

who, by the principles of their religion, are taught to believe that the body and blood of Christ are neither really present nor received either in one kind or both?

But why does Scripture, in so many places (John vi. 53, 54, 55, 56. 1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 29), mention both the bread and the cup together? Is not this a good argument that both are to be received?

"A most weak and insufficient argument. As if mentioning a thing was commanding it. And, how easily might this logic of Protestants be turned against themselves; for both several other places of Scripture mention the bread alone, and that very chapter of St Paul, (1 Cor. xi.) which mention both kinds so often, mentions also, in verse the twenty-seventh, either the bread or the cup: a plain argument according to the Protestant's way of arguing, that the bread alone, or either the bread or the cup, is to be received. The truth is that from the places of Scripture, which mention both kinds, it is neither a consequence that there is a command for every one to receive both; nor is it a consequence from the places of Scripture which mention but one, that there is a command of receiving but one. But whereas, the Scripture mentions sometimes both, and sometimes one, the only natural consequence is, that this sacrament may be taken sometimes in one kind, sometimes in both, and it seems proper and expedient to the Church, which is certainly left at liberty to order and dispose such matters (as to the manner of receiving or administering sacraments) whensoever the Scripture or God himself does not otherwise determine." (See Catholic answer to Mr. Barrett's Sermon, sec. 15, p. 38. Acts ii. 42. Acts xx. 7. Luke xxiv. 30. John vi. 51, 58). And hence we may gather that the holy Eucharist was received sometimes in one kind, sometimes in both, in the times of the apostles; which is the true reason why the Scripture sometimes mentions only one kind sometimes both, in speaking of this sacrament; it being usual for writers to mention things according to the custom when they write. That sometimes even in the age of the apostles, this sacrament was received in one kind, may also be gathered from these words of St Paul: "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. xi. 27. Which proves that the faithful then might receive either the bread or the cup. The same truth may be gathered from the Acts: "And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread and in prayers." Acts ii. 42. As also from chap. xx. ver. 7; "And upon the first day of the week (Sunday) when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the

morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." It is highly probable that this breaking of bread was no other than the eucharistical bread; otherwise, why is it joined with preaching and prayer, and said to be done in the religious assemblies of the primitive Christians, on a Sunday? From these texts then it is more than probable that the faithful even when the apostles were living, did sometimes communicate in one kind. And certain it is, and a thing well known to all learned Protestants, that in the second and third age of the church, the holy Eucharist was frequently given to the sick and others in one kind only.

Protestants themselves, notwithstanding their exclamations against communion in one kind, are conscious that it is the true and entire sacrament and by no means contrary to the institution and command of Christ. For there are decrees in the reformed churches abroad, that the holy communion may be administered in one kind, in cases of necessity, when any person through sickness, or antipathy to wine, is incapable of receiving both kinds. And, as to the Church of England, by a statute of Edward the Sixth (1 Ed. VI. c. 1.), which was confirmed by another of Queen Elizabeth, it is enacted, that the holy communion shall be commonly administered to the people in both kinds, with this exception, unless necessity do otherwise require. A very fair confession, that communion in one kind is an entire sacrament; or else, in every case, it would be an entire sacrilege; nor can it be said by Protestants, to be contrary to the institution and command of Christ, unless it be said too, that the Protestant parliament of England, with the supreme governess of the Church of England, the glorious Queen Elizabeth at the head of them, did, by a solemn act, dispense with the people of England to receive the communion, in some cases, in one kind, contrary to the institution and command of Christ; which, I really believe, every English Protestant will be ashamed to own.

General Intelligence.

ITALY.

The popularity of his Holiness appears to be on the increase, if that be possible.

(Private Correspondence of the *Universe*.)

"Rome Sept. 8: 1846.

"During three days an extraordinary excitement has manifested itself on all the routes in the environs of Rome. Albano, Frascati, Tivoli, Civita, Vecchia, Viterbo, and all the neighbouring villages had no more vehicles to convey to the capital the curious who were anxious to assist at the triumph which Rome was preparing for Pius IX. The feast of the Nativity was never celebrated with so much pomp.