

## **II. Whether the truth and teaching of the Gospel are contained both in the written Word of God and in traditions received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ and handed down by the Apostles as dictated by the Holy Spirit, to be accepted with equal devotion and reverence as the written Word?**

*Johann Heinrich Heidegger*

*Tumulus Tridentini Concilii, vol. 1, p. 119*

The decree on the canonical Scriptures affirms this in nearly the same words. However, it is clear that the issue is not so much the manner of handing down the same Word of God, but rather that under the name of "tradition," things are opposed to the written Word of God. This is evident both from the decree itself, where Scriptures are contrasted with unwritten traditions—phrased somewhat awkwardly to denote unscripted doctrines—and from the interpretation of Andradius, who himself attended the Council. For he testifies that by the phrase "unwritten traditions," even those traditions are implied which cannot be proven by any testimony of Scripture. And he teaches that whatever the Roman Church believes, holds, and observes that is not found in the Scriptures must be counted among these traditions. Moreover, the controversy is not about tradition of a historical kind, indicating rites, discipline, or ecclesiastical customs; nor about exegetical tradition, explaining in what sense more obscure passages of Scripture have generally been understood by the Fathers—such tradition, since it is nothing other than explained Scripture or the transmitted fundamental sense of written truth, we willingly embrace. Rather, it concerns didactic tradition of a kind that mixes human inventions with the indisputable text to supplement its deficiency in certain necessary articles. We deny that such extravagant and shifting traditions exist, for the following reasons.

ARGUMENT I. The written Word forbids anything to be added to or taken away from it: Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:32; Joshua 1:7; 1 Corinthians 4:6; Galatians 1:8; Revelation 22:18–19. Yet any such tradition adds to the written Word in some cases and takes away from it in others.

RESP. REDING: 1. *Divine and Apostolic traditions never contradict the Word of God.* 2. *The Fathers acknowledge not only the written Word of God but also the unwritten or transmitted tradition.* 3. *Deuteronomy 4:12 forbids the Israelites from adding to the words which Moses had spoken, not to what he had written. However, Deuteronomy 31:24 states that Moses finished writing the words of the law; yet soon after, in chapter 32:7, they are commanded to ask their father.* 4. *1 Corinthians 4:6 forbids only that one be puffed up against another beyond what is written.* 5. *Galatians 1:8 subjects to anathema anyone who preaches a gospel contrary to what Paul preached. But traditions do not preach a different gospel.* 6. *Revelation 22:18 forbids adding to the prophecies of the Apocalypse, not to the whole of Scripture. Therefore, you are the one adding to and taking away from the words of that prophecy. How will it be for you, unless*

*you repent?* (Tract II, pp. 188-190). RESPONSE: 1. Tradition, or unwritten dogma, either agrees with Scripture and follows from it; or is different from it; or is contrary to it. If the first, it does not differ from Scripture as an opposite species under the same genus (the Word of God)—for you argue thus subtly—but is contained within the power and authority of the written letter in signifying it. When you prove your traditions to be of this sort, peace on this matter will easily be established. If the second, do they not add things that are different? If the third, do they not subtract by introducing contraries? Furthermore, since all things Divine and Apostolic, insofar as they pertain to faith and salvation, are written, and no revelation is contained outside of Scripture, it follows that your traditions are neither Divine nor Apostolic, but apostate. You too hastily refer diffuse matters to the Fathers. We shall see their opinion below. 3. In Deuteronomy 4:12, the word to which we are forbidden to add or subtract is understood as both spoken and written, each being the same in substance. For God commanded Moses to write down the entire substance of the spoken word, and Moses wrote it down, being a faithful servant in all God's house, appointed as God's public scribe for the church (Deuteronomy 31-32; Hebrews 3:2). Whatever the Prophets added in writing, or the Fathers in teaching and narrating, was an interpretation of one and the same word in substance. 4. St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 4:6 expressly forbids being wise "above that which is written" (ὕπερ τὰ γεγραμμένα), with the reason given: lest one be puffed up against another. This is what happens to those of the Papacy who wish to be wise above what is written. For under the pretext of their traditions, they lord it over the faith of others and are pitted against others. However, Reding, you have been misled—being ignorant of Greek—by the Vulgate translation, which omits the verb "to be wise" (φρονεῖν) and perverts the sense. 5. Galatians 1:8 subjects to anathema anyone who preaches "beside" (παρ') that which Paul preached. Here he uses the word "παρ'" (beside), which has a broader meaning and excludes both contrary and different things. The general and proper signification must be preserved, not rashly restricted to the fraud of Scripture itself. Therefore, whatever is added to the written Gospel of St. Paul (for since he both preached perfectly and wrote perfectly concerning the substance of faith, certainly what he preached he also wrote, to leave a public monument and perfect mirror of his doctrine, 2 Corinthians 1:13)—unless Reding says that Scripture is not the Gospel but only a part of the Gospel, in which case it could never be determined who preaches beside Paul's gospel and thus deserves anathema—that addition is more truly "beside" his Gospel. To have a gospel "beside" is to have another, different gospel. Thus, to worship "beside" God is to deny God. Augustine also explained it variously as "besides what he had received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures." 6. Finally, Revelation 22:18 forbids adding not only to the prophecy of John but to the entire Scripture: both analogically, because the Word of God, which is of a spiritual nature, has one and the same rationale in its whole and in each of its parts; and properly and simply, because St. John, who wrote last of all the Apostles (with spurious books excluded from the Canon before his death), closed the Canon of Scripture with the book of Revelation and with this seal, as it were, sealed up the whole Scripture—not that book alone—by the Spirit of God. Therefore, it is not I who should fear adding anything to Revelation and the whole Scripture; but you, Reding, and those like you, and your souls (if you have any), who add many impious things under the guise of traditions to both, should with your whole heart day and night dread those terrible plagues threatened against those who add or take away.

ARGUMENT II. The written Word is a sufficient instrument of instruction in matters of faith and morals, both because Scripture in general is a most abundant witness to its own sufficiency, as in 2 Timothy 3:16–17, Romans 2:20, 2 Timothy 3:8, Romans 6:17; and because Christ and the Apostles faithfully testified to the perfection of the Old Testament, as in John 5:38–39, 46, Luke 16:29, Acts 20:27 together with Acts 26:22; and because, in particular, the perfection and sufficiency of Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles can be demonstrated by irrefutable arguments; and because Scripture contains the Law, the Covenant of God, and the Gospel, to which three everything that must be known for salvation can be referred; and finally, because nothing can be added to the Word of God that is either different or contrary. Not different, because the articles of faith are interconnected, so that all are contained in the fruitfulness and power of one principle. Not contrary, because otherwise the Spirit of God would be both yes and no, and so would the churches of the Spirit.

