

Church; and Beza is right in saying that it has fewer inconveniencies, as far as relates to the manner of speaking, than that of the Lutherans, that is, the literal sense is better preserved by it."

Hospinian every where makes the same acknowledgement, as when he says, in refuting a work of Luther's: "If we must exclude all figure from the words of Jesus Christ, the opinion of those who follow the Pope is correct." The same author, as well as other defenders of the figurative sense, remark with much correctness against Luther, that Jesus Christ did not say *my body is here, or my body is under this and with this; or, this contains my body; but simply, this is my body.* Whence it follows that he in no wise wished to give his disciples a substance which contains or accompanies his body, but his body without mixture of any foreign substance.

Calvin frequently insists upon this same truth; but not to dwell too long upon particular authorities let us listen to an entire synod of Zuinglians: that of Czeuger in Poland, related in the Geneva collection. This synod demonstrates that the consubstantiation of the Lutherans is indefensible, "because, says the synod, as the rod of Moses could not have become a serpent without transubstantiation, and as the water was not blood in Egypt, nor wine at the marriage feast of Cana without a change: so in like manner the bread of the Lord's Supper cannot be substantially the body of Jesus Christ if not changed into his flesh, by losing the form and the substance of bread." Let us say with Bossuet, that good sense dictated this decision. In fact, the bread remaining such, can no more be the body of our Saviour, than the rod, remaining a rod, could be a serpent, or that the water remaining water could be blood in Egypt, and wine at the marriage-feast of Cana.

Moreover, it is worthy of remark, that in spite of the bitterness and vehemence of Luther and his followers against transubstantiation, they did not entertain so terrible an idea of it in the beginning. The simplicity of the words, which has always induced them to preserve, the dogma of the real presence, for a long time kept them in the belief of the change of substance.

Luther commenced by teaching it most positively in the following terms; "Every action of Christ is an instruction for us, as he himself has told us: I have given you an example that as I have done, so do you also. Do this in commemoration of me, said he. What is the meaning of do this? Is it not what I have just been doing, with you? But what does he do? he takes bread and by this word, *this is my body* he changes it into his body, and gives it to his disciples to eat." But soon after Luther changes his own doctrine, and proposes another quite different, still however leaving his followers to adopt which of the two they pleased.

"I permit, says he, that each one may hold which opinion he pleases.—Let each one know that he is free, without endangering his salvation.

to embrace which of the two he pleases." He had so little aversion to the catholic belief upon the change of the substance, that he himself declares that his only reason for rejecting it was because he was so much pressed to receive it. He was even content that it should be inserted and clearly drawn out by Melancton first in the confession of Augsburgh, and then in the apology.

Here is a literal translation of the 10th article of the Confession, such as it was presented to the Diet. "Concerning the Lord's supper, we teach that the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are truly present under the species of bread and wine: that they are distributed and received: for this reason we condemn the opposite doctrine."

A year after this authentic confession had been presented at Augsburgh, Melancton found himself obliged to write a defence of it, which was equally approved and signed by all the Lutheran states. In it he still more clearly establishes the change of the substance, in these words; "We find that not only the Roman Church maintains the corporal presence of Jesus Christ, but that the Greek Church also maintains it at the present day, and has maintained it in ancient times. This we may discover from their canon of the mass, in which the Priest publicly prays that the bread may be changed and may become the body of Jesus Christ. And Vulgarius, an esteemed author, clearly says that the bread is not a figure only, but that it is changed into flesh." These two passages extracted from two acts, solemnly approved of by all the party, evidently shew that the Lutherans, commenced by admitting transubstantiation in expressions, and even by going so far as to condemn the contrary doctrine. We know that Melancton was then seeking to draw the principles of reform near to those of the church, and to present to the deist as much conformity as possible between the two. Perhaps people may now feel disposed to call in question the authenticity of these two passages: I grant that the first was notably altered, ten years after the first edition of the Confession of faith, and that the second has been totally retrenched in later editions of the Apology. It will therefore be necessary to say a few words by way of establishing the authenticity of them both.

1° Count de Kollonitch bishop of Winstadt, reprinted three German copies of the Confession of Augsburgh, taken from the imperial library at Vienna. These three copies, although printed at different times, and differing in many parts, are word for word the same upon the 10th article, of which I have given the literal translation.

2° The conformity of this compilation with the passage in the defence renders its authenticity more probable, if it be true that the passage of the defence is itself authentic: and we shall see lower down that the Lutherans grant it to be so.

3° It is certain from Sleiden and Melancton, as well as from Chytræus and Celestine in their histories of the confession of Augsburgh that the catholics made no objection to the 10th article, in their refutation of the confession, produced by order of Charles V. Now it is not less certain that they

would have opposed it, if instead of the articles mentioned above, most conformable to our dogma they had discovered the one so contradictory, that was afterwards substituted in these words: "That in the Lord's Supper the body and the blood of Jesus Christ are given to us with the bread and wine."

4° Hospinian, a celebrated minister, maintains that this confession must be the original, because it is the one found in the edition of 1530, published at Wittenberg, the cradle of Lutheranism, and the usual abode of Luther and Melancton. He says that the article was afterwards changed, on account of its favouring transubstantiation too much, by specifying that the body and blood are received, not with the substance, but under the species of the bread and wine. Schlussenburg, a Lutheran writer makes no difficulty of accusing Melancton himself of having changed his 10th article of the confession, from the leaning he afterwards discovered towards the opinion of the reformers.

As for the passage from the Apology, it was so intimately connected with that of the confession, that it could no longer subsist after the essential alteration which the other had undergone. Consequently they got a new edition of the Apology to be published by the same printer, and instead of taking the pains to change the article, they suppressed it entirely. The discovery of this fraud produced many complaints, to which it was coldly replied that the article was not worth preserving. Heshusius disapproved of conduct so dishonest, and declared that he would have preferred to have had the error publicly confuted, rather than have given occasion to most unfavourable impressions, by suppressing it with secrecy and fraud,

Grotius, who so well understood the spirit of Protestantism, expresses himself as follows: "It is incontestable that according to the Fathers, and a great number of Protestants, with the signs is presented to us the thing itself (in the Eucharist), but in a manner imperceptible to our senses. Thus taught Bucer and others. To speak my sentiments on the subject I think that all our great disputants understand perfectly well what the ancient Church teaches, and what the Greek and Latin Churches still teach: but they pretend to know nothing of it; that they may have subject for declamation before those who are led more by the senses of the body than by those of the mind."

Molanus, the learned Abbe of Lökkum, in the project for the reunion of the Catholics and Protestants of the confession of Augsburgh, speaks in the manner following: "Drejerus, Professor at Königsberg, admits here, in a certain sense a substantial change. I would not vouch for this doctrine; but I should think that I said nothing contrary to the analogy of faith, by supposing that by the words of institution, there is produced in the Lord's Supper, or in the consecration a certain mysterious change, in which is verified, in an undiscoverable manner, this proposition so common in the Fathers, *the bread is the body of Jesus Christ.* The catholics must then be entreated, without entering upon the question of the manner in which the change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist