

**DIRECT AUTHORITY: BIBLICAL &  
HISTORICAL**

**Being**

**A refutation of the Essential Mother Daughter Authority  
for the constitution of Baptist Churches**

And a

Critique of *The Great Commission Credentials*

And other books and articles on this subject.

By

**J. C. Settlemoir**

*Author of Landmarkism Under Fire*

**Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set. Pro. 22:28.**

*So at the present day many persons claim a divine authority for ideas and practices  
which are simply of human origin. Broadus.*

Copyright 2012



## DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to Elder Wayne Camp who first challenged me to examine the subject of church constitution through his paper *The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator*. He has boldly stood for proper exegesis of Scripture and for the Baptist standard of Direct Authority. As Baptists we are indebted to him for his defense of the truth.



## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	vii
1. Scripture Speaks.....	1
2. Scriptures Used to teach EMDA.....	5
3. Acts 13:1-4 Examined.....	7
4. Mt 28 Examined.....	11
5. Baptist Testimony for DA.....	13
6. More Baptist Testimony for DA.....	21
7. Landmarkers on DA.....	29
8. Graves on DA.....	39
9. Graves on DA Continued.....	45
10. The Salem Church Constitution.....	53
11. The Kittery Church Constitution.....	59
12. The Philadelphia Baptist Association.....	67
13. Ordained Men and Church Constitution.....	77
14. The Powerful Influence of EMDA.....	81
15. The EMDA Status.....	87

Conclusion .....	91
Appendix I.....	93
Appendix II.....	113
Bibliography .....	139

## Introduction

It has been six years since *Landmarkism Under Fire* (*LUF*, 2005) was published. That book was an examination of several articles and one book, *Scriptural Church Organization* by Bro Milburn Cockrell. It set forth *Direct Authority* (*DA*) for church constitution and repudiated the theory of *Essential Mother Daughter Authority*, (*EMDA*).

In 2007 Brother Mark Fenison published *The Great Commission Credentials* (*GCC*) in defense of *EMDA* and in an attempt to refute *LUF*. In his book the author asserts that Scripture demands *EMDA*; that Baptists in general held to it; that Landmark Baptists *specifically taught* it as did J. R. Graves.

In my critique of *GCC* (and other *EMDA* productions), I will attempt to prove that each one of these four propositions is false. My contention is that Scripture does not teach this doctrine; that Baptists never held it; that it never was a Landmark doctrine and finally, that J.R. Graves himself never held that position. But to go further, I will endeavor to prove that Baptists, Landmark Baptists and J.R. Graves all embraced *DA* explicitly. Therefore it will not be necessary for me to follow *GCC* throughout but only to demonstrate that the author's propositions are incorrect. In doing so, *EMDA* will be refuted and *DA* established and *GCC* fully answered.

It is also important for me to remind the reader that we are not here discussing the correctness of the views of Graves, Landmarkism or Baptists for that matter. That is another issue entirely. Here we only seek to determine their position on how churches are constituted.

Also let me say I am not replying to Bro Fenison personally (nor to others mentioned herein) but only to his propositions which I believe indicate a prepossession with *EMDA*. I

consider him to be my superior in every way but age. I have read with approval and profit (I trust) other works which he has written and it is only with reluctance that I differ with him on the subject of church constitution.

In case anyone should suggest that I have not dealt with any EMDA argument found in *GCC* or elsewhere because it is too strong, I will be glad to take the DA side of any proposition, if they will agree to publish both sides together in one of our papers, article for article.

By grace only,

J.C. Settlemoir, February 1, 2012.



## Chapter 1

### SCRIPTURE SPEAKS

The first question to consider, is does the Bible teach DA? If we can ascertain the teaching of Scripture on this subject, we shall have no problem with history or tradition. Is there any elaborate theory of church constitution set forth in the NT? Not that I can see. But we do have Mt. 18:20 which describes the result of saints gathering together in Christ's name and by His authority:

**For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.**

Mt 18:20 is a text that speaks of Christ dwelling in the midst of two or three who are gathered together in His name. He keeps His promise and we can depend upon His Word for all time. There is no good reason why this passage does not refer to church constitution. This interpretation is as old as the NT. We have an example of DA very early after the closing of the NT. Tertullian said:

For the very Church itself is, properly and principally, the Spirit Himself, in whom is the Trinity of the One Divinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. (The Spirit) combines that Church which the Lord has made to consist in 'three' and thus, from that time forward, every number (of persons) who may have combined together into this faith is accounted 'a Church,' from the *Author and Consecrator (of the Church)*. [Tertullian, *On Modesty, Apostolic Fathers*, vol. iv. p. 99-100].

Tertullian understood Mt 18:20 (to which he alludes) to refer to church constitution and that it was applicable to any number of persons who combined together into this faith. They were, he says, accounted a church! We believe this is what the text means.

## CHURCH-LIFE GIVEN BY CHRIST HIMSELF

Here in this text is Christ's own word on church constitution. This is the positive declaration of the Word of God. "***Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.***

Whenever He leads men to gather together in His name by His Holy Spirit, then He promises to be in the midst of them.

**Church-life** is bestowed and another church-lamp is lit by the Lord Himself. This is how a church begins.

To argue otherwise is to make Christ's word void. It is to say that what He promised in this text is not true or to show a considerable amount of presupposition, as *GCC* does when it says this refers only to a business meeting of a church already in existence! [p.21]. But great numbers of our most learned and spiritual men were bold enough to differ with Bro Fenison for they stated this verse does refer to church constitution or, at least, it was applicable to it, so I need not belabor the point. Will anyone take the position that when saints meet in the order designated by Christ that He is not present? There is no mother church mentioned or suggested here, nor anywhere else in Scripture.

## CHRIST ALONE WALKS IN THE MIDST OF THE LAMPS

Christ alone walks in the *midst* of the golden lampstands, (Re 1:13). No one else is able to occupy this position (Re 2:1). It is a divine activity. This is a most essential and important work. He will not give His glory to another, (Is 48:11). Neither a church, nor churches combined, no association, no presbytery, no elder, no pastor, no evangelist, no pope, no priest, no hierarchy, no government, no apostle, no man, no group, no entity on earth can enter into this domain! It is the exclusive place of Christ because He is the Head of the churches.

Lighting a church lamp is his prerogative alone. It is strange fire when anyone or anything attempts to do this! (Le 10:1). He who walks among the lamps is the only one who can give a group *church life*, *church light*, and *church status*. No one else can light or extinguish a church lamp but Christ Jesus Himself. This is never done, and cannot be done, by a church neither in institution nor in disbanding.

How is a church dissolved? When a church disbands, how is it done? The members agree to dissolve in the same manner they agreed to constitute. No one seeks EMDA to disband. Christ is the one who actually *snuffs out* the light of a church just as He is the one who actually *lights* the church lamp but he manifests His action by the action of the group, (Mt 18:18-19). If Christ is the only one who can snuff out a church lamp (Re 2:5) then surely He is the only one who can light it!

There is no indication in Scripture that one lamp received its light from another lamp, in type or in antitype, (Ex 25:37; Ac 9:31; 1 Th 2:14; Ga 1:2; Re 1:11, 20; 2:5). This is what EMDA mistakenly requires. The *light* of the *churches* never goes out (Mt 16:18; Ep 3:21; Le 24:2) but individual church lamps do. They are snuffed out for two purposes. One is for trimming the wick—the improvement of a church, Ex 30:7. There would otherwise have been no need for snuffers in the Tabernacle and Temple types, (Ex 37:23; 1 K 7:50). The other is to remove the lamp and replace it, (Re 2:5, Cf. 2:16; 3:3, 15), if it is flickering or smoking, (Mt 12:20; 1 Sa 3:3).

## **CHURCHES ARE FOUNDED ON JESUS CHRIST**

Concerning the Church at Corinth, Paul said they were founded upon the foundation of Jesus Christ, 1 Co 3:10, 11. They were God's building, v 9. They were the "temple of God" 1 Co 3:16; Ep 2:21; 2 Co 6:16. They were a habitation of God, not because they had a mother church, but because they were founded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the corner stone, Ep. 2:20. This body is fitly *joined together* and *compact*ed, Ep

4:16; cf. with Ac 5:13; 9:26. He dwells in them, Mt 18:20, Le 26:12; Ex 29:45 because they gather together in His name, 1 Co 5:4; Col 1:27; 2 Co 8:5.

## **NO CHURCH IS BUILT UPON ANOTHER CHURCH**

A church receives all that it ever has in power, commission, and connectivity from Christ the great Head according to Mt. 18:20. A true church does not depend on anything outside of Christ and Scripture for its existence. Churches are composed of baptized saints and Christ has promised that those who are gathered together in His Name, have a proper connection with Him. They are not placed upon another church as EMDA claims, but are built upon Christ as the living stone! They are a spiritual house, 1 Pe 2:4, 5.

## **ACTUAL CONSTITUTION**

The actual constitution of a church takes place the moment a group of saved baptized saints meet together with the purpose in mind to constitute. The formal constitution is but a ceremony and the church would be a church without it as much as with it. Thus all the other things often included in the formal constitution of a church are not at all essential to the act and as far as the NT is concerned, there is no hint of any such ceremony!

## Chapter 2

### Scriptures Supposed to Teach EMDA

I will list those Scriptures which are held forth as proof of EMDA. They are:

Mk 13:34; Mt 28:19-20; Ac 11:22-23, 26; 13:1-4; Ga 4:26; 2 Jn 1:13; Ep 5:22-22; 1 Pe 5:13 and perhaps a few others. Most of these are only filler. There is no effort to prove they actually teach EMDA.

It is a most important thing to note here and to note carefully that no one would ever know anything of EMDA by reading these various texts—even if they pertain to church constitution! The idea is simply not found in any of these passages unless it is injected into them!

We may be surprised that some of these texts are used to teach EMDA but they are. Cf. *LUF*, (chapter 5). We discuss Acts 13 and Mt 28 in the following chapters.



## Chapter 3

### ACTS 13:1-4, EXAMINED

We now consider Ac 13:1-4 in Acts because this passage is considered **one of the most important by EMDA supporters.**

Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. 2 As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. 3 And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. 4 So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus. Acts 13:1-4.

Does this teach EMDA?

If the Holy Spirit meant to teach by this passage, that an essential of church constitution is a horizontal investiture of church power, one church giving it to another, then I must confess I am among those who would never have even thought of such an idea from studying the text or context. For suppose this is what the Holy Spirit meant to teach us—that is, how to constitute churches by EMDA—it certainly is not stated! And how then could anyone know that is what is meant?

If you read this passage a thousand times you will be no closer to the answer! Take some things mentioned in the text as an example.

*Fasting* is mentioned in this passage. Is this essential to constitute a church? Does the text teach that you must fast to constitute a church? Why not?

Paul was a special *apostle* and he made much of this fact. So, does this text mean you have to have an apostle to constitute a church?

There is a *laying on of hands*. Is it not as reasonable to say that no church can be constituted without the laying on of hands as it is to claim EMDA? At least this is mentioned in the text!

*Prophets* are mentioned in this passage. Are they essential to constitute a church?

The Holy Spirit *spoke audibly* to these five men and called two men for this work. Is it essential to hear an audible voice to constitute a church?

These things are stated in the text but very few are brave enough to claim that all of them or any one of them is essential to constitute a church! How then do men claim something which is not even hinted at in the text is essential to constitute a church, but at the same time they exclude these things which are in the text?

The *Holy Spirit* specially called these men and announced their call for a specific work and said: “Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.” This was vertical authority—and long after that EMDA was supposed to be given in Mt 28! (See next chapter). But note. He did not say: *I have appeared unto the Church at Antioch so that you can be a mother church and I authorize you to start other churches and this is the essential pattern of how churches must be constituted for all time.*

Not a word of it!

The idea is not in the text unless it is put there!

The text *contains nothing* of EMDA near or far.



Is there anything in this passage that even *mentions* church authority? Is there anything in this passage that *suggests* church authority? I confess that if there is I am unable to see it. Is this how the Holy Spirit gives a command?

A Baptist standard is that *positive law requires a positive command*. We have such commands for love, 1 Jn 3:23; Baptism, Mt 28:18-20, the Supper and so on. Positive laws "...must be plain and express..." and "...it is unlawful to conform to any part of a religious rite, without divine warrant..." [Booth. *Paedobaptism Examined*, I, p. 17]. Yet, there is no positive law for EMDA.

When men make a law but have no positive command for it, what are we to do? We have an example in the NT. Some said "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved", Ac 14:1.

Was that true?

What response did the apostles and elders give to that *law*?

They denied it!

They said, "We gave no such commandment!" [Ac 15:23]. That is, there is no such commandment! They never *thought* it! They never *taught* it! They never *said* it! They never *wrote* it! They never *dreamed* it! Nor had these Judaizers ever *read* this law in Scripture! But they thought they found a *pattern* for it and from that supposed pattern they asserted it was essential for salvation! They convinced themselves that *it had to be that way*! And consequently, they were bold enough to say—you *cannot be saved without circumcision*—which was a law without a positive command!

So our EMDA brethren do the same thing. They say *you cannot constitute a church without EMDA*! But where is this *law* stated in Scripture? *Where is this law found*? Do not give us an allusion of it; do not give us a vague pattern of it; do not

give us an implication of it; do not tell us that it is *suggested* in this or some other passage—but give us the *positive command* for it! Give us one Scripture where EMDA is stated! When men unchurch, unbaptize, unordain, condemn and disfellowship, as they do, with exclusion, epithet and denunciation all who do not follow their tradition, we must ask them to give us a *thus saith the Lord!*

## Chapter 4

### Matthew 28 Examined

In this chapter we take up Bro Fenison's claim in *GCC* that Mt. 28:18-20 teaches EMDA.

This attempt to make Mt. 28:18-20 teach EMDA is certainly one of the most convoluted arguments that I have ever seen! It actually takes *thirty nine* pages in *GCC* to set it forth! [1-39]. Without going through the whole thing, it basically amounts to this. The author appeals to the Greek grammar of Mt. 28:19-20 in the attempt to prove this text

...designates an earthly administrator ("ye") that stand between Christ and all recipients ("them") of this commission. [*GCC*. iii].

He then maintains this demands EMDA!

What is wrong with this theory? My refutation of this irrelevant and laborious exercise is very simple. Bro Fenison's problem is not grammar English, Greek, or otherwise but **application!** He makes an unjustified application which is without Scriptural or historical warrant.

Does this text teach EMDA?

When one makes a novel interpretation of Scripture, (and no one can deny that this is one of the most unique treatments of a text ever conceived!) he usually brings forth considerable evidence that others have taught the same thing. Yet in thirty nine pages Bro Fenison gave not one other man who ever held this position unless it was Bro Cockrell (p. 17) and I believe the reason is obvious.

The idea that this text teaches EMDA is highly suspect to say the least. Bro Fenison will not deny that thousands of the best Baptist scholars who ever lived have given more time and

attention to this text than he has and yet not one of them ever made such a supposed discovery as he thinks he found! To my mind, this gives pause to his theory.

But even if we grant all the nuances Bro Fenison strives to establish, and this we are not inclined to do, yet there is one great problem with the whole thing. Namely, there is nothing in this text that would ever lead anyone to EMDA! If you actually have this episcopal stratification between the *ye(s)* and the *them(s)* (it is painful to hear a Baptist pronounce such popish ideas!) what then? The thing that unravels the whole garment is this one loose thread. There is no such idea as EMDA in the text! What is there, except prepossession, which would lead anyone to think there is any such thing in the text? Not one thing that I can see. Cf. Ga 2:13.

For example. One can take the same reasoning and as logically come up with the theory of Roman Catholicism. He can claim the *ye(s)* refer to the Pope or to the Cardinals and that this is how the authority of Christ is conveyed! That is exactly what Catholicism teaches! The text teaches this as much as it does EMDA! Or, one can claim that it is the Episcopal idea which is taught in this text and that the authority trickles down through the fingers of the clergy. Or he might claim that this was spoken to the Apostles as such and that you therefore must have an apostle to convey this authority and this will open the door for Seekers like Roger Williams! There is nothing—absolutely nothing—in the text which would lead any interpreter to the idea of EMDA. Proof of this is, as has already been stated, that no other writer of any stripe, much less a Baptist, ever thought he found this theory in this text other than those who have a hierarchal axe to grind! This *Baptist* hierarchy does not belong to Baptists!

The proverb is true, “If it is true, it is not new, and if new, it is not true!” But Bro Fenison's theory is new—very new! So new that no one before our own times ever heard of it! It has the strong smell of new paint. Let him give one Baptist who ever thought Mt 28 taught EMDA!

## Chapter 5

### BAPTIST TESTIMONY FOR DA

Bro Fenison (and other EMDA writers) not only maintains church power or authority is derived from a mother church but he also claims this has always been standard Baptist doctrine through the ages. If this was a fact, why did he not give proof? If that was their position through the ages, their history will verify it. If this claim is false, and I contend that it is, their history will thoroughly refute the assertion by presenting an entirely different method of church constitution. In the following pages we will give standard Baptist works on this subject. Keep in mind that we seek *specific* statements on this very subject. The question is, from *whom* or from *what* is church power derived?

William Williams was a professor both at Mercer and Southern Baptist Seminary and therefore a representative Baptist. He said:

Our Savior intended that his disciples should form themselves into churches....Again: it is made the duty of every disciple to extend the spiritual reign of his Maker. Much of this labor can be carried on only by associated effort. For such reasons as these, our Lord has taught us that his disciples in any place should form themselves into fraternal societies. [Williams. *Apostolical Church Polity*. 1874. Quoted in Dever. *Church Polity*, p. 544].

J. L. Reynolds (1812-1877) was a pastor and a professor. He said:

What, then is the Church? The context affords a satisfactory reply. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I.' This is the Church to which Christ alludes. It is gathered in his name, and blessed with his presence.... [Reynolds. *Church Polity*.... Quoted in Dever, *Church Polity*, 328].

Its nature as a voluntary society, involves the right to admit and to exclude. *Primitive Christians constituted a voluntary*

*compact; they gave themselves first to the Lord, and then to one another; and were always addressed as those who had decided for themselves on the solemn subject of adherence to Christ.* [Reynolds, J.L., *Church Polity or the Kingdom of Christ*, 1849. Quoted by Dever, *Church Polity*, p. 328].

Of Samuel Jones (1735-?) it was said: "...if not superior in scholarly attainments to every other American Baptist of his day, was equaled by few and surpassed by none." [Cathcart]. Jones said:

A number of believers are united together into a particular church, by an act of mutual confederation, 'Gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God.' 2 Cor. 8:5. [*Treatise of Church Discipline*, 1805. Quoted in Dever. *Church Polity*, 140].

Benjamin Keach needs no introduction. He wrote:

For hath not one regular Church as great Authority from Christ as another. [Keach. *Glory of A True Church....* 1697, Quoted by Dever. *Polity*. p. 81].

W.B. Johnson was a leading Baptist (d.1862). His reputation extended over the whole country. He was the first president of the Southern Baptist Convention. Such a well-known and highly respected leader of Baptists certainly knew the Baptist position on church constitution. Here are his words:

The power of a church is *derived, not original, delegated, not transferable*. Its power is then necessarily dependent upon him from who it is derived, and therefore, restricted to those objects which he commands them to accomplish, and within those bounds which he prescribes. Unless, then, there is, in the character of the church, authority to transfer its power to some other body, it may not so transfer it. Now, so far as I understand the New Testament, I see no authority given to a church of Christ to transfer its power or authority to any other church or body of men on earth. [Johnson. *The Gospel Developed*. 1846. Quoted in Dever, *Church Polity*, 173].

Johnson insists that church authority is derived and cannot be transferred! No church can transfer power or authority to some

other group or body! How EMDA could be more plainly rejected and DA more directly stated I cannot conceive.

Again he said:

The apostles taught the disciples the duty, and the principle, of church relation, and they complied with it. But no official act of the *apostles* beyond teaching, do we learn, gave validity to its existence. With the pattern thus clearly given, and the scripture record of numerous churches in different places, we are taught, that wherever a sufficient number of believers in Christ, baptized upon a profession of faith in him, live sufficiently contiguous to each other for the purposes of the church relation, they should unite together in such relation on the principle of ONE ACCORD, *mutual consent in the truth*. The Bible is their only standard of doctrine and duty. [Johnson, W.B., *The Gospel Developed*, 1846, Q. Dever, *Polity*, p. 187].

In this quote Johnson excludes the idea of ordained men giving any essential authority when he says, "... no official act of the apostles... gave validity to ... [a church's] existence." This denies the idea that one must have an ordained man present to constitute a church, which Bro Fenison and Bro Cockrell claim as an essential of church constitution.

Next is a statement by J. M. Cramp:

Where the Saviour or his apostles have not legislated, we are free to choose out of various modes of operation that which appears to us to harmonize best with the spirit of the gospel, or to be most consonant with Christian expediency,—as in the organization of a church .... [J. M. Cramp. *Baptist Quarterly*, 1870, p. 455. H. G. Weston, editor].

Isaac Backus (1724-1806):

Every true visible church of Christ, or ordinary assembly of the faithful, hath, by Christ's ordinance, power in itself immediately under Christ to elect, to ordain, de-priv and depose their ministers, and to execute all other ecclesiastical censures." Ibid., prop. 5. "[ Backus. *A History of New*

*England with Particular Reference to the Baptists*, Volume 1.  
p. 9].

Immediate means *without intervening medium or agent; direct*. So church power comes direct from Christ and can refer only to DA according to Backus.

John Hinton (1791-1873) a noted English Baptist preacher and author said:

As to the formation of churches, of which also the volume in my hand [*Wayland's Principles and Practices*-JC] says nothing, but which is generally understood to be affected [in America—JC] not without the convening of a Council, somewhat after the manner of an ordination, I need only say, in passing, that, in this country [England-JC] a Baptist church is formed by any number of Baptist professors who are pleased to form one, and where and when they please. There is no power which pretends, or is able to say, you may not, or you may; you shall, or you shall not. If the parties like to consult one or more neighboring ministers or brethren they do so; if not, their proceedings are equally valid without it. [*Wayland's Principles of the Baptists*, Editor John Howard Hinton. p. xxi, London, 1861.

What was the custom of English Baptists in the 1800s? Hinton gives a plain statement and it does not agree with EMDA!

Hiscox wrote numerous books on Baptist polity. The following quote is from *The Baptist Church Directory* first published in 1859. The first edition was 30,000 volumes. If the things in this book were not the Baptist position how can we account for its wide use and general reception? In the section on “The Authority of Churches” he says:

This authority [of a church—JC] is derived directly from God; not from states, nor princes, nor people; not from its own officers, nor its members, not from any other source of ecclesiastical or civil power or right. But Christ ‘is head over all things to the church,’ and also as of right, ‘the church is subject to Christ.’ [Hiscox. *The Baptist Church Directory*, 1859. P 16-17].



Is this DA? Ask any EMDA brother if this is what he believes and you will see his denial in facial contortions before he answers! Hiscox excludes any other source of ecclesiastical power than that of Christ. This necessitates DA and excludes EMDA.

Again in his *New Directory* [1894] Hiscox in a section entitled “The Authority of Churches” says:

Its [a church's authority—JC ] chief authority is given by Christ alone....Quite as little can that authority emanate from any ecclesiastical source, since all ecclesiastical orders emanate from and grow out of, the churches and are created by them—do not create them. [Hiscox. *New Directory*, p. 48].

These are explicit statements on DA but they totally refute EMDA! In fact Hiscox is as far from that idea as it is possible to be! So far as EMDA men are concerned this statement produces a sound which their ears cannot endure! It does not fit in their scheme and they will not allow it! How is it then that men quote Hiscox on some irrelevant matter and claim he believed EMDA as Bro Fenison did after this quote was given in *LUF*?

Again Hiscox says:

All rightful authority therefore is conferred by Christ, the king in Zion. [Hiscox. *New Directory*, p. 49].

Is this EMDA or is it DA? Why is it that EMDA men cannot see these words? Does Bro Fenison believe what Hiscox said? Does he agree with Hiscox? Did Hiscox know what Baptists believed? How could Bro Fenison quote Hiscox (*GCC*. 100) in support of EMDA? These questions, I submit, will never be answered.

Brand gives the account of the First Baptist Church ever organized in the state of Illinois:

The formation of the church [May 28, 1796] was a simple proceeding. Elder Badgley and Mr. Chance read the scriptures and offered prayer. The purpose of the meeting was stated, and the nature of a Baptist church was explained. The names were taken of those who wished to unite in church capacity, and they formally voted to become, a gospel church for the maintenance of the ordinances, the edification of one another, and the evangelization of the world. No ceremony of prayerbook or ritual, no presence of bishop or priest, was required. Articles of faith were read, considered, and adopted. Perhaps also an agreement or covenant with each other to maintain a holy life. No authority save that of their Lord Jesus Christ was needed or recognized. And as the church was self constituted it was also self governed, since the authority that constitutes a body must be the authority that controls it. [Edward Brand, *Illinois Baptists, A History*. 1930. p. 27].