RESP. REDING: 1. *The true word of God is that living word in the hearts of the faithful, propagated through tradition alone, entrusted principally to the Apostles. Scripture, however, is its true instrument, not principally but secondarily, written down by the Apostles on certain occasions so that the Church could preserve it; without tradition it remains mutilated and incomplete, consisting entirely of dead parchments.* 2. *St. Paul in 2 Timothy 3:16-17 teaches that Scripture is perfect, and not without the transmitted word, since faith—by which the Holy Scriptures themselves are relied upon to receive divine things—rests on that alone. Thus Christ in John 5:39, by commanding the study of Scripture, simply mandated faith in the transmitted word, by which alone certainty in studying Scripture consists, and its genuine sense is drawn out.* 3. *In Acts 20:27, "Paul is said to have declared the whole counsel of God," namely by mouth, not in writing; and in Acts 26:22, he denied having said anything beyond Moses and the Prophets—not in general, but concerning certain condemned articles of faith about which he speaks there. And he applied Moses and the Prophets to a mystery not future but already past, guided not by Scripture certainly, but by living tradition.* 4. *The transmitted word is contrary to what is written, but is virtually contained in it, so that it may truly be said that the articles of faith are conjunctive, and all are contained in the fecundity of one principle, insofar as there is one formal motive of all articles of faith, whether written or unwritten: the truth of the first revelation, so that whoever assents to one article of theological faith assents to all.* (Ibid., pp. 190, 196.) Response:

1. Reding here reveals scarcely anything other than his rancor and hatred—shall I say, conceived blasphemies—against Holy Scripture. Namely, tradition alone is the true principle of faith, the living word in the hearts of the faithful; but Scripture is some instrument, a dead parchment, written by the Apostles not with principal intent but accidentally. Is this to receive traditions and the written word with equal piety and reverence, as the Tridentine Fathers themselves commanded? What indeed is the cause of your hatred, rancor, blasphemy? The same, surely, as that of the ancient Gnostic heretics who, as Irenaeus testifies in Book III, chapter 2, when refuted from the Scriptures, turned to accusing the Scriptures themselves, 'as if,' he says, 'they are not correct, nor are they from authority. And because their sayings are varied, etc., because the truth cannot be found from them by those who do not know tradition. For it was not handed down through letters, but through the living voice.' Do you hear the Gnostics, Reding? Indeed, do you

hear yourself, your Papists, who with almost the same words and arguments attack the Scriptures? Moreover, that living word in the hearts of the faithful, propagated, as you speak—what, pray tell, is that to you? I think it is none other than the oracle of the Roman Apollo hidden in writing to the Pope, putting itself forth through the mandates and decrees of the dominating Pope, which had to be opposed to the Scriptures by you, lest you suffer detriment from those Scriptures openly condemning your errors. Thus your Carranza writes in Controversy 2: The Church sometimes seemed to act against the Scriptures, and sometimes beyond the Scriptures. Therefore, it itself is the rule of those things which are handed down in the Scriptures. Therefore we believe the Church against the form of the Scriptures. Driedo in Book II, folio 283, lists traditions of this kind: veneration and invocation of the Saints and Martyrs, solemn fasting, abstinence from meat and other things, suffrages of the living for the dead, voluntary vows of chastity and virginity devoted to God, purgatory, the Sacraments of Confirmation, Confession, Holy Orders, Unction, the body of Christ under the species of bread and wine, the sacrifice of the Mass, and other ecclesiastical offices. If in these, he says there, we despise tradition, there will be nothing holy for us which we are unable to defend as Christian faith now is. Driedo spoke frankly what the matter is and revealed the defense of any traditions. The word of God is undoubtedly that alone which is living and as such is received by true faith in the hearts of believers. Yet that is not the oracle of the Pope, but that very and only word which is contained in the Scriptures: it is the immortal seed (1 Peter 1:23), sown by the sower (Matthew 13:3), living and powerful (Hebrews 4:12), spirit and life (John 6:63), given by inspiration of God (2 Timothy 3:16), powerful for salvation to everyone who believes (Romans 1:16), the arm of Jehovah (Isaiah 53:1). If you suppose another word, it will be plainly ἄδηλον (unclear), obscure, impenetrable, lacking a touchstone and rule by which its truth and certainty can be tested—in a word I say: Enthusiastic, leading straight to Atheism. The rule and standard of all faith is Scripture, or the word—the revelation contained in Scripture—which itself proves and manifests its divinity by its inherent power testified by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers; not by any other living word outside itself (for whence will evidence of such a word's eternity come? From another word likewise? Through progress to infinity?). Meanwhile we never despise the ministerial and pedagogical testimony of the true and Catholic Church. We are God's cultivation (1 Corinthians 3:9). And just as cultivation requires the labor of farmers while first seeking from God the efficacy and increase of the seed; so for our conversion and instruction these three ordinarily concur: the living and immortal seed of God's written word; ministers of the Church as farmers; and every increase imparted by the grace of the Holy Spirit. 2. Therefore all things collapse by the same reasoning which you opposed from your rancid principle to my cited testimonies of Scripture (2 Timothy 3:16-17; John 5:39; others) and which you treated so negligently that if Bellarmine himself were revived he would nauseate at your rehashed cabbage. Besides that it is also solid to conclude from traditions about Scripture to traditions outside Scripture—which alone are at issue here—and also that tradition about Scripture is rather sensed through testimonies and experience than revealed authentically and authoritatively so that God's word depends on it. 3. St. Paul indeed in Acts 20:27 announced all the counsel of God to the Ephesians by mouth certainly. But since he announced the word by mouth and also wrote down those same things—the substance being one—and since the Apostles handed down to us through God's will placed in Scriptures their Gospel which they then preached—to be the foundation and pillar of our faith as Irenaeus expressly says in Book III, chapter 1—it follows that he also wrote all the counsel of God. And since also the substance of

future or predicted things and past things and those fulfilled is one and same; St. Paul preaching fulfilled things which Moses and Prophets predicted would be fulfilled certainly spoke nothing (Acts 26:22) beyond Moses and Prophets; but nothing which those Prophets had foretold as future; thus he recites not only certain heads—such as those in verse 33 either for example or as principal ones—not all. For he gave an account of his whole preaching to which those things about Moses and Prophets must be referred. 4. When you say that transmitted word is virtually and implicitly contained in writing—and indeed so as you explain according to S[anction] III—so that no Divine Tradition is lacking which either is not formally expressed through Sacred Scripture or can be reduced through a principle-word or conclusions into some text of Holy Scripture; certainly you seem to grant us much. For if Tradition is virtually and implicitly contained in written word—and indeed in that way you have declared—it will certainly be nothing other than Scripture. For whatever is implied and exists virtually in Scripture is considered written; since Scripture consists not in leaves and surface of words but in marrow of sense; not in letter but letter having power to signify powers virtues values; just as words are powers not unclear sounds not in external sound but in power virtue of voice (1 Corinthians 14:11); moreover what is inferred and concluded from writing or premises differs from writing only by reason as definition from definition. But then you will have to labor greatly how you elicit from Scriptures causes inferences conclusions for traditions' truth—especially those I mentioned above—Pharisaic rather than Divine or Apostolic traditions; which you will achieve only when you derive eye from heaven darkness from clear light black from white contrary from contrary. Finally articles of faith are conjunctive not only in sense you indicated but primarily by reason of unique principle foundation faith which is so broad in its scope embraces whatever must be believed for salvation concerning which elsewhere more fully.

