

### Transubstantiation explained by way of Question and Answer in two Chapters.

#### CHAPTER THE FIRST.

**Question.** What is a *Catholic*, or true meaning of Transubstantiation?

**Answer.** It means the change of the whole substances of the bread, and of the wine, into the body and blood of Christ.

**Q.** Why do you say the whole substances of the bread and wine, and not the whole bread and wine simply?

**A.** The reason is, the whole of the bread, and wine, are not changed by the words of the Institution; for, nothing is changed but the substances simply.

**Q.** What parts of the bread and wine are not, either changed, or affected, or altered, in any way by the act of Transubstantiation?

**A.** The outward, or visible, forms, qualities, appearances, or accidents, are not changed in any sense. The color, taste, touch, smell, and sight (or appearance) of the sacramental matter are not transubstantiated at all.

**Q.** But why are not these sensible properties of the bread and wine changed with their substances?

**A.** Because Christ did not change them, as He did their substances, at the Last Supper; and, He has not given his Priests power in these words, "Do this," to do otherwise, than He himself did. The Priest acts instrumentally, yet effectively, and authoritatively.

**Q.** But how can these visible qualities exist with the sacrament without their corresponding substances?

**A.** By the positive Institution, will, and Omnipotency, of that God, who created both substances, and accidents, out of nothing.

**Q.** But is there any scriptural example, or analogy, to show that properties can exist without corresponding substances?

**A.** There are many. When the Holy Ghost stood on the head of Christ, in the shape of a dove, he had the color, the touch, the appearance, size and all other visible and tangible properties, of the dove, and yet it would be a terrible blasphemy to say that He had in himself the corresponding substances of that bird. The same reasoning is applicable to the Angels that appeared in human appearances, to Christ in the appearance of a traveller, a gardener, and to the tongues of fire.

**Q.** But suppose there were no Bible-precedents for Transubstantiation, would we be still obliged to believe in the change?

**A.** Why not? Can God do nothing without examples? How did He create the heavens, and the earth, and all things animate, and inanimate? with examples? or without them? Are Omnipotency, and mysteries, and sacraments, the creatures of analogy? What are precedents in the eyes of the Eternal.

**Q.** But what becomes of the substance after or in the change effected by the words of the Institution?

**A.** They cease to be in the sacrament. But how they cease, or are changed, or are transubstantiated, we know not. The

reason of our ignorance is the positive will of our Lord, who has not thought proper to instruct us. Can any one explain how God has made something out of nothing? how angels could eat food, and not digest it?

**Q.** But are not the very particles of the substances of the bread and wine, truly, really, and physically, transmuted into the very particles of Christ's body and blood?

**A.** They are not, and cannot, be so changed,—Christ's body cannot be produced out of pre-existing matter, for if it could, He would have other bodies. No earthly, or physical, particles can be mingled with, or changed into the spiritual, glorified, and impassible body and blood of Christ. It is enough for us to know that the substances are absolutely changed by the Power that created them, without impiously endeavoring to fathom mystery. Mysteries are for belief, and not for anatomy:

**Q.** Is there anything in the Bible, that would serve us in faintly understanding this sacramental change of substances?

**A.** There is. Angels did eat of mortal food, and yet they did not turn by any process of digestion the substances of that food into the very substances of their spiritual natures. Christ dined with his Apostles after the Resurrection, and yet we know, that the food was not changed into his glorified, and adorable body. These are things of faith, and not of speculation.

**Q.** But what good reason can be assigned for the visible appearance remaining without their substances in the sacrament?

**A.** They are absolutely essential to the sacrament. They are the sensible sign of the sacrament. Take them away, and you eliminate the sacrament. It is impossible to receive the body and blood of Christ sacramentally without them.

**Q.** But why do Catholics use such a hard, and barbarous, and modern word, as Transubstantiation, to express their belief?

**A.** Who has a right to dictate to Catholics their choice of terms? Cannot Catholics use their own words to express their own belief? Is there any sect so learned as to be able to teach the church of the universe? The church has her own choice of words but no choice in dogmas. The word Transubstantiation is neither harder, nor less elegant, nor more barbarous, and modern, than the terms, *Consubstantiation*, *Impanation*, and other Euphonious terms. Why do men fight about a word, whilst they sacrifice the doctrine? Sophists quarrel about sounds; sound reasoners about sense. The Arians, and Nestorians, and Lutherans and other pseudo-reformers, would squabble about Housion, Deipard, Transubstantiation, and yet basely abandon the doctrines expressed by these words! This is an old trick of heresy.

**Q.** But as the sacrament can be corrupted, eaten profanely, and broken in pieces, the body of Christ, may, therefore, be exposed to man's profanation.

