at different times and places, but their faith and practice have always characterized them as a people and denomination. The Regular Baptists have ever considered the inventions of men in religious matters an abomination in the sight of God, and when the modern Missionary heresy manifested itself among them, a non-fellowship was declared for those who advocated and went off into it.

### CHAPTER 8.

Elk River Association—Twelfth Item—Abstract of principles— Two hundred and twenty-eight members excluded in 1827— Members leaving County Line church— Jonathan Floyd— Minute of Grand Pier in May 1830—Garrison Fork church— Heavy rent—Extract from W. S. Montgomery’s letter—Extract from Elder Jeremiah Stephens’ letter.

“For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”—Acts. 20: 29, 30.

“And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.”—2nd Peter. 2: 2.

HAVING the minutes of the Elk River Association of Baptists before me, I will here insert the twelfth act of said Association, in session at County Line meeting house, Lincoln County, Tennessee, September, 1828:

“Whereas, sundry ministers formerly belonging to this Association, viz: Wm. Martin, Wm. Keele, John Rushing, Isaac Reed, Hezekiah Lositer and Josiah Conn having withdrawn themselves from the Union in a disorderly manner, and formed themselves into a separate body upon different principles and contrary to the rules of the United Baptists, said ministers having been excluded from the churches to which they formerly belonged, we hereby notify the neighboring Associations in Union with us and the world, that their fellowship with us is dissolved.”

“But,” says one, “the Elk River was a United Baptist Association.” Very true,

but the principles upon which said Association was established surely set forth the characteristic features by which she was known as an Association. The following are the articles of faith of said Association as recorded in the minutes for the year 1825:

**ABSTRACT OF PRINCIPLES.**

“We believe in one only true and living God, and that there is a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and yet there are not three Gods, but one only.

“We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice.

“We believe in the fall of Adam, and that by his transgression all his posterity fell and were made sinners. We believe in the corruption of human nature and the impotency of man to recover himself by his own free-will and ability.

“We believe that sinners are justified in the sight of God only by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them: and that good works are the fruits of faith and follow after justification, and are evidences of our gracious state.

“We believe that the saints shall persevere in grace, and not one of them shall be finally lost.

“We believe that there will be a resurrection of the dead and a general or universal judgment; and that the happiness of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked will be eternal.

“We believe the visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men and women, who have obtained fellowship with each other, and have given themselves to the Lord and one another; having agreed to keep up a godly discipline according to the rules of the gospel.

“We believe that Jesus Christ is the Great Head of the church, and that the government thereof is with the body.

“We believe that water baptism and the Lord’s supper are ordinances of the gospel and to be continued until his second coming.

“We believe that true believers are the only fit subjects of baptism, and that immersion is the only gospel mode.

“We believe none but regularly baptized members have a right to commune at the

Lord's table.

“We believe that the Lord's Day ought to be observed and set apart for the worship of God, and that no work of worldly business ought to be transacted thereon; works of piety, mercy and necessity only excepted.”

From the foregoing articles we see that although the Elk River went by the appellation United Baptists, yet the principles upon which she was known as an Association, are in harmony with, and even the principles that characterize the Regular Baptists to-day as a denomination. Hence, it is evident that those who “withdrew in a disorderly manner and formed themselves into a separate body upon *different* principles,” cannot be the genuine Baptists. Not only were the six ministers above alluded to excluded from the churches composing Elk River Association, but by examining the minutes of the said churches I find that during the year 1827, two hundred and twenty-four persons were excluded.

Sister Priscilla Fulkerson, who is now living in Pope County, Illinois, and who is a member of Grand Pier church, was present at the split which took place in one of the churches composing Elk River Association. She says that a preacher, one day at meeting, arose from his seat and said: “Who will follow me and the Bible?” When quite a number arose and followed him, leaving the church house in a disorderly manner.

By examination of the minutes of said church (County Line) I see that twenty-five members were excluded.

Brother Jonathan Floyd, Sister Fulkerson's father, was a member of County Line church, and after the division there moved to Pope County, Illinois, and in March, 1829, joined Grand Pier church by letter. The following May he was chosen deacon of said church and faithfully performed the duties of said office for a number of years. He was also appointed Clerk and faithfully served for a period of twenty-one years. He departed this life August 20th, 1855.

By reference to the church book of Grand Pier, the following among other things may be seen: “Met in church conference Saturday before the third Lord's Day in May 1830, &c. Then came forward Brother Edward Patterson and Sister Sally Patterson, his wife, who were formerly members of the Garrison Fork Church, Bedford County, Tennessee, and related that when the most of that church denied

the general Union of the Baptists, they went with them. They now desire to throw themselves back into the Union again, and from their acknowledgment to us, we therefore receive them into full fellowship again with us,” &c. The said Garrison Fork church belonged to the Elk River Association, and, in 1826, numbered two hundred and thirteen members; in 1827, twenty-two, and in 1828, only twelve.

The above is taken from the minutes of Elk River Association, which shows a heavy rent in said Garrison Fork church—leaving only twelve out of two hundred and thirteen.

It will be seen that Brother Patterson’s statement, when he says most of that church denied the general Union of the Baptists, is in harmony with the tabular statistics as above given. It will be seen, too, that he *went off with* them. But upon due acknowledgement, he and wife were received back into full fellowship with the Regular Baptists. Brother Floyd did not go off with the party that denied the general Baptist Union, but remained firm upon the principles of the Elk River Association. Shortly after the division there, he took his letter from County Line church, moved to Illinois and put his letter in at Grand Pier church *prior* to the split in Southern Illinois. This church (as has previously been stated) was constituted a *Regular Baptist* church in October, 1827.

