

inexorably fixed ; and knowing the bitter remonstrances of Dr. Pryor and his friends against it, and the painful and injurious consequences that resulted from his exclusion, it will not be thought surprising that I look upon the pretext set up in the Reply as a mere subterfuge. It requires a bold front for one man to look another in the face and assert what is known to both to be a falsehood within their mutual knowledge. This is what, in fact, Granville Street Church has done in the Reply to this charge.

In the Reply, page 7, they claim the benefit of my opinion, and I willingly give it. I remember at the time thinking and saying that if I were situated as Dr. Pryor then was, I would probably prefer to withdraw till the matter should be cleared up, and it is very likely that I anticipated some inconvenience from Dr. Pryor's preaching, and may have so expressed myself, although I do not recollect doing so. But I did not make my judgment and feelings a law for him ; and had the interview with him taken place which I proposed, and had he presented the probable injury with a tithe of the force with which it was realized, I should have acknowledged the justice and propriety of his occupying the pulpit, offend whom it might. This I know, that when I found how terribly Dr. Pryor had been injured, owing to the impression that went abroad that he had been turned out of his pulpit from having been adjudged guilty by his Church, I deeply reproached myself that I had not taken a more decided stand,—fruitless as it would have been had I done so.

It must be remembered that my complaint was,—that a course so just and decorous as a personal interview with the pastor on a subject of the deepest interest to him, had not been adopted ; a course the more necessary because it was not until he had left the meeting that the subject of exclusion from preaching was discussed.

Every Baptist ought to know something of the relation that subsists, or ought to subsist between the pastor and his Church ; and he should be able to judge whether the rejection of the proposal for a personal interview evinced that affectionate regard, becoming respect, and just consideration which is due from a people to their pastor, in a commencement of a season of terrible trial ; and whether in the spirit that was evident in that rejection, may not be seen the germs of the disrespect, harshness, prejudice, and injustice, manifest in succeeding stages of the transaction. Remember also that at that time the pastor was recognized as an innocent man.

Even the Council, mildly as it treated the Church throughout, could not refrain from saying:—"It might nevertheless have been better if the deacons had sought a personal interview with Dr. Pryor, and consulted with him in reference to the services of the approaching Sabbath."

Every Baptist, I believe, will echo this sentiment, and it will give emphasis to the utterance when it is considered that the fault was not inadvertent.

But the Reply claims for the Church the benefit of the Council's opinion in their favor—page 37. Strange obtuseness of intellect this !