

the Pope, that they might have fuller sway over their subjects. Under the spiritual commonwealth of nations they were subject to a higher authority and practically wielded their sceptres only during good behavior. This was of course odious to avaricious princes, who saw that they were restrained from absolute rule only by the authority of the Popes. They looked with eager eyes on the riches of monasteries and church benefices which became theirs by the rejection of the Church. Many of them were actuated by such immoral motives as were betrayed by the Landgrave of Hesse and Henry VIII. The dissenting clergy themselves, by their subsequent lives showed how odious had been the vow of celibacy, and what was the nature of the freedom they sought. But above all it is the principle of private judgment, the soul of the whole movement, that has led to license. What else than license can come of a principle which destroys all authority, which undermines the validity of state as well as church, and which, as everyone must admit, has fostered Anarchy in all the forms we witness in the world today? In religion this same principle has led to the abjuration, one by one, of every dogma of faith, to the denial of the inspiration of the Bible, and when carried out consistently, to absolute infidelity. Protestantism is rent into hundreds of sects, each with a different interpretation of the Gospel; in London alone there are one hundred and fifty denominations, each professing to be the True Church. The only liberty gained by such a principle is liberty to fit the law of God to varying inclinations; for if there is but one Gospel there is but one Law and only one interpretation of that Law. We still maintain that Protestantism has engendered license. It has destroyed respect for authority by its very first principles; it has led to the abandonment of the sacraments, by whose grace alone human nature can restrain itself; it has led, when carried out, to the abjuration of the Deity and of all moral law.

We pass on with our critic to consider the three remaining accounts of the movement in question. The first does not detain him long: "That such events as Luther's disappointment or Henry's

divorce can in any sense be termed causes of the vast movement which was spreading throughout Europe contemporaneously with them, only the narrowest and most superficial thinkers would assert." We deny that those events were contemporaneous with that movement; they were initiative of it in both Germany and England. The writer contradicts this himself elsewhere by calling them occasions. And to show that we do not enjoy those superlative epithets alone in making the assertion in question, we again quote Hallam, a Protestant historian, who has won the praise of being "the most judical of great modern historians." Hallam says "The proximate cause of the Reformation is well known. Indulgences or dispensations granted by the Pope were sold . . . Luther inveighed against this, etc." Our position with regard to this view of the causes of the Reformation was clear enough. Here are our words: "A momentary event, such as Luther's matter of indulgences or Henry's divorce could not have brought on such convulsions . . . had there not been a disposition of popular feeling favorable for its inception." They were at most but partial causes, and as the line between partial cause and occasion proper is indistinct, we allow him his word if he wishes, but he must admit that the Reformation could not take place without them or some similar provocation, and it is extremely probable that had these events not happened the actual reform effected soon after by the council of Trent, lawfully instituted for that purpose, would have tided over the disaster. "What," he asks, "had Luther's indulgences to do with the Reformation in England, France, or Switzerland." It had as much to do as any great revolution in the feeling of one country has to do with awakening sympathetic feelings in others. What had the American Revolution to do with the French Revolution, or the French Revolution to do with the kindred popular feeling in England and Ireland at that time?

The next view considered, traces the causes to a general repugnance to spiritual authority and a spirit of independence of at least two centuries' growth. In considering it, he keeps carefully in mind the point at issue, that the Reformation was