

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.]

OCTOBER, 1841.

[No. 10.]

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

CRITICAL REMARKS ON JOHN xii. 23, 31, 32; AND xvi. 8—11.

The hour (*ωρα*) has come that the Son of man should be glorified. . . . Now (*νυν*) is the judgment of this world: Now (*νυν*) shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all . . . unto me.—*John* xii. 23, 31, 32.

And when he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:—of sin, because they believe not on me:—of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no more:—of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.—*John* xvi. 8—11.

COMMENTATORS do not agree as to the meaning of these clauses. One of the difficulties is to determine the sense of the word *judgment*—(Greek, *κρισις*, Latin versions, *judicium*).—Another difficulty is to determine the application of the word *all* (Gr. common text *παντας*, Codex Beza, *παντα*, Vulgate, Jerome, Augustine, Ruffin, Ambrose, and most of the Latin fathers, *omnia*—see Mill in loco.) Some difference of opinion exists also as to the meaning of the phrase, *prince of this world*. (*ὁ ἀρχων του κοσμου τουτου*). Gilbert Wakefield understands it to refer to our Lord himself, and according to this view he translates (*John* xii. 30,) thus: Now this world will pass sentence: Now will the ruler of this world be scornfully rejected. He cites *Rev.* i. 5; *Luke* vi. 22; *John* xvi, 11, to justify this version. Our country-man, Thompson, (the author of a translation of the Septuagint) follows Wakefield. Hardoin, the Jesuit, understands the word *prince*, in a collective sense. By it, he says, are intended all the princes of the priests of the Jewish synagogue. He cites *Luke* xxiv. 20; *Acts* iii. 17 xiii. 27; *1 Cor.* ii. 8; *Matt.* viii. 12. He adds, “Christ would not, I think, say that the devil is the prince of this world, or of the Jews.” (*Magnus mundi princeps ipse Deus omnipotens est*, 2 *Mach.* xii. 12—*τον μεγαν του κοσμου δυναστην* lxx.) But most of the commentators suppose that Satan is intended (*Superbo titulo ornatur spiritus adversarius Dei aeterni Camerarius*, *Eph.* ii. 2; vi. 12; *2 Cor.* iv. 4; *1 John* v. 19; *Rev.* xii. 9,) and this is doubtless the correct opinion.

But to return to the word *judgment*: Is the last judgment intended? But the appointed day or period of the last judgment had not

BRECKINRIDGE'S DEFENCE.

SPEECH OF REV. W. L. BRECKINRIDGE, DELIVERED IN THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ON TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 1, IN VINDICATION OF HIS PRINCIPLES AND CONDUCT AGAINST THE ASPERSIONS OF THE REV. MR. TAYLOR, UTTERED IN THE UNITARIAN CHURCH, ON SABBATH MORNING, MAY 29, 1841.

To all intelligent and candid persons of every religious persuasion, into whose hands this speech may fall, it is respectfully dedicated, by the author, with the confident expectation that they will do him justice—which is all he asks. He is assured that TRUTH IS OMNIPOTENT, AND PUBLIC JUSTICE CERTAIN.

The following notice appeared in the morning papers of June 1, 1841.

[**TO THE PUBLIC.**—The undersigned having been informed that representations were made in the Unitarian church, on the last Sabbath morning, by Rev. Mr. Taylor, of such a nature as to demand notice from him, takes this method of requesting his fellow citizens to suspend their judgment till they hear him; and to this end very respectfully invites them to meet in the First Presbyterian Church, this evening, at 8 o'clock.

W. L. BRECKINRIDGE.

HOWEVER unpleasant the occurrences of the last few days, which have occasioned this assembly, I deem myself compensated for all by the deep conviction that I have done right. The testimony of a good conscience is far better than the applause of men. Nor can their frowns, nor even their bitterest curses, be set by an honest mind, against the smile of God.

I should be uncandid, if I failed to say that I find an additional mitigation of all that is painful in these circumstances, and therefore, an abundant compensation, in this, that however you may view it, I am conscious that I stand before you in defence of liberty. It is an honor which God puts upon a man, when he forces him to defend just principles and great interests; and I hail it as such to-night—the due expression of which I am not afraid that the people will always withhold—that I appear before this vast, intelligent, and most respectable assembly, to plead for liberty.

I deem myself to have been arraigned at the public bar, by an attack, not only unprovoked, needlessly wounding my feelings, and unjustly assailing my character—not only violating the sanctity of my personal rights, as a citizen, a Christian, and a minister of the gospel—but in fact, assailing the rights of all, invading public liberty, insidiously violating the best liberty, without which there can be none, liberty of conscience!

