

cannot recognize it until the prophet or the saint has shown submissiveness to the established authority of the Church. On that rock many a prophet, and—who knows—a real prophet, has foundered. De Lamennais may have been a true prophet, but his will, his spirit of humility was not strong enough to restrain his imagination. He broke away.

In fact there is a difference between the liberalism he preached and that proposed by many Catholics today, including the Pope himself (c.f. the allocution of 6th December, 1953). De Lamennais made this into a principle: that all opinions should be given equal currency, that this in itself was a good thing. Modern Catholics, led by Pius XII, repudiate that statement of the case. They abhor error, and as such refuse to give it the freedom of the city of God in this world. But they allow that in the world such as it is, and granted the absolute right of the individual soul to true liberty of conscience, the suppression of all error would deny that just liberty; and so they would tolerate error, even though many consciences *de facto* would choose wrongly.

There were other prophets in the nineteenth century, and they had the necessary spiritual as well as the necessary intellectual and imaginative equipment: Newman, Lacordaire himself and Montalembert, Ketteler, St John Bosco most of all. Each age has its prophets and its *prophètes manqués*: a St Ignatius and a Luther, a St Francis of Assisi and a Joachim the Abbot. How are we to know which are the true prophets, which the false, unless we have some touchstone by which to judge? As Nestorius said of Eutyches on hearing he had been condemned in Rome: 'He had received judgment. What other judgment was requisite beyond that which the Bishop of Rome had made?'

COLUMBA CARY-ELWES, O.S.B.

THE CHURCH AND INFALLIBILITY. A reply to the Abridged 'Salmon'.

By B. C. Butler, Abbot of Downside. (Sheed and Ward; 12s. 6d.)

When the abridged edition of Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church* was re-issued over a year ago it was hailed in several responsible reviews as a devastating demolition of the Roman position. Indeed, the *Church Times* went so far as to imply that it had never been answered because it was unanswerable. The Abbot of Downside had called attention in a letter to *The Times Literary Supplement* to a series of articles written in reply to the original edition of Salmon, over fifty years ago, by the Very Reverend J. Murphy, D.D., in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. The *Church Times* reviewer brushed this aside by saying that had they met Dr Salmon's arguments adequately they would have been reprinted long ago. They have been reprinted this year in the same journal, and many will have now read them with satisfaction, for they are much

more than merely adequate. But an Irish Catholic review is scarcely read outside the Catholic community, and even among ourselves in England it has not a wide circulation, whereas Salmon's abridgement, as soon as it was published, was to be seen in every considerable bookshop.

Abbot Butler's answer to it is very welcome for this reason, and all the more because it is so cogent, and at the same time dispassionate, objective and free from acerbity. It is of course *ad hoc* in its approach, yet it has produced a most able and balanced exposition of the nature of the Church and its infallibility, as Catholics hold these truths, though his method is necessarily conditioned by Salmon's fundamental misconceptions of them. Primarily an answer to Salmon must deal with the argument from history advanced against the papal claims, but it must go deeper than this and show that Salmon's presuppositions arose from complete inability to see the Church as Catholics see it, or to understand the nature of its tradition and of the faith which receives and accepts it.

There are errors and mis-statements in the historical parts of the book which Abbot Butler duly corrects with equal fairness and scholarship, but the main strength of his reply lies in the force with which he shows how, to antiquity, a Church which was a visible concrete society, with a visible government and a united faith, incapable of internal division, was a matter of course, and that with this conception was bound up the idea of infallibility. Development is shown to be integral to the conception of a body of living truth, committed to the guardianship of a visible concrete society, and true development presupposes infallibility. Good use is made of Harnack to demonstrate that a Liberal Protestant historian of great learning and integrity can see tendencies in the early history of the Church which point conspicuously in the direction of the Catholic solution of the problem of Christian origins, though naturally Harnack's basic interpretation of them is widely removed from ours.

Newman receives scant justice or consideration from Salmon, who wholly misunderstood his view of development, but the balance is restored here and by considerable quotation the strength of Newman's position is made clear. Salmon wrote at a time when the published sources of the history of the Vatican Council were almost entirely hostile, though this does not altogether exculpate his many mis-statements and false deductions. Since the publication of Abbot Cuthbert Butler's *History of the Vatican Council*, in which use is made of official sources published after Salmon's book, and the story is written round Ullathorne's contemporary letters from Rome, there is no excuse for reliance on Salmon's version, and Abbot Butler makes this plain beyond

misunderstanding in his chapter devoted to the Council. In the chapter on the alleged argument in a circle, in a sense the *pièce de résistance* of Salmon's book, the reasoning is easily shown to be based on the fallacy of confusing infallibility with certitude.

Altogether this is a book admirably suited to its purpose. The authors of the now famous *Infallible Fallacies*, who seem to have been not unacquainted with Salmon's work, devoted exactly thirty lines of print to the subject of Papal infallibility; the silliest of them was the one which concluded that the doctrine is *nonsense*. It is to be hoped that they and many others will read Abbot Butler's book and that one of its principal effects will be greatly to diminish, if not entirely to abolish, Anglican dependence on Salmon, and the type of controversy it has encouraged.

HENRY ST JOHN, O.P

**SANCTIFYING GRACE.** By Aegidius Doolan, O.P., S.T.M. (Mercier Press, Cork; 7s. 6d.)

**ORDER AND LAW.** By Aegidius Doolan, O.P., S.T.M. (Dominican Publications, Dublin; 12s. 6d.)

These two books are in theme closely connected. Both are concerned with the springs of human enterprise and behaviour, grace being a newness of life coming from God, and law the standard of orderly life in community. The first is a useful introduction to a theological understanding of the mystery of sanctifying grace in the light of St Thomas's teaching. The earlier chapters dealing with the life of grace as expressed in Holy Scripture and in the Liturgy seem disappointingly slight. The following chapters have rather a different wave-length and are fuller and more concentrated. Possibly they presume too much in a reader who is unaccustomed to scholastic approaches and whose language is other than that of the English translation of the *Summa*. It cannot be too readily assumed that the names of Aristotle or Aquinas immediately strike a bell, or indeed mean very much as authorities to the uninitiated. And one would suppose that Latin and Greek quotations would be lost on them. This is the first volume of the 'Spiritual Life' Series published by the Mercier Press.

The second book, a more comprehensive work, is an elementary theological treatise on law and justice, following more or less the ground-plan of the *Summa Theologica*. The matter is brought down to earth by being related to some popular problems. The fullest treatment seems to be given to the subject of property. It seems certain that in the view of St Thomas, before the Fall there would have been common ownership. (cf. I, 98, i, ad 3.) What nowadays is called *social* justice is not another name for *general* justice. It includes not only what individuals