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DR. SALMON’S ‘INFALLIBILITY’

I

THERE are Catholic theologians who maintain, and not without good reason, that it is a note of the true Church that she should be calumniated and persecuted. And her Divine Founder insinuated this very clearly when He said to His disciples:—‘If you had been of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.’ Very early in the Church’s history she had bitter experience of the truth of these words; and every age of her existence supplies her with fresh experience of it.

But the shedding of Christian blood in hatred of Christian truth, has long since ceased to be fashionable, and if indulged in now, would, perhaps, call forth a protest from the Great Powers. The old hatred, however, finds expression still in a system of persecution, less openly cruel, but certainly more destructive of souls—the misrepresentation of Catholic doctrines and practices. Satan knows his enemy well, and in his warfare with the Church there is no truce. He gets his deputies to do his work, unceasingly, and by them no

1 The Infallibility of the Church. A Course of Lectures in the Divinity School at the University of Dublin, by George Salmon, D.D. London: 1890.
2 John xv. 19.
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means are left untried to weaken or destroy the faith of those who are within the Church or to hinder those who are without from entering her fold.

Amongst the assailants of the Church, there are very many the vehemence of whose declamation is in precise proportion to their ignorance of the doctrines they condemn. Such persons are rather objects for pity. They will not, of course, take the Church's teaching from herself; for then it may not be so easy to refute it. They persistently attribute to her doctrines which she does not hold, and so they readily refute the phantoms of their own creation. They act just like those pagans of whom Tertullian said: 'They are unwilling to hear, what, if heard, they could not condemn.'

And very often, too, the attack on the Church is made by men of undoubted ability, and of considerable acquirements, from whom, therefore, we should have expected accurate statements of our doctrines and intelligent treatment of the grounds on which these doctrines are held. And yet when we read their controversial works, we seek in vain for any of these qualities. They seem to understand the Church quite as little as the least educated of her assailants. The ability, the calmness, the spirit of dispassionate inquiry, which mark them in other departments of learning, seem to have completely abandoned them when they discuss the claims of the Catholic Church.

Dr. Salmon is a specimen of this class. He was known as a scientific scholar of some eminence. He is also the author of some articles in Dr. Smith's Dictionaries, and of an Introduction to the New Testament, which is a useful compilation, though often disfigured by needless exhibitions of anticatholic bias. His book on Infallibility will bring him no laurels. Indeed, judged by this book, Dr. Salmon seems to be a 'survival of the fittest' to remind us of a time when no charge was too vile to be made against Catholics, and believed of them on mere assertion; and when no vindication, however conclusive, of Catholic doctrines and practices would obtain a hearing. The book consists of a series of lectures delivered in Trinity College, Dublin, to young men preparing for the ministry of the
Protestant Church, and its aim is to show, that the claim to Infallibility made by the Catholic Church is groundless. The present writer's attention was called to Dr. Salmon's book on its first appearance some years since, but it did not seem to him to call for serious theological treatment, because the reasoning was of such a kind, as could not deceive any educated Catholic, whilst the cost and bulk of the volume made it highly improbable that it would circulate amongst the uneducated, who alone could be affected by it. As however it is now certain that determined and persistent efforts have been made to circulate it amongst Protestants to confirm them in their prejudices against the Catholic Church, to shut out the light of truth from them, and as it has been used also in attempting to unsettle the faith of converts to Catholicism; and is, furthermore, the storehouse whence proselytising parsons and Church Mission agents get their stock-in-trade, it may be well to call attention to its contents.

Père Hardouin is reported to have said to some friend who called him to task for his historical eccentricities: 'Do you think that I have been rising all my life at four o'clock in the morning, merely to say what everyone has been saying before me?' The learned Jesuit's mantle has certainly not fallen on Dr. Salmon. No long vigils were needed for the composition of his book. He has said nothing in it that was not often said by others before him. He does not seem to understand—he certainly does not state correctly—the Catholic doctrine on infallibility; and he has said little against it, that was not said, with more force and better taste, by Dr. Whately and Dr. Todd. Indeed, he quotes several long passages from Dr. Whately's Cautions for the Times without a syllable of change, and without the ceremony of an inverted comma. He draws largely on Usher and Chillingworth, and still more largely on Lesley and Littledale; he frequently adopts the reasonings and sometimes the words, of that theological luminary, Dr. Tresham Gregg. His parade of erudition can deceive only the ignorant as to the very second-hand character of his book. He seldom ventures on a proof of any of his statements;
no doubt, satisfied that his own assertion is a sufficient warrant of their truth. This, too, may have been the opinion of the students whom he lectured; but, after all, it is not fair to them to send them out into the world to carry on controversies with us, equipped only with the information supplied by Dr. Salmon. There are scattered through the book some smart sayings which may excite laughter amongst young men in a class-room, but do not help to prepare them for the more serious work that awaits them in the world abroad. Indeed, no fairly intelligent person can read through the lectures without feeling how little the students owe to their professor. Then, again, he frequently applies to us epithets, that are known to be insulting, and justifies himself by saying that he is speaking behind our backs. Well, this is all a matter of taste, and by all means let the Doctor indulge in his. It does us no harm. He volunteers graciously to make us one liberal concession. He will call us 'Roman Catholics' if we call him and his brethren 'Irish Catholics.' Truth forbids us, however, to make the compromise, and the Doctor would not know himself under the new title. He openly, and, indeed, needlessly, proclaims himself a 'Protestant' (page 9); but by 'Protestant' he means 'one who has examined into the Roman claims, and found reason to think them groundless' (page 10). This qualification limits very considerably the number of Dr. Salmon's co-religionists, and completely disposes of his claim to the title Catholic. And, though he is treating of an all-important subject, there is nothing in his book really deserving the name of argument—no sound reasoning, no dispassionate discussion, no elevating thought. 'My own opinion is'; 'For myself, I cannot admit'; 'I will tell you what seems to me'; 'My belief is'; 'In my opinion'—these are Dr. Salmon's *locri theologici*. The book teems with sinister insinuations against us, with misrepresentations of our doctrines and practices. It contains several statements regarding us that are made with reckless indifference to fact, and there is no relying on any of his quotations. Now, when a man like Dr. Salmon carries on the controversy
against us in such a fashion, and trains his students to do in like manner, what are we to expect from controversialists of the Lavender Kidds' school? We are to expect a perpetuation of that bigotry and intolerance of which Dr. Salmon's university has been, and is, the stronghold; and Dr. Salmon and his friends are to expect that our bishops shall be incessant in their warnings to Catholic young men not to enter a university in which the ruling spirit is of such a kind.

Dr. Salmon devotes an introductory lecture to the 'Controversy with Rome,' and he deplors that in recent times it has lost much of its interest. This decline of interest he attributes to various causes. 'Disestablishment,' of course, is one, which means, no matter how artfully Dr. Salmon may seek to conceal it, the loss of the 'loaves and fishes.' Then there has been 'a reaction against certain extreme anti-Romanist over-statements' (page 2), which is Dr. Salmon's nice name for the vile epithets applied to Catholics and Catholic doctrines by such pretty specimens of taste and truthfulness as Bale, and Fox, and Döpping. Then changes in Eucharistic doctrine and other High Church tendencies have had their influence on the decline of the controversy. And so, too, temptations to scepticism have made many weak-minded people 'recoil towards Rome, under the idea that they would be safer' (page 5). This, he tells us, has been the case with 'a majority of the perverts which Rome has made in later years' (page 5), including, of course, Cardinal Newman, and Cardinal Manning, and Dr. Ward. Well, if this disastrous indifference to 'controversy with Rome' is to continue, the fault shall not be Dr. Salmon's, for he proceeds to exhort the future parsons to apply themselves zealously to its study. And, in order to stimulate them more effectually, he says:—

I am not ashamed of the object aimed at in the Roman Catholic controversy; I believe that the Church of Rome teaches false doctrine on many points which must be called important, if anything in religion can be called important. . . . I count it then a very good work to release a man from Roman bondage.¹

¹ Infallibility, etc., p. 6.
And he offers the old golden rule for disposing of Romanism: The Bible, and the Bible only. 'Assuredly,' he says, 'if we desire to preserve our people from defection to Romanism there is no better safeguard than familiarity with Holy Scripture' (page 11). And again: 'I have said already that to an unlearned Christian familiarity with the Bible affords the best safeguard against Romanism' (page 15). That is, put a confessedly difficult book into the hands of an ignorant man, and he is quite certain to interpret it aright! And so certain is the Doctor of the all-sufficiency of the Bible that he says: 'I should be well pleased if our adversaries were content to fight the battle on that ground' (page 11). He must have calculated confidently on the ignorance of his audience when he made this astounding statement. He quotes Bellarmine, Dr. Murray, and Perrone; and does he find them declining the battle on that chosen ground of his? And though he would chose Scripture as his battle-ground, he is himself very sparing in Scriptural quotations; and whenever he happens to quote Scripture, the text is thrown up like a rocket, and left to its fate, without an attempt to show how it applies.

Considering the tone of these lectures, it is an agreeable surprise to find him giving his students the following prudent advice: 'You must be careful,' he says, 'also to distinguish the authorised teaching of the Roman Catholic Church from the unguarded statements of particular divines' (page 13). And he also cautions them against taking at second-hand extracts from the Fathers.

I find [he says] that those who originally made extracts from the writings of the Fathers were more anxious to pick out some sentence in apparent contradiction with the views of their opponents, than to weigh dispassionately whether the question at issue in the modern controversy was at all present to the mind of the author whom they quote, or to search whether elsewhere in his writings passages may not be found bearing a different aspect.¹

It would have been well that he had confirmed his advice by his own example, but the book affords abundant proof

¹ Infallibility, etc., p. 15.
that he has not done so. He devotes a great deal of his lectures to an attempt to identify the 'statements of particular divines' with 'the authorised teaching of the Catholic Church.' He labours to show that the Church is responsible for the statements made by St. Liguori in his *Glories of Mary*, and he states distinctly, 'that the attempt made to release the Church from that responsibility is not successful' (page 195). He labours to identify with the Church's official teaching the arguments used by Dr. Milner on the Rule of Faith. He more than insinuates that the Church is to stand or fall with Cardinal Newman's *Essay on Development* and *Grammar of Assent*. Again, the views of Gury, of Father Furniss, of the Abbé Louvet—and these, too, misrepresented—are set forth as the official teaching of the Church. But his transgressions in this department are venial, when compared with his quotations.

At page 20 he quotes 'Dr. Milner and other controversiasts,' as saying of the Immaculate Conception, 'that neither Scripture nor tradition contained anything on the subject.' The 'other controversiasts' are not named, but Dr. Milner, who is named, made no such statement, nor any statement from which it could be deduced. Towards the close of the thirteenth letter in the *End of Controversy*, Dr. Milner explains what Catholics mean by the Infallibility of the Church, and he adds:—

This definition furnishes answers to divers other objections and questions of Dr. P.—— The Church does not decide the controversy concerning the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing *absolutely clear and certain* concerning them either in the written or unwritten word.

Now, in saying that the Church 'sees nothing absolutely clear and certain,' Dr. Milner clearly implies that the Church saw some grounds for deciding the controversy, though *not absolutely clear and certain*; but Dr. Salmon, to suit his own purposes, omits the important words 'absolutely clear and certain,' and informs his students, that, on the testimony of Dr. Milner, the Immaculate Conception had no foundation in Scripture or Tradition; and that, therefore, on the
principle of Catholics themselves, the doctrine could not be defined at all! And this is the learned professor who assures his students, 'Our object is not victory but truth!' (page 13).

