

8. "Now I praise you brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the traditions as I delivered them to you." 1 Cor. xi. 2.

Here again the *written word* bears witness that all is not written; and that the apostle taught many things to his flock, at Thessalonica and Corinth, by word of mouth, which are not in his epistles; which, nevertheless, he enjoins them to believe, as being of equal authority with what he had written.

4. "Those things which you have heard from me before many witnesses, entrust them to faithful men, who are capable to teach others." 2 Tim. ii. 2.

It appears, by this text, that St. Paul, as well as the rest of the apostles, took the method of oral tradition to transmit his doctrine to all future ages: first, entrusting it to his disciple Timothy, who was to entrust it to other faithful men, who, without any alteration, were to teach it to others, that, by this method, it might be perpetuated from predecessor to successor, from master to disciple to the end of the world; at least, there is no appearance from this text, that it ever was the design of the apostles to leave only the *written word* behind them for the instruction of all ages, as Protestants pretend.

5. "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose, that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." John xxi. 25.

Is it not clear from these words of the Evangelist, that all our Saviour did and taught for the salvation of mankind is not written? In short, this doctrine of Protestants implies a contradiction; for, if nothing is to be believed with divine faith but what is clearly contained in the *written word*, then, this very thing, which Protestants thus boldly affirm, is not to be believed; because it is no where to be found in the *written word*. For where is it written, that the apostles were either commanded by our Saviour, or had any express design of their own to write all that our Saviour and themselves had taught? To write a complete body of divinity, containing all articles, both as to faith and morals, which they had preached, and which we are to believe? It is plain to the contrary, that Christian churches were founded, and many thousands of Christians fully instructed in the faith of Christ, by the preaching of the apostles, before any part of the New Testament was written; and that the different parts of this sacred book were afterwards penned, not with any set design to record all and every thing that Christ and the apostles taught; but, as occasion offered, either to confute some new heresy, or by way of exhortation and admonition to those who had been before instructed in the faith and worship of Christ. In a word: let the Church of England say, whether the following articles are not to be believed: viz., That the Virgin Mary was ever virgin; that the Sabbath was, by divine authority, translated to the Sunday: that the Christian Passover, or Easter, is always to be celebrated on a Sunday: that infants are to be baptized: and that the baptism of heretics is valid: yet, certainly these articles are not clearly contained in the *written word*; but Protestants received them from the tradition of the Church of Rome. Nay, I can produce one other capital point against Protestants of all sects and denominations, which they all receive upon the sole grounds of tradition; and which, themselves must confess, is no where contained in the *written word*: I mean, what books we are bound to receive for holy writ; which, of all necessary things, as the learned Hooker observes, is certainly one of the very chiefest for Protestants to know; and yet this point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach. For should one book of Scripture give testimony to all the rest, still that Scripture which gives credit to the rest will want another Scripture to give credit to it; and so on without end. For which reason the reformed Churches were forced to receive those books of Scripture, which they have put into their canon, from the tradition of the Church of Rome, and can have no other reason imaginable to believe them true and genuine, but because all Catholic Churches, from the Reformation upwards, believed so before them. Now, let Protestant people consider well, how fairly they are dealt with by their instructors; one while being told, that they are to believe nothing but what is clearly contained in the *written word*; at the same time they are to receive the *written word* itself upon the sole grounds of tradition. What more inconsistent? to receive the Scriptures, from whence they pretend all religion is derived, from the tradition of the Catholic Church; at the same time, they reject many other points of religion taught by that Church, which stand upon the same grounds with other points of tradition, which they receive, and with their belief of Scripture itself? Since it is notorious, that the same Catholic Churches, which, in all ages, from the Reformation upward, attested the books of Holy Writ now extant to be the genuine writings of the prophets, evangelists and apostles, did also attest the doctrine of purgatory, invocation of saints, the lawfulness of communion in one kind, the real presence, transubstantiation, &c., to be the genuine doctrine of the apostles: and, by consequence, Protestants have at least as good reason to believe these articles to be true, as they have to believe the Scripture itself, now extant, to be the word of God.