The Quarterly Review contains, under the title "New Reformation in Ireland," an article which not only effectually vindicates the recent religious movement among the population of the sister-island against the aspersions cast upon it by the Popish priesthood, but which takes a far wider range, and places the essentially political character of the proceedings of the Papal hierarchy in that country in a clear and most instructive light. As regards the former part of the subject, the controversy respecting the agency by which conversion from Popery has in thousands of instances been effected, we must refer our readers to the article itself, which goes fully into the evidence, and gives, The Quarterly Review contains, under the title " New been effected, we must refer our readers to the article itself, which goes fully into the evidence, and gives, besides, a highly interesting sketch of the religious history of Ireland. On the other part of the question, that which relates to the political character which marks the doings of Popery in Ireland, we cannot deny ourselves the satisfaction of transferring to our columns the following important passage:-

The Papal nominee's great Association has proclaimed its designs; and we avow our conviction that, "if England to herself be true," it is well that the power and purpose of a hostile faction should have been so banded together and openly, under such authority, banded together and openly, under such authority, arrayed against the constitution. Rinuccini was not a more inauspicious boon to Ireland in the days of Charles I., than Monsignor Cullen in ours; but the time when the Italian Prince came down upon the land was better chosen for evil. The intrusive Prelate's Association proposes to itself a bold enterprise, and beats up for recruits wherever various discontents late's Association proposes to itself a bold enterprise, and beats up for recruits wherever various discontents have embittered the minds of men. Its defensive system is an aggressive one. It proposes to break down the muniments of property—confiscating, as it were, Protestant possessions. It proposes to destroy the Church Establishment—disclosing the nullity of those sworn engagements which were agreed to as security twenty-three years ago, and which are still renewed by Members of Parliament and their constituents. It proposes to assail the Crown in its most vital renewed by Members of Parliament and their constituents. It proposes to assail the Crown in its most vital prerogative, and to arrogate to the prohibited titles and distinctions of a foreign Priest the eminence of dignity granted to favoured subjects by the Royal Majesty of England. Against Throne, Church, Property, the Catholic Defence Association pronounces open, and what with the usual audacity it calls "constitutional" war. We repeat—we do not regret this bold defiance, nor do we dread the issue. It has entirely changed many opinions long favourable to a liberal policy towards the Roman Catholics. It has, we are not ashamed to confess, considerably modified our own.

Our conviction is, that the Popish schism in Ireland

ed to confess, considerably modified our own.

Our conviction is, that the Popish schism in Ireland has never yet been judged of in its proper character, nor tried by its merits. A vague notion has spread itself abroad, that the Church of Rome is virtually the Church of Ireland:—that the mass of the people love and honour it, and that for their sakes the State owes it deference and support. Further, it has been continually asserted, and the assertion has too largely passed without rebuke, that the revenues of the existing branch of the Church Catholic in that country, were wrested from the Church of Rome at the time of the Reformation. Light, however, is beginning now to break in upon these long-rooted misconceptions. It is already known to every man who investigates historical evidence, that no such confiscation or diversion of revenues took place. The Irish Church, as then established, accepted the Reformation, and accordingly retained its revenues. This is part of the answer: the other part is revenues. This is part of the answer: the other part is more important. The Church of Rome, no less than the Church of England, underwent at that epoch a signal revolution. It cannot, as respects what every statesman must consider to be of the first importance, be identified with the Irish Church of the period preceding the Reformation. As no man can hold a living in our church who does not assent to the Book of Common Prayer, so, since A.D. 1564—but only since then—no Romanist Priest can retain a benefice anywhere without swearing to the Creed of Pius IV. Here lies the point. The adjustment of the Revenue which took place in Ireland was, in fact, not a transfer of posses-This is part of the answer: the other part is ortant. The Church of Rome, no less than the point. The adjustment of the Revenue which took place in Ireland was, in fact, not a transfer of possessions from an old Church to a new one—but an assertion of the rights of the old Church, and a protection of them against the demands of that newly formed system which chose to appropriate an ancient title. The Pope claimed for his new Church and for himself, that no ecclesiastic should hold possessions who would not claimed for his new Church and for himself, that no ecclesiastic should hold possessions who would not swear an oath of allegiance to him in the form of a profession of faith. An oath, never proposed or framed until the year 1564, the British Throne and Church resisted; and because they retained their possessions without adopting a new creed or taking an oath of allegiance to a foreign power, Irish ecclesiastics are charged with seizing upon the revenues of their predecessors. Should it be said that the obligations imposed in the creed of Pius IV., although new in point of form, were old as matter of fact, the same may be said of the were old as matter of fact, the same may be said of the Anglican articles and service—but with this difference—the assertion as affecting our Church would be true; on the assertion as affecting our Church would be true; on the part of Romanism would be a daring falsehood. The great articles of the creed of Pius are those which regard the Bible and the Decrees of Councils—and these had never been promulgated in any form, in any branch of the Church, at any period in the world, before their appearance in fatal 1564!

their appearance in fatal 1564!