Again, in the same passage, page 20, in speaking of the definition of the Immaculate Conception, in A.D. 1854, Dr. Salmon says the 'doctrine was declared to be the universal ancient tradition of the Church.' Now the definition or declaration was made by Pius IX., and yet, in a note at page 270, the doctor tells us, 'Pio Nono's language was not, 'Receive this because it has been held semper ubique ab omnibus, but because it is laid down now at Rome by me.'" No doubt the students who had heard the first version ridiculed as false in Dr. Salmon's second lecture, and the contradictory version ridiculed as equally false in his fifteenth lecture, had forgotten their professor's beautiful consistency, and had added both statements to their polemical stock-in-trade, their aim, of course, being 'not victory but truth.'

Again, at page 58, he says of Cardinal Newman: 'He taught that one must not expect certainty in the highest sense before conversion, "Faith must make a venture, and is rewarded by sight."' The reference is to Loss and Gain and the words in the text are: 'Faith ever begins with a venture, and is rewarded with sight.' This quotation is adduced to show that, according to Cardinal Newman, one must be always doubtful as to the validity of the claims of the Church to our submission. Dr. Salmon's own version of the argument as given in the previous page (57) is: 'You must accept, without the least doubt, the assertions of the Church of Rome, because it is an even chance that she may be infallible.' The text from Loss and Gain is adduced to show that, according to Cardinal Newman, the above version of the Church's claim is substantially correct. Now the words quoted do not represent Cardinal Newman's teaching at all. They are the words of Charles Reding, who is not yet a Catholic, and separated from this context they are grossly unfair, even to him. They are used by Reding in

1 Loss and Gain, Part 3, c. i.
reply to a Protestant friend who is dissuading him from joining the Church, who tells him that he is under a delusion, and that he will find his mistake later on. Reding answers: 'If I have good grounds for believing, to believe is a duty. God will take care of His own work. I shall not be abandoned in my utmost need. Faith ever begins with a venture, and is rewarded with sight.' The words then, as used by Reding, distinctly contradict Dr. Salmon, for he maintains that one can have no good grounds for believing in the Church; whereas Reding clearly implies that he has good grounds. And Dr. Salmon takes as much of Reding's statement as can be distorted, and gives this garbled text to his students as the clear testimony of Cardinal Newman against the claims of the Catholic Church, and his 'object is not victory but truth.'

In the sixth chapter of the same Part 3, Dr. Salmon could have found, what he might, with some show of reason, have quoted as Cardinal Newman's teaching. Reding on his way to London to be received into the Church, meets with a priest and gets into conversation with him on the subject of which his soul was full. He quotes some of the very statements made by Dr. Salmon: he finds himself unable though wishing to believe, for he has not evidence enough to subdue his reason:—

'What is to make him believe?' the priest says shortly but quietly: 'What is to make him believe? the will, his will . . . the evidence is not at fault, all it requires is to be brought home and applied to the mind; if belief does not follow the fault lies with the will . . . Depend upon it there is quite evidence enough for a moral conviction, that the Catholic or Roman Church, and no other, is the voice of God. . . . I mean a conviction, and one only, steady, without rival conviction or even reasonable doubt; a conviction to this effect—the Roman Catholic Church is the one only voice of God, the one only way of salvation . . . . Certainty, in the highest sense [the certainty of faith], is the reward of those who, by an act of the will, and at the dictate of reason and prudence, embrace the truth when nature like a coward shrinks. You must make a venture. Faith is a venture before a man is a Catholic, it is a gift after it.'

Dr. Salmon is welcome to all the aid he can get from this, the real teaching of Cardinal Newman. In the face of
such evidence of the cardinal's teaching it needs a very
strong imagination to quote him as admitting that there is
neither reason, nor prudence, nor argument, guiding those
who join the Church, 'and that it is an even chance that she
may be infallible.' (page 57).

Now, when books that are accessible to all, are so mis-
quoted—so misrepresented by Dr. Salmon—what confidence
we have in his quotations from works that are rare and
accessible to few, such as the Fathers and obscure theo-
logians? Let us see. At page 28 he says:

The Roman Catholic advocates ceased to insist that the
doctrines of the Church could be deduced from Scripture, but the
theory of some early heretics, refuted by Irenæus, was revived,
namely, that the Bible does not contain the whole of God's
revelation, and that a body of traditional doctrine existed in the
Church equally deserving of veneration.

And in proof of this he gives in a note the following
quotation from St. Irenæus:

'When they [the Valentinians] are confuted from the Scriptures
they turn round and accuse these same Scriptures as if they were
not correct, nor of authority; for that they are ambiguously worded,
and that the truth cannot be discovered from them by those who
are ignorant of tradition. For they say that the truth was not
delivered in writing but viva voce; wherefore Paul also declared:—
"We speak wisdom among them that are perfect, but not the
wisdom of this world."'

And to make the analogy complete, Irenæus goes on to complain
that when the Church met these on their own ground of tradition,
then they had recourse to a theory of development, claiming to be
then in possession of purer doctrine than that which the Apostles
had been content to teach.

This long extract fully illustrates the controversial tactics
of Dr. Salmon. He tells his students that we have 'ceased
to insist' on a doctrine which he knows we never held
at all, and he tells them also that the doctrines which we
do hold, and which are defined in the fourth session of
the Council of Trent, is the same as that of the Valentinians,
and is involved in the condemnation of these heretics by
Irenæus. We hold that all the revelation made to the

1 Irenæus, 1. 3, c. 2.
Apostles was not committed to writing by them; that part of it remained unwritten, and was handed down by the Apostles to their successors, and remains in the custody of the Church as part of the deposit of faith. Was this the teaching of the Valentinians? Was this the doctrine condemned by Irenaeus? Certainly not, and Dr. Salmon must be quite well aware of this. The Valentinians, like the Gnostics, 'claim to have a secret tradition unknown to the Church at large. This would imply either that the Apostles did not know the whole truth, or that, knowing it, they did not communicate it to those whom they taught' (page 150). The same tenets are attributed to them by Dr. Salmon at page 358, and again at page 381, where he states that the argument of St. Irenaeus were directed against that theory.

Dr. Salmon then informs his students, in his second lecture, that the Catholic teaching was the Valentinian heresy, and was condemned by Irenaeus; but in his ninth, nineteenth, and twentieth lectures he admits that it was quite a different doctrine that was held by the Valentinians, and condemned by the saint. Clearly he had no fear that his students would detect his inconsistency or trouble themselves to test the quotation from Irenaeus; and he so manipulated the text as to conceal from them effectually what the saint really did condemn. He breaks off the quotation precisely when Irenaeus begins to explain his meaning, and instead of the words of the saint gives a gloss of his own which has not an atom of foundation in the text. Immediately after the words quoted by Dr. Salmon the text is:

And this wisdom each one of them says is that which he finds in himself—a fiction, forsooth; so that properly, according to them, the truth is at one time in Valentinian, at another in Marcion, at another in Crinthus, and subsequently in Basilides, or in this or that disputant who can say nothing salutary. For each of them, in every sense wicked, is not ashamed to preach himself, thus corrupting the rule of truth. But when we challenge them to that tradition which is from the Apostles, which is held in the Church by the succession of presbyters, they reject tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser than the presbyters, and even than the Apostles, and have discovered the genuine truth—that the Apostles have mixed up legal observances with the Saviour's words, . . . whilst they themselves know the
hidden mystery with certainty, and without mixture of error, which is, indeed, to blaspheme their Creator in a most impudent manner. Hence it comes to pass that they neither agree with Scripture nor tradition.

And in the opening of the next chapter (3) the saint explains the apostolic tradition preserved in the various Churches, and witnessed to by the succession of bishops of each Church; and then he gives the Roman Church and its bishops as the great reliable witness of apostolic tradition for the whole Church. And, with this text before him, Dr. Salmon does not hesitate to tell his students that St. Irenæus condemns the Catholic doctrine on tradition. No. St. Irenæus is a most eloquent vindicator of Catholic tradition, whilst he condemns, in scathing terms, the impudent assumption by the Valentinians of superior, hidden knowledge, which is something very much akin to that gustus spiritualis which Dr. Salmon and his evangelical friends claim as their guide to the discovery of Biblical truth. The attempt, then, to make a pervert of St. Irenæus, is a miserable failure, and, in making it, Dr. Salmon has shown a reckless indifference to the responsibilities of his position. He is training up young men to be controversialists, and is, by very questionable tactics, filling their minds with false views, which, when the day of trial comes, will expose them to certain defeat and to ridicule.

Those few specimens of Dr. Salmon’s quotations will give some idea of his reliability in that department, but before proceeding to deal with his theology it may be well to give a specimen of the spirit which he seeks to instil into his students. At page 11, he says:

And assuredly if we desire to preserve our people from defection to Romanism, there is no better safeguard than familiarity with Holy Scripture. For example, the mere study of the character of our Blessed Lord, as recorded in the Gospel, is enough to dissipate the idea, that there can be others, more loving, more compassionate, or more ready to hear our prayers than He.

Here, now, is a statement as clear as it can be made by implication, that we hold that there are some—perhaps many—‘more loving, and more compassionate, more ready
to hear our prayers,' than our Blessed Redeemer is! Now, what are Dr. Salmon's grounds for this monstrous insinuation? He has none. Impossible. He knows his students well; they are prepared to believe everything that is bad of Catholics. Their minds have been, from their earliest years, filled and saturated with anticatholic prejudices; and now their professor, with all the weight that years and experience, and a reputation for learning, can give to his teaching, levels at us the insinuation, Satanic in its character, that we believe there are others more kind and compassionate than our ever Blessed Redeemer. If the young men who imbibe such teaching, bring to the discharge of their clerical duties charity, or liberality, or enlightenment, they certainly do not owe it to their professor. His lectures are teeming with all the time-worn calumnies against Catholics. He has a case to make, and is not scrupulous as to the manner of making it. He has a tradition to maintain, and his arguments in its favour are judiciously selected to suit the tastes and capacity of his hearers. Scripture, fathers, theologians are made to say precisely what the lecturer wishes them to say, and all the time the lecturer is a victim to his love of truth!

The specimens already given of Dr. Salmon's controversial style would seem to dispense with the necessity of any detailed examination of his book. Can anything good come from Nazareth? And the examination is entered on, not for his sake, but for the sake of those who have been, or are likely to be, deceived by his statements. The headings of the several lectures give a very inadequate idea of the contents: they are full of repetitions, full of irrelevant matter; there is much declamation, and no logical order. It is, therefore, difficult so to systematize the matter as to bring it within reasonable compass for treatment, but it is hoped that nothing important will be over-looked.

Dr. Salmon is a firm believer in the all-sufficiency of the Bible. It is his supreme antidote to Romanism. He says:—

The first impression of one who has been brought up from childhood to know and value his Bible is, that there is no room for discussion as to the truth of the Roman Catholic doctrine. . . .
And assuredly if we desire to preserve our people from defection to Romanism, there is no better safeguard than familiarity with Holy Scripture, . . . . thus believing, as I do, that the Bible, not merely in single texts, but, in its whole spirit, is antagonistic to the Romish system.  

I have already stated that to an unlearned Christian, familiarity with the Bible affords the best safeguard against Romanism.

