

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

JANUARY, 1834.

No. I.

ART. I.—*Remarks on the Epistles of Ignatius.*

THE Epistles of Ignatius may be said to be the sheet-anchor of diocesan Episcopacy. They are implicitly relied on, continually quoted, and made the subject of unceasing boast, as decisive witnesses for prelatical bishops. Whatever testimony may be doubtful on the subject, *this* has been pronounced, for more than two centuries, altogether unquestionable. In short, so much has been said concerning these Epistles, in reference to the Episcopal controversy, that the opinion seems with many to be taken for granted, that if their authenticity can be established, the cause of Presbyterianism is, of course, defeated. On this account, we presume that a few simple statements respecting the history and character of the Epistles in question, will not be uninteresting to our readers.

Ignatius, as Eusebius tells us, was bishop or pastor of Antioch, early in the second century. Where he was born; how educated; when, or by what means, converted to the Christian faith; and at what time inducted into the pastoral charge of the church of Antioch—are all points concerning which nothing is now known. Some of the ancients alleged that he was the “child”.

best society," and where the nature and design of education societies are examined with reference to the "spirit of our civil institutions."

The manner in which many miscellaneous questions in casuistry are also settled in this book, is no trifling reason why it should not only be read, but why it should be made a familiar companion and counsellor, in a great variety of the more common and unguarded circumstances of life. For example,

"At evening devotion, had a singular exercise. While singing, my soul thirsted for a blessing. The thought suddenly entered my mind; 'If you neglect your tea, you may obtain the blessing which you seek.' I inquired, whence is this? Is it from God, or from the devil? But I concluded, that the Lord's blessing came not by a purchase of mine, and therefore that he could as well bless me then as afterwards; and I determined to throw myself at his feet and ask his favour, and thus defeat the adversary who was ready to cheat me out of a blessing. My Father smiled upon me, the work of grace was deepened, and my soul fed on manna from above."

We close this imperfect notice of one of the most holy and unexceptionable books we ever read, with a single extract, designed, as it is singularly adapted, merely to set the edge of appetite for more in the same spirit, on the subject of *death*:

"In contemplating my latter end, the question arose, what inscription would you have on your tombstone? and in thought I answered,

"Here lies ———. A sinner, born again; a sinner, washed, and justified, and sanctified. A sinner, once an heir of hell, a child of the devil by wicked works; but *by grace* a child of God, and an heir of heaven, a miracle of grace, deserving all the miseries of the second death; and yet an expectant of endless glory and felicity. Farewell earth, welcome heaven. I am nothing; Jesus is *all*."

Archibald Alexander

ART. IV.—*The Catechism of the Council of Trent. Published by command of Pope Pius the Fifth; translated into English, by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, &c. Royal College, Maynooth. First American, from the Dublin edition. Baltimore: published by James Myres, near the Cathedral, 1833. pp. 551.*

THE title would seem to import that the Catechism here brought into view, is the work of the Council of Trent; but we are in-

formed in the preface by the editor, that this is not the fact; but it has received this denomination from the circumstance, that the fathers of this synod made a decree, that such a work should be prepared, and appointed the persons who were judged fit to undertake it. A translation of this decree is prefixed to the volume now under review in the following words:

“That the faithful may approach the sacraments with greater reverence and devotion, the Holy Synod commands all bishops not only to explain in a manner accommodated to the capacity of the receivers, the nature and use of the sacraments, when they are to be administered by themselves; but also to see that every pastor piously and prudently do the same, in the vernacular language, should it be necessary and convenient. This exposition is to accord with a form prescribed by the Holy Synod for the administration of the sacraments, in a Catechism, *which bishops will take care to have faithfully translated into the vernacular language, and expounded to the people by all pastors.*”

The execution of this work, under the superintendence of the archbishop of Milan, was committed to four persons, three of whom were of the episcopal order. When completed it was presented to Pius the Fifth, and by him handed over for revision to a congregation, over which presided Cardinal Siret, who is here characterised as “profound and judicious.” The style, we are informed, was retouched by the learned Manutius; or, according to others, received its last improvement from the classic pen of Bogianus; and was speedily translated into the languages of Italy, France, Germany, and Poland. It is a book, undoubtedly, on which great pains were bestowed; and it has ever been in high esteem with the Romanists of every class. Whether the English translation here presented to the public has been faithfully made from the original, we have no opportunity of judging, as we have not been able to lay our hands upon the original work. The only circumstance which has excited a suspicion that some things have been omitted, is, that a citation which we have met with in a late author, cannot be found in this volume. This may, however, be a mere mistake; we mean not to bring any charge of unfaithfulness against the editor. Upon a careful perusal of this Catechism, candour constrains us to acknowledge, that it contains more evangelical truth than we had expected to find; but at the same time it contains the errors of Popery, exhibited without disguise. Our object, in this review, is not to travel over the whole ground of controversy, which would require volumes, instead of a few pages, but to confine our attention to a single point, namely, the doctrine of transubstantiation. On many other points, it is a matter of uncertainty,

or at least of disputation, what the Romanists really do hold; but here they avow their belief, and profess to hold all that their opponents have ever charged upon them. Here then the parties are fairly at issue; and as this doctrine is considered by them to be fundamental, and as this single error deeply affects their whole system, it will probably answer a better purpose to assault this strong-hold, than to run over the long list of errors which have been charged upon that degenerate church. If we should succeed in demolishing this single error, it would go far towards the subversion of their whole system. Our object is to treat this subject calmly and dispassionately, without having recourse to ridicule, sarcasm, or declamation; and much less to abusive epithets. We are of opinion, that the controversy with Roman Catholics, as with all other persons, should be conducted with a spirit of meekness and benevolence. Truth needs no poisoned weapons for her defence; truth deprecates such weapons, because they can be successfully wielded by the advocates of error. We feel ourselves bound, however, to strip this monstrous error bare, and to hold it up to the view of all reasonable and impartial men, as an absurdity, which never had among men a parallel. But while we shall endeavour to exhibit this incredible dogma in its true features of deformity, we will carefully avoid using any arguments or illustrations which appear to us fallacious or sophistical. What we principally fear is, that most of our readers will think that we use too many arguments, and dwell too long in the refutation of an opinion, which needs only to be distinctly proposed, to be rejected as an incredible thing. But let it be considered, that this error has struck its roots very deep, and is supported by all the influence of superstition, and by the authority of a power supposed to be infallible. We intend to make no appeal to those termed fathers; not because we believe that a fair construction of all that they have written would be unfavourable to our cause, but because we view them to be erring and fallible men like ourselves, to whose opinions we are under no obligation to submit. Our appeal is to reason and Scripture; and in the light of these, we hope to make it appear, that the doctrine of transubstantiation involves so many gross absurdities, that in order to believe it, a man must first take leave of his reason and common sense.

But let us hear from their own authorised formularies, what their doctrine is. In the Catechism now under review, we have the following explanation:

“The Eucharist becomes a sacrament by the sole consecration of the elements. In the material elements of which the other sacraments are composed, no change takes place; in baptism, for instance, the

water, in confirmation the chrism, lose not in their administration the nature of water and oil, but in the eucharist, that which before consecration was bread and wine, became after consecration really and substantially the body and blood of our Lord.”—p. 197.

Again,

“The Catholic Church firmly believes, and openly professes, that in this sacrament, the words of consecration accomplish three things; First, that the true and real body of Christ, the same that was born of the virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is rendered present in the holy eucharist. Secondly, that however repugnant it may appear to the dictates of the senses, no substance of the elements remains in the sacrament. Thirdly, a natural consequence from the two preceding, and one which the words of consecration also express, that the accidents which present themselves to the eyes, or other senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner, without a subject. The accidents of bread and wine we see, but they inhere in no substance, and exist independent of any. The substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, that they altogether cease to be the substance of bread and wine.”—p. 207.

