

Why Transubstantiation Is Not True And Not Necessary

**CATHOLICISM
TEACHES THE
ADORATION OF A
PIECE OF BREAD
BY TURNING A FIGURE OF
SPEECH INTO A LITERAL FACT
IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN**

Introduction

First of all, the author has written this article to point out false Catholic teachings for the spiritual benefit of those who have ears to hear. This is not some kind of anti-Catholic rant, though some Catholics may think it is. Pointing out theological error, even though the reader may not see it, is a matter of being a good disciple of Christ.

Transubstantiation Defined

We will start off looking at a pretty standard description of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation taken from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops website:

Transubstantiation refuted by John 6:63

*"The **whole** Christ is truly present, body, blood, soul, and divinity, under the appearances of bread and wine—the glorified Christ who rose from the dead after dying for our sins. This is what the Church means when she speaks of the "Real Presence" of Christ in the Eucharist."* [1]

If a person wants to believe in transubstantiation, they have no choice but to IGNORE John 6:63...

"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

In John 6:63 we see that Jesus clarified the prior statements He made in John chapter 6 about eating His body (His flesh), by letting His disciples know that He was talking about His spiritual body, NOT His physical body (because as He said "the flesh profiteth nothing") and He was NOT talking about physically or literally eating Him but rather spiritually feasting on His WORDS (because he said "the WORDS that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they

are life”).

Are we to believe that Jesus taught cannibalism?

So how does the illustrious Church of Rome get around John 6:63, seeing how that verse explains the spiritual nature of the language Jesus had been using in the prior verses? Claiming (as Catholics are taught to believe) that the disciples who walked away took Jesus prior statements literally does NOT mean those statements were meant to be taken literally, to see who would be willing to accept cannibalism (which is what transubstantiation boils down to). That passage in John 6 (verses 48-56) was meant merely to show who were sincere followers of Christ and who were not. Not to separate the cannibals from the non-cannibals. Once those false disciples walked away, then and only then did Jesus explain that His statements about eating His body were spiritual in nature, NOT literal. Jesus was not kind of religious loser who desperately needed followers and acceptance from others. He didn't need to go running after those who walked away from him and shout "Wait a minute! That's not what I meant!".

Communion is a memorial service, not a recreated sacrifice

Now we will see how the Catholic church uses double-talk to bolster its case for transubstantiation while dancing around related statements in scripture, namely the scriptures that declare the ordinance of communion to be a "memorial service"... which they superficially acknowledge while simultaneously trying to turn the communion ordinance into FAR MORE than a memorial service:

*"The Eucharist is thus a sacrifice because it **re-presents** (makes present) the sacrifice of the cross, because it is its memorial and because it **applies its fruit**: [Christ], our Lord and God, was once and for all to offer himself to God the Father by his death on the altar of the cross, to accomplish there an everlasting redemption. But because his priesthood was not to end with his death, at the Last Supper "on the night when he was betrayed," **[he wanted] to leave to his beloved spouse the Church a visible sacrifice** (as the nature of man demands) by which the bloody sacrifice which he was to accomplish once for all on the cross would be re-presented." [CCC 1366]*

Where did the Catholic Church get the idea that Jesus Christ wanted "to leave to his beloved spouse the Church a visible sacrifice"? And are we to believe that a round communion wafer is a "visible sacrifice"? All that is VISIBLE is a round wafer. And that wafer is not being nailed to a cross (i.e. not being "visibly sacrificed"). So what is this nonsense being stated in CCC 1366? It

appears to be nothing more than some Catholic religious gobbledygook to justify an imaginary event, that never actually happens but that we are supposed to believe happens at each and every Catholic mass.