Now, it is strange that so firm a believer in the all-sufficiency of Scripture should not be able to cite Scripture to his purpose. 'Neither,' he says 'shall I bring forward the statements of Scripture which bear witness to its own sufficiency' (page 132). And, for the best of all reasons, because there are no such statements. And it would have been well for Dr. Salmon's reputation if he had been equally economical in his quotations from the Fathers in favour of his pet theory. He informs his students, for instance, that they had the sanction of several of the most eminent Fathers for thinking that what was asserted, without the authority of Holy Scripture, might be 'despised as freely as approved' (page 29); the quotation is repeated at greater length at page 147. 'This, because it has not authority from the Scriptures, is with the same easiness despised as approved.' The quotation is from St. Jerome's Commentary on the twenty-third chapter of St. Matthew, and is quite characteristic of Dr. Salmon. It is separated from its context and quoted to prove a doctrine which has not an atom of foundation in St. Jerome's text. The saint is explaining the thirty-fifth verse in which the Scribes and Pharisees are charged, amongst other crimes, with the blood of 'Zacharias the son of Barachias whom you killed between the temple and the altar,' and he asks who is this Zacharias? because he finds many of the name. He gives various opinions, one of them being that the Zacharias named was the father of John the Baptist. This opinion, he says, is grounded on 'the ravings of some apocryphal writers,' who say that Zachary was killed because he foretold the coming of the Redeemer. St. Jerome rejects this opinion on the ground that it had no foundation in Scripture, whereas each of the other opinions had some.

---

1 *Infallibility, etc.*, p. 11.  
He says: 'You may as easily despise it as approve it.' St. Jerome, then, consults the books of the Old Testament—the authentic Jewish record, in which genealogies were, as a rule, pretty fully recorded—to determine which of a certain number of Zacharias this was, who is mentioned by our Lord; and he rejects an opinion on the subject which has no foundation in that record, but rests solely on the 'dreamings of apocryphal writers.' Is Dr. Salmon prepared to reject anything not found in the Old Testament, for St. Jerome's quotation will confine him to that? St. Jerome searches the Old Testament to determine a certain historical fact, and from this Dr. Salmon argues that we must all search the Scripture, and Scripture only, to determine our faith. St. Jerome says: 'You may despise or approve the ravings of some apocryphal writers,' and hence Dr. Salmon informs his juvenile controversialists, 'you must despise and reject apostolical tradition, and you have St. Jerome's authority for doing so.' From controversialists so trained, the Catholic Church has nothing to fear.

Two other quotations from St. Jerome are given in the the same page (147), and for the same purpose. 'As we accept those things that are written, so we reject those things that are not written.' The words of St. Jerome are: 'As we do not deny those things that are written, so we reject those that are not written.' This quotation is from St. Jerome's letter against Helvidius who denied the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin, and who to prove his view appealed to St. Matt. i. 25: 'And he knew her not till she brought forth her first son.' Helvidius also appealed to the texts in which the 'brethren of the Lord' are mentioned. He inferred from the texts that the Blessed Virgin did not continue a virgin; St. Jerome quotes a number of texts of similar construction to show that the inference was groundless. He quotes the texts of St. Matthew to prove that our Lord was born of a virgin—this is what the text does say. Helvidius relies on an inference from the text; that is, on what the text does not say. So also from the texts referring to the 'brethren of the Lord,' Helvidius infers that they were natural brothers, though the texts do not
say so. St. Jerome proves from parallel texts that this
inference is groundless. With this in his mind, St. Jerome
says: 'Just as we do not deny the things that are written,
so we reject the things that are not written; that God was
born of a virgin we believe because we read it; that Mary
ceased to be a virgin we do not believe because we do not
read it.' St. Jerome says then: 'I accept what the texts
state; I deny what they do not state.' And this is the
authority offered to his students by Dr. Salmon as a proof
of the all-sufficiency of Scripture and as an argument against
tradition! The Doctor did not tell his students that in this
very letter against Helvidius St. Jerome actually appeals to
tradition as a proof of the perpetual virginity of the Blessed
Virgin. After dealing with the arguments of Helvidius,
St. Jerome says:—

But why am I dealing in trifles. . . . Can I not put before
you the whole long line of ancient writers—Ignatius, Polycarp,
Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and many other apostolic and eloquent
men who have written volumes full of wisdom against Ebion and
Valentinian, who hold this same opinion?

That the writer of this forcible and eloquent appeal to
tradition, should be quoted against tradition, shows how
applicable to Dr. Salmon are St. Jerome's words immediately
following the above quotation: 'Which volumes if you had
read you would know something better.'

The next text from St. Jerome is still more extraordinary
in its application: 'These things which they invent, as if by
apostolic tradition, without the authority of Scripture, the
sword of God smites' (page 147). One can fancy the joyous
amazement of the young theologians of Trinity, as they
listened to this quotation. How they must have been
shocked at the duplicity of Rome; but now her days were
numbered; they must have felt that Dr. Salmon himself
was the 'pillar and the ground of truth.' But, as in the
other quotations, their professor was blindfolding them here
again. The quotation is from St. Jerome's Commentary on
Aggæus, i. 11: 'And I called for a drought upon the land, and
upon the mountains, and upon the corn, and upon the wine,
and upon the oil,' etc. The saint is explaining the woes
threatened to the Jews for their neglect in not rebuilding the Temple. He says that instead of 'drought' the Septuagint has 'sword,' whilst the Hebrew is ambiguous, inasmuch as the consonants in both words are the same, and only the vowel points would distinguish them. He proceeds to show how the 'sword' is used in Scripture as a symbol of the punishment of sinners. He then goes on to give a mystical explanation of the other words of the text. The mountains are those who rise up against the knowledge of God; the corn and wine and oil are the inducements held out by heretics to flatter those whom they deceive. The oil also, he says, represents the heavenly rewards promised by heretics. And then comes the passage quoted by Dr. Salmon: 'And other things, too, which without authority or testimony of Scripture, but as if by apostolic tradition, they, of their own accord, find out and invent, the sword of God smites.' Now, clearly the things condemned here are grounded not on genuine apostolical tradition, but on traditions falsely called apostolical. The words used are *reperient autque confingunt*. The tradition, therefore, is spurious, a fiction, and not apostolical. And had Dr. Salmon continued his quotation for one other sentence, his students would have got specimens of the traditions falsely called apostolical. They were, among other things, certain extraordinary austerities, long fasts, vigils, mortifications, sleeping on the ground, etc., arising out of the example of Tatian in particular, *de Tatiani radice crescentes*. St. Jerome, then, condemns fanatical practices which had no foundation on apostolical tradition, notwithstanding the pretensions of those who proclaimed them. And on the strength of this passage Dr. Salmon informs his students that St. Jerome condemns apostolical tradition, and maintains the 'Bible and the Bible only,' though, as already shown, the saint is a most eloquent and powerful advocate of tradition. To defend the Bible, and the Bible only, must, to Dr. Salmon's mind, be a forlorn hope, when he has recourse to such arguments as these; and it is sad to see one in his position instilling such views into the minds of young men who are not likely to take the trouble of verifying...
his quotations. He is treating them badly. They came to him, it must be presumed, for knowledge, and he is making them more than ignorant. They ask him for bread, and he gives them a stone. In his first lecture he gave them a wise warning as to quotations from the Fathers, and in nearly every quotation in his book he does himself the very thing which he condemned.

Dr. Salmon gives at pages 119-121 a very long quotation from St. John Chrysostom on the reading of the Scriptures. It is very eloquent, very forcible, and very appropriate all through. But should another edition of Dr. Salmon's book be called for, it is respectfully suggested that he should insert at full length the Encyclical of Leo XIII., On the Sacred Scriptures. He will find it as forcible, and certainly a far more able exhortation to the reading and study of Scripture, than anything he can find in St. Chrysostom. The quotation of the Encyclical would no doubt cause some murmur in the class-room; and would be distasteful to many of his readers, as it would tend to disturb their settled conviction of the hostility of Catholics to the Bible; but such considerations should not weight with one whose 'object is not victory but truth.'

But there is one brief quotation from St. Chrysostom at page 90 which merits a passing notice: 'All things are plain and simple in the Holy Scriptures; all things necessary are evident.' This is taken from St. Chrysostom's Third Homily on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. The homily is a vigorous and eloquent attack on persons who decline to come to the church to hear the Scriptures read and explained. One of the excuses given for abstention from church was, that there was no sermon; and St. John asks what need is there of a sermon, 'all things are plain and simple in Scripture.' Now, St. Peter ought to be, at least, as good an authority on this matter as St. Chrysostom, and he very distinctly states that the Scriptures are not so 'plain and simple,' and that certain very serious consequences follow from the misinterpretation of them. Dr. Salmon agrees with St. Chrysostom, in holding that the Scriptures are very plain and simple, and such being the case, how does it
happen that in a certain very plain passage of Scripture, St. Chrysostom finds the doctrine of the Real Presence, whilst in the very same passage Dr. Salmon finds the doctrine of the Real Absence? If Dr. Salmon be right in his view, then St. Chrysostom is wanting either in intelligence or in honesty; whereas if St. Chrysostom be right, then Dr. Salmon is not so far-seeing as some people fancy, or not so zealous in his pursuit of Biblical truth. The Doctor can maintain that St. Chrysostom is right, only by the humiliating confession that he is wrong himself. It may be too much to expect the Doctor to put the matter in this way to his juvenile theologians; but it is the true way to put it; and they would be all the better prepared for future contingencies, if they were told the truth, and nothing but the truth. Dr. Salmon says truly that St. Chrysostom was a most eloquent preacher, and such preachers are sometimes carried away by their eloquence into slight exaggerations. Of this we have a conspicuous instance in St. Chrysostom’s Seventeenth Homily on St. Matthew, where he distinctly condemns even a necessary oath. His words are: ‘But what if someone shall exact an oath, and shall impose a necessity for taking it?’ and he answers: ‘Let the fear of God weigh more with him than any necessity.’ Now this is clearly an exaggeration occurring in an eloquent invective against swearing; and the passage quoted by Dr. Salmon may be another instance of it. A few sentences lower down in Dr. Salmon’s quotation St. Chrysostom insists on the plainness of the historical portions of Scripture, and, perhaps, his general statement may be limited to such portions. But, at all events, in the very opening sentence of the next homily (IV.) he distinctly admits that St. Paul’s doctrine is obscure—a statement which no one, except for controversial purposes, would think of denying. And as Dr. Salmon himself says at page 124: ‘I suppose there is not one of them [Fathers] to whose opinion on all points we should like to pledge ourselves,’ he cannot deny the same liberty to others, especially in a case where the opinion is so notoriously opposed to facts. St. Athanasius, too, is put forward as a witness to the all-sufficiency of Scripture. He is quoted as
saying: 'The holy and inspired Scriptures are sufficient in themselves for the preaching of the truth' (page 154). This is from the Oratio Contra Gentes, and in its dexterous manipulation Dr. Salmon appears at his best. The text is:—

Sufficient indeed of themselves for indicating the truth, are both the sacred and inspired Scriptures, and the very many volumes written on the same matter by most holy teachers, which if one shall study, he will to some extent understand the sense of the Scriptures, and perhaps attain that knowledge which he desires.

The Oratio was addressed to Macarius, a learned man who seems to have asked St. Athanasius for an explanation of the Christian creed; and the saint tells him, that he may perhaps be able to get the knowledge he requires from Scripture interpreted by the writings of the Fathers—that is, from Scripture and tradition this learned man may, perhaps, be able to get what he is to believe. Dr. Salmon quietly suppresses the reference to the Fathers—tradition—and represents Athanasius as saying that the required knowledge can be got from Scripture alone. A learned man may get his faith from Scripture and tradition combined, according to Athanasius himself; therefore, argues Dr. Salmon, according to St. Athanasius even an ignorant man can get his creed from the Bible alone! Of course the students took the version of the Regius Professor, 'and sure he is an honourable man.'

But all Dr. Salmon's tall-talk about the Bible comes to a stand-still, when the plain question is put to him: How does he know that the Bible is the Word of God?—how does he know that the Bible is inspired? He is very indignant with Catholics for putting this question, and he frequently reproaches them with using 'the infidel argument.' But Catholics answer 'the infidel argument,' he cannot. St. Augustine put the answer tersely and truly when he said: 'I would not believe the Gospels, unless the authority of the Church moved me to do so.' Dr. Salmon does not believe in the authority of the Church, and cannot therefore give such an answer. He puts the Bible on a level with Livy or Tacitus, and there he must leave it. He
cannot appropriate our conclusions without submitting to our arguments. This matter will come on for fuller treatment later on.