Here is a straight forward organization of a NT Baptist church and one may see at a glance that there is no such thing as EMDA desired or even considered. This statement, *the authority that constitutes a body must be the authority that controls it*, is a powerful antidote and a warning of the EMDA position!

### **JOHN SMYTH TWO CAN MAKE A CHURCH**

John Smyth was a General Baptist. Ivimey quotes him:

Now for baptizing a man's self, there is as good warrant as for a man's churching himself; for two men are singly not a church; jointly they are a church, and they both of them put a church upon themselves: for as both these persons unchurched, yet have power to assume the church, each of them for himself and others in communion; so each of them unbaptized, hath power to assume baptism for himself with others in communion. [John Smyth. *The Character of the Beast or the false Constitution of the church discovered in certain passages.... 1609*. Q. in Ivimey. *Hist. of Eng. Baptists*, vol. I, p. 117, 118, 119; Cf. *LUF*. p. 151. Bro Cockrell quoted Smyth, *SCO*, p. 27].

Of course Smyth is here speaking of Mt 18:20 and he says two men *have power to assume the church*. Is this EMDA or DA?

Benjamin Griffith of the Philadelphia Association gives this statement:

In a 1749 essay on the power and duty of an association, Griffith began with a declaration 'that each particular church hath complete power and authority from Jesus Christ, to administer all gospel ordinances...and to exercise every part of Gospel discipline and church government, independent of any other church or assembly whatever.' The essay was adopted by the association and expressly declared to be the judgment of the entire body." [Hogue, *Antecedents of Landmarkism*, p. 157].

This is not authority by re-delegation from another church as EMDA teaches but directly from Christ Himself!

Bro Fenison and Bro Cockrell quoted Baptist manuals in support of EMDA. For example they quoted Edwin C. Dargan as if he was referring to EMDA. [*GCC*. 101; *SCO*. 20] But this was a mere allusion. We know this because Dargan asserts a *church constitutes itself*:

This action [constitution] may be performed, or expressed, in different ways, but it must evidently be taken voluntarily and definitely by the persons themselves who desire to constitute the church—that is to say, the church constitutes itself; it is not made, or brought into existence, by any outside persons. These may help in the organization by their presence and advice, or they may afterwards recognize the action as valid, proper and customary, but they have no hand in the actual constituting act. [Dargan. *Ecclesiology*, p. 195].

Did these men not read what Dargan said? This quote is on the very page they quoted! How could they so distort this man's words?

Another account:

Mr. Leland [John Leland, the pastor] and others adhered to the customs of New England, each one put on such apparel as suited his own fancy. This was offensive to some members of the church [Mountpony]. The contention on this account became so sharp that on the 25<sup>th</sup> of July, 1779, about twelve

members dissented from the majority of the church and were of course excluded. The dissenting members formed themselves into a church, and sued for admission into the next Association, and were received. [ Semple. *Hist. of Virginia Baptists*, p. 234].

How could these excluded members form a church without letters—without EMDA—without church authority? If Bro Fenison's theory is correct—that Baptists uniformly adhered to EMDA—how could a Baptist association receive this church which had no “earthly authority” when according to Bro Fenison they could not be a true church?

Do churches spring from other churches essentially? Lee Rector tells us of the authority of a church and where it comes from:

The Lord, and not Associated Churches, is the builder, Mt. 16:18. Church sovereignty is delegated, and not original. All church authority originates in Christ, the Builder.”—[Rector, W. Lee, *Church Truth*. Quoted in *Vital Ch. Truths* by R. J. Anderson, p. 55. No date but about 1935—J C].

## CHAPTER 6

### MORE BAPTIST TESTIMONY FOR DA

Please keep in mind we are presenting evidence that DA was the standard doctrine of Baptists. The reader will note that these quotes are on this express subject.

Can a church be formed without letters and without ministerial helps? GCC denies! What did Baptists say?

*District of St. Charles, Upper Louisiana, the first Saturday in May, 1810.*

The next year a Baptist church was organized a short distance west of Loutre Island, which was the first organization of the kind north of the Missouri River. It was organized after the following form "*District of St. Charles, Upper Louisiana, the first Saturday in May, 1810.*" "We, the Baptist members of the United Order, whose names shall be hereafter written, do covenant and agree to live together in a church capacity, and endeavor to hold up and be governed by the Old and New Testaments, believing it to be the only true rule of faith and practice. And as we have no opportunity to get helps to constitute, we do therefore form ourselves into a church, believing it to be legal and right, as we do not think it right for any human composition to be binding on the conscience of any, but that it is right to be governed by the Old and New Testaments. [Ducan. *A Hist. of Baptists in MO*, p. 130].

Here is another written in 1935:

Previously we have dealt with the matter of authority, authority for both individual and group. There arises here the question, by what authority is a Baptist church brought into being? The answer is close at hand: by the authority of the local group of a regenerate, baptized believers in Christ. These individually being competent in all matters of religion, and in the exercise thereof, having crowned Christ as the Lord of their lives, are collectively competent in all matters of church, even to the formation of a new church. [William Roy McNutt. *Polity and Practice in Baptist Churches*, page 132. 1935].

Again in 1911 Theodore G. Soares wrote in his *Baptist Manual*:

The Organization of Baptist Churches.

The right of organization lies in any company of Christians who desire to form themselves into a self-governing church. It is usual that they live sufficiently near to each other to meet stately for worship and to unite in Christian activities. The church thus formed ought to be approved by the neighboring churches represented in counsel. The approval would give to it that denominational recognition which would entitle it to full standing as a Baptist Church. The right of organization is inherent in the local body of believers. The right of recognition belongs to the sisterhood of churches, with which the local church expects fellowship. [Soares, Theodore G. *A Baptist Manual*, page 11. 1911].

How men can claim EMDA was standard Baptist doctrine in the face of these Baptists, who consistently assert DA in confession, manual, sermon, theology and other productions, in the most explicit terms, I do not know! We have given some of these as a sampling so that no honest man can question the fact.

Such is everywhere reiterated as when the London association wrote:

That in case the minor part of any church break off their communion from that church, the church state is to be accounted to remain with the major part. And in case the major part of any church be fundamentally corrupted with heresy and immorality, the minor part may and ought to separate from such a degenerate society; and either join themselves to some regular church or churches, or else, if they are a competent number, constitute a church state by a solemn covenant among themselves. [J. J. Goadby, *Bye-Paths in Baptist History*, p. 215].

What else could this quote mean if not DA?

Here we remind the reader that when these writers speak of being joined to the Lord and each other, they give Mt 18:20 as the proof text. Is this EMDA? Do EMDA men ever refer to this verse in this manner?

In the First London Confession the Particular Baptists refer to Mt 18:20 for the constitution of a church:

First London Confession 1644.

Article XXXIII.

That Christ hath here on earth a spiritual Kingdom, which is the Church, which he hath purchased and redeemed to himself, as a peculiar inheritance: which Church, as it is visible to us, is a company of visible[1] Saints,[2] called & separated from the world, by the word and [3] spirit of God, to the visible profession of the faith of the Gospel, being baptized into that faith, and joined to the Lord, and each other, by mutual agreement, in the practical enjoyment of the [4] Ordinances, commanded by Christ their head and King. 1] 1 Cor. 1:1; Eph. 1:1; 2] Rom. 1:7; Acts 26:18; 1 Thess. 1:9; 2 Cor. 6:17; 3] Rev. 18:18. Acts 2:17 with Acts 10:37. 4] Rom. 10:10; Acts 20:21; Mt. 18:19, 20; Acts 2:42; 1 Pet. 2:5.

How did the early missionaries constitute a church? Andrew Fuller knew and he gives this account:

The missionaries, arriving at the scene of action, would first unite in social prayer and Christian fellowship; and this would constitute the first church. (Andrew Fuller. *Works*, p. 832; Banner of Truth, Carlisle, PA).

J.R. Graves gives his opinion on how Baptist missionaries should constitute a church:

Answer 644. No, dear brother, one man, much less one sister, cannot constitute a Scriptural church. Christ says, 'Where two or three of you meet together in my name there am I.' A church cannot be organized with less than two. Less than two missionaries should not be sent to a heathen field. This was the example set us by the primitive churches. Two missionaries and their wives go to China or Japan or Cuba, and the first step they should take is to organize a mission church of four members in the house of one of them, and to this church the converts can, from time to time, be added, until a church house is built, although Paul never built a meeting house in all his life as a missionary, nor formed a mission school, nor a college, never. [Graves. *Tn. Baptist*, Aug. 13, 1887, p. 8].

Asher in his work on John Clarke states the Baptist position in the 1600s:

These early Baptists held that scripturally, any group of baptized believers could voluntarily assemble and organize themselves into a church, elect their own officers, and then observe the Lord's Supper in church capacity. [Asher, Louis Frankland. *John Clarke*. P. 106. 1997.].

Here follows another example of some of the Lord's saints shut out without any ecclesiastical authority, without letter and without recommendation but they formed a church:

Zoar. This is a small church made up of certain members who felt themselves aggrieved by the conduct of the Salem and Black-Walnut churches, in the affair of Morris; and therefore formed themselves into a separate church. [Semple. *Hist. Rise & Prog.*, p. 119].

How could they do that?

### **CHURCH AT ASHFORD.**

This church appears, from ancient records, to have been formed in the year 1653, in which year there was a congregation of Baptists assembled here and at Wye, Naccolt, and places adjacent, who formed themselves into an organized church, and constituted eleven articles of their faith and practice. [Ivimey. *Hist. Eng. Baptists*. iv, p. 388].

**Second Church.** — This church originated in 1656, when twenty-one persons broke off from the first church, and formed themselves into a separate body. Their names were William Vaughan, Thomas Baker, James Clark, Jeremiah Clark, Daniel Wightman, John Odlin, Jeremiah Weeden, Joseph Card, John Greenman, Henry Clark, Peleg Peckham, James Barker, Stephen Hookey, Timothy Peckham, Joseph Weeden, John Rhodes, James Brown, John Hammet, William Rhodes, Daniel Sabear, and William Greenman. [Benedict. *History of the Baptists*, I, p. 481].

These are not aberrations or anomalies on the Baptist screen but the common everyday method of constituting churches.



E. G. Robinson said:

Three persons may constitute a church, and may administer the ordinances. Councils have only advisory authority. Diocesan episcopacy is antiscritural and antichristian. [E. G. Robinson, Q. by Strong. *SST*, p. 890].

Oregon territory in the early 1800s:

Whereas: In the providence of God, a few names of us, the professed followers of Christ, who hold to one Faith, one Lord, and one Baptism, having been thrown together in these wilds of the West, and being members of churches in the United States, desirous of keeping the worship of God in our neighborhood, and in our families, -- We agree that we hereby constitute and come into union, first giving ourselves unto the Lord. and then unto each other, we do covenant and agree that we will meet together to worship God and keep the commandments and ordinances of God's house, and are hereby constituted into a church. ...

At first, none had letters, but were to get them as soon as practicable. For some years such reception of members was not uncommon, and was regarded as "regular," for many, supposing no Baptist churches were here, came without letters, united with the churches, and sent for letters afterwards. There was nothing to tempt imposture; often some neighbor could vouch for their membership; and the letters usually came in due time, and no serious trouble ever resulted from the practice. [C. H. Mattoon. *Baptist Annals of Oregon*, 1905, p. 2].

Will EMDA men maintain that the authority here was latent? Was it dormant? Was it hidden and only discovered in some accidental manner? If the EMDA law is true, then this church was a false church because laws operate at all times and places!

William Crowell's *The Church Member's Manual* was first published in 1847. It was revised and republished in 1857 and at other times thereafter. Crowell was born in 1806 and died 1871. He was the editor of two Baptist papers for about ten years each [Cathcart. *Baptist Encyclopedia*. 1296]. His book is quoted by J.R. Graves [*GIW*. 554; *NGIW*. 137; *OL*. 41]; by T. G. Jones; [*The Baptists*. 41]; by Hiscox; [*New Directory*. 368];

by Jarrel; [*Church. Perpetuity*; 4] and many other writers. These references indicate his book was recognized as a standard Baptist Manual by Baptists and that Landmark Baptists used it. What he says on this subject will not be some wild private interpretation or some abnormal viewpoint, but what was common among Baptists.

Crowell tells us believers in gospel order have the *right* to constitute a church:

From this view of the subject, it is evident that a suitable number of believers possess the right, at all times, in proper circumstances and from good motives, to unite themselves in mutual covenant to obey and execute the laws of Jesus Christ; and that, while they do so, they enjoy and exercise all the rights and authority which he has conferred on any visible church. [Crowell. *Church Member's Manual*, 57].

Again he tells us how *essential church power* is conveyed to a new group:

Having seen that every church is formed of believers, whose rights are equal, by a voluntary compact, in virtue of which they were endowed with church power; that one church is neither superior nor inferior to another in rights and authority; that all ecclesiastical authority comes directly from Christ, and not from, nor through, any particular church, or churches, or church officers; that each church is separately accountable to Him for the use or abuse of its power; that a suitable number of disciples may, for good cause, and in an orderly way, form themselves into a church by mutual covenant, and exercise the highest ecclesiastical power, without being connected with, or dependent upon, any other church... [Crowell. *Church Member's Manual*. 85].

According to Crowell this authority does not proceed from any earthly source! He asserts *all ecclesiastical authority comes directly from Christ, and not from, nor through, any particular church, or churches, or church officers!*

Crowell then goes on to tell us exactly how this church authority is conferred according to Baptists.

The proof is, therefore, complete, that **the power which each and every church exercises is conferred directly by Christ**, is continued on condition of obedience to his laws, and is withdrawn when that obedience ceases. It is also plain, that when a company of baptized believers assume these obligations in obedience to the plain will of their Master, and faithfully fulfill them, they become a church, authorized to perform all acts proper to a Gospel church. No bishop, no council of ministers, nor delegation from other churches, nor sanction of the church universal, can impart to them the least degree of church power. ....It must come from Christ alone. [Crowell. 69-70. My emphasis. JC].

This eliminates every vestige of EMDA! It affirms the authority must come from Christ *alone*! Those who compose a new church are endowed with church power *directly*! EMDA men would trade the farm if they could find a reference like this for their position! But, sadly, for their cause, no such reference has ever been found!

Let these statements be fairly considered. Is Crowell setting forth EMDA or DA? Is this Baptist doctrine? Did Crowell know what Baptists believed? Did the Baptists who referred to Crowell's book know what they believed on this subject? How can we account for the recognition given Crowell's manual, when we are told that Baptists universally taught EMDA? Does Crowell leave any doubt about what the Baptist position was in his day? Well just in case he goes even further:

Every church derives its ecclesiastical power immediately from the Lord Jesus Christ, comes into possession of it by conforming to his will, and is accountable directly to him for its rightful exercise. [Crowell. 114].

*Immediately from Christ!* This is exactly what we believe. What more could anyone say to reinforce DA?

Now these various writers have been quoted on the very subject in debate— *Church constitution*, not some irrelevant issue.

What is very significant as far as Baptist authors are concerned, is that not one writer has ever been found who specifically stated EMDA! That some Baptists have been quoted as if they supported EMDA is freely admitted, (Cf. *LUF*. 79). **But not one positive statement for this theory has ever been produced!** In no single instance does any author ever specify that authority to constitute a church must come from another church—or from any other earthly source. But these writers we have quoted tell us where the authority is—in *Christ!* They tell us how it is obtained—*directly from Christ!* They testify that this authority does not come from another church! They say it does not come through ordained men! They tell us this is *Baptist* doctrine!

There can be no question then! What these leading Baptists *have* presented is **Baptist** doctrine—**prevailing** Baptist doctrine—at least the men quoted thought so! These unimpeachable witnesses as to the Baptist position on church constitution are strong evidence that Baptists have uniformly held DA throughout their history. I believe these references for DA completely neutralizes the assertion of *GCC* on what Baptists believed on this subject!

## Chapter 7

### Landmarkers on DA

In *GCC* Bro Fenison made the claim (p.iv) that Landmark Baptists taught EMDA. In this chapter we take up the question of the Landmark position on how a church is constituted. If Landmark Baptists taught DA then this will make void the contention of *GCC*.

Bro Fenison tells in *GCC* us he has *proved* that the old Landmarkers believed EMDA. But in reality all he did was to quote some Landmarkers on irrelevant subjects (which statements could agree with EMDA but did not necessitate it) and then by this means he thought he had proved the authors held EMDA! These references were frequently taken from authors who plainly stated their position to be DA and sometimes in the very section quoted! (Cf. The Comparison charts in Appendix I and II for examples.). The reader will see that these quotes following are not like that. They are expressly on the subject of how a church is constituted and from whence it receives its power—not on succession—not on the Atlantic cable or some other irrelevant matter! The authors are permitted to state their own position and they specify DA to the exclusion of EMDA and that without a single exception!

We set forth the data. There can be no question as to where the evidence points. This will be evident as we proceed.

We quote first of all Dayton:

And it can do all that, in the Scripture, is predicated of any Church of Christ. But while it is independent of all other Churches or federations in its organization, and in the exercise of its functions, it so absolutely dependent on Christ its Lord and King, that it *can make no laws*, but only execute the law which Christ has made; and it can exercise *no authority*, but such as was specially delegated to it by Christ. Dayton, A. C. *Theo. Earnest*, II, p. 158.

A man said he liked figs but did not like the seeds. EMDA men may like Dayton but they will not accept his statements on this subject —too many seeds for their palate! He says “**it is independent of all other Churches or federations in its organization...**” What was Dayton saying? Was this EMDA? Will EMDA men admit this is correct? Was Dayton a Landmark Baptist? They dare not answer. Let the reader keep in mind that this book was first published in the pages of the *TN Baptist* under the careful eye of J. R. Graves!

When Dayton wrote this book in search of the church, (*Theodosia Earnest*, vol. II) and discussed everything about a church and gave the essentials of a church but did not include EMDA, it takes a master magician to pull the EMDA rabbit out of Dayton's hat! But Bro Fenison made a great effort to do it, [GCC, pp 93,125-129]. Yet, after all, he, like the magicians of Egypt, could not bring forth!

Dayton tells exactly how and from whence a church receives its authority:

The church "can make no laws, but only execute the laws which Christ has made; and it can exercise no authority, but such as was specially delegated to it by Christ....if it is the executive of his kingdom, it must, of course, execute the laws of the King. [Dayton. *The. Earnest*, II, p. 158-160].

This authority is **delegated to it by Christ** and he says — *specially* delegated to it by Christ—which is a strong assertion of DA, whereas EMDA claims the authority to constitute is *re-delegated* from a mother church! Is this not a contradiction of EMDA?

I.K. Cross was (died in 2008) an ABA preacher, educator and writer. He said:

I think if you will carefully examine the origin of the Paulician movement, you will find that this group of churches got underway without the vote of another church...The vote of a church is desirable, but is not necessary in order for a church to have New Testament authority. [Ross, Bob. *Landmarkism*, p. 96; Quoting I.K. Cross from a personal letter, 4-5-65].

Bro Cross is careful to tell us that the vote of church to start a new church *while desirable is not essential*. This is good Landmark Baptist testimony but it denies EMDA!

Bro Fenison quoted from J.M. Carroll's *History of Texas Baptists* on Primitive Baptists delegating authority to constitute a church but I give

an example from the same source of a Missionary Baptist church constitution:

The prayer-meeting was perseveringly maintained regardless of the hindrances. When a few weeks had gone by this devout group decided that they must have a church home. Conditions were not encouraging except in the light of God's promises. From no other source came any ray of hope. After days of earnest prayer to God and serious consultation among themselves, they unanimously agreed at once to enter into an organization, and here, in 1837, in the town of Washington, there was projected the small but momentous beginning of Missionary Baptist organized work in Texas. [J.M. Carroll. *Hist. TX Baptists*. p. 108].

Carroll describes the purpose of a council of recognition:

These councils of recognition, which are, perhaps, too much neglected in these days of restless hurry and telegraphic speed, are for the purpose of welcoming a new church into the brotherhood of churches. If, on examination, its doctrines, circumstances and reasons for organization are satisfactory and Baptist, the church is recognized. This custom is deemed a prudential measure, to guard against irregularities in doctrine and practice. A vote of approval by such a council secures the church the sympathy, co-operation and fellowship of sister churches. [J.M. Carroll, *Hist. of TX Baptists*. p. 110.

Of course in EMDA constitutions no church ever has recognition services. After all no mother invites others to *recognize* that her baby is a true child—her true child! What were these services for? They were not to obtain authority because Carroll says they were to *welcome* a new church—that is a church already in being—not something done to give it being! He also says it was a *prudential measure* and therefore not an *essential*.

Bro Rosco Brong on EMDA:

Essential mother-daughter authority was not taught by Dayton, Pendleton or Carroll. Nor was it taught by some of the staunch Landmarkers of old...I know for a fact that Bro Brong did not teach EMDA because he told us, on more than one occasion, that there are circumstances where baptized

believers can self-organize and form a legitimate church, even though this was not the preferred or optimal arrangement. [[Southernbaptist@yahoo.com](mailto:Southernbaptist@yahoo.com). “Rick Presley” 6-28-07].

### Ben Bogard:

The first step necessary in the organization of a new congregation or church is for as many as three baptized disciples to agree to meet statedly for worship, for mutual edification and united effort for the evangelization of the world. The object of a church is two-fold, viz., that the membership may be mutually helpful to one another and to work for God’s glory in the evangelization of the world.

The agreement to meet regularly for worship and work is commonly called a ‘Church Covenant.’ The word ‘covenant’ means agreement. This covenant should be in writing, lest some misunderstand the terms. When this covenant has been entered into the church is fully organized. This covenant is the organization. [Bogard. *Baptist Way Book*, p. 69].

J. B. Moody (1838-1931) was one of our most notable men but almost forgotten in our times. He said:

A Baptist church is composed of volunteers associated in congregational effort, each member in equal authority, and each church complete in itself and independent of all other churches and of all outside authorities. [Moody. *My Church*, p. 13].

Bro Buel H. Kaze (1900-1976) was a well-known Landmark Baptist and his testimony on this subject cannot be overlooked.

Another question closely associated with this problem [chain of baptisms, p. 103] is the one of church succession. That is, if it be true that a church must have divine authority in its work, and we doubt it not, how is this divine authority transmitted from one to another? That is, can a new church be started without the official grant of another church (sometimes called a ‘mother church’) to organize? [Kaze. *The Church & The Ordinances*, p. 104].



It is our own view that most of these early churches were constituted without much form or ceremony. [Kazee. *The Church & The Ordinances*, p. 104].

Again on the same page:

On all these questions the author of this book needs light, and we make no pretense toward having all the answers. Maybe others do, but let no one substitute cheap dogmatism for lack of light. [Kazee. *The Church & The Ordinances*, p. 104].

This substitution of cheap dogmatism on this subject seems to be very common in our time. He goes on to say:

It seems to us that in many realms the Scriptures do not spell out all the necessary procedures, and that 'sanctified judgment' is a necessity. We all accept it in certain areas. For instance, the Bible says nothing about people moving their memberships from one church to another, nor of a letter of recommendation in such cases. [Kazee. *The Church & The Ordinances*, p. 104].

Once more:

In this day [1965—J C ] among Baptists there seems to be a prevailing custom of establishing churches through the sponsorship or authority of a mother church, a very commendable practice, we think, although not spelled out in the Scriptures; but whether or not this has always been done is certainly another matter. It is very likely that back through history there have been many instances where Bible-believing churches thought that the ordination to preach carried with it the authority to judge confessions and baptize, yea, even to organize churches of these newly baptized converts. It is also likely that through these channels the baptism of many of us has come. For this reason we will need to be reserved in our declarations. [Kazee. *The Church and Its Ordinances*, p. 105].

Bro Kazee's position is straight forward—he admits that churches can be constituted without EMDA. His counsel is that we had better be cautious about making laws which the Bible does not contain and which our own history does not sustain. This is a far cry from the exclusivity of EMDA men

who denounce everyone who differs with them as *apostate* Landmarkers, who constantly un-church, un-ordain, and un-baptize with all the authority of an oracle!

J. D. Murphy was a nephew of A. P. Williams and was a well-known preacher in Missouri. He was a frequent contributor to the Tennessee Baptist in the 1800s. He gave this testimony:

The idea of interdependence among the churches does not seem to be of the Scriptures. That the existence of one church in some way depended on another, or all others, does not appear. [J.D. Murphy. *TN Baptist*. Jan. 9, 1886. p. 2. Article entitled *My Church*. No. 1].

W. A. Jarrel (1849-1927) was a noted Landmark Baptist and very active as a pastor, writer and debater. Did He know what Landmark Baptists believed? He said:

Every Baptist church being, in organization, a church complete in itself, and, **in no way organically connected with any other church**, such a thing as one church succeeding another, as the second link of a chain is added to and succeeds the first, or, as one Romish or Episcopal church succeeds another, is utterly foreign to and incompatible with Baptist church policy... [Jarrel, *Church Perpetuity*, p. 3, emphasis added—J C].

