

have come boldly to the front and stated their case with laudable frankness. The Eucharistic miracle they say is essential to spiritual life, and that miracle can be performed only by priests who have been ordained by bishops. In that case bishops, and the priests ordained by them, are of course not only the depositories of supernatural power but masters of the world, since by refusing to perform the miracle they can cut us off from salvation. Whether the conversion takes the form of actual Transubstantiation or some subtler and less conceivable form, such as that denoted by Real Presence, signifies nothing. The miracle is still a miracle; without it we cannot be saved, and it can be performed only by a rightly ordained priest. But the Church contains besides the High Churchmen, the Evangelicals, who probably have a large majority among the laity, and deny the miracle altogether. This would seem to be a question about which, at all events, there can be no paltering. To acknowledge the existence of supernatural powers where they do not exist and take part in the performance of a false miracle is surely as great a breach of loyalty to truth as it is possible to commit, especially when the delusion is made the basis of claims, the tremendous character of which is attested by the whole history of the Church. It is true that in the Anglican Communion Service, the two opposite views of the Lord's Supper are combined, as was the way of the Elizabethan statesmen, who were thorough politicians and only wished to make their State Church comprehensive; but to combine two opposite views is not to harmonize them or to make it possible for the same mind to entertain them both. Disruption was sure to come: it came with a vengeance in Charles's reign. After a period of torpor it has now returned, and matters must reach a point at which the Evangelicals and the body of the laity will have to choose between the positive admission and the final repudiation of the Sacerdotal claim. We do not see that any one of the High Church disputants tries to explain away the dilemma in which he and his party are placed as believers in the divine right of Episcopacy refusing to hear the voice of