

another Sovereign is a virtual repudiation of the allegiance which he owes already. This is still more apparent, if the Sovereign to whom a British subject swears allegiance should happen to be at war with this country. In that case the oath of allegiance taken to a public enemy would render the party taking it most justly amenable to all the penalties of treason.

Now that the Pope is the enemy of our Queen, of her throne and kingdom, no man in his senses can doubt. The Papists themselves loudly proclaim it. The fact that the Pope carries on his warfare not by equipping fleets and armies against QUEEN VICTORIA, but by fanaticizing her own subjects, and alienating them from their allegiance, makes him an enemy not less, but more dangerous. Nor is his hostility the less to be guarded against because it arises not from any temporary quarrel, which may be terminated by mutual concession, but from the irreconcilable antagonism of the principle on which the power of the Queen on the one hand, and that of the Pope on the other hand, is based. The Queen cannot be reconciled to the Pope without forfeiting her title to the throne; the Pope cannot be reconciled to the Queen, without denying the very foundation on which his usurped authority rests. The Pope, therefore, must be, and as a matter of history and of fact, is, the Queen's implacable enemy. The object which the Papacy has, and, in the nature of things, must have, most at heart, is to subvert a throne founded on the recognition of the only Church in Christendom which, with her sisters and daughters, opposes to the Antichristian power of the Papacy the testimony of primitive Christian truth and order.

If, then, which cannot be denied, the Pope is the Queen's implacable enemy, it follows that the Pope's sworn lieges and vassals must be the Queen's sworn enemies likewise. But all the Popish Bishops are *formally* and *directly*, and all the Popish Priests *virtually* and *indirectly*, the sworn lieges and vassals of the Pope. At their consecration all Popish Bishops take a most stringent oath of allegiance to the Pope which leaves no room for any other allegiance whatsoever. In the case of Papal Legates and Cardinals, the exclusive devotion of those high officers of the Papal hierarchy to the interests of the Papacy is still more conspicuous. All Popish Priests, moreover, are sworn to absolute obedience to their Bishops. The Popish Priests and Bishops are therefore, in fact, nothing else but an organized force of the most formidable character, which the Pope, the Queen's implacable enemy, maintains within her dominions, and recruits from among her own subjects. Why, then, should we hesitate to deal with these men as with alien enemies? They are such, let them be dealt with as such. Even in doing this, let us exercise all possible moderation. If any Popish Priest, or even Bishop, will confine himself to the exercise of his spiritual functions as a minister of religion by all means let the Popish sectarians within these realms have the benefit of his ministrations, until they can be brought to a better mind. But let the condition which invariably attaches to the permission granted to an alien to sojourn in this country, be rigidly enforced. If any alien were to take upon himself to intermeddle in the affairs of this country, he would not long be suffered to remain. If he were to do so with the avowed object of subverting the Constitution of this country, and bringing the realm into subjection to a foreign Potentate, he would have reason to congratulate himself if he escaped with the penalty of simple expulsion. Let this rule, then, be applied to the ecclesiastical alien of the Papal obedience. Whilst he is permitted to sojourn here without molestation, so long as he is content with the practice of his superstition, let him clearly understand that the instant he presumes to interfere in the affairs of this country, or does, or attempts to do, any act having a tendency to establish the Pope's jurisdiction within the Queen's dominions, he will—as the mildest punishment for such an offence—be expelled from the country. Let Parliament give to the Executive the same power over Popish Bishops and Priests which it has never hesitated to give over other suspicious and dangerous aliens, and to make a beginning, and by way of shewing that we are in earnest, let Cardinal WISEMAN and Legate CULLEN, whose very position in the Popish hierarchy marks the aggressive char-

acter of their mission, be sent about their business at once without further ado. Let this be done, and we will answer for it that the peace of the kingdom will not much longer be disturbed by the lawless insolence of Papal aggression.—John Bull.

#### POPULAR BAPTIST ARGUMENTS REVIEWED.

*Continued from last week.*

But, say they, there are still stronger evidences against infant baptism—"the Scriptures contain presumptive evidence against it." 1. The Evangelists three times record the fact that infants were brought to Christ. Had Christ baptized infants, we may suppose they would have been brought to him for baptism; but they were not brought for baptism, but that he might "touch them," (Luke 18, 15) and "put his hands on them and pray."—Mat. 19, 13. Jesus did not baptize these infants; but "took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and prayed."—Mark 10, 16. In not one of these three accounts is there the slightest allusion to infant baptism. Let the reader judge whether, if it had been the will of Christ that infants should be baptized, he would not have given some intimation of it on this favourable occasion? Is not the absence of any reference to baptism on such an occasion a presumptive evidence that it is not the will of Christ that infants should be baptized?

