

based on vicious principles. On the same ground as we have seen before, he maintains that repugnance to authority can not be termed a vicious principle unless that authority is a legitimate and rightful one. This objection we have already once solved, so it is needless to repeat the explanation. Up to this point of the criticism the writer has proceeded with quite ordinary processes of reasoning, but at this juncture, whether put to extremities for an argument, or seeking to avoid some imagined objection, he indulges in logical antics truly marvelous. We quote his own words, the italics are ours. "Now we maintain that this feeling or spirit alluded to was not the cause of that movement, but that *very movement itself*. We maintain that it is this very feeling, this very sentiment, that has to be accounted for, since it *constitutes one, though certainly not all of the principle features of the Reformation*." There is no explanation offered. In the course of the criticism, the writer in *The Presbyterian College Journal* does not fail to make the customary fling at Catholic consistency. An imaginary defect he styles a "characteristic specimen of the logic of Romanism," thus showing that however dignified and composed the exterior, there still lurks within that spirit of animosity which has ever animated the futile attacks of all assailants of the Church. We would not attempt to classify the specimen before us. Logic of Protestantism we could not call it; we have never known such a species. Logic has been so little concerned with the growth and spread of that form of religion that the idiom does not exist. What the writer's conception of identity can be we cannot surmise. According to the wording of the statement, this spirit of repugnance was one and the same with the movement itself; but he hastens to say that that was only one, certainly not all of its features. It is itself, yet only a part of itself. We confess ourselves at a loss to meet the dilemma. Truly a subtlety worthy of a Hippias! In the former statement he confounds movement with motive, the actual carrying out of a project, with the purpose, the outward act with the inward thought. In the latter he contends that this repugnance constituted only one feature of the Reformation. He seems

here to make provisions for other features which are not indicated. This spirit, we contend, constituted the very soul of the Reformation, since that movement was essentially a negation of authority; the establishing of new dogmas was secondary matter, a measure of prudence to supply the place of those rejected. The writer does not recover himself immediately as his following remark shows: "This account of itself," he says, "gives us no insight into the real causes of the Reformation, and even if it did, it does not of itself prove that that movement was founded on vicious principles. The writer evidently saw this himself" he continues, "for . . . he proceeds to narrate the causes which produced this spirit of independence. . . . thereby endeavoring to give us an idea of what he means by 'vicious principles.'" This our critic evidently considered an admission of weakness. Now what could be more reasonable than that, in order to show this repugnance to be a vicious principle, we should qualify it by giving the nature of the circumstances of which it was born. He goes on to consider some of the causes we gave.

The first of our statements examined under this head is that "the times were immoral, licentiousness was becoming rife." We quote his words on discovering this "confession." "What have we here? Nothing less than an honest confession on the part of the writer himself. The times were certainly becoming immoral, licentiousness was certainly becoming rife. But why was this? It was because the Church to which had been committed the mission of spreading abroad the salutary effects of the Gospel of Christ, and thereby doing away with the immorality and licentiousness of heathenism had proved herself unfaithful and utterly incompetent for the task." What are we to think of such an announcement? Is this another instance of private interpretation of Scripture? Has it come to this, that a student in a Presbyterian College, where we believe the Bible is taken as the rule of faith, should profess such ignorance, if not disrespect regarding the Church of Christ? Does the author of these words fully realize the purport of this utterance? What else is it than open blasphemy, a