

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

WITHHOLDING THE CUP FROM THE LAITY.*

Opposed to Scripture.

He (Jesus) took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them (his disciples); saying, Drink ye all of it: Matt. xxvi. 27.—the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion (literally, "the common participation") of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the body of Christ? 1 Cor. x. 16.—For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come: 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Opposed to the Fathers.

Let them receive in both kinds or neither, because the mystery is but one and the same, and cannot without sacrilege be divided: *Pope Gelasius opud Gracian de Conlez. dis. 2 cap. Cuperinus—Cassander and Aquinas affirm, that for a thousand years both elements were given to the people in the Latin Church: Cass. Consult. de Sacra Comm. sec. 22.—Aquinas Comm. in 6 John, lec. 7.—In the Greek Church the practice is still continued, as the Church of Rome admits: See Ambrose, in Cor. xi. Cyp. Epist. 63.*

Error when introduced.

The Council of Constance, in 1416, was the first to sanction this innovation, by a decree that the priests only should partake of the cup. Cassander admits that it was administered to the people in both elements for 1000 years.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Opposed to Scripture.

Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, take, eat, this is my body; and he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; but I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my father's kingdom: Matthew xxvi, 26, 29.—This do in remembrance of me: Luke xxii. 19.—The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not in the communion of the body of Christ? 1 Cor. x. 16.—And the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, and when he had supped, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come: 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26.—It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life: John vi. 63.

Opposed to the Fathers.

Unless, says Christ, ye eat the flesh of the son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.—He seems to command an outrageous and sinful act—wherefore it must be figurative, enjoining only participation with the Lord's passion, and with sweetness and profit to treasure up in our memories that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us: *Aug. Doct. Christ. Lib. iii. cap. xvi.—A Romish Bishop in France, in 1608, not knowing this passage to be Augustine's, quoted it as the sentiment of some heretic.—That which you see is the bread, and the cup which your very eyes declare unto you: Aug. Ser. de Sacra.—Theodoret says, the mystical symbol after consecration do not pass out of their own nature, for they remain in their former substance, figure, and appearance: Theod. Dial. ii.—The apostles received a command, according to the constitution of the New Testament, to make a memorial of this sacrifice upon the table by the symbols of his body, and healthful blood: Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. iii. c. ult.—St. Cyprian says, (Ep. lxxiii.) we cannot see the blood by which we are redeemed, when*

wine is not in the chalice; by which the blood of Christ is showed or represented.—Epiphanius (in Anchoret) says, that the bread is not like Christ, neither in his invisible Deity, nor in his incarnate likeness, for it is round and without feeling as to its virtue.—St. Ambrose writes (De Benedict Patriarch, c. ix.) this bread is made the food of saints.—Before the bread is sanctified, we call it bread; but when divine grace has sanctified it by the means of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, and is thought worthy of the name of the Lord's body, though the nature of bread remain in it: St. Chrysostom Epist. ad Cesarium.

Error when Introduced.

This error first appeared in the Greek Church about the year 787, and not in the Roman till 818.—It was defended by Paschasius Radbertus, with the grossest legends, one of which was, that the priest saw the wafer become an infant Christ, and having kissed it, then eat it. Paschasius was also ably opposed by Ratramus, alias Bertramus; and by Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, in 847, whose words are, "some of late, not having a right opinion of the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said, that this is the body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary; and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead, which error we have opposed with all our might."—It was not generally received till 1059, by Pope Nicholas, and again in an altered view in 1709, by Pope Gregory VII., and was affirmed to be an article of faith at the Council of Laeran, under Innocent III., in 1215.

TRADITION MADE EQUAL TO HOLY WRIT.

Opposed to Scripture.

Jesus answered and said unto them, why do ye transgress the commandment of God by your tradition: Matt. xv. 3.—Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition: Matt. xv. 6.

Opposed to the Fathers.

St. Benedict says, "The Abbot ought never to teach, ordain, or command anything, which goes beyond the precept of our Lord: but his precept, and instructions should be spread, as the heaven of divine righteousness in the minds of the learners." *Bened. in regul.—The Scriptures are sufficient for doctrines.—St. Anthony. St. Basil, to the question, should novices immediately learn the Scripture, replies thus, "It is fit, and necessary, that every one should learn out of the holy Scriptures that which is for his use, both for his full establishment in godliness, and that he may not be accustomed to the traditions of men: Basil in Reg. 95.—Also, it is a manifest falling from the truth, either to reject any one of those points that are written, or to bring in any of those that are not written: Basil ii. tom.—Tertullian—"If it be not written, let him fear the woe that is allotted to such as add to, or take away: Tertul. ad Hermog. ch. ii.*

Error when Introduced.

