ſenſible qualities remain. This more than miraculous change is called transubstantiation ; and is founded on the philosophy of Ariſtotle, which reſolves all bodies into *matter* and *form* (ſee Metaphysics, n⁰ 142—150.); for it is only the *matter* or imperceptible ſubſtance which ſupports the *forms* or ſenſible qualities of bread and wine, that is changed into the subst*ance* or matter of the body and blood of Chriſt, ſo that this divine matter, coming into the place of the former earthly matter, ſupports the ſame identical *forms* which it ſupported. Hence we are told, that Jeſus Chriſt, now preſent inſtead of the bread and wine, exhibits himſelf to us under thoſe very ſame outward *forms* or appearances which the bread and wine had before the change.”

Could this doctrine be true, it would be abundantly mysterious ; but to add to the myſtery, we are farther informed, that under each kind is contained Jeſus Chriſt whole and entire, his body and blood, his ſoul and divinity; ſo that when a man eats what has the appearance of a wa­fer, he really and truly eats the body and blood, the ſoul and divinity, of Jeſus Chriſt ; and when he afterwards drinks what has the appearance of wine, he drinks the ve­ry ſame body and blood, ſoul and divinity, which not a minute perhaps before he had wholly and entirely eaten ! The ingenious author from whoſe work we have taken this account of the Romiſh doctrine concerning the real preſence, may perhaps reject our inference that the orthodox members of his church muſt believe the *ſoul* and *divinity* of Chriſt to be *eaten* and *drunk* in the Lord’s Sup­per ; but he cannot deny that, according to his ſtatement of the Catholic faith, the ſoul and divinity are both re­ceived whole and entire into the ſtomach of each commu­nicant. He ſays indeed, that “ communion conſiſts in re­ceiving Jeſus Chriſt whole and entire, his ſacred body, his precious blood, his bleſſed ſoul, and his adorable divinity, into our *ſouls ;”* but that which was formerly bread and wine unqueſtionably goes into the st*omachs* of the commu­nicants ; and ſince, according to him, it is now the body and blood of Chriſt, the ſoul and divinity muſt go thither with it, for theſe four cannot be ſeparated. This our au­thor himſelf grants. “ The Scripture (ſays he) poſitively declares, that *Christ rising again from the dead, dieth no more; death ſhall no more have dominion over him* (Rom. vi. 9.) Conſequently his body, his blood, and his ſoul, ſhall never more be ſeparated from one another ; and as the union of his divine and human natures can never more be broken, ſo neither can theſe, his two natures, united in his divine perſon, be ever ſeparated. From this it neceſſarily follows, that wherever the body of Chriſt is, there alſo his blood, his ſoul, and his divinity, muſt of neceſſity be in like man­**ner.”**

Now, whether we ſuppoſe, with our author, that the soul and divinity of Chriſt directly carry his body and blood with them into the human ſoul, or, truſting in ſome degree to the evidence of ſenſe, believe that the body and blood carry the ſoul and divinity with them directly into the ſtomach of each communicant—is it credible, is it poſ­ſible, that the high and lofty One, who inhabiteth eternity, and whom the oracles of truth aſſure us that even the hea­ven of heavens cannot contain, ſhould be *ſubstantially* re­ceived whole and *entire* into a finite ſpirit like the human ſoul, or into a body ſo limited as the human ſtomach ? Our author ſays it is ; declaring that, “ by the bleſſed *presence of* Jeſus Chriſt, *whole and entire within us,* are com­municated to our ſouls all the heavenly graces which are the effects of the holy communion : ſuch as the ſanctification of the ſoul by an increaſe of juſtifying grace; the ren­dering of it more pure, more holy, more beautiful, more agreeable, in the eyes of God ; the cleanſing of the ſoul from all thoſe venial sins and imperfections of which we re­pent, and preſerving us from falling into mortal sins ; the uniting of us in a moſt intimate manner with Jeſus Chriſt, who comes to us in this holy ſacrament on purpoſe to dwell in our ſouls and abide with us ; and the giving us a pledge and earneſt of a glorious immortality, to the enjoy­ment of which it brings us at laſt, if we perſevere to the end in the grace of God.”

The conſequence of the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation is the s*acrifice of the mass,* by which, it is ſaid, God’s ac­ceptance of Chriſt’s ſacrifice on the croſs is obtained for the actual benefit of thoſe perſons in particular for whom the maſs is offered. In the work ſo often quoted, we are told, that “ Jeſus Chriſt our redeemer, who is both our high-prieſt and our victim, who, in order to perfect the work of our redemption, and reconcile man with his offend­ed Creator, offered himſelf once in a bloody manner upon the croſs, in order to communicate and apply to the ſouls of individuals thoſe graces, which, by his death, he merited for mankind in general, continues to offer himſelf daily upon the altar in an unbloody manner, by the miniſtry of his prieſts, in the *maſs.* The ſacrifice of the croſs and that of the maſs are both one and the ſame ſacrifice, becauſe in both the victim is the ſame and the high prieſt the ſame, viz. Jeſus Chriſt. The only difference is in the *manner* of offering. On the croſs he offered himſelf in a bloody man­ner and actually died ; whereas on the altar he is offered up to God in an unbloody manner, not *actually* dead, but under the *appearance* of death ;” ſo that the communicants not only eat the man Jeſus Chriſt, but even eat him alive @@(B)!

It is known to all our readers that this doctrine of tranſubſtantiation was one cauſe of the breach between the church of Rome and thoſe various ſocieties which call themſelves reformed churches. The real and ſubſtantial change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord is rejected by every reformer as a change con­tradictory and impoſſible, and fraught with the moſt im­pious conſequences ; and volumes have been written to expoſe the weakneſs of thoſe arguments which have ſo often been vainly urged in its ſupport. It has been ſhown to imply numberleſs abſurdities, ſuch as, that the ſame thing can be in a million of different places, *whole* and *entire,* at

@@@(b) This whole account of the Romiſh doctrine reſpecting the ſacrament of the Lord’s Supper is taken from a work in two ſmall volumes, called *The Sincere Christian instructed the Faith of Christ, from the Written Word.* Its author is a man of learning, and great perſonal worth ; and as he fills a high ſtation in the church of Rome, we cannot doubt but that he has given a fair view of the doctrine of that church reſpecting this and every other article of which he treats. We are ſorry however that his zeal ſhould have impelled him, in a *popular* work, to write in the manner that he has done of the ſalvation of thoſe who are not members of his church, or who cannot embrace all his opinions ; for if his doctrine on this ſubject be implicitly received by thoſe “ over whom he has the rule, and for whoſe ſouls he is ap­pointed to watch,” they muſt neceſſarily look upon the majority of their fellow citizens as reprobates doomed to eternal perdition. Let this be our apology for treating ſome of thoſe opinions, which he thinks ſo abſolutely