

BAD ARGUMENTS RELATING TO TRANSUBSTANTIATION

Here are some appalling arguments for transubstantiation. The Roman Catholic Church believes that Jesus turns bread and wine into his body and blood at Mass/Eucharist so that they are not bread and wine any more. He allegedly revealed the doctrine in John 6 and it is this we are concerned with now. Later on he allegedly did the transformation for the first time at the Last Supper.

Jesus in John 6 says we must eat the flesh of Jesus and drink his blood to have eternal life.

The word for eat in John 6 means chew rather than eat. Sarx the word for flesh and body is physical flesh. Catholics pounce on them as proof that Jesus meant transubstantiation. But strong and physical words can be used in symbolic fashion. Jesus said chew, not eat, my body. Chewing the body of the Lord cannot be more important than eating it so the proof fails. How could Jesus save you by letting you chew his body? Besides, at what point do you become one with Jesus in the Eucharist? Is it when it goes into your tongue, or when it goes down your throat or when you start to turn it into your own body in the stomach? This problem shows the utter absurdity of Roman Catholicism.

Some say that John 6 did not mean the Mass for even if the bread and wine become Christ we do not eat Christ but merely the appearances of bread. We don't drink his blood but the accidents of wine. Harming the Eucharist does not physically harm Christ. No physical contact is made. When the wafer is in your mouth it is not the body of Christ that touches your tongue but the appearance or accident of bread. But is it right to say that one eats Christ when he is the bread though no physical contact is made? Of course not. To eat Christ you have to assimilate him. But this doesn't happen in the Eucharist. If bread was put inside a plastic ball and you swallowed the ball does it follow that you ate the bread? You swallowed it but didn't eat it. John 6 means assimilating the body and blood of Christ spiritually. To take any other meaning is absurd. And if bread is not its appearances or accidents then it follows that even if you have a loaf a day you never ate bread in your life you only ate its appearances. They nourished you not the bread. The Catholic Church if it really believes in transubstantiation should not be saying you ever hugged your child. It was the appearances of the child you hugged the child is an ethereal substance that you cannot get at or touch. Do you see the utter madness of the Catholic Church?

It is a fact that in Palestine at the time, the expression, "Eat flesh and drink blood," meant to do a person grave physical harm. Catholics argue that if the Jews took Jesus' talk to be figurative that would have been the meaning they would have taken, that Jesus was asking for a violent and bloody destruction. They think it is mad to take Jesus to mean, "If you do me great violence and persecute me to death you will have eternal life and I will raise you up on the last day." But if you take Jesus to mean the crucifixion which is necessary for salvation then there is no problem. It does make sense.

And if eat flesh and drink blood meant do violence and the Jews did not take him that way then they knew he was not speaking literally. Their question about how Jesus could give his flesh to eat was sarcastic.

The Jews did not take him to be speaking in a figurative way when they asked how he could give his flesh to eat and let him alone. You don't ask silly questions like that for if somebody says, "Kill me," people don't quibble about what method they will use. They knew that Jesus did not mean what the expression means. Also, 2 Samuel 23:17 records that drinking blood is an expression of gaining benefit from violent death even if it was not the drinker's fault. Psalm 27:2 speaks of enemies coming to eat the flesh of the psalmist. So, the expressions about drinking blood and eating flesh do not necessarily have to have the connotations that Catholics would like them to have. Had the Jews taken Jesus literally they would not have wondered how he could give his flesh to eat for they would have thought he meant that he would be killed and then be cooked up as food. Incidentally, there are many problems in determining the exacting wording of the New Testament. There has been so much textual corruption. The Christians boast that the corruptions do not affect any doctrine. Yes they do for Jesus promised that heaven and earth would pass away before his words could pass which is a doctrine and he claimed to know the future and to be able to preserve his words. When something could have been omitted from the New Testament that we don't know of and certainly all the early scholars and copyists thought it had happened when they added in new verses it follows that Jesus was a false prophet. But the point here is that if John is hard to understand the reason might be that a verse was dropped.

Protestants often assume that in John 6:27 that they have a proof against the doctrine of transubstantiation. Here, Jesus says the Jews must stop working for the food that decomposes but the food he gives doesn't and satisfies forever. Since the Eucharist can decompose it cannot be the body and blood of Jesus. But the Catholic replies that says that only the outward appearances of the consecrated things decompose while the inner substance of Christ remains inviolate. But when we have to keep receiving the Eucharist clearly then the Eucharist contradicts the suggestion given by Jesus that his food fills and satisfies forever. The Protestants are right. Jesus has in mind food that gave no permanent benefits or nourishment and

criticises it for that and so the Catholic Eucharist which always leaves the recipient in need of a refill is no better.