While Pendleton's Manual is said by Bro Fenison and others to teach EMDA, Jarrel held that Pendleton and others taught the same thing he did on church constitution:

With equal clearness [as expressed by Hiscox—J C] J. M. Pendleton, D. D., E. Adkins, D. D., H. Harvey, D. D., Henry M. Dexter, D. D., W. W. Gardner, D. D., William Crowell, D. D., say the same thing. The New Hampshire Confession says: 'We believe that a visible church of Christ is a congregation of *baptized* believers, associated by covenant in *the faith* and fellowship of the gospel; observing the *ordinances* of Christ; governed by His law; and exercising the gifts, rights and privileges invested *in* them by His word,' etc. [W. A. Jarrel. *Baptist Church Perpetuity*, p. 4-5].

How is it that Jarrel reads one thing from *Pendleton's Manual* and Bro Fenison another?

Jarrel quotes Graves with approval:

Wherever there are three or more baptized members of a regular Baptist church or churches covenanted together to hold and teach, and are governed by the New Testament, etc., there is a Church of Christ, even though there was not a presbytery of ministers in a thousand miles of them to organize them into a church. There is not the slightest need of a council of presbyters to organize a Baptist church. [Jarrel. *Baptist Church Perpetuity*, p.1].

One can only be amazed that with these references by Jarrel before him, Bro Fenison in *GCC* attempts to find some support for EMDA in Jarrel! [p. 116]. To demonstrate how far Bro Fenison is from understanding the Baptist position correctly the following will illustrate:

Succession among Baptists is not a linked chain of churches or ministers, uninterrupted and traceable at this distant day . . . The true and defensible doctrine is, that baptized believers have existed in every age since John baptized in Jordan, and have met as a baptized congregation in covenant, and fellowship where an opportunity permitted. [W.A. Jarrel. *Baptist Church Perpetuity or History*, p. 1].

No EMDA man will identify himself with these statements! They well may attempt to identify themselves with these men and Landmarkism—but only after they have squeezed them into the EMDA mold!

In spite of all these statements which cannot be turned into EMDA, some refuse to see the facts. These Landmark Baptists explicitly state DA and repudiate EMDA.

Here is another by Jesse Mercer who was claimed by both Bro Cockrell and Bro Fenison as a strong supporter of EMDA, [SCO.48; GCC.107]. Bro Fenison's words prove he misunderstood Mercer's position. In an article written for the *Christian Index* December 1833 Mercer said:

There is not even any direct scriptural authority for such an organization as an association. The church, on the other hand, receives its power and authority directly from Christ. [Hogue. *Antecedents of Landmarkism*, p. 231].

Authority *directly from Christ!* If this is not DA how would one express it? This statement stands in direct opposition to EMDA. Mercer denies that idea and instead asserts an authority from Christ without any other intermediary—a concise definition of DA.

We also have accounts of Baptists who said the Bible gave no specific way in which churches are to be constituted. C. D. Cole is an example. C.D. Cole was the associate editor of *The Baptist Examiner* when T.P. Simmons began that paper in 1931. Bro Cole said:

Baptist churches come into being today somewhat after this manner. A group of believers in a community wish to become a church. The members in conference will make this wish known to other churches, and these churches send messengers to counsel them in accomplishing their desire. For the sake of order and recognition these messengers will inquire into their belief, and if it is thought wise, the visitors endorse their articles of faith and recommend their constitution as an independent church. These visiting brethren do not organize the church. Since the church is to be self governing, it must of necessity and logically be self constituted. And so those wishing to become a church enter into a covenant to that effect; and another church is born. The help from the outside is for the sake of order and fellowship and is not absolutely essential. [C. D. Cole. *Definitions of Doctrine: The NT Church*, vol. III, p. 7, 8. No Date].

There is no date in volume III of Bro Cole's book, but Bro Gormley said that Bro Cole died reading Volume II and had already started putting together Vol. III. [Cf. Vol. III, p. ii]. Bro Cole died in 1969. As this statement by Bro Cole was objected to by Bro Gormley, this may be an indication that EMDA was just then beginning to develop. We know for a fact that no such doctrine was taught by T.P. Simmons or John R. Gilpin before the early 1950s, Cf. *LUF*. 171,199.

Bro Fenison in *GCC* (142) pooh-poohed my suggestion (*LUF*.171-174) that Bre Gilpin and Mason did not embrace EMDA before 1955, as if their changing their position on this subject amounted to nothing! He expressed it with a “Wow!” But in his contempt of my statement he overlooked a few things. He forgot to tell us how it came to be that these two aged and learned Baptists were so ignorant, not only of the *Baptist* but also of the *Landmark* Baptist position, on church constitution! How could these two *Landmark* Baptists preach among Landmarkers for half a century and yet not know or believe, what Bro Fenison contends is a core doctrine of Landmarkism? If EMDA was always Baptist doctrine (this is Bro Fenison's claim), how came it to be that it took these men some fifty years to learn it? Did they not read their Bibles? Were they slow learners? Can a man be a leading preacher among Baptists for half a century and be totally ignorant of an essential Baptist doctrine? Were they so uninformed? Did they never read Baptist history? (John Gilpin said he had read a million pages of church history!). Were they so ignorant of Landmark Baptist doctrine that they rejected this essential doctrine for most of their lives? Were there no men, better informed (according to my opponent's theory), who pointed out to them their great error? Is this what Bro Fenison wants us to believe? If so it is a most striking absurdity! If EMDA has been Baptist doctrine from the beginning, then ignorance of such a law would be comparable to a man who was a Baptist scholar for fifty years but who did not know about immersion! Thus what Bro Fenison attempted to gloss over appears to be no easy fix. The ship that carries his answer will likely never make harbor! *Wow*, is indeed appropriate concerning this case—but in a way Bro Fenison did not anticipate!

T. P. Simmons in his book *Systematic Study of Bible Doctrines*, first published in 1936, gave the essentials of a true church which I have summarized:

#### XI. THE IDENTIFYING MARK'S OF THE CHURCH

If, as we believe, the church of Christ has been perpetuated then it is in the world today and been in the world since its founding. By what means, then, are we to identify this church in any age? In order to have a church, there must be-

1. A LOCAL INDEPENDENT BODY...
2. HOLDING THE TRUTH AS TO THE WAY OF MAKING DISCIPLES...
3. HOLDING THE TRUTH AS TO BAPTISM...
4. RECOGNIZING CHRIST ALONE AS ITS HEAD, AND SEEKING TO CARRY OUT HIS WILL AND COMMANDS... [Simmons. *Systematic Study of Bible Doctrines*. p. 366-7].

Simmons then concludes with this statement: “Wherever is found a local body possessing all of the attributes, there is a church. Without all of them there can be no church.”

Let the reader remember that Simmons was a Landmark Baptist and then let him ask, why is it that EMDA is not found in his book?

## **Chapter 8**

### **Graves on DA**

Bro Fenison claims that Graves also contended for EMDA. He even put a quote by Graves on the front cover of *GCC* and quoted him several times within. We give specific quotes so

the reader will be able to gather what Bro Fenison was trying to do. For example:

It is undeniable that Dr. Graves... denied the so-called doctrine of "direct" or "vertical" ...[Fenison. GCC. 118].

Again:

There are some in the ranks of Landmark Baptists today who believe in what they call 'direct' authority or what they call 'vertical' authority. They believe that authority to carry out the Great Commission comes directly from God though His Word APART FROM any gospel church. However, did the Old Landmarkers believe in 'direct' authority to carry out the Great Commission? [Fenison. GCC, p. 88].

And from Old Landmarkism:

If the church alone was commissioned to preserve and to preach the gospel, then it is certain no other organization has the right to preach it—to trench upon the divine rights of the church. A Masonic Lodge, no more than a Young Men's Association; and 'Odd-fellow' lodge or Howard Association, no more than a 'Woman's Missionary Board,' have the least right to *take* the gospel in hand, select and commission ministers to go forth and preach it, administer the ordinances and ORGANIZE CHURCHES.--J. R. Graves, *Old Landmarkism, What is it?* p. 36. [Fenison. GCC, Front cover. Note. The emphasis belongs to Bro Fenison not Graves—J C].

Again:

*A church is alone authorized to receive, to discipline, and to exclude her own members. This power, with all her other prerogatives is delegated to her, and it is her bounded duty to exercise it; she can not delegate her prerogatives....She can not authorize her ministers to examine and baptize members into fellowship without her personal presence and action upon each case. A minister, therefore, has no right, because ordained, to decide who are qualified to receive baptism and to administer it. Their ordination only qualified them to administer the*

*ordinances for a church when that church called upon them to do so.*--J. R. Graves, **Old Landmarkism**, pp. 37, 38. [Fenison. GCC, p. 90].

First, I have given these quotes exactly as they are found in GCC. The underscoring and italics belong to Bro Fenison not Graves. Second, Most EMDA men certainly do not in any wise believe what Graves said here for they regularly send men to the mission field with authority to baptize anyone they deem qualified. I have seen this done myself. Graves expressly denies that this is a proper procedure. Third, in this latter quote, Bro Fenison has combined two paragraphs as if they were one. The ellipsis in Graves' second paragraph began with this sentence which was deleted in GCC:

'Quod delegatur non delegatum est' is a legal maxim as old as the civil code. What is delegated can not be elegated.[Graves. OL. p. 48].

Why was this leading sentence of the paragraph left out? Could it be because it does not agree with EMDA! The heart of EMDA is *delegated* authority. But Graves denies the very possibility of a church delegating authority *consequently* the sentence was not welcome!

Delegated authority is *horizontal* authority, *ecclesiastical* authority or *earthly authority* (this last term belongs to Bro Fenison, GCC. p. 123), and it is in total contrast to *Direct* authority or *Divine* authority which is given from Christ. In the EMDA system, a church, a *mother* church, an ordained man, a presbytery or even an association gives, delegates or conveys *power* or *authority* to a group by some means or other (EMDA men cannot decide on just how this is done) to those who desire to constitute a new church. Without this *earthly* authority, they contend, a group cannot receive the Holy Spirit or become a true church!

The main thing to keep in mind at this point is the subject of debate—it is not how the Great Commission is received, but how is a gospel church constituted? This constant mixing of



diverse concepts is no small source of the confusion which exists among EMDA men.

To begin let me now give a statement by Graves which is plain and to the point:

An ekklesia of Christ "...is dependent upon no other body for its existence..." J.R. Graves. *New Great Iron Wheel*, p. 134.

Imagine that! Does this sound like EMDA?

Did an EMDA devotee ever write such a proposition? *An assembly of Christ is dependent upon no other body for its existence!* That is, for an *assembly* to come into existence!

But EMDA teaches the exact opposite! EMDA men call those of us who agree with Graves by every evil name they can think of, such as *apostate Landmarker* or *neo Landmarker!* (Cf. *SCO*. Pp 7, 42, 44, 45, 86, 79, 94, etc.). They accuse us of seeking to destroy the Lord's churches and promise to pray for us.

Let that all be as it may, we know what Graves said! Let the meaning of his words be measured carefully and only one answer will meet the brass tacks—Graves believed that the authority to constitute a church came from Christ directly!

But as we shall see, the assertion of Bro Fenison that Graves repudiated DA has no support whatsoever! It is exactly contrary to what Graves actually believed and the proof is not hidden in some generic term but is plainly stated by Graves with words of great force! This was so clearly presented in *LUF* that no one could possibly be ignorant of the fact—if he read the book! It is as if the author of *GCC* assumed EMDA was Graves' position and then never bothered to examine the evidence! But the references given in *LUF* in Graves own words totally refuted the idea that he embraced EMDA in any sense! Those quotes have been totally ignored by EMDA

writers, including Bro Fenison. Not one EMDA man has made any effort to explain Graves' statements of DA (*LUF*, Ch. 3, pp 14-25). [*LUF* is on line at [libcfl.com/articles/LUF/index.html](http://libcfl.com/articles/LUF/index.html)].

It is not necessary for me to follow Bro Fenison through the maze he created for what he says Graves believed on this subject. Page after page of *GCC* is voided by this one explicit statement above and there are many more to follow in which he explicitly states his position as DA! Some of these are now given for the first time since they were published in the *Tennessee Baptist* over a hundred years ago.

Now we ask why these quotes by Graves in *GCC* were given by Bro Fenison? Is there a single line which says anything directly about EMDA? Not a word! Is there anything in these quotes which would not square with DA? Nothing! So far as I am able to determine, the quotes by Graves in *GCC* have nothing whatsoever to do with the subject of this debate! The reader will see that I have not followed this policy but go straight to the point of discussion: *How is a church constituted?*

Graves specifically, precisely and constantly states his position is that churches are established by DA! How Bro Fenison could overlook such pertinent and prominent facts we will leave him to explain. This is also the death knell to the argument that EMDA is Landmarkism or that it has any part in it! Did Graves know what Landmarkism was? Thus to claim Graves believed EMDA is a striking misrepresentation of the man and his position. [See Appendix II.]

Now for more proof, Graves wrote:

A body of baptized Christians can organize themselves into a church at their pleasure, and no exterior body can organize them, much less can a presbytery organize a body superior to itself. [J. R. Graves. *The Baptist*. 1-17-1880, p. 486].

No child of thirteen summers can misunderstand! This quote is on the express subject of church constitution! EMDA says *another church must organize a group* or give them authority to do so. Graves says *no exterior body can organize them!* He insists that no church, no association, nor anything else on earth can organize a church! No man can more clearly express DA!

I give another:

Two or three baptized christians can organize themselves into a church in a private house—where there is need of a church, by covenanting together to be governed by the New Testament, discharging all the duties incumbent upon a church—without convening a presbytery;—and such a church can elect or ordain its own officers. [Graves. *The Baptist*. 1880. page 648. e. page 68].

Of course Graves is here appealing to Mt 18:20 without referring to it. How is this constitution done? Is it by a mother church? No. According to Graves it is by covenanting together! And they who so constitute a church do not even need a presbytery! Of course, Graves did not object to pastors being present at constitutions. In fact he thought they should be there to guide and help in the work but he wanted it understood that the power was not in the hands of ordained men, but in the saints themselves. How can anyone misunderstand Graves?

*GCC* insists that *no church can exist independent of the will of a mother church*, no matter what they call it. Every church's existence necessarily depends on the will of another church according to that theory. But hear Graves as he refutes this idea:

The Church of Christ is an independent body, consisting of one single local congregation, depending on the will of no other body on earth for her being or her ceasing to be. In one respect, like her crown head, she has power to lay down her life and power to take it up again. [Graves. *The Baptist*. April 8, 1880. Page 668].

Graves argues that a church is *dependent on the will of no other body on earth for her being* any more than for her ceasing to be! That is she has power from Christ to lay down her life—disband—and she has power to take it up again—that is, to constitute! All EMDA men will grant that a church can disband itself but Graves argues that baptized disciples have as much power given them by Christ to set themselves up as a church as they do to disband! Graves excludes any power communicated by any assembly or by any group of men or by anything on earth being essential for constitution of a church. And, he argues, that this power is given by Christ. This is DA explicitly stated!

## CHAPTER 9

### GRAVES ON DA CONTINUED

Graves hammers away at this false idea of some super authority in ordained men or in mother churches. He says a church is absolutely independent of all other bodies in her organization:

It is evident that, if a church must exist before her officers, and that she is absolutely independent of all other bodies, she must be authorized to elect and to commission her officers without being required to call upon some outside party..... [Graves. *Old Landmarkism*, p. 47].

This excludes churches, presbyteries, ordained men or what have you. Why is it that EMDA men cannot see these words? Do they read Graves? Why do they misunderstand? Why do they read one thing and understand another? Their spiritual dyslexia on this subject is astounding! But lest someone say that Graves did not mean that a group does not need another church to begin, he gives this statement:

Therefore, each assembly .... was divinely invested with all the power and prerogatives of a Church of Christ. [Graves. *New Iron W.* p. 125].

Divinely invested!

What idea can be given to the words *divinely invested*? Each assembly received whatever it has by a *divine* investment. Is that not *Divine* authority? Is that not *Direct*? Graves is not one to leave the reader to wonder about his meaning. He says again:

That each particular church was invested by its prime founder with all the functions, rights, powers and prerogatives ....until he should come again. [Graves. *NGIW*, p. 143].

Everything a church has, Graves reiterates, was invested in it by its prime founder—that is by the Lord Jesus Christ! This cuts off mother churches, presbyteries and all other supposed sources of power and places it exactly where Scripture puts it—in Christ's own hands! Is this what Bro Fenson says Graves believed? No man can read Bro Fenson in *GCC* and

know what Graves believed! It is plain as a, b, c, that either Graves or Fenison is wrong about what Graves believed! Bro Fenison tells us what he *thinks* Graves believed but we let Graves tell us what he himself thought on this subject and it is diametrically opposed to what Bro Fenison claims he believed!

But suppose we could ask Graves specifically a question about church constitution? What would he answer? Well here is an example from *The Baptist*:

Question. Have two or more legally baptized believers the Scriptural right to organize themselves into a church, without any ministerial aid?

Answer.-- "*I bi tris ici exklcesia licet caici.*" --Tertullian.  
*Where are three.* [Graves. *The Baptist*. 1879. E 68].

Graves here repudiates two of the main EMDA props — one, that you must have a *mother church* and two, that you must have an *ordained man* to constitute a church. He states his position as DA and repudiates EMDA *en passant*! The reader can see that I am quoting Graves *not on mere allusions* but on the very question which needs to be asked on this subject.

EMDA is an elaborate theory having several different laws all essential to constitute a church [Cf. *LUF* chapter 4, p. 30]. But Graves believed no such thing. He said:

We find no law in our code touching the forms necessary to constitute a church; nor do we find in the New Testament any example or intimation that a presbytery of ordained ministers ever acted in constituting a church. *Christ says the most about it, and it is but little: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them."* [Graves. *The Baptist*, Sept. 29, 1877, P. 663].

Is there a law in the NT for EMDA? Graves certainly did not think so. Thus as Bro Fenison has quoted him as believing EMDA, we see how prepossession can drive a man to claim Graves believed what he was careful to say he did not believe!

Again, Graves tells us exactly how churches are constituted—without the EMDA law:

When a company of baptized disciples, if only two or three, associate themselves as a church, covenanting with each other to be governed by the authority of Christ as indicated in the New Testament, they are, to all intents and purposes, a gospel church under the constitution. [ Graves. *The Baptist*. Sept. 29, 1877, P. 663, e. 282].

So Graves refuses to bow down at the EMDA music!

Somehow he constantly refuses to line up with the EMDA program. Instead, he denies it in every conceivable way. How then do EMDA men claim Graves supported their position? They could as well claim he believed in falling from grace!

The manner of EMDA missions and missionaries is rejected by Graves and he gave an entirely different method as practiced by Landmark Baptists in his day—a method which would be grounds for exclusion in EMDA churches today! Read carefully what he says:

It is not a multitude that makes a church. Christ had fore-designated how few would be recognized by Him "two or three are gathered in his name," under his authority, he would be present with them as their Head, *e.g.*, our missionaries to foreign fields are sent forth, two or more with their families, and on reaching their stations they organize themselves into a church, by covenanting to take the New Testament as their constitution, and Christ as their Head. [ J.R. Graves. *Great Carrollton Debate*, p. 809].

Did Bro Fenison read this quote?

Did he forget it? Does he believe it?

How could he be ignorant of it as it was quoted in *LUF*? But in case anyone pleads these missionaries must have had church authority for what they did and consequently that they

received authority unbeknown to them, Graves goes further. This question was sent in to *The Baptist*:

Can a church delegate her authority or power to any one, (even an archangel), under any circumstances, without disloyalty to Christ? ....

Answer. --*Quod delegatur, non delegatum, est*— delegated authority cannot be delegated. All the prerogatives of a church are delegated to her, and she cannot alienate them. [Graves. *Baptist*. 1879. e. page 161].

This is the precise question which needed to be asked but which no EMDA man ever dared ask of Graves. Nor do they accept his answer when he responds!

EMDA men maintain church authority is delegated from a church to a group and without this delegation of authority no new church can be formed—and if such be done without this delegated authority, it is a false church. Graves totally repudiates their contention! His position is that no church can ever under any circumstances delegate her authority! He means that no entity can delegate what is delegated to it. This rule is everywhere recognized, as with sheriff, president, congressman and so on. Surely we need not expand on what is so evident. Whatever authority a church has, it cannot give it away! This is a withering rebuttal of EMDA!

Another aspect of EMDA is the prevailing opinion of many of its advocates that there is some essential connection with a Scriptural constitution and ordained officers. In *SCO* we read:

Question: If the church does not have all authority to act for Christ in ecclesiastical matters in this age, how can it confer upon a man 'ordained to the full gospel ministry' the right to baptize and organize churches. [Milburn Cockrell. *SCO*, p. 79].

Bro Fenison agrees with Bro Cockrell on this idea. Graves responds:



The ministry in one form or another is attempting to assume the prerogatives of the local church.... That body of ministers assumed powers which they had no business with, as they do when they assume the right to constitute a church, to ordain ministers, to baptize whom and where they please.... [J.R. Graves. *The Baptist*. 1-17-1880, p. 486].

How sad these times in which Baptists take the road to Rome instead of the right way which is marked out so clearly! Again Graves raises this issue:

From what sources, pray, do the ministers get their authority to say, if any number of baptized disciples in any place, may or may not constitute themselves into a church by covenant, and “keep house for God”? No church certainly ever gave them the authority. Is there, then, a power higher than the local church? [J. R. Graves. *The Baptist*, 12-22-83, P 8].

We find nowhere in the Scriptures where a Presbytery had to be called to organize a church. Any number of Christians living in any neighborhood can come together, and by covenant, enter into church relations without asking the permission of any man or number of men. Upon its application to a District Association that body will decide whether it is a regular church of Christ or not—i.e. Duly organized, etc. those brethren had the right to organize. [Graves. *The Baptist*, 12-4-80. p 502].

To make sure Graves' readers recognized that he stood in good Baptist order, he quoted Hiscox:

Dr. Hiscox, in his Church Directory, which is a standard authority with American Baptists, says:

“It is customary for them [churches organizing] to call a counsel, to meet at the same time, or at a *subsequent time* to *recognize* them; that is to examine their doctrines, inquire into the circumstances and reasons of their organization, and express, in behalf of the churches they represent, approbation for their course and fellowship for them as a regularly constituted church of the same denomination. Calling the council is, however, entirely optional with the church, it is a prudential measure merely, to secure the sympathy and approbation of sister churches. BUT IT IS IN NO SENSE

NECESSARY.” pp. 17-18. [J. R. Graves. *The Baptist*, 12-22-83. P. 8. The emphasis belongs to Graves—J C].

Thus when Bro Fenison suggests that he and Graves are in agreement on this subject, we begin to suspect that the Graves of whom he speaks is not the real Graves but an imaginary character!

Graves constantly emphasized that no pastor can baptize for a church without that church being present which flies in the face of EMDA procedure which sends a pastor or a missionary to baptize people on the other side of the globe pretending they baptize these people into the home church thousands of miles away—and of all things—pretending that this procedure is Landmarkism! This sounds more like Star Trek than Baptist polity! [ *SCO*, 40, 41; *GCC*, 36].

Finally, we have Graves expressing himself on the church arm idea which is so ensconced in EMDA thinking.

We can learn nothing from God's word about church arms—a body that is not a church, and yet exercising all the functions of a church, and yet the attorney or agent of another body, is an anomalous organization. [ Graves. *The Baptist*, 3-10-83. P. 8].

In the light of these references (and there are hosts of others which we will publish later, the Lord willing) there can be no question but that EMDA men have misunderstood and misrepresented Graves and Landmarkism! What they claim as Landmarkism is a counterfeit and bears no relationship to the original and they ought to stand up like men and admit the fact. Bro Fenison said:

Neither can one identify themselves with historical Landmarkism and believe in “direct” authority. [Fenison. *GCC*. p. 156].

One seldom reads such an assertion, held out as if it was a rod of iron, but which hangs down like a whip when compared with the facts. Can Graves be identified with “historical

Landmarkism”? Perhaps Bro Fenison does not know “historical Landmarkism” when he meets it!

In conclusion, this chapter with its *direct quotes* on *church constitution* in Graves' own words (not, for example, on the great commission, on succession or on the Atlantic cable, which is what Bro Fenison appealed to in his book) will raise the question whether he can find any agreement at all between himself and Graves on this subject?

Are these EMDA men the kind of Landmark Baptist Graves was? We know they can never be what the Old Landmarkers were— as long as they hold to EMDA! And *If like begets like*, as they insist it does, in reference to churches, then they can have no connection with Graves and the Landmarkers of history—their own cliché effectually excludes the possibility!

If these explicit quotes on the subject of church constitution by Graves do not persuade EMDA men as to what he believed on this subject, then they would not be persuaded if he arose from the dead!

I do not believe EMDA men will make any effort to explain Graves' statements. So far not one writer among them has ever attempted to do so. The task is far too difficult. Rather they will continue to quote Graves on irrelevant matters—and pretend they are in agreement with him—and this will fool the choir! It appears the rope is too hot for them to hold, on one hand, and that they are too high to turn loose, on the other!

These quotes by Graves grip EMDA men in an enormous vise and his words continually tighten it turn after turn!

