

been denied a place at the table of the church, when the very Epistles which gave birth to church independence were written. When the Corinthian church, in the very first chapter, he speaks to them about *unity* and *love*, and insists that they should be "perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." And then, in the same chapter, he plunges into their consciences with the question, "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Did not this church, by Dr. Graves' rule of *synecdoche*—one for many—represent in these Epistles all the churches in Achaia—all of the species? And if the church is the body of Christ, "Is Christ divided?" Again, as a third proposition, Paul and the apostles addressed in these Epistles, for the most part, are one bread and one body, and are all partakers of that one bread. This is especially the passage on which Dr. Graves relies to prove that there is instructions on communion, contemplated in the Corinthian church, so exclusive that it could not admit any other church. The editorial note on the non-sensical way were not in using the word "one bread" to indicate a species of organic unity in the Corinthian church and all other churches, which makes intercommunion impossible (pp. 248, 273, 295), I propose at the beginning of this article to dispose of this argument. Paul says: "For we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread." (1 Cor. x. 17.) This is a kindred allusion, or rather an allusion, to the "one cup" and the "one body" which are used in the same sense that a member from any other church could not have united with that church in communion without destroying the symbol and vitiating the ordinance.
The "ONE BREAD"—I retain the old version because there is no essential reason for the rendering *loaf* instead of *bread*; and Dr. Graves retains the term *bread* because he has no special point to make against intercommunion (pp. 246, 247); and learned commentators use the words *bread* and *loaf* as equivalents. There is nothing in any mention of the communion bread which can be justly considered a law prescribing one loaf and prescribing two or more. Multiplied millions of particles of flour enter into the composition of a loaf used at a communion season in any church, and though it be baked into several loaves or cakes, it is *one bread*, and by Dr. Graves' rule of "synecdoche," we might speak of the *loaf* or *one loaf* when we meant all of the kind, or used on the occasion; as when it is said in the *Gospel* that it is the *loaf* of the South, and in the *Gospel* surely we do not mean by such a sentence that the South, or any family, uses just one biscuit *literally*. By this figure (synecdoche) the whole is put for a part, or the part for the whole; one person or thing for the whole class, as the genus for the species, *man* for all men. Again says Dr. Graves: "So in the Scriptures we read that 'Christ loved the church,' that he is 'the Head of the Church.' The church is used for multitudes of the same kind, the *genus* for all contained under it." (Intercom. p. 119.) And by synecdoche, when the Apostle speaks of the "one bread" and the "one body," he uses the *genus* for all of its kind. And I add, what is Scripturally true of one church is Scripturally true of all true churches, and their communion bread is *one bread*; it is not the bread of a common dinner or common supper; it is not the bread of a common pleasurable or heathen feast, but it is the bread of the Lord's Supper, symbolizing the body of Christ, and therefore it is *one bread—the bread—of a species*. Some churches, as the Roman Catholics, prepare the bread, as some of a species of communion. Dr. Graves' notion loses all its emphasis when he gets to the "one cup," which he rightly says symbolizes the one Redeemer—the one blood of our Lord; and yet he divides the cup "after thanks into as many glasses or cups as may be necessary to distribute it readily." (p. 282.) The rest of the argument is now in a position to make it harmonize with the *loaf* and *one cup* views. The New Testament speaks of breaking the bread, but it does not speak of dividing the cup.
THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH.
This church figures largely in all discussions on communion at the Lord's table, necessarily so, because it is not clear that instructions on the subject are given to any other church in the Epistles. And Dr. Graves comes in here with his figure, "synecdoche," does not say that the Corinthian church specifically; but I maintain that it does apply to that church, and I will submit three propositions which seem to be wholly overlooked by him; and propositions, which, if true, indicate that intercommunion is legitimate in that church, and may have been in other churches, and that the church, and all other churches, are in perfect harmony with church independence.
1. And the first is, that neither of these Epistles was addressed exclusively to the church at Corinth. The first Epistle, written "unto the church of God which is at Corinth," with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ," (1 Cor. i. 2.) This is the Epistle in which the instructions on communion were given *in extenso*. It was addressed specifically to the Corinthian church, and to no other church; and it also embraced all other Christians in that region—"all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ." And so the second Epistle to that church was addressed "to the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." I grant that it was purposed, that these Epistles should become the common property of all the churches in Achaia, and finally of all churches in all ages and countries; still, Corinth was the chief city of Achaia; Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.

