

SCRIPTURE, TRADITION, AND THE CHURCH¹

WE read in the Acts of the Apostles (xv, 23-29):

‘The Apostles and ancients, brethren, to the brethren of the Gentiles that are at Antioch and in Syria and Cilicia—Greeting.

‘It hath seemed good to us assembled together (*ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκλεξαμένους*) to choose out men and to send them unto you. with our well-beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have given their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

‘We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who themselves also by word of mouth will tell you the same things.

‘For it hath seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things—that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols—and from blood—and from things strangled—and from fornication. From which things keeping yourselves you shall do well. Fare ye well.’

We read in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas (Part 3, Qu. 42, Art. 4, Eng. trans.):

‘It was fitting that Christ should not commit his doctrine to writing:

‘First on account of his dignity; for the more excellent the teacher the more excellent should be his manner of teaching. Consequently it was fitting that Christ . . . should adopt that manner of teaching whereby his doctrine is imprinted on the hearts of his hearers . . . For writings are ordained as to an end unto the imprinting of doctrine on the hearts of the hearers.

‘Secondly, on account of the excellence of Christ’s doctrine, which cannot be expressed in writing, according to John (xxi, 25), *There are also many other things which Jesus did; which if they were written everyone, the world itself I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written . . .*

‘And if Christ had committed his doctrine to writing men would have no deeper thought of his doctrine than that which appears on the surface of the writing.

‘Thirdly, that his doctrine might reach all in an orderly manner: Himself teaching his disciples immediately; and they subse-

¹ The substance of a paper read, in connection with the Church Unity Octave, at Oxford, January, 1943. For Fr. McNabb’s paper for the Octave, 1942, ‘The World Mission of the Jews,’ cf. *Prayer and Unity* (Blackwell; 55).

quently teaching others by preaching and writing; whereas if he himself had written, his doctrine would have reached all immediately.'

* * * * *

A close examination of these two extracts may, perhaps, throw some light on the somewhat intricate subject of 'Holy Scripture and Tradition,' or better still: Holy Scripture, Tradition and the Teaching Church.

Our definitions present no great difficulty. By Scripture we mean the books of the Old and the New Testament; which begin with Genesis and end with the Apocalypse. By Tradition we mean all other written or unwritten witnesses to the Church's faith. These witnesses to the Church's faith are chiefly: the infallible Conciliar and Papal decisions, the official Creeds, the sacramental rites, the Liturgy, the ordinary administrative acts of the Church, the works of the Fathers and theologians of the Church. Both Scripture and Tradition are spoken of as Rules of Faith; and their relative importance as Rules of Faith has occasioned a vast controversial literature.

The phrase 'Rule of Faith' seems to have arisen about the fifteenth or sixteenth century. We are not certain that its rise has been worth the endless discussions which it has occasioned. But we are certain that in some minds the phrase 'Rule of Faith' has led to the false idea that outside the Teaching Church there is some Rule or Measure by which the Church as a whole, and every individual in that whole, must weigh and measure its faith. Now if something outside the Teaching Church were the Rule and Measure of the Teaching Church's faith, it would be very effectively the cause of the Teaching Church's faith, whereas both Scripture and Tradition are not the cause but the effect of the Teaching Church's faith.

Let me express this by a remote possibility. So many things have been destroyed or lost through time that even the entire Scriptures and all written records of Tradition might be lost. Yet if the Church lost all copies of all the inspired Books, and all records of all General Councils, and all books of sacramental ritual, and all Patrology and Theology, the Teaching Church would suffer no essential loss. Our acceptance or rejection of this possibility will show us whether we have or have not the true view of a divinely commissioned Teaching Church.

In determining the doctrinal significance of the Council of Jerusalem even the historical circumstances are to be recalled. Some seven years have passed since Herod had imprisoned St. Peter and 'the Lord had brought him out of prison' (Acts xii, 47). St. Luke,

writing his *Actus* (or *Acta*) of the Apostles (i.e. the Apostles Peter and Paul) for the Church of Rome had no need to tell it how St. Peter had gone, as many fellow-Jews went to the Ghetto in Rome. A constant, unique and reliable tradition tells us that when in Rome St. Peter stayed with his fellow Jew Aquila on the Aventine. At the foot of the Aventine and grouped round the docks of Rome was the Jewish Ghetto.