But then Dr. Salmon 'will argue still.' The Church of Rome, he says, 'is against the Scriptures because she feels the Scriptures are against her' (page 12); 'The Church of Rome has very good reason to discourage Bible-reading by their people' (page 123), etc. This is the old, old story, a thousand times refuted, contradicted by the most notorious facts of ecclesiastical history; and yet as often repeated with cool confidence by controversialists of the Dr. Salmon type. In fact, the case against the Catholic Church is so clear to Dr. Salmon, that he does not see the necessity of adducing any proof. In a note at page 123, he says, 'I have not troubled myself to give formal proof of the discouragement of Bible-reading by the modern Church of Rome,' etc. But he quotes the Fourth Rule of the Index to show that we 'are now often apt to be ashamed of this practice' (note, p. 123). Considering the general character of Dr. Salmon's quotations it would be idle to expect him 'to be ashamed' of the manner in which he has quoted this Rule. He omits from it a vitally important expression, and the omission enables him to completely misrepresent the object of the Church in making that Rule. The Rule is: 'Since it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue be permitted everywhere without distinction, owing to the rashness of men, more evil than good will arise from it,' etc. Now the expression, 'on account of the rashness of men'—*ob hominum tementatem*—clearly gives the motives of the Church in making the law. Bad men abuse the best of God's gifts, and the Church had abundant experience to convince her that bad men had abused the Bible in the vulgar tongue, and with this knowledge she seeks to check the abuse by permitting the Bible in the vulgar tongue to those only whose character is such that they are likely to be served and not injured by the concession. But Dr. Salmon omits the expression, 'on account of the rashness of men,' and leaves the future spiritual guides of Irish Protestants to infer that Catholics hold that the evils come from the Bible in itself, and not from the abuse of it
by bad men. Now, to restrict the reading for the motive here openly alleged by the Church indicates a reverence for the Bible, and a desire to save souls from spiritual ruin; but to restrict it for the motive cleverly insinuated by Dr. Salmon indicates a fear and dislike of the Bible in itself—the false charge which Dr. Salmon labours to fasten on the Church, and which he regards so clear as not to need even an attempt at proof. He quotes the Rule, he says, from Dr. Littledale. Surely he has the original in his own library, and he owed it to his own position as Regius Professor of Divinity, not to take his authority as second-hand, and that a hand so soiled as Dr. Littledale's. Dr. Littledale wrote for the rabble, whose sole article of faith is hatred of the Catholic Church; but Dr. Salmon is lecturing young men of some education, training them to be controversialists, and yet he confirms them in their ignorance of the very doctrines they will have to assail. Dr. Salmon is notoriously wrong in his version of our theory and practice in this matter, and it is difficult to fancy him ignorant of either. The Fourth Rule of the Index, comes to Catholics as a law, made by competent authority—the Church—legislating for a good end, and within her own proper sphere. The law, therefore, is binding on them, and if they refuse to obey it, they render themselves indisposed for absolution, and the Church treats them as such. There was no restriction made by the Church on the reading of the Scriptures until the sacred volume began to be abused. When corrupt translations of portions of it began to appear and to be abused, it became the clear duty of the Church to check the abuse, and to warn her children against taking in spiritual poison from a fancied source of life. Some such restrictions were made long before Luther's time. But at that time the prevalence of corrupt translations, made in the interests of heresy, led to the legislation of the Fourth Rule of the Index; and no unprejudiced person can find, in that legislation, anything but a wise and necessary precaution against the gross and soul-destroying abuse of God's Word. When the religious excitement of that time had somewhat abated, the law was modified by Pope Benedict XIV., and it has been still more
modified in our time by Pope Leo XIII. But Dr. Salmon may take it as a fact, that a Catholic is as free to read a Catholic vernacular Bible as he is to read his own. But it must be a Catholic Bible, published under proper ecclesiastical sanction, and with explanatory notes from fathers or approved theologians. Dr. Salmon then is completely wrong in his version of our theory, and is equally wrong as to our practice. If he ever happens to visit any of his Catholic neighbours he will find them possessed of a Catholic Bible, and quite unconscious of any prohibition as to its use. He will find Catholic Bibles sold by all Catholic booksellers, and at a very reasonable price. If he consult some authority more reliable than Dr. Littledale he will find that for the past hundred years several very valuable editions of the Catholic Bible have been published, and circulated, without the slightest indication of opposition on the part of the 'modern Church of Rome.' And if for some time previous to that period he should find few Catholic Bibles in Ireland, Dr. Salmon cannot be ignorant of the cause. It was not 'the discouragement of Bible-reading by the modern Church of Rome,' (page 121), but the worse than pagan tyranny of the Church to which Dr. Salmon himself professes to belong. The spirit that inspired the Penal Laws against Catholics, and that regulated their administration was the spirit of the Protestant Church, and had its focus in Dr. Salmon's own university; and it ill-becomes him to reproach us with the consequences of that degrading system. Our schools were burned, our teachers hanged or exiled; no Catholic Bible, or other Catholic book could be published in the country, except by stealth, and at fearful risk to the publisher and possessor. The law aimed at making us unable to read, and left us nothing to read that was not anticatholic. Protestant education we could have got, and Protestant Bibles too, and we would be well paid for accepting them. But we spurned the bribe, we defied the laws, and kept the faith. These few plain well-known facts, entirely overlooked by Dr. Salmon, help to explain our practice as to Bible-reading, at a time not so long past as to have left no impression on Dr. Salmon's memory. To the Catholic Church the sacred character of the Scriptures is a much
more vital matter than it is to Dr. Salmon's communion. She has always cherished it with affection; she has preserved it for the long ages before Dr. Salmon's Church came into existence. Her priests and her monks transcribed it, illustrated it, explained it. She is its sole legitimate interpreter now, as she has been since her foundation. Restriction she certainly has put on its reading, to ensure that it should not be abused; that it should be read with due reverence and with proper disposition. The Catholic Church will not permit ignorant men to dogmatise on the most sacred subjects, and to quote the Bible to confirm their ravings. The wisdom of her action in this matter is abundantly confirmed by the chaos existing in Dr. Salmon's own communion, where unrestricted Bible-reading has given everyone a creed for himself—where 'orthodoxy is one's own doxy and heterodoxy is everyone else's doxy.'

Does Dr. Salmon think that the Bible is enhanced as a standard of truth by the profane brawlings of Salvationists and of Sunday street-preachers? Between the Protestantism of Lord Halifax or 'Father' Puller and the Protestantism of Dr. Salmon or Mr. Kensit, there are, no doubt, many shades of opinion, not in very exact harmony; but all alike, and with equal logic, spring from that principle which Dr. Salmon regards as the 'best safeguard against Romanism' (page 15)—and he might have added, with much more truth, as 'the best safeguard against' the possibility of 'one fold and one shepherd.' He admits 'that the members of so many different sects each find in the Bible the doctrines they have been trained to expect to find there' (page 110), and in this, as in other matters, 'the tree is known by its fruit.'

Dr. Salmon thus is completely notoriously wrong, both as to our theory and practice as regards the reading of the Bible. But it would be unfair to him to pass over the following pretty specimen of his theological reasoning, in which he gives his students the key to our alleged hostility to the Bible:

If you let people read the Bible, you cannot prevent them from reflecting on what they read. Suppose, for an example, a Roman Catholic reads the Bible: how can you be sure that he will not notice himself, or have it pointed out to him, that, whereas Pius IX, could not write a single Encyclical in which the name of
the Virgin Mary did not occupy a prominent place, we have in the Bible twenty-one Apostolic letters, and her name does not occur in one of them.\(^1\)

And suppose that a Catholic does read the Bible, he finds it stated there that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God, full of grace, and blessed amongst women; and 'how can you be sure that he will not notice himself or have it pointed out to him' that in the whole course of the Bible no other creature is addressed in such language? May not a Catholic, then, infer from all this that the Blessed Virgin is more holy, more perfect, than other creatures, and, therefore, entitled to some higher honour than they? And the silence of the twenty-one Apostolic letters does not in the slightest degree affect this inference. Therefore, the Catholic who reads the Bible actually finds in it the foundation of his devotion to the Blessed Mother of God. This must be disappointing to Dr. Salmon. But Dr. Salmon himself believes in the fallibility of the Church, in the all-sufficiency of Scripture, in justification by faith alone, and these doctrines 'do not occur in one of the twenty-one Apostolic letters.' Now, if he may believe those doctrines, notwithstanding the silence of the 'twenty-one Apostolic letters,' why should he make that silence an argument against Catholic devotion to the Blessed Virgin? Dr. Salmon knows quite well the occasional character of those Apostolic letters. Each was called forth by some special circumstances, and in none of them is there a *cursus theologiae*. The silence of such letters, then, is no argument against the honour given by Catholics to the Blessed Mother of God, and Dr. Salmon has gained nothing for his Bible-reading theory by casting his last stone at her. He probably thought the argument good enough for his students, and they, too, may have thought it a master-piece of logical acumen; but once they get into controversy with any well-educated Catholic, they are certain to be rudely awakened to the defective character of their early training, and made to feel that, instead of arguing against Catholic doctrines, they are simply beating the air.

[To be continued.]

J. Murphy, D.D.

---

\(^1\) *Infallibility, etc.*, page 123.
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DR. SALMON'S 'INFALLIBILITY' II

Dr. Salmon's second lecture is on 'The Cardinal Importance of the Question of Infallibility.' 'The truth is,' he says, 'that the issues of the controversy mainly turn on one great question, which is the only one that I expect to be able to discuss with you: I mean the question of the Infallibility of the Church. If that be decided against us, our whole case is gone' (page 17). And the book itself is named The Infallibility of the Church: and yet, in the opening sentence of the twenty-second lecture (page 424) he says, 'the question of the Infallibility of the Pope is that with which I am directly concerned in this course of lectures.' This is an ordinary instance of the confusion that is manifested, all through Dr. Salmon's book; and, even without studying the volume, one may safely infer, that the Infallibility of either Church or Pope, is not likely to suffer much from the attack of one, who really does not know which of the two he is assailing. Random shooting of this sort is not likely to be effective. Perhaps, however, it was his keen attention to our movements that made him so oblivious of his own; and notwithstanding the indefiniteness of his aim, he is sanguine of success. We are, according to him, impervious to argument; continually changing our ground; retreating from one post to another; and our present condition, he says, is this: 'The Romish champions, beaten out of the open field, have shut themselves up in this fortress of Infallibility, where, as long as their citadel remains untaken, they can defy all assaults' (page 46). Our fate is, however, sealed; for he says:

But, though it is on the first view, disappointing, that our adversaries should withdraw themselves into a position, seemingly inaccessible to argument, it is really, as I shall presently show, a mark of our success, that they have been driven from the open field and forced to betake themselves into this fortress. And we
have every encouragement to follow them and assault their citadel, which is now their last refuge (page 24).

And the Doctor contemplates with delight, the prospect of our immediate annihilation, saying:—'This simplification then of the controversy realises for us the wish of the Roman tyrant, that 'all his enemies had but one neck. If we can but strike one blow the whole battle is won' (page 18). Dr. Salmon is in a very heroic state of mind; and, as he is a veteran in the service, his students must have expected wonderful results, when he is let loose on the Catholic Church. Well, the siege has gone on for a long time, and the fortress holds out defiantly still. No flag of truce has been raised, no signal of distress has been seen. And Dr. Salmon may rest assured, that when he shall have been gathered to his fathers, and his book quite forgotten, that fortress will still stand secure. She has a higher warrant than Dr. Salmon's to ensure her triumph over the 'gates of hell.'