The decree of the Council of Trent, on this subject, is in the following words:

“Since Christ our Redeemer has said, that that was truly his own body which he offered under the appearance of bread, it has therefore always been believed in the Church of God, and it is now again declared by this holy Council, that by the consecration of the bread and wine, there is effected a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood, which conversion is fitly termed by the holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation.”—*Con. Tred. Sess. xiii. c. iv.*

Again,

“If any one shall deny, that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there are entertained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; or say, that he is in it only as a sign or figure or by his influence, let him be anathema.

“If any one shall say, that in the adorable sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ [referring to the consubstantiation of the Lutherans] and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and the whole substance of wine into his blood, the appearance only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most properly calls transubstantiation, let him be anathema.

“If any one shall deny that in the adorable sacrament of the eucharist, a separation being made, the whole Christ is contained in each element or species, in the separate parts of each element or species, let him be anathema.

“This conversion then is so effectuated, that the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed by the power of God, into the whole substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine, into the whole substance of his blood, and this without any change in our Lord himself, he is neither begotten, nor changed, nor increased, but remains entirely, and substantially the same.”—*Cat. Con. Trent.* p. 215.

Again,

“Our Lord is not in the sacrament as in a place. The substance of bread is changed into the substance of Christ, not into magnitude or quality.” “As then the body of our Lord succeeds to the substance, the body of our Lord is contained whole and entire, under the least particle of the bread.”

“We have already proved, that the body and blood of our Lord are really and truly contained in the sacrament, therefore contrary to the physical laws, subsist of themselves, inhering in no subject.”

The doctrine of the Romanists by which the laity are restricted in the participation of the eucharist, to one kind, is also distinctly stated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

“The law of the Church restricts its administration under both kinds to any but the officiating priest, unless by special permission of the Church. Christ, it is true, as has been explained by the Council of Trent, instituted and administered to his apostles, at his last supper, this great sacrament under both kinds, but it does not follow of necessity that by doing so he established a law rendering its administration to the faithful under both kinds imperative.”

The reasons assigned for this departure from the example of our Saviour in the original institutions are, 1. That the Scriptures often speak of it under one kind. 2. This practice is necessary to avoid accident or indignity. 3. By this means it may always be in readiness for the sick. 4. There are many who cannot bear the taste or smell of wine. 5. In many places wine is extremely scarce. 6. Finally and chiefly, it was so ordered to crush the heresy, which denied that Christ, whole and entire, is contained under either species.

The doctrine of the sacrifice and adoration of the mass, is also explicitly declared.

“The difference between the eucharist as a sacrament and sacrifice, is very great; and is two-fold. As a sacrament, it is perfected by consecration; as a sacrifice, all its efficacy consists in the oblation. When

deposited in a tabernacle or borne to the sick, it is a sacrament, not a sacrifice. As a sacrament, it is to the worthy receiver a source of merit; as a sacrifice, it is not only a source of merit, but of satisfaction. It is never offered to any but God."—p. 231.

We have now seen what is the avowed doctrine of the Romanists, respecting the eucharist; in other cases they often complain, that their opinions are misrepresented by Protestant writers; but on this point, there is no such charge. They explicitly profess their belief in all that has ever been attributed to them. This is one reason why we have selected this particular dogma for the subject of our argument: there is here a fair issue formed, and there is no medium between the absolute truth and falsehood of the opinion which they hold. In the consecration of the bread and wine in the eucharist, these material substances are actually and really, by a stupendous miracle, converted into the flesh and blood of Christ; so that they are no longer bread and wine; although the sensible properties of bread and wine remain, yet these accidents exist without a subject: for what is eaten or drunk is truly the body of Christ, and the substance of the bread and wine no longer exists. This is the doctrine, concerning the meaning of which there is no dispute: nor concerning the name, for the Council of Trent has declared that it is "properly and fitly" called "transubstantiation."

We now beg the earnest and impartial attention of our readers to the following observations.

1. It cannot be denied, that there is something very extraordinary in the doctrine of the Romanists. There is nothing in the Bible which has the least analogy to it. In all other cases when miracles were wrought, the appeal was made to the senses of the people; but, here we are called upon to believe, that a miracle is wrought, when the testimony of the senses is in direct opposition to the fact. A piece of bread, made out of wheaten flour, lies upon the table. It is admitted, that it is what it appears to be, bread, and nothing else. But as soon as the priest pronounces the words "*hoc est meum corpus*"—*this is my body*, we are told, that the bread is changed, or transubstantiated, into the body of Christ: but after the pronounciation of these words, the substance on the table remains the same so far as our senses can judge. The appearance is the same to the sight; the weight is the same, if it be tried in a balance; all the chemical properties will be found the same upon analysis; the feeling is the same when handled; and the smell is the same. It is admitted, that there is no sensible change; no change of any kind, which we can discern. Now, we say, that there is nothing analogous to this in all the hundred of miracles recorded in the Bible. And before it is received as a fact, there

must be strong evidence, indeed, if any evidence can be sufficient, to produce a rational faith, in direct contradiction to the testimony of all the senses.

2. But, if there is such a change of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ, why are the properties of the bread and wine left to impose on our senses? What reason can be assigned why the evidence of the miracle, as in all other cases, is not made manifest? The only reason which we have ever heard assigned for this very extraordinary and unique case, is, that it serves to increase the mystery of the sacrament, and renders the faith which receives the truth, more mysterious. This, however, is an explanation which receives not the least countenance from Scripture. God never, in any other recorded case, dealt thus with his people; but where he works a miracle, he makes it evident to the senses of all who are his witnesses; and why is there a departure from this rule, here? If, on the third day after the crucifixion, the body of Christ had remained in the tomb, an apparently lifeless corpse, and the disciples had been informed, that notwithstanding this appearance of death, he was alive and had left the tomb, as he had predicted, it would be an analogous case. But if we were obliged to resort to such an invisible miracle; and not only invisible, but absolutely contradicted by the senses of all, what a triumph would have been afforded to the enemies of Christ! and what a theme for ridicule and triumph! If such had been the case in regard to the resurrection of Christ, his religion would never have survived a single year; yet it might be said, that the mystery would have been greater, and our faith more meritorious. It is a false principle, that God creates mysteries to astound his creatures with their incomprehensible nature, where there is no need of them. All the mysteries of revelation arise from the nature of the subject, or rather from the limited capacity of the human intellect. If a miracle is wrought, why should it not appear to be what it really is? If that bread is no longer bread but flesh, why does it not appear to be flesh? This change of substance, while the properties or accidents remain, has too much the appearance of deception. It is unworthy of the God of truth thus to deal with his creatures. He gave us our senses, and so formed us, that we cannot but credit their testimony; and to suppose, that he would place us in circumstances, in which we are required to believe that their information is false, is to subject his creatures to a dilemma, in which they must either act absurdly or wickedly. If we believe our own senses, we must be of opinion that that substance on the table is still bread; but according to the religion of Romanists, thus to believe is a damnable sin; for this which appears to be bread, is really the

flesh of Christ. And why, we ask again, are we subjected to this great difficulty? Why does not the element manifest its true nature, by its properties? Why does not the miracle appear evidently, as in all other cases? To these inquiries no satisfactory answer has been given, or can be given.

