

parts in this Sacrament, the existence in it of this inward part must be as real as the outward part, but, inasmuch as it is an *inward* part, it cannot be visible or carnal like the other, for then there would be no Sacrament, according to our Church's definition of a Sacrament. Now, as God, who is a Spirit, is a Real Being, so is there really but spiritually, under the outward sign or form, in the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ: this is clearly put in the following words, "which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper:" "Verily and indeed," that is, in modern English, truly and really: not figuratively, therefore, or in mere imagination; "taken and received," something therefore external to the receiver, for how could he be said, in any sense, to *take* what is already in his own heart? "Taken and received in the Lord's Supper," as distinguished from any other way of obtaining it. Is it, then, I ask, too much to say that there is in these words of the Church's authoritative manual of instruction for children, and young persons in order to qualify them for admission to Confirmation—is it too much to say that here we are taught to believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, under the outward sign or form of bread and wine, there is invisibly present, to be "verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, the Body and Blood of Christ" only "after an heavenly and spiritual manner?"—

And here we may pause to observe the clearly marked difference between this doctrine and that commonly called Transubstantiation, which asserts, in fact, that after consecration there remains no substance* of bread and wine at all, but that the whole substance of the bread is changed into the real substance of the Body of Christ, and the substance of the wine into His Blood: thus as much destroying the Sacramental character of this ordinance by leaving no outward sign or form, as the Zuinglian view does by admitting no inward part or thing signified. And, my Lord, I feel perfectly justified in saying that no one who holds the opinion that the Presence of Christ is to be found, not in, or under, the form of the elements, but only in the heart of the faithful Communicant, would ever himself originate, or even voluntarily use such language; and this is further confirmed by the fact that all such persons are careful to speak of the "Presence of Christ," not of His Body and Blood, whenever they do (which is not often) speak of Christ's Presence at all, as connected with, or to be met with in this Holy Sacrament.

The importance of the word "part" in these questions of the Catechism will, I think, appear from the fact that in the attempt made in 1689 to revise the Prayer Book, among other alterations the following were proposed in the Catechism;—(House of Commons Return 1854).

* The word "substance" being understood as in Article 28.