Every one has a right, as to his fellow-men, to be in religion, what he pleases; and he from whom this right is withheld, whether by ignorance, delusion, prejudice, or oppression, is the most abject and degraded of slaves.

God forbid that I, a Kentuckian, nay I bear a prouder name, an American and a freeman, whose veins are swelling with mingled currents of English, Scotch and Irish blood—boasting yet a higher distinction, in claiming to be an Evangelical Protestant Christian—God forbid that I should attempt to rob any human creature of this right. I must first abandon my principles and bury all my hopes. It is every one's ample and inalienable right, as to other men, to be just what he pleases in religion—Pagan, Turk, Atheist, Universalist, Unitarian, any thing he pleases. But none may compel me to countenance his errors—give my sanction to the usages of his false religion, and thus connive at, nay encourage and foster his sins. Such an attempt is going rather too far. My conscience objects—my liberty resists—for God's word says, and my reason assents to it, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."—2 John 9—11.

The attack upon my feelings, principles, conduct, and good name, which constitute about all I have—except, thank God, an incomparable wife, promising children, steady friends, and immortal hopes—this assault I shall not characterize in words, in the absence of my assailant. If you say, when all is told, that it was dastardly, malignant, and false, my adversary must blame himself and the truth, not me.

This attack was made principally on the last Sabbath morning, by the Rev. Mr. Taylor, in the Unitarian Church of this city—of course in my absence—and without any notice having been given me of his intention to make it. And when last evening in the other church, by the kind permission of the pastor previously obtained, I gave in his presence public notice of my purpose to-night, he informed the assembly that he was no warrior, he could not reply to any thing I might say, he had no time for such contests, having better things to do. Truly he may well say that he is no warrior. I do not wonder that he deprecates that distinction. Such demeanor is not honorable warfare. He may be a sailor, but he is not a *gallant* tar—he is no soldier—and brave stomachs must spew him out. He attacked me without cause—for no more than a respectful expression to him of my conscientious views of Christian doctrine and duties. He attacked me without notice, in a place where men's minds were hostile to my religious opinions, if not to my person—at least, where every prejudice was alive against me and my principles. He attacked me behind my back, and when I confronted him, he turned his own. I am ashamed to strike a coward, and shall, therefore, speak as mildly upon this whole subject as the nature of the case will permit.

I will shew you presently, too, that the charge, which he repeated last evening, of inhospitable and insulting treatment of him, as a stranger, on my part, is utterly unfounded, having not the most distant shadow of truth, in the sense intended by him, and so far as I can learn, understood by the community—but of that in its proper place.

The history of my knowledge of Mr. Taylor, and of my intercourse with him, is briefly this. According to my present recollection, I had never heard of him until lately. This may reflect some discredit on the extent of my knowledge, but so it is. I had heard of him only in general terms—that he was a converted sailor—now a preacher to seamen—a man of rare abilities—of great devotion to this particular enterprise—a Methodist minister. All this won my heart in advance.* Beyond this I had not heard any thing very particularly of his views and relations. I had the impression, however, (I know not how gotten, for my acquaintance with Boston, and with Bethel operations at large has not been as intimate as I would be happy to have it) that he was sustained by the Seaman's Friend Society—an Institution supported by sound Christians. With such information of Mr. T., I was truly gratified when I heard that he had been invited to this city by the Board of Managers of the Bethel Union here—which by the way, it now appears, that he never was. No doubt, as he told me, he supposed that he was when he came, and I supposed so too—but it seems that he was not.

When I was informed of his arrival a few days ago, I was as truly gratified, and took the very earliest steps in my power to have him invited to occupy our pulpit on last Sabbath night, and take up a collection for the Bethel.

On Thursday morning I called to see him, and then to my astonishment and mortification learned from himself what he was in religion. I say from himself—from his own lips. I went to no one else to enquire about him. I was entertaining no suspicion of him—my prepossessions were very strong

* I believe my first expression after being introduced to him and having welcomed him among us, was an affectionate—familiar enquiry, "Is this *Father* Taylor?"—surprised at his youthful appearance, having heard of him under that patriarchal appellation.

in his favor. I took him by the hand with the utmost cordiality. In our conversation he informed me that his connection with the Methodist Church was rather nominal than otherwise—that he went to the Conference annually—reported himself—was subject to its authority during its sessions—was assigned to his labors for a year—and then had no more to do with the Conference, and no farther responsibility to it till the next year.

A Methodist, that is to say, in his connections, and responsibilities, according to his own account of the matter, for some five, six, or ten days annually!