3. This is not all. The thing proposed to our faith, seems to be impossible. Different collections of material elements, forming bodies of various kinds, are distinguished from each other by their properties. Flesh has properties which make it flesh; and the same is true of bread. Now to assert that flesh has lost all the properties which constituted it flesh, and possesses all the properties which belong to bread, and yet remains flesh and not bread, is a contradiction. It is a thing impossible. It is the same as to say, it ceases to be flesh, and yet is flesh. It has all that which constitutes bread, and yet is not bread. The notion of properties subsisting without a subject, is repugnant to common sense, and involves a manifest contradiction. What is a property or accident? It is that which inheres in some subject, and by which it is what it is; but to talk of properties without a subject, is absolute nonsense. It is an absurdity which never could have gained footing, except in the dark ages, and under the influence of the false philosophy of the schoolmen. We know nothing of essence or substance but by its properties, and when we perceive them to exist, we are, from the constitution of our nature, obliged to believe, that the substance is what these properties manifest it to be. But here it will be asked, do you deny the power of the Almighty to uphold accidents where there is no subject? We answer, that God is not honoured by attributing to him absurdities and contradictions. Omnipotence can perform whatever is an object of power; but to cause the same thing to be and not to be, at the same time, is not a possible or conceivable thing; so, to create or uphold properties or accidents without a substance to which they belong, is impossible, because it involves a contradiction, as will appear whenever we attentively consider the import of the terms. For what is a property or accident? A property, as the word imports, is that which belongs to something; but if it belongs to nothing, it is no property; and the same is true of every other term by which qualities are expressed. The very idea of their self-existence without a subject, is contradictory. This block is extended, inert and divisible into parts: these are some of its properties, but can there be such properties created without a subject; or where the substance is changed, is it possible that the properties can remain unchanged? We feel mortified to be under the necessity of arguing such a plain matter of common sense; but our adversaries

are pertinacious in regard to this very point; for unless they can maintain themselves here, the whole fabric of transubstantiation must fall. We must be indulged, therefore, in some further illustrations. Matter and spirit are believed to be essentially distinct, because their invariable properties are not only distinct but incompatible. God could easily change one substance into another, and give to matter the properties of spirit; but to make no change in the properties of matter, and yet to make it spirit, is impossible, because it attributes to the same substance qualities manifestly incompatible. If this doctrine however be true, the substance of a stone might be changed into an intelligent mind, and yet the inertness, solidity, and extension of the stone remain as before. Here is a dark heavy piece of ore; now, as God can create worlds without any pre-existing material, so he could change this opaque body into a sun or star; but suppose the question to be, can God transubstantiate this substance into a bright luminous body, and without sensible weight, while it continued to possess all its former properties, of being opaque, heavy, &c.? Every man of common sense would say, it is impossible for this to be, because it involves a contradiction. But what if it were made an article of faith, that this lumpish stone was now changed into a brilliant star, although, to our senses, it still had all the properties of stone? Would not every man say, it is absurd to require us to believe in such a proposition? He would say, I am sure it is not so, for I see it to be the very same it was before you say the change in its substance took place. He takes it in his hand, and says, that which I thus handle cannot be a star; a star is a body of vast magnitude, but this is so small that I can grasp it in my hand; a star is a beautiful, luminous body, but this is a dark and unsightly lump of ore. To which, upon the principles of our opponents, it might be replied, you must not, in this case, trust your senses; God is able to change the substance of this stone into a star, and yet all the accidents of the stone may remain as before; and as his word declares that such a change has occurred, you must, on pain of damnation, believe the divine declaration. This is as precisely analogous to the case of transubstantiation, as any thing we can imagine. It would not be more unreasonable to insist, (nor half as much so) that the stone which you hold in your hand is a brilliant star of the first magnitude, as to believe, that the small wafer of bread which the priest puts in your mouth, is the whole body of Christ; and not merely his flesh and blood, but his "soul and divinity." It would be in vain to allege, that a small lump of matter could not be a star, because the properties of the stone might be said to remain, while the substance was changed; and

although to our senses it appeared to be nothing but a stone, yet under these sensible properties, there lay concealed the substance of a brilliant star. For thus they pertinaciously insist, that although this wafer has, after consecration, all the properties of bread, and this liquid in the chalice has all the sensible properties of wine, which it ever had; yet, by the exertion of divine power, a great miracle is wrought every time the eucharist is celebrated, and the bread and wine are converted into the flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. True, it is admitted, that we perceive nothing of flesh; but we must believe that our senses deceive us, and that that which, to our sight and taste and touch and smell, seems to be a thin cake of wheaten bread, is really the flesh and blood of the Son of God.

4. The very action which this doctrine of transubstantiation supposes to be performed by every believing communicant, is one which is shocking to all the unadulterated feelings of human nature. The idea of feasting on human flesh is so abhorrent to our nature, that most people think they would rather perish with hunger, than preserve life by such unnatural food. This natural abhorrence of devouring our own species, has for a long time rendered the world exceedingly incredulous about the existence of cannibalism. To the disgrace of our kind, the proof of the fact has become now too strong to admit of any further doubt; but still, when we read the narrative of the shocking feasts of the New Zealanders, it thrills us with horror, and our blood seems to be curdled in our veins. Now, to suppose that God would ordain, that the flesh and blood assumed by his own eternal Son, should be eaten and drunk daily, and that too as a part of our most solemn worship, is a thing so incredible in itself, that we doubt whether any evidence that can be conceived is sufficient to render it so probable, that in opposition to this strong instinctive or natural aversion, we should receive it as a truth, and as an essential part of the service which God requires. It is true, our Lord spoke familiarly to the Jews about eating his flesh and drinking his blood, and declared such a manducation of his body as essential to eternal life; but he could not have been here speaking of the eucharist, of which sacrament no intimation had yet been given. And surely Christ could not have discoursed to the Jews about an ordinance of which they could not have had the least idea. His words did, however, contain a prediction of the violent death which he knew he should die, and by which his body would be broken, and his blood poured out. As the Jews called for a sign from heaven, and referred to the bread which their fathers received in the wilderness, Christ took occasion to let them know, that the manna, concerning

which they spoke, was a lively type of himself; that he was the true bread which came down from heaven; and to teach the necessity of faith in himself, he insists on the necessity of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, in order to eternal life. As the manna kept the people alive only by being eaten, so a participation, by faith, of his atonement, was necessary to the salvation of men. Often Christ discoursed to the Jews, who were malignantly watching him, in a highly figurative manner; sometimes, that he might lead them on to a conclusion by which they condemned themselves; and at other times in just judgment for their perverseness, "that hearing they might hear and not understand, and seeing they might see and not perceive." The Jews had no idea of what Christ meant by eating his flesh and drinking his blood; and some of them understood his words literally; but they were not agreed in their interpretation of them, for it is written, "The Jews therefore strove among themselves saying, how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Our Lord, knowing their true character, gave them no further explanation, but extended his former declaration, "Verily verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." When, however, he perceived that they were offended with what he had said, as entertaining some gross and carnal idea of his doctrine, to leave them without excuse, he intimated to them with sufficient plainness, that his language was not to be interpreted according to the literal meaning. "It is," said he, "the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Now after this lucid exposition of the general import of this discourse, for any now to insist upon a literal interpretation, of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man, is to be more blind than the unbelieving Jews; for it is not probable, that any of them were so stupid as to suppose, that Christ meant nothing more by these expressions than an actual manducation of his flesh and blood; for they knew the law well enough to understand, that all drinking of blood was forbidden, and the reason of the prohibition would apply to human blood with tenfold force. It would be just as reasonable to suppose, that because Christ calls himself a shepherd, and speaks of his sheep of different folds, that he actually was engaged in tending a flock of sheep; yea, that he promised to sheep literally, a kingdom. Or, that he was really a door, or a vine; or that the Holy Spirit, whom he promised to believers, was "a well of water." There would be more excuse for having recourse to these words, to prove the

fact that Christ's body must be eaten and his blood drunk, if he had not precluded every gloss of the kind, by asserting that "the flesh profiteth nothing." As much as to say, if you could literally become partakers of my flesh, that could not profit you; and again, "The words I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." What can this mean, but this, that his words were to be interpreted spiritually; and that under the figure of eating his flesh and blood, he had represented spiritual blessings, connected with eternal life, which would be procured by his death and sufferings, and be made to nourish unto eternal life all who would believe in his name.

