

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1850.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The relations of Religion to what are called Diseases of the Mind.*

Our attention has been particularly directed to this subject by an elaborate and somewhat ingenious article in a foreign periodical of great respectability.* In a cursory examination of the article upon its first appearance we were disposed to question some of its positions, but, in hope that it would be better and more quickly done elsewhere, the purpose was dismissed, and casually revived by a reference to some of the cases which it records in support or illustration of the author's views. A more particular examination reveals to us a vein of error running through the body of the argument, and tinging all the doctrines and inferences which it sets forth.

No one can contemplate the present provision for the comfort and cure of the insane without gratitude to God, nor without admiration of the philanthropy and science which have together

* Winslow's Journal of Psychological Medicine and Mental Pathology. April, 1848. London.

our ministers, elders, and brethren will give it their hearts and their hands, we need entertain no apprehensions of failure.

It is urged by some that the church should not establish a paper. They would leave this matter entirely to individuals. The force of this objection we have not been able to appreciate. It seems like saying the church should not publish the gospel; for truly, as we hope, our paper would proclaim the glad tidings, proclaim them as purely as we hold Bible truth, and as extensively as our utmost limits, and in a manner most efficient. The church establishes schools, colleges, theological seminaries; she educates her sons, licenses them, and ordains them ministers of the word; she sends out missionaries; she publishes books; and why she should be restricted from preaching by a weekly press, it is not easy to conjecture.

We might notice other objections, and try to remove other difficulties; but it is time to close our remarks. The piety and wisdom, with the enterprise and liberality of our church, can remove every obstacle. Our people need only to have their attention duly directed. The importance of the object, its necessity, its capability of putting forth such an immense influence for good, must awaken feeling and lead to unity of counsel and promptitude in action. Then may the commencement of another year record it as a blissful fact, that the Presbyterian church is sending the glad tidings of salvation in weekly messages of love to tens of myriads who look to her for the knowledge of a Redeemer, and for guidance in the way of life.

ART. VII.—*Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome. Being Notes of Conversations held with certain Jesuits, on the subject of Religion in the city of Rome.* By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M. A. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 82 Cliff street. 1849. 12mo. pp. 237.

THIS small but entertaining volume is a record, as its title imports, of a series of conversations or discussions on the prominent articles of faith and practice in the Church of Rome. The time when they were held is studiously concealed, but in the

absence of all dates, we may approximate it with sufficient precision, from a comparison of several intimations scattered through the volume. We gather that they occurred during the pontificate of Gregory XVI. (by a most absurd typographical error printed "Gregory XII.," who died in 1417;) subsequent to the cholera in Rome, the publication of Tract No. 90, and Mr. Ward's *Ideal of a Church*, before the apostasy of Ward and Newman, and the Novena for the conversion of England; and at the commencement of the Ronge Schism. We are, therefore, authorized to determine the period in question as the latter part of the year 1844.

Mr. Seymour appears to have been a match for the Jesuits. In fact they were the most frank, unreserved and communicative of the two parties, while the astuteness and tactics were principally on the side of the Englishman. Not that we would accuse him of Jesuitry, but certainly, if his own notes may be depended on, he fairly outwitted his antagonists. In some quarters he has been accused of duplicity, but, we think, without reason. We must bear in mind the objects he had in view, the hazard he ran, and the unnatural and involuntary ambiguity of his position.

Mr. Seymour was a clergyman of the Anglican church, and naturally of an inquisitive and polemical turn. Having exhausted all the resources to which he had access at home upon the Romish question, he determined to repair to the fountain-head itself for more complete information. There are some of us who might deem this a very superfluous labour, as there is a judge of controversies always near at hand; but due allowances must be made for the prejudices of education and the influence of a hierarchical system, even among the evangelical party in the Church of England. Mr. Seymour was in easy circumstances, and had held preferment in the establishment. He spent some time in the city of Rome, diligently attending all the churches, and *assisting*, as the French have it, at every ordination, funeral, novitiate, festival and ceremony of consequence, to which he could gain access, and for which unusual facilities were afforded him by his Roman Catholic friends. The result of his observations he has published in a work entitled "*A Pilgrimage to Rome.*"

