

the establishment of the Greek exarchate at Ravenna (a power that can never properly, I conceive, be reckoned among the ten horns of the prophetic beast, emerging as the latter are said to have done, one and all, out of the barbarian invading flood), the Lombards came in; just as if to neutralize the Greek emperor's power in that country, and prevent its domineering over the Pope at Rome, so as over the Patriarch at Constantinople; and for some years so divided the empire of Italy with them, as to allow of Gregory the Great and others acting independently the part of king, as well as of Pope, at Rome.

At length in the course of the eighth century, the Lombard power altogether preponderating, and after the conquest of the exarchate, A. D. 752, acting like its predecessors in Italy to overawe the Roman see, the assistance of the Franks was called in by Popes Stephen II and Adrian I, from their devoted Gaulic province. And then the Lombard horn was eradicated through the instrumentality of Pepin and Charlemagne, just like those of the Vandals and the Ostrogoths previously, never again to be heard of in Christendom: and the exarchate of Ravenna, together with other of the Lombard conquests, attached forever to the Roman see, under the very singular appellation of the Patrimony of Peter.—“*Horw Apocalypticæ*,” Rev. E. B. Elliott, A. M., Vol. III, pp. 140-143, 3d edition. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1847.

Ten Tribes, The, THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL (953?-722 B. C.).—The kingdom of the ten tribes maintained its existence for about two hundred years. The little state was at last overwhelmed by the Assyrian power. This happened 722 B. C., when Samaria, as already narrated, was captured by Sargon, king of Nineveh, and the flower of the people were carried away into captivity. The gaps thus made in the population of Samaria were filled with other subjects or captives of the Assyrian king. The descendants of these, mingled with the Israelites that were still left in the country, formed the Samaritans of the time of Christ.—“*General History*,” Philip Van Ness Myers, p. 51. Boston: Ginn & Company.

Sargon II was a great conqueror. In 722 B. C. he captured Samaria and carried away the most influential classes of the “ten tribes” of Israel into captivity. The greater portion of the captives were scattered among the towns of Media, and probably became, for the most part, merged with the population of that region.—*Id.*, p. 42.

Tetzel.—See Indulgences, 239; Reformation, 407.

Theodoric.—See Papal Supremacy, 355; Rome, 439, 444, 445, 446, 448, 450, 451; Seven Trumpets, 507.

Theodosius.—See Bible, 95; Councils, 119; Eastern Question, 148; Heresy, 202; Inquisition, 251; Paganism, 323, 324; Rome, 437, 444.

Theosophy.—See Spiritualism, 532, 533.

Theudas.—See Jerusalem.

Three Angels' Messages.—See Advent, Second, 22-25.

Tiberius.—See Rome, 435, 436; Seventy Weeks, 520-523.

Tithing, BLESSING IN PRACTICE OF.—So far as known to the writer, there is but one evangelical denomination in the world which accepts

the tithe as a church tenet and belief, and regards the law of the tithe as of the same binding force as the law of the Sabbath. I refer to the Seventh-day Adventists. While the percentage of their growth in church membership has been large, having increased in all the world from 5,440 in 1870 to 104,526 in 1910, the financial results of their recognition of the law of the tithe are far more remarkable.—“*What We Owe, and the Results of Paying It*,” p. 21 (a tract bound with others in pamphlet entitled, “*Tithing and Tithing Reminiscences*,” A layman). Chicago, 1912.

Tithing, AS A TEST OF CHARACTER.—The supreme purpose of the tithe is to develop character and test our loyalty to God. The payment of the tithe when there is no compulsion and no pressure brought to bear, when it is a matter of a clear conscience between yourself and God, will develop in you those sterling qualities that will make you worth while in the kingdom.

The Bible designates two sources of revenue,—tithes and free-will offerings. The tithe is the Lord's, whether we keep it or pay it to him, not because he needs it in his business, but because it is dishonest to keep what does not belong to us.

The tithe is our just debt to God, and should be paid promptly and cheerfully, like any other debt. God has no need of our money (seeing all is his), but requires his share just to remind us that we are in partnership with him. Just as the tribute money paid to Cæsar was a recognition of his authority, so the tithe is the recognition of God's interest in every dollar we receive.—“*Tithing*,” tract compiled by C. Vernon Fox, M. D., p. 4. Chicago: The Methodist Book Concern.

Titus.—See Jerusalem, 262, 263.

Totila.—See Rome, 445, 448.