ARGUMENT III. The word by which the truth of the Gospel is contained must be so certain that it can ἀναγορευεῖν or generate the certainty of faith. Such is not the transmitted word, both because it does not in itself bear the marks of certainty that all can recognize, nor in any authentic norm; and because we have no faithful guardian of it, as Scripture has the faithful guardian of the letter, for which God promised to watch; and because it admits variety and contradiction; and because it is subject to corruption, as even the history of the earliest times before the written law clearly shows; and finally, because Bellarmine admits that of the things handed down by the Apostles, some were indeed delivered by them to all, others only to Prelates, Bishops, Priests, which is a wide-open door for imposing every kind of falsehood under the title of traditions, so that no certainty at all can be had concerning their sincerity.

RESP. REDING: 1. *Since the Holy Scriptures were received under tradition, tradition, as the presupposed first principle, ought to have the same certainty as Scripture itself.* 2. *Not only the written word, but also the transmitted word has God as its faithful guardian.* 3. *Nor is tradition more subject to corruption than Scripture, as appears from the Bibles of the Moderns, which conflict with each other with such great variety that they differ even from the entire books of Holy Scripture and from each other.* 4. *If before the law the transmitted word was subject to corruption, how could the certainty of faith stand when it was not based on the written word?* (Ibid., page 196.) RESPONSE: 1. The Holy Scriptures were received as certain primarily not

because of the authentic tradition of any man or church, but solely because of the splendor and efficacy of Divinity, impressed by the Spirit of God upon the hearts of believers, with the Church ministering in this duty. And whatever parts of this transmitting church are lacking, their certainty and all truth depend on the written word of God, not elsewhere. 2. That God has always watched over the written word is clear both from the promise in Isaiah 59:21 and Matthew 5:18, and from the outcome. For Scripture has come down to us from so many past centuries, despite the continual machinations of Satan and Antichrist against it. Nothing of the sort can be said about traditions. Their origin is either uncertain or openly false. When they have run through some centuries, like dogs following the tracks of a hare, they at last dissipate into clouds or hide themselves in a crowd, as happens with rumors rashly published without a certain author. And thus far the Traditionists have worn themselves out in devising rules for distinguishing traditions, because those put forth by them do not sufficiently safeguard Christian faith, which ought to be secure on all sides; and each has something peculiar to itself, smelling of the vanity of traditions—that is, appendages of human credulity—which the celebrated Chamier (de Canone, book VIII, chapter 14) says has been most solidly proven concerning them. 3. What is muttered about the Bibles of the Moderns is too diluted. For if interpreters of the Divine word err and go off in different directions, is that to be imputed to the word of God itself, which has been preserved whole and unblemished in its sources and come down to us? The case of traditions is different; they have no certain instrument for their preservation. 4. Traditions before the law were indeed variously interpolated and adulterated outside the true church, so that for this reason alone it seemed good to the Wisdom of God to deliver His word in writing, as a sure guardian of memory. Yet God preserved His word in the true church up to the law through continuous oracles and inspirations; indeed, even when men gradually fell away from them, He renewed it. Therefore, just as then extraordinary inspiration was necessary lest tradition be corrupted in the church, so after it became infrequent or plainly ceased, all tradition was entrusted to Scripture or the ordinary means.

ARGUMENT IV. In the Old Testament there was no place for traditions because Christ everywhere recalls the Jews from the Pharisaic deuteroses—whom He nevertheless acknowledges as sitting in Moses' seat—to Moses and the Prophets, and thus argues for the sufficiency of the written canon by separating them within themselves. But if in the Old Testament there was no place for unwritten traditions, neither can there be a place for them in the New, as Becanus, Cornelius à Lapide, and some others expressly admit, says Bellarmine—Bellarmine, a Catholic, that is, a Papist.

RESP. REDING: *The Pharisees could not have received Scripture or its genuine sense with certainty of faith without the unwritten word of God propagated through the tradition of the elders.* (Ibid., page 197). RESPONSE: You thus finely defend the Pharisaic traditionists because you are imbued with their poison. You could have used the same argument to plead their cause against Christ, who attacked them on account of their traditions. But remember: it is one thing to have tradition concerning Scripture; another to have traditions or articles of faith beyond or against Scripture—which is what all this dispute is about. The rest has been refuted above. Nor could Reding respond directly.

ARGUMENT V. It was necessary for the word to be handed down, either because of the sublimity of the mysteries, which could not be written, or for some other reason. However, it was not because of the sublimity of the mysteries: first, because no mysteries can be shown in the transmitted word that are not greater in what is written; second, because the successors of the Apostles committed them to writing, as our adversaries assert; and finally, because this is sacred only in false religions, whose mysteries it was not permitted to write or propagate, but only to hand down. Nor was it for any other reason, because none can be shown. This argument was advanced in the Council by Antonius Marinarus.

RESP. REDING: *1. You would have it that the successors of the Apostles did not have most of the Apostles, or even Christ Himself, commit the mysteries of God to writing. Were Christ and the Apostles, then, who transmitted mysteries orally and not in writing, guilty of false religion? 2. You also defend many traditions that are nowhere written.* (Ibid., pages 197–198.) RESPONSE:

1. Whatever Christ and the Apostles handed down orally pertaining to our salvation and necessary instruction, all of that was recorded in divine writings by the writers chosen by Christ. Nor did they teach anything beyond what is in the letter of Moses and the Prophets, and thus in the Scriptures. That the successors of the Apostles committed to writing mysteries not written by the Apostles, I wrote explicitly not from my own opinion but from that of our adversaries. By attributing this to me as if I had done so, you are openly giving false testimony. 2. The trivialities you assert about our traditions will receive no response. Traditions—or articles of faith not handed down in the Scriptures—we simply condemn all of them.

ARGUMENT VI: The Council generally defines that traditions without writing are to be received. But what those traditions are, where they may be found, how true ones may be distinguished from false, or what their number is, it does not define. Indeed, the hidden purpose of this deceitful and fraudulent generality can be nothing other than to allow anything not written to be defended under the pretext of tradition.

RESP. REDING: *The Synod considered it sufficient to declare, in accordance with desire, that the foundation of the Catholic faith is not only the command of the Scriptures but also tradition and the Apostolic streams received by the Church through the hands of creditors, and that there should be no alternation in these. As for which particular traditions these are, they subsequently determined them as the circumstances of matters required in congregations to be held.* (Ibid., page 198.) RESPONSE: That the Synod considered it sufficient to define this is clear. Nor was that in question; but why it did not define which traditions exist, what their distinguishing marks are, what their number is, etc., one ought to state the reason. For such a thing was not established by them; nor has it been declared anywhere which dogmas are to be held as written and which as handed down. The hidden purpose of fraudulent generality remains, as I said.

ARGUMENT VII: The Fathers are cited, among whom it was settled that there is no dogma which does not have testimony in the written canon. Tertullian against Hermogenes: "I adore the fullness of Scripture. Let Hermogenes teach that it is written, or let him fear that 'woe' pronounced against those who add." Athanasius in the Synopsis

briefly and forcefully calls the Scriptures "the firstfruits, anchor, and salvation of faith." Basil the Great in the book on the confession of faith: "Why do those who have an abundance of apostolic manifestation and these testimonies..." It is manifestly a crime of unfaithfulness and arrogance either to reject anything that is written or to add anything that is not written. Jerome on Matthew 23: "What does not have authority from the Scriptures is condemned with the same ease as it is approved." Augustine in *On Christian Doctrine* II.9: "In those things which are openly set down in the Scriptures are found all those things which contain faith and the conduct of living."

