as comprehensive a view as the limits prescribed to such articles will admit.

Our blessed Lord, in the same night that he was betray­ed, “ took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” Such was the institution of the Lord’s Supper as it is re­corded in the gospel by St Matthew ; and we have the same account of it, in almost the very same words, by other three inspired writers, St Paul, St Mark, and St Luke. That it was the bread which Christ blessed and brake that is here called his body, and the wine over which he gave thanks that he styles his blood of the new testament, will admit of no reasonable doubt; but in what sense they became so, has been the subject of many controversies.

The church of Rome, which holds, that after consecra­tion, Jesus Christ, God and man, is really, truly, and sub­stantially, contained under the outward appearances of the bread and wine, informs us, that about the middle of the mass, when the priest, taking into his hand, first the bread and then the wine, pronounces over each separately the sacred words of consecration, the substance of these ele­ments is immediately changed by the almighty power of God into the body and blood of Christ ; but that all the outward appearances of the bread and wine, and all their 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 ;* 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 *substance* or matter of the body and blood of Christ; so that this divine matter, com­ing into the place of the former earthy 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 further 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 Ro­mish 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 *stomachs 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 manner.”

Now, whether we suppose, with this 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 his 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 *sacrifice 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 bis 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!@@i

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

@@@1 This whole account of the Romish doctrine respecting the sacrament of the Lord’s Supperis taken from a work in two small volumes, called “ The sincere Christian instructed in 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 be has given a fair view of the doctrine of that church respecting this and every other article of which he treats.