Tradition, JEWISH.—Shammai and Hillel [in the century before Christ] were the first to speak of the written and the oral law as equally authoritative.—*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. IX, art. “*Oral Law*,” p. 424.

Traditions were laws, or precepts of men, which they (the Jews) said had been handed down by word of mouth from past generations. . . . They were often treated as of more authority than the laws of God.—“*The New Testament, with Introductions, Notes, and References*,” note on Matt. 15:2 (pocket ed.). New York: American Tract Society, 1906.

Tradition.—From being transcribers and expounders of the law, they [the Sopherim, “scribes”] supplied, after the captivity, the place of the prophets and inspired oracles, which had ceased; and from them arose those glosses and interpretations which our Lord rebukes under the term “traditions.” These became so numerous that they were collected by the Rabbi Judah (A. D. 200) into six books, called the *Mishna* (Repetition of the oral law), to which was subsequently added a book of comments (*Gemara*), which completed the whole traditionary doctrine of the Jewish church. The *Mishna* and the *Gemara* together constitute the *Talmud*, of which there are two, one by the Jews in Judea (called the Jerusalem Talmud), the other by those in Babylon (called the Babylonian).—*Oxford Sunday School Teacher's Bible*, art. “*Jewish Sects, Parties, etc.*,” sec. on the Sopherim (Scribes).

Tradition, DEFINED BY ROME.—Tradition (*παράδοσις*) means properly the act of handing down, and thus the doctrine so handed down. In its widest sense it includes all truths or supposed truths handed down from one generation to another; and in all societies which have no literature tradition is, with all its manifold imperfections, the great bond between the present and the past, and one of the great distinguishing marks between man and the brutes, which latter have no tradition, and therefore no history.—*A Catholic Dictionary*, William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold (R. C.), art. "Tradition," p. 882. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1893.

By tradition we do not mean a mere report, a hearsay, wanting sufficient evidence to deserve belief; or a local tradition started by men, and therefore merely human, as were those traditions of the Pharisees condemned by our Lord; but we mean a tradition first coming from God, continually taught, recorded, and in all desirable ways kept alive by a body of trustworthy men successively chosen in a divine, or divinely appointed manner, well instructed, and who are, as a body, protected by God from teaching what is wrong, or handing down unfaithfully to others the doctrine committed to them.—*Catholic Belief*, Joseph Faà di Bruno, D. D. (R. C.), pp. 39, 40. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1881.

The objectivity of Christianity would have necessarily disappeared, if, besides the Bible, there had not been a rule of faith, to wit, universal tradition. Without this rule, it would ever be impossible to determine with positiveness, safety, and general obligation, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity.—*Symbolism*, John Adam Moehler, D. D. (R. C.), p. 281. London: Thomas Baker, 1906.

The truths of Christian revelation were made known to the apostles either by Christ himself or by the Holy Ghost. They constitute what is called the Deposit of Faith, to which nothing has been added since the apostolic age. . . . The Bible, as the inspired record of revelation, contains the word of God; that is, it contains those revealed truths which the Holy Ghost wishes to be transmitted in writing. However, all revealed truths are not contained in the Bible. . . . Though the inspiration of any writer and the sacred character of his work be antecedent to its recognition by the church, yet we are dependent upon the church for our knowledge of the existence of this inspiration. She is the appointed witness and guardian of revelation. From her alone we know what books belong to the Bible. At the Council of Trent she enumerated the books which must be considered "as sacred and canonical."—*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. II, art. "Bible," p. 543.

Now for the first time the Roman Church became conscious of the full significance of tradition, so that, if they surrendered it in its character of an infallible transmission of God's word, they would surrender themselves; for all the ordinances against which the Reformation protested as novelties and abuses, established their divine claims from this tradition.—*Handbook to the Controversy with Rome*, Karl von Hase, Vol. I, p. 117. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1909.

Whence comes that tradition? Does it descend from the authority of our Lord and the Gospels? Does it come from the commands and epistles of the apostles? God testifies that we must do the things that

are written, saying to Joshua, "The book of the law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it day and night, that thou mayest observe to do all that is written in it." Likewise, the Lord, when he sent his apostles, commanded them to baptize all nations, and to teach them to observe whatsoever he commanded. If, therefore, it is commanded, either in the Gospels or in the apostolic epistles, or in the Acts, that those coming from any heresy should not be baptized, but only hands laid on them, then this is a divine tradition, and let it be observed; but if in these books heretics are called nothing but adversaries and antichrists; if we are told to avoid them as perverse and self-condemned, why should we not condemn those who, the apostle witnesses, are self-condemned?—*Cyprian, Ep. 74, Ad Pompeium*; cited in *The Infallibility of the Church*, George Salmon, D. D., p. 145. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1914.

