

mon limb, an insignificant twig—unworthy your pruning knife till it become *extra*.) To comment on your letter as I have done is unjust to you and to me, for “we have, from the Book, learned our lessons precisely alike”—we “teach the same things”—and are of the “same mind and same judgment.”

So then you give up the Oshawa practice as indefensible? That's right, for assuredly it has no warrant from the Book. But perhaps its defence is in your article now under consideration. Let us “see what we can see.”

“My authority to permit is in the same book, chapter, and verse where you find your authority for not permitting.” Indeed Out of the same fountain issues sweet water and bitter. The same verse grants authority to permit, and to withhold permission. Very convenient verse. This is the new light I was looking for. Where shall we find it? It is certainly your duty to point it out; for you say—“thus we teach, and thus we practise.” And do you teach and practise without authority? Yes, certainly. You candidly admit “there is no authority in the case.” This unauthorized teaching I do not admit, yet you say “we teach the same things” and “have learned our lessons precisely alike.” You do “what the apostles never *done*,” yet take the Book for your guide. You slay with the spirit's armour one who teaches the same things as you teach, because his opinion is of a different color—because he is a “rigid,” and has a “bias nurtured in some unfriendly and uncongenial school.” If such language does not “cover the subject with some of the particles of confusion,” I confess I do not understand you. If this is not a sample of genuine *zig-zagism*, I should like to see such a sample.

“So far as authority goes we are even.” “We both do what the apostles never *done*.” Affirming that we are both wrong is a cheap way of proving yourself right. “Let it be neither mine, nor thine, but divide it.” It would be more satisfactory were you to show that your teaching and practice are in accordance with truth.

You did not succeed in my opinion, in removing many of the “particles of confusion” from the phrase “authority to permit.” Please let me try. Adam, Abraham and Peter in the cases to which you refer acted as *individuals*, “on their own responsibility.” The church of Christ is an *organized body*, over which elders are placed, *to rule in accordance with the Book*. Every thing done in the church is done by *command or permission* of the elders; and they can enjoin or permit, *only by the authority of Christ*, the Head of the Church. “Authority to permit,” therefore, after all, seems to me to have a meaning which even common optics may perceive.

But perhaps it may be made plainer in another way. A. and B. are elders in a church of Christ. A pious professor applies to A. for admission to “communion” for his son. A. says I can act only by the authority of the Master. He has not expressed his will in reference to such a case. Therefore I have no authority—I cannot permit. But brother A. says—B., you are too squeamish. My opinion is not of his color at all. I feel delivered from the leanings and partialities