

THE CANADIAN

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER 5.

MAY, 1833.

VOLUME 2.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

(Continued from page 100.)

Our third argument is, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is inconsistent with what reason teaches us concerning the perfections of God. Reason and nature teach us that God is omnipotent and that nothing is impossible to be done by him. But though God is Almighty, we are not thence to ascribe to him contradictions. A contradiction consists of two contrary propositions, of which either the one or the other must be false. But no falsehood is to be ascribed to God. No contradiction is to be imputed to him.

That the doctrine of Transubstantiation contains a contradiction, may be easily shown. We admit that God may, if he pleases, convert the body and blood of Christ into the appearance of bread and wine. But the doctrine of which we speak, requires us to believe much more than this. It asserts that Jesus Christ while he was sitting in company with his disciples, discoursing to them and consoling them, at the same instant came into their hands in the form of bread. He was eaten, swallowed, and digested by them in the same manner as other bread; yet all this time he remained in his place, and continued to reason with

them, to admonish and comfort them. It is now time to ask, what miracle is there recorded in the gospel, which bears any resemblance to this. We are told that God might as easily effect this, as give sight to the blind, or restore the dead to life. But the cases are not at all alike. In the former there is a manifest contradiction: in the latter there is none. Had our Saviour, in restoring Lazarus to life declared him to be alive, whilst to the eyes of all the spectators he appeared to remain in the grave, without motion, activity, or sensation; this would have been a miracle similar to that of transubstantiation. Had our Lord declared the blind man's sight to be restored, whilst he could see nothing; or had he asserted the blind and deaf man to be healed, though he could neither speak nor hear, these would have been similar to the miracle of the Eucharist. Had our Saviour, in these cases, declared Lazarus to be restored; had he asserted the blind man to have recovered sight, and the dumb and deaf to have received the powers of speaking and hearing, we should then have been under the same necessity of believing these things, contrary to the senses of all present, that the church of Rome maintains, we are under to believe the transmutation of Christ's body into bread. But is there in fact any such miracle in