Dr. Salmon has a theory of the Church, which, if he could only establish it on a solid basis, would save him a great deal of labour, and would completely remove the necessity of disproving Infallibility. He sees no reason why the Church should not be a plastic institution which would change with the times, and adapt itself to the habits of good society. He says:—

May it not be supposed for example that He (God) wisely ordained that the constitution of His Church should receive modifications, to adapt it to the changing exigencies of society; that in times when no form of government but monarchy was to be seen anywhere, it was necessary, if His Church was to make head successfully against the prevalent reign of brute force, that all its powers should be concentrated in a single hand: but that when, with the general spread of knowledge, men refused to give unreasoning submission to authority, and claimed the right to exercise some judgment of their own, in the conduct of their affairs, the constitution of the Church needed to be altered in order to bring it into harmony with the political structure of modern society (pages 40, 41).

Again:—

Let us liberally grant, that an ecclesiastical monarchy was the
form of government best adapted to the needs of the Church at the
time, when, in temporal matters, the whole civilized world was
governed by a single ruler; and yet it might be utterly unfit for her
requirements, in subsequent times, when Europe had been broken
up into independent kingdoms; and we might be as right now, in
disowning Papal authority as our ancestors were in submitting to
it (page 369).

This is none of your cast-iron Romanism, but an up-to-
date progressive Church, marching hand in hand with
civilization, and never offending against good manners by
insisting on any definite articles of faith as necessary con-
ditions of membership. Such a weather-cock Church would
be sufficiently fallible to satisfy even Dr. Salmon and his
pupils, and would have the unique advantage of showing
that they are as right in rejecting Catholic doctrines as their
ancestors were in professing them. On reading such
passages one is forcibly reminded of St. Hilary's indignant
exclamation (Ad Const.)—O, tu sceleste quod ludibrium de
Ecclesia facis?

Dr. Salmon is quite right in insisting on the 'cardinal
importance of the question of Infallibility.' If the Church
be infallible, that doctrine is a sufficient warrant for the truth
of every other doctrine she teaches; and discussion on
details becomes needless, and Catholics, who believe that
document, accept the Church's teaching without the slightest
difficulty or hesitation. But Dr. Salmon is not content
with *a priori* considerations of the importance of the doctrine.
He says:—

I should have been convinced of it from the history of the
Roman Catholic controversy, as it has been conducted in my own
lifetime. When I first came to an age to take a lively interest in the
subject, Dr. Newman and his coadjutors, were publishing, in the
*Tracts for the Times*, excellent refutations of the Roman doctrine on
Purgatory, and on some other important points. A very few years
afterwards without making the slightest attempt to answer their
own arguments, these men went over to Rome, and bound them-
selves to believe, and teach as true, things which they had them-
selves proved to be false. . . . While the writers of the *Tracts*
were assailing with success different points of Roman teaching, they
allowed themselves to be persuaded, that Christ must have pro-
vided His people with some infallible guide to truth; and they
accepted the Church of Rome as that guide, with scarcely an
attempt to make a careful scrutiny of the grounds of her pretensions (pages 18, 19).

This unconditional surrender, Dr. Salmon attributes to the craving for an infallible guide, and 'the craving for an infallible guide arises from men's consciousness of the weakness of their understanding' (page 47). It would be amusing if the matter had not been so serious to find Dr. Salmon charging Newman, Ward, Oakley, and Dalgairns, with 'weakness of understanding,' with going over to Rome 'without making the smallest attempt to answer their own arguments' against her, and with 'scarcely an attempt to make a careful scrutiny of the grounds of her pretensions.' Dr. Salmon frequently refers to Newman's Essay on Development, and he may, therefore, be presumed to have read it; and on the very first page of it he could have seen a statement of the writer's objections to Rome, and immediately following it are these words:—'He little thought, when he so wrote, that the time would ever come, when he should feel the obstacle, which he spoke of as lying in the way of communion with the Church of Rome, to be destitute of solid foundation.' Therefore, before Dr. Newman joined the Catholic Church he satisfied himself that his arguments against her were 'destitute of solid foundation,' though according to Dr. Salmon he did not make 'the smallest attempt to answer' them. Again, on the last page of the Essay, after his magnificent analysis of Patristic teaching, Newman says: 'Such were the thoughts concerning the "Blessed Vision of Peace," of one whose long-continued petition had been, that the Most Merciful would not despise the work of His own hands, nor leave him to himself:—while yet his eyes were dim, and his breast laden, and he could but employ reason in the things of Faith.' And after a like analysis, in the twelfth of his Lectures on Anglican Difficulties, Newman says:—

What was the use of continuing the controversy, or defending my position, if, after all, I was but forging arguments for Arius and Eutyches, and turning devil's advocate against the much-enduring Athanasius, and the majestic I.o.e? Be my soul with the saints! and shall I lift up my hand against them? Sooner
may my right hand forget her cunning, and wither outright as his who once stretched it out against a prophet of God:—perish sooner a whole tribe of Cranmers, Ridleys, Latimers, and Jewels—perish the names of Bramhall, Usher, Taylor, Stillingfleet and Barrow, from the face of the earth—ere I should do aught but fall at their feet, in love, and in worship, whose image was continually before my eyes, and whose musical words were ever in my ears, and on my tongue (page 306).

To charge the writer of these magnificent passages—the writer of the Apologia—who had for years devoted all the energy of a giant mind to the earnest pursuit of truth—to charge such a man with going over blindly to Rome without an attempt to answer his own arguments against her, or to examine her claims—is a specimen of recklessness, all the more extraordinary in such a theologian as the writer of these lectures. But he has a much graver charge against Dr. Newman. In a note at page 22, he says:—

I never meant to impute to Newman insincerity in his profession of belief.

But how are we to understand the following?

When Dr. Newman became a Roman Catholic it was necessary for him, in some way, to reconcile this step with the proofs that he had previously given that certain distinctive Romish doctrines were unknown to the early Church. . . . . This is the object of the celebrated Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, which he published simultaneously with his submission to the Roman Church (page 31). . . . The book having been written before he had yet joined them (page 33).

Now, whatever Dr. Salmon meant by the words quoted, any ordinary reader will take them to mean, that, Dr. Newman had accepted all the teaching of the Catholic Church—had become a convinced Catholic—but that he felt that some justification of his conduct was rendered necessary, by his previous career, and that in order to provide this justification he wrote the Essay on Development, and published it simultaneously with his public reception into the Church, though he had been during the time of its composition a Catholic on conviction—not publicly, for he had not yet made his public submission, but secretly. This is the meaning of Dr. Salmon’s words. ‘When Dr. Newman
became a Roman Catholic it was necessary,' etc., therefore he was a 'Roman Catholic,' at least secretly, before the necessity arose for justifying his action. 'This is the object of the essay' etc., therefore while he was engaged in providing this justification he was a Catholic, at least secretly; and when he had his justification ready, he published it, and made his public submission to the Roman Church simultaneously. This is the ordinary logical meaning of Dr. Salmon's words, and if there be not a charge of 'insincerity in the profession of belief' conveyed by them, words have no meaning. But the charge was answered, once for all, and it is amazing that the spectre of Kingsley, on the pillory, should not have made Dr. Salmon more cautious. Dr. Newman, then, did not leave his own arguments against the Church unanswered—he pronounced them to be 'destitute of solid foundation,' like those of the 'devil's advocate'; he did not go over to Rome without inquiry; he devoted to the inquiry many years of hard study, and of constant prayer.

One would expect that, as Dr. Salmon undertook to convince his students of the cardinal importance of the doctrine of Infallibility, he would have explained the doctrine to them. They could not know its importance unless they knew what it really was. And, moreover, as he professed to be training them to refute the doctrine, he should have told them what it was. But, instead of doing so, he devotes a very long lecture to a series of mis-statements, well calculated to intensify their ignorance of Catholic teaching, and to strengthen their prejudices against the Catholic Church. Had he put the doctrine clearly and correctly before them, any student of average ability could have seen for himself that the professor's declamation left it untouched. He said to them: 'An infallible Church does not mean a Church which makes no mistakes, but only one which will neither acknowledge its mistakes nor correct them' (page 111). There was no necessity for devoting twenty-three lectures to proving the fallibility of such a Church. It is openly proclaimed. But the teaching of the Catholic Church is not so easily disposed
of; and in order to put that teaching clearly before him, it is necessary to call Dr. Salmon’s attention to a few facts that ought to be regarded as first principles by anyone who accepts the New Testament as a truthful record. When our Blessed Redeemer came amongst us, He proved His divinity, the reality of His divine mission, and the consequent truth of His doctrines, by a series of extraordinary miracles, and by prophecies fulfilled in Him, and spoken by Him, and subsequently verified. For those who witnessed His miracles, and yet rejected His doctrines, there was no reasonable excuse; and He Himself frequently said so. He gathered to Himself a number of disciples,—the nucleus of His Church—and out of the number, He selected some whom He trained specially to be the future teachers of that Church. He did not write a book which they were to study in order to learn His doctrines. He Himself, in person, taught them orally. In proof of the truth of His teaching, He frequently appealed to the works which He had done; and He exacted from His followers, full unconditional faith in His doctrine, and obedience to His moral precepts; and this faith and obedience, He exacted as a necessary condition of salvation. This system of oral, personal teaching, our Lord continued during His earthly career; and when that career was about to close He commissioned His Apostles to continue His work and His method as well. He gave them His own authority, and sent them forth to teach as His ambassadors. They were to continue His mission,—that which He had got from His Eternal Father,—and the Holy Ghost was to be with them to ensure their success; and He promised that signs and wonders, even greater than His own, would confirm their mission. And after our Lord’s ascension, we find the Apostles carrying out their commission, both in its matter and in its manner, exactly as they were commanded. They went forth teaching the truths that had been revealed to them; they represented themselves as His legates, teaching His doctrine, manifesting His power. The miracles they performed were, they said openly, not performed by any power of their own, but by His power and in His name.
They did not write books and hand them to their disciples to be studied by them in order to learn the truths of faith. Few of them wrote anything, and the Church was well established, and widely diffused, before any of them wrote a line at all. Like their Divine Master they taught orally, personally, the truths of faith; and like Him, too, and in His name, they exacted from their followers faith in their teaching and obedience to their moral precepts. And this obedience of faith, too, they exacted as an absolutely necessary condition of salvation. Not for any words of their own, but for God's Word revealed to them, did the Apostles demand acceptance and faith; and they gave abundant proof of their divine commission to teach in His name; nor did they tolerate amongst their followers a rejection of any portion of their teaching, or any divergence from it. Thus, then, the first Christians believed the Word of God on the authority of God Himself; and that authority was brought home to them by ambassadors divinely commissioned to do so, and divinely assisted in doing so. The teaching authority of the Apostles imposed on their followers the obligation of believing; the obedience of faith. There was thus an authoritative teaching body established, and the members of the Church accepted, and were bound to accept, from that teaching body the truths of faith, and moral principles, and the explanations of both. Thus was God's Kingdom on earth established; supernatural in its origin, for it is founded by God Himself; supernatural in its life, the Spirit of God working in it through faith and grace; and supernatural in its end, which is God's glory and man's salvation. The kingdoms of this world change with time and die away; the kingdom of to-day may become the republic of to-morrow, and the pandemonium of some day in the near future. Not so the Kingdom of God. Like the mustard-seed in the Gospel, it becomes the spreading tree, giving shelter to all that seek it; but its identity remains. It is ever the same—a living, active teaching body, and such it shall continue till its mission shall have been accomplished. When the Christian faith was for some
time established, and already widely spread, the Gospels were written, giving our Lord's personal history and some of His teachings. The Epistles, too, were written, called forth by special circumstances, and fragmentary in doctrine. They were so far instruments of Revelation in the custody of the Church, which lived and taught as before. This was the system, the method of teaching and propagating the faith, adopted by our Lord, and continued by His Apostles. It is, therefore, the Christian method and system, and there is not in Christian antiquity the slightest grounds for any departure from that system. Such as it was, it was our Lord's institution, and men could not change it; and such a departure from it as would strip the teaching Church of her authority, and condemn her to silence, and would substitute, as sole source and sole teacher of faith, a written book that is dumb and speaks not—such a change would be a subversion of our Lord's institution, would be anti-Christian, a triumph for the 'gates of hell.'