I. We can never be assured that any articles were invariably or entirely without any addition or diminution conveyed down to us by tradition; since it hath been in all times and ages observed that matters of fact, much more of belief, not immediately committed to writing, presently degenerated into fables, and were corrupted by the capricious malice or ignorance of men. . . .

II. In the next place, tradition cannot certainly and invariably propose the belief of Christianity to all private persons. For, from whence shall this tradition be received? From a pope, or a council, or both; or from none of these, but only the universal church? In every one of these cases infinite difficulties will occur, which even singly will appear insuperable. . . .

III. Tradition is so far from being independent of other articles of the Christian faith, that the belief in all other articles must be presupposed before it. For since all sects propose different traditions, and the truth of none of them is self-evident, it must first be known which is the true church before it can be determined which is the true tradition. . . .

IV. Lastly, it can never be proved that tradition was assigned by God as a rule of faith. For this proof must be taken either from the Scriptures or from tradition. Not from the first; for not to say that Scripture is wholly silent in this matter, such a supposition would destroy itself, and involves a manifest contradiction. . . . No less absurd is it to imagine that any proof of this article can be drawn from tradition. For we can never be assured that the tradition of this very article is of divine authority and consequently infallible, until we be first satisfied that God, by assigning tradition for a rule of faith, conferred divine authority upon it, which is the matter now in question.—*Treatise of Bishop Pecoocke, Proving Scripture to be the Rule of Faith*, published by Henry Wharton; cited in *Romanism: A Doctrinal and Historical Examination of the Creed of Pope Pius IV*, Rev. Robert Charles Jenkins, M. A., pp. 60-63. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Tradition, CHRISTIAN; ITS BEGINNINGS.—Some of the Apostolic Fathers are found in the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament at the end of the canonical writings; Clement was first made known through the *Codex Alexandrinus*; similarly, Hermas and Pseudo-Barnabas are appended to the canonical books in the *Codex Sinaiticus*. Standing between the New Testament era and the literary efflorescence of the late second century, these writers represent the original elements of Christian tradition.—*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, art. "Apostolic Fathers," p. 639.

"Without tradition," says Collier, "we could not prove that the Old, any more than the New Testament contains the word of God." "Tradition, not Scripture," Lessing says, "is the rock on which the church of Jesus Christ is built."—"Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent," Rev. A. Nampon, S. J. (R. C.), p. 157. Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham, 1869.

TRADITION SAFER THAN THE BIBLE.—Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine tradition contain the word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths. Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, tradition is to us more clear and safe.—"Catholic Belief," Joseph Faà di Bruno, D. D. (R. C.), p. 45. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1881.

TRADITION OF SAME AUTHORITY AS THE SCRIPTURES.—The sacred and holy, ecumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, . . . seeing clearly that this truth and discipline [of the gospel] are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; (the synod), following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament,—seeing that one God is the author of both,—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.—"Dogmatic Canons and Decrees," pp. 7, 8. New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1912.

NOTE.—This decree was celebrated in the fourth session of the council of Trent, April 8, 1546.—Eds.

TRADITION, AUTHORITY OF, PROVED BY THE CHANGE OF THE SABBATH.—Finally, at the last opening on the eighteenth of January, 1562 [Council of Trent], their last scruple was set aside; the Archbishop of Reggio made a speech in which he openly declared that tradition stood above Scripture. The authority of the church could therefore not be bound to the authority of the Scriptures, because the church had changed Sabbath into Sunday, not by the command of Christ but by its own authority. With this, to be sure, the last illusion was destroyed, and it was declared that tradition does not signify antiquity, but continual inspiration.—"Canon and Tradition," Dr. J. H. Holtzman, p. 263.