5. "The flesh profiteth nothing." There is much in these words deserving our attention; and which has a direct bearing on this subject. The eating of any flesh can have no effect to invigorate the spiritual life of the soul. Christ's body, although perfectly free from all the defilements of sin, consisted of particles of matter, otherwise it would not have been a body; and his body was derived from his mother by the power of the Holy Ghost, by whose operation it was produced, otherwise it would not have been a human body. Some heretics of old, and some enthusiasts of modern times, imagined that Christ did not receive his body from his mother, but that the matter of which it consisted was celestial, and passed through the womb of Mary, as water through a tube; but all such opinions have ever been rejected by every branch of the Catholic Church, and by the Romanists as well as others. Now, the body of Christ being material, his flesh formed and configured, like the flesh of other human bodies; and his blood also material, and of the same qualities as the blood of other men, except that his whole body was uncontaminated with the stain of original or actual sin; it plainly follows, that however the flesh of such a body might, upon the principles of nutrition, invigorate or sustain the life of the body, it could not possibly, by being carnally eaten, promote the health and purity of the immortal soul. If a man should eat nothing else but the flesh of Christ, and drink nothing else but his blood all his life, it would never improve the moral qualities of the immortal soul. The argument which our Lord uses so forcibly, to prove that that which enters into a man's stomach cannot defile his soul, is founded on the same principle as the one which we are now using. Material causes cannot directly affect the mind, either to purify or defile it. We cannot see, therefore, that the mere eating of the flesh of Christ's body, and drinking his material blood, could in itself, *ex opere operati*, have any more effect to produce or increase spiritual life, than the flesh and blood of any other person. We do not deny, however, that

God can institute a connexion between external acts and the communication of his grace: and if he had made eating Christ's flesh a means of grace, or the channel through which he communicated spiritual life, this act would stand precisely on the same footing with other ordinances; the efficacy of which depends, not on the act performed, but on the blessing of God, which can give efficacy to that which has none in itself. But is it probable, is it credible, that God would ever institute such an ordinance as this, by which we are bound, on pain of the loss of salvation, to devour the flesh of the Son of God?

6. Another view of this subject, connected with what has been said, is, if the bread is converted into the flesh of Christ, and is eaten, and enters through the œsophagus into the stomach, and is there subjected to the process of digestion, it is a matter of real and serious difficulty to know what becomes of it. By a miracle it may immediately be carried away, before the process of digestion commences; but then it may be asked, what good is effected by eating it? Or it may be digested like other food, and assimilated into the body of the participant; but then the body of every believing communicant would contain as a constituent part of itself the whole body and blood; yea, the soul and divinity of the Son of God. This would be incorporating Christ with his disciples, not by a spiritual and mystical union, but by a gross corporal and physical union. The remaining alternative, which is, that the body of Christ received into the stomach, turns with other parts of unassimilated food to corruption, presents an idea so gross, and indeed blasphemous, that we are sure no one would ever think of entertaining it. Now, it may be said in reply, that this is curiously to pry into mysteries which are inscrutable, and that all observations of the kind here made are impious. If so, the whole blame must rest on the doctrine of transubstantiation; for this alone lays the foundation of such remarks. The consequence is inevitable and undeniable, that if the real fleshly body of Christ is taken into the stomach by eating, it must be disposed of in some way. Let the Romanist tell us how—or we will give him a choice of every conceivable hypothesis. Is there any thing profane in drawing from an asserted fact, consequences so palpable? We say again, if there is, the fault is not in the inference, but in the principle from which it is derived.

We are aware that the advocate of transubstantiation will answer to all these reasonings, that the doctrine is explicitly taught in the Gospel, and what God has said must be true, however much it may be opposed to our sense and reason. It is, however, a reasonable inquiry, whether the ground assumed for the proof of transubstantiation does not go far to destroy all external

evidence of divine revelation. This view of the subject is so forcibly given by archbishop Tillotson, in his admirable sermon "on Transubstantiation," that we will cite a few paragraphs, on this point.

1. "I shall only ask," says the venerable prelate, "whether any man has, or ever had, greater evidence of the truth of any divine revelation, than every man hath of the falsehood of transubstantiation? Infidelity were hardly possible to men, if all men had the same evidence for the Christian religion which they have against transubstantiation; that is, the clear and irresistible evidence of sense. He that can once be brought to contradict or deny his senses, is at an end of certainty; for what can a man be certain of, if he be not certain of what he sees? In some circumstances our senses may deceive us, but no faculty deceives us so little, and so seldom; and when our senses do deceive us, even that error is not to be corrected without the help of our senses.

2. "Supposing this doctrine had been delivered in Scripture in the very same words that it is decreed in the Council of Trent, by what clearer evidence, or stronger argument, could any man prove to me that such words were in the Bible, than I can prove to him, that bread and wine are bread and wine still? He could but appeal to my eyes, to prove such words to be in the Bible; and, with the same reason and justice, might I appeal to several of his senses to prove to him, that the bread and wine after consecration, are bread and wine still.

3. "Whether it be reasonable to imagine, that God should make that a part of the Christian religion, which shakes the main external evidence and confirmation of the whole? I mean the miracles which were wrought by our Saviour, and his apostles, the assurance whereof did at the first depend on the certainty of sense. For, if the senses of those who say they saw them, were deceived, then there might be no miracles wrought; and, consequently, it may justly be doubted whether that kind of confirmation which God hath given to the Christian religion would be strong enough to prove it, supposing transubstantiation to be a part of it; because every man hath as great evidence that transubstantiation is false, as he hath that the Christian religion is true. Suppose then, transubstantiation to be a part of the Christian religion, it must have the same confirmation with the whole, and that is miracles; but of all doctrines in the world, *it* is peculiarly incapable of being proved by a miracle. For if a miracle were wrought for the proof of it, the very same assurance that any man hath of the truth of the miracle, he hath of the falsehood of the doctrine; that is, the clear evidences of his

senses. For that there is a miracle wrought to prove that what he sees in the sacrament, *is not bread, but the body of Christ*, there is only the evidence of sense; and there is the very same evidence to prove, that what he sees in the sacrament *is not the body of Christ, but bread*. So that there would arise a new controversy, whether a man should rather believe in his senses giving testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation, or bearing witness to a miracle wrought to confirm that doctrine, there being the very same evidence against the truth of the doctrine, which there is for the truth of the miracle."

But let us come now to the examination of the scriptural evidence, on which this doctrine is supposed to be founded; and it is all included in one short sentence; the words of Christ, where he says, "*this is my body*." Other texts, indeed, are brought in as auxiliaries, but the stress is laid upon this simple declaration. If this can be set aside, all the others will fall of course. Now, let it be well observed, that our Lord says not a word about the transubstantiation of the bread. He never intimates that he was about to work a stupendous miracle, by changing the bread into his own body; of which we might have expected that he would have given some more explicit information. But having taken the Jewish passover, with his disciples, after this supper was ended, he took in his hand a piece of the unleavened cake or loaf, which was used on this occasion, and said, "this," that is, this bread, "is my body;" and having broken it and blessed it, he gave it to his disciples and said, "take eat, this is my body; and he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them and said, drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." By Luke it is added after the words, 'this is my body,' "which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." The account of this transaction as revealed to Paul, and by him delivered to the Corinthian church, accords fully with the narrative of the evangelists, "That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." It is undeniable, from all these accounts, that Christ does call the bread his body, and the wine his blood; the only question is, in what sense are these words to be understood, literally or figuratively? Did the Lord Jesus intend that his disciples should believe, that the

piece of bread contained literally his own flesh and blood? It is admitted, that when he took it up, it was nothing else but bread, but it is alleged, that at the instant when he said, "this is my body," the substance was changed, and it was no longer bread, but the flesh of our Lord. Now, the mode of speaking by no means corresponds with this idea. "This is my body" does not convey the meaning, that now I change, or transubstantiate this bread into my body. But passing this, we would remark, that if the bread was thus converted into the body of Christ; and if, as the Catechism teaches, the whole body and blood was contained in this one piece of bread, then there existed at one and the same time two complete bodies of Christ; the one the visible living body, for no one will pretend that this did not continue still to be the body of Christ after the consecration. Here then is mystery upon mystery; one Christ stands, or sits, with a complete living body at the table, and holds in his hand another complete body of Christ; and when the wine was changed also, as each of the species contains the whole body complete, there must have been three complete bodies of Christ, two of which were eaten by the disciples, but the living visible body was not eaten; and if Christ partook of the elements which he distributed, as seems to be reasonable to suppose, then he ate his own body and drank his own blood. We resolved, on entering on this subject, to avoid all ridicule; and yet we are apprehensive that the bare statement of these things presents a case so truly ludicrous, that we shall be accused of resorting to this unsuitable weapon. We must, however, for the sake of truth, exhibit the doctrine of transubstantiation with all its legitimate absurdities. If some of these are monstrous or ludicrous, it is not our fault; the blame lies with the doctrine itself, as was before said.