RESP. REDING: 1. *Tertullian speaks of only one dogma, the creation of the world from nothing. This is indeed clearly mentioned in Scripture.* 2. *Athanasius calls Scripture the anchor and salvation of faith; but its application, which is the whole point of the question, cannot be done without tradition.* 3. *Basil forbids adding anything to Scripture—namely, anything contrary.* 4. *Jerome speaks of a particular opinion of those who held that Zechariah, slain between the temple and the altar, was the father of John the Baptist. But one cannot rightly infer a universal from a particular.* 5. *Augustine speaks of those dogmas which are simply necessary for salvation. Elsewhere, in Epistle 118 to Januarius, he explicitly brings forth traditions (Ibid. pp. 198–199).*

RESPONSE: 1. Reding, you trifle so childishly that your nonsense hardly deserves or calls for a reply. Although in the cited passage Tertullian deals with only one dogma, his general argument is drawn from the fullness or perfection of Scripture (for what is fullness but the perfection containing all things?), which seems applicable to all other parts of doctrine. What would be more ridiculous than to speak of fullness while considering only one member or particular aspect? Is a man full whose limbs are intact but who lacks teeth, arms after a great battle slaughter, and perhaps his head? 2. Athanasius simply called Scripture the firstfruits of faith, the anchor and salvation. You know it must be applied through tradition—that is, through the oracle of your Pope. But where does Athanasius say anything similar? Your fabrication is not the opinion of Athanasius. And who ever said that a species is applied through an opposite species? According to the Tridentine expression, indeed, under the word of God as a genus, Scripture and tradition lie as opposite species, as even Walenburgius explains they differ. In *Oration 6 against the Gentiles*, Athanasius has an aphorism worthy of being inscribed in golden letters, which reads: "The very Scriptures, containing the works by which zeal for reproof is held, sufficiently show forth the truth." That is, the Holy and Divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient for proclaiming the truth. Moreover, it is the authors who suffice by themselves, not through another, such as tradition or the church. 3. Prove that Basil speaks only of contrary additions. For you are not a praetor to whose edict we must rise. He simply attributes to perfidy and arrogance "any invention and addition"—adding something that is not written. But whoever adds something different also adds what is not written. 4. But Jerome also clearly applies the thesis to the hypothesis and refutes the opinion about Zechariah by this general reasoning: whatever does not have authority from Scripture must be rejected. Otherwise his argument would be plainly feeble. 5. Thank you, Reding, for admitting that St. Augustine speaks of dogmas necessary for salvation. This suffices for us. For we place the perfection of Scripture in nothing else more than this. Concerning the other passage of Augustine, more below.



ARGUMENT VIII: The origin of this error concerning traditions can be clearly shown. The ancients, namely Irenaeus and Tertullian, opposed heretics who twisted the Scriptures with prescription and tradition—that is, the Catholic sense of Scripture especially in fundamental questions of faith. Cassander himself explains this mind of the Fathers in *On the Duty of a Pious Man*, p. 782. Then the Roman Episcopal See, which had clearer monuments of tradition, was exalted. Hence it happened that the primary heads of religion were treated negligently, that certain ambiguous sayings escaped the Fathers, and that the definition of a Council or the supreme See was held as a principle of faith, and its determinations, even if not proved by Scripture, were held as dogmas of faith and Apostolic traditions. By these steps our Council arrived at the canonization of traditions in a sense which the true Church never held—indeed, which it condemned in heretics.

RESP. REDING: *Good that you admit that tradition contains the Catholic sense of Scripture, residing in the Roman Church and once opposed to heretics* (Ibid. p. 199). RESPONSE: Yet nothing here turns to your advantage. For what is that Athenian tradition? What is Tertullian's prescription? Indeed, you are ignorant and do not hesitate to impose a novel sense on those words, utterly foreign to their meaning. Know for certain that to the ancients, tradition was nothing other than the continuation in the Catholic Church of dogmas handed down—not outside, beyond, or against the Scriptures—especially concerning the foundation. This is clearly evident from Irenaeus, Book III, chapters 2, 3, 4, etc., both because he opposed tradition to the heretics of his time who erred in points of written dogmas concerning God, Christ, creation, and similar matters; and because he refuted at length all the impiety of these heretics from Scripture—indeed in three whole books—yet not one did he examine individually and by name from tradition; and finally because, in chapters 2, 3, etc., speaking of barbarians learning the Gospel without Scripture from tradition alone and expounding the articles of their faith, he names none other than those which all Catholics believe drawn from Scripture. Irenaeus said nothing at all on this matter that we do not embrace with both hands—indeed, with one.

ARGUMENT IX. Finally, even Bellarmine himself, in his work "On the Word of God," Book III, Chapter 11, admits that everything simply necessary for all was written by the Apostles. Moreover, Gregory XIII, in his preliminary letter to Philip, King of Spain, prefacing the Bible of Arias Montanus, writes thus: "As for Theology, which is the highest philosophy, in these books (the Bible) ALL the mysteries of our religion and divinity are explained."

RESP. REDING: *Granted. Yet Bellarmine assumed an unwritten word by which the mind and salutary sense of Scripture is acquired, and the canonical book is opened.* (Ibid., page 199.) Response: Therefore, he assumed something that conflicts with his own statement. For does the sense of Scripture in necessary matters require another unwritten word by which it is believed? Or rather, by which unwritten dogmas (for the sense of Scripture, being inseparable from it, is not an unwritten dogma) are revealed? Would this not lead to an infinite regress? For that unwritten word also requires another word to inspire faith and obtain its sense; and this again another, ad

infinitum. Thus, clearly, the entire Christian religion would be exposed to ridicule, indeed utterly extinguished!

