

damnable errors, idolatry and heathenism. If infallibility is needed to the Church, the practical question is: To whom was infallibility given? Our reply is: It was given to the Episcopate united with the Pope, and to the Pope when defining a point of revelation or morals for the whole Christian Church, that is, the privilege of infallibility is vested in the teaching body of the Catholic Church. In an Oecumenical Council, the majority of the Bishops, united with the Pope, is infallible. God alone of His own nature is infallible, but He can keep whomsoever He pleases from falling into error. This we believe He has done for the Church and for the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, that is, giving a definition of a point of dogma or morality binding on the whole Christian world. Infallibility is not impeccability. The Pope can sin, like other men, and in that case cannot be saved, except he should truly repent. The Pope is not called "your Holiness," not because he is personally holy, but because his office is a holy one. In his private capacity the Pope is fallible. As a writer, he may teach error. He is not infallible as a preacher. John XXII. expressed, in a sermon, an opinion which he afterwards condemned. The Pope is not infallible as a scientist, nor as a priest, nor as a bishop, nor as a temporal ruler, nor as a politician, nor as a legislator, nor in his relations with temporal princes, but he is infallible in his capacity of Supreme Head of the Church and Visible Vicar of Jesus Christ, when he explains or defines a point of revelation or morality, and the definition is addressed to the Universal Church. In no other case is the Pope infallible. The Pope can make no new dogmas; he cannot add to Divine Revelation; he is only the custodian and interpreter of Divine Revelation and of the moral law. He can neither add nor subtract from, nor in any way modify the teaching of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. It is a dangerous illusion to fancy that the Pope can modify Divine Revelation as he pleases; he can only remind us of it, if he thinks we were exposed to forget it, or explain it to us, if we were in danger to form a wrong conception of it. Infallibility does not forbid Biblical researches, scientific investigations, or new discoveries. Geologists, astronomers, philosophers, historians, metaphysicians, etc., may exercise their genius as much as they please. They may observe, experiment, analyse the rational proofs of revelation; the Pope and the Church will encourage and praise them, provided they do not go beyond their proper sphere of scientific investigation. In our lecture on "Science and revelation" we shall see that there can never be a real conflict between true science and revelation. The objection of Galileo we have answered in our lecture on toleration, and we refer our rev. friend to it. The proofs of the infallibility of the Church and of the Pope have not been examined by the Rev. J. Dickson—we advise him to read them and meditate upon them. Let us observe also that a definition *ex cathedra* can never be reformed. The Pope and the Church are always united in such a definition, and there can never be a conflict between them; the members and the head work in harmony together. Some particular members of the Church may rebel, as the famous Dollinger of lamentable memory, but they are the only sufferers, and this does not destroy the unity of the Church. The Episcopate *Ecclesia docens*, and the faithful, *Ecclesia discens* will always agree in all defined points. The Rev. J. Dickson tells us, with his usual pomposity: "With the Bible for a text book, infallibility is not wanted to teach religion." In this he disagrees even with the greatest lights of the Reformed Churches. Let me give only a few proofs of this. "The Word of God is abused," said Collier, in his ecclesiastical history of Great Britain. "How people squabble about the sense! how it is turned into wretched rymes, sung jangled in every ale-house and tavern! and all this in false construction and sounter-meaning to the inspired writers. I am sorry to perceive the readers of the Bible discover so little of it in their practice, for I am sure coarsty was never in a more languishing condition, virtue never at a lower ebb, nor God Himself never less honoured and worse served in Christendom" (Colliers Eccles. Hist., P. III., 5, p 208, Ed. London, 1852). If the Bible were sufficient as a text book to teach religion, as my rev. friend affirms, how is it people should squabble about the sense? How could they put false constructions upon it? How could they contradict the meaning of the sacred writers, if the Holy Ghost assisted their private judgment? If He does not, how can they rely on the explanation of it given by a minister who, like them, can put a false construction upon the sacred text and lead them astray? Does not this show that the Bible alone is not sufficient, as a text book, to teach religion, and that it requires an infallible authority to explain it? Luther himself is not less explicit: "This one will not hear of baptism," he says, "that one denies the sacrament, another puts a word between this and the last day; some teach that Christ is not God, some say this some say that; there are about as many sects and creeds as there are heads. No bumkin is so rude, but when he has dreams and fancies, he thinks himself inspired by the Holy Ghost, and must be a prophet. . . . If the world endureth much longer, we shall be forced, by reason of the contrary interpretations of the Bible which now prevail, to adopt again, and take refuge in the decrees of the councils, if we have a mind to maintain the unity of faith" (Luther II., Contra Zwingle). "Our answer," says the Rev. J. Dickson, "is unity in variety, not uniformity, is the