The extraordinary assiduity in this occupation, with the

Pontifical in hand, attracted the attention of the ecclesiastics; and, after being sounded on the subject, he was visited at various times by distinguished individuals of the Order of Jesus, some of whom were deputed for the special purpose by no less a personage than the General of the Order. They easily fell into the error of supposing him to belong to that increasing party under the banners of Pusey and Newman, who were hankering after the vanities of Rome, and were already far advanced upon the Appian way, the *Via Media*, but who, for appearance sake, would not yield without some show of argument. To his disclaimers they evidently attached no more importance than to the complimentary courtesies of a tournament. Mr. Seymour was thus placed under a necessity of discussion, at the same time that he felt fully aware of the danger which might ensue from the free expression of his sentiments at the Papal Court. One of his visitors was a dignitary of great power and influence, a word from whom could procure his passports to be sent him with an order from the police to quit Rome. The Anglican Amos might have found in him another Amaziah, priest of Bethel, to counsel him, "O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there; but prophesy not again any more at Bethel; for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court." The fate of poor Dr. Achilli sufficiently evinces that the meridian of the Eternal City is not the safest for the promulgation of the truth.

Such are the circumstances under which these conversations are introduced to our notice; and we can easily understand the necessity which compelled Mr. Seymour to adopt a systematic wariness and caution, that furnish no unapt illustration of the wisdom of the serpent combined with the gentleness of the dove. We must do him the justice to say, that so far from practising any unworthy concealment, he made at the very opening the most distinct and unequivocal avowal of his cordial attachment to his own communion, and repelled the idea of his desiring a change.

"I dealt with all frankness with these several gentlemen, as to the object of their visit. . . . I was very careful to undeceive them, stating that I should be most happy to confer with them on the differences between the two churches, but that I could not do so under a false colour; that I was devotedly

attached in judgment and in feeling to the Church of England; that I looked on her as the Church of God in England, and the most pure, most apostolic, most scriptural of all the churches of Christendom; that, without unchurching other churches, she was still the church of my judgment and of my affections; and that I had never for a moment harboured the thought of abandoning her for any other church, and especially for the Church of Rome." P. 7.

"I said at once that there must be some mistake; that some one must have misinformed him; for that I was an attached member of the Church of England; that I had, as one of her clergy, held preferment in her, but had resigned my appointment; that I was perfectly independent in my circumstances and my feelings; that I had always been warmly opposed to the Church of Rome, as well as sincerely attached to the Church of England; and that I had now visited Rome with a desire to see and judge all things for myself, to change, modify, or confirm my former opinions, after a free and fair examination of everything to which I might be so fortunate as to obtain access." P. 15.

These declarations must be regarded as sufficiently explicit, to defend the author from the charge of deception and duplicity. The nearest approach to any thing like it is to be found on P. 113. "I could not expect that anything that I could offer, especially under the peculiar circumstances and manner in which I was obliged to state my views, could have any lasting effect on his mind, especially as I could so seldom give expression to my argument as if it were my own deep feeling, but only as a suggestion as to what might possibly be the impression on the minds of others." But let it be remembered that the individual with whom he was thus obliged to be on his guard, was the dignitary, a word from whom would suffice at a moment's notice to send him from Rome with his cherished purposes unaccomplished. P. 97. For it would appear that besides his design of obtaining information on the general question of the Papacy without committing himself, he was desirous to decide on the propriety of his receiving the communion from the hands of the Romish priests, (p. 65) and to discover the mode of reasoning by which they contrived to work on the minds of the English. P. 78.