Brother Patterson *did* go off with the party that denied the general Union of Baptists and set up on “different principles,” hence he did *not* remain firm upon the principles of the Elk River Association. While in this rent-off condition, he also moved to Illinois, and in May, 1830, —prior to the split in Southern Illinois—presented himself to the same Grand Pier church for membership, and by acknowledging his error and desiring to come back, he was received with full fellowship.

The following is an extract from a letter written by Brother Wm. S. Montgomery, of Social Circle, Georgia. In writing to Brother T. J. Carr upon the subject of the split, he says: “It is astonishing how we have been treated by the Missionaries in this country. Before the division those calling themselves Baptists, introduced Sunday schools, Missionary Societies and all other societies that ingenuity and money could invent, clearly unauthorized by the word of God. We reasoned, expostulated and begged them to be content with the scriptures, but they preached Arminianism, free

agency, means and instrumentality to make them harmonize with their societies and not with the word of God, and when it became impossible to live in union and fellowship any longer with them, we were obliged to pass resolutions of non-fellowship for them and all its followers. We were called ‘Hard Shells,’ ‘Antinomians,’ ‘Bigoted,’ ‘ Ironsides;’ were taunted and ridiculed, made the jest and gibe of the Missionaries, and told that we would all be dead in so many years. Many said they expected to preach our funeral. Now they have the hardihood to try to steal our name and impose on the credulity of the simple by calling us the ‘split-off.’”

The following is also an extract from a letter written by Elder Jeremiah Stephens, of Chapel Hill, Tennessee. In writing to Brother Carr upon the subject of the division, he says: “It was known and acknowledged by all, from the time of the division until recently, that the Missionaries left the Old Baptists. Everybody knows that to be the fact, themselves claiming to be the New School, or Missionary Baptists. In fact, it seemed to insult them to call them Old Baptists, as they looked upon those old and far behind time folks to be unpopular with the world. But now having learned that everybody knows that they are a new order of Baptists, and seeing that we, the old primitive order, are regarded by everybody who knows the facts in the case as being the Baptists proper, they now want to take from us our name.

I am in my sixty-second year of my age, and I know, as every other person knows who was living and knew anything about the division, that the Missionaries seceded from us, and only such as have no personal knowledge of the fact can be imposed on by these designing men lying in wait to deceive.

Much additional testimony could be introduced in confirmation of the priority of the Regular Baptists, but sufficient has already been given to prove to the unprejudiced reader and honest enquirer after truth, that the Regular Baptists are the legal descendants from the Apostles. In conclusion I would remark that if one is not disposed to believe what has already been written, he would not believe “though one rose from the dead.”

*O, dear friends, its time you'd look  
For the truth in some good book,  
On which you might still rely,  
If at once you were call'd to die.*

## APPENDIX.

At the urgent request of the author of the foregoing work, I have reluctantly consented to append a short essay thereto. But for the kind regards I entertain for the aged father, whose silvery locks are blossoming, as it were, for the tomb, I should shrink from the attempt; for I feel my utter inability and inadequacy to prepare an article for the public gaze—an article that would be at all interesting and instructive. In venturing this essay, I shall address myself particularly to that “afflicted and poor people,” and to those of them who are wandering in the “streets of Babylon.”

Although his education is very limited, yet my intimate acquaintance with him has proved to me that Elder Coffey possesses a more than ordinary natural talent. He is kind, gentle in his manners, of sound and superior judgment, well posted in the Holy Scriptures, always ready to give instructions, honest in all his dealings, stands high as a citizen, noted for his piety, sound in doctrine, firm in the faith, and, in short, he possesses those noble traits of character which make up the man of God.

Having carefully examined his manuscript pages, I feel satisfied that his little volume merits the approval and will meet with a hearty welcome and kind approbation from every Old Baptist and from every person who sincerely desires to know the truth concerning the division of the Baptists. Elder Coffey is perhaps the only man living that was present and took part in all the debates and discussions upon the subject which led to the separation of the Baptists in Southern Illinois. His personal and familiar knowledge of the split, linked together with records and history bearing upon this subject, cannot fail to make the foregoing history a strong and valuable work.

Although it was the design of Elder Coffey to give only a brief history of the Baptists in Southern Illinois, yet it was quite necessary that he should go back to the ancient Baptists and examine their articles of faith and their practice, in order to see whether the Regular Baptists of to-day are of the same stamp. Their abstract of principles, it will be seen, harmonize with those of the Regular, or Primitive Baptists at the present time; and in order that the reader may see and know as to the correctness of the above statement I will here insert the articles of faith upon which they stand to-day:

## **ABSTRACT OF PRINCIPLES.**

“We believe in one only true and living God; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

“We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice.

“We believe in the doctrine of original sin.

“We believe in the doctrine of election, and that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world.

“We believe in man’s impotency to recover himself from the fallen state he is in by nature, by his own free will and ability.

“We believe that sinners are justified in the sight of God only by the imputed righteousness of Christ.

“We believe that God’s elect shall be called, converted, regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Ghost.

“We believe the saints shall persevere in grace and never fall finally away.

“We believe that Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are ordinances of Jesus Christ, and that true believers are subjects and that the true mode of Baptism is by immersion.

“We believe in the resurrection of the dead and general judgment.

“We believe that the punishment of the wicked and the joys of the righteous will be eternal.