**CHAPTER 10**  
**THE SALEM CHURCH CONSTITUTION**  
**Salem, Mississippi**

Concerning this church which I mentioned in *LUF*, Bro Fenison says:

Bro. Settlemoir has grossly misrepresented this case. The whole truth of the constitution of this church is obtained only when both histories are considered together. [Fenison. *GCC*. 200].

Apparently he means by *both histories* Christian's *History* and *A Complete History of Mississippi Baptists*, by Leavell & Bailey, published in 1904. He asserts the whole truth concerning the constitution of this church can only be obtained when both of these histories are compared. If true, then two things are patently clear. 1) No one knew or understood the whole truth about this church until 1926 when Christian published the second volume of his history! This means that the Salem Association did not know the whole truth! Bond, who wrote the *History of the Mississippi Association* in 1849, did not know the whole truth about this church! 2) Bro Cockrell did not know or present the truth on this church in *SCO* [86-87], either 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> edition! Why? Because he did not even mention Christian's *History of the Baptists* on the Salem Church—and this means he could not have known the *whole truth* according to Bro Fenison! Also the question is blurted out, why does Bro Fenison limit his criteria to these two histories? Has he surveyed all the other histories and found them of no value? Has he read the two histories which he says are essential to the whole truth? What about Boyd's, Newman's and McLemore's histories? What about the Salem Church's own minutes? [See bibliography for references to Baptist history of churches in Mississippi]. Or, it is just possible that Bro Fenison has overshot the runway?

Bro Cockrell issued the challenge [*SCO*. 84] to find a church constituted with no connection to another church or without a missionary. Bro Fenison commented on Bro Cockrell's challenge:

Examples where pure 'direct authority' is involved in the constitution of a church are extremely rare in American Baptist History. So rare that Elder Milburn Cockrell in his

book entitled 'Church Constitution' challenged his opponents to find cases where no ordained minister, or letters of dismission, or mother church was connected to a constitution. Bro Cockrell was not denying it could be done, but it would be difficult to find. [GCC. 198.].

Now we know a law is in operation at all times. If someone says it is a law that water boils at 130 degrees F, and you can boil it at 120 degrees F you prove that theory false. It is no law at all! Thus Bro Fenison unintentionally admits EMDA is not a law because he recognizes that churches have been constituted by DA!

Bro Fenison said I could find **only one example** of this in *LUF*. [GCC. 198]. Actually *seven* were given, [*LUF*. 60-66; and there are others expressly so constituted].

### Correction

But I did make a mistake in this section on the Salem church in *LUF* [60-61] where I referred to the constitution of this church. I gave the author of a book Christian quoted (he gave only the last name of the author) as *John* Bond when in fact the author was *T. M. Bond*. I discovered this error when I examined the book itself. [T. M. Bond. *A Republication of the Minutes of the Mississippi Association from its Organization in 1806 to the Present Time*, 1849]. I wish to correct that error here. [Cf. *Christian. Hist.* II. 333].

Note first that Bro Fenison claims there is only one church mentioned in this account.

In the mean time while they waited upon the "parent church" for authority to act, the unbaptized converts were recognized as candidates for membership "in the church"—referring to the **parent church** as no other church was yet constituted. [GCC. 198. The emphasis and the quotations marks belong to Bro Fenison].

I believe this is a complete misunderstanding of this historical record. The evidence indicates that there are two churches in

this account, one in South Carolina and the other in Mississippi. The *church* which was caring for those awaiting baptism was clearly the Salem Church in Mississippi not the church in SC! This means there are *two churches mentioned* here and if so Bro Fenison's supposition is incorrect. These candidates for membership were waiting baptism in the *Salem Church* in Mississippi—not the Pee Dee Church in SC! The proof of this is easy. They were baptized by Bro Curtis before he returned to SC! Even after he left, when others were saved, they were baptized by a man named Chaney.

While Curtis was gone, a number of persons desired baptism, and it was agreed that Wm. Chaney should perform it, and, accordingly, he administered the ordinance to a number of persons. [Bond. *Hist. MS Baptist Association*, p. 4-5].

How could these candidates in Mississippi have been *cared for and encouraged* by the church in SC? Does Bro Fenison think they had a Lear Jet at their disposal so they could fly the SC pastor to MS to minister in Salem and then fly back to SC for the next service there?

The question the church at Salem asked and what they communicated with the parent church about was not to obtain authority to constitute—which is Bro Fenison's idea and it is pure imagination— an idea which is totally foreign to the records! Why is that? Because **they had already constituted themselves a church in 1791!** It was some time, at least several months after they constituted, before this question came up! The converts wanting baptism brought up the question. Thus the question the church posed could have nothing to do with constitution! You cannot obtain authority to constitute after the fact! Any EMDA church will declare any such church constitution as unscriptural and insist that it be constituted on their terms!

What the Salem church asked, was what to do about *baptizing converts*, since **they had no ordained man among them**—an essential as they understood it! They sought *advice* about

baptizing without an ordained man; not *authority* to constitute a church!

This is not a difficult account! The language is not hard to understand. There are no foreign terms to contend with. How Bro Fenison could make the claim that there was only one church in this account without any evidence whatsoever and in face of the documents stating they constituted in 1791 is a mystery!

In historical matters primary documents have more weight and take precedence over all other data. In this case we have the minutes of the Salem Church and I quote:

Original Minutes of First Baptist Church.  
October 1791. The Baptists of the vicinity of Natchez met by request of Richard Curtis and William Thompson at the house of sister Stampley on Cole's Creek, and formed into a body, receiving (or adopting) the following articles or rules, considering it necessary that such as have a mind to join the church are only to be received by letter or experience. [Boyd. *Popular Hist. Bap. MS.* 18; Cf. McLemore. *Hist. MS Baptists.* 14].

Some questions are in order.

What did they do? They met together! When? October, 1791.

What the purpose of this meeting? To constitute a church.

How did they do that? They formed themselves into a body ("formed into a body") and adopted the articles of a church.

What authority did they have? They had no authority from SC. They had no ordained man among them. The only authority available to them was found in Mt 18:20.

Did they have articles of Faith? Yes they did. They adopted the articles listed in their minutes and covenanted together on the articles and rules which follow!



If this was not a church constitution then these saints in Salem were mistaken! But one thing is certain—*they thought they constituted a church*—as these records indicate and this proves the EMDA theory was not known among them or they would never have proceeded as they did!

This makes it quite certain that Bro Fenison's theory is flat on the rim simply because the church constituted in 1791 according to their own records! This means they constituted before it was possible for them to obtain EMDA according to Bro Fenison's theory! But then what are we to think when Bro Fenison tells us they wrote back to SC for authority to constitute? When did this church communicate with the church in SC? Not until sometime after their organization in 1791 when they had converts awaiting baptism according to their own records. The records of these historians mentioned agree with this account of the Salem church and what it did.

Christian says they were constituted in 1791.

Leavell and Bailey say this church was constituted in 1791.

Boyd says the Salem was constituted in 1791.

Bond, who wrote *The History of the Mississippi Baptist Association*, said the church was constituted in 1791.

The Salem church records say they were constituted in 1791!

Did I *grossly misrepresent* this account?

## **Chapter 11**

### **Kittery Church Organization**

Bro Fenison sent a letter to me (and perhaps a hundred others, May 21, 2008). In it he gave the following quote:

"On January 3, 1682, we find Humphrey Churchwood, one of the members, at Kittery, Main, with a band of brethren

gathered about him. These were organized into a regular Baptist Church September 25, 1682, with William Screven as pastor. He then made a trip all the way to Boston to be ordained BY THE CHURCH UNDER WHOSE AUTHORITY THEY WERE CONSTITUTED." J. H. Grime, *A History of Middle Tennessee Baptists*, p. 1 (pp. 108-109)

This quote is also in his book *GCC*, 108,109, 116, and is supposed to prove EMDA was used by Baptists in history.

Bro Fenison has emphasized (in this case with all capitals) some of the words of Grime without making the reader aware of this addition, a habit of his constantly demonstrated throughout his book. These quotes are also emphasized in bold type in *GCC*. Again he does not inform the reader that the emphasis belongs to him, not to the author he is quoting.

He holds up this statement without any investigation as to the meaning and intent of the author. Had he done so, I do not believe he would have mentioned it. The statement to which Bro Fenison is so strongly attracted to in Grime —*by whose authority they were constituted*— is not that of the church records nor of the original historian, but a passing comment by Grime! This then is not the idea of the mother church. It is not what the daughter church thought. It is not the word of Burrage (the author of the *History of Maine Baptists*) but this is a phrase that Grime used over two hundred years after this church was constituted! I ask the reader. Is this the proper way to prove anything?

But even Grime (whatever he may have believed about EMDA) does not state a **mother church is essential for constitution** anywhere in *The History of Middle TN Baptists!* What did Grime mean by this statement, “under whose authority they were constituted” is not so certain. It is possible Grime meant EMDA. But if so one would expect to find some explicit statement of this doctrine, if not in his *History* then in his *Catechism of Ecclesiastical History* or in *Why I am a Baptist*, or somewhere. But instead Bro Fenison gives us this

incidental aside and suggests this proves not only that Grime believed EMDA but this proves the first Baptist Church of Boston believed it and then in a leap of logic, that ergo, Baptists in general believed this doctrine, which is a stretching the data as if it were rubber!

Without some other information we cannot be sure that Grime meant EMDA. He may only have meant they were lettered out of the church in Boston. Or he may have meant that they were *sent out* by that church. He may have meant the church at Boston *helped* the group at Kittery form themselves into a church (which we know they did) but without any idea of EMDA. Did Grime mean EMDA by this phrase? Did Grime anywhere state he believed EMDA? Is it possible that Bro Fenison misunderstood Grime? Is it possible that Grime misunderstood how this Kittery church was constituted? All of these things are possible. Thus Bro Fenison should have done enough research to derive the facts of the case rather than to *assume* what Grime meant, and thereby assume that these early Baptists believed and practiced EMDA! But while EMDA brethren excel in such assumptions they are woefully lacking in facts!

Now here is the situation. Bro Fenison *assumes* Grime meant EMDA by this **incidental statement** without any proof whatsoever that Grime believed EMDA! He next assumes, apparently, that Grime is quoting from the records of this early church but this is not the case! Bro Fenison then supposes this proves the Kittery church was constituted by EMDA! Then he imagines this proves EMDA is a Baptist doctrine! All of this is based upon a mere incidental statement by Grime some 220 years after the constitution of the church in question and then on a whole series of assumptions without one single line of proof from the records of the original church to support the initial supposition! I believe this is far-fetched!

I might rest the case right here but let me give more than is required. Suppose, for a moment, that the Boston Church **did not** have EMDA itself! What would this do for Bro Fenison's proposition? Nothing could deflate his claims more quickly or

more completely. Could Boston provide EMDA to the Kittery Church if it never had it? If the Boston church never had it, could this incidental phrase by Grime some two hundred years later supply that lack? Of course not!

Both reason and EMDA exclude the possibility!

You must have EMDA to give EMDA, according to the theory!

The theory adamantly maintains *no EMDA no church!* This is the whole system in a nutshell. No matter what Bro Grime may have meant by the phrase *by whose authority they were constituted* and no matter what Bro Fenison thought it meant, no man can put EMDA into this Kittery account if it was not in the Boston church first! This is the crux of the matter and it brings us to the question, was the Boston Church constituted with EMDA?

No! It did not have EMDA!

How do we know this? Because we have the records of this church!

The simple fact is that the Boston Church records state it was self constituted without any such thing as EMDA and without an ordained man and consequently the church at Kittery could not obtain EMDA from Boston because Boston never had it! And whatever the church at Boston did for the Kittery group, they certainly did not grant them authority in the sense of EMDA, or if so, they were selling goods which they did not possess! And no matter what Grime meant, his words cannot create EMDA in this account! The terms which Bro Fenison claimed as proof for EMDA, do not support EMDA in any sense but are just a misunderstanding on his part.

The records for this church clearly state the facts. Either Bro Fenison knew the facts and withheld them or he was ignorant of them. If he did not know them, (he certainly should have

known them as the account of the constitution of this Boston church was included in *LUF*, 65, which chapter he indicated he read, *GCC*, 198). If ignorant, then he is selling an account of a church as having solid EMDA support which instead was constituted by DA. Either way his situation is not too good! Now to the records.

## **ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CHURCH BOSTON**

Of the formation of the Baptist church and the reasons for it Gould himself gives an account. A small section of his narrative is here transcribed as follows:

Now after this, considering with myself what the Lord would have me to do; not likely to join with any of the churches of New England, and so to be without the ordinance of Christ; in the meantime God sent out of Old England some who were Baptists; we, consulting together what to do, sought the Lord to direct us, and taking counsel of other friends who dwelt among us, who were able and godly, they gave us counsel to congregate ourselves together; and so we did, being nine of us, to walk in the order of the gospel according to the rule of Christ....after we had been called into two courts, the church [protestant church at Cambridge] understanding that we were gathered into church order.....

The organization of this Baptist church caused a great noise throughout New England. [Christian. *History of Baptists*, vol. 2, p. 74.].

This constitution took place May 28, 1665. [Cf. Benedict. 383; Armitage. 705; Backus. I. 288].

Please consider. This group (the First Church of Boston) did not have authority from any church nor from any other entity on earth! This throws a wrench in the EMDA works!

Will Bro Fenison now accept this church as a true church? If so he must tear out at least one hundred fifty pages of his book! Furthermore, this church did not have an ordained man among them! Will Bro Fenison now allow this to have been a valid constitution when he has argued for pages that no church

can be constituted without an ordained man? There goes another fifty pages! Is the constitution of this church in line with EMDA law?

This group did not have authority from the churches in England even though two of the men were Baptists before they came to America, neither of them were preachers. Goodall came from Kiffin's church; Turner and Lambert had been members of a church in Dartmouth, England.

Was this an EMDA organization? No EMDA man will approve of such an organization today but rather they declare with one voice that a church so constituted is no church whatsoever! [cf. *GCC* throughout and *Misnomer* by Bro. Medford Caudill as examples].

What would they say if this same kind of organization took place today? They would not recognize nor fellowship such a church! They will not support a missionary who believes this was a true constitution! Yet Bro Fenison maintains that the Kittery church was the EMDA example of how Baptist churches were then constituted! But now we learn this Boston mother was not a satisfactory mother at all according to EMDA decrees but it was itself an illegitimate church!

Remember EMDA advocates maintain you can't organize a church without authority from a mother church and you can't organize a church without an ordained man! They easily make these requirements up and increase or decrease them as the exigencies demand but in this case their ship hit the sand in spite of all their efforts! They must either give up their theory (which would be right and proper) or they must reject both the Boston and Kittery churches! These facts tear up the EMDA theory without mercy!

When this group determined to organize into a Baptist church, they did not send to England for EMDA. They did not send to Rhode Island to Roger Williams or John Clarke for it. Where did they get their authority? They got it from Christ in Heaven

according to Mt. 18:20; 2 Cor. 8:5; 1 Pe. 2:5; Re. 1:13; 2:5. They did not obtain **earthly authority** (which Bro Fenison claims is the essential thing) [GCC. 212] from any source! They followed the Bible not tradition! They congregated themselves together *according to the rule of Christ*.

Benedict discusses the constitution of this church. He says:

But about this time, says this afflicted man [Gould], some Baptist friends from England desired to hold a meeting at his house. *They* well understood how to manage cases of this kind, from their own experience at home. The meeting was accordingly commenced, and on the 28<sup>th</sup> of May, 1665, the church was formed, consisting of Thomas Gould,

Thomas Osboume, Edward Drinker, John George, Richard Goodall, William Turner, Robert Lambert, Mary Goodall, and Mary Newall. [Benedict. Hist. 383].

Now what was wrong with this church? The principle thing was that it did not have authority, as Benedict, quoting others, tells us. They got no authority from the Protestants—who demanded it just as EMDA brethren do! They did not obtain authority from the ruling powers that is, the powers of the Protestant political system. But this is not all. **They did not obtain any kind of authority from any Baptist church!**

Here it is most important in this discussion to consider that not one of the Baptist historians who mentions this account of the Boston Church constitution censures them for what they did nor for the way they did it—that is without any vestige of EMDA and without an ordained man! If these Baptist historians had believed EMDA (as Bro Fenison is so bold to claim) was the true way to constitute a church and if that theory was operational in their day (and this is the claim), their silence is inexcusable! If EMDA was not the doctrine of Baptists then this silence is perfectly consonant with Baptist polity. [Cf. Isaac Backus, *History of the Baptists of New England*, Vol. 1, p. 288; Benedict, *History*. I. 383-384].



Bro Fenison missed his mark by miles. He took a mere phrase from Grime accentuated as if it were the *sine qua non* of Baptist church constitution. He transported this allusion to the Church in Kittery with no effort to ascertain the meaning of the terms used and then assumed they got EMDA from the Boston Church and that would have sufficed except for the facts—these contrary facts! What are we to think when a man takes a phrase out of a book without checking the facts, without carefully reading the account referred to and claims it has specific and concrete teaching concerning EMDA, when the records prove it had no such thing? This shows the prepossession of men to find EMDA somewhere, anywhere, even where it never was!

In this case, as we have shown, EMDA was not involved in the organization of the Kittery church because the *mother church* was herself self-constituted without any one of the prerequisites the EMDA position mandates! It is also obvious that the very terms to which Bro Fenison appealed are irrelevant! They cannot mean what he thought they meant! His whole appeal to this account was a leap in the dark! These terms instead of proving EMDA refute it! It is sad but we know many EMDA men will fully embrace these errors and never bother to check the facts! This indicates the power of misinformation to deceive.

## **Chapter 12**

### **THE PHILADELPHIA BAPTIST ASSOCIATION AND EMDA**

Bro Fenison has a chapter in *GCC* on the Philadelphia Baptist Association, pp 68-85. Some of his conclusions I will note:

All of the churches mentioned in the opening pages of the Philadelphia Baptist Association minutes were constituted under the direction and authority of a preexistent church or churches and yet at the same time are said to have “gathered themselves”. For example we read: “*In the year 1711, they were advised to PUT THEMSELVES IN CHURCH ORDER BY THEMSELVES.....(p. 16)....to meet and SETTLE THEMSELVES in church order...*” Ibid., p.16. [Fenison. GCC. p. 79].

Bro Fenison assumes the term “church order” is EMDA, which indicates a proclivity of his to see EMDA in every nook and crevice of Baptist history.

He goes on to say:

There was no contradiction in their minds between church authority and the act of self constitution by covenant vote. It was somewhat parallel to baptism. There is the action of baptism but there is church authority giving validity to that action. The same is true with church constitution. There is the action of self-constitution by covenant vote but there is church authority giving validity to that action. All church constitutions within the Philadelphia Association first sought Church authority to constitute themselves and obtained it either by letters of dismissal for that stated purpose and/or submitting to the direction of church ordained representatives. [Fenison. GCC. p. 79].

This is Bro Fenison's commentary. It is not interpretation but speculation. He tells us what he *thinks* was in their minds but the only way we can know what was in their minds is by the records they left. Bro Fenison does find a single line to prove his assertion! His statement that “all constitutions within the Philadelphia Association first sought Church authority to constitute themselves...” goes begging. Where is there any statement in the Minutes of this Association which would justify this assertion?

But He goes on:

...all of the churches mentioned in the opening pages of the Philadelphia Baptist Association minutes were constituted

under the direction and authority of a preexistent church or churches... [Fenison. *GCC*, p. 79].

Where is this stated? Why did he not give a specific and concrete reference where this Association said a new church must be constituted by a preexisting mother church? Is this not hearsay?

We ask the reader to remember the point in debate—must a group have a mother church's authority to constitute? Bro Fenison argues that the Philadelphia Baptist Association demanded this very thing in every case where members wished to form a new church and that they had to obtain authority from a “called business meeting by church vote” [*GCC*, p. 72]. That is his assertion but the reference proving it is nowhere found in *GCC*! Instead of specific statements from the men who composed this Association we are given Bro Fenison's testimony about what he *thinks* they believed! This is inadmissible. We examine.

What did the Philadelphia Baptist Association in its first one hundred years of existence believe about how a church receives power?

Francis W. Sacks, a Roman Catholic Friar spent eight years studying the *Philadelphia Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, using primary documents. This book is published by the Edwin Mellen Press. It is volume # 48 in its *Studies in American Religion*. Sacks treatment is the most extensive thing ever written on the Philadelphia Baptist Association of Church and Church authority. It has 850 pages! Sacks tells how this Association understood church authority:

*Authority*—the right to exercise power in the church or Church, or the authorization to do so. Authority is of three types depending upon the origin: divine, from the Scriptures; ecclesiastical, from the churches or church; and human, from the nature of a society. [Sacks. *The Phil. Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, P. 34].

He says the Philadelphia Baptist Association understood authority to be of three types: Divine which is from Scripture; ecclesiastical which is from the churches; and human from the nature of a society. When he gives the source of church authority he says:

The local church, as the only seat of church-power (in its technical meaning), receives authority immediately from Christ on the occasion of the covenant established among professed believers.

Thus, all church authority belongs to Christ. [Sacks. *The Phil. Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, p. 590].

Authority *immediately from Christ* is DA. He goes on:

However, in order to execute his authority and sovereign power Christ gathers visible saints into churches. To these he hands over all the authority and power needed to execute his will. Each church, thus, has the ability to rule itself because all the necessary authority is given to each distinct church directly from Christ. Sacks, *The Phil. Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, p. 324.

In this quote he says the Philadelphia Baptist Association believed a church received its authority *directly* from Christ! He also touches on what they believed about the delegation of this power:

The church cannot alienate this power in any way, nor delegate it to any other group. [Sacks, *The Phil. Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, p. 595].

This Association, he concluded, believed that it was impossible for a church to alienate that power received from Christ! That is, whatever power a church had, it could not delegate, alienate or give to any other group! This expressly excludes EMDA! That Sacks is right on target is corroborated by Graves who taught the same thing in words that are strikingly similar:

All the functions, prerogatives whatsoever a church is warranted in exercising are *delegated* powers, and **delegated trusts cannot be alienated or relegated**. No church has the right to authorize her pastor and deacons, or any number of her members to examine candidates and baptize them or to transact any business that legitimately devolves upon a church, as such, to do. This determines the first question *negatively*. [Graves. *The Baptist*. Aug. 12, 1882, p. 151. My emphasis. J. C.].

Sacks then discusses *ecclesiastical power* which can be delegated according to the Philadelphia Baptist Association:

Ninth, the church's ecclesiastical power can be properly delegated. This requires the consent of the church or churches, and the power passed on by the local congregations never dominates church-powers. Nor are the delegated powers ever of a nature superior to those of the gathered church. All delegated authority is purely and simply authority to act in an advisory capacity to assist the churches. [Sacks, *The Phil. Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, p. 597].

Ecclesiastical authority which can be communicated or delegated is purely and simply **authority to act in an advisory capacity** to assist the churches! This is not EMDA in any wise but precludes and excludes it for EMDA does not advise but it empowers! EMDA does not assist, it creates!

Let me ask a couple of questions concerning Sacks' conclusions on how church authority is given to churches. How can we account for the fact that a Roman Catholic can study the Philadelphia Baptist Association in its *primary documents* for eight years and come to the exact same position that Graves, Crowell, Hiscox and other leading Baptists held while Bro Fenison comes to a completely different conclusion?

But there is other evidence for DA in which this Association gave its position on how a church receives its authority:

That an Association is not a superior judicature, having such superior power over the churches concerned; but that each

particular church hath a complete power and authority from Jesus Christ, to administer all gospel ordinances, provided they have a sufficiency of officers duly qualified, or that they be supplied by the officers of another sister church or churches, as baptism, and the Lord's supper, &c.; and to receive in and cast out, and also to try and ordain their own officers, and to exercise every part of gospel discipline and church government, independent of any other church or assembly whatever. [Gillette. Editor. *Philadelphia Baptist Association*, pp 60-61. Essay by Benjamin Griffith on the Power and Duty of an Association].

This Essay by Griffith was approved and signed by twenty nine preachers of this association [Minutes, p. 63]. No EMDA man would ever sign this document because it excludes EMDA and specifically states DA!

Bro Fenison brought in another account in an effort to bolster his proposition that the Philadelphia Baptist Association held the doctrine of EMDA:

In Virginia messengers sent out by the churches of the Philadelphia Association found Baptist churches that were not organized according to regular gospel order. They preached and taught among them and Semple says *"they were newly organized and formed into new churches, according to the plan of the Philadelphia Association, or rather according to the Baptist Confession of faith, published in London 1689, in conformity with which it seems the Philadelphia and Charleston Associations were organized"* Robert Baylor Semple. History of Virginia Baptists, p. 448. [Fenison. GCC. p. 81].

Bro Fenison assumes these churches referred to were constituted without EMDA and that this no-no was ascertained by these missionaries and that they then set these false churches straight by giving them what they had failed to obtain when first constituted—namely, EMDA!

Far from it!