The arrival of the Gospel in Rome was as usual the occasion of disputes between the Jews who accepted Christ and the Jews who rejected Christ. These seamen's and dockers' brawls so disturbed the peace of Rome that in the year 49 A.D. Claudius banished all Jews from the City.

Amongst the banished Jews St. Peter would find a place. No doubt he travelled in the company and at the charge of his fellow-Jew Aquila, whom we find a few months later giving hospitality to St. Paul at Corinth, as he had given hospitality to St. Peter in Rome.

But after seven years of absence St. Peter's unexpected presence in Jerusalem made possible an ecumenical Council to decide an issue vital or deadly to the Church. This issue was whether the Gentile Christian was to be bound by all the Torah or Law, even including the ceremonial Law which would have bound Christians to circumcision. To-day we can see what some of these early Christians could not see, how nearly this issue was bringing the Church to death. It just failed, as the sword of Herod failed to kill Redemption at its birth.

Devoted followers and lovers of the Redeemer were asking and answering one of two questions :

(a) Was the Messiah Jesus Christ not only a Son of Man but also and eternally the Son of God? In this case the Church he founded could only be the absolute religion; to which the religion of Abraham and Moses was relative.

(b) Or was the Church he founded not the absolute religion, but only a religious grouping (like the Pharisees and Sadducees) within the wider frontiers of the Synagogue? In this Jesus was not the Son of God; but only a Son of Man of lesser stature than Abraham and Moses.

Two parties with two accepted, if not official, mouthpieces were in being. There was the party of legalists or circumcisionists with James of Jerusalem as mouthpiece. There was the party of non-circumcisionists with St. Paul as mouthpiece. It was clear that between these two groupings some competent and accepted authority must decide. That competent authority was provided by the unex-

pected presence in Jerusalem of the Apostle to whom Jesus had given charge of the Lambs, the younger Sheep and the elder Sheep (Jo. xxi).

Leaving for a moment the quite obvious and decisive influence of St. Peter over the Council we may well be astonished at the power the Council claimed and the decision it made. *It appealed to no authority outside itself.* It did not measure its decisions by an outside Rule of Faith. In this it only acted as all legitimate authority acts. Whilst authority should never be self-seeking power; and rarely self-assertive power; it should always be self-conscious power. Self-consciousness of a power not possessed is of the nature of arrogance; whereas self-consciousness of a power that is possessed because it is given, has the nature of obedience to the giver.

The humble but profound self-consciousness of this First Council of the Church expressed itself almost naively in the phrase: 'It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to Us (*ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν*).

A little group of Jews amongst whom there were not many learned assert a collective guidance by the Holy Ghost which had never been asserted by any kindred group during the two thousand years since Abraham.

Not less astounding than this claim to divine and ultimate authority is the decision they feel the authority and duty to make. Circumcision was for the pre-Christian children of Abraham a rite with something of the significance of Christian Baptism. It was the outward visible sign that the racial Jew believed in a Messiah who when he came from their stock would fulfil their mystic world-wide mission.

Is it not astounding that a little group of unlettered Jews after not more than, I presume, a few hours' discussion, by abolishing Circumcision and therefore by abolishing the Ceremonial Law, should tell the whole world that Jesus Christ, the Absolute Son of God, had given mankind the one absolute form of religion?

Three facts make this decision of a handful of unlettered Jews still more astonishing. First, their divine Master Jesus Christ had said that he came not to take away one jot or tittle of the Law. Yet this group presume to take away what was looked upon as an essential part of the Law. Secondly, Jesus Christ himself had been circumcised! Thirdly, the Gospels make no mention of any commission given to the Apostles to abolish the Ceremonial Law, including Circumcision, the most necessary and symbolic precept of the Ceremonial Law. We need not say that each of the above points deserves an emphasis which we cannot give here.

Moreover, the little group of unlettered judges and legislators who were conscious of their power and duty to make a decision binding on the conscience of the Church were no less conscious of the necessary care they must take in formulating their irrevocable decision. A careful study of the Council's mode of action is now of first importance. The many sincere Christians who are seeking to re-unite the scattered forces of Christendom must understand and accept the Church's mode of action in her first official Council; and especially in its action of authenticating and interpreting a book of inspired Scripture.

