

or tradition, may supply its defect." Compare this acknowledgment with the principle of the reformation. M. Leibnitz gives more to tradition than St. Irenæus asked for it in the second century.

He had said in a preceding letter. "The question is whether the revealed truths are all of them in the sacred scripture, or are come at least from apostolic tradition, which is not denied by many of the more accommodating among protestants."— Upon which the illustrious prelate observes: "We are not here disputing about apostolic traditions, since you yourself say that the more accommodating, that is, as I understand, not only the most learned, but also the most judicious protestants, do not deny it, as I believe in fact I have remarked in your learned Calixtus and his disciples."

M. Leibnitz moreover, or rather M. Molanus, his skilful associate in the project of conciliation, treats tradition or the unwritten word as follows.— "What disputes are started upon this subject! They may easily be terminated by saying that the question between us and the catholics is not whether there are traditions, but whether there are any articles necessary for salvation, which are not in scripture, or which cannot be fairly inferred from it.— This latter is what protestants deny. But the more moderate amongst them are agreed that we are indebted to tradition not only for the scripture, but also for its true and orthodox sense in the fundamental articles; not to speak of other things, which Calixtus, Horneius, and Chemnitius have long since acknowledged can not be known, except by this means. Certainly those among the protestants who receive, with the apostles, and the Athanasian creed, the five first general councils and the councils of Orange and Milevis, with the agreement of at least the five first ages, as a second principle in theology, in such manner that the fundamental articles cannot be otherwise explained than they have been by the unanimous consent of the doctors, will scarcely have wherewith to dispute with the Church of Rome." The observation of M. Bossuet upon this chapter of M. Molanus is very short. "As for what relates to tradition the same author is agreed with us, that we are indebted to it not only for the Holy Scripture, but also for the legitimate and natural interpretation of this scripture, and that there are truths that we cannot know except by its assistance: which is quite sufficient for us: so that on this article we are completely reconciled, if we are to believe this learned writer."

It may appear strange to you, and yet it is very true, that the man who perhaps had the most to do with the drawing up of the thirty-nine articles, I mean Bishop Jewel, continually rests upon tradition, upon the fathers and the primitive Church, in the Apology that he published in 1562, with the approbation of his brethren, and by order of the supreme governness, and also, as we are assured, with the unlimited applause of all the protestant societies in Europe. Here then is the authority of tradition recognized, invoked, and appealed to in their own defence by the spiritual lords of the convoca-

tion indirectly, by declaring that the scripture alone was to be applied to for every essential of salvation. Let these gentlemen settle it among one another as they know best. As for myself, I throw aside here their sixth article, and adhere to the authentic testimony of their apology in favour of tradition.

In a most excellent work, entitled *England's Conversion and Reformation compared*, I find a passage taken from a protestant work, the author of which was probably a member of the Church of England. This protestant writer, who is quoted, after having considered the precepts of St. Paul on oral traditions, makes the following reflections:— "Here we see plain mention of St. Paul's traditions consequently of apostolical traditions delivered by word of mouth, as well as by epistles or in writing; and a condemnation of those who do not equally observe both (and still more a condemnation of those, who despise them so far as to put them quite aside, as the authors of the reformation and of the sixth article have done.) Thus it is evident (continues he page 78), that the whole of Christianity, was at first delivered to the bishops succeeding the apostles by oral tradition: and they were also commanded to keep it, and deliver it to their successors in the same manner, nor is it any where found in scripture by St Paul or any other of the apostles; that they would either jointly or separately write down all that they had taught as necessary to salvation, or that they would make such a complete canon of them, that nothing should be necessary to salvation but what should be found in these writings." These most just observations directly oppose the sixth article, and must be considered as an unequivocal disavowal of them.

"I am, not of those who admit the great knowledge in divine matters revealed in this latter age of the world, I do not think there are any now so likely to discover the truth of gospel mysteries as those of ancient days. As for that saying a pigmy set on a giant's shoulder may see more than the giant; pardon me if I call it a shallow and silly fancy, nothing to our purpose; for our question is not of seeing more, but of the clear discerning and judging those things we all see, but are in doubt what they mean; if a pigmy and a giant see a beast at a mile distant, and are in dispute whether it be a horse or an ox, the pigmy set on the giant's shoulder, is never the nearer discerning what it is, which depends on the sharpness of sight, not on the height of his shoulders: Now that the ancient and holy fathers of the Church were more spiritual and consequently sharper sighted in spiritual things than we carnal creatures of this latter age is evident by their spiritual holy lives: The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. 1. Cor. ii, 14. And how natural, how carnal, how purblind we are, is too, too visible. Besides a purblind man near the object will discern it better than a much sharper sight at a greater distance as we are. For if you ask those lofty conceited pigmies why they give more credit to the fathers of the second and third century, than to those of the fourth or seventh, they answer, because

those that lived nearer the days of Christ and his apostles, are likelier to know- their minds better than those of remoter and corrupted ages; the reason is good, but mightily confounds those who live at the very part of the hill in the valley of darkness and all iniquity, and therefore not so likely to discern the truth of the doctrine of Christ, preached on the top of Mount Sion, as those who lived in higher ascents. Wherefore I shall always hearken with due reverence unto what those primitive holy fathers deliver, and the more holy and more ancient, doubtless more to be regarded."

Beveridge, the learned bishop of St. Asaph's, after having said, to humour the sixth of the thirty-nine articles, that in the precepts necessary for salvation the scripture was very clear to all eyes, develops his sentiments as follows:—"In objects of doctrine and discipline, if we would neither err nor transgress, let us beware above all things of adhering obstinately to our conceptions and conjectures, or to those of others. Let us rather examine what has been the opinion of the universal Church, or at least of the major part of Christians: and let us attach ourselves to the opinion that has been unanimously adopted by the Christians of all ages. For as in the entire consent of all consists the voice of nature, says Cicero, so in disputed points the consent of all Christians should be held as the voice of the gospel. There are many articles which are not read in express terms in the Scripture, and which nevertheless are deduced from it by the universal assent of Christians: for example, that we must adore three distinct persons in the holy Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that each of these is God, and that nevertheless there is but one God; that Christ is God and man in one and the same person. (are these articles necessary for salvation or no?) These points and similar others are not traced out at full length in either of the two testaments; and nevertheless, that they are founded upon both, is what is agreed and has always been agreed by Christians, with the exception of some heretics, whom we must consider in religion as we do monsters in nature. And again, that the infant should be washed in the holy water of baptism. and the Sunday religiously observed; that every year we must solemnize the passion, resurrection and ascension of our Saviour and the descent of the Holy Ghost, and that the Church must be governed by bishops, distinguished from priests, and superior to them; these articles and others besides are no where expressly commanded in holy writ; and nevertheless, for these fifteen hundred years, they have been followed in the public practice of the Church: they are as it were, notions common to all, planted from the beginning in the hearts of Christians, derived from the tradition of the apostles, who together with the faith propagated in the world these ecclesiastical rites, and if I may term them so, these general interpretations of the gospel; otherwise it would be incredible, and even impossible that they should have obtained so unanimous a reception in all places, in all times and among all Christians."