He informed me farther—in reply to my enquiries, become of course more numerous and interesting to myself, as a new state of facts was opening before me—that he was not sustained in his labors in Boston, by Methodists, nor by the Orthodox, (I understood him to mean Evangelical Congregationalists) nor in short, as I understood him, by any body but Unitarians: that his pulpit had no doors, and was open to all, who called themselves Christians and had fair standing among their own sort, except those whom he called, Ultra-Universalists, understood by me, and upon enquiry explained by him to mean, those who hold to no future punishment of any kind or duration, distinguished therefore by him, from such as he termed Restorationist Universalists: that his views of Christian doctrines, duties, and fellowship, were such that he could refuse Christian intercourse to none who professed to hold the Bible, if they were orderly in their behaviour—and ministerial intercourse to none of like description who preached the gospel of Christ. I asked if he would consider one to preach the gospel of Christ, who *kept back* in his preaching what were commonly called *Trinitarian* doctrines. He said *he would!* I asked if he would consider one to preach the gospel of Christ, who positively preached what are commonly called *Unitarian* doctrines. He said *HE WOULD!*

I told him that I was inexpressibly pained and astonished to hear that such were his views and habits: that, it seemed to me, to have Christian fellowship with one holding such views and practising on them habitually at home, would be to sanction them here: that having now come to the knowledge of his religious character and views, I did not see how I could have any ministerial intercourse with him without being understood by the public to give my sanction to them: that I could, of course, commit no one else, but my impression was, that if his position at home had been understood here, the Board of Managers of the Bethel Union would never have invited him to visit this city*—and that the friends of the Bethel Union would not now desire his labors, if his position, views, religious character and principles were understood by them. I aver before this great assembly, and what is far more, before God, that this was said with all kindness, and with as much respect as my mind could entertain for one who held his principles. Having made known to him very candidly my first and very strong impression, as to my duty with reference to his occupancy of my pulpit under these circumstances, I added that before I finally decided on my course, I would confer with such of the Ruling Elders of the church, and such Managers of the Bethel belonging to our congregation, as I might be able to find—and parted from him with apparent kindness on his part, and certainly no feeling of another sort on mine, making to him as I left him a sincere and cordial tender of such hospitalities, as my poor house could afford. Having met, and fully conferred with four persons, being two of each of the classes referred to above—and being fully, I believe—certainly substantially—sustained by them in all my views of the matter, and these gentlemen concurring with me in the opinion that courtesy required me to see Mr. Taylor in person, and communicate to him, as respectfully as possible, our sense of the necessity of withdrawing the

* My impression was, it must be remembered, at the time of this interview, but corrected that afternoon, that Mr. Taylor had been officially invited by the board.

invitation, which had been given him, I called on him for that purpose. Instead, however, of being received by him, in a respectful manner, I deemed myself insulted by him. I felt of course, that it must be very unpleasant for him to receive, as it certainly was for me to make, such a communication—and I pocketed the insult—a thing that I am not in the habit of doing. I assured him that I meant it for politeness; and that if it were not really so, the error was in my sense of good manners, and not in my purpose. He appeared to be mollified by this special effort to convince him that no offence, but the reverse was designed, and that I was acting under a conscientious view of my public duty. I then left him, saying that I would address a note to the Board of Managers of the Bethel Union on the subject—his own suggestion of the propriety of that course concurring with my previous determination. After his address that night in the 4th street church, and the withdrawal of the assembly, the Board of Managers had a meeting, when that note was read, as follows:

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF MANAGERS OF THE LOUISVILLE BETHEL UNION.

SIR.—It is with unaffected pain and regret that I deem myself obliged to make the following communication. You are aware that I had desired the ministerial labors of the Rev Mr. Taylor, for the congregation which I serve, during some portion of his visit to this city, and that I had designed availing myself of such an occasion to take up a collection for the support of the Bethel enterprize here. Your Board, in whose hands Mr. Taylor had, with great propriety, placed himself while here, was kind enough, at my request, to assign him to us for next Sabbath evening. I am now constrained, very respectfully, to decline the arrangement which I had sought; and candor, no less than respect for your Board, and my concern for the interests involved, require me to state the reason. In a conversation somewhat full, with Mr. Taylor this morning, the first time that circumstances permitted me the pleasure of seeing him, I heard, with equal pain and surprise, fully expressed to him at the moment, that his views of Christian doctrines—his relations at Boston, and his habits of ministerial intercourse, are such that as I suppose, to avail ourselves of his labors, however valuable in many respects they may be, would require, hereafter, if consistency were observed, such concessions on the part of the evangelical friends of the Bethel in this city, as in my judgment, would be fatal to that enterprize. Mr. Taylor informed me that he was sustained at home (I understood him wholly) by the Unitarian churches—that his personal connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church, was rather nominal than otherwise—that his views of Christian doctrines and duties, required him to fraternize and exchange ministerial labors with Unitarian and Universalist clergymen. It seemed to me, that under the circumstances of the present case, for me to open my pulpit to Mr. Taylor, would be to sanction his views and habits upon these subjects—and that I could not hereafter, without inconsistency, object to the introduction into the Bethel pulpit in this city, of clergymen of the Unitarian, Universalist, and other kindred bodies. As a Trinitarian, from deep and clear conviction, I cannot willingly place myself in such an attitude. While, therefore, I have no right, as I have no desire to dictate to others, I feel it necessary to request, that the application lately made to your board, and so kindly granted, may be considered as withdrawn. The congregation to which I minister, will on another occasion, and in our own way, take up subscriptions for the Bethel, in which we feel a profound and undiminished interest—an interest, which I am sure, will not easily abate; although it is but candid to say, that if at any time, the competent authority should open its pulpit for the instructions of clergymen who deny what the body of my Christian brethren, correctly, as I think, interpreting the word of God, hold to be fundamental doctrines of the gospel of our Divine Lord, and this should become the settled policy of the Association, I should feel myself bound to exert what influence I possess to induce my congregation to withhold its support. I beg you to be assured of my respect for your Board, and of my sincere disavowal of any desire to wound the feelings of Mr. Taylor, or of those gentlemen at whose request he visited the West. I trust that no offence will be taken by any one, as I am only discharging what seems to me a duty as imperious as it is painful. I am, &c.