The other fallacy to which we allude has not a less pernicious influence. It is assumed that the religion of the Priests and people is the same, and power has been given to the priesthood because of the millions who are imagined to believe in their religion. Where the name is one it is natural to think their faith the same. This, however, we take leave to say distinctly, is not the fact in the case of Ireland. To a vast extent the multitudes boasted of by the Priests are ignorant of the dominant peculiarities of the Papal Church. Until the year 1825, when a Parliamentary Committee made it public, we believe the creed of Pius IV. was as little known among those who all (it was said by one of their Bishops) believed. those who all (it was said by one of their Bishops) be-lieved in it, as the Talmud; and even at this day, were it not for the exertions of Protesiant controversialists, we are persuaded its doctrines would be unknown to the great mass of the people. the great mass of the people.

The genius of the Vatican organizes the three or the five thousand who constitute the ecclesiastical body; the genius loci has hitherto furnished the millions who

gave that body consequence: nor has England ever made a persevering exertion to dissolve this alliance, but has contented herself with legislating or governing for the necessity of the hour, under paroxysms as it were, of austerity and indulgence. It became, from the completion of the Council of Trent, the fixed policy of the Court of Rome to hold the Papists in Ireland in a state in which they must be regarded as foreigners, if not enemies by the Crown. In the reign of James I. an oath of allegiance was condemned at Rome. All Irishmen were forbidden to take it—and ecclesiastics convicted of treason, to whom pardon was offered if they would swear that the Pope had not the power to depose Sovereigns for heresy, implored, in vain, permission to make this declaration; their piteous supplication was received with cold cruelty, and they died on the scaffold. In reign of Charles II. a declaration of the scaffold. tion of allegiance was circulated for signature, under the auspices of Ormond, and with the aid of some moderate ecclesiastics: it too was condemned at Rome, and the project was discomfited. Under Queen Anne, George II. and George III., efforts were made to bring Roman Catholics within the constitution, by administhey professed; and the prohibition of Rome prevailed in every instance against the interests and wishes of the Roman Catholics themselves. At length, at an advanced period of the reign of George III. (perhaps when the influence of the House of Stewart declined,) the gentry of the Roman Catholic persuasion in Ireland took the oath—the Clergy to a very great extent adopted the same course of prudence and propriety; and although Rome to this hour has never given an express sauction to the oath—while incidents elsewhere indicate that the Papal law has not become more indulgent to such professions-the oath continues to be taken without hesitation in Ireland, by people, and Priests, and Bishops—with, it is reported, the solitary exception of Archbishop Cullen.

As for the practical conclusion at which the review er arrives, it cannot be summed up better than in his own words:-

Far be it from us to underrate the resources still wielded by Rome in Ireland—or to contemn its manifest purpose to become, in the anticipated balancing of parties here, a power by which the State must submit to be governed. We even admit that such a scheme may, under existing circumstances, be fraught with more peril to the contemp. more peril to the empire than it was in the days when Mr. O'Connell kept in place the men who hated and feared him. But we hope and trust that the embodied presence of the Papacy in the Brigade which is to be its secular arm in the senate will—at last—awake a British spirit which has too long been slumbering.

But what is to be done? We have had tenative legislation enough. We want two things—that the laws as they exist shall be administered, and that Parliament, before it enacts new laws, shall be enlightened. Romanism has taken up a position and put forth pretensions to which the legislature cannot but give a child attention. But this implies the duty of explorstrict attention. But this implies the duty of explor strict attention. But this implies the duty of exploring the doctrines of that system, so far—and so far only—as they affect its political relations. We are bound to get rid of all mystery, of all doubt, as respects the Priest's oath. We place at the disposal of the Romish Bishops a fund by which they can induce or bribe young men to enter the ecclesiastical career—and cannot divest ourselves of complicity with the parties who require these young men, whether during their collegiate education, or afterwards in their clerical life, to swear an oath against the implety and antical life, to swear an oath against the impiety and anti-social character of which the gravest complaints have been made public. An inquiry is demanded not only by a sense of duty, but by the emergency of the season:—not inquiry such as it was on past occasions, when the plea of not guilty was accepted as conclusive evidence in favour of those whom their own admitted acts and professions accessed, nor inquiry such as acts and professions accused; nor inquiry such as it was when Roman Catholic Colleges answered the questions which Protestant statesmen allowed a Roman Catholic solicitor (and Jesuit, as some have said) to put into shape. If the Houses of Parliament will do their duty boldly—if they take fair and ample means to shew what—in a political sense—the Church of Rome is, and what it teaches—we firmly believe the result will be such a change in its constitution or small. result will be such a change in its constitution, or such diminution of its strength, as will render it innocuous, at least for political purposes, in Ireland.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD AND THE IRISH ELECTIONS.