In the Church's first official letter to the Gentile converts of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia we have what must be called a 'document,' even though modern rationalistic criticism has made the word 'document' of dubious orthodoxy. Those who sent it and those who received it would keep the original or an authentic copy of the original. The care taken to authenticate the document reminds us of the precision of a Government Office. Though Barnabas and Paul were '*men that have given their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,*' they are not entrusted with the official finding of the Council. Because St. Paul, if not Barnabas, was identified with the party whose action was approved by the Council, the Council's letter of approbation was entrusted to Judas and Silas, '*chief men (ἡγουμενους) among the brethren.*'

Here we may be allowed to pass judgment on a documentary theory of the Gospels which happily shows signs of its intrinsic mortality. Teutonic subjectivism, with its impressive self-assertiveness, had never been more victorious than when it induced sober English scholars to look upon the Gospels as a tissue of anonymous and therefore unauthoritative manuscripts. All we need say here is that for this documentary theory there was never a shred of either extrinsic or intrinsic evidence. Whatever evidence scholars found was found, as in the present case, to be against the anonymous documentary theory. We will add only this, that if the historical principles behind this documentary theory were valid, they would validate and necessitate the closing of the history schools in all our universities.

Unprejudiced students of the origin of the Gospels will note that the Council expects the Christians of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia to give no credence to a document purporting to come from a central Authority, even when brought by Barnabas and Paul, whose action the document supported. Yet by the Teutonic-led documentarists we are expected to believe that the whole Christian world would accept the four Gospels on the authority of anonymous documents. Per-

haps in a hundred years' time we shall realise that the Siegfried-line certainty and security men once gave to 'Q' was an Aryan myth leading only to intellectual disaster.

An important example of early Christian official precision is in the phrase 'our well-beloved Barnabas and Paul.' Twice in this account of the Council we find the order of the two names, 'Paul and Barnabas,' no doubt because it was Paul, rather than Barnabas, who was championing the Uncircumcision. But never in the Acts is St. Paul given any other official position than second to Barnabas. It is therefore of the greatest significance that in the Church's first official decision, official precedence should be fully recognised by placing Barnabas above St. Paul. This official accuracy can be ignored only by those who look upon the early Christians as of vastly lower mental culture than the average member of a modern trade union.

Again when the Council of Jerusalem appointed Judas and Silas to take an official letter and to explain its contents to a group of fellow-Christians, the Council had inaugurated the ecclesiastical system of 'Legates.' Though in the ecclesiastical order Judas and Silas were of lower rank than Barnabas and Paul, nevertheless as legates of an Ecumenical Council and until the end of their legatine mission they were above Barnabas and Paul. When the two Conciliar legates had handed over the letter to the Church at Antioch, Judas returned, we presume, to give an official report of his mission. Silas, now of lesser rank than St. Paul, chose to accompany him on his apostolic journeys. Hence when his name occurs it is not before, but after St. Paul's. It would be difficult to find an incident that gives a clearer view of the relation between the Church's living authority and a written word or Scripture.

The short letter of the Council is clearness itself. Its few regulations contain none that would not be understood by even less than average intelligence. Yet the Council understood that ultimate Authority can never be a book, but a person—not a writing, but a writer.

No wonder that by the action of the Holy Ghost this first Ecumenical Council, in sending two men to transmit and explain its own written word, proclaimed that the Church's Rule of Faith was nothing written, even if written by itself, but was the Church itself.²

² We cannot help noting the official precedent set by sending, not one legate but two. For official authentication Rome's practice is to have two witnesses. The precedent set by the Church's first Council was followed some three centuries later by the Second Council of Nicea (A.D. 325). To that Council Pope St. Silvester I sent as his legates the Roman priests Victor and Vincentius, and appointed them presidents of the Council.