But if these words, "this is my body," must be taken literally to signify the flesh of Christ, surely, all the other expressions in the same passage, and in relation to the same sacrament, must be interpreted in the same way. Then, when Christ says "this cup," or chalice, as they prefer to call it, "is the New Testament," or New Covenant, "in my blood," we should understand that the vessel in his hand, which contained the wine, was "a testament," or covenant. This, however, is so manifestly absurd, that all will be ready to say, that he meant the wine in the cup, and not the vessel; but even here we have an expression, which cannot be taken literally; the wine before or after consecration, can no more be a testament or covenant, than the chalice can be such. Our only reason for bringing forward these absurd interpretations, is to show to what consequences the prin-

ciple of interpretation which Romanists wish to establish, will lead, even in the explication of the same passage. But this is not the whole, nor the chief objection to this interpretation. Our Lord says, "this is my body which is broken for you—this is my blood which is shed for you." Now, if the word "body," must mean Christ's real flesh, then it must be admitted that the word "broken" must also be so taken; and it will follow, that Christ's body was already crucified, and his blood poured out for the remission of sins. In fact, therefore, his body was broken and slain before he was fastened to the cross. As the eucharist is a real sacrifice, and there could be no sacrifice without the death of the victim, it is clear that Christ must have been put to death at this time; and his words, taken literally, express this fact; for he says, "this is my body which is broken for you—this is my blood which is shed for you." But he was still alive, and his visible and animated body was not broken, and his blood was not yet shed; therefore his body was at the same time dead and alive, or rather, that body now produced from the bread was a dead and broken body; while the former body was alive and sound. But perhaps this idea of a plurality of bodies will be rejected, as no legitimate consequence from the doctrine of transubstantiation; and it will be alleged, that when the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood of Christ, they are not formed into a separate body, but changed into the same identical body, which before existed, and was born of the Virgin Mary. We are perfectly willing, so far as our argument is concerned, that this should be considered the hypothesis of the advocates of this doctrine. Let it be remembered, then, that at the moment when the change took place in the bread and wine, the body of Christ existed, complete in all its parts; then if these elements were transmuted into the already existing body, it must have been by substitution or addition, that is, the former body must have been removed or annihilated, and this new body, recently formed, must have assumed its place; or the former body continuing to exist without change, the new body must have been added to it. The idea of the annihilation or removal of the body before existing, will be admitted by none; therefore, the alternative must be adopted. The bread and wine, then, when transubstantiated, passed into the living body of Christ and became identified with it. To his body received at his incarnation, then, there was now added another recently formed of the bread and wine in the sacrament. But if his original body was perfect in all its parts, where was there room for such an addition; or what conceivable benefit could arise from such an increase? When this change took place, either the weight of

Christ's body, and the quantity of his blood was increased, or it was not. If the former, what special purpose could such an enlargement answer? It could certainly add nothing to the efficacy of his sacrifice; but if the body of Christ was not increased in bulk or weight by this change, how can it be supposed, that any addition of a corporeal kind was made to it? There is here another difficulty. The disciples ate the bread which had just been converted into the body of Christ; but if it had immediately become a constituent part of Christ's living body, how could they eat it? Did they eat the living flesh of Christ's body, and drink the warm blood which was then flowing through his arteries and veins? But this is not all; it is asserted in the Catechism now under review, that the body of Christ, of which believers partake in the eucharist, is "the same that was born of the Virgin." Now to us this appears to be a palpable absurdity, a contradiction as clear as can be expressed in words. It is to assert, that that which was not a fact is made to be a fact; that a substance which was entirely distinct and separate from the Virgin Mary, was that very body which was born of her. The bread and wine before consecration, no one will pretend, was the body of Mary; when the substance of the bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Christ, that act of power by which it is changed, cannot possibly make this to be the identical body born of the Virgin. It would be just as reasonable to assert, that God, by an act of omnipotence, could make the child just born to be Adam the first of men. Such suppositions are a disgrace to rational beings; the tendency of them is to obscure and unsettle all our firmest and clearest perceptions of truth. According to this philosophy, God might cause that which does exist, never to have existed; and the being which may be brought into existence hereafter, to have had an existence from the beginning of the world. It is only necessary to state such monstrous absurdities; their falsehood cannot be rendered more evident by reasoning; for there is nothing with which we can compare them, which could render their falsehood more manifest. To make a substance which, it is acknowledged, formed no part of the body born of the Virgin Mary, to be that identical body, is certainly one of the greatest absurdities of the doctrine of transubstantiation, so fruitful of absurdities; and it is not an inference of ours, but is explicitly avowed in this authorized formulary.

Having exhibited some of the difficulties and absurdities of the doctrine of transubstantiation, by considering the circumstances which attended the first institution of the sacrament, these will not be diminished by extending our views to the celebration of

the eucharist by the priests of the Romish church. Here we find the doctrine of the mass, with all the superstitions and idolatries which accompany it.

The doctrine of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as it is called, not only asserts that the body of Christ in the eucharist is the same as that which was born of the Virgin, but the same as that now glorified in heaven. The apostle Paul, indeed, declares, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven." Christ's body, before entering into heaven, underwent a glorious transformation, to fit it for the heavenly state. There it appears now resplendent with ineffable glory. It is no longer a body of gross particles of flesh and blood for such a body, though suited to his condition and work upon earth, would be entirely incongruous with the heavenly state. Now that celestial and glorious body is complete, and can neither receive any addition or diminution. Although, then, bread and wine may by omnipotence be changed into flesh and blood, and this flesh and blood may be received into the mouths and stomachs of communicants; yet it cannot be that this flesh and blood should be the identical body of Christ, which is now enthroned in glory. It cannot be, that that heavenly body should be eaten every time the eucharist is celebrated. The idea is so shocking, as well as absurd, that we know not how it could ever have been received by any man in his senses. If the merit of faith rises in proportion to the difficulty and impossibility of the thing to be believed, then is there nothing more meritorious than the faith of Roman Catholics, on this point. A hundred thousand priests, throughout the world, often celebrate the eucharist at the same hour. In every one of these instances, if the priest only have a right intention, the body of Christ, even his body now glorified in heaven, is produced by the repetition of the form of consecration, "this is my body." Now how this glorified body of the Saviour can be present in a hundred thousand different places, at one and the same time, and yet remain complete and un mutilated on the throne of glory, in heaven, is a thing not easy to be believed. The Lutherans, who adopted the opinion that there was no change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, yet maintained that the real body and blood of Christ were present with these elements, and were received by every communicant, whether in the exercise of faith or not. And when urged in controversy with the reformed, with the consequence, that this rendered it necessary that the body of Christ should exist every where, they admitted the inference, and held the ubiquity of Christ's body; but this was to attribute to a finite and created nature, one of the attributes of Deity; therefore, they adopted the absurd opinion, that in consequence

of the hypostatical union, divine attributes were actually communicated to the human nature of Christ. But another stubborn difficulty attended this hypothesis. It is the property of all bodies to exclude all other bodies from the space which they occupy; hence, if ubiquity be ascribed to Christ's body, it will exclude all other bodies from the universe. There was no method of obviating this objection, but by giving a new definition of a body; and here was opened a field for abstruse speculation which occupied the learning and labours of men of the first order of intellect. And when they had completed their theory, it was impossible to say what was essential to body; or in what respect they who held a bodily presence of Christ, differed from those who maintained that he was really but spiritually present.

