

SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER.

AN *anonymous* writer, subscribing himself "A Catholic Layman," but who may be, for aught that we know, the mere *amanuensis* of Bishop Gillis, or the priests, has addressed a long reply in manuscript to the Rev. R. P. Blakeney's questions.

No. I.

In reference to question 4, he says, "*The infallibility of Councils headed by the Pope*, for no individual opinion, concerning any other source of infallibility, am I called upon to consider, is, *infallibility in faith.*" (The italics are his.) In reply to the question, "What infallible authority has declared, that Councils headed by the Pope are infallible in matters of faith?" he says, "I then answer as follows:—The infallible authority of our blessed Lord and Saviour has declared it. When you object, as doubtlessly you will, how we know He has declared it, I answer, 1st, That we know it, and know it infallibly, by tradition." *Anonymous*, when asked to give infallible authority for believing that Councils with the Pope are infallible, gives *tradition!!!* We now call upon him (1.) To name that tradition; and (2.) To prove that it is infallible. The Greek Church appeals to tradition, and, *led thereby*, it denies that Councils with the Pope at their head are infallible. We ask, What independent infallible authority has declared that the Greek Church is in error, and the Roman Church right?

No. II.

Further, on the same subject, *Anonymous* says, "That tradition, or the testimony of men, subject to certain conditions, which our tradition possesses, is able, *by itself alone*, to support an infallible assurance, and that so surely, that a miracle worked for the express purpose would not increase its certainty." 1. We call upon *Anonymous* to state what these conditions are, and to show how an *oral* communication, handed down from mouth to mouth, could give any, much less an *infallible* assurance. 2. If tradition, "*by itself alone*," be able to give such an "infallible assurance," what need is there of Councils and Popes at all to interpret them? or what need is there of the Scriptures at all?

DILEMMA No. 1.—Either such tradition needs an interpreter, or it does not. If it does need an interpreter, and if the infallible interpreter be "Councils headed by the Pope," then we ask, "What Councils headed by the Pope have interpreted tradition, and consequently declared, that Councils headed by the Pope are infallible?" If tradition does not need such interpreter, then we may dispense with Councils headed by the Pope. Will *Anonymous* have the kindness to extricate himself from the horns of this dilemma, if he can?

No. III.

We had asked, "What becomes of infallibility when it is the business of a Council to decide between the claims of opposing Popes?" He gives Mumford's reply, "Though a Council without a Pope cannot define any article of faith; yet, in time of schism, it can judge which is true Pope, and provide the Church of a true Pastor if she had none." We answer, (1.) That Mumford was a mere individual; as such, he says, that a Council without a Pope "cannot define any article of faith." The Council of Constance declared otherwise. (*See Labbe's Councils*, tom. xii., p. 22. Paris, 1672.) This affords us a specimen of the difference of opinion existing in the Church of Rome on fundamental points.

(2.) Here Mumford declares that a Council cannot define without a Pope, and *Anonymous* tacitly admits that it does not possess infallibility in such circumstances; for he asks, "Is the act of choosing a Pope one that requires "the exercise of infallibility?" Common sense teaches, that if a Church be infallible at all, it ought especially to be infallible when called on to pronounce which of two Popes is the Vicar of Christ and the Rock of the Church.

DILEMMA No. 2.—Either the Council is fallible or infallible. If fallible, it may reject the true Pope. If infallible, Councils without a Pope are infallible.

No. IV.

Anonymous makes a distinction between articles of faith; and (1.) He intimates that the infallibility of Councils is an opinion.

DILEMMA No. 3.—He has infallible authority for his belief in that distinction, or he has not. If he have infallible authority, let him name the Council headed by the Pope which declares that distinction. If he have not such authority, he is inconsistent with himself, for he believes without infallible authority. (2.) But even if we conceded his distinction, which we do not, the difficulty still remains. THERE ARE CASES IN WHICH A COUNCIL WILL HAVE TO PRONOUNCE UPON ARTICLES OF FAITH WITHOUT THE POPE. Pope Adrian VI., Alphonsus a Castro, and several great authorities in the Church of Rome, maintained that the Pope might become a heretic. If so, the Council may then have to decide upon an article of faith without a Pope.

DILEMMA No. 4.—Either the Council is infallible or not, under such circumstances. If infallible, Councils are infallible *without* a Pope. If fallible, there is no infallible authority to decide the point.

No. V.

Anonymous argues, that if the Council headed by the Pope be not infallible, we have no satisfactory authority

for Holy Scripture! The old infidel argument again! a thousand times urged, and as often refuted. We believe in the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Bible on *evidence*.

DILEMMA No. 5.—Either that evidence is sufficient, or it is not. If sufficient, *Anonymous* is foiled. If insufficient, what can *Anonymous* give in its stead—the assertions of a few clergymen, or, in other words, the decrees of Councils? As well might the authority of Mohammedan priests prove the Koran

No. VI.

Anonymous admits “the possibility of a priest’s *pretending to consecrate, baptise, marry, &c., without due intention;*” and he adds, that “*Sacraments administered without intention are invalid.*” But he argues that the Romanist may be morally certain that intention exists. We answer, (1.) That the plea of *moral certainty* is inconsistent on the part of a Romanist, who, on other matters, insists upon the necessity of *infallible certainty*. Dr Browne, a Roman Catholic bishop, in his late letter to Mr Bailey, argues that Christians should have “*absolute certainty.*” (2.) The Romanist cannot have moral certainty. As he looks back upon the long line of succession, and numerous links in the chain, let him recollect, that even if one link be broken, if there be one invalid ordination or baptism, the whole line is lost! Baronius says, that Popes have been “*monsters horrible to behold.*” Is it not morally certain, that already innumerable *nullities* in baptism, ordination, &c., have taken place

DILEMMA No. 6.—Either Romanists are infallibly certain that they have true Sacraments, or they are not. If they are infallibly certain, then the doctrine of their Church as to intention is false. If they are not infallibly certain, their pretension to infallibility is practically useless.

No. VII.

Anonymous, in reference to the words, “This cup is

“the New Testament,” says, “Our Lord explains *that it is a figure.*” Just so; and thus are the words figuratively spoken at the same time, “This is my body.”

No. VIII.

Anonymous denies that several passages which we quote prove that the Bible is the rule of faith. He does not even *attempt* to substantiate his assertion, but refers us to Dr Wiseman's book, as, in other places, he refers to Lingard, Mumford, and Bossuet's works on other points. We were quite aware that books were written by these persons, and we were as well aware that *they have been answered.* It is with *Anonymous himself*, however, that we have now to do, and his arguments. Of his personalities, and his expressions of contempt, &c., we take no notice. They are worthy of his cause.