herself ever as these: whose whole of usefulness elves? How

All who came eavenly, and ession, were

with whom speak more reet Church ill claim the

ister E. M.
or." What
or husband
d modestly.
she would
earts would
not alone.
uilty of the
ch differed,
g, by which
but neither

"We differ
e of agreeg with you
you unemial resting

gion. But I not leave rejoinder. hat is the le Church. Il shut you ompel you mmunion.

ne which

and cont tribunal judgment y honest mind, acquainted with the relations of a Baptist Church, feels that she cannot, in such circumstances, fulfil those relations with the Church that has thus acted. To do so she must put her tenderest and most sacred feelings to torture; she must act a falsehood in pretending, by her conduct, a fellowship that does not exist, and make a mockery of sacred things; or, she must submit to be disgraced, and sent abroad an outcast. Surely, such a doctrine cannot commend itself to reflecting minds. It can only tend to render contemptible the act of exclusion, for no one will be, or will feel to be disgraced under such circumstances.

I must notice the mistake into which I am said to have fallen, in reference to certain charges against the Church, presented to the Council, (see Reply, page 21,) because there was, apparently, a mistake in my Letter. In reality there was none, at least, according to my apprehension of the circumstances. I presented those charges as from myself, as a member of the Church, and supposed that it was so understood, as well by the Church as the Council. They were withdrawn at the desire of the Council, because, as I understood, they did not consider their functions to extend beyond the questions between Dr. Pryor and the Church. By some misapprehension, what I intended to do on my own behalf, was supposed to have been done for Dr. Pryor.

The Reply abounds with allusions to my observations that the decision of the Council was just and righteous, and with labored arguments to shew that the Council had acquitted the Church, and,

therefore, I ought not to censure.

I have not been able to see the accuracy of the premises, or to comprehend the force of the argumentation. My remark on the decision was intended in reference to the acquittal of Dr. Pryor, but I have no objection to its being extended; and the decision speaks only of two points in the Church's conduct, and of both with disapproval.

Among much that I cannot comprehend, one thing is clear, Granville Street Church has profound respect for the judgment of the Council—provided, always, that it can be construed in their own favor; as a shield to protect themselves it is invulnerable; when thrown over Dr. Pryor it is worthless; but then it is a more sacred duty to shield Granville Street Church, from even the slightest imputation, than to save their late pastor from ruin in its most terrible forms.

X.—I have now to enquire into the nature of the relation that subsists, or ought to subsist between a Baptist Church and one or more of its members, who can conscientiously no longer continue in their connection either from change of opinion in doctrine, or from the belief that the Church or an influential portion of its members have violated fundamental principles of Christian conduct, under circumstances that destroy respect, confidence and affection.

There is required in Independent Churches a personal and individual fellowship and intimacy in Church relations between the different members. Were this wanting they would be brought into parity with systems from which, on that account, among others, they differ.