

four views, we dismissed the first one as wrong and indicated the grounds on which we disproved it. As to our own view, here are our words: "Of the three views held by Catholics, the last most nearly covers the ground as it comprehends the other two and adds a third cause which must have played an important part in producing the conditions favorable for the inception of such a movement." From this it would be difficult to discern that we did not adopt the first or the second. The third we said *most nearly* covered the ground, but even it we did not entirely support. After considering the causes proposed under this third view, we gave additional causes which we thought exercised a deep influence, and which with those previously admitted constituted our estimate of that revolution. To disprove our premises it would not suffice to take each of the causes enumerated and show its inadequacy by itself, but to take the sum of these causes and prove the result insufficient. This, it will be found, our critic does not do; he takes up each of three causes, and acting on the presumption that we made it a direct and sole cause, attempts to prove their inadequacy or utter inefficiency. We shall examine the methods he employs in so doing. Before beginning, however, he enters a complaint against us for not considering the Protestant view. Our object, he says, "is to prove that the so called Reformation was the effect of vicious principles, and as the Protestant affirmation is virtually the direct denial of such a charge, his first duty is to disprove this account." Now we know not under what obligation or duty we stand to disprove or even state the Protestant view. It is not necessary for him who would prove a theory to disprove all others. By establishing his own he virtually disproves all contraries. To our mind this view offered no feasible explanation and we rejected it. We, however, did state the Protestant view and indicated, without going into a formal demonstration, the grounds on which we disproved it, namely, that it gave rise to license, not liberty. Now besides this, while we stated what we believed to be the view most commonly held by Protestants, we by no means thought that it was necessary to dem-

onstrate its fallacy this late in the century. The foremost thinkers among Protestants have long since discredited it. We may go back as far as the historian Hallam and find this condemnation of such an idea. "The adherents of the Church of Rome have never failed to cast two reproaches on those who left them; one, that the reform was brought about by intemperate and calumnious abuse, by outrages of an excited populace, or by the tyranny of princes; the other, that after stimulating the most ignorant to reject the authority of the Church, it instantly withdrew that liberty of judgment, and devoted all who presumed to swerve from the line drawn by law, to virulent obloquy or sometimes to bonds and death. These reproaches, it may be a shame for us to own, can be uttered and cannot be refuted." As to how the Reformation could have given rise to license the writer offers this conjecture regarding our meaning. "The religious movement of the sixteenth century gave rise to license in that it was a successful struggle against an established authority." He draws from history to prove that such does not constitute license unless the authority disobeyed be a legitimate or necessary one. Now since we have sufficient reasons for considering this view, we shall take up the result of his conjecture and explain the reasons why we hold the Church to be a legitimate and necessary authority and that therefore dissent from her is license. When Christ established the new faith on earth, he founded one Church as the depository, guardian, and teacher of the Divine Word. At its head he placed Peter, and promised that head His perpetual assistance. There was but one Church, which was therefore a legitimate and necessary authority. The successors of Peter formed a continuous and unbroken succession, the form which Christ gave the Church, the dogma and faith practiced by the Apostles were preserved in the Roman Catholic Church and in Her only, which must therefore have been the One True Church, a legitimate and necessary authority. Dissent from such authority must be then, as he admits, a measure, not of liberty but of license. The rulers who recognized the Reform were eager to shake off the supremacy of