

THE CANADIAN

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER 6.

JUNE, 1838.

VOLUME 2.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

(Concluded from page 192.)

It appears from the account given by *Sieur Barthelemy* of the writings of *Paschasius*, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not at that time universally admitted in the church. *Paschasius* must have written either to instruct those who were ignorant of this doctrine, or to convince those who denied it. In either case, it is clear there must have been persons who did not entertain the same sentiments with *Paschasius*. It is of no consequence what was the cause of this difference; whether ignorance or conviction. The fact remains the same; namely, that the church was not universally of the same opinion.

If conviction was the cause of the difference, then, this consequence is very plain, that there were persons who were convinced that the real presence was not founded on the scriptures, nor on the authority of the fathers. And if this was the true cause of the difference it follows further, that the number of persons who denied the real presence, must have been very considerable; otherwise, a person like *Paschasius*, who is said to have

been both learned and pious, would never have spent so great a part of his life in refuting them. Nor could he even have acquired so much honor and reputation for opposing a few scattered individuals.

But if ignorance was the cause of this difference, then, it clearly follows that multitudes were, in that age, ignorant of one of the capital articles of the Catholic faith. The Christian church had now subsisted more than seven hundred years. For three hundred years, the Christian religion had been universally embraced by all the nations, in Gaul, Britain and Germany. Yet multitudes remained all that time, ignorant of what the Catholics esteem the most important article of faith. Are we then to suppose that the Bishops and Presbyters of those ages were so deficient in their duty, as wholly to neglect the instruction of their flock in this fundamental point? Or is it not much more reasonable to suppose either that the bishops had not yet adopted this doctrine, or if they had adopted it, that they did not esteem it a subject of any importance? This we must either admit, or suppose that they had neglected their duty for more than three hundred years.

It is clear that the writings of *Paschasius* were not