He appears to have been remarkably skillful in conducting an argument; his mind is strictly logical, and his style so clear and limpid that it is impossible to misunderstand his meaning. His reading was extensive. He was not only acquainted with the common routine of controversial writers, but was intimate with the early fathers, and ready to cite passage for passage. Whether the matter in dispute was the decrees of councils, or the inscriptions in the catacombs, he showed himself equally at home. His antagonists were men of eminence and ability: sometimes picked men; learned, courteous and agreeable. If there were any individuals whose opinions might be deemed weighty and authoritative, these seem to have been the persons. We may therefore feel that we have presented to us the very best face which can be put upon that side of the question. We may also repose reasonable confidence in the accuracy of the report, as Mr. Seymour states that he was in the habit of taking notes during the conversations, and of committing the whole to writing the moment his visitors had withdrawn.

There are two things that have struck us very forcibly upon perusing this work. One is the rooted hold which superstition has taken on all minds, even the most enlightened, that are subject to the deathly grasp of the Papacy.

"Lethale vomebat
Suffuso virus cælo, Stygiaque per urbes
Religione sacer, sævum retinebat honorem."

It is indeed a curious psychological phenomenon that we are invited to witness—the extent to which credulity and superstition are compatible with learning and intellectual ability (of a certain sort at least). Here we see men expert in science, philosophy, belles lettres, and the classics, whose minds are quite contracted on theological topics, and reduced within the narrowest limits of bigotry. Habitually courteous and affable, we find them unhesitatingly affirming the conviction, "that every one must be damned in the flames of hell who did not believe in the supremacy and infallibility of the pope." P. 132. As Mr. Seymour remarks, this avowal derives considerable importance from the position of the person who uttered it. The speaker was the chief teacher of theology in the order of the Jesuits, and in the Collegio Romano.

These learned men did not blush to avow their belief in

miraculous pictures, even to the length of assenting to the preference which the Virgin Mary would give to one picture of her over another, if they were placed side by side; hearing the prayers addressed to the miraculous pictures, and refusing to hear those addressed to the picture that had not the reputation of being miraculous. Well might the author say, "I must frankly confess that I was wholly unprepared for this. In all my former experience of controversy in Ireland and England, I had been told that all those were the mere abuses of the superstitious, and not sanctioned by the learned, if, indeed, such things were believed or practised anywhere. I had often heard them denounced as mere fabrications, pure inventions to injure the character of the Church of Rome, and I felt much surprise to find them not only believed and practised, but defended. I felt that it was opening out to me a new state of things, a new phase of mind, and a totally new system of faith or credulity which I had never anticipated. A mind must be in a peculiar state to believe in the miraculous powers of a picture or image." P. 40. "This was a degree of credulity, not to say superstition, for which I was wholly unprepared; and I felt that there must be something in the atmosphere of Italy, or something in the training of the mind of Italy, that could lead an intelligent, a travelled, and educated man to such a state of credulity." P. 41.

A ludicrous story was gravely narrated by one of the Collegio Romano, of a whole tribe of American Indians marched down to a river by a Roman Catholic missionary; there, without any preaching, instruction, or profession of faith, sprinkled with water and decorated with little crosses; and claimed as worthy converts. At the expiration of two years, the missionary returned, in the course of which time the Indians had had no instruction whatever. When he summoned them to confession, he was overjoyed to find that not one of them had any sins to confess! So far from imagining the possibility of this unconscionness of sin arising from their deplorable ignorance of the nature of sin, he seriously insisted on the explanation "that there was no matter for the Sacrament of penance, as during these two years the Indians lived such converted lives, such holy and Christian lives, that there was not one among them who had committed a single sin, and therefore had no sins to confess, and the missionary priest was unable to confer absolu-

tion, inasmuch as there was no matter for the sacrament!" P. 182. But this is nothing to the story of a devout Indian, immediately subjoined, who was too far from the missionary to admit of the host being conveyed to him; whereupon the host flew out of his fingers over to the poor Indian, and into his mouth! "Oh," he added, in a tone of the most reverential devotion, "the blessed Lord Jesus so loved that poor savage, that he longed to enter into his heart, and thus miraculously flew into his mouth! How anxious he was to get into him!" P. 183. The fervour and earnestness of this priest forbade all doubt of his entire sincerity in crediting the miracle. He had a wide esophagus!

