

political atred having any influence upon the movement, the writer maintains that such a cause fails to account for the radical change in religious thought and feeling, doctrine and discipline, which was simultaneously brought about. That it was the direct and principle cause we do not hold, but that it had an influence in the creation of that movement we still contend. If not, how does the writer account for the fact that the line between Catholic and Protestant peoples coincided with that which divided them in politics; how account for the fact that Protestantism nowhere flourished except where encouraged and enforced by the state; how account for the fact that in England at the end of Henry's reign of prostitution the whole nation returned to the Church under Catholic Sovereignty? We do not attribute to Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, or Melancthon political motives—their motives were even worse. For them it was first of all rebellion against the Church of Rome. But the princes who embraced it had other motives. These were unwilling to acknowledge the primacy of the See of Rome and any reasons were sought as a pretext for a schism. A religious system which could not be established but by civil support, or, as Hallam says, by unlawful means, whose dogma was not in itself sufficient reason for acceptance, is not the Christianity of the Catacombs, and is not the outcome of purely religious thought and feeling. The critic quotes from Fisher, "Political agencies were rather an efficient auxiliary than a direct and principle cause." The efficiency was such, however, that that movement never would have spread without them; without political agencies it would not have become the widespread establishment that Protestantism is, but would have been numbered already with Arianism, Nestorianism, Gnosticism—an ism of the past.

With this ends the criticism of the second point of our article. Of the first view concerning this point he admits practically as much as we. We have already shown with what success he has refuted the second and third view. Now the reader will recollect that the third object of our article was to prove the Reformation a sedition and incapable of

reforming the Church; and the first argument in support of it was that of consequence from premises already proved—that the Reformation was based on vicious principles. With the greatest complacency our critic declares that as our premises have already been proved false, his conclusion is necessarily false also. How has he disproved our premises? He has discussed the three causes contained in the three views, and attempted to prove the inadequacy of each alone, but he has not touched our view yet. We did not adopt any of these views as our own. The third, *most nearly* covered the ground, but in addition to those causes we gave others, three of which we treated at length, namely, the disregard for the authority of the Holy See, engendered by the scandal of Philip the Fair; the Wycliffe heresy in England, a forerunner of the Reformation; and the havoc worked in the faith of the masses by the great Western Schism. To the resultant of these causes we attributed the Reformation, and in them placed the vicious principles. The writer has not confuted our premises till he has considered all these in conjunction; this he did not do; he dealt with three of these separately and passed over the remainder without comment. Therefore, we hold that our premises are still valid and our conclusion as well. Another argument in support of our third point was "That it was a return to the primitive Church and that the Catholic Church had departed from the path of the True Church is illogical since it supposes the impossible case of a time when the True Church did not exist on earth." Now he replies, "this supposed illogicalness arises from a mistaken idea—from the idea that we maintain that the Romish Church had *wholly* departed from the doctrine and discipline of the primitive Church." He contends that there were still some within her pale who had not "bowed the knee to Baal"; and in addition to this there were "communities varying in size which held the truth of the gospel in greater purity than the Church of Rome, as for instance, the Culdees in the British Isles, and the Albigenses in Southern France. These were the ones who formed the True Church of Christ in these troublesome times." It is plain from this that the writer confounds the