We have alluded to the scenes now taking place in We have alluded to the scenes now taking place in Ireland at the elections. The conduct of the Papal elergy in that unfortunate country seems in audacity and violence to surpass any exhibitions of a similar nature to which we have heretofore been treated. If the freedom of election be not a mere mockery, and to be viewed as such in future, when Parliament meets some steps must be taken to present these upstarts from assuming the whole representative power of Iresome steps must be taken to present these upstarts from assuming the whole representative power of Ireland. If they had a single feeling in common with British freemen, or a single interest in accordance with those of this empire, however anconstitutional it might be to permit this usurpation, we might perhaps over-look it as a temporary ebullition. But in the case of these men it is altogether different. They are British subjects merely in name. Their whole aim and object is and must ever be, the subjugation of all around them to the bondage of which they are at once the victims and the instruments. Their conduct at the bustings—the sentiments they uttered—their frantic gestures and furious exclamations—their brandished cudgels and elenched fists, foaming mouths, and fercious language, are calculated to bring all religion into disrepute. They resemble nothing we have ever heard or read of in the shape of ministers of religion, except the Druids when presiding at human sacrifices, or the frantic Dervishes of the Mahomedan countries. These men must be driven back to their altars and to their proper functions, and not be permitted to ruin British freedom in their frantic efforts to restore in those countries the brutal ignorance and slavish doctrines which prevailed throughout Europe previous to the Reformation.—London Morning Herald,

BY THE REV. J. T. LEWIS, A. B.

In the following pages some of the most popular arguments against infant baptism are combated. The operations or effect of baptism are not treated of, the controversy being confined to the question whether there be such evidence existing as to warrant Baptists in asserting that persons baptized in infancy are not baptized at all. And, without doubt, all Baptists should carefully consider this evidence, because they decidedly lack learning, morality, or piety of the first propagators of their tenets. A Baptist may be certain, that if he is a person of ordinary capacity, he may venture on deciding the question of baptism, without such abstruse arguments in favour of his system, though he cannot attain to them, yet the founders of his sect probably did, as they were much more addicted to fanaticism than reasoning; this will appear from the following extract, detailing the first rise of the Baptists, taken from a Historian whom all sects delight to honour. The different denominations in Montreal have lately combined to procure a new edition of his work.

" It is difficult to determine, with certainty. the particular spot that gave birth to that seditious and pestilential sect of Anabaptists, whose tumultuous and desperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cause of religion and the civil interests of mankind. Whether they first arose in Switzerland, Germany, or the Netherlands is, as yet, a matter of debate, whose decision is of no great importance. It is most probable that several persons of this odious class made their appearance at the same time in different countries, and we may fix this period soon after the dawn of the Reformation, when Luther arose to set bounds to the ambition of Rome. This appears from a variety of circumstances, and especially from this striking onethat the first Anabaptist doctors of any eminence, were almost all heads and leaders of particular and separate sects. For it must be carefully observed. that though all these projectors of a new and unspotted Church were comprehended under the general denomination of Anabaptists, on account of their opposing the baptism of infants, and their rebaptising such as had received that sacrament in childhood, yet they were, from their very origin, sub-divided into various sects, which differed from each other in points of no small moment. The most pernicious of all those that composed this motley multitude, was that which pretended that the founders of the new and perfect Church were under the direction of a divine impulse, and armed against all opposition by the power of working miracles. It was this detestable faction that, in 1521, began their fanatical work under the guidance of Munzer, Stubner and Storck; they employed at first the various acts of persuasion in order to propagate their doctrine. But when they saw that these methods of making proselytes were not attended with such a rapid success, and that the ministry of Luther and other eminent Reformers were detrimental to their cause, they had recourse. to more expeditious measures, and attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms, but this seditious crowd was routed and dispersed without much difficulty by the Elector of Saxony and other princes. Munzer, their ringleader, was ignonimiously put to death, and his factious counsellors scattered abroad in different places. A great part of this rabble seemed delirious, and nothing more extravagant or incredible can be imagined than the dreams and visions that were constantly arising in their disordered heads. Such of them as had some spark of reason left, and had reflection enough to reduce their notions into a certain form, maintained, among others, the following points of doctrine :- " That the Church of Christ ought to be exempt from all sin; that all things ought to be in common among the faithful; that all usury, tythes, and tribute ought to be abolished; that the baptism of infants was an invention of the devil," &c., &c.—Mosheim, cen.