The growth of Mariolatry is painfully brought to view in these pages. The subject is of sufficient importance to quote the passage at length:

"My clerical friend, after a pause, which I was unwilling to break, lest I should express myself as strongly as I felt, resumed the conversation, and said, that the worship of the Virgin Mary was a growing worship in Rome; that it was increasing in depth and intenseness of devotion; and that there were now many of their divines, and he spoke of himself as agreeing with them in sentiment, who were teaching that as a woman brought in death, so a woman was to bring in life; that as a woman brought in sin, so a woman was to bring in holiness; that as Eve brought in damnation, so Mary was to bring in salvation: and that the effect of this opinion was largely to increase the reverence and worship given to the Virgin Mary." P. 41. "The whole devotional system of the Church of Rome, the prayers unceasingly offered to the Virgin, the innumerable pictures of the Virgin, the countless images of the Virgin, the many churches dedicated to the Virgin, the universal devotion rendered to the Virgin, the manner in which all the services and prayers of the Church and people are impregnated with thoughts of the Virgin, the extent to which, in conversation, all classes went in speaking of the Virgin, all had impressed me with the feeling that the religion of Italy ought to be called the religion of the Virgin Mary, and not the religion of Jesus Christ." P. 106.

This is perfectly in keeping with the notorious facts that in 1799, the Tuscans appointed the Virgin Mary their Generalis-

simo; and in 1836, the king of Spain made her the Commander-in-chief of his forces, their banner being a consecrated petticoat embroidered by his royal hands. In 1816, an association was formed with the pope's sanction, called the Children of Mary, and May was the month especially set apart for her worship. To these follies, and the graver blasphemy of "Our Lady's Psalter," we may add the infatuation of the present pope, Pius IX.; whose whole soul seems to be much more taken up with having the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin formally established as the doctrine of the Church, than with the personal administration of his dominions. Surely it would hardly be a misnomer to call the Romish communion a Marian, rather than a Christian church.

Among the reasons adduced in favour of the worship of Mary, we find one which at least has the merit of novelty. "Their" (the Jesuits') "devotion to the blessed Virgin is known through the whole world; and as for their holiness, they have been accused of ambition, of intrigue, of politics, with opposing sovereigns and disturbing the peace of kingdoms, but no one has ever charged them with impurity or immorality." p. 121.

But the grand and crowning reason to which they perpetually recur, with never-wearied and grateful unction, is the superior tenderness of Mary.

We cannot enlarge further on this point, but for additional particulars, particularly the vindication of the recital of "Hail Mary!" and nothing else, in the ears of a dying man; and the droll mistake of the priest who took the cry of a little child in danger, "O mamma! mamma mia!" as an invocation to the Virgin, instead of its mother; we must refer the reader to the book itself. We feel strongly inclined to the opinion, that for this prevailing preference of Mary to Christ, the Fine Arts are in a great degree responsible. "*Picturæ ecclesiarum sunt quasi libri laicorum,*" said Comester, in the twelfth century. Among the paintings which adorn the walls of Roman Catholic churches, there is no subject which is a greater favourite than the Madonna and Child. The greatest masters of all countries have tried their skill upon it. The mother of course occupies the most prominent and patronizing position. There are even pictures of the Virgin and Child in Heaven, although it was in the maturity of manhood Jesus entered into heaven, and of course

the child in her arms can be employed merely as a convenient mode of designating the Virgin Mother. But the most revolting length to which the practice has been carried, is the representation of Mary administering chastisement to her child, by way of illustrating his subjection to his parents. How is it possible for people whose only books are such pictures as these, to take up any other idea than that of the permanent inferiority of Jesus?