Louisville, May 27, 1841.

It should have been stated that Mr. Taylor, in an early part of his address to the citizens on Thursday evening, had said that it had been intimated to him from a very respectable source, that if his position, views, &c., had been understood, he would probably not have been invited to come here, and that if they were now understood, his continued labors might not be deemed desirable: that he was here at personal inconvenience, and while he wished to do us all the good he could, he wished to do us no harm: if, therefore, his labors were undesirable on any account, he would gladly "make his bow" in the morning, and return to his important labors at home. He closed his address with the same strain of remark. When my note was read to the board of Managers, assembled immediately after his address closed, and the congregation had retired, he made great exceptions in some remarks before the Board. In the observations, which I made in reply, intended to be perfectly respectful, but firmly to take the ground which I believed to be proper, and therefore tenable, I alluded with much caution, as I supposed, and with all due modesty to what Mr. Taylor had insisted upon and reiterated in his discourse just delivered, to wit, his willingness and desire to return home at once, provided evil instead of good were likely to result from his labors here. Was I, or was I not, bound to believe him sincere? I said that I had seen enough to assure me that a continuance of his labors would divide and distract the friends of the Bethel in this city—and that I much feared the issue would be the ruin of that enterprize, which was too interesting and important to be lightly sacrificed: that he would, therefore, in my humble opinion, best consult his own honor, and the permanency and true interests of the Bethel cause here, by doing what he had said would be very convenient and highly pleasing for him to do. It soon appeared that I was utterly wrong in ascribing candor to Mr. Taylor: he replied with much asperity that this was equivalent to ordering him out of the town, &c. I rejoined that nothing was farther from my intention: I claimed no right to order any body away: I knew and respected his rights as a freeman as fully as my own; and that I meant only respectfully to say that in my opinion, the course which he had twice publicly declared would be highly agreeable to him would be the most honorable and useful.

And now was I right? I protested, at the time, that I meant no indignity; and I protest so now; and no just, unprejudiced mind will do me the wrong of doubting my candor. Then, in fact, was I right? Mr. Taylor's heart, he tells us, is in the Bethel cause. He lives for it—he has long laboured in it—he is willing to die for it. Now would he be more truly glorious, leaving it in peace, as he found it, or by what he has brought on—endangering its very existence? Is it the glory of a man to stir up strife? Is it the real glory of a man to consult his own gratification—to indulge his own pride, vanity, ambition, even any of his better sentiments, at the expense of a noble cause with which he has linked his name? I confess I know not what is true honor if this be so. And had I no cause to say that the course which he had himself suggested would be the most useful to the Bethel? Time alone can disclose the issues of events. But who thinks this commotion good for the Bethel? And yet I do not say that Mr. Taylor was bound to go away. But I do say that I was justifiable in expressing as I did, the convictions of my own mind on the subject, especially under its peculiar circumstances.* Now I have been informed that Mr.