## OBJECTIONS OF THE TRIDENTINES.

OBJECTION I. *Paul distinguishes the word of God into written and unwritten, saying: "Hold to the traditions you were taught, whether by our speech or by our letter" (2 Thessalonians 2:15).* RESPONSE: Paul calls traditions the twofold manner of delivering the same doctrine, not a different one—to those present by speech, to those absent by letter—not unwritten articles of faith. For he includes the letter itself, or Scripture, under the category of apostolic traditions. Moreover, that "whether... or" Paul clearly refers not to the apostles but to the word "which you have learned," and thus that disjunctive pertains not to the traditions but to the modes of learning. Furthermore, Paul, in commending these traditions, intends to fortify the faithful against deception, lest they believe a lie. Yet praising tradition in the adversaries' sense would have opened a wide door to deception. Additionally, in this way he would have obligated us to believe something that we have learned neither by speech nor by writing—since not all could then benefit from Paul's speech, nor do we claim to. Finally, the same Paul in chapter 3, verse 14, refers all obedience back to the letter.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: *1. It is poorly argued from the fact that St. Paul, in the cited passage, mentions the word "by letter," that all obedience is thereby reduced to the letter. 2. Is the word now orally transmitted of such a kind that we have not learned it from writing? Or could all the faithful in the time of the nascent Church have made use of Paul's Epistles, so that there was no need for speech? 3. The mode of transmitting through Scripture is equally liable to deception as that through living oracles. But the Holy Spirit has preserved both. 4. If Paul commended not diverse doctrines, but diverse modes of transmission, it follows that all doctrines are contained in his epistles to the Thessalonians. 5. The disjunctive particle distinguishes between traditions, that is, the doctrines transmitted, not the mode of transmission.* (Ibid., pp. 199-200.) Response: 1. You twist the words, change the order, and sophisticate everything according to your custom and nature. From the fact that St. Paul commands the retention of traditions even by letter, I concluded that Scripture also comes under the name of tradition, not that he reduced all obedience to the letter. You have created a phantom, which you might more easily have refuted. 2. The word transmitted orally is entirely the same as what we have also learned from writing. Therefore, St. Paul did not commend traditions, that is, doctrines never written, never to be written. Nor were Paul's epistles needed by all at the very beginning of the nascent Church. Yet it was necessary that what the Apostles first preached should afterward be written. And indeed, whatever was necessary for salvation to be known has been written. 3. I do not know how you can say that the mode of writing is equally liable to deception as the mode of oral transmission. For the written letter remains. The speech heard by listeners is scarcely

retained, is easily changed and corrupted. Nor has the Holy Spirit preserved tradition as He has Scripture. For tradition does not come to us uncorrupted and genuine without Scripture and outside of it. Scripture comes to us whole and unblemished. 4. Nor does it follow that all of St. Paul's doctrines must have been contained in his epistles to the Thessalonians. It is sufficient that certain things are in those Epistles; the rest, which he preached orally, were committed to writing by the same Paul or by others elsewhere. The whole and same Gospel—not "a different one" (Gal. 1:6-7)—was at first not yet written; yet it was later written. Nor does the whole preaching extend more broadly than the whole of Scripture.

5. The Thessalonians are commanded to retain the traditions, that is, the whole doctrine transmitted by St. Paul. They are said to have learned them "by word" or "by letter"—that is, both by speeches and by letter, or at least by one of these two modes; not some doctrines never written and never to be written by speech, others by letter. For did they not also learn, or could they not have learned, by speech what they learned by letter? Therefore, it is manifestly not the transmitted things, but the modes of transmission, that are inquired into and distinguished. Thus Theodoret pleases in interpreting St. Paul's words: "Hold fast to the rule of doctrine, the words which we delivered to you, both those we preached to you when present and those we wrote when absent." And Chrysostom most clearly says in Homily 29 of the *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*: "From the time that this impious heresy, which is the army of Antichrist, shall prevail in the Church, there can be no proof of true Christianity, nor can there be any other refuge for Christians wishing to know the truth of faith except Divine Scripture." This, O Reding, you will overcome; and by attacking with all your admonitions, you reveal yourself to be in the army of Antichrist and yet wish to lie hidden in it.

OBJECTION II. *Paul (1 Cor. 11:2) praises the Corinthians because they hold fast to the traditions just as he delivered them to them. And in verse 34, he promises that he will set in order the things which are not written when he is present.* RESPONSE: 1. Paul calls "traditions" his whole doctrine, which he taught either in writing or orally. The same things which he delivered to them personally, he also delivered through intermediaries. And the canon and rule of his oral doctrine is now in the Scriptures. 2. Paul promises he will set some things in order when present. But those doubtful matters are not articles of necessary faith, since Paul is not dealing with articles of faith here, and "setting in order" pertains not to dogma but to order. Therefore, it pertains to instruments and means in external order—which if our adversaries would produce for us from the archives of the Corinthians in detail, we would give great thanks.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: 1. *At least it follows from this that the Apostle taught something orally before that letter was written. However, it cannot be proven that everything he taught orally was later committed to writing.* 2. *What he promised in verse 34 to set in order clearly pertains to the order or rite of the Church; yet they depended on Divine revelation, and thus were articles of faith, which are now written.* (Ibid., pages 200–201.) RESPONSE: 1. Why should the Apostle not have taught something orally before writing to the Corinthians? But what he taught orally, he could also teach from the Scriptures, and later either he or others could write it down. For the very things he wrote explicitly in that chapter were first delivered by spoken word. Just as what Peter preached orally to the Jews was later written by Luke in Acts, and Paul, what he first

delivered orally to the Thessalonians, he later wrote to them, as he himself testifies in 2 Thessalonians 2:5: "Do you not remember that when I was still with you, I told you these things?" Indeed, the very perfection of Scripture argues that what is preached orally as necessary for salvation is also written in the same place. 2. You are the most ignorant of all if you refer every single thing divinely revealed to articles of faith. Are historical accounts, predictions of events in the Church, and revealed rites all articles of faith? And again, I challenge you to show us from tradition what the Apostle promised to set in order, if it is nowhere written. You will always be stuck here; and even from this, if your mind is not perverse, you will recognize the emptiness of your argument.

OBJECTION III. *Certain doctrines of faith must be proven not from Scripture but from tradition. Such are the article on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, infant baptism, the irrevocability of baptism, the observance of the Lord's Day, the immortality of the soul, etc.* RESPONSE: All these, and any other doctrines necessary for salvation, are found in Scripture—if not explicitly or axiomatically for the most part, yet certainly by implication as to their sense and meaning. This is known to no one except those who are unwilling or who love to quarrel and oppose the truth.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: *Since the formal sense of those doctrines is not expressed in Scripture, it has been expressed through living faith in the hearts of the faithful and thus propagated.* (Ibid., page 201). RESPONSE: Even what is explicitly written is expressed through living faith in the hearts of the faithful; nor does this establish anything about unwritten tradition. And what is inferred from Scripture by evident consequence was contained in the depths of Scripture beforehand. For how can something be inferred from Scripture that does not exist in it? What then does all this have to do with the tradition of unwritten doctrines?

OBJECTION IV. *That Scripture is the Word of God is proven not from Scripture but from universal tradition.* RESPONSE: 1. Our question is not about principles but about what follows from them: namely, given the Scripture we have, is there a need for unwritten traditions to supplement its deficiency? 2. Nor is faith in the divinity of Scripture an unwritten tradition; rather, it depends on the authority of God who reveals, who endowed His word—which is living and effective—with this power, so that it can irrefutably demonstrate its divinity to every conscience.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: 1. *The belief in the Divinity of Scripture, which depends on the authority of God who reveals it, is an unwritten article of faith, because it is not proven from any text of Scripture.* 2. *Nor can it be proven from any text of Scripture that God has endowed Scripture with the power to demonstrate its Divinity to every conscience. Otherwise, why did Luther deny that certain epistles were Divine, which the Zurich theologians declared to be divine?* (Ibid., p. 201). RESPONSE: 1. You clearly reveal a desperate cause, wandering everywhere and always outside the point in a disgraceful manner. For here you ought to have known, or should have known, that what is being debated is not tradition concerning Scripture, but tradition of dogmas outside of Scripture. But you care little about this, as long as you do not lack something to say. How correctly you speak, you do not care; indeed, you have chosen to