Let us now turn from the Church's first Council to the Church's most accredited theologian. Seldom does St. Thomas so undeniably justify the Church's trust in his thought as in the question and answer from which we took our opening extract. The question asked by this theologian of the thirteenth century was: *Whether Christ should have committed his doctrine to writing?* We must never overlook the fact that in the Ages of Faith and in the highly organised schools of theology the words *Sacra Scriptura* and *Sacra Theologia* were practically synonymous. So synonymous were the words 'Sacred Scripture' and 'Sacred Theology' that the official text-book of Masters of Sacred Theology was the Bible.

These theologians of the thirteenth century had no hesitation in admitting a principle which the sixteenth century obscured by its somewhat bitter zeal in theological controversy. When St. Thomas and his fellow theologians identified *Sacra Scriptura* and *Sacra Theologia* they proclaimed that the Sacred Scriptures contained at least implicitly all the truths of Faith and Morals necessary for man's salvation. They did not proclaim, as some theologians of the sixteenth century seemed to proclaim, another source of Faith, which they called Tradition and which taught certain necessary truths of Faith not taught by the Sacred Scripture.

Theologians on both sides of the discussions let controversial zeal mislead them. The theologians of one side were right in demanding the equal need of Tradition and Scripture because Scripture did not contain all the truths of Faith. They were wrong in saying that Scripture did not contain all the truths of Faith necessary to salvation. On the other hand, their opponents were right in saying that Scripture contained all the truths of Faith necessary for salvation. They were wrong in saying that Scripture contained all these truths of faith necessary for salvation with such clearness that there was no need of Tradition or of a Teaching Church.

The profound reasonableness of this attitude of the Ages of Faith is seen in the reasons St. Thomas gives for answering that Jesus Christ should not have committed his doctrine to writing. Had Jesus Christ written a 'New Testament' he would have been the 'Author' of it in a way not covered by the official phrase *Auctor utriusque Testamenti*.

His first reason why Jesus should not have written a New Testament containing his teaching is the transcendent character of the Teacher. Let us at once say that, as the Church is the Incarnation prolonged, this transcendent character belongs to the Church.

The second reason why Jesus Christ should not have committed his doctrine to writing is the transcendent character of the doctrine

and the limited character of writing. No writing can be its own explanation. Where doubts arise about the meaning of what is written, the necessary and ultimate appeal must be to the writer.

This principle is confirmed by the contrast between the New Testament and the Apostles' Creed. It is undeniable that the books of the New Testament were not drawn up as formulae or Articles of Faith. They were sometimes so personal, so occasional and so unfitted for general instruction that even the expert mind of St. Peter found St. Paul's Epistles 'hard to understand.' But at the same time that the books of the New Testament were being written the Church was quietly drawing up a simple formula of Faith which every candidate for Baptism had to understand and accept. Later on when heresies began to arise, as they usually arose, not amongst the simple flock but amongst the shepherds of the flock, the simple Creed of the Apostles was developed into the Nicene Creed. This still remains the necessary Creed to be understood and accepted by all candidates for the Episcopate. Indeed, the official examination of the candidate is the most dramatic act in the noble drama of a Bishop's Consecration.

The Liturgy of the pre-Elizabethan Church of England presents an interesting example of the Church giving the true meaning to important words of the Sacred Scripture. As usual, it is the simpler but more fundamental words of the Scripture that occasion most discussion. Hardly any words could be simpler than 'This is My Body.' But it is almost to the credit of man's humility that many thought the simple meaning too great a boon for sinful man. The insufficiency of Scripture had therefore to be supplemented by the decision of the Teaching Church or by what we call Tradition. This decision had to be accepted most especially by all candidates for the official teaching order of the Episcopate. In this matter of orthodoxy about the Real Presence the Church of England was delicately and, I may add, uniquely sensitive. She did her best that none of her Bishops should give to the words 'This is My Body' the meaning given by Berengarius.