“We believe that no ministers have a right to the administration of the ordinances, only such as are regularly baptized, called, and come under the imposition of hands by the Presbytry.

Thus are set forth the articles of their faith, the characteristic features by which they are known as a denomination. And by comparing them with those of the ancient Baptists, it will be seen that there is a perfect harmony; that both declare and beautifully accord in setting forth the same great truths, several of which I wish to give a passing notice. So firm in the belief were the Baptists anciently that the Old and New Testaments were the “only rule of faith and practice,” they declared the inventions of men in affairs of religion an unspeakable abomination before God. The Regular Baptists stand firm upon these principles even to-day; and because they

will not engage with the isms of the present day, they are ridiculed, scoffed at, charged with being opposed to the spread of the gospel, but “none of these things move” them. They are so firm in the faith that these human inventions proceed from anti-Christ and produce distress, that they will not engage, believing, as their ancient brethren, that “the genuine spirit of religion will be preserved by those only who dissent from all establishments devised by human policy.”

The doctrine of election and that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world, seems to have been, and is still, an important item among the Primitive Baptists and was so understood and promulgated by them even in the Apostles’ day. Peter says, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God,” &c., and Paul says, “Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son,” &c. And again he says: “According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love” and yet some of the Missionaries tell us that the doctrine of election and predestination is not the truth, while others go so far as to say that it has lined hell with thousands.

But again. Not only do the Primitive Baptists believe in the doctrine of election and that God chose His people in Christ before the foundation of the world, but they believe the “elect shall be called, converted, regenerated and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.” This doctrine seems to have characterized them as a people even to the days of the Apostles. Abundance of Scripture might be brought to bear in confirmation of the above abstract of principles did space admit, but to enter into a thorough discussion would extend this essay to a greater length than I had anticipated; hence, I will only introduce a few of the many Scriptures bearing upon this point. Peter says, the promise is “even to as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Acts 2: 39. “Moreover, whom he did predestinate them he also called, and whom He called them He also justified,” &c. Rom. viii. 30. Jude says, “preserved in Jesus Christ and called,” and David says, “they are preserved forever.” Well, who are they? “Thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins.” “His people” were given to Christ in the covenant of redemption. “Thine they were and thou gavest them me.” There is no danger that any will be left behind, for “all that the Father giveth me shall come to me.” “All shall know me from the least to the

greatest.” Hebrews 8: 11. How will they know him? “As thou hast given Him power over all flesh that He should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given Him.” John 17: 2. How is it done? “No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and no man knoweth the Son save the Father, and He to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.” And Peter would say, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit UNTO obedience,” &c. Hence, we see that they are made acquainted with their heirship by revelation and sanctified (set apart) by the Spirit unto obedience.

It was not my design to discuss the articles of faith of the Regular Baptists, but they were introduced in order that the reader might see how well they harmonize with those of the Primitive Baptists as given by Elder Coffey in his little work.

Be it remembered that those as above given are the abstract of principles upon which the Baptists stood prior to the division upon the Missionary question, and when there was only “one sort of Baptists.” But as there are now “two bodies of Baptists in Southern Illinois and both claiming Apostolic succession,” it does seem to me that the body that is standing upon the same platform and advocating the same doctrine and practice maintained by them before the separation, surely must be the legal successors—that is, if the Baptists were in that succession previous to the split, and both parties admit that they were.

In order that the reader may see the articles of faith upon which the present order of United, or Missionary, Baptists are founded—the principles which should characterize them as a denomination—they are here inserted, and are as follows:

“We believe that the Holy Bible is the written word of God; written by men divinely inspired, and is the only sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practice, and that it teaches the following truths:

“That there is but only one true and living God, infinite in every perfection, and that He has revealed Himself as the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit.

“That man was created and pronounced very good by His maker, but by willfully violating His law he fell from that state, and that by nature there is no good in us, we are all inclined to do evil, and as all have sinned all are the children of wrath—justly exposed to death.

“That the only way of deliverance from this state of guilt and condemnation is

through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, who assumed our nature, sin excepted, and whom God sent to be a propitiation through faith in His blood; having so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

“That the election taught in the Scriptures is through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, and that none are authorized to consider themselves elected until they repent and obey the gospel.

“That the Redeemer, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man; that He is the Savior of all men, especially those that believe, and that based on the provisions of the atonement all men everywhere are commanded to repent and obey the gospel.

“That the influence of the Spirit is co-extensive with the proclamation of the gospel.

“We believe that the saints will persevere through grace to the end, being so inseparably united to Christ, their head, that none are able to separate them from His love, or pluck them out of His hands.

“Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are ordinances given by Christ to the church. Baptism is immersion in water, and believers the only subjects, and that baptism is prerequisite to the communion.

“We believe that according to the New Testament, the first day of the week, or Sunday, should be religiously observed as the Lord’s Day or Christian Sabbath.

