

many, employ them all in proper service, it is *very* good. Do you belong to the class of souls that create? let your imagination be sanctified to the service of God, or do you belong to the class of minds that receive? use what you have acquired in imparting it to others. "There seems to be only two classes of souls, the creative and receptive." I speak with reverence, there are only two classes of being; the creative and receptive; for what is all creation but a receptacle of emanations of the power, and wisdom, and goodness of God, and the human race, of his exuberant mercy.

For the Gospel Tribune.  
REVIEW OF CURTIS ON COMMUNION.

[Continued.]

11. Did Mr. Hall, or could he act out his principle?

P. 205. Mr. C. observes, "it may be called party spirit, or any thing else, but that spirit which impels a man to act out a principle boldly to all its legitimate results—is one of the most noble and useful dispositions that can actuate any man."

Mr. Hall's principle was, that *nothing ought to be made a term of communion that is not a term of salvation*; and at p. 102 and elsewhere, he is charged with acting out his principle boldly to all its legitimate results; and backward as he might be constitutionally, in all that required practical energy, according to Mr. C. it was by no means manifested in regard to his principle of Open Communion: for he, Mr. C., declares that in his advocacy and exemption of it he shrunk from no consequences; so that if that spirit which impels a man to act out a principle boldly, &c., be one of the most noble and useful dispositions, Mr. Hall has the merit of possessing it, Mr. C. being witness. He goes on to observe, "the most decisive test of truth and error is, that the former is capable of being acted out to all its legitimate consequences, and can never lead the party doing so astray, while the other, the further it is pursued, conducts only to the more complicated and gross inconsistencies." Tested by this ordeal Open Communion has no reason to fear. Let a strict regard to *genuine christian character* be observed in the admission of members, whether these be Baptists or Pedobaptists: and this is just acting it out to its legitimate consequences, and there is no fear for the results; but let Strict Communion be subjected to this ordeal, and it will necessarily lead to consequences from which even its warmest advocates would instinctively shrink. One of its consequences would be the exclusion from the Church of Christ of many of the most pious that ever existed,—another consequence would be the separation from the Church of Christ of every one known to hold any error however trifling, because every error *may be fundamental*.

13. Can a profession of faith be made by a Pedobaptist?

P. 221. Mr. C. says, "every visible Church must, in the nature of things, have some visible profession of christianity among the pre-requisites to its mem-

bership." As to this we have no dispute with him. But we deny that Baptism is that alone which can be viewed as a valid profession of faith. Indeed Baptism is not so properly a *profession of faith* as a symbol of that profession. Both faith itself, and the profession of it are in every instance prior to Baptism. The Eunuch professed his faith before he was baptised, and a simple, sincere declaration of faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God is doubtless a valid profession of faith, independent of Baptism. To confess with the mouth the Lord Jesus,—to call upon his name, and to evince by a conversation becoming the Gospel a sincere love to Christ—to his people, and to his cause, are far superior in the sight of God to the most punctilious observance of external ceremonies. Surely Mr. C. needs not to be informed of this.

Mr. Hall very justly observes, "the genius of the Gospel is not ceremonial but spiritual—when the obligations of humility and love come into competition with a punctilious observance of external rites, the genius of religion will easily determine to which we should incline." That a pious Pedobaptist cannot make a valid profession of religion, because he cannot see it his duty to be immersed, is to say the least, an assumption which has no countenance in the said record. The observance of Baptism, if alone, God desires not, nor delights in; but a broken and contrite spirit he will not despise though the person exhibiting it may not see it his duty to be immersed.

14. Mr. Hall's leading position: is it suited to the present state?

P. 223. Mr. C. calls it novel, visionary, and quite unsatisfactory; it is a sophism, it is incontrovertibly based on error; it is unsuited to the present state; it is in short a *splendid fallacy*. Yet, it appeals to exalted sentiments; it is maintained by brilliancy and piety; it must be pronounced the most enchanting of all visions. It is sublime,—affording elevated contemplations—too elevated to be realized on earth. This designation is surely somewhat anomalous. Its author seems at a loss for epithets to depict Mr. Hall's theory. Upon the whole however, it must be allowed, anomalous as it is, its excellencies decidedly predominate. And how can it be proved that what is urged as derogatory to it is really inherent. Novelty is not necessarily a discredit to any theory. It is vain to call it visionary, for it is perfectly practicable. But it is unsatisfactory, he says. This brings to mind the testimony of Benedict regarding the working of Open Communion, in Nova Scotia. It seems they had commenced on the open system there, but according to him after several years trial they found it necessary to give it up, because their churches and ministers found themselves embarrassed beyond endurance by the inconsistencies, inconveniences and collisions in which it involved them. The Pedobaptists, he says, with whom they associated, were unquestionably a very pious and devout people, and nothing but stern necessity influenced them to decline a continuance of an intercourse in which the