contend with me with a great mass of words, not with the weight of matters, in order to cast a veil over the simple-minded. Is it truly so that even the Divinity of Scripture is proven from no text of Scripture? Reding, is the Divinity of Scripture inherent in the whole and in each of its texts, or not? If you deny it is inherent, you differ nothing from an Atheist. If you affirm it, how then does it hold that the Divinity of Scripture is proven from none of its texts, when it is as inherent and native to the whole of Scripture as light is to the sun, heat to fire, moisture to water? 2. If Scripture does not have the power to demonstrate its Divinity to every conscience, how then could it demonstrate itself to the Church, which you contend bears sole witness to it? No one can bear witness about a matter that is not manifest and demonstrated to him. Whatever is Divine demonstrates and manifests its Divinity just as God Himself does—unless perhaps one wishes to blasphemously imagine some dead, lifeless Divinity. Nor is there need here for a specific text, since by the very fact that Scripture as a whole is recognized as Divine, such power must necessarily be attributed to it. Although indeed, most explicit texts of Scripture are not lacking. Out of many, read a few if you will deign to do so, such as: Deut. 32:47; Isaiah 53:1; Matthew 13:23; John 5:39; Romans 1:16-17; 2 Corinthians 4:2; Ephesians 6:17; 1 Timothy 1:15; and also 2 Timothy 3:16; Hebrews 4:12. Cicero calls each verse of Euripides individual oracles. The same testifies that Aristotle pours forth a golden river of speech. But you accuse the Holy Scriptures, which are equipped not so much with stings as with thunderbolts against all impiety, of having no force, no power. Indeed, for you and those like you, Scripture is veiled, a scent of death leading to death. Yet this does not prevent the sincere Wisdom of God, insinuated into the hearts of the elect by the Spirit of God through Scripture, from working in them faith, love of truth, charity, and hope. 3. Luther recently doubted concerning certain epistles (for the Spirit of God is not given to all believers in the same measure), while you openly blaspheme Scripture in an intolerable manner. However, when the matter was more maturely considered, he ceased to doubt. And just as the Sun does not lose its power to manifest itself because some who are dim-sighted cannot more broadly perceive its light, so too Scripture, which is the truest light and lamp for our feet, does not lose its power to manifest and demonstrate its Divinity to all because some close their eyes to it, or others struck by blindness cannot look upon it with unseeing eyes—which by the just judgment of God has befallen you thus far.

OBJECTION V. *Through continuous tradition we have the written canon. For tradition is the reason why Paul's epistle to the Ephesians is held as canonical, but not that which is circulated as to the Laodiceans.* RESPONSE: 1. Tradition is taken either actively for the action of handing down, or passively for the doctrine and indeed that which is handed down orally only. The question here is not about the latter. That the written canon has come down to us through tradition—namely actively understood—no one denies. Such tradition is not a dogma distinct from the written canon, but the faithfulness of the Church, which is the depository and guardian of the canon. Thus, the tradition of a law codex is not a dogma or law unwritten in the codex. 2. That we hold Paul's epistle to the Ephesians as canonical, but not that which is circulated as to the Laodiceans, has its occasion from the form or tradition of the church; its true and solid cause is its ascertained divinity.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: *That the written canon is Divinely inspired is a dogma of faith, which through tradition alone—actively accepted—propagated by the faithfulness of the church, has been derived to us and is distinguished from the written canon as principle from principle.* (Ibid., p. 201-202). RESPONSE: Blinded by a hateful hatred of Scripture, I do not know what you are writing. For that Scripture is canonical and Divinely inspired is a principle of faith, not a dogma—much less an unwritten dogma within that principle of faith. For the Divinity of Scripture is as innate as light is to the sun, heat to fire. Therefore, although the church guards, vindicates, and hands down Scripture, nevertheless its Divinity—or its radiance and splendor—is no more from the Church than the splendor of light is from any light-bearer holding and handing on a lamp.

OBJECT VI. *The meaning of Scripture pertains to faith. Yet it is not derived from Scripture itself, since its letter is ambiguous and, according to the intention of the Holy Spirit, carries various meanings, which are discerned solely by the Catholic Church; but rather from ecclesiastical tradition.* RESPONSE: 1. What then remains for Scripture? Merely the letter, a mark flexible and changeable at will. But for us, Scripture consists in its doctrine, in its meaning, through which Scripture is what it is. 2. Nor does the exegetical tradition of meaning, which is founded on Scripture, prove the existence of a didactic tradition of unwritten dogma. 3. The ambiguity of the letter is resolved by the intention of the speaker, the analogy of faith, the spiritual allegory of things, and other aids. 4. Moreover, by the design of the Holy Spirit, there is only one historical and grammatical sense of Scripture, just as there is one Spirit; but that single sense has varied usefulness and application, which demonstrates its fruitfulness and richness, not ambiguity.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: 1. *If the letter and meaning of Scripture are flexible according to one's will, how did you say above that the letter is the faithful guardian of Scripture? Yet that letter and its sense are preserved by Divine providence, and its certainty comes from the tradition of the Church.* 2. *Languages and liberal arts serve to reveal the sense of Scripture, which ought to be directed by a superior and infallible rule for generating the certainty of faith: the word of God, handed down by our forebears, not written.* 3. *Indeed, even the written word must be received by faith. But faith, which is prior to the written word, can only be born from the word handed down. For in Holy Scripture there is the matter, namely the characters and signs of truth hidden beneath them; and the formal truth contained under those signs, which is handed down by the unwritten word of God, propagated in the minds of the faithful, and to be propagated—though it would never have been confirmed by characters, as its vessel and instruments.* 4. *Both Scripture and the Fathers testify to the obscurity of Scripture. But how is it obscure if the intention of the speaker and certain such things remove ambiguity? Nor can any analogy of faith, equally clear to all, be obeyed, since the word of God lacks the evidence of God's attestation and lies hidden in an enigmatic mirror. And did not even the ancient heretics tear apart that spiritual star?* 5. *If there is one sense of Scripture, why does Paul in Acts 13:33 explain those words of Psalm 2:7, "Today I have begotten you," concerning Christ's resurrection, which in Matthew 19:28 is called regeneration; but Augustine in his exposition on the same Psalm explains it concerning Christ's eternal regeneration, temporal birth, and incarnation?* (Ibid., pp. 202–203.) RESPONSE: 1.