ferent. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

My third proposition is the demand for recognition, as a church, to be extended to the Corinthian church toward other churches, and the messengers of other churches; and the same recognition was required of and found in all other apostolic churches. When Paul sent to the Corinthian church along with Titus, "the brother, whose praise was in the Gospel throughout all the churches," it matters not whether it was Luke, as some suppose, or whether it was Barnabas, or Apollos, or another, as others insist, he was a "brother," and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace." And then in addition to this, said Paul, "We have sent with them our brother, a third brother, whom we have often times proved diligent in many things." And, in the Corinthian church, he inquired of, (at Corinth) in the *Epistles*, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ. Wherefore show ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf." (2 Cor. x. 2.)
And so in the first Epistle, when Timothy was to appear at Corinth, they were instructed by Paul that he was one who worked the work of the Lord, and must be among them without delay, and no man was to despise him, or to neglect him, or to despise him, and they must help him in his work when he should leave them. (1 Cor. 16:10, 11.) In all this there was a recognition of church relations required of the Corinthian church and churches of Achaia, toward all other true churches, and toward the ministers and agents of all other true churches; and so Paul sends to these churches, his letters, which were his communications to other churches and other eminent Christians; (verses 19, 20,) all of which is absolutely incongruous with Dr. Graves' position. And this interrelationship among the early Christians, in a full recognition of the church relations of each other, appears in nearly all the Epistles of the Apostles. Some members of one church, who visited other churches, needed letters of commendation, others did not. (2 Cor. 3:1.) Nearly the whole 16th chapter of Romans consists of commendations and salutations, beginning with the Apostle's commendation of Phoebe, a Christian woman of the church at Achaia, and then he commends to the churches of Achaia, Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.

And so the second Epistle to that church was addressed "to the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." I grant that it was purposed, that these Epistles should become the common property of all the churches in Achaia, and finally of all churches in all ages and countries; still, Corinth was the chief city of Achaia; Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.
Every argument made by Dr. Graves, having any force about it, as have stated former articles, is false. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

My third proposition is the demand for recognition, as a church, to be extended to the Corinthian church toward other churches, and the messengers of other churches; and the same recognition was required of and found in all other apostolic churches. When Paul sent to the Corinthian church along with Titus, "the brother, whose praise was in the Gospel throughout all the churches," it matters not whether it was Luke, as some suppose, or whether it was Barnabas, or Apollos, or another, as others insist, he was a "brother," and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace." And then in addition to this, said Paul, "We have sent with them our brother, a third brother, whom we have often times proved diligent in many things." And, in the Corinthian church, he inquired of, (at Corinth) in the *Epistles*, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ. Wherefore show ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf." (2 Cor. x. 2.)
And so in the first Epistle, when Timothy was to appear at Corinth, they were instructed by Paul that he was one who worked the work of the Lord, and must be among them without delay, and no man was to despise him, or to neglect him, or to despise him, and they must help him in his work when he should leave them. (1 Cor. 16:10, 11.) In all this there was a recognition of church relations required of the Corinthian church and churches of Achaia, toward all other true churches, and toward the ministers and agents of all other true churches; and so Paul sends to these churches, his letters, which were his communications to other churches and other eminent Christians; (verses 19, 20,) all of which is absolutely incongruous with Dr. Graves' position. And this interrelationship among the early Christians, in a full recognition of the church relations of each other, appears in nearly all the Epistles of the Apostles. Some members of one church, who visited other churches, needed letters of commendation, others did not. (2 Cor. 3:1.) Nearly the whole 16th chapter of Romans consists of commendations and salutations, beginning with the Apostle's commendation of Phoebe, a Christian woman of the church at Achaia, and then he commends to the churches of Achaia, Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.
Every argument made by Dr. Graves, having any force about it, as have stated former articles, is false. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

And so the second Epistle to that church was addressed "to the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." I grant that it was purposed, that these Epistles should become the common property of all the churches in Achaia, and finally of all churches in all ages and countries; still, Corinth was the chief city of Achaia; Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.
Every argument made by Dr. Graves, having any force about it, as have stated former articles, is false. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