This objection affords an excellent instance of the way in which Scripture may be tortured to prove anything. It says, "had Christ baptized infants, we may suppose that these infants would have been brought to him for baptism." Granted. But we know that Christ baptized neither infants nor adults; (John 4, 2) and this is a most satisfactory reason why they were not brought for baptism. The objection is merely a piece of sophistry. Why should we suppose that these infants should have been brought for baptism, when we know that Christ never baptized any one? Do people generally make requests which they have no reason or encouragement for making, and which they have reason to know will be refused? That they were not brought for baptism, therefore, proves nothing; nor, indeed, could it, unless we knew from Scripture that Christ was in the habit of baptizing. Then, perhaps, his omitting to allude to infant baptism might afford a presumption against it. We never read of adults being brought to Christ for baptism, (though they were brought for many other purposes.) Are we, then, to conclude that he disapproved of adult baptism? There is, then, no point whatever in the objection so pompously urged, "Jesus did not baptize these infants." Let us remember, too, that at this time Christian baptism was unknown. The baptism in the name of the Trinity was not yet authorized; not until after Christ's resurrection. Is there, then, anything extraordinary or significant in the fact that these Jews did not bring their children to partake of an ordinance which they knew nothing about? Moreover, there is not the slightest ground for supposing that these infants had not been before baptized by St. John, as we have already shown that there is nothing in Scripture to make us believe that St. John Baptist confined his baptism to adults; but rather the contrary. Jesus, then, did not baptize these infants; but not for the reasons the Baptists give, viz.: to show his disapprobation of the practice, but for the reasons assigned above. Again, so far from this being a favourable occasion for our Lord's making any allusion to baptism, there does not seem to have been any room whatever for referring to it; the probability being, that some persons who had witnessed the wonderful results which followed the imposition of the Saviour's hands, or even touching the hem of his garment, brought their children in the superstitious hope that the touch of our Lord's hands would impart to them some supernatural graces.—Our Saviour accordingly improved the opportunity, not indeed "to put his hands upon them and pray," as the Baptists misquote the passage, but "to put his hands upon them, and bless them."—Mark 10, 16. This misquotation may seem but a trifling inaccuracy; but it is unfair, because we make no doubt, that they would much prefer to read *prayed* instead of *blessed*. The infants must have received some benefit from

Christ's blessing; the Baptists (though asking "what profit can baptism be to an unconscious infant,") admitting "that God institutes no useless ceremonies."

Let the reader then judge whether in this objection there be any presumption against infant baptism? Nay; it seems to us that we find in it a clear presumption in favour of infant baptism. The Baptists do not tell us what Christ said on this occasion—"Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." Now, whatsoever these words mean, this, at least, may be gathered from them—that infants are capable of becoming members of the kingdom of God (the visible Church); and if so, they may be baptized. The passage plainly intimates, first, that infants may be partakers of grace, for Christ's blessing and imposition of hands must have been effectual; and, secondly, that infants, being capable of enrollment in Christ's visible church, may be formally admitted thereto by baptism.

2. "Baptism is that of which infants are incapable—for instance, "baptism is the fulfilling of righteousness."—Mat. 3, 13. But infants can neither commit sin nor fulfil righteousness."

Baptism is "the answer of a good conscience toward God."—1 Peter 3, 21. But infants can neither have a good nor a bad conscience.

Baptism implies, and is a sign of, dying unto sin and living unto God.—Rom. 6, 3. But infants can neither die unto sin, nor live unto God.

Baptism is a burial with Christ, and a rising with him through faith.—Col. 2, 12. But infants can neither be buried with Christ, nor rise again with him through faith. If this be a correct view of Christian baptism, there is a manifest impropriety in applying it to infants, for they can neither be what it implies, nor do what it requires.

In all these texts, the sacred writers are describing the effects of baptism on adults, or rather how it ought to affect adults; but they do not imply anything about its applicability to infants. The Apostles were naturally more solicitous about adults: the progress of Christianity depended altogether upon the conversion of adults. There is, therefore, nothing significant in these passages being more applicable to adult baptism. Indeed, by this mode of arguing, we might prove that infants cannot be saved, because salvation is "the end of faith."—1 Peter 1, 9. But infants cannot possess faith. Salvation is the result of hope: "we are saved by hope."—Rom. 8, 20. But infants cannot hope. Salvation is a work: "work out your salvation." But infants cannot do this.

