

rive the proofs of his omnipotence, wisdom and beneficence? Where are we to search for the proof of these doctrines, but in the universe which God has made, and which cannot be known to us but by our senses? It appears then, that faith is founded in the testimony of the senses; and it can have no other foundation. But the doctrine of transubstantiation contradicts our senses. It overturns their testimony. Consequently, if true, it overturns faith also, and all the doctrines of religion, which can have no other foundation than that testimony. Since this doctrine overturns the testimony of the senses, and there is no other way in which it can be proved, it is evidently incapable of proof. There is no species of evidence left on which it can rest. There is no method of proof by which it can be established. It clearly follows that this doctrine cannot be proved at all. And if the gospel contained such a doctrine it would be a clear proof that the gospel did not contain a divine revelation.

The fourth argument that was mentioned, was, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is contrary to what we are taught in the scriptures concerning Jesus Christ. The scriptures inform us that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, the third day after his death, and that he will die no more. He is alive for ever more. But how is this consistent with the assertion that we eat his body in the sacrament of the Eucharist? Is it not a plain contradiction to say we eat the body of a person, who is still alive, and who reigns over all things? We eat his body, and feed upon it, digesting it in our stomachs; yet he is alive, glorious and triumphant. The one of these propositions flatly contradicts the other. They cannot both be true—one of them must be false. Whatever we have proved respecting the former contradiction, is equally true of this. It must not be ascribed to God, the Author of the scriptures: it cannot be explained as a miracle—it affords no proof of omnipotence. It does not serve the purpose of a miracle; nor can it be proved by the same evidence by which a miracle is established. This therefore is another contradiction implied in the doctrine of transubstantiation, which contains all the absurdity, and all the difficulty of the former.

Having explained our four arguments for the figurative interpretation of our Saviour's words respecting the bread and wine used in the Eucharist, we go on to consider the reasons stated by the Bishop of Meaux, in favor of the literal explanation of the same words.

The Bishop of Meaux argues, that, as the Jews

were required to eat the flesh of their sacrifices, so christians believed really to eat the body of Christ. This at least is given as an illustration of the doctrine, if not as an argument for it.

This mode of reasoning is altogether inconclusive. For, although the Jews had been required to eat part, or the whole, of *their* sacrifices, it does not follow that all sacrifices must be eaten. There were many circumstances attending the Jewish sacrifices which are not to be found in the sacrifice of Christ. The victims among the Jews were presented by the persons in whose behalf they were offered; they were slain by priests, and laid upon an altar. But Christ presented himself, though he was not sacrificed on his own account; he was slain by Roman soldiers, and laid upon the cross, not an altar. We are therefore authorized in saying that it was by no means necessary for the sacrifice of Christ to be treated in every respect, in the same manner with the Jewish victims.

But what sets the weakness of this reasoning in the clearest point of view, is, that, in fact, the Jewish sacrifices were not all eaten. Some were required to be eaten, and some were to be wholly consumed with fire; which clearly shows that the circumstance of eating the victim is not essential to the nature of a sacrifice. The Bishop of Meaux indeed attempts to explain this in a manner agreeable to his own hypothesis, by saying, that the eating of one kind of sacrifices shows that we must eat the body of Christ; while, the abstaining from eating another kind of sacrifices served to remind the Jews of the imperfection of their oblations; and therefore Christ the perfect sacrifice, must be really eaten. But this explanation is entirely arbitrary. It has no foundation in scripture, and is altogether unsatisfactory. It still remains clear, that since some sacrifices were to be eaten, and others not, we are just as much at liberty to suppose the sacrifice of Christ to be of the latter kind, as of the former.

The belief of transubstantiation, it is said, greatly heightens the effect of the sacrament; as the person who receives the mass, believes the body of Christ to be within his breast, and consequently is more deeply affected with the impression of his Saviour's love than he could be by simply meditating on his passion. To this, we answer, first;—that Christ's corporeal presence in the sacrament does not in the least enhance his love. His sufferings, whether corporeal or mental, are allowed to be the same, whether this doctrine be true or false. The only way, then, that this doctrine can be supposed to produce a better effect upon christians, than the manner in which Protestants consider the