If we compare the elaborate Rite for the Consecration of a Bishop in the present Roman Pontifical and in the Sarum Pontifical we find them identical in every word and in every liturgical action—with one almost startling exception. A dramatic and essential part for consecrating a Bishop as an official teacher in the Church is the official examination about the acceptance of the faith he must teach. The consecrating Bishop examines him by asking him a long list of articles of faith. This list is identical in the Roman and Sarum Pontifical both in number and in order, save for the following two ques-

tions and answers, which are not yet found in the Roman Pontifical :

‘ Dost thou believe that the bread which is placed on the Altar is only bread before the Consecration, but in the very act of Consecration, by the unspeakable power of God, the nature and substance of bread is changed into the nature and substance of the flesh of Christ, and of the flesh of no other than Him Who was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary? ’

R) ‘ I believe. ’

‘ Likewise that the wine mixed with water in the chalice placed for hallowing is truly and essentially changed into the Blood which by the soldier’s lance flowed from the side of our Lord? ’

R) ‘ I believe. ’³

This unique liturgical fragment of the pre-Elizabethan Church of England has not received the attention it deserves from liturgical and theological scholars. Probably introduced into the Sarum Rite by Langfranc, the opponent of the Berengarian heresy, it still remains a unique witness to the faith of the Church of England on two important points. First it witnesses to the exact Eucharistic faith and the great Eucharistic devotion of England. Secondly, in demanding of the Bishops of England this full Eucharistic faith in words not found in Scripture it witnesses that in the mind of the English Church even the plainest words of Scripture demand the final judgment of the Living Church based on Tradition.

The limitations of the written word had led England to the scholarly cautiousness and precision of the Sarum Rite. But when a new era was ushered in by the invention of the printing press and the discovery of America, men began, as youth often begins, by despising cautiousness. The Scripture which their forefathers had always recognised as a Rule of Faith these intellectual youths of the sixteenth century began to proclaim as the one and only Rule of Faith. Looking back on those wind-swept days, their exaggerations seem almost excusable because inevitable. The printing press with its mass production of Bibles, and especially of Bibles in the mother-tongue, brought a New World—a spiritual America—to the millions who were just schooled enough to understand their mother-tongue. An old proverb took on a new dramatic meaning. ‘ Jack began to be, or to think himself to be, as good as his Master, ’ even in those matters of interpretation where the first necessity is not the sincere seeker, or the scholarly expert, but the divinely-authorised Master.

³ Quoted from *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. (Maskell, London, 1847). Vol. iii, p. 250

With this thought in our mind we can see the profound wisdom of the third reason which St. Thomas gives why Jesus Christ should not have put his teaching in a Book. Man is a social being. His perfection is social perfection. In the natural Community or Commonwealth his natural perfection is social perfection. In the supernatural community or world-wide Church Man's supernatural perfection is still a social perfection.

Supernatural truth and supernatural sacramental grace come to him from God—but from God through his fellow men. The life of faith is not the solitary contemplative life of man with a book, but of a man living with his fellow men under the necessary guidance of God-commissioned guides. Man can get many things out of a book. Yet if religion is not just an opinion or a conviction, but a life and essentially a social life, then man cannot get religion out of a book.

After these thoughts on Scripture and Tradition we must add a few closing words on Tradition and Scripture; or, more accurately, the Tradition about Scripture. In order to shorten what I have to say I will say it autobiographically. Yet I feel that my own experience, at least in its earliest stage, was not rare but average.

A Catholic home, with its large brass-clasped 'Holy Bible,' had taught me what the average Catholic child is taught, that the Bible is the Book of books, being the very Word of God. Looking back on that naive belief I find it differed little from the idea of divine authorship which has been denied by St. Thomas. For us children of a Catholic home this Word of God was an object of awe rather than of love. So many false and even amoral doctrines had been taught in the name of the Bible by those who did not 'rightly handle the word of truth' that the Bible seemed as dangerous for the unguided soul to read as for a child to handle high explosives.

I did not know that this over-dread of the Bible was an authentic offspring of the crude literalism of sixteenth-century amateur hermeneutics. Until the German printing presses poured forth thousands of Bibles into amateur hands the Bible and its commentary were in the hands of the Masters of Sacred Theology. The worst that can be said of these official commentators is that they also poured forth floods of somewhat arid, if accurate, biblical commentary.