Such is the condition of the heretics today that they appeal to no other matter more than they, under the pretense of the word of God, overthrow the authority of the church; as though the church, which is the body of Christ, could be opposed to this word, or the head to the body. Yea, the authority of the church is most gloriously set forth in the Holy Scriptures; for while on the one hand she recommends them, declares them divine, offers them to us to be read, in doubtful matters explains them faithfully, and condemns whatever is contrary to them; on the other hand, the legal precepts in the Scriptures taught by the Lord have ceased by virtue of the same authority. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been changed into the Lord's day. . . . These and other similar matters have not ceased by virtue of

Christ's teaching (for he says he has not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it), but they have been changed by virtue of the authority of the church. Should this authority cease (since there must be heresies), who would then witness for truth, and confound the obstinacy of the heretics?—Extract from an Address by Caspar del Fossa, Archbishop of Reggio (R. C.), in the Council of Trent, Jan. 18, 1562; cited in "History of the Councils," Labbe and Cossart, Vol. XIV, cols. 1253, 1254.

TRADITION, UNRELIABLE CHARACTER OF.—If all the testimony of Christ were to be resolved into those who heard some say that others told them, that they had it from such, who saw those who conversed with them who saw Christ in the flesh—at such a distance the authority of a testimony is extremely lessened—which is not like a river which grows greater by running; but like a mineral water, which loses its strength by being carried too far.—Extract from a Sermon by Bishop Stillingfleet, preached at the Guildhall Chapel (London), Nov. 27, 1687; cited in "Romanism: A Doctrinal and Historical Examination of the Creed of Pope Pius IV," Rev. R. C. Jenkins, M. A., p. 68. London: The Religious Tract Society.

TRADITION, THE BIBLE, AND THE ANCIENTS.—Thus while we leave the Bible to gad after the traditions of the ancients, we hear the ancients themselves confessing that what knowledge they had at this point was such as they had gathered from the Bible.

Since therefore antiquity itself hath turned over the controversy to that sovereign book which we had fondly straggled from, we shall do better not to detain this venerable apparition of Leontius [the representative of apostolical tradition] any longer.—"The Works of John Milton in Verse and Prose," Vol. III, "Of Prelatical Episcopacy," pp. 76, 77. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1851.

You may take it as a general rule that there is not a Father who, if his own belief is demanded for something not contained in Scripture which he is not disposed to accept, will not reply in some such language as St. Jerome: "This, because it has not authority from the Scriptures, is with the same easiness despised as approved." "As we accept those things that are written, so we reject those things that are not written." "These things which they invent, as if by apostolic tradition, without the authority of Scripture, the sword of God smites." You will see, then, that if we were at the desire of the Romish advocates to leave the Scriptures and resort to the Fathers of the early church for a decision of our controversies, these very Fathers would send us back to the Scriptures as the only guide to truth, the only safeguard against heresy.—"The Infallibility of the Church," George Salmon, D. D., p. 147. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1914.

TRADITION, PROTESTANTS CHARGED WITH INCONSISTENCY CONCERNING.—But is it not the fact that Protestants are obliged to allow, at least by their practice, that the absolute rejection of tradition is *absurd* and *impracticable*? They admit the Scriptures and a multitude of doctrinal or moral truths, which, as Luther acknowledges, they could not have received except from tradition. Whence do they learn that the Old and New Testaments are inspired?—From tradition. Who taught them that a multitude of texts of Scripture are to be understood in a sense quite opposed to their literal meaning? for instance, that Sunday is to be set apart for the worship of God, and not the Sabbath; that receiving the eucharist is not absolutely necessary for the salvation of infants, notwithstanding those words of our Saviour: "Except you eat

the flesh of the Son of man . . . you shall not have life in you;” that baptism conferred on infants even by heretics is valid, although Jesus Christ has associated baptism and faith as inseparable means of salvation: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;” that the washing of feet is not obligatory, in spite of that formal precept: “You also ought to wash one another’s feet;” and that terrible sanction, “If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me.”

Who has told them that the command to abstain from eating blood and things strangled, which was published by the apostles at the Council of Jerusalem, no longer affects us?—Tradition. The Protestants called Episcopalianians regard episcopacy as a divine institution, and by divine right superior to the priestly order: from what source have they derived this doctrine?—From tradition. In reality it is tradition alone which has given Protestants all they yet possess of Christianity. They cannot then reject this same tradition without placing themselves in flagrant contradiction with themselves.—“*Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent*,” Rev. A. Nampon. S. J. (R. C.), pp. 152, 153. Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham, 1869.