“There will be a general resurrection and final judgment, and the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”

Elder Coffey has fully shown, both by records and his own personal knowledge, the United, or Missionary, Baptists to be the split-off party; and from the articles of faith, as above given, it is clearly seen that they are “set up” on abstracts of principles differing materially from the original ones, and yet they claim to be the legal successors to and descendants from the Waldenses and even the church of Christ! It will be seen that their fifth article touches upon the doctrine of election; that it is “through sanctification of the spirit unto obedience;” but then “none are authorized to consider themselves elected until they repent and OBEY the gospel.” Then one would suppose that after a person has *repented* and *been obedient*, he is then set apart by the Spirit *unto obedience!*

An illustration just here in regard to election. It takes two parties to constitute an election, the elector and the elected. Under our form of government, the people, being sovereign, are the elector, and the person or persons chosen, the elected. When the last ballot is cast for the President of the United States, for instance he *is then* elected, but since he has no *knowledge* of the fact at that time, has no right “to consider himself elected,” but when the “returns” make it manifest to him, he then can “consider” himself elected, and, being set apart by the people *unto* obedience, it is his obligatory duty to obey the laws. But if he is not “authorized to consider himself elected *until he obeys*,” then he cannot “consider” himself elected until the end of his term of office. Behold the absurdity of such a position!

The government of God is a theocracy. He, of course, is sovereign, and therefore the elector, and His chosen ones the elected. Paul says they were chosen of God in Christ *before the foundation of the world*. Eph. i. Peter says, “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the spirit *unto* obedience.” From the above scriptures, we find that the election took place before the foundation of the world, and that the elect are set apart by the spirit *unto* obedience. All the elect do not yet know that they have been chosen, neither should one consider himself elected until it is made manifest by the Spirit; it is then his duty to be obedient. The difference between the United Baptists and the Regular Baptists upon this point, is that the United Baptists hold that God elects a person because he has been obedient, while the Regular Baptists believe that a person should be obedient because he has been elected. From the foregoing we see “that the election taught in the Scriptures,” is in harmony with the teachings of the Regular Baptists, while “the election taught” by the United Baptists is not in keeping with the word of God.

But again. Their seventh article reads: “That the influence of the Spirit is co-extensive with the proclamation of the gospel.”

The United Baptists hold that the gospel is for the purpose of awakening the dead sinner; that the preacher is the instrument in the hands of God for the purpose of offering salvation to the “perishing world,” and, that their salvation depends upon their act—that of accepting the terms offered. Should they repent and obey the gospel God will save them; should they refuse the “overtures of mercy,” God will

damn them. Dr. Webster says that co-extensive means equal in, or to the same extent. Now if the “influence of the Spirit” is only to the same extent, it follows that where the gospel does not go the influence of the Spirit does not go, and, hence, the Spirit is confined to the narrow-limited extent of the gospel. To think that “many souls are perishing for want of the gospel,” (See minutes Big Saline Association of United Baptists for the year 1861; also Baptist Circular published from St. Louis;) and they cannot be saved without it; for the influence of His Spirit is confined to the extent of the gospel. It renders the salvation of a “perishing world” quite precarious. And then when we add, “The best of men stand waiting, only the money is wanting,” to enable the “Board” to send the gospel—to enable the Spirit of God to reach the “perishing,” it surely places them in a doubly uncertain state. But suppose we should say that God will so influence the hearts of the people that they will give of their means to enable the Society to extend this “great work in behalf of the perishing.” But when we think the “influence of the Spirit is only co-extensive with the proclamation,” we see at once the Spirit cannot reach their hearts. The gospel must go before the Spirit can influence the people to throw in their mite; and the gospel cannot go until the mite is thrown in. But some of the United Baptists in Southern Illinois say they are not Missionaries, and they go so far as to say these Missionary preachers are ministers of the devil transformed into angels of light; and that their Missionary societies are the gates of hell; but Elder Duncan, their champion historian, says the United Baptists of one State are the same as the Missionary Baptists of another. They know this is the truth; they know they are all but one denomination, and hold the annual Associations together; and have a network of correspondence to their sister Associations. Notwithstanding this, the Big Saline Association of United Baptists seem to oppose these Missionary operations and strenuously contend that they are not Missionaries. But let’s turn to the minutes of their eighth annual session, held with the New Liberty church, Pope County, Illinois, on the 30th and 31st of August, and the 1st and 2d of September, 1861, and the following may be seen :

“WHEREAS, This Association is fully convinced of the importance of contributing and transferring on our minutes, the following, to wit: ‘Whereas, a great destitution is found in the bounds of this Association and many souls are perishing for the want of the gospel, therefore,

“ *Resolved*, That we recommend our ministers to devote as much of their time as possible in cultivating the gospel field in our bounds; note the number of sermons preached and exhortations delivered, the number of miles traveled, the number of families visited for religious instructions, the number of conversions and baptisms witnessed, also, the number of churches constituted and the amount of contributions received, and report at our next annual meeting, and further,

“ *Resolved*, That we recommend our churches to sustain their pastors and ministers in this glorious enterprise.’

“ *Resolved*, That we request the churches composing this Association to report in their letters to our next meeting, the amount contributed to the support of their pastors.”

Now compare the above preambles and resolutions with quotation from Baptist Circular given by Elder Coffey in the foregoing work and you cannot fail to see the close relationship they bear to each other.

Again. The influence of the Spirit coextensive with the proclamation of the gospel. Then what is to become of the infant? The gospel cannot reach them. “Oh! but infants are born pure and holy, and are not sinners,” says one. But it should be recollected that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners. Then if the infant is not a sinner, it has no Savior. If they are not under the law until they commit actual transgression, they have no Redeemer; for Christ was made of a woman, made under the law to redeem them that were under the law.

Since the Spirit cannot reach them, and they have no Savior nor Redeemer, are not infants in a condition not at all desirable? Then is it not rather strange that the United Baptists would charge the Regular Baptists with advocating a doctrine that involves infant damnation, when the doctrine that they themselves preach not only involves infant damnation, but the damnation of the race of man?

