

CONFESSION OF FAITH.

CHAPTER 29.-*Of the Lords Supper.*

VI. That Doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of Bread and Wine, into the substance of Christs Body and Blood (commonly called Transubstantiation) by Consecration of a Priest, or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common Sense and Reason; overthroweth the nature of the Sacrament, and hath been, and is, the cause of manifold Superstitions; yea, of gross Idolatries¹.

Question 1.—*Is that doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called Transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason?*

Answer.—Yes. Acts 3:21 *with* 1 Cor. 11:24-26; Luke 24:6, 39. Thus does the Romish church err, maintaining the change of the very substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ by consecration of some Popish priest or other Popish hireling. It is repugnant to the Scriptures for the following reasons: 1.) From the passages where the Eucharistic symbols retain the same name after the consecration which they had before (namely, the name of bread and wine), Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; 1 Cor. 11:23, 26-28; 10:16. 2.) The same is evident from the sacramental words, Luke 22:19, 20. Although the Papists seek from the words “this is my body,” &c. their strongest argument, strangles their cause—a.) The pronoun “this” can denote nothing else than the bread and its substance. b.) The causal particle “for”—“given for you”—shows the reason of the command to take and eat “this”—this bread which he reached out to them, because it was his body (not common and ordinary bread, but sacred and mystical), *to wit* the sacrament of his body. c.) On the hypothesis of the Papists, who maintain that in virtue of these words transubstantiation is effected—what is made the body of Christ only after the words have been pronounced, that was not as yet the body, the words not yet having been pronounced. d.) The words of Christ do not suffer any substantial conversion because Christ does not say “is made” the body and blood (which he must have said to designate a conversion), but he simply enunciates what was already, but does not command or declare what it ought to be made. e.) The substance of the bread was converted neither into the whole nor the broken body; not into the whole because such a body is not given for us; not into the broken body because when Christ pronounced these words, the body was not broken, but still whole. f.) If these words have conversive force, the accidents of the bread and wine would be changed into the accidents of the body and blood of Christ no less than the substance of the bread. 3.) We never read of a miracle wrought by God, but what was evidently seen to be such. As Moses' rod was turned into a serpent, and became a rod again, Ex. 4:2, 3. Such were the wonders of Egypt. Such was the dividing of the Red sea, the striking of the rock, and the flowing out of the water, Num. 20:11. The destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, was evident to all the Israelites, Num. 16:31, 32. So were the miracles which were wrought by the holy prophets, such were the

¹ Acts 3:21 *with* 1 Cor. 11:24-26; Luke 24:6, 39.

miracles which Christ and his apostles wrought, Luke 4:39. Was not the water most evidently turned into wine?, John 2:7, 8. 4.) The silence of the Scriptures ought to have great weight with us. Who can believe so many miracles wrought every day in the church of Rome, and yet nowhere in Scripture is this mentioned or promised? 5.) As the water in baptism is not transubstantiated into the blood of Christ, so the bread and wine are not into the body and blood of Christ—both of these being sacraments of the New Testament.

It is repugnant to common sense because the senses uniformly always and everywhere testify that after the consecration, the symbols are properly bread and wine, and not body and blood. Therefore, this is necessarily true. Otherwise we would have to say that there is nothing certain in the nature of things and the testimony of all the senses would have to be condemned—which is absurd.

It is repugnant to reason which teaches that only one body occupies one place and cannot be at the same time in more places than one because it would be one and not one, standing apart from itself and exposed to various and contrary motions, which everyone ought to see is absurd.

Question 2.—Does this wicked doctrine overthrow the nature of the sacrament, and has it been, and is it, the cause of manifold superstitions; yea, of gross idolatries?

Answer.—Yes. Ex. 12:11, 12; Rom. 4:11. Thus do the Papists err who most wickedly confuse the sign and the thing signified, thus destroying the understanding of the true nature of the sacrament and introducing manifold superstitions and idolatries born of their perverting the truth. It is irrefutably true that the Lord's Supper is a sacrament. If such a change of essence from bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ did indeed occur in the Lord's Supper, it would be no sacrament, for in all sacraments these five matters must be true: 1.) its institution as a sacrament, Matt. 28:19. 2.) the presence of an external, physical sign, 1 Cor. 11:23, 25. 3.) the signification of a spiritual matter which points to Christ, 1 Cor. 10:16. 4.) a relationship between the sign and the matter signified, Matt. 26:27, 28; and 5.) its purpose—which is to signify and to seal, Rom. 4:11. All of this has been proven above. Such an essential change thus nullifies all this.—a.) It eradicates the external, physical sign, for it implies that the bread and wine are removed and do not exist when they are consumed. b.) It eradicates the matter signified, for if the sign ceases to exist, this is likewise true for the matter signified. If the bread is the body of Christ itself, it would not signify anything. It furthermore would destroy the body of Christ itself, since it robs the body of Christ of its magnificence, visibility, tangibility, and unity. c.) It eradicates the relationship between the sign and the matter signified, for there is no longer a sign and no longer a matter being signified. d.) It eradicates the purpose of the sacrament, for in the absence of a sign there is also no seal—which it nevertheless is, as it seals the suffering and death of Christ to believers. Since the body and blood of Christ itself would be present, it eliminates the remembrance of them, for remembrance relates to something which is absent. It thus follows that there is no such essential change.

Thus, we see the sinfulness and superstition of the adoration of the consecrated elements, because the Papists do most wickedly suppose they reverence Christ in the adoring of the bread, when Christ could not be present in body, Acts 3:21.