* It is proper for me here to say, what escaped me in the delivery of the speech, that at the close of the meeting of the Board on that evening, and as the persons present were retiring from the house, Mr. Taylor approached me with a manner of kindness, and taking and holding my hand with apparent cordiality, said to me in substance, if not in words, "Here our war closes." Supposing him to allude to the general question which had been spoken of in the Board at the meeting just held of the admission into the Bethel pulpit of Unitarian ministers, for the settlement of which the Board had adjourned to the next afternoon—and understanding him to mean that it would be promptly settled when the Board

Taylor stated in the Unitarian Church that some one in this city, understood by his audience to be myself, had written him a note requesting him to leave the city. It has come to me without any search on my part, through some four or five different channels, all respectable and independent of each other, that he was understood to make such an allusion to me, and such a statement about me. Now I declare that I never addressed a line to him on the subject—and you have seen that the note which I did address to the Board contains nothing whatever on that subject. The whole affair occurred precisely as I have related it.* And yet Mr. Taylor, with an ingenuity and promptitude worthy of a better use, attempted, and with unique consistency has all along attempted, to discredit me by the charge of arrogant rudeness to a stranger. It has been made a serious accusation against me. Now, when you express an opinion that great harm will result from certain things, are you ordering the people who practice them out of the city? I understand that there are many gentlemen from distant places now in this city pursuing the sports of the turf daily in the vicinity. Many of you think that these sports are dangerous and hurtful to those who practice them, and beyond all doubt and to a great extent injurious to this city in their influence upon it—and these opinions you do not hesitate to express upon proper occasions. But are you to be understood by such expression to order all these persons out of the city? There are many coffee-houses as we call them, kept here, which many of you believe to be exceedingly injurious in their tendency and influence—and you do not hesitate to say so. Now do you mean by this to order the people who keep them out of the city? There are many, no doubt, in this house to-night, who think that my course towards Mr. Taylor is improper and hurtful, and some of you have had no hesitation in saying so, and that in very different terms and spirit, from those employed by me when I said this thing. Now are all such to be understood by me, and the public as ordering me out of the city? And suppose you are—who cares? Do I? Do I care? Why, yes—there is a sense in which I would care. Because, for many reasons, I desire the esteem and confidence of you all. But there is another sense in which I care not—in which I would trample such orders under my feet as

should meet, by admitting such ministers, I replied, "No, Sir, it just begins here—the question must be met and fully discussed." He then made some remark which showed that I mistook his meaning, which had reference to war between him and myself personally. I instantly said—"There has been no war between us, except what you have seemed disposed to wage against me. I have felt no anger against you in the matter." After some other brief expressions on both sides, not now recollected, but meant on my part to be friendly and received from him as meant in the same spirit—we parted. I thought to myself, why, he must be a generous old sailor after all—excitable—violent—but kindly too, and ready to forget and forgive—and so I supposed that I should not be pained with having given him serious offence—but that appreciating my motives and approving my adherence to my principles, he had dropped all unkindness in a frank and manly spirit. I heard no more particularly of Mr. Taylor until the ensuing Monday morning, when I was informed of his violent attack upon me in the Unitarian Church the day before. What wrought the change, is not for me to say.

* There is something rather queer about this. Since the delivery of this speech two very respectable gentlemen, friendly to Mr. Taylor, who heard him, have declared to me that he said no such thing as is here ascribed to him about a note or letter—while the number of the channels, equally respectable, and perfectly independent of each other, through which assurances of the most positive kind have come to me that he did make this statement, has now swelled to a much larger amount than stated in the speech. It is a small matter as to the letter, however, comparatively, and susceptible of innocent mistake, and it is certain that both there and in other places, he has stated that I had desired him to depart the town. So I have done him no injustice.—(Since this speech was printed in pamphlet form, I have taken some pains to ascertain the precise language employed by Mr. Taylor—and, as the result of my enquiries, I am satisfied that he used the term, *communication*—not saying whether verbal or written—but making the impression generally that he meant a written communication.—It would be easy to prove that some of his very particular friends so understood him—and between the time of his making the statement, and my reply to him, expressed themselves very bitterly in relation to me for having written to him in that way. It is impossible for Mr. Taylor to escape from the charge of misrepresentation on this point.)

baser than the dirt. It is as much MY CITY as any other man's. I possess but little of its goods, but there is a clear sense in which it is as much my city, as it is the richest man's in it. And so Mr. Taylor knows, or else his bosom does not hold a freeman's heart, that it is as much his city as mine. (And here I might have said in the speech and I will say in this parenthesis—suppose that I had gone to Boston and that Mr. Taylor had really done far more and worse things to me than he has ever charged that I have done to him, would I have gone around to such churches as I might be permitted to occupy, and under the guise of preaching the gospel or promoting some benevolent institution, abused and slandered Mr. Taylor, and complained and whimpered of his ill treatment, until under such false and mean spirited pretences, I had gotten the good people of Boston by the ears—what would you have said to me when I came back? I believe you would almost have ordered me out of the city. You would have said that I was a base and false representative of you and your manly spirit, in the old cradle of liberty. You would require me to respect myself, and to remember that I went from you, tho' every man in Boston were to insult me. And you would have shewn me no countenance, if my conduct had been like his.) Then why all this ado? Why this studied, persevering, undignified, self-degrading effort to excite a popular clamor against me! Why does he attempt to discredit me by these unworthy appeals to your generous sympathies for a stranger, and rouse your displeasure against me, for that, which was as far from my design and which is as foreign from my nature, as it can be from yours? No! No! If he were a MAN, worthy the name of a Christian Minister, or an American Citizen, he had never stooped to such dishonor!

