

Thirdly, the practical *annulling of Scripture authority*, which, as has been said, resulted from Sacerdotalism.

For anything like a complete reformation of Christianity at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the abolition of the union of Church and State, the destruction of Sacerdotalism, and the reinstatement of the Scriptures in their position of paramount authority, would have been absolutely necessary.

Let us take Lutheranism as the most influential element in the Protestant revolution, and is fairly representative of the entire politico-ecclesiastical movement, and test it by the categories that have been laid down. Did Lutheranism employ, to the best advantage, the pure elements of opposition to the hierarchy that had come down from the past, rejecting the vitiating elements? Did Lutheranism secure the ends whose accomplishment was indispensable to a pure reformation—the reinstatement of the Scriptures as the guide of faith and practice the abolition of Sacerdotalism, the abolition of the unhallowed union of Church and State? We shall see.

I said that in Lutheranism the five elements of opposition to the hierarchy were combined. Yet these elements could not possibly be combined harmoniously. The pure elements could not fail to be vitiated by combination with the impure. The final result could not be pure. If a given movement be purely Biblical, it may be at the same time Mystical, for there is a Biblical Mysticism; it may be at the same time Biblical, Mystical, and Humanistic, in a measure; but Biblical, Mystical, Humanistic, Realistic, Political, it could not possibly be without inner inconsistencies and incoherences. Hence we find the character, the actions, and the writings of Luther—his writings furnish an almost perfect index to his character, all sorts of inconsistencies. Luther could be Biblical when it suited his purpose. When he would refute the claims of the hierarchy no man could urge the supreme authority of the Scripture more vigorously than he. But does he always so urge it? Let us see. When James is quoted against his favorite doctrine of justification by faith alone—with marvelous audacity worthy even of his legitimate successors of the modern Tübingen school, he turns upon the luckless epistle and denounces it as a "right strawy epistle." So, also, he contrasted the Gospel according to St. John with the other Gospels, greatly to the disadvantage of the latter. So, also, the Book of Revelation was not of such a character as divine inspiration would have given. Other books of Scripture fared no better. Again, when he came into controversy with rigid adherents of the Biblical principle, he no longer held that that only is allowable in ecclesiastical practice which