ther ; that gold, for inſtancc, has a different s*ubstratum* or *basis* from iron, lead, or ſilver ; that the internal organiza­tion or ſtructure of the body of an ox is different from that of a horſe ; and that the *internal substance* or s*ubstratum* which exhibits the appearances of bread and wine is different from that which ſupports the ſenſible qualities of fleſh and blood (see Metaphysics, Part I. Chap. I. and Part II. Chap. I. and II.). Suppoſing therefore the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation to be poſſible and even true, it would ſtill be impoſſible, by any ſtatement of it in human language, or by any argument urged in its ſupport, to render that doctrine an object of rational belief ; for if it be ſaid that the words τουιο εσιι τοσωμα μου were ſpoken by a divine perſon, who could neither be deceived himſelf nor intend to de­ceive us, it may be replied, that the ſenſible appearances of bread and wine, which are confessed to remain, are like- wiſe the language of a divine perſon, even of the Creator and Governor of heaven and earth ; that this language addressed to the sight, the taſte, the touch, and the ſmell, is equally intelligible to all nations ; that ſince the creation of the world its meaning has never been miſtaken by the ſcholar or the clown, the ſage or the ſavage, except in this ſingle inſtance of our Lord’s fleſh and blood exhibiting the ſenſible appearances of bread and wine ; and that it is therefore infinitely more probable that the members of the church of Rome ſhould miſtake the meaning of the words τουιο εοιι *το σωμa μoυ,* which, though ſpoken by Chriſt, are part of the language of men, and liable to all its ambiguities, than that all mankind ſhould miſtake the language of God himſelf, which is liable to no ambiguities, and which was never in any other inſtance misunderſtood by a ſingle in­dividual. Should tranſubſtantiation therefore be really true, its truth can never be proved or rendered probable, but by an immediate operation of the ſpirit of God on the mind of man ; and he who is conſcious of no ſuch opera­tion on his own mind, may rest aſſured that the Father of mercies, who knows whereof he is made, will never bring upon him, for his incredulity in this inſtance, any of the anathemas denounced by the church of Rome upon thoſe who place implicit confidence in the univerſal language of Him who created them, in oppoſition to her figurative and contradictory interpretations of the written word. Of the tranſubſtantiation of the elements a viſible miracle would afford no proof. Had the water been changed into wine at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, for the expreſs purpoſe of bearing teſtimony to this Angular converſion, what muſt have been the conſequence on the minds of thoſe who witneſſed that miracle ? Nothing, we think, but ſcepticiſm or a 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 incloſure 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 afferting 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 be obſerved too, 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 notione 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 Catholic delegates expreſſing his diſlike of this laſt clauſe, the Proteſtant miniſters gave the following explanation of their ſentiments : “ No diſtance of place can bindet us ſrom 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 wines but after the manner of a ſacrament, **and not at** all **accord­**ing to place or natural poſition @@\*.”

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 **no­**tions 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**

**@@@**[m]\* Luther. Cogit. MS. 400. Gerbard in Loc. Theol. de Sacra Caena.

**@@@**[m]\* Thaemus, lib. 28. See also Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, vol 1.