Tradition, NOT APOSTOLIC.—There is not the slightest historical evidence that the apostles transmitted to posterity any rule, but what is recorded in the New Testament. The Fathers therefore are precisely on the same footing with respect to the authority of their interpretations, as the commentators of the present age. Nor in fact are they uniform in their interpretations even in regard to doctrine, notwithstanding the agreement alleged by the Church of Rome; though some commentators may be selected, as well ancient as modern, which agree on particular points. The *regula fidei*, therefore, set up by the Church of Rome, was justly discarded by our Reformers, who contended for the right of Biblical interpretation unfettered by the shackles of tradition.—“*A Course of Lectures*,” Herbert Marsh, D. D., F. R. S., part 3, pp. 13, 14. Boston: Cummings and Hilliard, 1815.

Whatever be the rule of faith adopted by any Protestant community, it is so far from being considered as independent of Scripture, or as resting on authority derived through another channel, that its validity is acknowledged on the sole condition of its being a fair and legitimate deduction from Scripture. This total and absolute dependence of the *regula fidei* on the Bible (not the refusal to admit one at all) is that which characterizes Protestants.—*Id.*, p. 15.

Tradition, FOUNDATION OF ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH.—In the words of the Roman author [Perrone] just quoted, “The Tridentine Fathers knew well that there are certain articles of faith which rest on tradition alone; they sanctioned tradition as a rule and foundation of faith wholly distinct from Scripture.”—“*Letters to M. Gondon*,” Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., p. 131. London: Francis and John Rivington, 1848.

Tradition, A SECOND BIBLE.—Let me entreat you to reflect, whether the Church of Rome, by assigning equal and independent authority to tradition, of which she herself is the only channel, or rather the only source, has not only developed a second, unwritten Bible, but invalidates the first written one? whether what Tertullian says of the heretics of his day is not true of her, “*Credis sine Scripturis, ut credas contra Scripturas?*” [You believe without the Scriptures, in order that you may believe contrary to the Scriptures], and whether in this way also she does not abrogate the laws of God, and impose her own in their place?—*Id.*, p. 133.

Tradition, WORD OF GOD VS. WORD OF THE DEVIL.—Cardinal Hosius says, “That which the Church (of Rome) teaches is the express word of God; and that which is held contrary to the sense and consent of the church, is the express word of the devil.”—*Id.*, p. 153.

Tradition, NECESSITY OF.—The objectivity of Christianity would have necessarily disappeared, if, besides the Bible, there had not been a rule of faith, to wit, universal tradition. Without this rule, it would ever be impossible to determine with positiveness, safety, and general obligation, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. The individual, at best, could only hazard the assertion, This is *my* view, *my* interpretation of Scripture, or in other words, without tradition there would be *no doctrine of the church, and no church*, but individual Christians only; no certainty and security, but only doubt and probability.—“*Symbolism*,” John Adam Moehler, D. D. (R. C.), p. 231. London: Thomas Baker, 1906.

Tradition, DEFINITION OF.—What then is tradition? The peculiar Christian sense existing in the church, and transmitted by ecclesiastical education; yet this sense is not to be conceived as detached from its subject matter—nay, it is formed in and by this matter, so it may be called a full sense. Tradition is the living word, perpetuated in the hearts of believers. To this sense, as the general sense, the interpretation of Holy Writ is intrusted. The declaration which it pronounces on any controverted subject, is the judgment of the church; and, therefore, the church is judge in matters of faith (*judex controversiarum*). Tradition, in the objective sense, is the general faith of the church through all ages, manifested by outward historical testimonies; in this sense, tradition is usually termed the *norma*—the standard of Scriptural interpretation—the rule of faith.—*Id.*, p. 279.

Tradition, CHURCH OF ENGLAND’S ARTICLE AGAINST.—It is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.—“*Letters to M. Gondon*,” Christopher Wordsworth, D. D., p. 39. London: Francis & John Rivington, 1848.

Tradition, PROTESTANT APPEAL TO.—The first precept in the Bible is that of sanctifying the seventh day: “God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.” Gen. 2: 3. This precept was confirmed by God in the ten commandments. “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Exodus 20. On the other hand, Christ declares that he is not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. Matt. 5: 17. He himself observed the Sabbath: “And, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day.” Luke 4: 16. His disciples likewise observed it after his death: “They rested on the Sabbath day, according to the commandment.” Luke 23: 56. Yet with all this weight of Scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath or seventh day holy, Protestants of all denominations make this a profane day, and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None whatever, except the unwritten word, or tradition, of the Catholic Church, which declares that the apostles made the change in

honor of Christ's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week.—*The End of Religious Controversy*, Rev. John Milner, D. D. (R. C.), p. 71. New York: P. J. Kenedy.