But again. The preacher is sometimes by way of illustration compared to a pen in the hands of God, for the purpose of awakening the dead sinner; the ink to the Holy Spirit and the paper to the sinner’s heart. Well, the best of pens stand waiting, only the money is wanting to enable God to “take up His pen.” Let’s suppose that the Society gets up a festival with twenty-five cents admission; perhaps by this religious social gathering, sufficient funds may be obtained to enable the life directors to start

one at least, and being so eager for the salvation of the perishing world, God immediately dips His pen into the ink and prepares for the business, but just as He begins to write the paper jerks back and says, “You shan’t write on me.”

What a God! What a system! Such a God as this may do for Arminians to worship, and such a system may do for them to preach, but the God of the Bible, even the God whom the Regular Baptists worship “inhabiteth eternity.” (Isaiah. 57: 15.) His “hand is not shortened that He cannot save.” (Isaiah 59: 1) “and He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth and none can stay His hand or say unto Him, what doest thou? (Daniel. 4: 35.) He opens and none can shut; shuts and none can open. He worketh all things after the counsel of His own will, saying, my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure. So infinitely great is He that David would say, “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high; I cannot attain unto it. Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?” David, not having a Missionary Baptist to tell him to step aside from the proclamation of the gospel, knew no better than to say: “If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me and Thy right hand shall hold me.”

The system taught in the Bible in regard to salvation, is that Jesus came into the world to save sinners, that He accomplished the work He came to do, and that it was done by the sacrifice of Himself. By the shedding of His blood, He canceled the sins of His people, to wit: Israel—the elect—the church, which people by transgression fell under the condemnatory sentence of God’s law—became dead in trespasses and sins, having neither the will nor power to redeem themselves; and since it was necessary that it should be done, Jesus, obedient to the Father’s will, steps in their law room and stead, and was made a curse for them. Hear God, by the mouth of His prophet Isaiah say, “He was wounded for our transgression, He was bruised for our iniquities.” And again: “For the transgression of my people was He stricken.” “Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief.” And again: “By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities.” How and when “shall he bear their iniquities?” “Who His *own self* bare *our sins* in His own body, on the tree.” (1st Peter 2: 24.)

And Paul says, “When He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.” (Hebrews. 1: 3.) Notwithstanding Jesus bore the sins of His people in His own body when nailed to the cross of rugged Calvary, yet they all do not know it, but remain in their dead state, until He shines by His Spirit’s power into the heart of the poor lost sinner, thus quickening him, thus opening his blinded eyes, thus unstopping the deaf ear. Nor does He consult the sinner as to whether he desires to be saved. Neither does the sinner jerk back and say you shall not write on me; for God says, “I *will* put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts, and I *will* be to them a God, and *they shall* be to me a people. And *they shall not* teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord; for *all shall* know me from the least to the greatest, for *I will* be merciful to their *unrighteousness* and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” (Hebrews. 8: 10, 11, 12.) And again the Lord says: “Will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people.” (Jeremiah. 31: 1.) And again, “*Surely* they are my people, children that will not lie; so He was their Savior. In all their afflictions He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them; in His love and in His pity He redeemed them; and He bare them and carried them all the days of old.” (Isiah. 63: 8, 9.) “Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee.” (Jeremiah. 31: 2.) “Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end.” (Isiah. 45: 17.)

How many does Israel—the elect—the church—embrace? All that have been redeemed to God by Christ’s blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. (Revelation. 5: 9.) As to their numerical strength it embraces “a great multitude, which *no man* could number.” (Revelation. 12: 9.) Here the field opens to such an extent that it would require considerable space to bring to bear all the testimony touching upon this point. I could also go on to show from scripture testimony, a people that were not embraced in the eternal love of God Almighty; a people against whom He hath indignation forever, (Malachi. 1: 4;) a people that cannot cease from sin, (2 Pet. ii. 14;) a people that “shall utterly perish in their own corruption,” (2nd Peter. 2: 12;) a people “to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever, (Jude 1: 13;) a people that shall do wickedly and shall not

understand, (Daniel. 12: 10.) But I must now leave this part of the subject and proceed at once to give the Bible testimony in regard to the use of the gospel and duties of the preacher.

Paul says, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” (2nd Timothy. 3: 16, 17.) This is plain, positive testimony. Then if *all* Scripture is for the purpose of thoroughly furnishing the *man of God* unto all good works, where is any of it given for any other purpose? Nowhere. Then why should one search the Bible to find a Scripture to overthrow Paul’s testimony? He would not have written thus to Timothy had it not been the truth. Paul, in writing to the Romans, says: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” (Rom. i. 16.) Some contend that this scripture is applicable to the unbeliever. One or two things is true of this. Either the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, or else it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that does not believe it. Well, which is it? Paul says, to every one that *believeth*. Jesus says, “He that *believeth* on me hath everlasting life.” (John 6: 47.) And again: “He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed* from death unto life.” (John 5: 24.) Hence “every one that believeth,” *is passed* from death unto life, and, as a matter of course, is a “a man of God,” and the Scripture is for the purpose of thoroughly furnishing him unto all good works. Here then is a perfect harmony seen between the two quotations from Paul. But how can the gospel be the power of God *unto* salvation to one who is saved already? Timothy was one of the “saved already” when Paul was writing to him, yet he says, “Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.” (1st Timothy. 4: 16.) This cannot have reference to eternal salvation from two considerations; first, Timothy was at that time a young preacher of the gospel; second, if he was to save *himself* and *them* that heard him, there would have been no necessity for Jesus Christ, since Timothy, in this case would not only be his *own* savior, but the savior of *them that heard him*, be they many or few.