order of nature. Unity without variety would mean here stagnation and death." Indeed, with Bible reading and private judgment, you have variety enough; some deny the hierarchy, some the priesthood, some all the sacraments, some the Divinity of our Lord, some marriage, some celibacy and religious vows, some good works, some sin, etc. Is this the variety advocated by my rev. friend; if it is, the less we have of it the better. Beza did not, like the Rev. Dickson, find that variety beautiful, for he said:—"Our people are carried away by every wind of doctrine. If you know what their religion is to-day, you cannot tell what it may be to-morrow. In what single point are those churches which declared war against the Pope united among themselves? There is not one point which is not held by some of them as an article of faith, and by others rejected as an impiety" (Beza Ep. L. ii., Ep. 202). If it were I who should so speak, my friend would perhaps accuse me of exaggeration. In our own time, has the situation changed; from the Salvation Army to the Anglican Church do not all the sects contradict one another in the most vital points? Let this suffice to dispose of the affirmation of the Rev. J. Dickson, that "With the Bible as a text book, no infallible authority is wanted." But what about the "Cardinals?"

### The Cardinalate.

The Rev. Dickson says that "In the Church, as organised by Christ, there was, unfortunately, no provision made for Cardinals." Even if there was not, what would it show? Would it prove that the cardinalate is not a most wise and useful institution? But my friend is again mistaken. "In the Church as organised by Christ and His inspired Apostles there was some provision made for it." Let me explain how this was. In every Apostolic Church, there was an assembly of presbyters, composed of priests and deacons. They formed the Council of the Bishop, and assisted him with their advice. St. Ignatius, in many of his epistles, speaks of them. He tells the Christians of Philadelphia to obey the bishops, priests and deacons. He gives the same admonition to the Thracians. Later on, the members of the Bishops' Council were called Cardinals, because they were the permanent *incardinati* advisers of the bishop. In process of time, the canons of cathedral churches fulfilled the same office. St. Peter had his cardinals or advisers, and among them were St. Linus, St. Cletus, St. Clement, who succeeded him. Such is the origin of the Cardinalate. The only difference between the Bishops' advisers and those of the Pope, was that the formers advised the bishop for the affairs of the diocese only, whereas the advisers or cardinals of the Pope advised him for the government of the whole Church. The word Cardinal is used now for the advisers of the Pope. Sixtus V. limited the number of Cardinals to seventy. There are fifty cardinal-priests, 14 cardinal-deacons, and six cardinal-bishops. It is to the college of the cardinals that the choice of the successor to the Papacy is entrusted. They also administer the Church during the vacancy, but they can make no innovation, nor frame laws for the Church. In the absence of the Pope, the dean among the cardinals presides at the consistories. The various branches of the administration of the Church are presided by cardinals. Presbyterians have mimicked the Pope, and admitted laymen, instead of priests and deacons, as their advisers; is this a happy Reformation?

In our next lecture, we shall answer the Rev. J. Dickson's other objections against infallibility.

### TEMUKA.

(From an occasional Correspondent.)

WITH great sorrow I have to chronicle the death of Mr James Gillespie, of Temuka, which took place at Castle Hill, near Christchurch, on the first of March. Your readers will remember that some time ago I referred to the promising future which was before this young man (who was only 26 at the time of his death), who was then about to take charge of the Seddon State school. I referred to the excellent results his energy and ability had produced, and to-day I join his family and all who knew him in mourning his loss. Some time ago the deceased young man caught a bad cold, and he had to desist teaching. Not long ago he, in company with Miss Gillespie, whose devotion to her brother is worthy of note, went to the place mentioned above to recruit his health, but there he passed away in peaceful resignation, fortified with the rites of the Holy Church. He was brought to Temuka on the 3rd March, and on the following day was taken to the Church, where a Mass was celebrated, and the "Dead March in Saul" was played by Miss Quinn. The funeral was a very large one, being followed by school children, footballers, cricketers, and a large number of vehicles and public on foot. Innumerable wreaths were kindly sent by friends. The late Mr Gillespie was an enthusiast, and where good was to be done there were his sympathy and assistance. When Father Anby was raising an organ fund the young man whose loss we lament rendered material assistance, and when Father Malone's Debating Society was in existence he was the centre figure. He was respected and beloved by everyone, and in common with all, extend my sympathy with his good mother and family. Mrs Gillespie desires to tender

SMOKE "ROYAL COLORS" TOBACCO.

(IMPROVED AROMATIC.)