Tar, he claims to be—one of the "blue-jacket boys!" I think he's a double Tar,—Tartar, dastardly at that!*

But it is said that Mr. Taylor is a Methodist minister, in good standing with that church—so received by his brethren here, and so ought to be received by all Christians.

Certainly, his standing with them, who are cordially embraced by me as Christian Brethren, is *prima facie* evidence in his favor. But it is not *conclusive*. And when an objection comes against him, we must look behind all that. Am I bound to recognize as a Christian brother, as a sober and honest man, every professed Methodist in this city? Am I bound to invite to my pulpit every Methodist, or every Presbyterian minister who may come along? There was a time when to be a Roman citizen was to be a freeman everywhere. I know not but to be an American citizen now is to carry a passport round the globe. But can a man do nothing to forfeit his personal claims to respect before he loses his citizenship!

It is rather too summary a method of whitewashing character to demand that standing in one church, and that but nominal standing in the present case, should bar all enquiry. Mr. Taylor's own account of himself, apart

* I freely confess myself to be heartily ashamed of these words—not that they do not contain the very truth, and truth, the proper utterance of which was justified, nay, demanded by the circumstances—but because they are in miserably bad taste, and fall very far "below the dignity of the discussion." I would gladly expunge them—but they were uttered by me as they stand here—and I deem it proper to print the speech, as nearly as possible as it was delivered. I can offer no apology for their use, except the extremity of the provocation, and that, although I endeavored to use all possible caution, even in the selection of my words, the time was too short to weigh them with sufficient deliberation. I think any one would find it hard to measure his terms in such a case. I say, too, that however much I regret this instance of impetuosity, and however gladly I would recall the words, neither my assailant nor his defenders can justly object to the language used in reply to him, who had charged me with bigotry, intolerance, narrow-mindedness, and insulting arrogance towards a stranger. He is reported to have said, speaking of the bigot—and understood to have levelled it at me—"he is moved by no kindly sympathies, he sees not, he feels not, his skin is thicker than that of the Leviathan, and the tenderest fibre of his heart is cast iron." Whoso cannot forgive my language, let him put himself in my place, and I am willing to abide his judgment, without one word of murmur.

from his use of the term, convinced me that he is but a *nominal* Methodist. Now if those brethren choose to have nominal members not bound by their avowed principles, and settled and published standards of doctrines: very well. But Christian liberty and faithfulness require me to form my estimate of the man as he *is*—not as their connivance at his irregularity or dishonesty may intimate that he is. Nor does it meet the case for Mr. Taylor to asseverate and protest that he is a sound and consistent Methodist, when so much of his conduct contradicts him. Actions, I have heard ever since I was born, speak louder than words. The way to estimate a man is not merely by what he says—but also by what he does. Now, to whom is the influence of Mr. Taylor given at this time in this city? To Methodists, or to Unitarians? His name which has grown very great—his talents, which are certainly considerable—his power to move the public mind, his aspersions of me, his perversions of truth—to whose aggrandizement do they all tend, and whom do they encourage and gratify most highly? To whom, if not to Unitarians, will his victory inure if he should gain one? Was it to advance Methodism, or “liberal Christianity,” that he went into the Unitarian Church and defamed me? I charge upon this gentleman then, that he is no Methodist—and I say it is not right to impose himself on men as one. I charge that he is a piratical vessel sailing under false colors. And I think that when such an one ventures out upon the high seas, and still more, when he runs into an unsuspecting and peaceful port, any one who can detect his character, has a right to capture him. The consent, the policy, the necessity of nations require every vessel to sail under its true flag—and whoso sails under a false one becomes a public enemy. If Mr. Taylor choose to adopt a flag of his own, and to become, as a good and brave, but rather injudicious gentleman, who wished to be a looker-on merely at the battle of Guilford, declared that he was, to wit, a Neutral and Independent Power—be it so. As far as we are concerned he has a right to be so—but then don't let him say he's a Methodist—Oh no!

But this gentleman insists that he is a Methodist minister of good and ancient standing. If so, you, every body, I, have a right to expect that he will carry out the Methodist principles in his conduct, as they are announced in their Book of Discipline. Let us bring him to this test. He cannot object—for these are his principles—if he be a Methodist minister—declared to the world, as solemnly adopted by him. The book in my hand is “The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church.” The edition, I believe, in common use here, authorized by the Bishops, and published by the regularly appointed Agents of the Church. On page 8, I read, “ARTICLES OF RELIGION. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.* There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity;—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

IX. OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN. We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings:—Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.”