Paul tells how Timothy and himself were saved; that is how their eternal salvation

was accomplished: “Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.” (2nd Timothy. 1: 9.)

From the above quotation we see His eternal salvation did not depend upon, nor was it “according to our works.” But the salvation that Paul was writing to Timothy concerning, did depend upon “in doing this.”

Paul, in giving his charge to the elders at Ephesus, says: “*Take heed* therefore unto *yourselves* and to all the flock,” &c.: “For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.” (Acts xx, 28, 29, 30.) And again, “That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.” (Eph. iv. 14.) “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies,” &c.; “And many shall follow their pernicious ways.” (2nd Peter 2: 1, 2.)

By Timothy taking “heed” to himself and to the *doctrine* he saved himself and them that heard him (the flock) from “grievous wolves;” saved from being drawn away by men speaking “perverse things;” saved from being “carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the *sleight* of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;” saved from those “damnable heresies” privily brought in by false teachers; saved from following “their pernicious ways,” in short, they were saved from every false way.

Now to the duties of the preacher. The people that were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, to wit, the church, by transgression fell under the “law of sin and death”—became dead in trespasses and sins; and although Christ gave himself for us, (Ephesians. 5: 25) purchased the church with his own blood, (Acts 20: 28) put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, (Hebrews. 9: 26; 10: 12, 14) and by so doing He obtained eternal redemption for them, (Hebrews. 9:12) yet many have not been made acquainted with their heirship. They remain in a dead state until quickened by the voice, the Spirit, the power of God Almighty. (John 5: 25.) When quickened, one is then a subject of gospel address; having had the blinded eyes

opened and the deaf ear unstopped. Now hear the great God say: “I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding.” (Jeremiah. 3: 15.) “And He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers;” and what for? “For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” How long, Paul? “Till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.”

Paul tells the elders of the church at Ephesus to “Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with His own blood.” (Acts 20: 28.)

Peter says, “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind;” &c. (1st Peter. 5: 1, 2.)

Not only is it the duty of the ministry to “feed the flock of God,” but it is also their duty to hunt up the sheep (not to make sheep.) Now hear the great God by the mouth of the prophet, say, “My people hath been lost sheep.” (Jeremiah. 1: 6.) And again: “Israel is a scattered sheep.” (Jeremiah. 1: 17.) Well, what is to be done with them? “As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day.” (Ezekiel. 34: 12.) How accomplished? “Behold I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and after will I send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks.” (Jeremiah. 16: 16.)

“And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea, for they were fishers. And He saith unto them, Follow me and I will make you fishers of men.” (Mathew. 4: 18, 19.) When Jesus had gathered up twelve (fishers and hunters) He sent them forth and

commanded them to go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (Mathew. 10.) They were sent at that time under certain restrictions; but after His resurrection, Jesus appeared unto the eleven and spake unto them, saying, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations,” &c. Not only to the Jews but to all nations. Teach them with knowledge and understanding. “I lay down my life for the sheep. And *other sheep* I have which are not of this fold; them also must I bring and they *shall hear my voice*; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.” (John 10: 15, 16.) Now turn to Revelations and see what John, who was permitted to see them after the resurrection, says: “After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands.” &c. (Revelation. 7: 9.) “These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” (Revelation. 7: 14.) “And he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them.” (Revelation. 7: 15.)

Not only had they been taught with “knowledge and understanding;” not only had they been edified till they all came “in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,” but John saw them triumphantly landed over Jordon’s stormy billows and eternally gathered into heaven’s celestial fold with Jesus, their Great Shepherd, dwelling among them, where “they shall hunger no more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.”

But again: When the eleven were commanded to preach to or teach “all nations,” Peter could not as yet understand that it was lawful for “a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation,” and while in a trance the Lord told him to rise, kill and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God *hath cleansed*, that call thou not common. Now Peter, get down and go, nothing doubting. Did Peter say Lord, I stand waiting, only the money is wanting? Nothing of the kind is on record; but he says, “came I unto you without gainsaying, as soon

as I was sent for.” But was the gospel to be preached to Cornelius, by Peter, for the purpose of awakening him? Verily no; for Cornelius was “a devout man and one that feared God with all His house.” (Acts 10: 2.) This being true, he desired “to hear words” of Peter. Being “born again,” was, of course, a “man of God,” and could hear God’s words. (John 8: 47.) Cornelius did not understand the plan of salvation. Peter being a teacher “according to mine heart,” was sent of God to feed Cornelius “with knowledge and understanding” and he said, “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons. But in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him.” (John 8: 34, 35.) And since Cornelius “feared” God, Peter fed him with the *knowledge* of his acceptance with God.

Since God Almighty hath exalted Jesus Christ “with His right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.” (Acts 5: 31.) Jesus said unto the eleven “That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” (Luke 24: 47.) Peter said to Cornelius, “And He commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. To Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive the remission of sins.” (Acts 10: 42, 43.) From the last three quotations we learn that Jesus hath been exalted to *give repentance* to Israel; to give the forgiveness of sins; that repentance and *remission of sins* should be *preached* in His name among all nations, and that Peter is preaching to Cornelius “that through His name whosoever believeth in Him, shall RECEIVE the remission of sins. Although Cornelius was one of the “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God,” “chosen of God in Christ before the foundation of the world;” although Jesus had put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, whose blood was so precious that it “cleanseth from all sin,” yet Cornelius had not been cognizant of the fact. After divine, or eternal life had been imparted to him, God sent Peter to preach to him, and since he was ready “to hear all things that are commanded thee of God;” (Acts 10: 33) and since he was commanded to preach remission sins in the name of Jesus, Peter tells Cornelius, “whosoever believeth in Him shall receive the remission of sins,” and Cornelius being quickened, a man of God, and of course a believer, certainly received the “knowledge” of the remission of sins.

