ch. The itution" e clearly nto God of His y to the ted, nor ificed in orials of s never to offer crumb

nother

nt that ther of Lord's sciples. hing of odies," otions, iving"

of the by the some-coffer lso of e the ouder does ents.

with is in the tion, hose they hich d to only the

inference, that there takes place an objective change of the bread and wine quite independent of their use, in fact that they "become" the flesh and blood of Christ. The language allows the whole doctrine of Transubstantiation, to be grafted on the words: "become the body and blood," both in the literal meaning and in the spirit of that most unscriptural and dangerous Popish doctrine.

Now it is morally, if not indeed absolutely certain, that our Saviour Christ used no such words. Indeed, it is a remarkable fact, and of deep significance that the word for "Consecrate" is not once used in the Gospels concerning the elements in the Lord's Supper. Nor is it found in the early Christian documents (see the Didache, Ch. IX.; Justin Martyr Apol. 85). There is much loose thinking abroad in regard to "Consecration" which sadly needs be corrected. For "Consecration" properly understood means that buildings, bread, wine, and whatever else, are solemnly set apart for exclusively sacred uses. It does not mean that the material thing undergoes some intrinsic change in the thing concerned itself, but only in relation to its use. The Church of England distinctly declares that "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances." (Black Rubric.) The work of the Holy Spirit relates only to the living souls of men, and operates in the spirit-world alone.

Now the present Communion Service of the Church of England is not only the most primitive, but it is also the most periect in Christendom. This high praise could only be claimed because it is at the same time the most scriptural of all Communion offices. The most recent research has also shown that it is a return to the most primitive practice, and the most ancient order.

The theory of those who wish to restore the form of the first Prayer Book (which in its day pleased nobody) and assimilate the Church of England use to that of the Scottish and American Prayer Books, that this is a restoration of the use of the Primitive Church, is not true to fact, nor can it face the fierce fire of historical criticism. It falls to the ground on the first count that it is not true to fact, for the Scottish Liturgy is very far from being the "ancient order of the Prayer of Oblation and the Invocation of the Holy Ghost." It is a pure development of much later date, an accretion which grew up in a superstitious age, an alteration of the ancient order.