

soul is by the body, the senses of this body must in general be first arrested, that the invisible soul may be moved. This is the principle by which the church acts in the institution of every ceremony in her public service, or the administration of the sacraments.

The Catholic church has been much censured by her adversaries, for denying the cup to the laity. But it will be seen, that the censure is unfounded, when we reflect, that under either form of bread or wine, Christ's body and blood, soul and divinity, are entirely contained. The man who receives either, then, receives as much as he who partakes of both: there is consequently no injury done to the laity. If it be asked, why the officiating priest receives both, the answer is obvious. He is commissioned to represent the mystery of redemption, and as in that mystery the blood was drained from the Redeemer's body, so in the Mass is the appearance of wine separated from that of bread, and the representation of the sacrifice made more perfect by his receiving both. The laity are not commissioned by the church to represent, in that perfect manner, the mystery, of redemption, and it was only to the twelve Apostles and their successors, that Christ said at the last supper, 'Drink ye all of this.' The people cannot complain, if no injury be done to them; neither is the sacrament impaired or injured by this custom. Most of the reformed churches have declared, that the sacrament may be administered without the cup. The divines of the established church of England have written, as well as the Calvinistic Synod decreed, that those, who on account of sickness or any other cause, cannot drink wine, may partake of the bread only. (Discipline, chap. xii. art. 7. Synod of Rochelle, 1751.) For our adversaries, she should be sufficient proof, that the wine is not essential to the sacrament; for if it were, the bread should be absolutely be refused, unless united with the wine. In the Catholic church, the refusal of the cup is a matter of discipline, in which she does not pretend to be infallible, unless it be connected with faith or morals; our assent and compliance, however, are justly required, so long as the disciplinarian canon is in force. For it does not belong to an individual to infringe a law even of expediency, when that law is general. "If the Catholic church," observes the eminent Bossuet, "have confined the faithful to one kind, it is not through any contempt of the other, but to prevent their irreverence, which the inattention or negligence of these latter ages might occasion: reserving the re-establishing of both kinds, until the period, when peace and union may thereby be more effectually promoted." (Expos. sec. 17. p. 119. N. York edit. 1808.)

The Catholic church formerly gave communion

under both kinds; but for wise reasons, she afterwards ordained, that the laity should receive under the form of bread only. This ordinance does not stand in contradiction to any part of scripture, for Christ says, "If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." (St. John, vi.) To eat bread then is sufficient. St. Paul writes, "Whoever shall eat this bread or drink this cup" (1 Cor. xi. 27; the reformers changed the *or* into *and*.) Hence it seems, that even in the apostolic age, communion was sometimes administered under one kind only. In fact, the manner of administering the sacrament, (for we have proved that both kinds are not essential,) can hardly be a matter of serious disunion, and like other points of discipline, may and ought to vary, as the circumstances of times and places change, and justify those variations. In points of faith and morals alone, does the church claim infallibility and immutability.

Another object of censure in the eyes of our dissenting brethren, is the adoption of an unknown tongue, in the celebration of Mass. I need not here repeat the arguments, which Catholic divines generally employ to defend a custom, consecrated in their eyes, by the sufferings of so many centuries. Every other church is a modern church, the language of their liturgies then should be modern; but as the Catholic church is of ancient date, the language which was vernacular at the period of its institution, should still be retained. The Christians of the Latin church are not singular in the use of an ancient language, in their public service. The Greeks, the Russians, and the Armenians, the Syrians, Copts, Ethiopians, and Georgians, together with the other eastern Christians, still retain the liturgies, which they received from the fathers of their faith, and which are written in languages unintelligible to the vulgar. Every living language is in continual fluctuation, and the present generation can hardly understand the language of their ancestors, at a few centuries remove. If a modern language were adopted in the church service, the service would of necessity be frequently reformed, and this change would be particularly odious in a church, whose greatest pride is immutability. The service of the Jews, after the captivity, was performed in a tongue generally unknown; nor do we learn, that the custom was ever blamed by our Saviour. Neither is the modern church of England perfectly free from objection on this subject, for in the year 1560 the English prayer book was introduced among the natives of the sister country, and the Irish were compelled under the severest penalties, to assist at the celebration of the English liturgy, although they were perfectly unacquainted with the language. The Catholic suffers no inconvenience from his ignorance of the language, in which the Mass is celebrated; his