These churches were not reconstituted because of a lack of EMDA in organization, as Bro Fenison supposes, but because

the members were unconverted when constituted! These churches were not true churches because composed of unconverted people! Any time a church is founded with unsaved people, it is no church! Semple makes this clear and it appears that only a careless reading of the account could miss what Semple said:

Their manner of gathering churches was very loose indeed, or at least was very adverse to the method now prevalent among the Baptists in Virginia. They required no experience of grace or account of their conversion, but baptized all who asked it and professed to believe in the doctrine of baptism by immersion. [Semple. *History of Virginia Baptists*, p. 447].

So the reconstitution of these churches had nothing to do with the *manner* but with the *material* of constitution! These people were not saved when constituted and did not profess to be! Bro Fenison does not

understand the problem of these churches! It had nothing to do with EMDA—a subject of which Semple says not a word! It is strange that Bro Fenison can see EMDA everywhere but can find it nowhere!

Another line of refutation of Bro Fenison's theory on the Philadelphia Baptist Association is that we have a sermon preached before this it on what a gospel church is. Now if EMDA was the position of this Association, then in that message we will find it spelled out. But when one reads this straight forward message he finds that the method set forth is DA—not EMDA! EMDA is not found in this message! It is not demanded! It is not suggested! It is not given as an essential! It is not even mentioned! How could this be if the Philadelphia Association believed EMDA and all the churches were set up with this law?

HART'S SERMON ON A GOSPEL CHURCH  
PORTRAYED AND HER ORDERLY SERVICE POINTED  
OUT, PREACHED BEFORE THE PHILADELPHIA  
BAPTIST ASSOCIATION



Hart's outline is as follows:

1. To describe the house of the Lord, as built upon the gospel plan. 2. Show when it may be said that the service of this house is set in order, or what is necessary thereunto. 3. I am to describe the house of the Lord, as built upon the gospel plan, or, in other words, portray a true gospel church.

The materials have already been described. To erect the building these materials must coalesce, or be joined together; for while they continue as detached pieces, (although all of the mystical body of Christ) they cannot, with any propriety, be termed, a church. They become a gospel church, therefore, by confederation, or mutual compacts; in which, 'they give up themselves to the Lord, and to one another, by the will of God;' covenanting by grace divine to discharge all the duties incumbent upon them, in this gospel relation; and to 'walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.' They must become a body corporate, under CHRIST the head, 'from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God--' in whom in whom all the building fitly framed together, growth on to an holy Temple in the Lord.'

The number necessary to constitute a church is not ascertained; but as Christ has promised his gracious presence with two or three, gathered together in his name, if this may be applied to the gathering of a church, (and I see not why it may not) it must indicate that a few may compose a church, even supposing these two or three certain, for an uncertain number they should not however be so numerous, as not to be able, commodiously, to meet together, for divine service in one place. [A Sermon on a Gospel Church Portrayed and Her Orderly Service Pointed Out.' Preached at the opening of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, Oct. 4, 1791, in the city of Philadelphia, by Oliver Hart. Sacks. *Philadelphia Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority*, page 751].

Now here we have a clear statement on how a church was constituted in the Philadelphia Baptist Association. This message was preached before the Association Oct. 4, 1791. The author expresses DA! He even appeals to Mt 18:20 which throws a chunk in Bro Fenison's gears. Now if all these sweeping generalizations about this Association given by Bro Fenison demanding EMDA for constitution are swept away by

Hart's message— and they are— then it is easy to see that such irrelevant references as he gave in *GCC* prove nothing! Notwithstanding these strong assertions, EMDA is not found in the Philadelphia Baptist Association.

But there is one more source for the Philadelphia Baptist Association on this subject which I will now give. This Association on two different occasions had a manual prepared on church polity for the churches composing it. The first by Benjamin Griffith, was published with the minutes in 1743, [Cathcart. *Baptist Encyclopedia*, p. 476]. The second was written by Samuel Jones and it was published in 1797.

Neither of these treatises supports EMDA.

Griffith says:

Before there can be any orderly discipline among a Christian assembly, they must be orderly constituted into a church state, according to the institution of Christ in the Gospel. [Benjamin Griffith. *A Short Treatise Concerning a True and Orderly Gospel Church*; Quoted by Dever. *Polity*, p. 96].

Griffith gives six points on what an **orderly constituted church is** but none of them mention EMDA! Of course, no group espousing the EMDA theory would ever forget to insert it—essential that it is— into such a document. Why did Griffith not include EMDA in his treatise?

The other work by Samuel Jones is more extensive. It was entitled *A Treatise of Church Discipline and a Directory* and was published by the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1805. Jones treats first *Of a Gospel Church*. This chapter is divided into fifteen paragraphs. Nowhere is EMDA even mentioned, which if Jones or the Philadelphia Baptist Association had believed, it would have been an unconscionable crime to leave it out. He says:

5. A number of believers are united together into a particular church, by an act of mutual confederation., 'Gave their own

selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God,' 2 Cor. 8:5.

6. Whether the requisite number should be twelve or thirteen, because our blessed Lord and his disciples, at the first celebration of the Lord's supper, made that number, or whether three will be sufficient, because of the promise in Mt. 18:20, may be doubtful but there ought to be so many, as to answer the end of that holy institution.

7. When such a number is found in any place, they ought to propose among themselves, or others may propose it to them, to be constituted a church.

8. For this purpose it will be necessary to appoint a time and place, when they are to meet fasting. One minister or more should be present to assist. And to preach on the occasion. Acts 8:14. 11:22. [Samuel Jones. *Treatise on Church Discipline*. Q. by Dever. *Polity*, p. 140-141].

The supposed evidence that the Philadelphia Association believed EMDA utterly fails. But we have presented strong evidence which indicates that this Association in fact held to DA.

## **CHAPTER 13**

### **ORDAINED MEN and CHURCH CONSTITUTION**

Is it essential to have an ordained man to constitute a church?  
That Baptists today can even ask such a question shows how  
far they have drifted from the moorings of our fathers! This is

the position of the authors of *GCC* and *SCO*. We believe this is not only incorrect but absolutely dangerous!

The question is not, *is it good to have an ordained man present in constitution?* It is not, *is it a beneficial thing?* It is not, *is it helpful to insure things are properly done?* It is not, *would you advise a group to have an ordained man present when they constitute?* These questions would all receive a positive answer. But the question is rather, *is it an essential for an ordained man to be present in a constitution?* Now if you ask the Roman Catholic this question you will receive an affirmative answer. If you ask the Episcopalian, you will also receive a positive answer. Some other groups respond in like manner. But for Baptists, **this question must receive a negative answer!**

EMDA men see ordained men holding one side of essential authority necessary to constitute a church. The other side, they say is held up by a mother church. Thus in essence they have *two sources* of authority—the mother church and an ordained man. This is both unscriptural and untenable! James Pendleton said:

Baptists believe that God calls men to preach the gospel, and that the churches recognize his call. They cannot make a minister, but they can approve what God has done—at least, what they believe he has done. This is all a church does in voting for the ordination of one of its members to the pastoral office. Believing him to be divinely called to the office, the church, by its vote, recognizes the call; and this vote of recognition is the essence of ordination. Such a vote must precede a Council of ordination, and the Council is called by the church of which the brother is a member. Andrew Fuller well remarks: "The only end for which I join in an ordination is to unite with the elders of that and other churches in *expressing my brotherly concurrence in the election, which, if it fell on what I accounted an unsound or unworthy character, I should withhold.* [Pendleton. *Dist. Principles of Baptists*. p. 203].

But once you admit the source of ordination, you can never consistently claim ordination is essential to church

constitution. Sound Baptists know this because the church *precedes* ordination! The church existed before there were any ordained men, (Mt 5:1; 10:1-4; Mk 3:14; Ac 1:21-26; Ac 14:23). Churches recognize God's called men and thus ordains them—but ordained men cannot produce a church. If there was not an ordained man on earth today, a Baptist church could have a fully ordained man tomorrow! This has been both the Baptist and the Landmark Baptist position and was constantly proclaimed and defended by J. R. Graves and others, (Cf. Gill, Hiscox, etc.). Crowell says:

No bishop, no council of ministers, nor delegation from other churches, nor sanction of the church universal, can impart to them the least degree of church power. [Crowell. *Church Member's Manual*, p. 70].

Crowell is saying that no council of ministers can convey church power or church status to a group and we are disappointed when Baptists do not know this plain fact. EMDA men do not hold the same position that Crowell and Graves did on the purpose of having ordained men at a church constitution. EMDA men insist it is an essential; that something flows through them as it supposedly does through a Roman Catholic Bishop's fingers! Graves rejected this idea outright. Although he thought it was important to have ordained men in a church constitution for guidance, he denied it was *essential* to the act. He saw the ordained men in constitution as guides—not as bearers of church light! There is a major difference between EMDA and Graves on this. They are injecting episcopal power into Baptist church formation which neither Scripture nor history offers the least support. For example in *The Tennessee Baptist* this question was asked:

Q. ...y Grove Church called her pastor and two of her members as a presbytery to ordain one of her members [to the wo]rk of the ministry. The brother was ordain[ed with o]ne minister and two deacons. Was he legally [ordained ?] J. R. Vick. [Note: Print is missing where ellipsis and brackets occur. Suggested letters and words are added—J. C.].

A. A score of ministers and deacons would have made no better presbytery. It is a fundamental, vital principle in

Baptist church polity that a church can elect and ordain her own officers. She has in herself all the ecclesiastical power on earth, and a Presbytery of one thousand ministers would not add one iota of authority to what is possessed by each church. No church in apostolic times went beyond her own officers for a Presbytery! [Graves. *TN Baptist*. 4-26-1884, p. 8].

Graves does not mince words here. He denies this supposed ordained torch-bearing-power on one hand and strips away the error on the other by insisting that the power is in the church itself when constituted!

There is a powerful influence among Sovereign Grace Baptists at this time to throw the Episcopalian pale over Baptist churches. Graves saw this in his day and warned against it. He says:

The ministry in one form or another is attempting to assume the prerogatives of the local church. Nine tenths of the queries that reach us involve this assumption, just as clearly as the above involves it. That body of ministers assumed powers which they had no business with, as they do when they assume the right to constitute a church, to ordain ministers, to baptize whom and where they please, and to preach what they please, and deny the local church any guardianship over the gospel, or its own government or ordinances. We warn the churches against those ministers, though they appear to be angels from heaven, who would usurp prerogatives that belong alone to the church. They are dangerous to the very existence of a scriptural church. They fain would be lords over God's heritage, while the true ministers of Christ rejoice to say with Paul, "We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord and ourselves your servant's for Jesus sake." [J.R. Graves. *The Baptist*. 1-17-1880, p.486].

What Graves was condemning then, EMDA men practice wholesale today! They go off with authority in their pocket and contrary to Scripture, and all alone, far from the church, and they baptize, they receive members, they exclude, they ordain, they constitute churches, and they administer the Lord's Supper—encroaching upon the prerogatives of the church as if they were Cardinals! And what is even more

amazing, all the while, they claim that they are practicing *church* authority! These men are perilously close to that hierarchical reef of Roman Catholicism!

## **CHAPTER 14**

### **THE POWERFUL INFLUENCE OF EMDA**



Prepossession with a theory can have powerful effects on what someone believes. This is the only way I can account for some of the ideas which EMDA men embrace. It seems their predilection with this theory also compels them to go where they would never otherwise go. Here I will illustrate this with some theories that were published by Bro Fenison as if they were facts. I make only a few comments on these propositions as I believe the mere stating them will be all the refutation needed.

### **GOSPEL ORDER IS THE SAME THING AS EMDA**

1. The claim that *Gospel Order* equals *EMDA*. This is given betimes but never with any proof [*GCC*, iv, vi, 39, 53, 54, 55, 70, 72 et al.], for the simple reason there is none! [Cf. *LUF*. 192].

### **WHITSITT IS THE FATHER OF DA**

2. On page 121 of *GCC* the author says Whitsitt was the father of DA. Of course the reader will think I am joking. It defies reason, yet there it is in *GCC*!

Dr. William H. Whitsitt...is the father of the so-called "direct authority" theory. [Fenison. *GCC*, p. 121].

Something in the EMDA doctrine strangely affects the minds of its adherents!

### **BENEDICT SUPPORTED EMDA**

3. This was asserted in *GCC*.114. In a discussion on Bro Moody's list, Bro Fenison quoted Benedict in support of EMDA. I informed him that Benedict did not believe EMDA and gave him this quote to prove it:

Any company of christians my commence a church in gospel order, by their own mutual agreement, without any reference to any other body; and this church has all power to appoint

any one of their number, whether minister or layman, to commence anew the administration of gospel institutions. [Benedict. *Hist. Baptists*. p. 450].

He immediately dropped Benedict in that discussion but in his book he still set forth Benedict as supporting EMDA.

## **LANDMARKERS COULD NOT DEFEND SUCCESSION**

4. In *GCC* it is stated that Graves and other Landmarkers could not defend *succession* and that they “retreated” from *succession to perpetuity*!

Such historical problems were the primary cause for retreating from the use of the term 'succession' in regard to the Landmark historical position. [*GCC*. 138].

He also says they:

...were forced to take the position of perpetuity rather than succession.... [*GCC*. 142].

The only thing Bro Fenison forgot to do was to give supporting evidence—and he was consistent in this inconsistency! I will be glad at any time take up the proposition in opposition to what he has stated. It would also be most helpful if Bro Fenison would tell us what discovery made since 1900 enables Baptists to defend succession now which was not available to Graves.

## **GRAVES BELIEVED DA BUT PRACTICED EMDA**

5. The claim that Graves taught DA *in theory*, but used EMDA in practice was not given in *GCC* (and one certainly wonders why it was not there if true, as it is so important to this discussion), but was posted on Bro Fenison's on line list in a reply to Bro Van Nunen, February 2007. No proof was offered for this novel idea.

## **EARLY PARTICULAR BAPTISTS TAUGHT EMDA**

6. In *GCC*. 52-57 it is claimed that the Particular Baptists of the 1600s, such as John Spilsbury, Spittlehouse, Garner and so on, (who contended they could restart the ordinances if they were lost), yet taught EMDA.

### **YOU MUST HAVE AN ORDAINED MAN TO CONSTITUTE A CHURCH**

7. This is a constant theme in *GCC*. The idea is that it is impossible to start a new church without an ordained man present, which is a power beyond what the mother church can give. [*GCC*. iv]. In response to this Roman Catholic-Episcopal idea, Graves said:

'Wherever there are three or more baptized members of a regular Baptist church or churches covenanted together to hold and teach, and are governed by the new Testament', etc., 'there is a Church of Christ, even though there was not a presbytery of ministers in a thousand miles of them to organize them into a church. There is not the slightest need of a council of presbyters to organize a Baptist church.' [Graves. Quoted by Jarrel in *Baptist Perpetuity*, p. 1. Cf. Also the next item # 9].

I believe Bro Fenison is, in this theory, unintentionally pressing for the purple!

### **Mt. 18:20 DOES NOT REFER TO CHURCH CONSTITUTION**

9. *GCC* claims Mt 18:20 has nothing to do with church constitution and that this was the Landmark Baptist position in Graves' day. [*GCC*. 21]. But Graves gave the Landmark Baptist position on this text and the EMDA shoe will not fit Graves' horse:

We find no law in our code touching the forms necessary to constitute a church; nor do we find in the New Testament any example or intimation that a presbytery of ordained ministers ever acted in constituting a church. Christ says the most about it, and it is but little: "Where two or three are gathered

together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them.”  
[Graves. The *Baptist*. Sept. 29, 1877, p. 663]

Of course not every Baptist believed this text referred to church constitution but many agreed with Graves. [See quotes from Hiscox and Crowell given elsewhere].

## **GRAVES CHANGED HIS POSITION FROM DA TO EMDA**

10. Bro Fenison claimed on Bro Moody's on line list that J.R. Graves *changed his position* on church constitution from DA to EMDA! [From: fenisonmw To: [mbaptist@yahogroups.com](mailto:mbaptist@yahogroups.com) Sent: Friday, April 27, 2007 8:54 PM ; Subject: [mbaptist] Re: J.R. Graves on Church Authority in constitution of a church]. Had Bro Fenison read *LUF*, he would have known this theory is false. Bro Fenison was probably following Bro Curtis Pugh who made this claim in 2001, but also without evidence. [Cf. *LUF*. 129]. We have asked for the proof for this theory for over ten years and not a line has ever been given! If there had been any evidence for it, it would have been presented.

## **JERUSALEM CHURCH SENT MEN ALL OVER THE WORLD TO CONSTITUTE CHURCHES**

11. *GCC* claims the first church in Jerusalem sent out men to all the regions of the earth where there were disciples to constitute them into churches! That is, they followed up every report of disciples meeting anywhere in the world so they could give them authority and constitute them into churches! [*GCC*. 46-47]. The church at Jerusalem must have had one extensive card file!

For anyone to espouse these eleven statements indicates an astounding prepossession with EMDA which appears to be the driving force behind them.



**Chapter 15**

**THE EMDA STATUS**

That Bro Fenison is not able to tell us exactly where EMDA is nor how it is transferred indicates how precarious his position is.

He suggests the authority is obtained by the direct vote of a church in a called business meeting, [*GCC*. pp. V, 67, 72, 76]. But wait! It may also be conveyed in a church letter! He then opines this church authority alone is insufficient and insists you must also have an ordained man in the constitution to make it valid. But when he remembers that these things will not cover all the historical cases, he also decides that it may be done by an ordained man alone! And if this does not answer all situations (and it will not do so) he suddenly remembers that this essential authority may just possibly be in baptism itself! [pp. 96; 141]. What these variations suggest is what I have contended for all along. EMDA men do not know what the authority is according to their theory, nor do they know where it is found, nor do they know how it is conveyed!

This is the grappling hook approach—if one point does not catch, perhaps another will! It is a vain attempt to cover all bases but it does not help a failing cause! Bro Fenison has gone full circle from the specific vote of a mother church in a business meeting all the way to the ordinance of baptism! This means this essential authority for church constitution is among EMDA men somewhat in question, to say the least. It also is quite evident that there is no positive command for this doctrine or that would settle the issue. This is quite a let-down. When a man proposes to set the record straight on EMDA [*GCC*. p. iv] but winds up throwing out an uncertain handful of possibilities, the tsunami of disillusion rolls in! Yet, in light of these uncertainties in their position they can and do pronounce anyone who differs with them as an apostate Landmarker!

### **NO EVIDENCE FOR EMDA**

The impossible position for the EMDA idea is simply put—there is nothing to substantiate it! There is nothing in the Word

of God in the form of a positive command for EMDA and the leading advocates of it have admitted this. Its proponents have done their best to deduce it from various passages of Scripture but without success. The Scriptural argument for their cause has been an exercise in futility.

The EMDA position is also confronted with an insurmountable problem as to Baptist history. There is not one single specific statement of this tradition that has ever been produced from any Baptist source before our own times! That is, there is no Baptist manual, no Baptist history, no Baptist sermon, no Baptist book of doctrines, no Baptist commentary, no Baptist handbook, no Baptist book of theology, no Baptist record, no Baptist confession, no Baptist covenant—no Baptist source of any kind— which states this doctrine or even gives it a glancing notice! It is beyond comprehension that Baptists could have held a doctrine so essential to the constitution of a church throughout their long history and yet never mentioned it! This must be the case because no one has ever found a specific reference to it! Brother Cockrell closed both editions of *SCO* without one. Bro Fenison in *GCC* which was written nearly ten years later (with full electronic searches) could not do it! After laboring for two hundred nine pages, he ended without a single explicit reference for EMDA from any Baptist author! None of the other writers searching continually for many years have been able to find a single source of it! They have been unable to bring forth one reference where any Baptist ever embraced EMDA! Now this fact weighs heavily on this theory and the implications for it are profound.

Furthermore, none of the non-Baptist authors (until our times) have ever attempted to place this doctrine on the Baptist door step! No scholar has ever charged Baptists with EMDA. No Historian such as Mosheim, Gieseler, Schaff, Neander, La Tourette, Walker nor any other scholar known to me ever suggested that EMDA had a Baptist stamp!

If these things are true, EMDA is an impossible scenario, without a scriptural foundation and void of historical connections and if we honor Christ and His Word we must



reject it for what it is—a late tradition of men! It has no more validity than the decree of the Pope.

If EMDA is true then the Lord must get permission from a mother church before He can light a church lamp! He must hold the taper in His hand, until a mother church grants permission to constitute, then and only then can He light the church lamp!

We would, if this doctrine were true, expect to see some such statement in Scripture as, the church of Cenchrea which was mothered by the church at Corinth, which was mothered by the church of Antioch, which was mothered by the church at Jerusalem and so on. Or, greetings to the church in Priscilla and Aquilia's house which was formed by the mother church in Caesarea. But no where do we find any such idea except in EMDA writers. See for example the Dyersburg to Jerusalem list, [*LUF*. 180-188].

### **EMDA IS JUST A THEORY**

EMDA is a theory paraded as a law but it is only a theory—an unproven theory. Some men claim it is a law and they assert this with great fervency. It is repeated as was 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians,' but with no more validity! True churches have been formed without any connection to a previous church all through Baptist History and this proves EMDA was not a law as far as Baptists are concerned! We read of churches formed in the NT which had no direct connection to any other church so far as we know, Ac 13:20; 9:31; 18:22; 20:17; Ro 16:1, 5, 23; 1 Co 1:2; 4:17; 15:9; 16:19; Ga 1:13; Phil. 4:15; Col. 4:15; Philemon 2; 1Thess. 1:1; Ga 1:2; 1 Pe 5:13; 3 Jn 6,9, 10; Re 2:1, 8,12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14. There is no express command for EMDA in Scripture and this forever settles the question for those who bow to the authority of the Word of God. *Positive law demands a positive command* is an evangelical standard which no Baptist is brash enough to deny! Graves said:

Baptism is a positive law and since no positive law is left to be inferred, certainly no essential part of a positive law can be supposed to be left to be inferred, but must be clearly indicated. If Baptists deny this, they must repudiate one of their most cherished and distinguishing principles, i.e., that the Scriptures are a perfect rule of practice as well as faith. [Dayton. *Alien Baptism*. Intro. by J.R. Graves, p. vi].

EMDA is, in the estimation of its promoters, a law but their most able men admit it is a law without a *positive command!* [Cf. *SCO*. P. 35, 50]. Consequently it is as much a tradition as is the primacy of Peter, the doctrine of Purgatory, the assumption of Mary or the baptism of infants. And remember, tradition is especially hated of the Lord and it is neither *improved* nor *approved* because it is *Baptist* tradition! In fact it is made worse because the Lord expects better of those who demand of all others a “thus saith the Lord” but who can’t produce it for their own doctrine! “For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.” Luke 12:48.

## CONCLUSION

*GCC* made a very long argument in an attempt to prove Mt 28:19-20 taught EMDA. But when examined, we found nothing in the text which supported this idea. Nor did Bro Fenison give a single author who took his position on this text! Our investigation found nothing in the Word of God and specifically nothing in this text which favors the EMDA theory.

We also examined the theory of *GCC* that Baptists generally taught EMDA. But we could not find the slightest evidence to support this theory. Instead there can be no question, from the references given, that Baptists consistently stated their position to be DA throughout their recorded history.

It was strongly asserted in *GCC* that Landmark Baptists embraced EMDA. Again we could find no support to indicate this theory was ever a doctrine of Landmark Baptists. On the other hand, they plainly and expressly declared DA.

It was also asserted in *GCC* that J. R. Graves held to the theory of EMDA and wrote *Old Landmarkism* to set the record straight on this subject. However, we have demonstrated this was a total misunderstanding and a complete misrepresentation of Graves. It was suggested that Graves changed from EMDA to DA. In fact, Graves was one of the most vociferous contenders for DA throughout his editorial life—almost fifty years!

No Baptist of any stripe ever taught EMDA so far as historical records are concerned. *GCC* did not produce one single explicit reference for this theory from any Baptist, Landmarker or otherwise.

But we have demonstrated, Baptists, including Landmark Baptists, taught DA. We believe the explicit references we have given plainly reveal where the truth is. That our fathers believed Scripture taught DA and that this is what they practiced seems beyond question, so long as we allow the facts to guide us to the conclusion.

So far as we know, no Baptist ever expressed EMDA in any form until our own time! There is no written record of any Baptist of any age who in sermon, confession, covenant, testimony, autobiography or book ever set forth this idea! Yet, if EMDA is, against all the evidence to the contrary, the doctrine of Scripture, if it was the doctrine of the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ through the ages, and if it is an essential of church perpetuity (and this is what its advocates claim), then it must of necessity follow that Baptists are not churches of Christ because there is no record that any Baptist ever embraced this tradition!

## **APPENDIX I.**

### **TABLE OF COMPARISONS**

In controversial subjects one constant source of error is improper quotations. I mean quoting a man as supporting a position which he never held and whose words do not indicate that he did. Bro Cockrell said: .... do not misrepresent these old brethren.... [ *SCO* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, p. 91 ]. Another author has said:

For to use any argument with an intent to deceive, hath in it (though there be no proposition uttered that is false *in terminis*) the nature of a lie: which, as it is base and unmanly in human affairs, so it is impious when it is pretended to be for God; as Job says, 13:7. [Wall. *Hist. Of Infant Baptism*, Part ii. p. 382. [524]. Quoted by Gale. *Reflections*. Vol. III. p. 21].