Once again you put forward your most audacious trifles, sworn enemy of Scripture, and propose nothing solid. For behold, I did not say Scripture, but the letter as the faithful guardian of the divine word—and not a dead letter, but one that signifies, and thus is joined with sense. And now you dare to subject not only Scripture and all faith but even the providence of God to your tradition? So evidently neither will God exist nor will He look down from heaven unless your Pope has handed it down? 2. Languages and arts serve the written word because through their operation words are understood and matters are illuminated, without regard to tradition as an infallible rule. For example, בָּרָא (bara) means "he created," whether your church or your Pope hands it down or not. And in the words "Herod is a fox," if tradition is silent, all understand it to be a metaphor. For where has tradition determined, defined, or judged the use of languages and arts in explaining Scripture? A far more certain rule is both Scripture itself—and in it the speaker's aim, the sequence of statements, the analogy of faith—and the sober use of sound reason and speech, by which languages and arts are directed. 3. That faith is prior to the written word—that is, after Scripture was written—and therefore from the word handed down and known before Scripture, you rashly and impiously assert; nor do you even attempt to prove it by any reason. Indeed, faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the preaching—but certainly the preaching of the Gospel, and not just any gospel, but that which is written. For every revelation after the canon was established occurs in Scripture, nowhere else. Nor are you so shameless as to dare deny that the Gospel, from which preaching or immortal seed faith is born, is contained in Scripture. For how otherwise could Scripture make one wise for salvation, perfect, and equipped for every good work? And if the formal—that is, the truth of the Gospel—is contained under the material—that is, the signs and characters of Scripture as facts—and thus the kernel under the shell, then does not even you, forgetful of your lies, judge that the whole word of God is contained in Scripture? Otherwise what monstrous insanity would it be to produce a double word from Scripture: a material one (the characters and signs) and a formal one (the word contained under them), written and handed down? Thus in any Scripture there would be a double word: written (the characters, signs) and handed down (the truth or thing comprehended by those characters); and indeed, as your Tridentine fathers know (from whom you nevertheless severely depart), both are to be received with equal piety and reverence—that is, both the characters and signs and the thing contained under them. Thus while you thought yourself wise, you plainly contradicted yourself. 4. If the Gospel is obscure and hidden to you, you will testify against yourself that you are among those whose minds the god of this age has blinded, as St. Paul says in 2 Corinthians 4:3. In truth, the manifestation of truth commends itself to every conscience, as it says in verse 2 there; thus it is a lamp shining in a dark place (2 Peter 1:19). But that clarity requires heavenly and spiritual eyes, true and living faith, as well as subordinate means. Nor does it hinder this that we see here in a mirror and in an enigma. For it is clear that this is understood not concerning those things revealed as necessary for faith and salvation, but concerning those reserved for vision. And whatever heretics once boasted, arrogating spirituality to themselves, all that detracts nothing from those who judge truly and legitimately. For if a wicked wrangler distorts or you pervert the divine word, that prejudices nothing for a just judge. 5. The words of God the Father concerning the Son, "Today I have begotten you" (Psalm 2:7), have one and the same sense: that the Son of God was begotten from eternity from the substance of God the Father—that is, that He is the proper and natural Son of God. But since this is especially renewed in His calling to priesthood and resurrection from the dead, therefore Scripture testifies that these

were then fulfilled—not as if He were then begotten, but because it was powerfully manifested by that reason and demonstration that He was begotten from eternity by God the Father and thus is His true Son. Meanwhile, what you mean by "eternal regeneration of the Son," I do not know. Certainly your words smack of pure heresy.

OBJECTION VII. *Heretics cannot be refuted from Scripture, because they themselves also reject it, but only from ecclesiastical tradition.* RESPONSE: 1. Heretics indeed boast of Scripture, which they twist and distort like charlatans, but they do not demonstrate their meaning from it. 2. By exegetical tradition—the sense founded in Scripture—heretics are rightly refuted. However, this does not prove an unwritten didactic tradition of new dogma.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: 1. *Heretics twist Scripture like charlatans precisely because they do not accept the tradition prior to Scripture.* 2. *That the exegetical tradition, founded on the sense in Holy Scripture, has been and is the rule by which heretics are rightly refuted, must be proved entirely from Scripture itself. This truth must be sought not from Scripture but from tradition.* (Ibid., pp. 203-204) RESPONSE: 1. Do the Jews with their *deuterosis* and the Papists doing the same not twist Scripture, even though both are accustomed to use the shield of a tradition prior to Scripture? Is the Word of God delivered in Scripture easily twisted, but when pronounced orally—which has various hearers and quickly vanishes unless it falls upon a faithful heart—it cannot be twisted? 2. The exegetical tradition of the sense founded in Scripture is nothing other than Scripture itself, namely, explained from Scripture. If we listen to Reding, this must be sought from unwritten tradition, and it is an unwritten dogma. He babbles as usual.

OBJECTION VIII. *From Scripture alone it cannot be sufficiently determined which articles are necessary for all and each individual. Therefore, ecclesiastical tradition is needed for this.* RESPONSE: 1. If ecclesiastical tradition determines them, it certainly does not wander outside Scripture but points them out in the Scriptures themselves. What does this have to do with the tradition of unwritten dogma? 2. Scripture indeed does not explicitly call the necessary things "necessary." Yet it teaches what is the certain rule of believing and acting, what that foundation is to which all things must be referred as to their center. It also teaches what our true prudence and wisdom are, what life and blessing are, what the saving covenant and testament of God is, what the mystery of godliness is. These things abundantly suffice.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: 1. *The truth which is openly declared—which articles are necessary for all and each individual—is a matter of faith. But that is not written. Therefore, it is an unwritten dogma.* 2. *For you, the rule of faith is properly the instinct of conscience. Where is this written?* 3. *Could it have published the foundation of faith?* (Ibid., p. 204) RESPONSE: 1. But how will you teach that truth from a tradition wandering against Scripture? Try, so that we may see. Scripture implicitly shows all necessary things in the rule and foundation of faith; and it hands down marks from which the necessary can be explicitly known, as I have shown elsewhere at length. 2. I have nowhere said that one's own conscience is the rule of faith. The revelation contained in the Scriptures alone is the rule of faith. That it commends itself to every conscience,



and is to be received not according to another's sense (like that of the Pope, Cardinals, etc.) but according to one's own with reference to salvation, is attested by St. Paul (Rom. 14; 2 Cor. 4:2). Nor is the persuasion of one's own conscience opposed to the Word of God, but to a blindfolded, false faith. 3. Have you never read, Redingius, about the foundation of faith in the Scriptures? Have you never perused the most explicit passages—Isaiah 28:16; 1 Corinthians 3:11; Ephesians 2:20—not to mention countless others? What sort of thing, then, is it that your unwritten tradition proposes as the foundation of faith? Do not betray a lust for bringing forward anything at all and an ignorance unworthy of a Christian!

OBJECTION IX: *Those doctrines which are not contained explicitly in Scripture but are deduced from it only by inference are known not from Scripture itself but solely from ecclesiastical tradition. For a doctrine drawn by inference from Scripture is not Scripture itself, since in every syllogistic inference the conclusion is something different from the premises. Moreover, in such an inference, one premise is always from Scripture, the other from reason, which therefore cannot be considered revealed before the Church's tradition.* RESPONSE: 1. A doctrine elicited from Scripture by inference is itself Scripture, as Christ testifies in Matthew 22:29, where He rebukes the Jews for being ignorant of the doctrine of the resurrection—which is to be derived by inference—as if they were ignorant of the Scriptures. 2. Although the conclusion is different from the premises, it is nevertheless contained in the power and force of the premises, just as a definition is contained in the power and force of what is defined. The only difference here is that the slower human intellect does not immediately grasp what is contained in the force of the written word. Hence, what our intellect distinguishes as different, the divine intellect apprehends as the same. 3. Such a conclusion, even if it follows from a premise of reason, can nevertheless be apprehended by faith before ecclesiastical tradition, since faith does not exclude such a principle and foundation. Indeed, the premise of reason in such a syllogism is nothing other than the unfolding and declaration of a scriptural term, and therefore in such a deduction the total cause of the conclusion is Scripture.