How far the Lutherans still adhere to the old doctrine, we cannot certainly say, but we are inclined to believe, that the doctrine of consubstantiation or *impanation*, as some of their theologians choose to express it, is not at present held with a very firm grasp by the existing Lutheran church; and yet they will not be forward to renounce a dogma, to which Luther clung with invincible pertinacity, and which was originally the only point of distinction between the followers of the German and Swiss reformer. The doctrine of the ubiquity, or omnipresence of Christ's body seems to follow as certainly from the Roman Catholic as the Lutheran doctrine; but as far as we know, this consequence has never been admitted by Popish writers: they have even impugned with severity the absurd doctrine of ubiquity. They resort to another principle of explanation, which is, that Christ, by his divine power, can render his body present whenever, and wherever, the eucharist is celebrated; but while they shun one absurdity, they fall into another, fully as incredible. For though they do not believe in the omnipresence of the body of Christ, yet they are forced to admit, that it may exist in many different and distant places at one and the same time. It exists in heaven and upon earth, at once and in as many places on earth as the mass is celebrated. It becomes necessary, therefore, for them as well as the Lutherans, to resort to subtle and abstruse definitions and distinctions, in regard to matter and space, to free their doctrine from absurdity: and just so far as they succeed in clearing away the difficulties from the subject, it is by removing the idea of the palpable presence of solid resisting matter, and giving such views, as render it difficult to understand what they mean by bodily presence; or to see how it differs from the real, spiritual presence maintained by Calvin and his followers.

The doctrine of transubstantiation, absurd as it is, is not in it-

self so dangerous and impious, as the sacrifice of the mass, which naturally comes out of it. The inference is fairly deduced that if the bread and wine, after consecration, be the real body and blood of Christ; and if his soul and divinity, as they teach, be also present in these elements, then are they proper objects of worship. Accordingly, they are elevated in imitation of Christ's being lifted up on the cross, and they are carried in procession that all the people may worship them. But if this be the real body of Christ, broken for us, then as often as it is created, it may be offered as an expiatory sacrifice to God, for the living and the dead; and as this oblation of Christ is the most important part of the whole transaction, it is often repeated when there is no participation of the consecrated elements by the people; and thus private masses are encouraged and performed, especially for the relief of those who are supposed to be suffering the pains of purgatory.

That we may exhibit fairly this doctrine of the mass, we will give some account of it from works of acknowledged authority among the Romanists. Dr. Challoner, in his *Catholic Christian Instructed*, p. 74, c. vi. asks,

“What do you mean by the mass?” and among other things, answers, “The mass consists in the consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the offering up of the same body and blood to God, by the ministry of the priests, for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same to the end of the world.

“Is the mass properly a sacrifice? Yes it is.

“What do you mean by a sacrifice? A sacrifice, properly so called, is an oblation or offering of some sensible thing, made to God by a lawful minister.

“How then is the mass a sacrifice? Because it is an oblation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, offered, under the outward and sensible signs of bread and wine, to God, by the ministry of the priests of the church, lawfully consecrated and empowered by Christ; and this oblation is accompanied with a real change and destruction of the bread and wine, by the conversion of them into the body and blood of Christ, &c.

“Is the sacrifice of the cross and that of the eucharist the same sacrifice, or two distinct sacrifices?

“It is the same sacrifice; because the victim is the self same Jesus Christ; it was He that offered himself upon the cross; it is He that offers himself upon the altar. The only difference is in the manner of the offering; because, in the sacrifice of the cross, Christ really died, and therefore that was a bloody sacrifice; in the sacrifice of the altar, he only dies mystically, inasmuch as his death is represented in the consecrating apart the bread and wine, to denote the shedding of his sacred blood, from his body, at the time of his death.”

Now this whole doctrine of the mass is without the slightest evidence from the New Testament. There is, in fact, under this dispensation no other priest but Christ; no other is ever mentioned; and the ministers, teachers, and governors of the Church are not invested with any sacerdotal office.

This notion of a repeated oblation of the body and blood of Christ, is not only unauthorized by Scripture, but is in direct violation of what Paul testifies in the epistle to the Hebrews, "For by *one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now *once* in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did *once*, when he offered up himself." "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, *once for all.*"

Now what Dr. Challoner says, in answer to the arguments of such texts, is nothing to the purpose. He alleges that Christ's offering on the cross is not injured by his prayers and intercessions continually offered up; which is true, but wide of the mark. It furnishes no proof that there was need for his body and blood to be offered up often. Again, he says, "Though the price of our redemption was to be paid but once, yet the fruit of it was to be daily applied to our souls, by those means of grace which Christ has left in his Church, that is, by his sacraments and sacrifice." All this is very correct, except the last word, which stands directly opposed to all Paul's declarations, that the offering of Christ was made but once. The application of the merits of Christ's sacrifice does not require that it should be continually renewed. This renders his sacrifice on the cross insufficient, like the sacrifice of the priests, under the Levitical law; for if the one sacrifice was complete and satisfactory, why repeat the oblation continually? He speaks of this, as an "unbloody sacrifice;" but how is it unbloody, when the real blood of Christ is on the altar, as much as it was on the cross? This doctrine of the mass is, therefore, unscriptural, and highly derogatory to the one sacrifice of Christ; besides which the Scriptures of the New Testament acknowledge no other; for if other expiatory oblations are requisite, call them bloody or unbloody, then was this offering of Christ imperfect. All that this author says in favour of such a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ, is irrelevant; and, if admitted, does not prove the truth of the doctrine which he maintains.

The doctrine of the mass, as laid down in the Catechism under review, is,

“That the holy sacrifice of the mass, is not only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross; but also a sacrifice of propitiation, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious.” “If, therefore, with pure hearts and a lively faith, and with a sincere sorrow for past transgressions, we offer in sacrifice this most holy victim, we shall, no doubt, receive from the Lord, ‘mercy and grace’ in seasonable aid. So acceptable to God is the sweet odour of this sacrifice, that through its oblation he pardons our sins, bestowing on us the gifts of grace and repentance.” “Its benefits extend not only to the communicant, but also to all the faithful, whether living or numbered among those who have died in the Lord.”

Transubstantiation is not merely chargeable with bringing Christianity into disgrace by its palpable absurdities, but has given rise to gross idolatry. No sooner has the officiating priest pronounced the words of consecration over the bread, than it becomes, as the body of Christ, an object of worship, just as truly as if Christ should descend from heaven and appear before us in all the glory of his exaltation. But here we are met by a perplexing difficulty, which no ingenuity can resolve. It is admitted that no change takes place in the bread unless the priest consecrates with a right intention, and unless he is a regularly ordained minister. Before the people worship the host, as it is called, there should be some method of ascertaining whether indeed the bread had been actually converted into the body and blood of Christ; for if, on either of the accounts mentioned, that transubstantiation should not have taken place, they are offering their supreme worship to a piece of bread. As we cannot know the hearts of priests, and as we cannot tell whether there may not have been some canonical defect in their succession or ordination, we never, in any case, can be sure that we are not guilty of idolatry. Nothing can be learned from an examination of the elements; for these remain the same, so far as our senses can judge, whether the miraculous conversion takes place or not. The wafer, as soon as consecrated, becomes a proper object of worship; and, as has been before mentioned, is carried about with much pomp and ceremony, elevated on high, that all the people may get a sight of it, and join in the worship; and, in countries completely under Popish dominion, all are forced to kneel down in token of adoration, as the pageant passes.