I will confine myself to one more instance of Protestants' abandoning their own rule, that of Scripture alone, to follow ours, of Scripture explained by tradition. If an intelligent pagan, who had carefully perused the New Testament, were asked which of the ordinances mentioned in it is most explicitly and strictly enjoined, I make no doubt but he would answer that it is "the washing of feet." To convince you of this, be pleased to read the first seventeen verses of St. John 13. Observe the motive assigned for Christ's performing the ceremony there recorded, namely, his "love for his disciples:" next, the time of his performing it, namely, when he was about to depart out of this world. Then remark the stress he lays upon it, in what he said to Peter: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Finally, his injunction at the conclusion of the ceremony, "If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." I now ask, On what pretense can those who profess to make Scripture alone the rule of their religion totally disregard this institution and precept? Had this ceremony been observed in the church when Luther and the other first Protestants began to dogmatize, there is no doubt but they would have retained it; but, having learned from her that it was only figurative, they acquiesced in this decision, contrary to what appears to be the plain sense of Scripture.—*Id.*, pp. 71, 72.

Tradition, A ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEW OF.—The Fathers had spoken of the unwritten teaching of the apostles, which was to be sought in the churches they had founded, of esoteric doctrines, and views which must be of apostolic origin because they are universal, of the inspiration of general councils, and a revelation continued beyond the New Testament. But the Council of Trent resisted the conclusions which this language seemed to countenance, and they were left to be pursued by private speculation. One divine deprecated the vain pretense of arguing from Scripture, by which Luther could not be confuted, and the Catholics were losing ground; and at Trent a speaker averred that Christian doctrine had been so completely determined by the Schoolmen that there was no further need to recur to Scripture.

This idea is not extinct, and Perrone uses it to explain the inferiority of Catholics as Biblical critics. If the Bible is inspired, says Peresius, still more must its interpretation be inspired. It must be interpreted variously, says the Cardinal of Cusa, according to necessity; a change in the opinion of the church implies a change in the will of God. One of the greatest Tridentine divines declares that a doctrine must be true if the church believes it, without any warrant from Scripture. According to Petavius, the general belief of Catholics at a given time is the work of God, and of higher authority than all antiquity and all the Fathers. Scripture may be silent, and tradition contradictory, but the church is independent of both. Any doctrine which Catholic divines commonly assert, without proof, to be revealed, must be taken as revealed. The testimony of Rome, as the only remaining apostolic church, is equivalent to an unbroken chain of tradition. In this way, after Scripture had been subjugated, tradition itself was deposited; and the constant belief of the past yielded to the general conviction of the present.—*The History of Freedom*, John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton (R. C.), pp. 513, 514. London: Macmillan & Co., 1909.

Transubstantiation, DECREE OF.—And because that Christ our Redeemer declared that which he offered under the species of bread to be truly his own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the church of God, and this holy synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is by the Holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation.—*Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 74. New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1912.

Transubstantiation, CANONS CONCERNING.—Canon I. If any one denieth that, in the sacrament of the most holy eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that he is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue; let him be anathema.

Canon II. If any one saith that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be anathema.

Canon III. If any one denieth that, in the venerable sacrament of the eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated; let him be anathema.

Canon IV. If any one saith that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the eucharist, but (are there) only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that, in the hosts, or consecrated particles, which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true body of the Lord remaineth not; let him be anathema.—*Id.*, pp. 81, 82.

Transubstantiation, ROMAN CATHOLIC TEACHING CONCERNING.—

20. How does our Lord become present in the eucharist?

Our Lord becomes present in the eucharist by transubstantiation; i. e., by the changing of the whole substance of the bread into the body of Jesus Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood.

21. Is it then true that after consecration there is neither bread nor wine on the altar?

Yes; after consecration nothing remains but the body and blood of Christ.

22. What remains of the bread and the wine after consecration?

After consecration nothing remains of them but the species or appearances. The substance of the bread and the substance of the wine have been changed into the substance of the body of Jesus Christ and the substance of his blood.

23. Are the substance of the bread and the substance of the wine annihilated when the host is consecrated?

No, but they are changed into the true body and the true blood of Jesus Christ. If they were annihilated, there would be no change. Now, the church expressly teaches that there is a change.

24. Is Jesus Christ, whole and entire, present in the eucharist?

Yes, Jesus Christ, whole and entire, is present under the appear-