

You have prayed the Holy Ghost to enlighten you,
So have I.

Your salvation is dear to you.

Not more so than my soul is to me.

You admit your fallibility.

I am but an erring mortal myself.

As there is no one then to decide which of us is in the right,
and which in the wrong, it must be a drawn battle between us."

To their arguments from Tradition the Doctor very properly replied:—

"These arguments have no consistency or weight, except in the mouth of a Roman Catholic. If they have any force with the Church of England man, they should lead him back to the pale of the Roman Catholic Church;" and the cunning Doctor was right.

The Church of England is like certain sectarians of old, described by St. Irenæus, who, when they were pressed by the authority of Scripture, had recourse to Tradition. and when tradition was quoted against them, fled back to the Scriptures, not being able to trust one or the other. The inevitable result is, that they adhere to neither. *Eventit itaque, neque Scripturis jam, neque Traditioni consentire eos. Irenæus, Lib. III. c. 2.*

'On nothing is Scripture more explicit than on the necessity of observing the Sabbath. If you ask a minister of the Church of England, why he presumes to transfer the celebration of the Sabbath from Saturday—the Scriptural day—to Sunday, he will begin to quote Tradition, and the authority of the early Church. Quote Tradition or Church authority for him in favour of any Catholic doctrine, and he will admit none of them, but cry out for Scripture alone, as if the Devil himself did not cite Scripture against the very Founder of the Church.

Now for the dissection of the 6th Article.

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

But Holy Scripture no where declares this; and even if it did, its authority on the subject cannot be admitted, unless its *divine inspiration* be first proved. There are portions of Scripture, even in the New Testament, which contain no prophecy, no miracles, no distinctive mark of inspiration, no intrinsic evidence beyond that of the writings of any of the early disciples or first fathers of the Church.

Again: The written word of God cannot be greater than the Incarnate Word.

But the Incarnate Word required a testimony different from himself to prove his divine mission, and hence he said. "If I bear witness of myself my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me." (John v. 31, 32.) And we read therefore, that "John was sent from God as a witness to bear witness of the Light, that all men might believe through him." (Ib. I. 7.)

Therefore, Scripture cannot be an evidence in its own cause; because if we admit this, it will follow that the *Dead Letter* of the Written Word is superior to the *Living Voice* of Jesus Christ himself.

Is it not "necessary" for their "salvation" that infants should be baptised? And yet where does Holy Scripture contain any injunction or direction to baptise them? Our Saviour did not say, *Go baptize and teach*; but, *Go teach all nations*—

teaching them. The teaching precedes the baptism, and as infants cannot be *taught*, on what authority does the Church of England baptize them? Alas! she can make no answer to those who press this argument against her. But the Catholic Church consistently can. She will declare with St. Augustine that if there be any obscurity in the Written Word on this point, the Baptism of Infants rests on the authority of Apostolic and Divine Tradition.* And this tradition on a tenet so *practical* in the Church, brought as clear conviction to the early Fathers, as if it had been written ten thousand times over.

How did the early Church know that persons baptized by heretics or schismatics were not to be baptised? Certainly not from Holy Scripture which is altogether silent on the point, but from Apostolic tradition, as the same Holy Doctor assures us.†

Is it not necessary for salvation to keep the Sabbath in the manner, and on the Day, that the Lord has appointed? Now God has appointed *Saturday* in the Scripture, and we have no text in Holy Scripture to prove that he changed the Day. But the Church of England keeps her Sabbath on *Sunday*, contrary to Scripture, and she has no more Scriptural authority for doing so, than if she kept it on Tuesday or Thursday. The principle is the same.

St. Paul tells the Thessalonians to respect oral tradition as well as his written communication, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, either by word, or by our Epistle." (2 Thess. II. 14) Upon which text St. Chrysostom observes, (Comment in 2 Thess. c. II.)— "Hence it is clear that they did not deliver *all* things by Epistle; but many things also which were not written. And the latter are equally worthy of faith as the former. For this reason we believe the tradition of the Church also to be worthy of Faith. It is tradition, inquire nothing more."

That ancient and truly Scriptural Father, St. Basil in his Book on the Holy Ghost, addressed to S. Amphilechius Bishop of Iconium, writes thus; "Of the dogmas preached in the Church we have some transmitted in writing; others, which were delivered in mystery, that is, in a secret manner, we have received by means of Apostolic Tradition. Both are equally efficacious in promoting piety. . . . For if we proceed to reject as of little moment, such points as are not transmitted in writing, we shall by our impudent daring also condemn those things necessary to salvation, which are contained in the Gospel; nay, we shall reduce the whole preaching of the Faith to a mere name. . . . Who has taught us in Scripture to mark with the sign of the Cross those who have placed their hope in Christ? In what part of Scripture are we taught to pray facing towards the east? Which of the Saints has left us in writing, the words of Invocation when the Bread of the Eucharist and the Chalice of Benediction are exposed to view? For, not content with those which the Apostle or the Gospel mentions, we also use, both before, and after, as of great moment to the Mystery, *other words* which we have received from Tradition, and which have not been reduced to writing. Again, by what Scriptural authority do we consecrate the water of Baptism, and the Oil of Unction and the person baptized? Is it not on the authority of silent and secret tradition? What words of Scripture teach us how to anoint with oil? Where is it revealed in Scripture that man should be thrice immersed, or from what part of Scripture do we derive the other ceremonies used in Baptism, such as the renouncing of Satan and his angels? Is it not from the doctrine

*August. De Genes. ad Ileran. x. 22. Lib. I. c. 26. ad Marcellinum.

†Aug. de Bapt. c. 2. De Mat. II. 7 and y. 23.