Moreover, the consecrated wafer, whether used or not, is the real body of Christ, and may be laid up in a pyxis or box, to be adored, or to be eaten, as the case may be. Now suppose it be-

comes mouldy, or should be devoured by mice, or worms, what are we to think? Or suppose before consecration arsenic should accidentally, or by design, be mixed with the flour of which the bread is made, and should be consecrated as a constituent part of the bread, does that also become a part of the body of our Lord? Or would this bread, after being changed into the flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus, affect the health of the communicant? If it be said, that the accidents or sensible qualities do not belong to the body of Christ, then is there no use in eating the bread or drinking the wine; for in the process of manducation or digestion, nothing else but these accidents or sensible qualities come at all in contact with the body. We cannot feel, or taste, or chew, or swallow, that which has no solidity, no taste, no material quality whatever. If then these sensible properties are not the properties of the body of Christ, then the communicant cannot be said to eat his flesh and drink his blood; for that which he sees is no visible part of the body of Christ, that which he feels is no palpable part of that body; so, likewise, that which he tastes and smells is not Christ's body; for these sensible qualities exist without any subject. But as eating and drinking are corporeal acts, they can only be exercised on that which has material qualities; that is, the food which is eaten must have some solidity or extension, for if these accidents are taken away from a substance, it can no more be eaten than an immaterial spirit can be eaten. Upon the admitted theory of the Roman Catholic, Christ's body, after all, is not eaten; but only those properties which, though real, have no subsistence. In fact, the partaker of the eucharist, according to the hypothesis of Romanists, cannot be said to eat the bread or the body of Christ; for he cannot properly be said to eat mere accidents or qualities, without a substance; nor is it possible to conceive that a body which has no material qualities can be eaten.

Mr. M'Gavin in his "Protestant," tells a pleasant, and not inappropriate story.

"A Protestant lady entered the matrimonial state with a Roman Catholic gentleman, on condition he should never use any attempts to induce her to embrace his religion. He employed the Romish priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instil his notions into her mind; but she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and during his affliction was recommended by the priest to receive the holy sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare the bread and wine for the solemnity; she did so, and on presenting them to the priest, said, 'This, sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the

real body and blood of Christ, after you have consecrated them.' 'Most certainly,' he replied. 'Then sir,' she rejoined, 'it will not be possible for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; for, says our Lord, 'my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed,' and, 'he that eateth me shall live by me.' 'Assuredly,' answered the priest, 'they can do no harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate good.' The ceremony was proceeded in, and the bread and wine were consecrated; the priest was about to take and eat the bread; but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him and said, 'I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, sir, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it cannot of course do *you* any harm.' The faith of the priest was not strong enough to induce him to eat it. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on the lady the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation.' Whether this anecdote be literally true," says Mr. M'Gavin, "is of little importance to the argument. It may be said very fairly to put any Papist to the test as to his belief of transubstantiation. If the priest's pronouncing the words of consecration should have the power of expelling the arsenic, as well as the flour and water, from the consecrated wafer, I will acknowledge a miracle."

We presume that the advocates of transubstantiation would say, in reply to the above, that notwithstanding that the substance of the bread is changed into the real body of Christ, the accidents or sensible properties remain precisely what they were before consecration; and, therefore, the wafer not only retains the appearance, smell, and taste of bread, but also the nourishing qualities of wheaten bread; and so of the wine; no one, we presume, would pretend that a large quantity of strong wine, after consecration, would not intoxicate. Its being mixen with water, is doubtless intended to guard against any effect of this kind. And so they would admit, we suppose, that arsenic in the wafer would retain its poisonous quality; and, therefore, if a priest, or any other communicant, should be actually deprived of life by such a wafer, it would not prove that the *substance* is not converted into the body of Christ. We do not know how else this case could be disposed of. But still the explanation does not remove the difficulty. We would like to see a logical answer to the following plain syllogism:

That which has no substance cannot injure any one;
 But the transubstantiated bread has no substance as bread,
 Therefore, the bread when consecrated, though filled with arsenic, can
 not hurt any one.

Or the following,

Mere accidents or properties which have no substance, cannot operate efficiently on the body,
 But the sensible qualities of the bread, after consecration, exist without any subject. *Ergo.*

Now the only possible escape from this conclusion, must be by denying that these accidents of bread and wine can affect the body, which they will not assert; or that that which has no existence as a body, can, nevertheless, operate as a body, and produce effects on the body to nourish, to intoxicate, or to pain. Let the Romanist extricate himself if he can from this dilemma. To us it appears impossible. And this comes of holding that accidents may exist without a subject.

Now, after an impartial view of all the difficulties and absurdities which cluster round this strange doctrine, we cannot but wonder that multitudes should be found to hold to it, or think that they believe it; for we are fully persuaded, that in most cases the true nature of the proposition to be believed is not brought distinctly before the mind. The imagination, under the influence of superstitious dread, overpowers the dictates of reason, and, indeed, all nice scrutiny into the subject is discouraged and forbidden; and even the priests are cautioned against attempts at explanation. The language of the Catechism under review, is, "to explain this mystery in a proper manner is extremely difficult. On the manner of this admirable conversion, the pastor, however, will endeavour to instruct those who are more advanced in the knowledge and contemplation of divine things: those who are yet weak may, it were to be apprehended, be overwhelmed by its greatness. This conversion is so effectuated, that the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed by the power of God, into the whole substance of the body of Christ, and this without any change in our Lord himself." No wonder that apprehensions should be entertained that such a doctrine might overwhelm the mind of the novice. Bread and wine are changed into the real body of Christ, and yet his body undergoes no change whatever! Again. "But according to the admonition so frequently repeated by the Holy Fathers, the faithful are to be admonished against the danger of gratifying a prurient curiosity, by searching into the manner in which this change is effected. It mocks the power of conception, nor can we find any example of it in natural transmutations, nor even in the wide range of creation. The change itself is the object, not of our comprehension, but of our humble faith; and the manner of the change forbids the temerity of a too curious inquiry. The same salutary caution should be observed by the pastor, with regard to the mysterious manner in which the body of our Lord is contained whole and

entire under every particle of the bread. Such inscrutable mysteries should scarcely ever become matter of disquisition." (p. 215. 216.) No wonder that they discourage all disquisition on such a subject. The last sentence quoted sets all reason and common sense at defiance. Suppose a loaf of bread to be consecrated; and we know that such a loaf is capable of a continued division until the parts become too small for the cognizance of our senses, and too numerous for arithmetical notation, then what is it that the Romanist believes? That every one of these particles is the whole body of Jesus Christ! On the absurdity of thus multiplying the body of Christ, we have remarked before; we now bring up the subject to show the folly of insisting on a literal interpretation of the words of Christ, when every difficulty is avoided, by interpreting them figuratively; for which we have hundreds of analogous cases in the Holy Scriptures, which abound in bold and striking figures, which, if they should all be taken literally, would turn the Bible into a jargon of nonsense; and we have shown that, in this very passage, we are forced to adopt this mode of interpretation.

And after all, what is the benefit expected from this doctrine? Material flesh and blood cannot affect the soul; but truly, according to the hypothesis of the Romanists, it is only the essence or hidden substance of Christ's body which is present; the gross sensible qualities of flesh and blood are not there; now in what respect does such a presence of the body differ from a spiritual presence; and such an eating of the body from a spiritual eating? And as to the daily mass or oblation, it can do no good—the sacrifice of Christ once offered on the cross, is ever before the throne, and needs no new oblation. All we need is, that the exalted Saviour and Prince of life, should, on the ground of it, intercede for us; and that we should exercise a lively faith in the efficacy of his atonement, to aid us in which the eucharist is an appointed and powerful means.

