marriage in Cana of Galilee for the express purpose of bear­ing testimony to this singular conversion, what must have been the consequence on the minds of those who witnessed that miracle ? Nothing, we think, but scepticism or dis­trust of their own faculties ; for they would have had the very same evidence that *no* substantial change was wrought on the elements, as that the water was *actually* turned into wine.

Though the reformed churches unanimously reject the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of course the sacrifice of the mass, its inseparable consequence, they are far from being agreed among themselves respecting the nature of the Lord’s Supper ; and the notions of this ordinance en­tertained by some of them appear to us as untenable as any part of the doctrine of the church of Rome. The Luthe­rans believe that the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present with the bread and wine ; that the body is really and truly eaten, and the blood really and truly drunk, by the communicants; and that whatever mo­tion or action the bread has, the body has the same.@@’ Ac­cording to them, therefore, the same sensible appearances are exhibited by two substances united in some inexpli­cable manner, which is neither a personal union, nor incor­poration, nor the enclosure of the body within the bread ; nor does it last longer than while the sacrament is cele­brating. This union is generally called *consubstantiation ;* but they reject the term, contenting themselves with assert­ing the real presence, without presuming to define the mode by which the body and blood of Christ are united to the sacramental elements.

It would be superfluous to waste time in replying to this doctrine. Every reader sees that it implies the possibility of the same thing’s being whole and entire in a million of places at one and the same instant of time, which has been so often urged as an unanswerable objection to the Romish doctrine ; and it is fraught with this additional absurdity peculiar to itself, that two bodily substances may at once occupy the same place, which is directly contrary to our notions of solidity. It may likewise be observed, that what­ever be the real sense of our Saviour’s words, he says ex­pressly, “ This is my body this thing which I give you, and which you see and feel : whereas, had he meant what Luther and his followers teach, he would surely have said, *“ With* this bread receive my body, *with* this cup receive my blood.”

The notions of some of the early Calvinists respecting the Lord’s Supper are very mysterious, and expressed in language of which we are not sure that we understand the meaning. In the year 1561 an attempt was made in France to bring the Catholics and Protestants to an uniformity of doctrine on this great topic of controversy ; and deputies were appointed by both parties to meet at Poissy, and de­bate the question in a friendly manner. The principal ma­nagers on the side of the Catholics were the cardinals of Lorraine and Tournon ; those on the side of the Protes­tants were Beza and Peter Martyr. After several meet­ings, disputes, and violent separations, the Protestant de­puties declared their faith in the following words : “ We confess, that Jesus Christ, in the Supper, does truly give and exhibit to us the substance of his body and blood by the efficacy of his Holy Spirit ; and that we do receive and eat spiritually, and by faith, that very body which was of­fered and immolated for us, so as to be bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, to the end that we may be enlivened thereby, and receive what is conducive to our salvation. And because faith, supported by the word of God, makes those things present which it apprehends, and by that faith

we do in deed and reality receive the true natural body and blood of Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit: by this means we confess and acknowledge the presence of his body and blood in the Supper.” One of the Romish dele­gates expressing his dislike of this last clause, the Protes­tant ministers gave the following explanation of their sen­timents. “ No distance of place can hinder us from com­municating of the body and blood of Christ, for the Lord’s Supper is a heavenly thing ; and though on earth we re­ceive with our mouths bread and wine, which are the true signs of his body and blood, yet by faith, and the efficacy of the Holy Ghost, our minds, which are fed with this food, are rapt up into heaven, and enjoy the presence of the body and blood ; and that by this means it may be said that the body is truly joined to the bread, and the blood to the wine ; but after the manner of a sacrament, and not at all according to place or natural position.”@@2

If the reader can discover the precise meaning of these passages, his sagacity exceeds ours. That the Protestant deputies believed, or professed to believe, that the natural body and blood of Christ are by the faithful received in the Lord’s Supper, is indeed evident ; but their notions respect­ing the manner of this reception are very unintelligible, if not contradictory. In the former quotation, they confess that Christ’s body and blood are really present 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 faith. 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.@@3 In one important circumstance these two churches seem to differ. The Confession of Faith, as we understand it,@@4 affirms that in the Lord’s Supper there is no sacrifice. 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*

@@@, Luther. Cogit. MS. 400. Gerhard, in Loc. Theol. de Sacra Cœna.

@@@i Thunnus, lib. xxviii. See also Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, vol. i.

@@@t Articles of the Church of England, art. xxviii. ; and Confession of Faith, chap, xxix.

@@@4 Chap. xxix. § 3.