Having extended the discussion of this subject as far as space will admit of, I close by saying to the ministering brethren, “preach the word;” earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; feed the church of God, over the which He hath made you overseers; feed them with knowledge and understanding.

*“Feed every little Lamb,  
And of the flock take care.”*

Speak comfortably to Jerusalem, cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord’s hands double for all her sins. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

Although my little experience, if any at all, has heretofore been published, would it be presuming too much to give a short sketch of the same together with my reasons for joining the Regular Baptists? If not, I will under the embarrassing circumstances attempt it.

I was raised up under the influence of the popular religion of the day—principally Campbellism. While sitting under the sound of their preaching, I would sometimes tremble and quake, but so soon as services were over, this trembling would subside. I would often resolve to join them, but one thing was always in the way. I was really afraid that I could not go to meeting a sinner, join the church, be baptized and return home the same day full of “joys unspeakable;” yet it was my intention ultimately to join the “Christian” church. This caused me serious reflections at times. When about the age of twenty, my reflections became more and more serious; and now I felt indeed to be a sinner in the sight of God, yet I tried to smother these thoughts.

A protracted meeting was being held some two or three miles distant, which some of my young associates were attending, and seemed to be deeply concerned, but rather than go I went to the Bay Creek bottom to work. While there I had very serious thoughts, and it occurred to my mind that my friends were professing religion and leaving me behind and by myself.

Whether these thoughts were from a proper, or otherwise, source, I know not, but to this day have my doubts as to whether they were evidences of conviction. On

going home, I met one of my brothers, who seemed deeply concerned in matters of religion. We slept together at night. Sometime after we had retired, I heard him praying the Lord for mercy, when it appeared to me that I was in the presence of an angry and sin-avenging God, who was ready to pour out His wrath upon me. If not mistaken, I felt "guilty before God." The next day I went to meeting with sad feelings. After preaching, an invitation was given to mourners to go to the "anxious seat," but since none went, the preacher said: "Farewell; if you will go to hell, good bye." I left the meeting with a hard heart. The next day I attended meeting at another place; and on my arrival it appeared that everyone looked upon me with scorn and contempt; that I was friendless and forsaken. I took a seat to myself, and such were my feelings that my eyes were filled with tears. My pitiful, awkward prayer, which I attempted to utter, seemed to be solemn mockery. After preaching, mourners were called for and some ten or fifteen went forward, but feeling too mean I did not, preferring rather to be to myself. Since others were going to the "anxious seat" and professing, I finally resolved to go to the mourner's bench, when one would come along and tell me to do this and another do that, &c., but in one thing they all centered. It was this: That I must exercise faith; that just so soon as I would believe, God would come immediately and relieve me; for He was ready, willing and waiting to save me. Of course, I tried to do everything they told me, thinking they knew what to tell me to do. But for the life of me, I could not exercise sufficient faith to believe that God would come instantly.

One day the preacher said to the mourners that so long as they did not exercise faith they were making solemn mockery. Thinking he knew, I strained every power within me, for I really did not wish to make a mock of God Almighty, but it was no go. I could not "exercise" from the fact that I didn't have it. But they told me to ask God to give me faith. Suppose I did. I certainly asked without it, and "without faith it is impossible to please God." Hence, I could not please God, and He, therefore, could not grant me faith. The Bible says that our faith is born of God. (See 1st John 5: 4.) Jesus says this is the work of God that ye believe on Him, &c. (See John 6: 29) and God deals it to every man according to the measure of faith. (See Romans. 12: 3.) Now when God gives faith, one believes and to the extent of the "measure" he can "exercise," and no more. But our preachers were silent on these Scriptures

and required faith at our hands,—a matter impossible with me at least. Time passed on and while others were making professions, I was growing worse; and sought solitude, where everything in nature seemed garbed in loneliness and where the frowns of an angry God appeared to be upon me. I finally concluded to go back to meeting and get down upon the ground as low as possible with the thought that God might, perhaps, take pity on me. While there my pitiful mockery of a prayer was hushed; I forgot that I was a “mourner,” (*if* one at all) and was listening to the most beautiful singing I thought ever uttered by mortal tongue. On my way home, a spark of hope seemed to manifest itself. At night about 12 o’clock my burden was gone, and those who had apparently been my enemies, now seemed to be my best friends and I desired very much to meet them. Next morning, I was calm and quiet, but said nothing to any one in regard to my state of feelings. On meeting me some would say that they could plainly discover a change upon my countenance, and that I might just as well acknowledge. I told them not to try to make me think I had met with a change. I was in this calm state for about a half day, when it appeared to me that I was deceived. Oh! imagine my feelings. Deceived! I thought I was ruined. I was in this deplorable condition for about a half day, when I sometimes hope the Lord “journeyed that way and poured in the oil, causing me to rejoice with joys unspeakable. On looking back to said time I now often exclaim, Oh, if I had had one of God’s pastors to have taught me with “knowledge and understanding”—for I was truly ignorant—it would have been a great blessing and untold benefit to me, and would have saved me from error and the false way that I very soon got into. But being deprived of this and knowing no better, I attached myself to the Missionary Baptists, or like the prodigal son, joined myself to a citizen, where I fain would have eaten the husks, but nothing palatable was given. Since I could not grow in grace as the others seemed by their actions to be doing, doubts and fears arose as to whether I had ever been born again. Hesitatingly I would speak of this (from fear they would become offended at me) when they would tell me that I must not doubt.