I read again on page 134, which is in chapter 4—“THE FORM AND MANNER OF MAKING AND ORDAINING BISHOPS, ELDERS AND DEACONS.”

Sec. 2d, “The form and manner of Ordaining Elders.” Among other questions, the Bishop asks of the candidate the following: “Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word? *Answer.* I WILL, THE LORD BEING MY HELPER.”

Such are some of the doctrines held by the Methodist Church. They are rules for none but Methodists—but for them and especially for Method-

ist ministers, they are obligatory and indispensable. For the Church to connive at their violation by her ministry, while they remain her doctrines would be not only wrong—but if general, destructive and suicidal—and whoso says that he is a Methodist minister, and holds them not, is not an honest man.

Such too are the especial, grave and solemn vows which this gentleman has taken, if he be a Methodist clergyman ordained to administer the ordinances.

Behold how he fulfils them! You have seen what the doctrines are—which at his ordination he said he held—these are doctrines indispensable to the system—their opposites, to a Methodist are false—nay, ruinous; they must not be taught, lest they destroy, instead of saving men. Such, all such, all false doctrines, contrary to God's word, he has in the most solemn manner promised that he will with all faithful diligence banish and drive away—not by force, certainly, except the force of reason and truth—not by violence—but by example and precept—by combatting them in all proper ways, and utterly refusing to countenance and sanction them—and religiously speaking, those who propagate them. Is not this the plain, reasonable, necessary sense of the vows which he has assumed? Behold, then, how he acquits himself of this great responsibility! His intimate connections at home, his religious associations, his constant intercourse, are with UNITARIANS, who deny truths which the system, claimed by him to be his, lays down as fundamental and necessary to salvation! Nor does he hesitate in like manner to countenance errorists of all grades—one single class excepted, Ultra-Universalists, as he calls them. But how is honesty maintained, while, being a Methodist, he countenances others in preaching doctrines which he has declared, and being a Methodist, is every day by his profession declaring, to be at war with such as are vital to the system not only of Methodism, but of Christianity!

The Methodist standards of Christian doctrine, announce as the true explanation of the Bible, a method of salvation—the way of being saved. Unitarians and Universalists teach other and different methods, while they deny positively points of the Methodist system which are fundamental. I say he is sailing under false colors! He reminds one too forcibly to pass it over, of the scripture which says, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach."—Isa. iv. 1.

Now was I bound to receive, nay could I with a good conscience, with honor, with fidelity to men, at large, and especially to my own congregation, receive this gentleman into my confidence and open to him my pulpit? I had cordially invited him, while ignorant of his character; but when I learned it, was I not bound in candor, in honor as a gentleman, in all fidelity as a Christian minister, to tell him that I had been wholly mistaken in him—and that I must decline a fellowship which I had ignorantly sought? Would any other course have been candid—honest—manly? If I had opened my pulpit to him, and thus as to all essentials, endorsed his character, when all the while I had my doubts about him, nay could not confide in him, and yet not told him so, had this been honest, polite, manly or Christian?

I thank God I have not so read my Bible. I have no such ways about me. I never sucked such principles from my mother's breast. She would disown me this day if she knew I held them. I can't bring her gray hairs down with sorrow to the grave. I don't mean, God helping me, to dishonor my name, or my religion!

Christian doctrines are something, nay with Christians, *great things*. If every one, who says he believes the Bible, is to be held to understand it aright, and to teach it truly—and charity will not allow, and religious liberty will not tolerate, the questioning of any one's soundness in the faith—

but if all are bound to say that all doctrines are equally good and equally efficacious to save sinners, why religion is at an end. You may as well tear down your churches, and burn your Bibles. No, you must leave every man to the untrammelled liberty of his own conscience, not only as to what doctrines he will hold himself—but as to the confidence and fellowship which he will extend to others in their doctrines. Every faith must be tolerated by law—but every doctrine must not be sanctioned by Christians. I hold that Unitarians undermine the very foundation of the gospel. They have a right, as far as man is concerned, to risk their own salvation on their doctrines; but they have no right to require me to risk mine, or by connivance to encourage other persons to risk theirs—and they invade my liberty and my conscience when they try to do it. I understand Jesus Christ to be Divine in the highest sense of Deity—and to deny that is with me to deny the gospel. I will not therefore be compelled to have fellowship—(why how can you *compel* fellowship?) with any who deny it. And I hold to be one with such those who will countenance them religiously—nay if they profess to know and do really know better, they are more to be blamed on that account—for to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin. I cannot be forced to sanction this universal connivance at men's errors.