My third proposition is the demand for recognition, as a church, to be extended to the Corinthian church toward other churches, and the messengers of other churches; and the same recognition was required of and found in all other apostolic churches. When Paul sent to the Corinthian church along with Titus, "the brother, whose praise was in the Gospel throughout all the churches," it matters not whether it was Luke, as some suppose, or whether it was Barnabas, or Apollos, or another, as others insist, he was a "brother," and not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace." And then in addition to this, said Paul, "We have sent with them our brother, a third brother, whom we have often times proved diligent in many things." And, in the Corinthian church, he inquired of, (at Corinth) in the *Epistles*, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ. Wherefore show ye to them, and before the churches, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf." (2 Cor. x. 2.)
And so in the first Epistle, when Timothy was to appear at Corinth, they were instructed by Paul that he was one who worked the work of the Lord, and must be among them without delay, and no man was to despise him, or to neglect him, or to despise him, and they must help him in his work when he should leave them. (1 Cor. 16:10, 11.) In all this there was a recognition of church relations required of the Corinthian church and churches of Achaia, toward all other true churches, and toward the ministers and agents of all other true churches; and so Paul sends to these churches, his letters, which were his communications to other churches and other eminent Christians; (verses 19, 20,) all of which is absolutely incongruous with Dr. Graves' position. And this interrelationship among the early Christians, in a full recognition of the church relations of each other, appears in nearly all the Epistles of the Apostles. Some members of one church, who visited other churches, needed letters of commendation, others did not. (2 Cor. 3:1.) Nearly the whole 16th chapter of Romans consists of commendations and salutations, beginning with the Apostle's commendation of Phoebe, a Christian woman of the church at Achaia, and then he commends to the churches of Achaia, Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.
Every argument made by Dr. Graves, having any force about it, as have stated former articles, is false. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

And so the second Epistle to that church was addressed "to the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." I grant that it was purposed, that these Epistles should become the common property of all the churches in Achaia, and finally of all churches in all ages and countries; still, Corinth was the chief city of Achaia; Christians from all parts of that province would naturally often visit that city, carried by various business and Christian influences, and especially to hear these letters read; and so, at any time present, at least a large number of churches, and the members of those churches, would have been present at the reading of these letters.
Every argument made by Dr. Graves, having any force about it, as have stated former articles, is false. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

Every argument made by Dr. Graves, having any force about it, as have stated former articles, is false. He is constantly showing the bad side of the apostolic churches, and inferring from that an argument against intercommunion. All communications to the churches are such like characters, and all passages which have usually been used in discussions on corrective church discipline, are introduced by him against intercommunion. (pp. 206-208.) This is all done as if every church of Christ must regard every other church of Christ as condemned already, and that every church taking this uncharitable and *anti* view of all other churches, is non-fellowshiping with them. The fact that some churches have been pointed out as its own membership. For all those terrible passages which Dr. Graves quotes were given to each church as the treatment to be administered to its own members. What would be thought of the family, who would insist, that because one of its own members had committed himself, therefore all other families must be considered full members, and per consequence all other families are too doubtful in character to regard the good man and his plan, and he has given no such place to any church. And now as to the argument by inference, I insist that I have established in the reasoning above the fact, that the Holy Spirit has arranged for a fellowship among the churches of the same order, which involves and provides for intercommunion at the Lord's table, and in perfect recognition of church relations and church independence. See this argument forcibly stated in the last chapter of John, where the brethren, some of whom were after *strong* errors, were received by the church. Ephesus of which Caius was a member; they were received, not to membership, but to a recognition in church fellowship and to help them on their journey. "We therefore ought to receive such; that we might be fellowshippers to the truth. I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who has the pre-eminence among them, receiving not our love, says, 'We all are one bread and one body,' and we are all partakers of that one bread." And so the Apostle says to the Ephesians, that believing "Jews and Gentiles are united in one body by the Cross;" that "Christ is head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all, and the church is one body, and one Spirit, even as we are all part of the same body, and of the same blood, called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And so Jesus prayed, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one." (John 17:11, 21.) Now it cannot be denied that Jesus and the Apostle intended that his church should ignore independent church relations in organic unity; not that he supposed, on the other hand, that they provided for the *division* of the church of Christ, into as many independent churches, making separate seats of every local church; but this is what Dr. Graves' position does, and it arrays all local churches as "antagonistic seats"—suspecting, distrustful, disowning, and antagonizing each other. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." (1 Cor. i. 16.)