Almost the only reply to which Romanists resort in their attempt to obviate the objections which Protestants make to the doctrine of transubstantiation, is to adduce the doctrines of the Trinity and incarnation, as equally contrary to our reason, and equally incomprehensible. But truly there is scarcely any analogy between the cases. There is in these doctrines of Scripture, we acknowledge, high mysteries, which greatly transcend our powers of comprehension; but there is nothing which contradicts our senses, or is repugnant to the plain dictates of reason. If this could be proved, which we are aware has often been attempted by rationalists, we should feel constrained to give up these doctrines as untenable; or rather to give up the Scriptures in which they are so plainly revealed. But as Archbishop Tillotson has handled this subject very perspicuously, we beg

leave here to conclude this review, by citing a few passages from his discourse “concerning the unity of the divine nature.”

“Before I leave this argument, I cannot but take notice of one thing which they of the church of Rome are perpetually objecting to us upon this occasion. And it is this, that by the same reason that we believe the doctrine of the trinity, we may and must receive that of transubstantiation. God forbid: because of all the doctrines that ever were in any religion, this of transubstantiation is certainly the most abominably absurd.

“However, this objection plainly shows how fondly and obstinately they are addicted to their own errors, how misshapen and monstrous soever; insomuch, that rather than the dictates of their church, how absurd soever, should be called in question, they will question the truth even of Christianity itself; and if we will not take in transubstantiation, and admit it to be a necessary article of the Christian faith, they grow so sullen and desperate that they matter not what becomes of all the rest: And rather than not have their will of us in that which is controverted, they will give up that which by their own confession is an undoubted article of the Christian faith, and not controverted on either side; except only by the Socinians, who yet are yet hearty enemies to transubstantiation, and have exposed the absurdity of it with great advantage.

“But I shall endeavour to return a more particular answer to this objection, and such a one as I hope will satisfy every considerate and unprejudiced mind, that after all this confidence and swaggering of theirs, there is by no means equal reason either for the receiving or for the rejecting of these two doctrines of the trinity and transubstantiation.

“1st. There is not equal reason for the belief of these two doctrines. This objection, if it be of any force, must suppose that there is equal evidence and proof from scripture for these two doctrines. But this we utterly deny, and with great reason; because it is no more evident from the words of Scripture, that the sacramental bread is substantially changed into Christ’s natural body by virtue of those words, “*This is my body,*” than it is, that Christ is substantially changed into a natural vine by virtue of those words, *I am the true vine*, John xv. 1; or than the rock in the wilderness, of which the Israelites drank, was substantially changed into the person of Christ, because it is expressly said, “*that rock was Christ;*” or than that the Christian church is substantially changed into the natural body of Christ, because it is in express terms said of the church that it is his body. Eph. i. 23.

“But besides this, several of their most learned writers have freely acknowledged that transubstantiation can neither be directly proved, nor necessarily concluded from Scripture. But this the writers of the Christian church did never acknowledge concerning the trinity, and the divinity of Christ; but have always appealed to the clear and undeniable testimonies of Scripture for the proof of these doctrines. And then the whole force of the objection amounts to this, that if I am bound to believe what I am sure God says, though I cannot comprehend it; then I

am bound by the same reason to believe the greatest absurdity in the world, though I have no manner of assurance of any divine revelation concerning it. And if this be their meaning, though we understand not transubstantiation, yet we very well understand what they would have, but cannot grant it; because there is not equal reason to believe two things, for one of which there is good proof, and for the other no proof at all.

“2d. Neither is there equal reason for the rejecting of these two doctrines. This the objection supposes, which yet cannot be supposed but upon one or both of these two grounds: Either because these two doctrines are equally *incomprehensible*, or because they are equally loaded with *absurdities* and *contradictions*.

“The first is no good ground of rejecting any doctrine, merely because it is *incomprehensible*, as I have abundantly showed already. But besides this, there is a wide difference between plain matters of sense, and mysteries concerning God; and it does by no means follow, that, if a man do once admit any thing concerning God which he cannot comprehend, he hath no reason afterwards to believe what he himself sees. This is a most unreasonable and destructive way of arguing, because it strikes at the foundation of all certainty, and sets every man at liberty to deny the most plain and evident truths of Christianity, if he may not be humoured in having the absurdest things in the world admitted for true. The next step will be to persuade us, that we may as well deny the being of God because his nature is *incomprehensible* by our *reason*, as deny transubstantiation because *it evidently contradicts* our *senses*.

“2d. Nor are these two doctrines loaded with the like absurdities and contradictions: So far from this, that the doctrine of the trinity, as it is delivered in the Scriptures, and hath already been explained, hath no absurdity or contradiction either involved in it, or necessarily consequent upon it. But the doctrine of transubstantiation is big with all imaginable absurdity and contradiction. And their own schoolmen have sufficiently exposed it; especially Scotus, and he designed to do so, as any man that attentively reads him may plainly discover: for in his disputation about it, he treats this doctrine with the greatest contempt, as a new invention of the Council of Lateran under Pope Innocent III. To the decree of which council concerning it, he seems to pay a formal submission, but really derides it as contrary to the common sense and reason of mankind, and not at all supported by Scripture; as any one may easily discern that will carefully consider his manner of handling it, and the result of his whole disputation about it.

“And now suppose there were some appearance of absurdity and contradiction in the doctrine of the trinity as it is delivered in Scripture, must we therefore believe a doctrine which is not at all revealed in Scripture, and which hath certainly in it all the absurdities in the world, and all the contradictions to sense and reason; and which once admitted, doth at once destroy all certainty? Yes, say they, why not? since we of the church of Rome are satisfied that this doctrine is revealed in Scripture; or if it be not, is defined by the church, which is every whit as good. But is this equal, to demand of us the belief of a thing which hath

always been controverted, not only between us and them, but even among themselves, at least till the Council of Trent? And this upon such unreasonable terms, that we must either yield this point to them or else renounce a doctrine agreed on both sides to be revealed in Scripture.

“To show the unreasonableness of this proceeding, let us suppose a priest of the church of Rome pressing a Jew or Turk to the belief of transubstantiation, and because one kindness deserves another, the Jew or Turk should demand of him the belief of all the fables in the Talmud, or in the Alcoran; since none of these, nor indeed all of them together, are near so absurd as transubstantiation: Would not this be much more reasonable and equal than what they demand of us? Since no absurdity, how monstrous and big soever, can be thought of, which may not enter into an understanding in which a breach hath been already made, wide enough to admit transubstantiation. The priests of Baal did not half so much deserve to be exposed by the prophet for their superstition and folly, as the priests of the church of Rome do for this senseless and stupid doctrine of theirs with a hard name. I shall only add this one thing more, that if this doctrine were possible to be true, and clearly proved to be so; yet it would be evidently useless and to no purpose. For it pretends to change the substance of one thing into the substance of another thing that is already, and before this change is pretended to be made. But to what purpose? Not to make the body of Christ, for that was already in being, and the substance of the bread is lost, nothing of it remaineth but accidents, which are good for nothing and indeed are nothing when the substance is destroyed.”

ART. V.—*Notices of the Monosyllabic Languages of South Eastern Asia. From the German of Adelung.*

J. W. Alexander

PREFATORY REMARKS.

THERE is no part of the world which is at this time more interesting to the Christian philanthropist, than the populous countries on the south-eastern part of Asia. Comprising, as they do, a third of the human race, they cannot but attract and stimulate the enterprise of the church. And as, in the prosecution of the missionary work, language is a prime instrument, it is natural to feel a corresponding solicitude to know something of the remarkable tongues and dialects into which the word of God is to be translated. To the missionary, this is all-important; to the candidate for the missionary service, it is full of interest; and to those who devise and mature at home the plans for foreign