But vernacular translators, whose translations were little better than inaccurate commentaries, finally gave us a crude biblical theory whose baleful effects are still to be found in Catholic lands and in Catholic homes; even as the baleful effects of Jansenism are still to be found, somewhat diluted, in some Catholic reviews of to-day. The extent of this infiltration of a non-Catholic view of the Bible

into Catholic ecclesiastical circles may be judged by the following fact. Some little time ago I had a friendly discussion with a distinguished Catholic theologian and professor. At the end of our discussion I found him maintaining that everything in the Bible was of faith, as if it were revealed. But I could hardly believe my ears when he maintained that there would be no incongruity in reciting the Apostles' Creed thus: 'I believe in God the Father Almighty . . . and in Jesus Christ His only Son . . . I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sin, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting—and that Toby's dog wagged his tail.'

From a literalism little removed from this I was delivered when in revising the English translation of the *Summa* of St. Thomas I first came across a chain of texts giving the true Biblical tradition still dominant in the thirteenth century. When first I came upon these texts I own I was startled. Indeed only my profound recognition of the genius and orthodoxy of St. Thomas kept me from being shocked. Yet I must own that as I came across more and more of these texts I felt like a prisoner must feel when his prison door is opened and he is free under the sun.

After a few years of quiet collecting I put these texts together, linking them with the simplest of explanation. The havoc wrought by sixteenth century literalism can be measured by an incident which some of you may think for laughter and some of you may think for tears. I offered this series of texts from St. Thomas to the then editor of the *Dublin Review*. But they were returned as too dangerous for publication! They had to wait some years until with the arrival of BLACKFRIARS upon the modern theological arena they were published in one of its first numbers.

My hearers can judge of my surprise when I found St. Thomas assuming as traditional rather than enunciating principles of biblical criticism judged too modernistic for the pages of a modern Catholic review. In the *Summa Theologica* alone I found almost every principle now used by sound and scholarly biblical criticism. I found appeal from one version to another, I found that errors might creep into the text through the carelessness of transcribers: I found that the chronological order was frequently misplaced, especially in the historical books. I found that Job might be an elaborate parable (or drama) like the story of the Prodigal Son, or Dives and Lazarus. But I was most startled when I found the following passage:

'Augustine says it is stated in Exodus that *the Lord spoke to Moses face to face*, and shortly afterwards we read: *Show me Thy glory*. Therefore, he perceived what he saw; and he desired

what he saw not. Hence he did not see the very Essence of God . . . Accordingly when Scripture states that *he spoke to him face to face*, this is to be understood as expressing the opinion of the people, who thought that Moses was speaking with God mouth to mouth' (*Summa Theologica*, IaIIae, Qu. 98, Art. 3, reply to 2).

St. Thomas's exegesis was nothing if not simple, but startling in its simplicity. In substance it is as follows :

'The inspired writer of Exodus (xxxiii, 11) wrote : '*And the Lord spoke to Moses face to face.*' But this inspired writer did not add—nor is there anything in the context to suggest—the people thought that Moses spoke to the Lord face to face. But the people thought wrongly.'

Simple minds startled by this way of explaining the meaning of Scripture may well ask : How are we to know a meaning so unconnected with the plain words of Scripture? But simple and sincere minds will answer their own question by recognising the claims of a visible, vocal Teaching Church whose official teachers, the Bishops, are divinely commissioned to interpret.

There was one principle of St. Thomas which at once brought consolation without any preliminary shock. It lay at the beginning of his *Summa* as it lay at the beginning of his vast synthesis of Natural and Revealed Truth. Speaking of the literal and spiritual senses of Scripture, he writes this profound and consoling principle :

'Nothing of Holy Writ perishes on account of this [i.e. two-fold sense], since nothing necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual sense which is not elsewhere put forward by the Scripture in its literal sense' (Ia, Qu. 1, Art. 10).

I think you can appreciate the relief given by this profoundly wise exegesis when it was first offered to a mind largely but unconsciously suffering from sixteenth-century literalism. You can appreciate still more easily a Catholic editor's conscientious objections to endanger his review by enunciating St. Thomas's principle even on the authority of St. Thomas.

It has always seemed to me that in proclaiming the necessity and sufficiency of the literal or historical sense St. Thomas may rightly be considered the founder of the modern historical school of Biblical Criticism. Yet he would be the first to claim for himself no greater genius than that of being taught by *Alma Mater Ecclesia*, whose two gifts to man's intellect are her Scripture and her Tradition.

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.