Another thing which we had forcibly impressed upon us by the perusal of Mr. Seymour's work, is the imbecility of reasoning exhibited by the learned men of Rome. His antagonists were not obscure individuals encountered by accident, but personages, (in one case selected by the Padre Generale), whose station qualified them to be considered as authoritative exponents of the doctrines of their church; the professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Collegio Romano, or University of Rome; the professor of Canon Law; the professor of Archæology; the Librarian; a tutor in the College of Nobles; a dignitary of no small note and influence whose title is not given, besides other priests and Jesuits. Yet highly educated and shrewd as these men were, they were sometimes exceedingly at a loss for a reply, when, too, a reply naturally suggested itself to our own minds, heretics as we were.

We are not unaware of the fable of the lion and the painter. We know the partiality of men to their own offspring, and how easy it is for a reporter to colour here, and embellish there, and suppress in another place, so as to make the published account more favourable to himself or his party than the real argument was. Cicero's oration in defence of Milo is an example in point. Another is furnished by Mr. Kennedy in his life of Mr. Wirt. In the great steamboat case of Gibbons against Ogden, Mr. Emmett was counsel for the defendant in opposition to Mr. Wirt, and in allusion to New York enterprise, quotes from the *Æneid* an exclamation of the hero, "Quæ regio in terris, nostri non plena laboris!" and applies it in a triumphant strain. Mr. Wirt, who was a thorough Virgilian, very happily took up the quotation, and completed it, and showed from the context that so far from being the language of triumph, it was that of lamentation. This turn of thought he pursued in glowing descant on the horrors of disunion which

were threatened by the then aspect and position of the State of New York. In the published report of Mr. Emmett's speech, as revised, these words are interpolated, "She may turn the mournful exclamation of Æneas into an expression of triumph," &c., thus anticipating the eloquent passage in Mr. Wirt's felicitous reply, and taking away all its point and bearing.

But, making all due allowance for self-partiality in the case, still, if any thing like a faithful report is given, we are able to draw our own conclusions. There is the argument itself, its naked bones and sinews, in the plainest, most unpretending, but clearest, of styles. Of this pellucid style the admirable expositions of justification, sanctification, and the merit of good works, pp. 198, 200, may be referred to as specimens. Mr. Seymour represents himself as a man of prayer, a devout and conscientious man; and such is the logical structure of his mind, that we can hardly conceive the discussions to have borne any altering or tampering of consequence. In short, we feel that the account before us is altogether trustworthy.

In almost every encounter the Jesuits made a failure. Mr. Seymour professes himself amazed beyond expression at the weak and inconclusive arguments and hasty retreats of men whom he had been led to regard as most subtle, practised, and formidable controversialists. Whether the leaden pressure of authority, the early submission to that mockery of reason, transubstantiation, or the habit of dwelling on peculiarities of dress and ceremony had emasculated their intellects, the facts stand forth prominent, and the defeat is not to be concealed. We are disposed to ascribe the perversion and prostration of their faculties on points of theology, to the wretched system under which they had been trained. They had been bred implicitly to venerate the canons of the church and its dogmas as of equal authority with the scriptures; and it never entered into their heads to doubt. Their reason had been permitted to fall into entire disuse as far as the investigation of religious truth is concerned. It was a case of complete *non-user*, and entailed the natural consequences of neglect. The Yogee who extends his arm for a series of years, at last loses its muscular power, and is disabled from retracting it. Of the sincerity of his Jesuit friends Mr. Seymour became perfectly satisfied. He once had been of the common opinion that the Romish priesthood were all infidels;

but this opinion, further acquaintance induced him to abandon. "I am satisfied that multitudes among them believe, with the fullest and most implicit faith, the dogmas of their church; and therefore, instead of regarding them as hypocrites and monsters of deception and wickedness which such a supposition implies, I regard them as melancholy evidences of the fall of the human nature, and sad monuments of the shipwreck of the human judgment, evidencing to the world that no reach of human intellect, and no grasp of mental genius, and no range of this world's learning, can bring the true and saving knowledge of God to the mind or heart of man." P. 185. He gives a melancholy example of a man of talents, an English proselyte, who offered up blindly the sacrifice of his intellect to the ecclesiastical Moloch. P. 82.