We, therefore, believe that the entire body of Revelation, the entire, complete deposit of faith, was entrusted by our Lord to His Church; that he made her its guardian, interpreter, and teacher; and that, in her office as such, He promised efficaciously to protect her against error or failure till the end of time. In virtue of this promise the Church is infallible; that is, she is exempt not merely from actual error, but from the possibility of error, in believing and in teaching the divine deposit of faith. The Christian Revelation terminated with the Apostles, and the deposit of faith comprises all that was revealed to them, and nothing that was not revealed to them. It can receive no addition; it can suffer no diminution; it is in the Church's keeping; and she is its infallible custodian and teacher. The Church may be considered as a body of believers, embracing both the teachers and the taught, but regarding them as believers; and, so regarded, the Church is infallible in believing the whole deposit of faith. Whatever it believes to be of faith is so certainly, and whatever it rejects as opposed to faith is so with equal certainty. It is thus a witness to the fact of Revelation in this sense, that the
universal belief of any doctrine by the Church, as revealed, is a proof that the doctrine was revealed. This is called passive infallibility, because the Church, so regarded, does not raise its voice in controversy; its teaching must be gathered from it by the teaching body—the Ecclesia Docens. The Infallibility of the Church, in this sense, Dr. Salmon does not discuss, and it shall be alluded to only briefly here. The doctrine is clearly contained in the celebrated text of St. Matthew xvi. 18: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' This text, and many others bearing on the subject, have been beautifully developed by Dr. Murray in his admirable work De Ecclesia. In that work Dr. Salmon will find the arguments for our doctrine fully and ably stated, and had he read it, before delivering his lectures, he would have been able, if willing, to give his students a more accurate conception of the work before them in 'the controversy with Rome.' Nothing can be more certain than that our Lord wished that His doctrines should be preserved pure, and perpetuated in their purity. Often did He warn his disciples against false teachers—the leaven of the Pharisees, the Father of Lies, and his agents; and He promised them the Spirit of Truth to preserve them from error. The spirit of their Divine Master animated the Apostles also; and we find them always jealously guarding against any deflection from revealed truth. Even St. John, the Apostle of Charity, forbade his followers to speak to a believer in false doctrine. Therefore, belief in true doctrine, in its integrity and purity, must have been a vital principle of the Church; and any betrayal of truth, rejecting a true doctrine as false or accepting a false doctrine as true, would have made the Church the prey of her great enemy. But, according to St. Matthew, the prey of her enemy the Church shall never be. The text speaks of the Church which our Lord was to establish, and contemplates it as a spiritual edifice of the highest degree of stability. Its foundation is the immovable rock. Its Architect is infinite in wisdom and in power; and the purpose of its construction, one dearest to Him—to serve as a home for His chosen
followers, and as a treasury for the blessings He was to leave them. Therefore must it be permanently secured against sudden destruction or gradual decay. Enemies of the most formidable kind were to assail it—in vain. Amongst the worst, the most deadly of these enemies is heresy, that would poison the source of the Church's life. Were heresy to prevail against the Church, were she to disbelieve a true doctrine, or profess a false one, her Founder's solemn promise would have been falsified, and Satan would have gained the victory which, according to the promise, never can be won.

This passive infallibility of the body of believers presupposes the active infallibility of the teaching body—the Ecclesia Docens. The Ecclesia Audiens is bound to accept the doctrine of the teaching body; and in its divinely guaranteed fidelity in doing so, its own infallibility consists. This active infallibility—infallibility in teaching—has a twofold seat in the Church. It exists in the body of bishops united with their head—the Pope—whether assembled in a general council or dispersed throughout the world's wide extent; and it exists also in the Pope himself, when teaching officially, ex cathedra. Each is an article of faith, and if Dr. Salmon could disprove either, or disprove any article of faith so held, he would have simplified the controversy for his students very considerably. But he has not done so, nor even made a clever attempt to do so. He has but reproduced the old stock-in-trade of Protestant controversialists; and that, too, without rising above the usual level of such disputants. And, as already stated, he has so confused the Infallibility of Church and Pope that he does not seem to know which he is assailing. For clearness' sake the doctrine shall then be kept distinct; thus the interests of truth will be better served, though more labour will be incurred in making order out of Dr. Salmon's chaotic book.

The bishops of the Catholic Church, in union with the Pope, their head, whether assembled in a collected body or dispersed throughout the world, constitute the teaching body—the Ecclesia Docens—and that teaching body is infallible. This body is the infallible guardian, interpreter,
and teacher of the entire deposit of faith, and of all that appertains to faith and morals; and the infallible judge of every controversy in which faith or morals are involved. Whatever it declares to be revealed, and of faith, is so certainly; and whatever it declares to be opposed to faith, or inconsistent with it, is so, with equal certainty; and in virtue of its Founder's promise it shall continue to fulfil its divine mission as guardian, judge, and teacher of revelation till the end of time. And though the teaching Church is concerned directly with the deposit of faith, its authority extends indirectly to many things not contained in that deposit. As custodian of the faith the Church preserves her precious charge from all admixture of error, and so she detects and condemns those systems and doctrines that aim at impairing the purity of the deposit of faith. It is the shepherd's duty not merely to feed his flock, but also to ward off the wolf from the fold. This gift of Infallibility differs very much from Inspiration; though Dr. Salmon either intentionally or inadvertently confounds them, and, as a consequence, makes some very silly charges against us. Inspiration is the direct action of the Holy Spirit on the mind of the writer or speaker, moving him to write or speak; suggesting to him what to write or speak, and often even how to do so. The inspired teacher then is under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost moving him to write or teach what God wills him to write or teach. Infallibility is a much lower gift. The infallible teacher as such receives no interior revelation or suggestion from God. He is under no direct divine influence to teach. The Holy Ghost does not dictate to him what to say or how to say it. It is only his external utterances that are controlled, so that when he does teach officially, he can teach nothing that is not true. He is preserved from error in his teaching by a supernatural providence, an exterior over-ruling guidance of the Holy Ghost. What the inspired teacher says is the Word of God Himself, and is either a new revelation or a divine statement of a truth already known. What the infallible teacher says is a true declaration or explanation of a revelation already made. This is what we mean by
the Infallibility of the Church. But Dr. Salmon of course knows our doctrine much better than we ourselves do, and in a note at page 43, he says:—

A Roman Catholic critic accuses me of forgetting that the Catholic claim is not inspiration, but only inerrancy. I consider the latter far the stronger word. In popular language the word 'inspired,' is sometimes used in speaking of the works of a great genius, who is not supposed to be exempt from error, but no one can imagine the utterances of a naturally fallible man to be guaranteed against possibility of error, unless he believes that man to be speaking not of his own mind, but as the inspired organ of the Holy Spirit.

This is very clever. Now Dr. Salmon in his Introduction to the New Testament, speaks of its inspiration. Does he use the word there as it is used in 'popular language'? Ah, no. If he had so used it, there would be an end of the inspiration of the New Testament Scripture. He uses it then as a technical theological term, in its proper sense, to enable him to defend the truth of Scripture (though he does not, and on his principles cannot prove the inspiration), but he uses it here in its 'popular' sense—a false sense—to enable him to attribute false doctrines to us. 'I consider it,' he says, 'the stronger word'—yes; if it be taken in a false sense. And in any case, that he should 'consider it the stronger word,' is not a conclusive proof that it is so.

The Infallibility of the teaching Church in the sense here explained Catholics believe as an article of faith. According to Dr. Salmon our great argument for this doctrine is its necessity. 'The great argument by which men are persuaded to believe, that there is at least somewhere or another an infallible guide, is that it is incredible that God should leave us without sure guidance when our eternal salvation is at stake' (page 97). Now, so far from this being our 'great argument' it is not, in the sense indicated by Dr. Salmon, an argument at all. God could have remedied our short-comings in many ways besides by the appointment of an infallible guide—even supposing He was bound to remedy them at all. And, again, the creed for which Dr. Salmon says we profess to require an infallible guide, is only a very small fraction of our creed, and for arriving at
sufficient knowledge of the few articles contained in it, God might have provided in various ways. But on the supposition that Christ established a Church, to which he entrusted a Revelation; that this Church was to spread all the world over, and to last till the end of time; that the Revelation was to be preserved pure and unchanged, and preached to all mankind; that it contained many doctrines opposed to human prejudices, and many mysteries impervious to human reason; that faith in this Revelation is necessary for men in order to please God and save their souls; that men are very prone to error, and especially so in matters of faith; taking all this into account the argument for the necessity of an infallible guide becomes too strong for Dr. Salmon's carping criticism.

But our argument for the Infallibility of the Church is the express and unmistakable Revelation of that doctrine by God Himself, both in His written and unwritten Word. It is clearly contained in St. Matthew xxviii. 18, 19, 20, and in many other Scripture texts besides. And as the argument for this doctrine is given, and fully developed by most of our dogmatic theologians, and developed at great length and with special force by Dr. Murray, it will be sufficient to refer to the matter briefly here.

On the eve of our Lord's ascension He appeared to His Apostles, and delivered to them His final charge saying:—

'All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth: going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.'

The object of the Apostles' mission was to bring men to a knowledge of revealed truth and to teach them the observance of moral laws. To do this at any time, was a tremendous task for a few poor illiterate men, or for any men to undertake. And hence our Lord began His commission to them, by setting forth His own power, as the principle on which they were to rely—the source of their strength, the warrant of their success. It is