There is NO scriptural justification for the Catholic idea of a “re-presented” sacrifice. The New Testament speaks of a MEMORIAL of Christ’s sacrifice, but not a re-presentation of it. This MEMORIAL ceremony is mentioned THREE TIMES in the New Testament:

1. *“And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do **in remembrance of** me.”* – Luke 22:19

2. *“And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do **in remembrance of** me.”* – 1 Corinthians 11:24

3. *“After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, **in remembrance of** me.”* – 1 Corinthians 11:25

When I purchase a house or a car – making a FULL ONE-TIME payment – I don’t have to keep making that full one-time payment over and over again, nor do I have to re-enact (i.e. “re-present”) that payment process over and over again. Likewise, the Lord Jesus made a FULL ONE-TIME payment at Calvary to PURCHASE the FULL pardon for HIS BRIDE. His BRIDE was – at that point in time – FULLY PURCHASED, completely and once-for-all-time REDEEMED.

*“For as much as ye know that ye were not **redeemed** with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot”* – 1 Peter 1:18-19

Catholic “wordsmiths” invent their own spiritual terms

Please note how the Catholic Church has to INVENT spiritual terms – like “re-present” – in order to justify their erroneous teachings and practices. In a similar manner they use various spiritual terms to relabel their worship of Mary and saints as something less than worship using terms like venerate, dulia and hyper-dulia.

Catholic Church doctrinal confusion

Another problem with the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is that it creates a paradox, by its own definition. That is, if the eucharist WAFER contains the LITERAL body, BLOOD, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, then what does the communion CUP contain? Just extra blood of Christ? There

really is no need for the communion cup, based on the Catholic description of transubstantiation, hence, the Catholic Church OMITTS that vital part of the communion MEMORIAL ceremony. There are so many references in Scripture to the atoning BLOOD of the Lamb of God, yet the Catholic Church withholds the communion cup from its members during their communion services. And the CUP is an integral part of the LAST SUPPER described in the New Testament (Luke 22:20) and the CUP is also an integral part of the communion ceremony described in 1 Corinthians chapter 11. Obviously, such an omission in Catholic communion indicates that their communion services are INCOMPLETE and therefore not VALID. How about that?

“Likewise also the CUP after supper, saying, This CUP is the new testament in my BLOOD, which is shed for you.” - Luke 22:20

“After the same manner also he took the CUP, when he had supped, saying, this CUP is the new testament in my BLOOD: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.” - 1 Corinthians 11:25

“Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this CUP of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and BLOOD of the Lord.” - 1 Corinthians 11:27

Do you understand now why transubstantiation is a man-made farce? It is used by the Catholic Church to deceive their followers into thinking that only THEIR Church has that special one-of-a-kind “eucharist”, so they dare not ever leave Catholicism, lest they be deprived of their miraculous wafers that no other Church offers, wafers that they are told can help them attain eternal life. Specifically, they are taught that their eucharists can actually take away sins [2] and that by ingesting those wafers they are literally “receiving Christ”.

Some Questions For Catholics:

The Catholic Church Claims that EACH of their specially formulated communion wafers contains the literal body, BLOOD, soul and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

1. WHAT is the NEED for their communion CUP if each of their wafers contain an entire Jesus already, including His blood?
2. Where in Scripture does it say that we are to use round wafers (patterned after the sun god) instead of NORMAL bread for communion?
3. Where in Scripture does it say that each piece of bread used in communion is the ENTIRE body, blood, soul and divinity of Jesus?
4. Isn't the use of a LOAF of bread (instead of individualized wafers) meant to symbolize the UNITY and COMPLETENESS of the local body of Christ, of which each member is an integral vital part?

REFERENCES:

1.
<https://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/the-mass/order-of-mass/liturgy-of-the-eucharist/the-real-presence-faqs>
2. CCC 1393 – Holy Communion separates us from sin. The body of Christ we receive in Holy Communion is “given up for us,” and the blood we drink “shed for the many for the forgiveness of sins.” For this reason the Eucharist cannot unite us to Christ without at the same time cleansing us from past sins and preserving us from future sins.

— *RM Kane*
