

strument for repressing great sin in ourselves is, that after an interval of apparent peace, the soul becomes possessed by far greater iniquities than ever. The new sins which are thus developed may not be so violent or so obviously immoral. They may be sins, as our Lord expresses it, that find their suitable dwelling in a house that is swept and garnished. Yet they are worse than the original iniquity. They are sins of vanity, contempt of men, hypocrisy, formality, coldness of feeling, hatred of those who differ from us in doctrine and in outward forms of religion, though having more genuine love to Christ. These new tenants are prim, church-going devils, that adapt themselves to all the ways of respectable society. They do not court eviction by disturbing the neighbors, but all the while they are carrying on nefarious practices, which will some day overwhelm the house in disaster. For the man whose whole religious experience can be fairly summed up in the statement that he has cast out a devil, or, in other words, rid himself of one form of iniquity, has built his religion on regard for self much more than on regard for Christ, and therefore sees all things upside down. He cultivates his own character rather than fellowship with Christ; and he will thus be led to become external, formal, pharisaic in his religion, and will learn to denounce all who differ from him in the externals of which he makes so much. Hatred, envy and uncharitableness, supercilious bigotry, and sourness of spirit enter into him, and make him as unlike Christ as it is possible for a man to be. It is possible then that attention to religion may rather damage than improve the character. There are persons who have been quite spoiled by their religion; who would have been more humble, sincere, truthful, affectionate, useful persons, had they never given any attention to religion than they are at the present moment. Their mode of dealing with religion has given birth to faults of which originally they showed no trace. Religion has in their case only served to make their last state worse than their first. It is so always, if religion does not fill the heart with genuine love for what is good, with a real hunger for righteousness, with enthusiasm for those for whom Christ died.—*The Revd. Marcus Dods, D. D. in the Expositor.*

ROME ABANDONED.

THE *Forum* for March contains a deeply interesting article, signed Eugene J. V. Huignin, wherein he narrates the mental and spiritual history of his leaving the Church of Rome to share the higher life of the Catholic Church of England. We give the first portion below and the other section will appear at a later date:—

"I was born into the Roman Church, my parents being Roman Catholics. Religious beliefs were formed to hand for me, and as I grew up I accepted all the teachings of that church as the very gospel of Christ. My personal convictions were not accounted at all. I had no right to say whether I would believe or not. True, I was told that I had a right to examine the claims, authority and doctrines

of the church; but having been allowed that measure of liberty, I was forbidden, under guilt of mortal sin and pain of excommunication, to reject or doubt any of the Roman dogmas, no matter how weak the proofs, how unreasonable or unscriptural the doctrines or claims.

From an early age I longed to be a priest, and no objection was made to my choice. Having studied classics for nearly seven years, I entered as a "logician" the great ecclesiastical college at Maynooth. During my classical and philosophical terms I learned to think and read for myself, to select my own books of reference, and to form my own opinions. Sometimes I had opposed the opinions of the professors, and quoted authorities against them; thus I learned that they did not know all things, and I ceased to regard even the most able of them as infallible. My mind was quickly outgrowing its youth-time, and long before my philosophical course was ended I had put aside the mere authority of old age, and resolved to stand by principles and facts.

The professors in the colleges were considered by Pius IX. as second to none in the Roman Church, and justly so. They were men to be respected and loved; they were also to be pitied, for they were in a system that held them as in a vise. They might search the Scriptures and history and tradition, but all ended there. Their minds were not their own as to faith, and it was at times pitiable to hear them try to defend defenseless doctrines. I could see in them that unrest of mind and skepticism as to matters of faith which pervade to so lamentable an extent the priesthood in the Roman Church.

During my first year's course in divinity the treatises on true religion, both natural and supernatural, were read. The entire current of theological thought was turned to prove papal authority and infallibility. The decrees of the Vatican Council were taken as a text, and all the teachings and writings of ante Vatican times were either explained away or quoted to prove the Vatican doctrines. Here my mind first rebelled. The doctrine of papal infallibility appeared to be unnecessary and injurious, making Catholicity as taught by Rome repulsive to men's minds; for one could not help seeing that the world had lived for centuries without such a doctrine, and that God could save men in the future, as in the past, without the necessity of assent to such a claim. The arguments used to support the claims of the pope seemed to me untenable, and the explanations of the difficulties more plausible than logical or forcible. I could not help coming to the conclusion that there is not in all Scripture a trace of evidence that St. Peter was constituted universal ruler over the other apostles, and that there is not a word in favor of papal claims and papal infallibility. What, then, of the teaching of the great doctors, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Eusebius, and countless others, that no doctrine is Catholic or apostolical except it be contained in "the Scriptures," the "divine oracles," the "legal and evangelical" writings?

It is asserted that the universal church has always believed in and taught the superiority of the pope to a general council, and his infallibility in teaching *ex cathedra* faith and morals to the entire church. Is this so? Were not Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus (a Roman saint) Sabellian heretics? Did not Pope Vigilius teach now one thing, and again the opposite, in his public and formally official declarations concerning the "Three Chapters?" Is not his teaching at times opposed to councils held as general? Vigilius himself stated in a letter to Eutychius of Constantinople that "Christ had removed the darkness from his mind," and that "it was no shame to admit and retract error." The whole question, to use Bossuet's words, "pertained to the cause of faith." Large numbers of bishops in council assembled strenuously opposed Vigilius and his teaching, showing plainly that they had no faith in infallibility. Was not Pope Liberius an Arian? That such he was is admitted by Baronius, Petavius, Bossuet, Fleury, Dollinger, Hefele, Dupin, and hosts of others. And we have authority even greater than that of these famous authors: we have the testimony of the great saints and doctors Athanasius and Hilary and Jerome, and the clear evidence of the historian Sozomen. But, say Roman divines, the pope was compelled by fear to teach Arianism, and in the exercise of his infallibility he should be free. Let us examine this specious defense of infallibility. According to all writers on the laws of mind and will, more external violence or threats can affect the violation of mental acts. But violence or threats may excite fear, and fear, according to Roman divines and other writers, can and does at times destroy the freedom of mind and will necessary for a free human act. Nevertheless those acts which do proceed from fear are, according to Roman teachings, for the most part free acts. All authorities agree that acts performed under the impulse of grave fear are free and voluntary, provided the fear is not so intense as altogether to destroy the use of reason. Even granting, then, that Liberius acted under fear, who will assert that the fear acting on the Pope was such as to destroy the freedom of mind and will necessary for a human act? Not even Cardinal Newman with all his eloquence can defend Liberius. The cardinal compares Liberius to an English chief-justice carried off by bandits, and kept without notes, books, or counsel, and forced by fear of death to give a certain decision. The comparison is at fault in every particular. Liberius had studied the subject in controversy, and was presumably infallible and supreme in teaching on the point at issue, and aided in a special manner by the Holy Ghost.

Was not Pope Honorius a Monothelite heretic? Sundry general councils and about one hundred and forty popes condemned him as such. Leo II. wrote to the bishops of Spain that Honorius was damned for his heresy. Pope Stephen VI. disinterred the body of Pope Formosus, condemned him, and annulled his ordinations. Pope Leo V. deposed Pope Chris-