In these appendices I have tried to demonstrate that these EMDA quotes have been taken out of context. In fact the real meaning of the author appears to have been totally overlooked—sometimes on the very page quoted! Only two books have been selected for this comparison. The first is *Scriptural Church Organization* by Milburn Cockrell. The second *Great Commission Credentials* by Mark Fenison. It is believed this juxtaposition of these references will make the contrast conspicuous.

## References In *SCO* Compared

<p style="text-align: center;">Benedict- Cockrell</p> <p>David Benedict (1799-1874), wrote about how churches were organized. He said: 'In looking over the list of the primitive churches, according to the New Testament records, I find the first one arose in Jerusalem, and that soon it became very large, and the new churches out of Palestine, it is natural to suppose, in the language of Giesler, formed themselves after the pattern of the mother church.' [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 99; Quoting Benedict, <i>Fifty Years Among the Baptists</i>, p. 326].</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Benedict</p> <p>Any company of Christians may commence a church in gospel order, by their own mutual agreement, without any reference to any other body; and this church has all the power to appoint any one of their number, whether minister or layman, to commence anew the administration of gospel institutions. [Benedict. <i>History of the Baptists</i>, p. 450. 1848]</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Bogard-Cockrell</p> <p>The church only has authority to baptize. It was to the church the commission was given...The church only having authority to baptize, it follows that all baptisms administered without church authority are null and void. For this reason Baptists have in all ages refused to recognize the baptism of those who were not baptized by the authority of a Scriptural church. It was to the church the commission was given and the church institution to which the commission was given is in the world today, and if the Lord meant what he said, he is with that church today. The baptisms of that institution are valid and no other is. [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 74. Quoting Bogard, <i>The Baptist Way-Book</i>, pp. 9-10]. <b>Note: One can only wonder why this quote was given? It has nothing to do with the subject.--JC.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Ben M. Bogard</p> <p>The first step necessary in the organization of a new congregation or church is for as many as three baptized disciples to agree to meet steadily for worship, for mutual edification and united effort for the evangelization of the world. The object of a church is two-fold, viz., that the membership may be mutually helpful to one another and to work for God's glory in the evangelization of the world.</p> <p>The agreement to meet regularly for worship and work is commonly called a 'Church Covenant.' The word 'covenant' means agreement. This covenant should be in writing, lest some misunderstand the terms. When this covenant has been entered into the church is fully organized. This covenant is the organization. [Bogard. <i>The Baptist Way- Book</i>, p. 69; <b>Note: This chapter (XII) from which this quote was taken is entitled: <i>The Way to Organize Churches</i>.--JC.</b></p>

Carroll, B. H. - Cockrell	Carroll, B. H.
<p>I am not discussing church history now. I am discussing God's purpose in establishing the church. Jesus said: 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'" I do not believe they have. They have never been able to convince me that the gates of hell have prevailed against the church.</p>	<p>4. What is the ecclesiastical meaning of the word [covenant] as used by Baptists?</p>
<p>I believe that God not only has had people in all ages, but that he has had organized people.</p>	<p>It means that agreement between saved individuals by which they associate themselves into a local church, setting forth their mutual engagements as members of one body. It is usually appended to their Articles of Faith because a common belief is a necessary condition of fellowship and co-operation.</p>
<p>He provided for transmission: 'The things which I have committed to you, the same commit thou to faithful men.' how do men have faith? By hearing. How can they hear without a preacher, and how can they have a preacher unless he is sent? Did he not send the church all gifts—apostolic gifts, prophetic gifts, evangelistic gifts, and pastoral gifts? He set every one of them in the church. The apostles and prophets served the church; when they were taken away, there remained pastors, evangelists, teachers. On whose authority? Christ's? Where placed? In the church. . . . The ordinances continue to tell their story. Churches come from churches somewhat as horses come from horses. History cannot trace every detail of the pedigree showing how a certain drove of wild mustangs in western Texas are descendants of the Spanish barbs, brought here by the discoverers 400 years ago. The fact that the mustangs are here proves the succession, since only like begets like. [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 92. Carroll. <i>Interp. Eng. Bible</i>. Eph. 131-132].</p>	<p>5. What is a church of Jesus Christ?</p>
	<p>A local congregation of baptized believers in Christ united in the belief of His doctrines and covenanting to do what He has commanded." — [ B. H. Carroll, <i>Christ And His Church</i>, p. 245].</p>
	<p>"14. Who are the parties to this covenant?</p>
	<p>All the saved individuals given up wholly to Jesus, who associate themselves, i.e., all who voluntarily 'join the church.' "</p>
	<p>15. What do they agree to do?</p>
	<p>'Walk together,' i.e., form a company.</p>
	<p>16. 'Walk together' in what?</p>
	<p>'In newness of life,' i.e., form a company to walk together in newness of life." [B.H. Carroll, <i>Christ and His Church</i>, p. 248].</p>

Crosby-Cockrell	Crosby
<p>...Crosby devoted 58 pages showing and tracing English Baptist succession back to the age of the apostles. Torbet, the Baptist historian, has properly placed Crosby at the head of the Landmark type of historians. [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 55].</p>	<p>Among the Baptist historians who have held this view [secessionist theory—JC] are the following: (1) Thomas Crosby....(2) G. H. Orchard.... (3) J. M. Cramp....(4) William Cathcart... (5) John T. Christian....</p> <p>There have been various theories of succession by which a chain of authority from Christ to the present can be ascertained. Among these are the following: (1) apostolic succession, by which is meant a chain of ordination; (2) baptismal succession, a chain of baptism by those properly baptized; (3) church succession, a chain of local churches bearing the true marks of the church; (4) a succession of principles which are evident in individuals or groups who have held essentially the Baptist witness. [Torbet. <i>A History of the Baptists</i>, pp. 18-19].</p> <p>Note: There is no indication that any of the men mentioned by Torbet, including Crosby, ever held to EMDA. The succession of churches does not mean EMDA.--JC.</p> <p>In the month of April 1704, the ministers and messengers of the thirteen churches, in and about the city of London, held an Assembly at Lorimers Hall, which continued three days....</p> <p>Their conclusion and agreements. [From the margin].</p>



	<p>That it is the opinion of this Assembly, that in case the minor part of any church break off their communion from that church, the church-state is to be accounted to remain with the major part. And in case the major part of any church be fundamentally corrupted with heresy and immorality, the minor part may, and ought to separate from such a degenerate society, and either join themselves to some regular church or churches; or else, if they are a competent number, may constitute a church-state by a solemn covenant among themselves. [Crosby. <i>Hist. Of English Baptists</i>, vol 4, p. 6].</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Dargan-Cockrell</p> <p>Taking all this for granted, the next step will be for the persons interested in forming the church to obtain letters of dismission from the churches of which they are members. In such cases it is desirable that the letters should specify the purpose for which they are granted. Now, where a number of persons go out from one church for the purpose of organizing a new one, their names may all be included in a joint letter—that is, the mother church grants to the brethren and sisters named [in] this letter with a view of their uniting with each other, and with others of like mind, for the purpose of constituting a new church; or something to this effect.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dargan</p> <p>1. Coming now to the act of organization itself, we must say that in all cases this must be the voluntary action of those persons who enter into the new church relation. This action may be performed, or expressed, in different ways, but it must evidently be taken voluntarily and definitely by the persons themselves who desire to constitute the church—that is to say, the church constitutes itself; it is not made, or brought into existence, by any outside persons. These may help in the organization by their presence and advice, or they may afterwards recognize the action as valid, proper and customary, but they have no hand in the actual</p>
---	--

<p>[Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 20; Q. Dargan, <i>Ecclesiology</i>, p. 195].</p> <p>Listen to him still again: 'The constitutive elements of organization are essential. They belong to the very beginning of the church's life. There is no organization without them. These necessary things are two—viz., covenant and creed.' [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 20. Q. Dargan. <i>Ecclesiology</i>, p. 190].</p>	<p>constituting act. [Dargan. <i>Ecclesiology</i>, p. 195].</p> <p>2. The modes of procedure whereby this act of organization is publicly taken are various. In some cases it is taken by the church [church in anticipation—JC] alone. The brethren and sisters come together, appoint a moderator or chairman from among themselves, a clerk or secretary, and then proceed by the examination of letters and the adoption of a creed and covenant to vote themselves a church. Sometimes the presence of a minister or some well-known leader is requested, and he gives advice as to the steps to be taken. This is the simplest way of organizing a church. [Dargan. <i>Eccl.</i> 196].</p> <p>3. Another way is for the church [church in anticipation—JC] to organize itself in the presence of an advisory council—that is, a council, or presbytery, composed of representatives of neighboring churches specially appointed by request for the purpose of witnessing and sanctioning the step. This council organizes itself and votes approval or disapproval, or postponement, as the case may require. But the constitution of the church is really independent of the action of the council and may have taken place before the council was called to recognize the body. In such cases the approval of the presbytery only endorses the church and gives it a standing among its sister churches. The disapproval of the council does not unmake the church, but simply leaves it to itself. [Dargan. <i>Eccl.</i> 197].</p>
---	---

	<p>4. Another way [to organize a church—JC] is by an advisory council. Here there would be some difference in the procedure according to circumstances. Without having obtained letters, or being yet prepared to enter an organization, certain brethren might ask churches in the neighborhood to send members to sit in council on the propriety of organization, and then these brethren would take subsequent action according to the findings of the council, either proceeding to organize, or concluding not to do so. Or, having obtained letters, but not yet being organized, the holders of the letters before taking the final step may seek the advice of a council to help them shape their action. Should the council advise delay, or even disapprove the project altogether, the letters may be returned, but the holders are free to act as they please without reference to the judgment of the council. It will remain for other churches to recognize them or not, as may seem best to them. Should the council advise organization, this may proceed in their presence by the action of the church [church in anticipation—JC] itself, and then after the church has organized itself, the council may reconvene and formally give recognition to the church. [Dargan. <i>Eccl.</i> 197-8].</p>
--	--

Gill-Cockrell	<p>Gill</p> <p><i>Secondly</i>, A particular church may be considered as to the <i>form</i> of it;</p>
---------------	--

<p>“...Particular respect may be had to the first Gospel church at Jerusalem, which consisted of persons born from above, were blessed with a Gospel spirit, which is a spirit of liberty, out of which the Gospel went into all the world, and from among whom the apostles and first preachers of the word went forth everywhere, and were the means of the conversion of multitudes, both among the Jews and Gentiles, and so might be truly said to be the mother of us all.” [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 51-2 quoting Gill. <i>Com. Ga</i> 4:26].</p> <p>If a church is a mother in taking care of new born babes in Christ, is she not a mother in a greater sense when she is responsible for another new church? Being the source of this new church's origin, is she not properly its mother? If not, what is she? Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 51-52.</p>	<p>which lies in mutual consent and agreement, in their covenant and confederation with each other.</p> <p>3. This union between them is made by voluntary consent and agreement... [Gill. <i>Body</i>. p. 623].</p> <p>6. It is this confederacy, consent, and agreement, that is the formal cause of a church. [<i>Op. Cit.</i> 624].</p> <p>A church of saints thus essentially constituted, as to matter and form, have a power in this state to admit and reject members, as all societies have; and also to choose their own officers; which, when done, they become a complete organized church, as to order and power... John Gill. <i>Body of Divinity</i>, Bk. II, chap. I, 6. p. 625].</p>
---	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Gillette-Cockrell</p> <p>In the year 1711, they were advised to put themselves in church order by themselves, for they were far distant from other churches, and especially from the Welsh Tract, where hitherto they belonged as a branch of that church. Accordingly, in the month of April, 1711, a day was set apart, by fasting and prayer, to accomplish this solemn work, having for their assistance Mr. Elisha Thomas, and others from the Welsh Tract Church, and after solemn prayer to God for his blessing, they gave themselves to God, and to one another in the Lord,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Gillette</p> <p>Oliver Hart's Sermon Before the Philadelphia Baptist Association October 4, 1791, entitled: "A Gospel Church Portrayed, and Her Orderly Service Pointed Out." [Cf. Gillette, <i>Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association</i>, p. 270].</p> <p>Hart's outline is as follows: 1. To describe the house of the Lord, as built upon the gospel plan. 2. show when it may be said that the service of this house is set in order, or what is necessary there unto. 3. I am to describe the house of the Lord, as</p>
--	---

according to 2 Cor. 8:5, and had a right hand of fellowship as a sister church; and at the same time did unanimously choose Hugh Davis, and ordained minister, from South Wales, to be their minister, who is yet living, but past acting by reason of age. [Cockrell. *SCO*. p. 85. Gillette. *Minutes Phil. Assoc.* p. 16].

built upon the gospel plan, or, in other words, portray a true gospel church.--[JC].

The materials have already been described. To erect the building these materials must coalesce, or be joined together; for while they continue as detached pieces, (although all of the mystical body of Christ) they cannot, with any propriety, be termed, a church. They become a gospel church, therefore, by confederation, or mutual compacts; in which, 'they give up themselves to the Lord, and to one another, by the will of God;' covenanting by grace divine to discharge all the duties incumbent upon them, in this gospel relation; and to 'walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.' They must become a body corporate, under CHRIST the head, 'from which all the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God'-- 'in whom all the building fitly framed together, growth into an holy Temple in the Lord.'

The number necessary to constitute a church is not ascertained; but as Christ has promised his gracious presence with two or three, gathered together in his name, if this may be applied to the gathering of a church, (and I see not why it may not) it must indicate that a few may compose a church, even supposing these two or three certain, for an uncertain number, they should not, however be so numerous, as not to be able, commodiously, to meet together, for divine service in one place. 'A Sermon on a Gospel

	<p>Church Portrayed and Her Orderly Service Pointed Out.' Preached at the opening of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, Oct. 4, 1791, in the city of Philadelphia, by Oliver Hart. Sacks. <i>Philadelphia Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority</i>, page 751].</p>
--	---

Gilpin- Cockrell	Gilpin
<p>It has also been alleged that Elder John R. Gilpin did not believe in a link chain of true churches, or one church organizing another church. First, I would say that I personally knew John R. Gilpin, and I know this is a terrible misrepresentation of his views on ecclesiology. Any person who has read <i>TBE</i> knows better than this.</p> <p>Second, I shall let Elder Gilpin (1905-1974) speak for himself. He wrote in his paper: "Church perpetuity is a Baptist position, that there has been a continuous history of Baptists in all ages, and that true Baptist Churches have organized other true Baptist Churches in a linked-chain succession from the days of the apostles to the present. Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. P 71. Gilpin. <i>TBE</i>, Jan. 29, 1966, p. 2.</p>	<p>What Are the Real Prerequisites of a Missionary Baptist Church</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The organization must hold up the standard of a regular membership.</li> <li>2. The organization must have a proper conception of Scriptural baptism.</li> </ol> <p>I am perfectly ready to grant that I would like for every church to be sound in 'all things' of God's word. However, though that organization might be heretical on some of these, if it is sound on regeneration and baptism, it is still a missionary Baptist church. Gilpin. <i>TBE</i>. March 1, 1947, p. 1.</p> <p>What is the least number that can be organized into a church?</p> <p>The Master started with four. Read Mt. 4:18-22. I think right there was the beginning of the first Baptist church, the world ever saw. Possibly it would be all right to organize with even two. Read Mt. 18:20. Gilpin. <i>TBE</i>, March 30, 1940, p. 2.</p>

	[Note: Bro Gilpin did change his position to EMDA sometime after the above was written—JC].
--	---

Harvey- Cockrell	Harvey The Church
<p>Hezekiah Harvey (1821-1893) in his book on the church warns of carelessness when it comes to church organization: 'Now, as the powers thus committed to the church as a congregation constitute the vital functions of a church, it follows that church power resides neither in a hierarchy, nor in an ecclesiastical judicatory, but in the whole assembly of the membership. The organization, therefore, is neither prelatial nor presbyterial, but congregational. It follows, also, that since a church is entrusted with power so grave and responsible, no body of believers should be constituted a church unless it possesses the intellectual capacity, knowledge, and gifts adapted to the wise exercise of such powers; and in the absence of these, the body should not take on it a church organization, but should remain a mission under the care of some well-organized church. Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>, p. 21; Q. Harvey, <i>The Church</i>, p. 43.</p> <p>A church, therefore, is a permanent organization with a definite design and a mutually obligatory compact; and it differs from an ordinary assembly of Christians in that it is organized under a divine constitution and according to a divine model. Otherwise, an Christian organization—as a</p>	<p>A church...is organized under a divine constitution and according to a divine model. Harvey. <i>The Church</i>, p. 36.</p> <p>The church is in things spiritual independent of the state. It is formed under authority from Christ, and owes supreme allegiance to him. Harvey. <i>The Church</i>, p. 64.</p> <p>But we deny that an unbroken chain of succession is an essential mark of a true church. Harvey. <i>The Church</i>, 96.</p> <p><b>A CHURCH IS VALID ONLY BY VIRTUE OF CONFORMITY IN CHARACTER, DOCTRINE, AND ORGANIZATION TO THE CONSTITUTION GIVEN IN GOD'S WORD.</b></p> <p>The divine constitution of the church has been given in the principles, precepts, and examples of the New Testament; it follows that any body of Christians conformed in its character, doctrine, and organization to that constitution is, by virtue of such conformity, a true church, invested with all the powers conferred on the church by Christ, and acting under his authority... Harvey. <i>The Church</i>, p.96.</p>

<p>missionary society—would be a church. Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>, p. 37, Q. Harvey. <i>The Church</i>, p. 36-7.</p>	<p>An association formed in conformity with that constitution is a divine church by virtue of such conformity, and acts under divine authority. It may have no formal connection with any previous church, but it is nevertheless apostolic and in the true succession. Harvey. <i>The Church</i>, pp. 96-7.</p> <p>He [Mosheim] adds: “With regard to government and internal economy, every individual church considered itself as an independent community, none of them ever looking, in these respects, beyond the circle of its own members for assistance, or recognizing any sort of external influence or authority.” Harvey. <i>The Church</i> p. 98.</p>
--	---

<p>Jones, T. G.--Cockrell</p> <p>T. G. Jones, the Baptist historian, said of the Baptists: 'They have always maintained that their churches are as ancient as Christianity itself. That their foundations were laid by no less honorable hands than those of Christ and his apostles. In all ages since the first, the Baptists have believed that their denomination more ancient than themselves.... and all these, as well as the humblest and most unlearned among them, believe that Baptists, (whether with or without the name, is a matter of difference) have existed 'from the days of John the Baptist until now.' Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>, p. 59-60, Quoting Jones. <i>The Baptists</i>, pp. 23-25.</p>	<p>T. G. Jones</p> <p>In the same spirit Dr. Ripley says: “A church that came into existence yesterday, in strict conformity to the New Testament principles of membership, far away from any long-existing church or company of churches, and therefore unable to trace an outward lineal descent, is a true church of Christ—for Christianity is not a religion of circumstances, but of principles—while a church so-called, not standing on the apostolic principles of faith and practice, and yet able to look back through a long line up to time immemorial, may have never belonged to that body of which Christ is the head.”.... “Amongst their sister churches they are related by sympathies and kind offices, but they own no subjection, and</p>
--	---



	<p>acknowledge no dependence either on contemporary churches of their own country, or upon the churches of other lands or other times, except as those churches have held the same truth, clung to the same Head, and have exhibited the same spirit....They claim to hold directly of the ever-living, almighty, and omnipotent Spirit, and to lean, without the interposition of chains of succession and lines of spiritual descent, immediately and for themselves on the bosom and heart of the Saviour, who pledged his presence to the end of the world, where two or three are gathered together in his name. To all pedigrees of spiritual and priestly class, claimed by some Christians, we oppose the permanent presence and indefeasible priesthood of the great Melchisedec of our profession, without beginning of days or end of years; and we claim to come up out of the wilderness, stayed directly on Christ and leaning on our beloved. We touch, so to speak, his bare arm as our stay, without the intervention of the envelopes of any favored order or virtue running through a chain of spiritual conductors. Our graces are not transmitted, but taken direct from the Redeemer's own hand." T.G. Jones. <i>The Baptists</i>, p. 26-27. Electronic copy.</p>
--	---

<p>Keach—Cockrell</p> <p>First I see a mother church in typology in the Old Testament. The Shulamite country girl in the Song of Solomon had a mother (S. of S. 8:1). In typology the young; Shulamite represents the church, and</p>	<p>Keach</p> <p>The Matter or Materials with which it is built are Lively Stones, i.e. Converted Persons: Also the Matter and Form must be according to the Rule and Pattern shewed in the Mount, I mean Christ's Institution, and the Apostolical Churches</p>
---	---

<p>her mother would be her mother church.</p> <p>Commenting on Song of Solomon 8:1 Benjamin Keach (1640-1704) wrote: 'By Mother in these scriptures is meant the church of God... As God is a believer's Father, so the church is his Mother....Some mothers have daughters who have children. So the universal church hath many daughters, many particular churches, which are very fruitful to Christ.' Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. Quoting Keach, <i>Preaching from the Types and Metaphors of the Bible</i>, pp.695-698].</p>	<p>Constitution, and not after Men's Inventions. Keach, Quoted by Dever. <i>Polity</i>, p. 64.</p> <p>For hath not oneregular Church as great Authority from Christ as another. Keach. <i>Glory of A True Church...</i>; Quoted by Dever. <i>Polity</i>, p. 81.</p> <p>VI. It's Beauty and Glory consisteth in that all the Stones being not only united by the Spirit, to Christ the Foundation, but also to one another in sincere Love and Affection. In whom all the Building, fitly Framed together, groweth up unto an holy Temple in the Lord. <i>Glory of A True Church</i>, Quoted by Dever. <i>Polity</i>, p. 85.</p> <p>IX. In their having the divine Presence with them: Or when the Glory of God fills his Temple. [References in the footnote are: Ex. 20:24, Mat. 18:20. Keach. <i>Glory of A True Church</i>, Q. By Dever. <i>Polity</i>. p. 85].</p>
---	--

<p>King, Henry Melville- Cockrell</p> <p>In 1896 Henry Melville King wrote a brief account of origin and early history of the First Baptist Church, Providence, Rhode Island. The title of the book: <i>The Mother Church</i>. [Cockrell. <i>SCO</i>. p. 99].</p> <p>Note: The Mother Church to which Bro Cockrell refers is the Church founded by Roger Williams—J C ].</p>	<p>Henry Melville King</p> <p>1. The exact date of the organization of this mother church is unknown. [King, Henry Melville. <i>Mother Church</i>. p. 16].</p> <p>A church after the New Testament pattern came into being, born in loneliness and exile, but born of the Spirit of God, to human appearance self-originated and without lineal descent or pedigree, untouched by priestly hands, unanointed by apostolic grace, and yet a church of</p>
--	--

	<p>Jesus Christ, the fruit of the divine seed of the kingdom, which had been borne safely across the Atlantic on the wind of God's providence and planted in the virgin soil of this western continent, the beginning of a spiritual harvest which should wave like the golden fields of autumn and spread from ocean to ocean. [King. Mother Church. p. 18.]</p>
--	---

<p>Mercer-Cockrell</p> <p>The APOSTOLIC CHURCH continued through all ages to the end of the world, is the only TRUE GOSPEL CHURCH ...Of this church, CHRIST is the only HEAD, and ministers, who originated since the apostles, and not successively to them, are not in gospel order; and therefore cannot be acknowledged as such. That all, who have been ordained to the work of the ministry without the knowledge and call of the church, by popes, councils, &amp; c. are the creatures of those who constitute them, and are not the servants of Christ, or his church, and therefore have no right to administer for them.</p> <p>Then he gives four reasons for rejecting Pedobaptist churches and the baptism of their ministers: I. That they are connected with churches clearly out of the apostolic succession and therefore clearly out of the apostolic commission. II. That they have derived their authority, by ordination, from the bishops of Rome, or from individuals, who have taken it on themselves to give it.... [Cockrell. SOC. 48].</p>	<p>Mercer</p> <p>There is not even any direct scriptural authority for such an organization as an association. The church, on the other hand, receives its power and authority directly from Christ. [Hogue. Antecedents of Landmarkism, p. 231. Jesse Mercer, "A Dissertation on the Resemblances and Differences between Church Authority and That of an Association," Christian Index, I, No. 22 (Dec. 10, 1833, 86).</p> <p>3. Church authority is competent to the examination of refractory members—to deliver them to Satan—to render them as heathen men or publicans; but an Association has no excommunicatory authority—no, not of a church! This belongs to Christ, as head exclusively. See Rev. 2:5.3:16. No church, Association, or ecclesiastical body, has any power to excommunicate, or injure, or unchurch a church of Christ; or even to dissolve one. This last act can only be done by the mutual consent of the members, by whose will alone they were constituted a church. [Mallary. Memoirs of Jesse Mercer, p. 456. Note: Italics belong to Mercer].</p>
--	--

	<p>DIFFERENCES. — 1. Church authority is from Christ, as Head and king alone; but that of an Association is from the churches only. [Mallery. Memoirs of Jesse Mercer, p. 455. Note: The italics belong to Mercer].</p>
--	---