Time passed on, and being so filled with doubts and fears, I had almost come to the conclusion that I was deceived, but at an unexpected time it seemed that Jesus Christ appeared so close to me that I could almost reach Him with my hand, and shed His love abroad in my heart till it was full; till it run over with unspeakable joy

and happiness. I thought it is enough; I'll doubt no more; —but alas! it was soon whispered to me that this was all delusion. This may be true, but when my little hope seems almost gone, I look back to this circumstance and “take courage.”

After some length of time I purchased and moved to a small farm, which was near an Old Baptist church. I attended meeting, and the first food I ever received fell from the lips of an Old Baptist minister. He could tell me about my travels, my little hope, my little feelings, doubts and fears, &c. Yet I did not believe the Old Baptist to be the Church of Christ. I was not prepared to believe it; but still continued to attend my own meetings, where all was wrangle and jangle. One would preach this was the plan; another, that, &c., and hence I would go away without being edified, and when hungry would necessarily have to attend the Old Baptist meetings, that I might feast upon the scattering blades that might fall near me.

There was a marked difference between the doctrines advanced by the Missionary Baptists and the doctrine advocated by the Regular Baptists. While the former set forth many plans of salvation and that the work of saving sinners was yet to be done, the latter preached only one plan, and that the work had already been done. Although this was new to me (for the key of knowledge had been taken away from me by false teachers) yet for several years I paid particular attention to it and read the Bible, making this resolve: that should I become convinced that the Regular Baptist is the church of Christ, I would offer myself to them. It was soon evident that I was unavoidably falling in love with them, and hence I tried to resolve not to go to hear them preach anymore; but I would go, and finally became a regular attendant at their monthly meetings where I was fed with knowledge and understanding until I became thoroughly convinced; but could not carry my resolution into effect, from the fact that I felt too unworthy and sinful to offer myself. Yet I dearly loved them. Finally, I became so distressed that I could see no peace of mind. After laboring under this sad circumstance for some time, I concluded to drag out a miserable life alone; for I would rather die it seemed than bring a reproach upon the church. But very soon, I went before the church, told them my little experience, and was received. Thus I bade adieu to the “gallant ship;” a lasting farewell to the “galley with oars,” (Isaiah. 32: 21) and joined that “poor and afflicted people,” whose trust is in the Lord, and, although I still felt unworthy, yet my tempest-tossed and troubled mind was stilled,

and there was a great calm, which remained with me until about two weeks previous to the day appointed for baptism, when I began to fear I was mistaken, and hence not a proper subject for baptism. The nearer the time approached the heavier my burden became; and when the time had fully come I barely could muster up courage to submit. With fear and trembling I took my carpet-sack and started for the water's side. On my arrival, I met the gaze of upwards of thirteen hundred spectators, who seemed anxious to witness the scene. Oh! that Elder Fulkerson could have taken me to some dense ravine, and baptized me, but how could I bear to face this large concourse of people! Since there were eighteen of us to be baptized, Elder F. seemed more than pleased at the idea of being the administrator, nor did he appear to have the least sympathy for my distressed condition. When about ready to go into the water, my troubles seemed to leave me, and although unworthy yet willingly I submitted.

In conclusion I would say that I have seen more enjoyment what little time I have been among that peculiar people, the Regular Baptists, than I realized during the whole of the thirteen years I was identified with the Missionary Baptists. I close with the following lines which I have composed. They are not, however, inserted for criticism:

*And did my Savior shed his blood  
On rugged Calvary?  
And did he suffer, bleed and die,  
And bear my sins for me?*

*Behold Him nailed up to the tree;  
Hear, oh! His groans and cried;  
Exclaimed "tis finish'd" gives up the ghost,  
And bows His head and dies.*

*But pleased was God to lay on Him  
The sins of Israel.*

*He paid the debt, redeemed his sheep  
From powers of death and hell.*

*Some of His sheep are yet astray  
From vale to mountain crest,  
He shines into their wand'ring hearts,  
And makes it manifest.*

*That He did bear their sins for them,  
When nailed up to the tree;  
And by His Spirit now draws near,  
And sets the captive free.*

*They now receive remission of  
The sins they've committed,  
And by the gentle cords of love,  
They're drawn to Christ their head.*

*Oh! how I hide my blushing face  
To think how kind He's been,  
When I've so little love to show,  
No heart His praise to sing.*

*Lord, keep me humble in thy sight,  
Nor let me from thee stray,  
Teach me to obey thy great commands,  
And walk the narrow way.*

*And when I lay me down to die,  
Oh! could it by thy will*

*To hover 'round my pillow nigh,  
My heart with love to fill;*

*And when I take the parting hand  
To earthly ties so dear,  
Oh! may I lean upon thy staff,  
And never yield to fear.*

*Long as I lie in death's embrace,  
Watch thou my sleeping dust,  
And bid me rise on judgement morn,  
To number with the just.*

*Then to thy name be all the praise,  
To thee all glory be;  
We'll sound thy praises long and loud  
To all eternity*

*Thomas J. Carr.*