Salvation comes of reading the Scripture: "Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation."—2 Tim. 3, 15. But infants cannot read them.

This kind of reasoning might be carried on indefinitely, and we might sum up, as the Baptists do, "If this be a correct view of Christian salvation, there is a manifest impropriety in applying it to infants, for they can neither be what it implies, nor do what it requires." Now, Baptists rightly think that such reasoning does not prove that infants can not be saved; and, we think, that similar reasoning does not prove that they should not be baptized. The absurdity of such argument is so transparent, that we need not dwell upon it; we will only add, that it overthrows circumcision, as well as infant baptism. Circumcision, as well as baptism, was "a fulfilling of righteousness," that is, the doing of a duty; but, for all that, infants were circumcised. What would be thought of the following argument to prove circumcision inapplicable to infants?—"Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."—Rom. 2, 29. Now, infants hearts cannot be circumcised, neither can they praise God; therefore, they ought not to be circumcised. Any one can see the absurdity of this reasoning.

3. "God institutes no useless ceremonies; but it cannot be proved that infant baptism answers any valuable purpose. Can baptism be profitable to an unconscious infant? Observation sufficiently proves that those baptized in infancy manifest the same depravity a

nature as those who are not baptized: they develop no moral qualities by which they can be distinguished from others. Baptism effects no change in the character of the infant; and, therefore, cannot effect any change in its spiritual condition. Infant baptism is a useless and, therefore, unreasonable ceremony. Can such a ceremony be part of that religion, the whole of which is designed for our profit?"

This argument, if good for anything, makes equally against circumcision; therefore, it is invalid; and the invalidity lies in not considering that we are not judges of what is useful or useless in religious ordinances. Infant baptism derives all its utility from God's appointment; therefore, to say it is useless, is tantamount to saying that God has not appointed it; and that is the question at issue. Infant circumcision answered no valuable purpose, that we can see, except as a sign of a covenant, and a test of obedience; and these purposes may be answered by infant baptism. Surely, "if observation proves that those baptized in infancy manifest the same depravity as those not baptized," observation will prove the same regarding adults, unless Baptists convince us that adults when baptized never fall away from grace. Indeed, the non-development of moral qualities in infants is an odd argument against infant baptism, because adults sometimes never develop any, nor is it always to be expected; because before baptism they are supposed to have had repentance, faith, and grace. Is adult baptism, then, useless? No; because it is commanded, and is a significant rite. This question, however, of utility or non-utility is quite irrelevant, and is most unaccountably adduced by the Baptists as a presumptive evidence "from Scripture" against infant baptism; whereas it is, in reality, derived from their own preconceived notions of the utility of ordinances. In short, we have no right to define the utility of a sacrament. We may safely affirm that certain blessings flow from it; but either to lay down definitely the whole utility of Christ's ordinance, or to contend that it is, in certain cases, inapplicable, because we see no aptitude in it, is highly presumptuous. To affirm, because we see a suitability in the baptism of adults and none in that of infants, that, therefore, baptism should not be applied to the latter, is absurd. The fact being, that we can of ourselves discern no utility in either case, except so far as results are concerned, and we greatly question whether those results testify altogether in favour of adults. This presuming to define the recipients of baptism from its supposed applicability, probably arises from the erroneous idea that baptism is applied merely in a utilitarian sense, that is, with a view to obtain certain benefits. Now, though we do hold that some blessing invariably attends baptism when duly administered, yet we certainly should err in administering it with that intent; nor, indeed, can we doubt that blessing would, in the case of adults, be withheld were the ordinance thus selfishly employed in total forgetfulness of obedience. The effusion of the Holy Ghost attended baptism by the Apostles; but yet it was not used merely for that end: this is evident from that remark of St. Peter, (Acts 10, 47.) "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" one of the ends for which the rite was given, here was already obtained; but then there were others; one, perhaps, being to test obedience. Let it be, moreover, observed that from these words of St. Peter we can deduce a fair argument in favour of infant baptism. Here we find baptism administered to the Gentile convert, not in order to obtain spiritual blessings, but in order to their admission into Christ's Church, in order to their enrollment under his banner; and St. Peter declares that the gift of the Holy Ghost was a decisive reason why they should be baptized; if so, there could be no reason assigned why St. John the Baptist (had he been born after Christ's commission to his Apostles) should not have been baptized, as he was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb; and if he were eligible, why not other infants? "he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven, is greater than he." Where, then, is the significance in the question, "Can baptism be profitable to an unconscious infant?"

(To be continued.)