The reader will find about a dozen occasions on which Mr. Seymour got the better of his opponents, either sorely graveling them, or reducing them to silence. He will notice the adroitness with which he met the reproach of the Puseyite divisions in England, with the counter movements of the Rongites in Germany; the dilemma in which he placed the defender of judicial absolution; the confounding of *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia*, which he proved in the prayer of Jesus, Joseph, and Mary in one breath; the total withdrawal of the argument for an infallible tribunal, to which he drove one adversary; the similar hesitation which he caused in another, when defending the omniscience of the Virgin Mary; the vexation of a third, when he turned against himself his seven essentials of Bulls *ex cathedrâ*; the inability of a fourth to reconcile the contradiction of the *flesh and blood* in the sacrament being styled "an *unbloody* sacrifice;" the lowering of the tone of the gentlemen of Collegio Romano, when they found that they could not impose upon his superior knowledge in regard to the inscriptions found in the catacombs; the ridiculous figure which he made them cut upon the subject of the scriptures in Rome; and the scarcely less ridiculous figure which the two Jesuits presented when unable to verify the claims of the Roman Church to infallibility. The last two are such rich scenes, that we shall obtain ready pardon for transcribing them at length.

The professor of Dogmatic Theology and the professor of Canon Law conveyed to Mr. Seymour a formal challenge; and the conversation was opened with the subject of the opposition

of the Church of Rome to the circulation of the sacred volume.

“The professor of Dogmatic Theology replied by saying that although it was very true that the people were wholly unacquainted with the nature of the holy scriptures, yet it was very incorrect to suppose that the Catholic Church was opposed to their reading them; that the Church set a great value on the sacred volume, and venerated it too highly to let it be used commonly or indiscriminately; that, so far from forbidding its circulation and perusal, the church permitted it to all whom she thought likely to profit by it, and forbade it only to those who, being ignorant, would be likely to pervert and misapply it; but that it was a great mistake, and indeed a calumny against the Catholic Church, to say that she was opposed to the full and unrestricted use and circulation of the Scriptures.

“The answer that I made to this was, that, having resided many years among a Roman Catholic population in Ireland, I had always found that the sacred volume was forbidden to them; and that, since I came to Italy, and especially to Rome, I observed the most complete ignorance of the Holy Scriptures, and that it was ascribed by themselves to a prohibition on the part of the Church.

“He at once stated that there must be some mistake, as the book was permitted to all who could understand it, and was in fact, in very general circulation in Rome.

“I said that I had heard the contrary, and that it was impossible to procure a copy of the Holy Scriptures in the Italian tongue, in the city of Rome: that I had so heard from an English gentleman who had resided there for ten years; that I looked upon the statement as scarcely credible; that I wished much to ascertain the matter for my own information; that I had one day resolved to test this by visiting every bookselling establishment in the city of Rome; that I had gone to the book-shop belonging to the Propaganda Fide—to that patronized by his holiness the Pope—to that which was connected with the Collegio Romano, and was patronized by the order of the Jesuits—to that which was established for the supply of English and other foreigners—to those which sold old and second-hand books, and that in every establishment, without exception, I found that the Holy Scriptures were not for sale. I could not procure a single copy in the Roman language and of a portable size in the whole

city of Rome; and that, when I asked each bookseller the reason of his not having so important a volume, I was answered in every instance, *é prohibito* or *non é permissso*, that the whole volume was prohibited, or that it was not permitted to be sold. I added that Martini's edition was offered to me in two places, but it was in twenty-four volumes and at a cost of one hundred and five francs, (that is, four pounds sterling,) and that under such circumstances, I could not but regard the Holy Scriptures as a prohibited book, at least in the city of Rome.

"He replied by acknowledging that it was very probable that I could not find the volume in Rome, especially as the population was very poor, and not able to purchase the sacred volume; and that the real reason the scriptures were not at the booksellers, and also were not in circulation, was not that they were forbidden or prohibited by the Church, but that the people of Rome were too poor to buy them.

