

of open communion. Very consistent! To this we replied:—

The difference between the views and practice I approve and the views and practice of the open communionist consists in these cardinal points, 1st. I never, like him, open new doors for entrance into the kingdom of Jesus, or make subjects of the kingdom other than by Christ's authority; and 2nd, I never teach that any man has a divine right to the Lord's table who has not complied with Jesus' command "Be baptized." The distinction between *teaching* and *permitting*—between *inviting* and *allowing*, is a distinction, I apprehend, that you cannot religiously comprehend; for the creed to which you have been accustomed, and to which you are now willingly subject, binds up all matters of this description so stringently that you have no opportunity of perceiving or learning this liberty. * * * The disciples teach that all who have put on Christ have a right to the privileges of Christ's house, and we invite all such to sit with us; and in the meantime, if others, whose love for the Lord so far overbalances their love of party as to desire to partake with us, we allow or permit them, with the full understanding that they take upon themselves the responsibility. * * * We hold that Christ's table is not scripturally exhibited when members are made independently of the laws of the oracles for the purpose of seating them to take part in this divine institution.

Our friend, whether because he was really satisfied or because he was logically annoyed, returned not again either with complaints or questions. Meantime our faithful correspondent "O," judging that the Elder needed help, or that the cause of truth demanded his interference and aid, came to the rescue. Says he—'Ah, yes; you teach—you permit; your authority if you please; I wait for your new light.' In reply, we arrested attention to these two very plain things: 1st. That our brother in calling so loudly for authority was asking from us what he could not produce for himself and his own correct views, himself being judge; and 2nd That it was entirely out of character, when treating of permitting, to demand authority for it, inasmuch as there have been according to scripture history very many things permitted by God, angels and good men, for which there was no authority from heaven or heavenly people—that, in short, it was simply a critical incongruity to speak of *authority* to permit; for 3rd. Wherever we find authority in the code of divine laws and institutions, we find something above permission—*something that must be taught and enforced*; an idea that the term permit does not generally convey. We may add, that the incongruity of speaking of authority to permit will clearly appear when it is reflected that authority invariably (without an exception, we believe) implies and carries with it responsibility; while the term *permit*, in many ten thousand instances, has not the slightest shade of responsibility attached to it. The Father of all, every day, permits evil; but who affirms that he is responsible for this evil by him permitted? In this illustration we have before us simply the idea or meaning of a word.

Very true, the term permit or permission, has, in some certain cases and positions, an authoritative sense. We say not otherwise. But