---

1 Matt. xxviii. 18-20.
as if He had said to them:—Fear not the magnitude of the
task I impose upon you; but armed with My own power go
out into the world; make disciples of the nations; teach them
to know and require of them to believe My doctrines, and
teach them to observe all My commands, and in the execu-
tion of this commission—a difficult one—I shall be with you,
aiding you, directing you, protecting you, and ensuring your
success for all time. Now, whatever be the extent of this
commission, it was given to the teachers of the Church,
it was a teaching commission. 'Make them disciples,' and
do so by 'teaching them to observe,' or rather to 'guard
with care' (as the Greek text has it) 'all that I have entrusted
to you.' Now, this commission and the accompanying
promise were not limited to the Apostles, but were intended
for their successors for all time, because (1) they were to
teach all nations which the Apostles could not, or at least
did not do, and (2) the work of teaching was to continue till
the end of time, which necessarily supposes that others
were to continue what the Apostles had begun. And the
teaching commission embraced all the truths revealed to the
Apostles, and extended to all men without exception:—'Teach
all nations . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have com-
mended you.' And for the successful discharge of this com-
mmission, our Lord promised His own special efficacious aid to
His Apostles and their successors to ensure this success. 'I
am with you all days.' Now, according to Scriptural usage,
conclusively established by Dr. Murray, this expression,
'I am with you,' means a special divine efficacious aid and
protection to the Apostles, ensuring the faithful discharge
of their mission. And this divine assurance and pledge of
success is not limited to the Apostles themselves; it is
equally promised to those who are to continue the Apostles' work till the end of time. Now, were it possible for the
Church to teach false doctrines, how could the God of Truth
be said to be with her, aiding her in doing so? How could He
lend His efficacious positive assistance to the propagation of
falsehood? Since, therefore, He has pledged Himself to be
with His Church in her work of teaching, the Church's
teaching must be always true.
This is our doctrine. It is intelligible; it is consistent; it ensures to us the possession of that true faith without which salvation is impossible; it secures us against those wretched systems that make shipwreck of the faith. Isaiah saw in the distant future the beauty of the Bride of the Lamb, and St. Paul described her admirable symmetry, when the reality was before him; but instead of the beauty foretold by Isaiah; instead of the order and symmetry insisted on by St. Paul, heresy shows us a deformed thing, corrupt and corrupting, and asks us to recognise it as the spotless Spouse of Christ. Instead of the harmony which Scripture everywhere attributes to the Kingdom of God on earth heresy presents to us a picture of that other kingdom in which no order but everlasting horror dwells; and we are told that our Lord preached up and propped up this other Babel, and called it the Ark of His Covenant with men; that He left His Church a mistress of manifold error, and called her, at the same time, 'the pillar, and the ground of truth.' Surely it can be no difficult task to vindicate the God of Truth against such an imputation as this—and this imputation is the sum and substance of Dr. Salmon's lectures. Our dogmatic theologians give several arguments, from the written and unwritten Word of God, to prove the Infallibility of the Church; they develop those arguments at considerable length, and answer the objections both to the doctrine and to the proofs; but Dr. Salmon conveniently ignores the arguments, and repeats the objections, with as much apparent confidence as if they had never been answered. When the powers of his young controversialists come to be tested they will discover that the Doctor's training of them was not the best. And not only does Dr. Salmon not consider our argument for Infallibility, but he actually maintains that we can have no argument at all; and that he has 'a perfect right to put out of court all Roman Catholic attempts to prove the Infallibility of their Church, as being attempts to build a fabric without a foundation' (page 79). This may be a very convenient, but certainly not a very effectual way of disposing of us. But he goes further, and informs his students, that
we ourselves must admit the hopelessness of our case, for 'there is one piece of vitally important knowledge,' he says, 'which Roman Catholics must own, God has not given men never-failing means of attaining; I mean the knowledge what is the true Church' (page 99). Now Dr. Salmon has given in his book, as an appendix, the 'Decrees of the Vatican Council,' and it may therefore be presumed that he has read them. And if he has read them how could he make the extraordinary statement given above that we ourselves must admit that we have no 'never-failing means' of finding out what the true Church is? In the chapter on Faith he could have read—he must have read—the following:—

But in order that we may be able to satisfy our obligation of embracing the true faith, and of persevering constantly in it, God, by His only begotten Son, instituted His Church, and gave to it marks of its divine origin so manifest that it can be recognized by all as the Guardian and Teacher of His revealed Word. For to the Catholic Church alone belongs all those things, so many and so wonderful, which are divinely arranged to show the evident credibility of the Christian faith. Nay more, even the Church, considered in herself, because of her wonderful propagation, her extraordinary sanctity, and her inexhaustible richness, in all good things; because of her Catholic unity, her unconquerable stability; she is herself a great and never-failing motive of credibility, and an indisputable proof of her own divine mission.

'With this text before him (page 480), which he must have read, it is amazing that Dr. Salmon should have made the extraordinary statement given above, and at the same time have supplied so readily the means of refuting his calumny. But the proof of the statement is more extraordinary still. He says:—'They must own that the institution of an infallible Church has not prevented the world from being overrun with heresy' (page 100). And he develops this argument (?) at great length. Of course we own it; but what follows? Does the admission disprove Infallibility? The vast majority of those who heard our Divine Lord teaching, and who witnessed His miracles, rejected Him, called Him a demon, and cried out, 'Crucify
Him.' Does this prove that He was not the Son of God?

If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. . . . If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin; but now they have both seen and hated both Me and My Father.¹

They disbelieved Him, therefore, in the face of most conclusive proof of His Divinity. 'And shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect.'² As well might Dr. Salmon have quoted the pagan millions of China, India, Africa, and Japan, against Christianity, as quote the prevalence of heresy against the teaching of the true Church. As the Vatican Council well and truly says the Catholic Church bears on her brow the mark of her divine institution. She is her own argument by reason of her extraordinary history. Pagan persecutors, heretics in each succeeding age, the jealous enmity of worldly powers, enemies from without and from within, she has confronted with a wisdom, a fortitude, a success that must have been divinely given. Each age has had its Dr. Salmon to asperse her, and its Dr. Cumming to predict her fall; but she, calm in the consciousness of divine protection, has gone on discharging her heavenly mission, whilst they have been wafted on the stream of time to oblivion. Such has her history been in the past, and such too shall it be in the future—always a fulfilment of her Founder's promise to be with her 'all days even to the end of the world.'

As already stated, Dr. Salmon does not meet the arguments of Catholic theologians in favour of the doctrine of Infallibility. He aims rather at bringing the doctrine into doubt by a series of assertions and charges, none of which really touches the doctrine at all, and most of which are false. The readers of Oliver Twist will recollect the cleverness, and the tone of lofty indignation, with which the Artful Dodger always managed to charge some one else with the crimes of which he was himself guilty. Dr. Salmon

¹John xv. 22-24. ²Rom. iii. 3.
must have taken lessons from this able tactician. He says the Church of Rome is perpetually changing her doctrines, and that which changes is not true; she has been always boasting that she never changes, and she has before our eyes quite recently promulgated doctrines never heard of before. This, Dr. Salmon told his students, was a conclusive proof of her fallibility. He says:—

The idea that the doctrine of the Church of Rome is always the same is one which no one of the present day can hold without putting an enormous strain on his understanding. It used to be the boast of Romish advocates that the teaching of their Church was unchangeable. Heretics, they used to say, show by their perpetual alterations that they never have had hold of the truth. . . . Our Church, on the contrary, they said, ever teaches the same doctrine which has been handed down from the Apostles, and has since been taught 'everywhere, always, and by all.' Divines of our Church used to expose the falsity of this boast by comparing the doctrine now taught in the Church of Rome with that taught in the Church of early time; and thus established by historical proof that a change had occurred. But now the matter has been much simplified, for no laborious proof is necessary to show that that is not unchangeable which changes under our very eyes. This rate of change is not like that of the hour hand of a watch, which you must note at some considerable intervals of time in order to see that there has been a movement, but, rather, like that of the second hand, which you can actually see moving (pages 19, 20).

Again:—

The old theory was that the teaching of the Church had never varied. . . . No phrase had been more often on the lips of Roman controversialists than that which described the faith of the Church as what was held always, everywhere, and by all (page 39).

This was always our boast; but now the logic of facts, brought home to us by theologians like Dr. Salmon, has compelled us to abandon this boast, and to admit that we, too, are changing with time. He says:—

You will find them now making shameless confession of the novelty of articles of their creed, and even taunting us Anglicans with the unprogressive character of our faith, because we are content to believe as the early Church believed, and as our fathers believed before us (pages 31, 32).

It is to be regretted that Dr. Salmon did not give the
names of the 'Romish advocates' who charge Protestants with 'the unprogressive character' of their various creeds. The charge could certainly not be sustained, for the authors of the 'Higher Criticism' are all Protestants; and they have so far progressed as to have left the Bible far behind them. And it would be equally unfair to charge the Protestant Church with 'the unprogressive character' of her teaching, for she teaches nothing. Individual Protestants may take their creed from the Bible, or from any other source they please; but their Church cannot tell them whether they are right or wrong. She has received 'the divine commission not to teach,' and she is discharging it with admirable fidelity.

But now as to the Catholic Church. Dr. Salmon's great charge is that she is boasting to be always the same, and yet is perpetually changing. If he had given the language in which the boast is conveyed by the 'Romish advocates,' we should be able to judge of its meaning; but he has not done so. He has given a paraphrase of the teaching of Dr. Milner and of Bossuet, perverted in both cases; and he has given an extract from a popular lecture of Cardinal Wiseman which proves nothing for him. If he were anxious, as he should have been, to give his students a correct version of our doctrine, he should have consulted our standard theologians, such as St. Thomas, Suarez, De Lugo, Dr. Murray, Franzelin, or Mazzella; and if he had consulted them, he would find them all flatly contradicting him as to the sense of the 'boast' which he attributes to us. He would find them, and every dogmatic theologian who has written on faith, asking the question whether there is any growth or increase in faith with lapse of time—utrum fides decursu temporis augeatur? Now, the very fact of our theologians putting this question shows that the sense put upon our boast by Dr. Salmon is a false sense, and their answer makes this more clear, and gives the true sense. The invariable answer is that since the Apostolic age there has been no growth, no increase in faith, considered in itself (simpliciter); that the divine deposit of faith remains unchanged and unchangeable; but that there has been a growth, an
increase in a qualified sense (secundum quid), limited to the interpretation—the explanation of the divine, unchangeable deposit by the infallible authority of the Church. St. Thomas says: 'Articles of faith grew with the lapse of time, not, indeed, as to their substance, but as to their explanation and explicit profession; for what has been explicitly and more fully believed in later times was implicitly and in fewer articles believed by the early fathers.'

Suarez has this same doctrine stated more at length in his Disp. 2°, s. vi., on Faith, and De Lugo has it in his Disp. 3, s. v.; Dr. Murray has it Disp. 1, s. iv., n. 55. It is, and always has been, the universal teaching of our theologians. And Dr. Salmon could have read this same doctrine in his own book, for it is distinctly stated in the fourth chapter of the Constitution De Ecclesia of the Vatican Council, which he gives in his Appendix (page 482). The Council says:

Neither is the doctrine of faith, which God has revealed, put forward like a philosophical system to be improved by human ingenuity; but as a divine deposit given to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared . . . therefore, let the understanding, the knowledge, the wisdom of each and all, of every age and time, of each individual, as well as of the entire Church, increase and progress very much; but let the progress be within its own kind only; that is, in the same truth, the same sense, and the same sentiment.

He must have known, therefore, from his own book, what our teaching was when he misrepresented it. The body of doctrines which constitute the divine deposit of faith comprises the revelation made by our Lord to His Apostles during His life on earth, supplemented by the revelation made to them by the Holy Ghost after our Lord’s ascension. With the death of the last of the Apostles, the deposit of faith was completed. Into that deposit, henceforward, no fresh revelation could enter. New revelations may, perhaps, have been made subsequently to individuals; but they form no part of the deposit of faith, and no article of Catholic faith can be grounded on them. The deposit of faith can receive no increase; it can admit of no diminution.
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It remains in the custody of the teaching Church, as its infallible guardian, interpreter, and teacher. As its infallible guardian the Church maintains that deposit in all its purity and integrity. She will permit no new doctrine, however true, to enter into it; she will not permit even the smallest portion of it to be lost. Her commission is to guard it faithfully, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost to interpret it and teach it to us, as times and circumstances demand. From this one source of divine truth all the Church’s teaching comes; and the Holy Ghost is with her assisting her in drawing her teaching from this one source of truth. It is to this complete body of doctrines that our Lord referred when He commissioned His Apostles to teach all that He had commanded them; to it also He referred when He promised to send the Holy Ghost to teach them all things, and to bring to their minds all that He had told them. The Apostles themselves were the first promulgators and teachers of this body of truth. Their commission of teaching passed on to their successors, and shall continue with them till the end of time. Now, from the very nature of the case, it is clear that the Apostles did not, and could not, put forth all revealed truths, to all men at the same time; there must be some order, some succession in their teaching. And we find quite abundant evidence in the New Testament to convince us that all the truths contained in the deposit of faith were not put forward at first with equal prominence. St. Paul told the Corinthians:—‘I judged myself not to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.’ And he added: ‘Howbeit we speak wisdom amongst the perfect.’1 Again: ‘And I, brethren, could not speak to you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. As unto little ones in Christ. I gave you milk to drink, not meat; for you were not able as yet.’2 And again: ‘For everyone, that is a partaker of milk, is unskilful in the word of justice: for he is a little child. But strong meat is for the perfect; for them who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil.’3 It is then clear that in communicating religious knowledge the Apostles took

1 1 Cor. ii. 2, 6.  
2 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.  
3 Heb. v. 13, 14.
into account the circumstances of their hearers, and their capacity for receiving instruction. And the above texts are understood in this sense by the best Protestant commentators—by Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Ellicott, Dr. Westcott, Dr. Evans, in the Speaker's Commentary; Alford, Bloomfield, and MacKnight. It must be, then, that the deposit of faith contained doctrines of so sublime a character, that neophytes could not readily take them in; and, at the same time, it is clear that it also contained doctrines so absolutely necessary to know and to believe, that without knowledge and belief of them, no adult could be saved. 'For he that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and is a rewarder to them that seek Him.'

