

Communion Under Both Kinds

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 17 March 2015 12:05

Genuine believers know there is only 'one kind' of communion, but what is 'Communion under two kinds'? It is a Roman Catholic twist on truth. Communion under one kind is reception of the bread alone or the wine alone (which is itself an error, for both are to be taken at the same time: what Catholicism calls 'communion under both, or two, kinds'). Rome loves to create confusion and mystery where none exists in God's mind or in scripture, because it gives the clergy greater power!

The concept is found enshrined in the Council of Trent (sess. XXI, c. i:XXII, c.i), and says that when the cup is shared, the people also share in the sacrifice of Christ, of which the Mass is an actual re-enactment. Each 'species', the bread and the wine, is said to equally contain Christ, even if only one 'species' is taken.

In this we see three major heresies and errors: the first is that no man can 'share' in the sacrifice of Christ. The sacrifice for sin is unique and is the sole act of Jesus Christ as Lord, the only sinless Lamb. Second, both bread and wine must be taken together, or it is not the Lord's Supper or communion. Third, Jesus Christ is NOT found actually and bodily in the wine or the bread. The bread is just bread or a biscuit, and the wine is just wine. It does not change and does not become the actual body and blood of Christ. The Mass as a whole is a blasphemy for it denies the once-for-all nature of Christ's sacrifice. Christ is NOT present bodily at all.

It is true in the early churches that in some cases only 'one kind' was 'administered'. Therefore, communion had not been taken! And the concept of it being 'administered' is another error, for it relies on an administrator – the priest. Biblically, communion is not 'administered' but is simply partaken. It is a shared event, where no man is greater or lesser. Communion need not be 'administered' by a minister.

Why did priests take over as 'administrators' of the 'Eucharist'? The Roman 'church' taught that people had to be 'as pure as possible' before taking communion. At the same time, Romanism became increasingly hierarchical. With these two errors already extant, Rome then decided that no ordinary man could ever be pure enough – but the priests were deemed to be holy and pure! So, 'administration' devolved to the priests. To prevent unholiness ruining the 'species' the chalice was not given to the 'laity' and the wafer was only placed on the tongue – no contact. Such is the ridiculous nature of Romanism.

Communion Under Both Kinds

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 17 March 2015 12:05

In 1564 the then pope gave permission to certain German bishops to offer the chalice again, following appeals made by some German princes. The following year, however, this permission was withdrawn. So much for papal invincibility!

Today, communion under both kinds is 'popular' in Catholic churches, but even this demands the express permission of the local bishop. Most bishops now give open permission (very kind of them to allow what God has commanded!).

By contrast, the Eastern orthodox Church believes, as I do, that the giving of only one 'species' (bread only or wine only) is imperfect, so it always gives communion under (or in) both kinds.

Article 39 of the Anglican Church decrees that all men may take part on communion (though it only mentions the cup). Protestants have always taken communion 'under both kinds', this being closer to truth than the failing or heretical 'churches'. Protestants tend not to use a chalice, but individual cups (which, today, is far safer), and many churches use grape juice rather than fermented wine. There is no biblical reason for this, however, only a Protestant dislike for fermented wine.

Interestingly, the Romanist bishops of Toronto banned communion under both kinds in 2003, because of the fear of spreading the SARS disease. Of course, there would be no problem if they had taken communion without using a shared chalice. Between the 12th century and the 1960s the 'laity' only received the bread (being too unholy as individuals – only the priests were holy enough, even though a majority were paedophiles and/or living with mistresses!).

Yet, in 2001, the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, issued by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, shows that only the 'possibility' of receiving 'both kinds' was the norm. How arrogant Romanism is! Instruction number 283 defines who may offer or take communion under both kinds. Even in this Instruction the priest can use or refuse 'both kinds' as he wishes. If he thinks the sacrament will be 'profaned' he can resort to only one 'kind'. Can you imagine communion being 'profaned' in a genuinely Christian setting?

The Instructions give permission for the bishops to allow or restrain 'both kinds' (bearing in mind that a 'bishop' of Rome is not the same as the scriptural bishop/ elder/presbyter/pastor). (Source: English edition of L'Osservatore Romano, 1st May, 2002, page 5).

Communion Under Both Kinds

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 17 March 2015 12:05

How different all this is from the simple communion held by Jesus Christ, the 'last supper'! Its structure and use is so clear and ordinary, with none of the Romish features and extraordinary complexity imposed by popes and committees, whose meddling subjects the people to a system that enhances the authority of Rome and not Christ himself.

© July 2011

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}