**A.** The Sensible sign of the sacrament,

that is, the properties of the bread and wine, may be effected in all these ways; but not so the body of Christ. Christ's body is now spiritual, glorious, incapable of suffering, and cannot therefore, by possibility, suffer any injury, any sacrilege, strictly speaking. God Himself, his essence, and all his absolute attributes are as absolutely, and unequivocally in hell, as they are in heaven, as essentially in the souls of the damned, as in the spirits of the just; in the most forbidden places, as in the loveliest retreats; and yet the Very God, his very essence, his darling attributes, are not, therefore, affected, injured, corrupted, destroyed!! The glorious disk of the sun is not eclipsed by the nature of the place, whereon his rays may fall. Let his effulgence dance on golden domes and silver turrets, and yet he is no brighter than when he warms the thatched cottage of yonder dale. Let God visit us in the veil of the sacrament, and let heresy rave.

**Q.** But are not all our senses deceived by the fond doctrine of Transubstantiation?

**A.** Not one of them is deceived, or can be deceived. The senses can, at best, but merely judge of those qualities only that fall under their cognizance. Their utmost extent of jurisdiction is when, and only when properly disciplined so pass sentence on visible accidents. The Catholic church neither interdicts, nor usurps, their province; for they see the properties of bread and wine, as truly and as infallibly, after the sacramental change, as they could before the divine words were uttered. The substances, they could not see before the act of God in the Mass them they cannot see afterwards. Whilst the senses look upon weak elements, the voice of the universe, the Voice of Faith, the voice of God, proclaim to us, cast aside the sacramental veils, and gave with faith, and love, and Adoration, on that flesh that suffered, that blood that flowed, that heart that burns whilst it bleeds, that soul that loves, that divinity that quit the heavens and came down, and that Jesus that lies bleeding, incarnate, and weeping to woo, and to welcome us from the land of sin, to the banquet of the Most High!! The senso of hearing hears the voice of Omnipotence—of Him whose existence is swallowed up in one Eternal Now, saying, "this is my body," "this is my blood," "this is my flesh," and believes, and adores, and is not deceived! Truth calls for substantial gifts, whilst heresy starves.

**Q.** Does that change, which the church calls Transubstantiation, belong to faith?

**A.** It does not merely belong to, but it is absolutely of, Faith. Let a man deny this change, called Transubstantiation, and admit of a different change and he will cease to be a Catholic. But nobody is bound to believe the different ways, whereby Theologians have endeavored to explain this wonderful change. The reason is Christ has not instructed us therein; nor has He told any one to act as teacher. What has a good christian, as such, to do with modes? Faith, Hope, and Love, are his province.—*Catholic Telegraph.*

From the Catholic Herald.

### The Protestant Reformation.

**Mr. Editor.**—Among the means used by the early Reformers in establishing the new religion, and overthrowing, as far as they could, the religion of Christendom, *Forgery* stood, and will stand, conspicuous. This is the principle engine with which error always surrounds itself, when it would dare to meet truth in open combat. How could it be otherwise? what else has it to depend on, and why should not the Father of the Reformation use very extensively, and stamp indelibly on the forehead of his offspring, his and their "peculiar disease?" Because he stood not in the truth, "he is a liar, and the Father thereof." So deeply attached were the English Reformers to forgery, that nothing within their power escaped their pollution; but above all, they aimed at corrupting the Holy Scriptures—so that they might appear to the common people, to have the Word of God on their side, and thus more readily impose their new doctrines on the unwary. In the editions of their Bible published in 1562, 1577, 1579, &c., they altogether excluded the words "Catholic"—"Altar"—"Priest"—"Bishop" &c.—and to this day "penance" is not found in their Bible, besides rejecting several Books of Holy Scripture altogether, and altering those they retained to suit their purposes! But on the accession of James I. when the Protestant religion was firmly established in England, the great number of Bibles that was scattered through the country, and the dangerous uses that was being made of them by the seditious and fanatic, compelled the Reformers (who now had to save their plunder) to acknowledge before the world that all the Bibles they had in use during the establishment of their Reformation, were greatly corrupted, and that a new one was highly necessary. Accordingly the work was undertaken, and although it corrected many of the errors of all the former editions, it left much more untouched, and added some new ones of its own.\* Hundreds of petitions, memorials, and remonstrances were presented to the King, by different bodies throughout the country, against the forgeries and corruptions of the new Bible. Mr. Brougham, in his epistle to the Lords of the Council, desires a new translation with all speed, "Because," says he, "that which is now in England is full of errors." He elsewhere tells the bishops that their public translation of Scripture into English, is such, that it perverts the text of the Old Testament in 848 places, and that it causes millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to eternal flames." We all know what the Baptists think of the present Protestant Bible, as well as the Unitarians and Universalists; but it is not generally known, especially among Methodists, that John Wesley condemns it as having its faults!† And yet this is the book, with all its "faults"—"corruptions," and "forgeries," which the would-

\* See Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible.

† Fletcher's Checks to Antinomianism.