Such truths are said to be necessary as means of salvation (necessitate medi[i]). Then there are other truths, the knowledge and belief of which are so necessary for our spiritual well-being that it is our duty to know and to believe them. The necessity of faith in such truths is called the necessity of precept. Now, it is clear that truths of this sort by reason of this necessity should occupy, and did occupy, a more prominent place in Apostolic teaching than the more recidive and speculative truths of faith. Such truths should enter into the public, obligatory profession of faith of the Church; they were explicitly proposed to the faithful, and explicitly believed by them; while other truths, equally contained in the deposit of faith, were not thus explicitly put forward, and were believed only implicitly. But the Church was to teach all that her Lord commanded her, and this implied the obligation of believing all on the part of the faithful; and they fulfil the obligation by believing explicitly all that is proposed to them by the Church, and in accepting her as a divinely authorized teacher they have implicit belief in all else that is contained in the divine deposit of faith. Now, in this deposit there are doctrines that are either obscure in themselves, or that have not been prominently set forth, for a time, in the Church's teaching; and there are doctrines also, apparently clear, and explicitly proposed which, in time, are found

\[1 \text{Heb. xi. 0.}\]
to require further explanation. Regarding such doctrines controversies necessarily arise, and the Church, assisted by the Holy Ghost, decides the controversy, and by a new definition, or rather by a new and more explicit statement of an old truth, makes known to her children the divinely revealed truth on the disputed question. Then again, we know how busy Satan is in this world, and how often he succeeds in bringing the vagaries of men’s minds, in various departments of knowledge so called, into conflict with God’s revelation. And when such conflicts arise it is the duty of the Church to ward off error from the faith of which she is the custodian. Thus more explicit statements of revealed truths become necessary, in order, more clearly, to point out to the faithful where the error lies. And as difficulties of such kinds are arising in every age of the Church they are to be met in every age by like action on her part. And by such definitions no new truth is announced; a truth, always contained in the deposit of faith, and thus hitherto an object of implicit faith, is by the definition authoritatively proposed to the faithful, and thus enters into their explicit faith—a divinely revealed truth passes from the category of implicit into that of explicit faith. This is the meaning of each new definition of faith by the Church, and the decrees of Councils, and of Popes as well, prove this most conclusively. And the moment the definition is announced the faithful accept it unhesitatingly, and it passes into the public obligatory profession of their faith; controversy ceases, and doubts disappear. And hence it is, that all over the Church there is always one profession of faith, and in that profession all Catholics of every tongue, and tribe, and nation agree with the most absolute unanimity. Just as there is no fear that any doctrine shall be defined that is not already contained in the deposit of faith, so there is no fear that a doctrine once defined shall ever be withdrawn or contradicted—all is harmonious and consistent because infallibly true. And, were any professing Catholic to refuse to accept a doctrine defined by the Church, he is by the very fact cut off from his communion, and left to herd with the heathen and the publican abroad. We have a divinely
appointed teacher, securing to us absolute unity of faith, and we follow her guidance. This is our proud 'boast,' or rather our grateful acknowledgment of God's mercy towards us. But this is not the sense of our 'boast' according to Dr. Salmon. According to him our boast 'was that the teaching of the Church had never varied'; that is, that our explicit faith, the articles of faith defined and obligatory, were always the same, and that no addition could be made to their number, and consequently that no definition of faith could be admitted—a 'boast' which no Catholic ever made or could make, for it would be a denial of the mission of the Church. Now, when Dr. Salmon undertook to lecture on 'Infallibility,' as held by us, he owed it to his students, at least, to learn himself the doctrine he was training them to refute. If he did so, why has he so greatly misrepresented us? If he did not learn our teaching (and it is charity to him to suppose that he did not), then he was lecturing his students on a subject of which he was himself ignorant, an insult to any self-respecting body of young men. By all means, let him refute our doctrines, if he can, and let him teach others to do so; but to represent our doctrines as a series of childish absurdities is to act as if he had been lecturing in a lunatic asylum. He fancies that he has an explicit and final condemnation of all new definitions of faith in the celebrated saying of St. Vincent of Lerins—*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.* We have been in the past always quoting this, saying, that our teaching has never varied (pages 20, 33, 183). New definitions have, however, completely falsified our boast, and we quote St. Vincent no longer. Now, though Dr. Salmon thinks St. Vincent's rule a serious difficulty for us he does not appear to expect much advantage from its use himself. He says, 'it is obvious that this rule can give us no help in a controversy' (page 270); and in a note he modifies 'no help' into 'little help.' But whether it 'gives no help,' or 'little help,' he thinks it useful against us. St. Vincent says that our faith must be what was held 'everywhere, always, and by all,' and as this must refer to explicit faith, it excludes all new definitions. This is Dr. Salmon's case.
against us, from St. Vincent of Lerins, and it is one of the commonest Protestant objections. Again Dr. Salmon is misleading his students, and if they had read for themselves the chapter of St. Vincent from which the words are taken, they would have seen that their professor's inference was groundless. In the second chapter of the Commonitorium St. Vincent says that he had frequently inquired from holy and learned men how he could find some safe general rule to enable him to distinguish Catholic faith from heresy, and the rule he gives is this: 'In the Catholic Church itself, then, we must take special care to hold what was believed everywhere always, and by all; for this is truly and rightly Catholic.' The Protestant inference from this is that nothing can be believed except what was held everywhere, always, and by all, and therefore that there can be no new definition. But St. Vincent did not say this nor did he mean it. He said that what was held everywhere, always, and by all, was Catholic faith; but he did not say that nothing else was. The fact that a doctrine was thus always universally held showed that it was of Apostolic origin, and therefore of faith, but St. Vincent did not say that a doctrine could not be of Apostolic origin unless it was thus universally held. Had this been his meaning, several truths controverted, and decided before his time, could not have been defined at all. He did not intend by his maxim, therefore, to exclude future definitions of faith, and he has himself taken care to make this clear and indisputable. In forcible and eloquent language he has himself anticipated, and answered, the Protestant objection. In chapter xxxiii. he says:

But, perhaps some one shall say, shall there then be no progress of religion in the Church of Christ? By all means, let there be, and very much progress. For who is he, so envious to men, so hateful to God, that would try to prohibit this? But let it be a real progress of faith, not a change. It is the character of progress that each thing should grow in itself; but it is the character of change that a thing should pass from one thing into another. It is right, therefore, that the understanding, the knowledge, the wisdom of each and all, of every age and time, of each individual as well as of the entire Church should increase,
and progress very much, but each in its own kind only, that is in
the same truth, in the same sense and sentiment.

He then goes on to compare the growth of faith in the
Church with the growth of the human body, and he shows
that just as the grown man is the same as the child, though
his limbs have grown and progressed, so, too, is the defined
article of faith the same as the truth out of which it has
grown. And he says:—

It is lawful that the original truths of the heavenly philosophy
should in the course of time be systematized, explained, illus-
trated; but it is not lawful that they should be changed, robbed
of their meaning, or mutilated. Let them receive evidence, new
light, classification; but let them retain their fulness, their
integrity, their distinctive character.

And after saying that if one doctrine could be corrupted,
all would soon be corrupt, and a shipwreck of faith would
follow, he says:—

But the Church of Christ, the careful, watchful guardian of
truths entrusted to her, never changes anything in them; never
takes anything from them, never adds to them; she cuts away
nothing necessary, she adds nothing superfluous; she loses
nothing of her own, she takes nothing that is not her own, but
with all zeal and care she aims at this one thing, that by faithfully
and wisely handling her ancient dogmas she might explain and
illustrate whatever was originally obscure and vague, that she
might strengthen and confirm what was express and clear, and
that she might guard what was already confirmed and defined.
Finally, what else has she ever aimed at by the decisions of her
Councils, except that what was hitherto simply believed, may hence-
forth be believed more diligently; that what was hitherto rarely
preached may henceforth be preached with greater emphasis; that
what was hitherto remissly cultivated may henceforth be cultivated
with greater solicitude. This, I say, and nothing else, has the
Catholic Church, when assailed by heretical novelties, done by the
decrees of her Councils. What she received at first by tradition
alone, from those who went before, this she has handed down,
even in written documents, giving a great deal of truth in a few
words, and very often for clearness' sake giving a new name to an
old truth of faith.

This is Catholic doctrine and practice to the letter,
taken literally from a saint who is called up as a witness
against both. And St. Vincent gives an instance of a definition which fully and forcibly illustrates the transition of a revealed truth from implicit to explicit faith. In chapter vi. he speaks of the controversy between Pope Stephen and St. Cyprian on the validity of Baptism given by heretics, and after referring to the writings and disputations on the question he says:—

What then was the result of it all? What surely but the usual, the customary result, the ancient doctrine was retained. The novelty was rejected. . . . . . And O, wonderful change! the authors of the opinion are accounted Catholics, its followers are heretics; the teachers are acquitted, the disciples are condemned, the writers of the books shall be the children of the kingdom, but hell shall receive the upholders of them.

Thus, then, we have a controversy in which up to the time of its definition Catholics were free to hold either side, but the moment the question was authoritatively settled by the Church, the adherents of the condemned doctrines were heretics. The authors of the writings, such as St. Cyprian and Firmilian, are accounted Catholics because they submitted to the voice of authority; but those who persisted in their opposition to that voice are declared heretics. One would imagine that St. Vincent is writing the history of the Vatican Council, that he has before him the history of the Catholic Church for all the centuries of her life—so accurately, so vividly, does he describe her working in the discharge of her divine commission as guardian and teacher of all revealed truth. And if Dr. Salmon had read St. Vincent's Commonitorium, he could not have indulged in his silly charges against the Catholic Church. With a confidence not begotten of knowledge, he quotes glibly four words from the entire book, as if they were to be the epitaph of the Catholic Church; and he poses before his students as a fountain of Patristic lore, though his book is a monument to his ignorance of the fathers, and nowhere is the ignorance less excusable than in his reference to St. Vincent of Lérins. What, then, becomes of his charges against us of 'new doctrines,' of changing faith? The charges are groundless:
the whole life and action of the Church brands them as false, the Church is only doing now what she was doing in the days of St. Vincent of Lerins, what she shall continue to do till the end of time; fulfilling her office as guardian of revelation by condemning errors, and faithfully discharging her teaching office by the promulgation and explanation of all revealed truth. And the 'proud boast,' attributed to us by Dr. Salmon, we have never made at all, and therefore have never retracted. The 'boast' we did make, and do make, has been traced down from St. Vincent to the Vatican Council, and it is the same all along the line; and there is nothing in Dr. Salmon's lectures by which it can be in the slightest degree imperilled. His arguments against us are in reality arguments against his own reputation for learning and prudence. He should have taken the advice of the 'judicious Hooker'.

Being persuaded of nothing more than this, that whether it be in matters of speculation or of practising, no untruth can possibly avail the patron, and defender long, and that things most truly are likewise most behovefully said.

[To be continued.]

J. Murphy, D.D.