

the connection you have above, unless it were intended as an ingenious contrivance to deceive the reader? As, then, you were not present at my interview with Mr. Howard how do you know that "Mr. Taylor told only *part* of the truth in relation to the proposed discussion with Mr. H.?" Perhaps you will say, that Mr. H. has informed you in regard to the circumstances, and has told you that my published account is not correct. Well, supposing he has, may it not be that *he* has neglected to state the whole truth? But according to your own story, you have not consulted Mr. H. on the subject. You say in the last paragraph of your letter, "I have written this without consulting Mr. H. since seeing Mr. Taylor's article." Perhaps you will say, that you saw Mr. H. before the appearance of my narrative. Suppose you did,—how could he tell you *before* my article appeared, I "had told only part of the truth?" It seems to me Br. Eaton, that fix it as you please, you have placed yourself in rather an unenviable situation; and that you would have appeared much better, if you had let Mr. H. step forth in his own defence instead of setting yourself up as the guardian of his theological reputation.

Suffice it to observe, that the conversation between me and Mr. H. was entered in my journal the next morning after it took place, and that every word I have published in regard to it, is literally correct, without addition or abatement. I will not, therefore, take up room to go over the matter anew. Mr. H. evidently shrunk from the discussion, and I have no doubt a majority of the persons present on that occasion, viewed the matter in the same light that I did.—Even one of his communicants, who called on me at Br. Starr's the next morning, had the frankness to confess it.

But it seems from your letter, that Mr. Howard has all at once grown as bold as a lion. He now comes forward, (or, rather you do for him,) and like the Philistine of old, defies the armies of the living God. After stating the following questions. 1. "*Will all mankind be saved with an eternal salvation?*" 2. "*Will a part of the human family be eternally lost?*"—you proceed to say, "Mr. Howard will discuss these questions with Mr. Taylor yourself, [editor of Trumpet] or any other respectable Universalist clergyman in America.—If they will visit New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, they shall be furnished with a house in which to hold the discussion; but if they are not desirous of coming so far, you shall be met at Eastport, Bangor, Portland, Boston, or even in Mr. Taylor's own meeting-house." Why did you not add New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New Orleans? Perhaps some zealous brother in the South, who is possessed of considerable moral courage, might be induced to meet you in New Orleans. Or, "If you are not desirous of going so far," it may be that New York would turn out a David, I cannot speak, however, for every Universalist clergyman in America (!) nor for any besides myself. I have therefore only to say in relation to the above, that I shall not take the trouble, nor be at the expense, to visit any of the places you have named on purpose to hold a discussion; but if Mr. H. or yourself should see fit to visit this village, and the meeting-house in which I preach should not be otherwise