

it a matter of positive injustice to them to be branded as disloyal to the Church, or as setting forth novel and strange doctrines.

I shall begin then with the Church Catechism, as the latest formula expressing the Church's views in a definite and dogmatic manner upon the subject of the Sacraments. The last part on the Sacraments is the work of Bishop Overall—then Dean of S. Paul's—Prolocutor of Convocation, and afterwards Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1614; he died in 1619. This last part of the Catechism was added in 1604, in compliance with the wish expressed by the Puritans at the Hampton Court conference, and with two very slight alterations was afterwards confirmed by Convocation and Parliament in 1661. This Catechism therefore represents the very last authoritative exposition of our Church's teaching.

Now the Catechism is very full and clear in teaching that in the two ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper both, there is more than the merely outward part. It asserts these to be Sacraments, and defines a Sacrament as having two PARTS; one, outward and visible; the other, inward and spiritual. It thus plainly asserts that *in* the Lord's Supper there is as much an unseen portion, or presence of something invisible, as there is present an outward form. But this is altogether a different idea from that entertained by even the higher School of those who deny a Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. They are willing to admit a real presence "in the heart of the faithful receiver"; but the Catechism speaks of another thing *in* the Sacrament besides the outward "sign or form," as it is termed in one of the questions. Passing on to the questions more immediately relating to the Lord's Supper, we find four distinct questions relating to its nature and object: (1) As to its object; *Why* was it ordained? (2) two separate questions as to its *nature*, viz., (A) What is the *outward part*, or sign? and (B) What is the *inward part*, or thing signified? and lastly, as a fourth question, What are the benefits whereof we are partakers *thereby*? Now we stop here to observe that on the supposition that there is nothing more *in the Sacrament* than the outward signs or forms, the third of these questions seems superfluous: it would have been enough, as in fact is done in this part of the Catechism with regard to Baptism, to have asked about the "benefit" as soon as the outward part had been stated. Obviously, then, the object of the Church was to draw direct and earnest attention to the fact that there is more than the outward, visible sign or form;—that *under* that outward form there is also an inward something which is distinct from the benefit conveyed by it; distinct also from anything in the heart of the receiver, which could be no *part of the Sacrament*. This inward part is actually defined to be "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful *in the Lord's Supper*."

On this we again observe that as there are declared to be *two*