Nor indeed can my accuser. He informed me—he informed the Board on Thursday night, that *ultra Universalists* were not permitted to preach in his pulpit. Then it is not correct as he has said, that his pulpit has no doors—it *has* doors to exclude the *ultra Universalists*. But who are they? Savages?—Turks?—Devils?—nay verily—men entitled to all our sympathies—mine, yours—Mr. Taylor's, no less than any other man's. Men like ourselves.

Why exclude them? Mr. Taylor's charity is wide as the sea and as the land. Why does it exclude these *ultras*? Who authorized him to call them *ULTRAS*? Is this the name they give themselves? I think not. The reason simply is, that in Mr. Taylor's judgment they have extracted from the Bible a system that denies the gospel. Now, if he may in his all expanded and pure charity, without bigotry or offence to religious liberty, bar up his doorless pulpit against these people, with what face can he revile me for acting upon the same principle according to my best discretion? Exercising that discretion on that principle, (and can this man justly blame me for it?) I exclude from my pulpit *Universalists* that are not called by him *ultras*, and then *Unitarians*, and then as part and parcel, hand and glove with them, himself!

Mr. Taylor could, I hope in his sailor days, navigate a ship better than he does an argument—he has given up the principle—he has allowed the right and duty—and hence he has raised a clamor against me for nothing. He has excited all this tumult, because I have treated him as he treats *ultra Universalists*! If they are *MEN*, they are entitled to the same sympathy with himself—and if I am wrong, no less is he.

And now, fellow citizens, you have heard my defence. There is a sense in which I am not responsible to you—and I tell you plainly, that unless I get far other light, I shall do again just what I have done now, for I am sure I have done right—and no man may hinder me in what is my clear duty to God and his truth. Nor will I regard the frown of all mankind, or, compared with the principle, care for their displeasure.

There is another sense in which I am responsible to you. I have said that I deem myself to be arraigned at your bar. Nor do I come there unwillingly. I have called you together to answer for myself before you. You have my defence—you are an intelligent and just people and I am willing you should decide this case. I ask no favor. I desire neither God nor man to protect me in the wrong. If I have done wrong, I pray you say so—and I bow to your judgment with deep respect, if not conviction. If I have done right—I pray you say so. You are competent to decide—

and justice demands that you do so. And justice is all I ask. For, however much I know that I have offended God and man in countless things, and however unfit to stand before God, and account for myself in other things, I do not fear *as to this* to meet my accuser at the judgment. And as I can lay my hand upon my heart, and, as I appeal to God to decide between us, feel that I am safe; so I can freely say to you, judge this case fairly, in the light of truth,—of reason, liberty, and the fear of God—and I'm content. I ask no more.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

A SERIOUS REVIEW OF "A CALM DISCUSSION OF THE LAWFULNESS, SCRIPTURALNESS, AND EXPEDIENCY OF ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS"—BEING A DEFENCE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL BOARDS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

PART FIRST.

*Ecclesiastical Boards necessary, and the proposed scheme offered by the objectors altogether untenable and insufficient.**

THE tendency of the human mind is to extremes. Man, by his fall, lost that perfection of wisdom, which would ever have preserved him in the middle path, safe from the dangers of latitudinarianism, on the one hand, and of ultraism on the other. As it is, we find the human mind like the pendulum perpetually verging from one extreme to the other.

This tendency is manifested in a very striking manner when the attention has been directed with absorbing interest to some great perversion of truth. When such errors, on whichever side of the line they are found, are sustained by all the force of apparent reason, and of persuasive eloquence; and thus call forth in their refutation the utmost powers of intellectual vigour; it is not in human nature to resist that impulse by which the mind is insensibly driven to the opposite extreme.

So has it been in the recent controversies in which our church has been so warmly engaged. The truth of God as it is contained in the doctrines of his word, and the purity of those ordinances which have been established in his church, have been both assailed, and both triumphantly defended. And as the power, with which such opposing views were advocated, has been great, and is still threatening us with a renewed assault. So has it called forth a fiercer and more determined resistance. Every position occupied by the enemy has been reconnoitred, and every possible force brought to bear against them. It is unavoidably necessary that in such an attitude and spirit of hostility, we should be disposed to

* The very able and temperate article published in our April number, and the reply by a distinguished hand now published, are written, we take leave to say, by gentlemen living remote from the centre of our ecclesiastical operations, and near each other; and who, therefore, view these matters wholly from the same position, and without the least personal bias. That they should arrive at conclusions so opposite, is surely a clear proof of the intrinsic difficulty of the subject; and may well excuse such of us, as for our scruples have fallen under the ban of those illustrious men, whose bread and glory alike depend on their ability to convince the church that she can, in no possible way, get along without them.—[Eds.]