"I replied that they probably were too poor, whether in Rome or in England, to give one hundred and five francs for the book, but that the clergy of Rome, so numerous and wealthy, should do as in England, namely, form an association for cheapening the copies of the scriptures.

"He said, in reply, that the priests were too poor to cheapen the volume, and that the people were too poor to purchase it.

"I then stated that if this was really the case—that if there was no prohibition against the sacred volume—that if they would be willing to circulate it, and that really and sincerely, there was no other objection than the difficulties arising from the price of the book, that difficulty should at once be obviated. I would myself undertake to obtain from England, through the Bible Society, any number of Bibles that could be circulated, and they should be sold at the lowest possible price, or given freely and gratuitously to the inhabitants of Rome. I stated that the people of England loved the scriptures beyond all else in the world, and that it would be to them a source of delight and thanksgiving to give for gratuitous circulation any number of copies of the sacred volume that the inhabitants of Rome could require.

"He immediately answered that he thanked me for the generous offer, but that there would be no use in accepting it, as the people of Rome were very ignorant; were in a state of brutal

ignorance; were unable to read any thing, and therefore could not profit by reading the scriptures. even if we supplied them gratuitously.

"I could not conceal from myself that he was prevaricating with me; that his former excuse of poverty, and his latter excuse of ignorance, were mere evasions; so I asked him whose fault it was that the people remained in such universal and unaccountable ignorance. There were above five thousand priests, monks, and nuns, besides cardinals and prelates, in the city of Rome; that the whole population was only thirty thousand families; that thus there was a priest, or a monk, or a nun for every six families in Rome; that thus there was ample means for the education of the people; and I asked therefore, whether the Church was not to blame for this ignorance of the people.

"He immediately turned from the subject, saying that the Church held the infallibility of the Pope, to whom it therefore belonged to give the only infallible interpretation of the scriptures.

"This led the conversation in another direction." Pp 125-129.

The only other instance we shall quote at length, showing the Jesuits at fault for a reply, is that relating to the claim of infallibility of the Church of Rome. The ground taken by Mr. Seymour is novel and ingenious, and sets in fine relief his scholarship and perspicacity. The professor, above alluded to, continued the discussion by proposing to argue the question of salvability in the Church of England, involving the question: whether the Church of England was the Church of Christ. They agreed to urge nothing without producing for it a written canon or article.

The professor laid down the syllogism: "The Church is infallible; the Church of England confesses herself fallible; therefore the Church of England is not the Church of Christ." On Mr. Seymour's pointing out the fallacy, and showing that the Church of England did not pretend to be *the Church*, but only a part of it, he altered the syllogism as follows: "The Church of Christ, in all her parts, is infallible; the Protestant Church of England confesses herself fallible; therefore the Church of England is not a part of the Church of Christ." Mr. Seymour denied the minor.

“He laughed at me good-humouredly, and with a look of triumph, and said that the Church of England had confessed it, and he could produce the article. He referred me to the Article XIX. I produced the article and read the words, ‘As the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.’ I said that this Article of the Church of England asserted that other churches, and that the Church of Rome in particular, had erred, and were fallible, but that she had said nothing of herself; and certainly had not, as his argument supposed and required, confessed herself fallible. He frankly acknowledged this to be a sufficient answer, and that his argument had failed, but said he would arrange his syllogism in another form, so as to obviate this. He seemed, however, slightly—very slightly annoyed at finding himself so easily foiled in his first two attempts. He proceeded with great quickness to arrange his argument again. The Church of Christ, in all her parts, claims to be infallible: the Protestant Church of England does not claim to be infallible: therefore, the Church of England is not the Church of Christ.’

Instead of taking the ordinary mode of denying the major, and opening up the question of the infallibility of the whole church, Mr. Seymour thought the time had come to turn the tables, and carry the war into the enemy’s camp. His reading had suggested to him an argument which struck him forcibly, but which he had never listened to a living soul. Like David with Saul’s armour, he had never tried it. He resolved to take this opportunity of making the first experiment, and “fleshing his maiden sword.” The syllogism having been reduced to writing, he drew the pen over the word “England,” and substituted the word “Rome.” It then read thus: “The Church of Christ, in all her parts, claims to be infallible; the Church of Rome does not claim to be infallible; therefore the Church of Rome is not part of the Church of Christ.” The two Jesuits laughed heartily, and anticipated an easy triumph. They insisted that the Church of Rome had always asserted her infallibility. He demanded coolly the authoritative document, according to the preliminaries agreed on.