Pendleton-Cockrell	Pendleton
<p>Elder Pendleton writes: “When the interest of Christ’s kingdom requires the formation of a new church the customary mode of procedure is about this: Brethren and sisters obtain letters of dismissal from the church or churches to which they belong, for the purpose of entering into the new organization. It is well for this purpose to be stated in the letters. When they meet together at the appointed time, a Moderator and Clerk pro tem are appointed. The meeting is opened with devotional exercises. Sometimes a sermon is preached, especially when it is not intended to have recognition services at some future day. Reading the Scriptures and prayer should be considered indispensable. This being done, the letters of dismissal are read, and the parties concerned resolve by solemn vote to consider themselves an independent church. .... [Cockrell. SCO. p.17-18; Quoting Pendleton’s Church Manual, p. 15].</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. And as churches in all ages must be formed after the apostolic model, it follows there where penitent, regenerate, baptized believers in Christ are found, there are scriptural materials for a church. Such persons having first given themselves to the Lord, and then to one another, in solemn covenant, agreeing to make the will of Christ as expressed in his word their rule of action, are, in the New Testament sense of the term, a church. Whether they are many or few in number, they are a church. [Pendleton. Church Manual, 14-15].</li> <li>2. As to local assemblies, so often called churches in the New Testament, their very organization implies an acknowledgment of Christ’s kingly authority. Their right to existence depends on his authority...</li> <li>3. In answer to the question, What is a church? It may be said: A church is a congregation of Christ’s baptized disciples, acknowledging him as their Head, relying on his atoning sacrifice for justification before God, and depending on the Holy Spirit for sanctification, united in the belief of the gospel, agreeing to maintain its ordinances and obey</li> </ol>

	<p>its precepts, meeting together for worship, and cooperating for the extension of Christ's kingdom in the world. If any prefer an abridgment of the definition it may be given thus: A church is a congregation of Christ's baptized disciples, united in the belief of what he has said, and covenanting to do what he has commanded. [Pendleton. Church Manual. p. 7].</p> <p>XIII. OF A GOSPEL CHURCH</p> <p>4. We believe that a visible church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the gospel; observing the ordinances of Christ; governed by his laws; and exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by his word... [Pendleton. Church Manual. P. 55].</p> <p>Note: Whatever a church has, is according to this confession,—the New Hampshire—invested in them by his word. There is no word in Pendleton's Manual about mother church authority! How could Pendleton write a Baptist church manual and leave out an essential of church constitution, if he believed it was an essential?— J C.</p> <p>That the power of a church cannot be transferred or alienated, and that church action is final. The power of a church cannot be delegated. There may be messengers of a church, but there cannot be, in the proper use of the term, delegates. [Pendleton. Christian Doctrines. p. 328, 340].</p> <p>That church power is inalienable results from the foundation-principle</p>
--	--

	of In- dependency—namely, that this power is in the hands of the people, the membership. [Pendleton. Christian Doctrine. p. 340].
--	---

<p>Shackelford-Cockrell</p> <p>Baptist have never held to the doctrine of apostolic succession but have generally believed in church succession, and have always claimed that all authority is vested in the churches as the executives of Christ. [Cockrell. SCO, p. 62].</p>	<p>Shackelford</p> <p>These churches were all modeled after the church at Jerusalem, being: First. Independent in their organic relations, one from another. Second. They acknowledged no head but Christ, and owned no Lawgiver but him. [J. A. Shackelford. Compendium of Baptist History. p. 40].</p>
--	--

<p>Smyth-Cockrell</p> <p>John Smyth in his Short Confession of Faith said in Article 12: 'That the church of Christ is a company of the faithful; baptized after confession of sin and of faith, endowed with the power of Christ. [Cockrell. SCO, 27. Quoting Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, p. 101].</p>	<p>John Smyth</p> <p>A true church has the covenant, the promises, and ministerial power given to it, not through a carnal line of succession, but directly and immediately, by Christ. The church receives these 'from Christ's hand out of heaven.' This immediate authority is given, not to the pope, to the bishops, or to the presbytery, but to the body of the church. [Smyth Quoted by Tull, James E. Shapers of Baptist Thought. P. 23].</p> <p>Now for baptizing a mans self, there is as good warrant as for a mans churching himself; for two men are singly not a church; jointly they are a church, and they both of them put a church upon themselves: for as both these persons unchurched, yet have power to assume the church, each of them for himself and others in communion; so each of them</p>
--	---

	<p>unbaptized, hath power to assume baptism for himself with others in communion.” [ John Smyth. The Character of the Beast or the false Constitution of the church discovered in certain passages.... 1609. Q. in Ivimey. Hist. of Eng. Baptists, vol. I, p. 117, 118, 119; Cf. LUF. p. 151].</p>
--	--





## APPENDIX II.

### TABLE OF COMPARISONS

#### Fenison's References From GCC Compared

Carroll, J.M. - Fenison	J.M. Carroll
<p>Saturday Sep-30-1837.</p> <p>Elder Daniel Parker, Reported, That on the seventeenth day of September 1837, He exercised <b>the authority vested in him by this Church in Constituting a Church.</b> Said Church is Constituted on the East side of the Angeleney river in Brother Cook's settlement—On eight members five males and three feemalles, one deacon Wm. Sparks and on the same artical of Faith that this church is constituted, acknowledging her relationship to and with said Pilgrim Church of Regular Predistinaran Baptist. [J. M. Carroll. <i>A History of Texas Baptists</i>, p. 64, 65, 66].</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Bro Fenison is quoting from an electronic copy of Carroll's book. The actual page number for the above quote is 48. The bold emphasis has been added by Bro Fenison without informing the reader of it. When one reads the whole account, as indicated in the adjacent column, the church expressly stated that this authority which it was granting was only <b>to assist</b> in constituting churches and ordaining officers! Whatever this authority was the deacons had it as well as the preachers according to the records of this church! Why</p>	<p>Saturday, July 4<sup>th</sup> 1835. After an Elapse of time from the 15<sup>th</sup> of November 1834 to the present. According to a prevous notice or arrangement, the following named Brethren and sisters,***** Met at the house of Eder Daniel Parker's in Brunets Grant Jurisdiction of Nacogdoches Texas. Being in possession of the Church Book by consent of the Clerk, upon Examination Consider themselves leagerly and properly the Pilgrim Predestinarian Regular Baptist Church and therefore proseded to business. Elder G. Greenwood moderator Protém, and D. Parker Clerk Protém.</p> <p>At this meeting this further business was transacted:</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>. The Church proseded to clothe Elds G. greenwood and D. Parker or either of them and the deacons of this Church to assist in Constituting Churches and ordaining officers therein; if called on and they think it avisable to do so. [J.M. Carroll. <i>Hist. TX Baptists</i>, p. 47. Original spelling maintained—J C].</p> <p>The prayer-meeting was perseveringly maintained regardless of the hindrances. When a few weeks</p>

<p>didn't Bro Fenison quote this paragraph with this explicit statement that these men were to <b>assist</b> in constitutions and ordinations? Could it be that it does not agree with his position?--JC].</p>	<p>had gone by this devout group decided that they must have a church home. Conditions were not encouraging except in the light of God's promises. From no other source came any ray of hope. After days of earnest prayer to God and serious consultation among themselves, they unanimously agreed at once to enter into an organization, and here, in 1837, in the town of Washington, there was projected the small but momentous beginning of Missionary Baptist organized work in Texas. [J.M. Carroll. <i>Hist. TX Baptists</i>. p. 108].</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Christian- Fenison</p> <p>John T. Christian quotes the letter from the parent church authorizing their constitution in these words: That there was no law against necessity, and under the present stress of circumstances the members ought to assemble and formally appoint one of their number, by election, to baptize the converts.' This advice was acted upon and Richard Curtis baptized the converts. Thus the first church in Mississippi was organized without a presbytery of ordained ministers." [Fenison. <i>GCC</i>. p. 200. John T. Christian, <i>A History of the Baptists</i>, Vol. II, p. 334].</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Christian</p> <p>1. This community was called the Salem Baptist Church; but it was constituted, not only without a presbytery of ministers, but without the presence of a single ordained minister. They simply agreed to meet together stately, says Bond, and worship God according to his Word, and to exercise good discipline over one another, and called Elder Curtis to preach to them...' John T. Christian, <i>History of the Baptists</i>. Vol. II, 333.</p> <p>The footsteps of the Baptists of the ages can more easily be traced by blood than by baptism. It is a lineage of suffering rather than a succession of bishops; a martyrdom of principle, rather than a dogmatic decree of councils; a golden chord of love, rather than an iron chain of succession, which, while attempting to rattle its links back to the apostles,</p>
--	---

	<p>has been of more service in chaining some protesting Baptist to the stake than in proclaiming the truth of the New Testament. It is, nevertheless, a right royal succession, that in every age the Baptists have been advocates of liberty for all, and have held that the gospel of the Son of God makes every man a free man in Christ Jesus. John T. Christian. <i>History of The Baptists</i>, vol. I, p. 22-23.</p> <p>The distinctive characteristics of this church [as found in Scripture—JC] are clearly marked in the New Testament. Such a church was a voluntary association and was independent of all other churches. It might be, and probably was, affiliated with other churches in brotherly relations; but it remained independent of all outward control, and was responsible to Christ alone, who was the supreme lawgiver and the source of all authority. J.T. Christian. <i>History of the Baptists</i>, vol. I, p. 13.</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Dargan-Fenison</p> <p>Taking all this for granted, the next step will be for the persons interested in forming the church to obtain letters of dismissal from the churches of which they are members. In such cases it is desirable that the letters should specify the purpose for which they are granted. Now, where a number of persons go out from one church for the purpose of organizing a new one, their names may all be included in a joint letter—that is, THE MOTHER CHURCH grants to the brethren and sisters named in this letter with a view of their</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dargan</p> <p>1. The modes of procedure whereby this act of organization is publicly taken are various. In some cases it is taken by the church [church in anticipation—JC] alone. The brethren and sisters come together, appoint a moderator or chairman from among themselves, a clerk or secretary, and then proceed by the examination of letters and the adoption of a creed and covenant to vote themselves a church. Sometimes the presence of a minister or some well-known leader is requested, and he gives advice as to the steps to be taken. This is the simplest way of</p>
---	---

<p>uniting with each other, and with others of like mind for the constituting a new church; or something to this effect. Fenison. <i>GCC.</i> p.101. E. C. Dargan, <i>Ecclesiology.</i> p. 195.</p> <p>[Emphasis is not in Dargan—JC ].</p>	<p>organizing a church. Dargan. <i>Eccl.</i> 196.</p> <p>2. Another way is for the church [church in anticipation—JC] to organize itself in the presence of an advisory council—that is, a council , or presbytery, composed of representatives of neighboring churches specially appointed by request [of those intending to form the new church—JC ] for the purpose of witnessing and sanctioning the step. This council organizes itself and votes approval or disapproval, or postponement, as the case may require. But the constitution of the church is really independent of the action of the council and may have taken place before the council was called to recognize the body. In such cases the approval of the presbytery only endorses the church and gives it a standing among its sister churches. The disapproval of the council does not unmake the church, but simply leaves it to itself. Dargan. <i>Eccl.</i> 197.</p> <p>3. Another way [to organize a church—JC] is by an advisory council. Here there would be some difference in the procedure according to circumstances. Without having obtained letters, or being yet prepared to enter an organization, certain brethren might ask churches in the neighborhood to send members to sit in council on the propriety of organization, and then these brethren would take subsequent action according to the findings of the council, either proceeding to organize, or concluding not to do so. Or, having obtained letters, but not yet being organized, the holders of the letters before taking the final step may seek the advice of a council to</p>
---	--

	<p>help them shape their action. Should the council advise delay, or even disapprove the project altogether, the letters may be returned, but the holders are free to act as they please without reference to the judgment of the council. It will remain for other churches to recognize them or not, as may seem best to them. Should the council advise organization, this may proceed in their presence by the action of the church [church in anticipation—JC] itself, and then after the church has organized itself, the council may reconvene and formally give recognition to the church. Dargan. <i>Eccl.</i> 197-8.</p>
--	--

Dayton-Fenison	Dayton
<p>The administration of baptism is an official act, done by authority of the Church..... They were addressed as the representatives of the Churches which they should establish, and the successors of those churches 'to the end of the world.' To the Churches therefore, the commission says, Go ye and preach my gospel to all nations, baptizing them &amp; c.....A. C. Dayton, <i>Alien Immersion</i>, pp.212, 218-219. <i>GCC.</i> 93-94. [Note: The bold emphasis does not belong to Dayton—J C].</p>	<p>1. He made every one a priest and a king. He invested every member with the right to execute his laws, but only when assembled with the brethren. As many as could conveniently unite came voluntarily together and by mutual consent were constituted an ekklesia, or official assembly, of Christ. It was subject to his laws: it acted by his authority: it used his name to give a sanction to its acts; and as he had authorized it, and conferred on it all its authority, so he promised to be in its midst by his Spirit, and to ratify in heaven what it did upon earth. A. C. Dayton. <i>Theodosia Earnest</i>, Vol. II, p. 115; <i>Alien Baptism</i>, p. 167.</p> <p>2. The Church consists of such baptized believers as have voluntarily associated themselves together according to the scriptural constitution, to administer Christ's ordinances, and enforce his laws</p>

	<p>among themselves. Dayton. <i>Theodosia Earnest</i>. II. 150.</p> <p>3. Is this a true church of Christ?...If it be, it has authority from the King to administer his ordinances. Dayton. <i>Alien Baptism</i>. 123-4.</p> <p>4. No one can reach the Church, except through baptism; but every baptized believer is not a Church member. The eunuch was in the visible kingdom as soon as he was baptized; but he was not a member of any church. Dayton. <i>Theodosia Earnest</i>. II. p.150.</p> <p>5. He provided for all this before he went, by directing as many of the citizens of the kingdom as could conveniently meet together, to assemble and organize themselves into a "church," which should in its corporate capacity attend to all these matters.... Dayton. <i>Alien Baptism</i>. 167.</p> <p>6. There are no branches of the Church at Jerusalem, or any other Church. No Church is ever called a part of any other Church. Each ekklesia was complete in itself. It was the assembly which Christ had called out from the world, in the place where it was located. It was, therefore the 'ekklesia'—the assembly of Jesus Christ in such or such a place. It is this, and nothing more. Dayton. <i>Theo. Earnest</i>. II. p. 76-77.</p> <p>7. Here, then, is the embodiment of the scriptural idea of a Church of Jesus Christ. It is an assembly of those who have repented of sin, believed on Christ, and then have been baptized; who meet together in regular order to break the bread and</p>
--	--

	<p>drink the wine in his remembrance, and to transact business in his name. Dayton. <i>Theo. Earnest</i>. II. p. 76.</p> <p>8. What, then, do we find the Church of Christ actually to have been? Simply a local assembly of baptized believers, meeting by his authority to administer his ordinances, and transact the business of his kingdom in his name. Dayton. <i>Theo. Earnest</i>. II. p. 93.</p> <p>9 Signs or Marks by which to recognize a true Church of Jesus Christ.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It consists only of professed believers in Christ</li> <li>2. Its members have been baptized upon a profession of their faith.</li> <li>3. It is a local organization, and independent of all others.</li> <li>4. It has Christ alone for its King and Lawgiver, and recognizes no authority but His above its own.</li> <li>5. Its members have become such by their own voluntary act.</li> <li>6. It holds as articles of faith the fundamental doctrines of the gospel.</li> <li>7. It began with Christ, and has continued to the present time.</li> <li>8. It never persecuted for conscience's sake.</li> </ol>
--	--

	<p>9. No apostate Church can be a true Church of Christ. Dayton. <i>Theo. Earnest</i>. II. p. 480.</p> <p>...and we read in Acts 14:23, of churches which seem to have existed without any elders or presbyters, from which I infer that a Church may exist without any officers until it can choose deacons and its pastor, and have them properly ordained. It is not complete, but still it is a church, and has within itself the authority to perfect its organization by the election from its own members of a pastor to minister in the Word, and deacons to minister in its temporal affairs. Dayton. <i>Theo. Earnest</i>. II. 186.</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">Graves-Fenison</p> <p>As you can plainly see, Dr. Graves believed that the vast majority of American Baptists were directly influenced by the beliefs and practices of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. In the previous chapter, we demonstrated that the Philadelphia Association was permeated by the beliefs and practices of the Welsh and English Particular Baptists. Among these Baptists, regular church order was not only their practice but their doctrinal belief. Church authority in the Great Commission was their doctrinal basis behind regular church order in the constitution of churches. Fenison. <i>GCC</i>, p. 87.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Graves</p> <p>An ekklesia of Christ "...is dependent upon no other body for its existence or self-perpetuation..." [J. R. Graves. <i>New Great Iron Wheel</i>, p. 134].</p> <p>A question in the TN Baptist:</p> <p>Has a company or number immersed penitent believers walking orderly, the right to constitute themselves into a church of Christ without the presence and approval of a Presbytery of ordained ministers of the gospel, under any circumstances? By answering the above in the Baptist, you will much oblige. R. N.</p> <p>Graves' Answer:</p>
--	--



It is undeniable that Dr. Graves..... believed three essentials that separates them from those today which Elder Milburn Cockrell identifies as “apostate Landmarkers”.

They denied the so-called doctrine of “direct” or “vertical” authority in the Great Commission. In the words of William Cathcart, they believed in – “scriptural authority UNDER God FROM a gospel church.” Fenison. *GCC*. 118. [The emphasis in this last sentence does not belong to Cathcart—J C ].

If the church alone was commissioned to preserve and to preach the gospel, then it is certain that no other organization has the right to preach it—to trench upon the divine rights of the church. A Masonic Lodge, no more than a Young Men's Christian Association; an 'Odd-fellow' Lodge or Howard Association, no more than a 'Woman's Missionary Board,' have the least right to take the gospel in hand, select and commission ministers to go forth and preach it, administer the ordinances and ORGANIZE CHURCHES. Fenison. *GCC*. Front cover; p. 118.

Two or three baptized Christians can organize themselves into a church in a private house – where there is a need of a church, by covenanting together to be governed by the New Testament, discharging all the duties incumbent upon the church – without convening a presbytery; – and such a church can ordain its own officers. Graves. *Tn Baptist*. 3-27-80. p. 648.

A body of baptized Christians can organize themselves into a church at pleasure, and no exterior body can organize them, much less can a Presbytery organize a body superior to itself. Can I stream rise higher than its fountain? On the other hand, a sovereign and independent church can dissolve her organization of her own good will and pleasure, and a presbytery can no more prevent than it could order it. Graves. *TN Baptist*. 10-03-85, p. 8.

Therefore, each assembly was a complete Church, and being complete in itself, it was independent of all other like bodies in other localities, and being each independent it was divinely invested with all the power and prerogatives of a Church of Christ. Graves. *New Iron Wheel*. p. 125.

Christ said, “where two or three are gathered in my name [authority], there am I in the midst of them.” Matt. 18:20. Graves. *NGIW*, p. 135. Emphasis belongs to Graves.

“Three are sufficient to form a church although they be laymen.” Graves. *NGIW*. P. 136. [Graves is here quoting Tertullian with approval—JC] .

	<p>We can learn nothing from God's word about church arms— a body that is not a church, and yet exercising all the functions of a church, and yet the attorney or agent of another body, is an anomalous organization.</p> <p>We do know from the divine constitution of the churches of Christ, that each one is by Christ invested with all the ecclesiastical rights, privileges, powers and prerogatives that he allows to be administered on the earth, and it is made her bounden duty to faithfully conserve and execute these delegated powers and prerogatives. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. 3-10-83, p. 8.</p> <p>We find nowhere in the Scriptures where a Presbytery had to be called to organize a church. Any number of Christians living in any neighborhood can come together, and by covenant, enter into church relations without asking the permission of any man or number of men. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. 12-4-80, p. 502.</p> <p>The fact is, that a body of baptized disciples in any place can constitute themselves into a church, without an ordained minister, and then proceed to elect their own officers. The highest and oldest authorities sustain this position. Christ says: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." – Matthew 18:20. Tertullian, who wrote in the year 150, 50 years after the lifetime of the last apostle, says: "Where there are three, there is a church, though they be laymen. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. 12-22-83, p. 8.</p>
--	---

## FUNDAMENTALS OF A NT CHURCH

Now there are two principles fundamental to the New Testament and Baptist church polity, viz.:

1. That each church of Christ is an absolutely independent organization, complete in itself, and clothed with executive functions only.
2. That to the churches, as such, Christ delivered the ordinances, and constituted each one responsible for the purity of its administrations.

I mean by fundamental, that a scriptural church can not be constituted without them. An organization may possess every other feature; but not possessing these two, it is not a Christian or evangelical church, and should not be so called. J.R. Graves. *Intercommunion*, p. 287.

It is not a multitude that makes a church. Christ had fore-designated how few would be recognized by Him "two or three are gathered in his name," under his authority, he would be present with them as their Head, e.g., our missionaries to foreign fields are sent forth, two or more with their families, and on reaching their stations they organize themselves into a church, by covenanting to take the New Testament as their constitution, and Christ as their Head. Two males and two females generally compose Our first mission churches. Graves. *Great Carrollton Debate*, p. 809. See also pp. 950, 816.

	<p>“The absolute individuality and independence of each particular church having been fully established....the following conclusion irresistibly follows, viz:--</p> <p>That each particular church was invested by its prime founder with all the functions, rights, powers and prerogatives necessary to its self-preservation and perpetuation, and for the discharge of all the trusts he designed it to execute, until he should come again.” Graves. <i>NGIW</i>, p. 143.</p> <p>Now I wish Elder Ditzler to know that there is a world-wide difference between originating an organization different from anything that can be found in the Bible, different from anything the world had ever before seen or heard of, and calling it a Church, and organizing a Christian Church. It is true that two or three baptized individuals can organize a Church, provided they adopt the apostolic model of government, and covenant to be governed by the sole authority of Jesus Christ. J.R. Graves. <i>Great Carrollton Debate</i>, p. 975.</p> <p>I will now define a Scriptural Church, as regards its polity and powers, and these define its character, whether Democratic or otherwise, whether legislative or executive only.</p> <p>SEC. 1. Each particular Church is independent of every other body, civil or ecclesiastical, and receiving its authority directly from Christ, it is accountable to him alone. <i>Graves - Ditzler Debate</i>, (1875) Pages 995-</p>
--	--

	<p>996.</p> <p>Querist.</p> <p>Has a company or number of immersed penitent believers walking orderly, the right to constitute themselves into a church of Christ without the presence and approval of a presbytery of ordained ministers of the gospel, under any circumstances? By answering the above in <i>The Baptist</i>, you will much oblige, R.N.</p> <p>Two or three baptized christians can organize themselves into a church in a private house—where there is need of a church, by covenanting together to be governed by the New Testament, discharging all the duties incumbent upon a church—without convening a presbytery;—and such a church can elect or ordain its own officers. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. 1880. page 648. e. page 68.</p> <p>Querist.</p> <p>Can a church go into dissolution without a presbyter, or without the unanimous voice of the church? Yours most respectfully, etc., W. H Lindsey. Conway, Ark.</p> <p>Answer:--The Church of Christ is an independent body, consisting of one single local congregation, depending on the will of no other body on earth for her being or her ceasing to be. In one respect, like her crown head, she has power to lay down her life and power to take it up again. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. 1880. page 668. April 8, 1880.</p>
--	---

	<p>Epigram:....a council has no right to organize or disorganize a church of Christ. If you think so tell us who gave a council such authority. Graves. <i>TN Baptist</i>. June 4, 1887, p. 9.</p> <p>What is the remedy for such a circumstanced body of men women ? [A group of professed believers—JC] Answer: Appoint a day for a general meeting, and then and there agree upon and adopt articles of faith which clearly set forth the fundamental principles of the faith and order of the gospel, and covenant with each other to walk, by God's help, in that faith and order, and to discharge all the duties devolving upon a church of the living God, a pillar and ground of the truth. Graves. <i>Tn. Baptist</i>. Feb. 7, 1885, e. 45.</p> <p>Remarks.—These and thousands of other questions touching church polity and discipline can be determined by referring to the divine prerogatives of the local church.</p> <p>1. All the functions, prerogatives whatsoever a church is warranted in exercising are delegated powers, and delegated trusts cannot be alienated or relegated. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. Aug. 12, 1882.</p> <p>Answer.—They [unjustly excluded members] can organize themselves into an independent church, or they can apply for membership to any other church in the State, and it would be the duty of that church to restore to them the rights of which they have been for righteousness</p>
--	---

	<p>sake, deprived. Graves. <i>TN Baptist</i>. Dec. 9, 1882. p. 5.</p> <p>It is evident, if a church must exist before her officers, and that she is absolutely independent of all other bodies, she must be authorized to elect and to commission her officers without being required to call upon some outside party. Graves. <i>Old Landmarkism</i>, p. 47.</p> <p>Question in The Baptist: Can a church delegate her authority or power to any one, (even an archangel), under any circumstances, without disloyalty to Christ? Answer. --Quod deiigatur, mem delegatian, est delegated—authority cannot be delegated. All the prerogatives of a church are delegated to her, and she cannot alienate them. Graves. <i>The Baptist</i>. May 24, 1879, p. 214.</p>
--	--

Hiscox-Fenison	Hiscox
<p>Before the organization actually takes place, however, such persons as propose to constitute the body, should procure letters from the churches of which they are members, GIVEN FOR THE PURPOSE OF FORMING A NEW CHURCH.” Fenison. <i>GCC</i> p.100. E.T. Hiscox, <i>A New Directory for Baptist Churches</i>, pp. 53-53.</p> <p>Note: Emphases (italics and caps do not belong to Hiscox.—JC.</p>	<p>The Authority of Churches.— the authority of a church is limited to its own members, and applies to all matters of Christian character, and whatever involves the welfare of religion. It is designed to secure in all its members a conduct and conversation ‘ becoming godliness.’</p> <p>This authority is derived directly from God; not from states, nor princes, nor people; not from its own officers, nor its members, not from any other source of ecclesiastical or civil power or right. But Christ ‘ is head over all things to the church,’ and also as of right, ‘the church is subject to Christ.’ But the authority of the church does not extend to its</p>

own members even, in matters merely personal and temporal, and which do not affect their character or duties as Christians.” Hiscox. *The Baptist Church Directory*, Hiscox, 1859. P 16-17].