of such eminence and candour, shows that Baptists These preliminary remarks are essential to underhave no such learned arguments in reserve; that standing how the case stands between us and the they need deliberate about examining for them- Baptists before we commence our investigation selves. This treatise is, therefore, commended to into the Scriptural objections adduced by them in their attention, as it has been taken in hand for a pamphlet entitled "a concise view of Christian their attention, as it has been taken to dand to the purpose of refuting "a concise view of Christian Baptism" put forth by the Baptist College in Montreal, and designated by the publishers as "an infant baptism." It will be my object to show that those objections, though plausible, prove nothing against infant baptism. This would be sufficient for our ally commended to those members of the English Church who have become much more familiar with the arguments against infant baptism than

POPULAR BAPTIST ARGUMENTS with those for it. Let both be balanced together, REVIEWED. and we entertain little doubt that the members of the Church will see ample reasons why they " may not change the faith of their fathers like a garment unsuited to the climate in which they seek to

At the time of the Reformation in the English Church, while many abuses were laid aside, many practices of immemorial antiquity were retained, and perpetuated to this day, the Churchmen of that day, and we of the present, who abide by their decisions, are justly called on to give our reasons for any changes then made in doctrine or discipline. any support which men may derive from the Accordingly, we readily undertake to disprove transubstantiation, image worship, papal infallibility, &c.; but as regards those articles of Faith, or ceremonies, which the English Church held before her Reformation, and retained after it, seeing no much ado. He may be sure that there are no reason why they should be changed, these we are by no means called on to establish, or to assign the reasons why they were left unaltered. They who differ from us on these points, are bound to show why they so differ, and then we are bound to reply. Thus it would be most unreasonable for a Baptist to demand the cause why we retain infant baptism, till he first shows us why he rejects it. If his meaning be, that he wishes to know why we baptise infants, for the same reason that he wishes to know why we worship Christ, then the dispute is not between us and the Baptist, but between us and the infidel; but if his meaning be, that he would wish to know our reasons for baptising, because he sees better reasons why we should not do so, then he is bound to produce his objections, and we are obliged to answer them. And let it be remembered, that we feel quite satisfied if we refute these objections, because, though we may not prove expressly from Scripture the practice of infant baptism, yet we are justified in continuing that usage against which there are fewest objecttions. The matter stands thus :- The Church of England when reformed determined that the practice of infant baptism should be retained. Why? Because it was found existing in the Church. History says nothing about when it began to be practised. Now it is incredible that if adult baptism was the exclusive practice of the Church in the Apostolic age, the custom of baptising infants could have been introduced, and yet no notice of the innovation be taken by any writer. Changes in doctrine and discipline, comparatively trifling, have been carefully noted and disputed in every age, and we have the history of them. But that adults only should have been baptised by the Apostles, and yet that no mention should be made, or dispute be caused, or schism be occasioned, when the strange spectacle of a baptised infant was first beheld; that sects innumerable, differing in minute points, should have their history transmitted to us; that one of the most important schisms (the Donatist) should have involved the question of re-baptising heretics-and yet that not one even an incidental hint of the audacious transition from adult to infant baptism should be found in the enormous mass of ancient writings in our hands, this does seem extraordinary! indeed so extraordinary, as to afford a strong presumption in favor of infant baptism. And if to this be added the fact, that previous to the sixteenth century there was no Church, in existence which we have any knowledge, which did not baptise infants the proof that the rite originated with the Apostles is demonstration itself. Let Baptists tell us when infant baptism commenced? They cannot. Therefore, from the reason of the thing, we are convinced that it arose in the Apostolic age, with Apostolic sanction. We can give them the date of the origin of adult, as opposed to infant, baptism. And we know that the attempted change in the world's practice made a great stir. Had the change been from adult to infant baptism, can we suppose that the stir would have been less, and yet not a word about it in history? So conclusive is this argument, that it is quite sufficient for the advocate for infant baptism to show that Scripture The foregoing extract, taken from a historian Then, what more can a sober-minded man require? the internal evidence of Scripture is in favour of it. purpose, but we will prove further that these objections are not only invalid, but do, in point of fact, support infant baptism.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]