“After some moments’ pause, he said he could produce several instances, and named the Council of Constance, the Council of

Basle, the Council of Florence, and several other lesser authorities. I knew each of the decrees to which he referred; and therefore, when he said that one asserted the supremacy of the Church of Rome as the mother and mistress of all churches; and that another held that every soul was subject to the Roman pontiff at the peril of his salvation; and that others still asserted that every man must be obedient, and owed obedience to the successor of St. Peter: and others, again, that it belonged to the Church of Rome to interpret Holy Scripture—when he said all this, I reminded him that all this was beside the real question—was nothing to the real point before us; that my assertion was that no received decree, or bull, or other authoritative document of the Church of Rome claimed infallibility, and that he answered me only by producing some which claimed supremacy and authority. He said that supremacy and authority implied infallibility. I answered by an emphatic No! My opponent here did not deny the principle I had thus laid down; but he seemed puzzled and perplexed at finding that all his documents failed in the precise point of asserting infallibility. He referred to several others which he had not already named, but in a moment after he gave them up as inadequate; all, when examined, were disposed of by my preceding answer.

“I shall never forget, while I live, the spectacle of these two Jesuits, able, learned, and subtle as they were, and long habituated to controversy, yet so completely perplexed at this turn of the argument as to be looking at one another, and consulting and endeavouring to find an answer sufficiently plausible. My opponent, the reverend professor of Theology, seemed a little cast down at first, but soon rallied, and laughed at the perplexity and singularity of his position. He laughed good-naturedly, no longer at me, but at himself, and honestly said he had never seen the difficulty before; that he had thought the point clearly settled, but that it certainly was not so; and that he could not see how to answer me.

“His companion, however, the reverend professor of Canon Law, was not so good-humoured on the occasion. He was excited and annoyed at the failure, and asked confidently and warmly why it was that Protestants were always charging the Church of Rome with arrogance, and presumption, and blasphemy for claiming infallibility, if, as would now appear

from the argument, she has never claimed it.

“I was unwilling to reply to this in the warm spirit in which it was spoken, and I merely said that I had never objected to the Church of Rome that she had been arrogant, or presumptuous, or blasphemous in claiming infallibility, or even that she ever claimed it or pretended to it at all. I believed that, as a Church, she never, on any occasion whatever, had advanced such a claim; I knew, indeed, that her advocates usually claimed it for her, and that her controversialists generally asserted it for her, and that the multitudes imagined she both claimed and possessed that divine prerogative; but I also knew that they were not THE CHURCH; that a few learned advocates were not the Church; that a few subtle controversialists were not the Church; that the multitude of an ignorant people were not the Church, and I knew, also, that THE CHURCH herself had never claimed or asserted it. If I was wrong in this broad statement, I was in presence of those who could easily correct me. They could tell me when and where THE CHURCH had claimed or asserted it. They could name the council and point to the decree. They could designate the pope and point to the bull. There never was an assertion more easily confuted if indeed it was capable of being confuted at all.

“They still asserted that the Church was infallible, and claimed to be infallible, though they seemed in a quiet way to acknowledge that they could not further prove their position.” Pp. 134-143.

We here take leave of Mr. Seymour and his book, recommending it as likely to prove highly interesting to any one who is fond of intellectual gladiatorship, or who, like the author, is curious to ascertain the state of things at head-quarters.

SHORT NOTICES; AND QUARTERLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Life, Health and Disease. By Edward Johnson, M. D. New York: John Wiley, 161 Broadway, and 13 Paternoster Row. London. 1850.

This is one, and not the least remarkable, of the countless efforts to