EXCEPTION BY REDING: *The conclusion is a matter of faith not only insofar as it is contained virtually and implicitly in the premises, but also insofar as it is explicitly set forth. Yet it does not rely on Scripture as such, but on the principle of tradition flowing from the mouth of Christ or the Apostles, or resting on the definitions of the Church's Councils* (Ibid. pp. 204–205). RESPONSE: You answer rather superficially, though more carefully—if not more solidly—than Walenburg and the rest of your Methodist followers. Nor do I know whether your associates will concede, or even whether the Council of Trent established, that the traditions which the Roman Church markets are nothing other than explicit conclusions contained implicitly and virtually in the written word. How then are the written word and tradition considered opposite species under the same genus? But if you wish to call conclusions legitimately deduced from Scripture—and thus explicitly drawn—by the name of "traditions," then the dispute will no longer be about the thing itself but only about the name. Yet it will then be your task not merely to boast but to demonstrate solidly that your dogmatic traditions—about which we contend and which we assert are contrary

to Scripture—are deduced from the written word by legitimate inference and are contained in the power, force, and validity of that same written word. *Here is Rhodes; here leap.*

OBJECTION X. *The Fathers support traditions. Basil, in On the Holy Spirit chapter 27, attributes equal force to doctrines handed down by writing and by Apostolic tradition. Chrysostom, on 2 Thessalonians 2, teaches that many things have been handed down without writing, worthy of the same faith as Scripture. Augustine, in On Baptism Against the Donatists IV.24, asserts that what the whole Church holds, instituted by Councils but always retained, is most rightly believed to have been handed down by Apostolic authority. And the ancients everywhere urge tradition from prescription.* RESPONSE: Understand that they sometimes refer to the *manner* of handing down, sometimes to historical or free ritual tradition, or exegetical tradition—about which we do not dispute—but not to didactic tradition of dogma not founded in Scripture, as is clear from the circumstances employed in the cited passages. Hence Jerome on Haggai chapter 1: "What they bring forward and confirm without the authority and testimony of Scripture, as if by Apostolic tradition, is struck by the sword of God."

EXCEPTION BY REDING: 1. *Are the traditions that you call historical human or divine? If human, why do the Fathers call dogmas that are in agreement with the Scriptures trustworthy? If divine, since you contrast them with exegetical traditions, they will be didactic.* 2. *Basil, in the cited book, expressly writes that we have received the dogmas preached in the Church partly from written doctrine and partly from the tradition of the Apostles delivered to us in mystery. Soon after, in chapter 29, he lists many such traditions, and whatever they may be, the Holy Father certainly calls them dogmas, which ought to be divinely inspired.* 3. *Chrysostom also clearly agrees with the decree of Trent in the cited book, saying that the Apostles handed down many things without writing, and these are worthy of the same faith as those that are written.* 4. *Augustine, in the cited book concerning the baptism of infants, speaking of ancient articles of faith, writes that what the whole Church holds, and was not established by councils but always retained, is most rightly believed by the authority of apostolic tradition. Elsewhere, in Book V against the Donatists, chapter 23, discussing the non-rebaptism of heretics, he says that many things are held by the whole Church, and because they were commanded by the Apostles, they are rightly believed, even though they are not found in writing.* 5. *Jerome, in the cited passage, speaks not of all traditions but of those that exist and are spontaneously discovered, yet are referred to as apostolic traditions.* (Ibid, pag. 255, 206.) RESPONSE: 1. I say that historical and ritual free traditions, sometimes commended by the Holy Fathers, are human because those divinely revealed are found only in the Scriptures. 2. The words of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit, chapter 27, read as follows: "Among the things handed down in the Church as teachings and instructions from the elders, some we have from written doctrine; others we have received from apostolic tradition transmitted in mystery." The "teachings" here are the chapters and articles of the Christian religion, which today go by the name of dogmas; the "instructions" are ceremonies, institutions, and rites, whose rationale is not always clear (cf. Acts 15:1–4; Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14). If he had meant articles of faith by the name of dogmas, it would be utterly absurd for him to write that we received them from apostolic tradition and not from written doctrine. For are there no articles of faith—indeed, are not all of them written? Moreover, Basil immediately calls his

dogmas "unwritten mysteries," which he contrasts with "the Gospel" or "the preaching of the Gospel." Furthermore, in enumerating examples of dogmas, there are none except those pertaining to rites. For in this category he places turning toward the East, the sign of the cross, the formula of invocation in the Eucharist, the blessing of baptismal water and oil, triple immersion, genuflections, standing, and similar things. In vain would one seek there purgatory, the Mass, merits, the veneration of images, the invocation of saints, and similar things. 3. Chrysostom rightly writes that the Church has instituted many things without writing—understanding, of course, not articles of faith but rites and ceremonies pertaining to the order and decorum of the Church. However, he said less correctly that these deserve the same faith as those that are written—unless perhaps he meant this concerning the general precept of maintaining order and decorum (1 Cor. 14:40). 4. Augustine in the cited passages speaks neither about doctrine or articles of faith nor about the doctrine of sacraments in their essence; rather, he speaks about their rules, examples, and certain circumstances. For he does not derive the dogma itself concerning not rebaptizing heretics from tradition but manifestly draws it from Scripture (Book I on Baptism against the Donatists, chapter 7), saying: "Lest I seem to rely on human arguments (including the authority of the Catholic Church itself among human arguments), I bring forward clear proofs from the Gospel." Later, in Book II, chapter 6, he says: "Let us assert divine matters from the Scriptures," etc. And in Book V, chapter 22, he argues: "By the testimony of Holy Scripture it is not only shown but clearly shown that many pseudo-Christians, although they do not have the same charity as the saints, nevertheless have baptism in common with the saints." Moreover, Augustine refers to apostolic traditions—in the sense I have described—those things that both the whole Church holds and has always held from apostolic times. But most of your traditions lack both those conditions; some lack one. 5. Jerome in the words I cited indeed argues against those who fabricate something under the pretext of apostolic traditions—as you also are accustomed to attribute false traditions to the Apostles. Yet the force of his entire testimony lies in these words: "without authority and testimony of Scripture," which constitutes a valid argument. For his point is this: it is characteristic of heretics to invent something outside Scripture, and whatever is put forward must be confirmed from Scripture. Otherwise his statement would be inept: "What heretics spontaneously discover and fabricate without authority and testimony of Scripture must be rejected." As if heretics could be said to fabricate anything spontaneously with authority and testimony of Scripture; or as if they could establish anything at all that ought not to be rejected. Furthermore, there is no need to bring back to the anvil those testimonies of the Fathers concerning traditions that you collected on page 189 and following—or rather excerpted from Bellarmine—since they have been thoroughly examined by the learned Junius in his *Animadversions on Bellarmine*, Controversy I, Book IV, chapter 7.