By monks of Pope Hildebrand's party, says Waltheram, Bishop of Naumberg. "Despising that which was delivered of God, they desired other doctrines, and introduced dogmas of human origin; they permitted neither children nor young men, in their monasteries, to pursue the study of saving knowledge, forsooth that their uninformed minds might be nourished on the husks of demons; even on the customs of human traditions, that, being used to such nauseous food, they might be incapable of tasting how sweet the Lord is."—To be continued.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

In a late number of the Episcopal Recorder, we find a copious extract from a charge by Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio to his clergy, upon this all important doctrine, the articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae, as Luther styled it. We would gladly present the whole of the extract to our readers if our limits would permit, as it contains a full and clear exposition of the doctrine as set forth in the articles, Homilies, and formularies of the Church, and also gives

in striking contrast the opposite errors which have at different periods crept into christian communities. In reference to these errors the Bishop has the following observations:

"Justification by inherent righteousness or human merit, was no invention of Romanism. It is indeed the peculiar distinction of the Church of Rome, to be the first and only one of the great sections of Christendom that has embodied into formally professed declarations, the fiction of such a righteousness; and especially, that has pronounced anathema upon whoever should profess the opposite; but in this as in all her other corruptions of religion, the spirit of Romanism is substantially the spirit of human nature. Its errors will be found to be the natural and spontaneous growth of the human heart, not so much the effect as the cause of the Romish system of religion. No one accordingly can point out any precise period at which this "mystery of iniquity" first began, or specify any person who first introduced it; no one in fact ever did introduce any such system; the corruptions crept in one by one, and gradually changed her bridal purity for the accumulated defilements of the mother of harlots.—They grew out of that universal disposition of mankind which leads them to go about establishing their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God. Of that disposition, Romanism is just the direct and multiform consequence; the most systematic, gigantic and avowed development. What we behold full grown and developed under the hideous proportions, the bold frontlet, and the "scarlet" drapery of that predicted "man of sin, who sitteth as God in the temple of God," was born into this world thousands of years before Christianity began. Justification by human merits was the device of satan as soon as enmity was first put between the serpent and the woman, and his seed and her seed. It was the distinguishing feature of the sacrifice of Cain, and in him led to the first persecution and the first martyrdom for the faith. Under the form of the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, it grew into a compacted system and made the commandment of God of none effect, by the traditions of the Elders, under the Jewish dispensation, just as under the Christian, it has done the same, by the traditions of the Romanists, "teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men." It was this, among the Christians of Galatia, against which St. Paul was contending, when he asked: "Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Always has it been a chief ruler of the darkness of this world. It was not left to be confined within the fold of Romanism, because the Reformed branded it with their solemn protest. It forsook not the hearts of the people when it was cancelled from the standards of their faith. It abode with them as a plague, because they carried with them the corruption of their fallen nature. Under divers shapes, has it often since appeared in Protestant communities, and in the writings and ministry of Protestant divines. From the doctrine of Scripture, on this subject, which stands as a summit-level and dividing ridge, like the ancient Church in the mountains of Piedmont, between the opposite declivities that terminate in the two extremes of Atheism and Popery, the currents of pernicious error, heading in the same vicinity, have ever been flowing, under the guidance of adventitious circumstances, in opposite directions; some towards the German Sea of Universal Scepticism; others towards the Italian Gulph of Universal Superstition; both meeting at last in a common war against the truth for the shipwreck of the Gospel. Thus it is, that according as circumstances have operated to give it, one direction or the other to error, the doctrine of merit, whether by the inherent grace, or the external work of righteousness, has appeared under opposite forms, sometimes in the shape of a dead ice-bound Rationalism; at other times, in the monastic garb and fervent zeal of a solemn Mysticism now proceeding towards the rejection of all mediation and atonement, and to a proud dependence on its own foundation for peace with God; now tending to the multiplication of atonements and mediators, in voluntary penances and additional observances and prayers of saints; one while setting at naught all exte-

* From the Church Magazine.