in the ſacrament ; that they are made preſent by faith (we ſuppoſe the faith of the communicants) ; and that the *very body* which was offered and immolated for us is eaten *ſpiritually* and by f*aith.* In the latter quotation, they ſeem to ſay that Chriſt’s body and blood are in heaven, at a great diſtance from the true ſigns of them; that on earth the com­municants receive only theſe ſigns, which are bread and wine; but that, by faith and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, their minds, during actual communion, are rapt up into heaven, where they enjoy the preſence of the body and blood; and that by this means the body and blood are truly joined to the bread and wine through the medium of the mind of the communicant, which is at once preſent both to the sign and to the thing signified. To this myſterious doctrine it is needleſs to urge objections. Every man who is accuſtomed to think, and to uſe words with ſome determinate meaning, will at once perceive that the authors of this de­claration muſt have had very confuſed notions of the ſubject, and have pleaſed themſelves with ſound inſtead of ſenſe, ſatisfied that they could not be wrong if they did not ſymbolize with the Lutherans or the Council of Trent.

The churches of England and Scotland, in their eſtabliſhed doctrines reſpecting the Lord’s Supper, appear to be Calviniſtical ; but the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles and of the Confeſſion of Faith muſt have been much more rational divines than Beza and Peter Martyr. They agree in condemning the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation as contra­ry to common ſenſe, and not founded in the word of God; they teach, that to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the ſacrament, the bread which we break is a par­taking of the body of Chriſt, and the cup of bleſſing a partaking of the blood of Chriſt ; and they add, that the body and blood of Chriſt are eaten and drunk, not corpo­rally or carnally, but only after a heavenly and ſpiritual manner, by which the communicants are made partakers of all the benefits of his death @@\*. In one important circumſtance theſe two churches ſeem to differ. The Confession of Faith, as we underſtand it @@\*, affirms, that in the Lord’s Supper there is no ſacriſice made at all. The thirty-firſt article of the church of England likewiſe condemns the Popiſh ſacrifice of the maſs as a *blaſphemous fable* and *dangerous deceit ;* but in *the order for the administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion,* the celebrator “ beſeeches God moſt mercifully to accept the alms and *oblations* of the congregation,” and again “ to accept *their ſacrifice of praiſe* and thankſgiving:” from which petitions many have inferred that, in the Lord’s Supper, that church offers a commemorative and euchariſtical ſacrifice. This inference ſeems not to be wholly without foundation. In the order for the adminiſtration of the Lord’s Supper, according to the form of the Book of Common Prayer ſet forth by act of parliament in the ſecond and third years of king Edward the Sixth, the elements were ſolemnly offered to God as a ſacrifice of praiſe and thankſgiving; and though the prayer containing that oblation was, at the review of the liturgy ſome years afterwards, removed from the prayer of conse­cration, to which it was originally joined, and placed where it now ſtands in the poſt communion ſervice ; yet the very act of parliament which authorized that alteration, calls king Edward’s “ a very godly order, agreeable to the word of God and the primitive church, and very comfort­able to all good people deſiring to live in Chriſtian converſation.”

The Engliſh church, however, has not poſitively deter­mined any thing reſpecting this great queſtion ; and whilst ſhe condemns the doctrine of the real preſence, with all its dangerous conſequences, she allows her members to enter­tain very different notions of this holy ordinance, and to publiſh theſe notions to the world. Accordingly, many of her moſt eminent divines @@(e) have maintained that, in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, the elements of bread and wine are offered to God as a ſacrifice commemorative of Chriſt’s one ſacrifice for the sins of the whole world ; that theſe elements, though they undergo no ſubſtantial change, yet receive ſuch a divine virtue by the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, as to convey to the worthy communicant all the benefits of Chriſt’s paiſson ; that they are therefore called his body and blood, becauſe being, after their obla­tion, eaten and drunk in remembrance of Him, they ſupply the place oſ his body and blood in the feaſt upon his ſacri­fice ; and that it is cuſtomary with our Saviour to give to any thing the name of another of which it completely ſupplies the place, as when he calls himſelf the *door @@\* of* the ſheep, becauſe there is no entrance into the church or king­dom of God but by faith in him. They obſerve, that the Euchariſt’s being commemorative, no more hinders it from being a proper sacrifice, than the typical and figurative ſacrifices of the old law hindered them from being proper ſacrifices: for as to be a type doth not deſtroy the nature and notion of a legal sacrifice, ſo to be repreſentative and com­memorative doth not deſtroy the nature of an evangelical ſa­criſice. To prove that, in thc celebration of the Lord’s Supper, there is a real sacrifice offered to God as well as a ſacrament received by the communicants, they appeal to St Paul, who says expreſsly @@\*, that “ Chriſtians have an *altar,* whereof they have no right to eat who ſerve the ta­bernacle,” and who by contraſting the cup of the Lord with the cup of devils, and the table of the Lord with the table of devils@@\* teaches plainly, that thoſe cups and thoſe tables had the ſame ſpecific nature. That the *table of de­vils* ſpoken of by the apoſtle was the Pagan altars, and the *cap of devils* the wine poured out in libations to the Pagan divinities, will admit of no diſpute ; and therefore, ſay the advocates for the euchariſtical sacrifice, the table of the Lord muſt be the Chriſtian altar, and the cup of the Lord the wine offered to God as the repreſentative of the blood of Chriſt ; otherwiſe there would not be that *abſurdity* which the apoſtle ſuppoſes, in the ſame perſon drinking the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, and partaking of the Lord’s table and the table of devils. They obſerve farther, that in all the ancient liturgies extant there is a ſolemn form oſ oblation of the ſacramental elements, and that all the Chriſtian writers from the ſecond century down­wards treat of the Lord’s Supper as a sacrifice as well as ſacrificial feaſt, having indeed no value in itſelf, but accep­table to God as repreſenting Chriſt’s one sacrifice ſor the sins of the world. Our limits will not permit us to give even an abſtract of their arguments ; but the reader who ſhall attentively peruſe Jo*hnſon’s unbloody Sacrifice and Altar unveiled and ſupported,* will discover that their notions are better founded than probably he ſuppoſes, and that they are totally irreconcileable with the doctrine of tran­ſubſtantiation and the Popiſh sacrifice of the *maſs.*

Other Engliſh divines of great learning, with the cele­brated Hoadley biſhop of Wincheſter at the head of them, contend ſtrenuouſly that the Lord’s Supper, ſo far from

@@@[m]\*Articles of the Church of England, Art. 28. and Confession of Faith, chap. 29

@@@[m]\* Chap. 29. p 3.

@@@[m]\* St John x. 7.

@@@[m]\* Heb. xiii. 10.

@@@[m]\*1 Cor. x. 16, &c.

@@@(e) The archbiſhops Laud and Wake ; the biſhops Poynet, Andrews, Bull, and Patrick ; the Doctors Hickes, Grabe, and Brett ; Messrs Bingham, Johnſon, Mede, Wheatly, Scandaret, Bowyer,