the ſame inſtant of time ; that it is near 1800 years old, and yet may be not more than one minute ; that *forms* or ſenſible qualities are real things independent of their ſub­ject and the ſentient beings who perceive them ; that the infinite and eternal God, who created and ſuſtains the univerſe, is himſelf wholly and ſubſtantially comprehended by the human ſoul ; and that the half, or fourth, or tenth part of the body of Chriſt, is equal to the whole of that body. That theſe are neceſſary conſequences of tranſubstantiation has been ſo completely proved in various works @@(c) to which every reader may have acceſs, that it is needless for us to repeat arguments ſo hackneyed ; but there are two objections to that doctrine, which, as we do not re­member to have met with them elſewhere, and as they appear to us abſolutely concluſive, it may be worth while to ſtate in this place.

The advocates for the real preſence in the Lord’s Sup­per contend, that every word relating to that ordinance is to be taken in the ſtricteſt and moſt literal ſenſe, and they affect to triumph over the Proteſtants, becauſe their notions of the ſacrament cannot be ſupported without having recourſe to figure and metaphor. This however is a very vain triumph ; for we heſitate not to affirm, that ſuppoſing tranſubſtantiation poſſible, and even capable of proof, there is not in the whole New Teſtament a ſingle word or a single phraſe which, if interpreted *literally,* gives the ſlighteſt countenance to that wonderful doctrine. The reader will remember, that tranſubſtantiation, as we have ſtated it from **a** dignitary of the Romiſh church, and as it is in fact ſtated by the council of Trent @@(d), conſiſts in a change of the *matter, imperceptible substance,* or s*ubstratum* of the bread and wine into the *matter, imperceptible substance,* or su*bstratum* of Chriſt’s body and blood ; for all parties agree that the ſenſible qualities of the bread and wine remain, and, accord­ing to the Romaniſt, are after conſeration either ſupported by the *matter of* Chriſt’s body and blood, or hung upon nothing. But the phraſe *τoυιο εσιι το ϲωμα μoυ, if* taken in the literal ſenſe, cannot possibly denote the conſequence of ſuch a change as this ; for every perſon at all acquainted with the Greek language, eſpecially the language of the Peripatetic school, knows that το *σωμα μoυ* ſignifies, not the *matter* or s*ubstratum* of my body diveſted of its ſenſible qua­lities ; but the body of me in its natural ſtate, conſiſting of *matter* and *qualities,* or *matter and form united.* Unleſs there­fore the *ſenſible qualities,* as well as the *matter* of the bread and wine, give place to the ſenſible *qualities* as well as the *matter* of our Saviour’s body and blood, and unleſs he ap­pear glorified on the altar as he appeared on the mount at his transfiguration, the words το *σωμa μoυ* muſt be interpreted figuratively. Had the apoſtles underſtood their Maſter’s words in the ſenſe in which they are underſtood by the church of Rome, they would have rendered them into Greek, not τoυιο εσιι *το σωμα μoυ,* “ this is my *body,"* but τουιο εσιι ή ύλυ *σωμαιος μου,* “ this is the *matter* of my body.” In like manner, when St John relates @@\* that Jeſus ſaid, “ Who ſo eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day,” had he un­derſtood his adorable Maſter to ſpeak of his fleſh and blood in the Euchariſt in the ſenſe in which they are taught to be there by the church of Rome, he would have repreſented him as ſaying, not Ο' τpωγων *μου την σαγων,* ϰαι πινων *μου το άιμα,* **but Ο'** *τpωyωv τηv**μου τϛ σαρϰοϛ,* **ϰαι πινων τηv υλγγ** *μου* του άιμαιοϛ*,* “ whoſo eateth the *matter* of my fleſh, and drinketh the *matter* of my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt day.”

But further, ſuppoſing this singular converſion poſſible in itſelf, it cannot be rendered credible, however ſtated in any language that ever was or ever will be ſpoken by man. At firſt light it may appear paradoxical to affirm, that a poſſible fact cannot be ſo related as to obtain credit ; but that tranſubſtantiation, if poſſible, is ſuch a fact, will be apparent on the ſlighteſt conſideration.

The relation that ſubſiſts between things and words is arbitrary ; ſo that what is termed *body* in English, is *σωμα.* in Greek, and *corpus* in Latin ; and the ſame thing might with equal propriety (had the authors of theſe languages ſo pleaſed) have been expreſſed in the firſt by s*oul,* in the second by ιουϛ, and in the third by *anima.* (See Language, n⁰ 3, &c. ) The conſequences of this are, that there is no univerſal language ſpoken ; that the natives of one country underſtand not the ſpeech of thoſe of another ; and that dif­ferent men ſpeaking the ſame language are perpetually liable to miſtake each other’s meaning. Between the substra*ta* of bodies and their *ſenſible qualities* there is a relation founded in nature, ſo that the ſenſible qualities which indicate the ſubſtance to which they belong, to be *gold,* for inſtance, in one country, indicate the ſame thing in every other coun­try, and have done ſo from the beginning of time. The ſenſible appearances of bodies therefore are an univerſal language, the language of the Author of Nature, by which he declares to his creature man, that though the ύλη πρωιη, or primary matter of all bodies, may be the ſame kind of ſub­ſtance ; yet the προσεχηϛ of one body, or the internal combination of its primary parts, differs from that of ano-

@@@[m]\* Chap. vi. verse 54.

neceſſary to ſalvation, with leſs ceremony than perhaps we ſhould have done, had he less poſitively pronounced our damnation for not having it in our power to embrace them. He is not indeed much leſs ſevere on the moſt virtuous heathens, though they never ſaw the New Teſtament, or heard the doctrines of his church preached. But perhaps this ſeverity may be occaſioned by the following queſtion of Cicero : “ Cum fruges, *Cererem ;* vinum, *Liberum* dicimus, genere nos quidem ſermonis utimur uſitato : sed ecquem tam amentem eſſe putas, qui illud, quo veſcatur, deum credat eſſe ?” *De Natura Deorum,* Lib. 3. Cap. 16.

@@(c) Among other works on this ſubject, we may confidently recommend to the reader a ſmall tract publiſhed by Dr Abernethy Drummend, about twenty years ago, in the form of *A Dialogue between Philalethes and Benevolus.* In that treatiſe, together with a defence of it, which were both printed for Balfour and Drummond, Edinburgh, the abſurd conſequences which we have mentioned are, by arguments unanſwerable, proved to flow from the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation ; and the artful ſophiſtry, by which a very acute genius endeavoured to keep theſe conſequences out of ſight, is detected and expoſed on acknowledged principles of the ſoundeſt metaphyſics.

@@(d) The canon of that council which eſtabliſhes tranlubſtantiation is thus tranſlated by the author of *The Sincere Christian Instructed :* “ If any man ſhall say, that in the bleſſed ſacrament of the Euchariſt the ſubſtance of the bread and wine remains along with the body and blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and ſhall deny that wonderful and ſingular converſion of the whole ſubſtance of the bread into the body, and of the whole ſubſtance of the wine into the blood, the appearances of the bread and wine only remaining, which converſion the Catholic Church calls *transubstantiation,* let him be anathema.”