

instance of the sense in which immorality was a vicious principle. It was not through a desire for real reform, which they knew only the Church herself could effect, that they took up the cry of reform. Had it been, subsequent events would have proved far different; instead of immediate quarrels and dissensions among themselves, we should behold the Reformers united under one head, following what they believed to be the True Church reformed. The masses already weakened by immorality, deluded by false ideas of pagan thought, impatient of the restraints of religious discipline, were caught by the cry of reform, and made it a pretext for renouncing entirely the authority of the Church.

The reviewer next proceeds to examine the third and last account advanced to explain the religious movement of the sixteenth century. He calls attention to the fact that this account was based on the assertion that the Reformation was due to "an odiousness to Germanic nations of submission to a foreign authority so Romanic as the Church then was." Before attempting to refute this, he makes a slight digression to point out an apparent contradiction in some of our statements. Alongside of the quotation just cited he places other statements made by us in a different connection, which are as follows: "The spread of pagan ideas gave birth to a desire of returning to the Roman form of government of pagan days;" and again, "To the revival of pagan literature which took place at this time, can be traced a great deal of the change of attitude. After the diffusion of Greek and Roman literature, Europe abandoned itself to a base adulation of everything Greek and Roman." The critic considers this a flagrant contradiction. "The Germanic nations," he says, "had such a great dislike for a species of authority barely Romanic, that a mighty revolution of thought and feeling was produced as a consequence, and yet at the same time they had a desire to return to the Roman form of government of pagan days, and through the diffusion of classic literature abandoned themselves to a base adulation of everything Roman." In the first place we did not make the bare dislike for Roman authority the sole and direct

cause of the Reformation, as he says, but only one of the many causes which produced the conditions favorable. In the second place, the fact that the German nation disliked the Roman authority of that day does not prevent their admiration of the Caesarism of ancient Rome, or their adulation of the customs of that age fostered by pagan literature. The United States are to-day far from desirous of British domination, yet their constitution is founded on the principles of British Law.

Had the writer been less precipitous in discerning contradictions it would have occurred to him that we said "a desire of returning to Roman form of government of *Pagan days*," which is quite another thing from a desire of Roman authority. No more should the dislike for Romanic rule prevent their being infected with the licentiousness of Pagan Roman literature. France can hardly be said at present to have any liking for Germany or German authority, yet it is well known that her society is deeply infected with the errors of heresy and infidelity diffused by German literature. And when speaking of the influence of Pagan literature we spoke of Europe's adulation of everything Greek or Roman, it was plain we spoke of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome. We left it to the intelligence of readers that pagan classical literature was not a product of the sixteenth century. Then in considering the first statement he asks, "Granted that there existed such an antagonism between Germanic nations and Rome, does it follow that the movement it is alleged to have caused was based on vicious principles?" Our meaning is misconstrued to be that "German nations in their struggle against Roman aggression were violating some code of morals, some standard of right and justice; and the writer wastes words in attacking a position we never held. We do not place the vicious principle in the fact that those people disliked Rome, we by no means defend Rome in the ancient struggle with the Teutons; but where we do place vicious principle is in the fact that they allowed their dislike to so far master them as to influence them in abandoning and attacking through their spleen the Church.

In considering the theory itself, of their