Note: this Baptist Church Directory is distinct from The New Directory For Baptist Churches, first issued in 1894, but Hiscox tells us the New Directory “...is entirely in harmony with previous manuals, as to Baptist, polity, and neither abrogates not antagonizes any of the fundamental principles announced or advocated in those previous issues. *New Directory*, p. 8.

### III.– Churches Recognized.

It is customary for them to call a council, to meet at the same, or at a subsequent time, to recognize them; that is, to examine their doctrines, inquire into the circumstances and reasons of their organization, and express, on behalf of the churches they represent for their course, and fellowship for them, as a regularly constituted church of the same denomination. The calling of a council is, however, entirely optional with the church; it is a prudential measure merely, to secure the sympathy and approbation of sister churches, but it in no sense necessary.

The council usually hear their articles of faith and covenant; listen to a statement of the causes which led to their organization; examine the letters held by the constituent members; carefully consider the whole subject, and then vote their approval, if they so approve, or



	<p>advise them to the contrary, if they disapprove. It is customary to hold some appropriate religious service on the occasion, when a discourse is preached, a charge given to the church, the hand of fellowship extended by the council to the church, through some one chosen by each for the service. Hiscox. <i>The Baptist Church Directory</i>, p. 17-18.</p> <p>Note 3.— If a council should refuse to recognize a newly constituted church, still that church would have the right to maintain their organization, and continue the forms of worship, and would as really be a church without, as with the sanction of the council. It would seldom, however, be expedient to do this, against the convictions of churches and pastors expressed in the decisions of a council. Hiscox. <i>The Baptist Church Directory</i>, p. 19.</p> <p>The process by which new churches are constituted is very simple. The necessity for, and the practicability of, organizing one, must be decided by those who are to constitute it, and who are to bear the expense and the responsibility of its support. There may be persons belonging to some other Church or churches, who find themselves living where there is none, but where one is believed to be needed, and where the increase of population shows a need for increased religious privileges. Or such persons may be converts from some recent revival in a neighborhood where there seem both room and a demand for another Church. After mature deliberation on the part of such persons, meeting together for consultation, canvassing all sides of the question, taking counsel of wise and discreet</p>
--	--

	<p>brethren, with much prayer for divine direction--since such a movement is one of grave concern—general agreement being secured, a meeting is finally called for the organization. ....”</p> <p>The ‘Constituting act’ would properly and appropriately be the unanimously voting--perhaps by rising--a resolution like this: ‘Resolved, That, guided as we believe by the Holy Spirit, and relying on the blessing of God, we do, here and now, by this act, constitute ourselves a Church of Jesus Christ to perform His service, and to be governed by His will, as revealed in the New Testament. And to this end we do hereby adopt and agree to the following Covenant and Articles of faith.’ Such an act makes such a company of disciples, ipso facto, a Church of Christ with all the rights powers, and privileges of any New Testament Church.” Hiscox. <i>New Directory</i>, pp. 52-54.</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">Jarrel-Fenison</p> <p>.... But these missions and their pastors continued under the care of the mother church. This gave the pastor of the mother church a pastoral care over all the missions and their pastors. This is the case now in quite a number of Baptist churches. Fenison. <i>GCC</i>. 116].</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Jarrel</p> <p>Every Baptist church being, in organization, a church complete in itself, and, in no way organically connected with any other church Jarrel. <i>Baptist Church Perpetuity</i>. 1894. p. 2.</p> <p>All that Baptists mean by church “succession,” or Church Perpetuity, is: There has never been a day since the organization of the first New Testament church in which there was no genuine church of the New</p>
---	---

	<p>Testament existing on earth. Jarrel. <i>Baptist Church Perpetuity</i>. 1894. p. 3.</p> <p>In Mt. 18:20, Jesus speaking of the Church, said: “Where two or three are gathered together [it is not the middle voice—gathered themselves together; but it is the perfect passive participle--(συνεγμενοι) in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” See Ep 1:18-23; where God fills His church. “Those three already formed the Christian Church.” Jarrel. <i>Gospel in Water</i>, p. 182.</p>
--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">T. G. Jones-Fenison</p> <p>He also wrote a book defending Baptist History. In that book he claimed that the Great Commission as given in Matthew 28:19-20 was a process that includes authority to constitute churches. He said:</p> <p>“In this simple analysis of the commission is presented the very process by which Baptists are now made, constituted into churches, and governed. That it was the process by which the first preachers made converts, and constituted churches, is beyond question.” T. G. Jones, <i>The Baptists, their Origin, Continuity, Principles, Spirit, Policy, Position and Influence, a Vindication</i>. (Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society) p. 27. <i>GCC</i>. p. 50.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">T. G. Jones</p> <p>In the same spirit Dr. Ripley says: “A church that came into existence yesterday, in strict conformity to the New Testament principles of membership, far away from any long-existing church or company of churches, and therefore unable to trace an outward lineal descent, is a true church of Christ—for Christianity is not a religion of circumstances, but of principles—while a church so-called, not standing on the apostolic principles of faith and practice, and yet able to look back through a long line up to time immemorial, may have never belonged to that body of which Christ is the head.”.... “Amongst their [Baptist—JC] sister churches they are related by sympathies and kind offices, but they own no subjection, and acknowledge no dependence either on contemporary churches of their own country, or upon the churches of other lands or other times, except as those churches have held the same truth, clung to the same Head, and have exhibited the</p>
---	--

	<p>same spirit...They claim to hold directly of the ever-living, almighty, and omnipotent Spirit, and to lean, without the interposition of chains of succession and lines of spiritual descent, immediately and for themselves on the bosom and heart of the Saviour, who pledged his presence to the end of the world, where two or three are gathered together in his name. To all pedigrees of spiritual and priestly class, claimed by some Christians, we oppose the permanent presence and indefeasible priesthood of the great Melchisedec of our profession, without beginning of days or end of years; and we claim to come up out of the wilderness, stayed directly on Christ and leaning on our beloved. We touch, so to speak, his bare arm as our stay, without the intervention of the envelopes of any favored order or virtue running through a chain of spiritual conductors. Our graces are not transmitted, but taken direct from the Redeemer's own hand." T.G. Jones. <i>The Baptists</i>. p. 26-27. Electronic copy.</p>
--	--

<p>Daniel King-Fenison</p> <p>Throughout the 1650's there were printed defenses of Baptist Church succession... Daniel King. <i>A Way to Zion Sought Out and Found for Believers to Walk in</i>. London, 1650 and Edinburgh, 1656. Fenison. GCC. p. 183-4.</p>	<p>Daniel King</p> <p>That Believers Convicted of The Truth, May Take Up An Ordinance Of God, As Baptism, Though It Have Been Intercepted, And No Baptized Person To Administer It.</p> <p>In this case He is to be looked upon as visible a Disciple, as if He were under the Ordinance Himself, and so by the motion of the Spirit, and the call of those convinced believers, intending to join themselves together in a Church, He may and ought to</p>
--	---

	Baptize, as well as Preach the Gospel. King. <i>Way to Zion</i> . p. 82.
--	--

Mercer—Fenison	Mercer
<p>Our reasons therefore for rejecting baptism by immersion, when administered by Pedobaptist ministers is that they are connected with churches clearly out of the Apostolic succession, and therefore clearly out of the apostolic commission. Jesse Mercer, <i>A History of the Georgia Baptist Association</i>, p. 126.</p> <p>Notice that Mercer connected apostolic succession and apostolic commission 'with churches.' he flatly denies that institution can be called churches if they are 'clearly out of the apostolic succession'. In essence, he is claiming what English Baptists and the Baptists of the Philadelphia Association defined as 'regular church order' in regard to the great commission. This was the basis for taking a stand against the ecumenical practices that were invading the practice of Baptists in his day. Even earlier than this Jesse Mercer stated in 1811:</p> <p>That all churches and ministers, who originated since the apostles, and not successively to them, are NOT IN GOSPEL ORDER; and therefore cannot be acknowledged as such'</p> <p>Here Mercer uses the old phrase 'gospel order' to define his position on church succession and church authority in regard to the great</p>	<p>There is not even any direct scriptural authority for such an organization as an association. The church, on the other hand, receives its power and authority directly from Christ. Hogue. <i>Antecedents of Landmarkism</i>, p. 231. Jesse Mercer, "A Dissertation on the Resemblances and Differences between Church Authority and That of an Association." <i>Christian Index</i>, I, No. 22 (Dec. 10, 1833, p. 86).</p> <p>What constitutes, in our judgment, any number of believers in Christ a church, is their coming together into one body, according to the rules and faith of the gospel. And wheresoever any body of professed christians is found so walking together, they should be acknowledged and received as a true church. Charles D. Mallary, <i>Memoirs of Elder Jesse Mercer</i>, pp 456.</p> <p>Church authority is competent to the examination of refractory members—to deliver them to Satan—to render them as heathen men or publicans; but an Association has no excommunicatory authority—no, not of a church! This belongs to Christ, as head exclusively. See Rev. 2:5.3:16. No church, Association, or ecclesiastical body, has any power to excommunicate, or injure, or unchurch a church of Christ; or even to dissolve one. This last act can only be done by the mutual consent of the members, by whose will alone they</p>

<p>commission. Fenison. <i>GCC</i>. Pp 107-108.</p> <p>Note: As to this second quote, Bro Fenison, does not identify the source. It is found in the <i>Memoirs</i> by Mallary, p. 146. Also the emphasis does not belong to Mercer. Bro Fenison assumes that apostolic succession, regular church order and gospel order are synonyms for EMDA, a constant source of confusion for himself and his readers.-- J C.</p>	<p>were constituted a church. Mallary. <i>Memoirs of Jesse Mercer</i>, p. 456. Note: Italics belong to Mercer.</p> <p>Church authority is from Christ, as Head and king alone; Mallary. <i>Memoirs of Jesse Mercer</i>, p. 455. Note: The italics belong to Mercer.</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;">J. B. Moody-Fenison</p> <p>Among the Middle Tennessee Baptists were such men as J.B. Moody, ..... demonstrates that church authority in establishing churches was practiced during this time frame.....</p> <p>“‘Continuity’ is not far from the true idea, as these churches were a continuation and extension of the first church. So out of continuity there came perpetuity, AS IN HUMAN HISTORY. These other churches did not spring out of the ground, but came from the first church [132-3].... This is true of our own species. I know I am in the succession, not because I can trace it, but because God originated the race with this law of self-propagation – a law we see in operation now, and so far as history testifies, it has thus ever operated; hence the proof and conclusion are irresistible. You may tell me I can’t trace it. You may urge variety of complexion and countenance, and</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">J.B. Moody</p> <p>And wherever two or three baptized disciples abide, there they ought to ‘gather together in Christ’s name,’ and organize, and co-operate. They should take Christ as their only head, and lawgiver, and teacher, and they should bind themselves to be governed in all things by his word and to his way... J.B. Moody. <i>Distinguishing Doctrines of Baptists</i>, P. 11.</p> <p>A Baptist church is not a branch of that trunk, nor any other trunk. It is the thing itself, all to itself. Its members live in Christ, the vine. He is life to the members, but head to the church. The member gets life from the vine, while the church gets authority from its head. Moody. <i>My Church</i>, p. 62.</p> <p>Prayer -meetings, Sunday-schools, social and benevolent gatherings are of divine permission, but not of divine organization. . They are not the appointed guardians of laws,</p>
--	---

customs, as unfavorable to one origin [160] ... I CLAIM TO BE IN THE SUCCESSION. Men may challenge the historical proof, and it may never be furnished, yet the proof, the right kind of proof, is abundant, and the succession is sure" [161] [Fenison. *GCC*, 135-136, 160-136, Quoting J.B. Moody, *My Church*, pp.133, 160, 161.

Note: These references are taken from different pages without apprising the reader of where one starts and the other begins. I have inserted in brackets the page numbers from *My Church*. The emphasis throughout belongs entirely to Bro Fenison, not to Moody. —JC.

doctrines and ordinances, and they have nothing to do with them, having no authority in the kingdom of Christ. Privilege, permission and authority are very different things. When men mete out authority, they must meet with authority, and that means by authority. Authority does not spring out of the ground, but comes down from heaven. Moody. *My Church*, 167.

Any Baptist church can divide; or any part of it for good reason can pull out and organize when and where it pleases, because individual liberty is not destroyed or impaired by church membership. The churches of Judea, Samaria, Galilee, etc., thus organized, were recognized by the mother church, and by the apostles, and Christ. This is a golden mark. Moody. *My Church*. 58-59.

I believe the words of Christ in Mt 18:19 are true. I would render them thus: 'Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any business you crave to accomplish, it shall be done for them of my Father who is in heaven.' 'For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' The context compels the conclusion that Christ was speaking of church work. Wherever two or three persons live together, they should talk together and pray together and work together for the spread of the Kingdom and the upbuilding of the church. Moody. *Distinguishing Doctrines of Baptists*, 103.

Note: This quote above is taken from chapter XV which is entitled *Church Constitution*. These titles were supplied by the publisher— J C.

	<p>A Baptist church is composed of volunteers associated in congregational effort, each member in equal authority, and each church complete in itself and independent of all other churches and of all outside authorities. Thus it was in the beginning. J. B. Moody, <i>My Church</i>, p. 63.</p>
--	---

Spilsbury—Fenison	Spilsbury
<p>When John Spilsbury spoke of the Great Commission as given by Christ in Matthew 28:19-20 he regarded it as the “rule and order which Christ left...for the constituting of His church.” In other words, Matthew 28:19-20 was designed and given by Christ for the purpose of constituting churches according to a given “rule and order. He said:</p> <p>“Christ Left His Rule and Order For The Constitution of His Church, Faith and Baptism. And Lastly, I dare not go from that <b>RULE AND ORDER WHICH CHRIST LEFT IN HIS LAST TESTAMENT, FOR THE CONSTITUTING OF HIS CHURCH, AND TAKING MEMBERS INTO THE SAME, WHICH IS BY FAITH AND BAPTISM.</b>” John Spilsbury, <i>A Treatise Concerning the Lawful Subject of Baptism</i>. London, 1652, pg 53. Fenison. <i>GCC</i>, p. 189.</p> <p>Note: The emphasis belongs to Fenison—JC.</p>	<p>The Constitution of The Church</p> <p>This will be further cleared in the constitution of the Church, which now follows, which constitution is the orderly collection of conjoining of persons into the New Covenant or visible union with Christ their head, as their mutual faith and agreement in the truth to the practice of it, and so consequently into an orderly body among themselves; wherein the Saints are the matter, and the covenant is the form; from which these two concurring, the Church arises, and is by them constituted, as Ezek. 16:8; Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10; Gal. 3:18, 29; Heb. 6:17; Zech. 1:3, 9; [probably 8:3, 9—JC ] with Deut. 26:16, to 19; Deut. 29:12, 13; &amp; Romans 9:8; with Gal. 4:28. By which it appears, that it is the promise, or the Covenant of Grace, that produces a Christian, and gives him a being in such an estate of grace, and so consequently the Church itself; for that which is true in a part, is the same in the whole.</p> <p>The constituting causes which God ordinarily uses to effect this work are:</p>



Now for the constituting causes by which God ordinarily uses to effect this work, they are these:

1. The Word of God, which is to fit and prepare the matter for the form;

2. The Confession of Faith, which is to declare the fitness of the matter for the form;

3. The free and mutual consent and agreement of the particular persons, upon the practice of the same truth believed and confessed, as aforesaid.

4. And lastly, the Spirit of Christ, uniting and knitting up their hearts together, in and by the same truth... Spilbury. *Lawful Subject of Baptism*, p. 72 .

Gospel Order Stands Firm Forever Unalterable

The answer is, where there is a beginning, some must be first, and our obedience to God depends only upon His word, that gives being to all order of worship, and the Gospel order once instituted stands firm for ever unalterable, for all that believe to obey and submit themselves thereunto, by a practical profession of the same, Acts 2; 2 Tim. 3:15-17; Rev. 22:18-20.

Jesus Christ Makes His Own Into a Spiritual House and Holy Priesthood

And so to enter upon it, as living matter upon the foundation, which is Jesus Christ, Who calls all that have faith in Him, as living stones to come

	<p>unto Him, to be built upon Him, a spiritual house, and an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Him, Who has by His own blood made a free and open way for all that believe to come with boldness unto the most holy place, and if so, then much more to enjoy all those privileges of grace inferior to the same, and when any lay short of their obedience to the holy rules of the Gospel, it is only the Spirit of truth, that brings up any man to the obedience of truth, by what instrument, or means He pleases, and such as God so works in by His Spirit, as to enlighten the understanding in the truth, the conscience convicted by it having faith in it, as a duty to obey it, with the way open to it, such by their mutual Agreement with truth, are by faith one together in the truth, which gives being to the practice of it, for the which Christ prayed, Heb. 10; John 17:20, 21. God approves, Matt. 18:19, 20; and believing hearts obey, Acts 8:12, to such Christ freely opens, John 10:3, 9, and receives them into the fellowship of His own body, I Cor. 1:9; Col. 3:15; I Cor. 12:12, 13, and 27. Spilsbury. <i>Lawful Subjects of Baptism</i>, p. 75-6.</p> <p>Note: The headings in this copy of Spilsbury's work were added by Bro R.E. Pound and probably the emphases also—JC.</p>
--	--



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Pro EMDA References

**Note:** For a review of some of the following articles, not discussed in this present volume, the reader is directed to <http://ntbaptist-lizton.org/> Select *Landmark Issues*.

Caudill, Medford. *Voice In the Wilderness. Self-Constitution... A Misnomer*. March 9, 2006.

Cockrell, Milburn. *Scriptural Church Organization*. 1998. POB 39, Mantachie, MS.  
[www.bereabaptistchurch.org](http://www.bereabaptistchurch.org)

Cockrell, Milburn. *Scriptural Church Organization*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 2003. POB 39, Mantachie, MS.  
[www.bereabaptistchurch.org](http://www.bereabaptistchurch.org)

Killion, Larry J. *Landmarks on the Old Path*. *BBB* June 5, 2008.

Newell, D. P., III. *Death Blow to the Self-constitution Proponent's Demands*. *The Berea Baptist Banner*. September 5, 2006, p. 407-9.

Newell, Doug IV. *Antioch Was Not Self-Constituted*, *BBB*. 4-5-06

Newell, Doug IV. *Church Organization Is Not Found in Mt 18*. *BBB*. 6-5-06.

Perdue, Rick. *Response to J. C. Settlemoir's Six Laws of EMDA*. No publishing data.

Pugh, Curtis. *Colonial Landmarkism*. *BBB*. 12-5-06.

- “ *New Light: Baptist History*. BBB. 5-5-07.
- “ *Can a Member of a Church Dismiss Himself?*  
BBB. 3-5-09.

Ross, Tom. *Resetting an Old Landmark*.

Stang, William. *Voice In the Wilderness. Where is the Authority?* Dec. 6, 2006, p. 25.

Van Nunen, William. November 2008. Email letter. *Clement of Alexandria*. williamvannunen@yahoo.com

Wolfe, Ronnie. “*Two or Three*” posted under "Articles" and "Local Church Seminar" at this web site:  
<http://www.firstharrison.org>. Subsequently it was also picked up and published in *The Berea Baptist Banner*, Mantachie, MS. with the title of “*Matthew 18:20*” [ Sept 5, 2002, p. 401].

#### SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asher, Louis Franklin. *John Clarke*, Dorrance Pub. Co. 1997.
- Benedict, David. *Gen. Hist. Baptists*. 1859.
- Carroll, J.M. *History of Texas Baptists*. 1923.
- Cathcart, William. *Baptist Encyclopedia*.
- Crowell, William. *The Church Member's Manual*, 1857.
- Dargan, E.C. *Ecclesiology*. Electronic copy.
- Dayton, A. C. *Alien Baptism*. 1858.

- “ *Theodosia Earnest*. Vol. 2. Baptist Book Shelf. 1996.
- Drapes, Edward. *Gospel Glory*. Electronic copy.
- Dever, Mark. Editor. *Polity*. Center For Church Reform. 2001.
- Fenison, Mark. *Great Commission Credentials*. 2007.
- Furman, Richard. Sermon on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Church. Preached before the Charleston Association, 1791. Sacks. *The Philadelphia Baptist Tradition of Church and Church Authority, 1707-1814*, p. 759. Edwin Mellen Press, vol. 48. 1989.
- Graves. J. R. *First Baptist Church in America*. ABA. 1939.
- Graves-Ditzler. *Great Carrollton Debate*. Southern Baptist Publication Society. 1876.
- “ *Great Iron Wheel*, 1855.
- “ Intercommunion... 1882.
- “ *Old Landmarkism*. 1881.
- “ *Tennessee Baptist; The Baptist*. Questions and answers. Various years. The TN Baptist on DVDs is available from The Baptist Bookshelf, P.O. Box 13 Nappanee, IN. 46550.
- Hart, Oliver. Sermon, “A Gospel Church Portrayed...” Preached in Philadelphia, October 4, 1791 before the Philadelphia Baptist Association. [Sacks. *The Philadelphia Baptist Tradition of Church And Church Authority, 1707-1814*, pp.749-755. Edwin Mellen Press, vol. 48. 1989].

- Harvey, Hezekiah. *The Church: Its Polity and Ordinances*, Backus Book Pub. No date.
- Hiscox, E.T. *The New Directory for Baptist Churches*. 1894.  
*The Baptist Church Directory*. 1859.
- Jarrel, W. A., *Church Perpetuity*. 1894.  
*The Gospel in Water or Campbellism*, National Baptist Publishing Co, St Louis, 1886.
- Jones. T. G. *The Baptists*. Reprint Published by Grace-Landmark Pub. 2003. Note. Pages may be different in original 1860 edition.
- Kazee, Buel. *The Church and the Ordinances*. By the author, 1965.
- King, Henry Melville. *The Mother Church*. American Baptist Publication Society, 1896.
- Mallary, Charles D. *Memoirs of Jesse Mercer*. Baptist Standard Bearer Reprint, no date.
- Mason, Roy. *The Church That Jesus Built*, Tenth edition. No date; no publishing data.
- Moody, J.B. *Distinguishing Doctrines of Baptists*, Baptist Standard Bearer reprint, 2006.
- “ *My Church*. Dean Hall-Moody Institute, Martin, Tn. 1908.
- Moore, Douglas. *Old Landmarkism Vs. The Pedigree Pushers*, 8127 Butternut Dr., Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Reynolds, J. L. *Church Polity or The Kingdom of Christ*, Baptist Standard Bearer reprint. 2006.

Sacks. *The Philadelphia Baptist Tradition of Church And Church Authority, 1707-1814*. Studies in American Religion. Edwin Mellen Press, vol. 48. 1989.

Soares, T. G. A Baptist Manual. Amer. Baptist Pub. Society. 1911.

Spilsbury, John. *The Lawful Subjects of Baptism*. Electronic copy.

### **General and Specific Baptist Histories of Mississippi**

Boyd, Jesse Laney, *A Popular History of the Baptists in Mississippi*. Baptist Press, 1930.

Bond, T. M. *A Republication of the Minutes of the Mississippi Baptist Association, from its Organization in 1806 to the Present Time*. New Orleans. 1849.

Christian, J. T. *A History of the Baptists of the United States*. Vol. II, Texarkana, Texas. 1926.

Leavell, Z. T. and Bailey, T. J., *A complete History of Mississippi Baptists*. Jackson, MS. Mississippi Baptist Publishing Co., 1904. 2 Vols.

McLemore, Richard A. *A History of Mississippi Baptists, 1780- 1970*. Jackson, MS 1971.

Newman, A. H. *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 1894.



Peck, J. M. *Early Baptists in Mississippi*. 1846.

Shilling, T. C. *Abstract History of the Mississippi Baptist Association for 100 years*. 1908. Cf. also:  
<http://baptisthistoryhomepage.com/mississippi.history.index.html>