

plished Melancthon! Even the strong, deep nature, and the warm heart of Luther, would have been moved in her presence. The calm-browed Calvin might still have retained his wonted composure—his powerful intellect would still sway and master his emotional nature, but he would scarcely stand the occasion as did Knox. Yet, whatever we may think of him as a man and a courtier, who can fail to admire his adamant strength and unbending, uncompromising power of principle? He had not, indeed, the great learning of Melancthon. He knew nothing of the *mild, moderate, tender* soul of the great Philip, yet he possessed that which Melancthon never possessed, and which made his life comparatively a failure, but which served to give such a force and power to the character of the Scottish Reformer as to stamp itself firmly on the fate of his Kirk and country. Knox saw *clearly*; Melancthon saw *widely*. Knox acted *firmly*; Melancthon so balanced difficulties and refined his speculations as to incapacitate himself for vigorous and determined action. Knox saw that Rome was in error—he believed that the Pope was “the Antichrist,” “the Man of Sin,” and that the kingdom of “the Beast” had become so *thoroughly* corrupt that it must be totally overthrown and erased from its foundation. The peace-loving Melancthon proposed a milder remedy. He thought that the Church might be purified, but still preserved—that by patching up the old temple, it might stand in holy beauty. Knox felt convinced that no “half measures” would serve the purpose—that the work of destruction must be thorough—a plucking up of root and branch. Whose opinion has been confirmed in history? That Knox recognized the true position and relation of earthly kings and princes to the kingdom of Christ, as well as to their own subjects, we do not hesitate to affirm, although the expression of it was at times somewhat strange and startling. It was one of his successors who, in speaking of and to another of Scotland’s sovereigns, addressed him as “God’s silly vassal”—a successor who inherited much of the stern directness of the earlier Reformer.

The second interview between Knox and Mary shews the character of the Reformer in a very striking light. It took place at Lochleven Castle, where Mary had been enjoying the quiet beauty of the surrounding scenery. (Ah! little did she then think that it should in so short a time become her prison-house.) Here the queen still attended Mass, as of old—a circumstance which aroused the indignation of Knox. Some priests were seized and punished. Mary knew the influence of Knox and his party, and sent for him, resolved to use every persuasion to modify his opinion, and secure his good-will. Knox came. The queen complained that her subjects had taken the law into their own hands, and said it was hard that men should be punished for

worshipping God according to their consciences. “The sword of Justice, madam, is God’s,” said the Reformer, “and is given to princes and rulers for one end, which, if they transgress, sparing the wicked and punishing the innocent, they that in the fear of God execute judgment where God hath commanded offend not God; neither yet sin they that bridle kings from striking innocent men in their rage. The examples are evident, for Samuel spared not to slay Agag, the fat and delicate king of Amalek, whom king Saul had saved; neither spared Elias Jezebel’s false prophets, albeit king Ahab was present. . . . And so, madam, your Majesty may see that others than chief magistrates may lawfully punish the crimes which God commands to be punished.” In justification of the argument of Knox, we may state that the law of Scotland made the holding of Mass unlawful at this period. The queen seems to have borne with him patiently, and continued the conversation for two hours. Supper-time had come, and Knox left her presence. Before sunrise, however, he was again summoned before her Majesty. Of this interview, Cunningham says: “The queen had gone out to enjoy a day’s hawking, and Knox came up with her in the woods near Kinross. She received him with the greatest kindness and condescension; told him of a little love affair between Lord Ruthven and herself; warned him against the Bishop of Galloway, whom she knew to be a dangerous man; confided to him some domestic differences between the Earl and Countess of Argyle, and begged his good offices to effect a reconciliation, and finally, before parting, said to him, with reference to their interview on the previous evening, that she would cause all offenders against the laws to be punished, and see justice done. She kept her word, and caused the Archbishop of St. Andrews, among others, to be brought before the Council and committed to custody.” But did this suffice to tame the Reformer? Did her queenly grace and kindness gain him over to her cause, or seal his lips against denouncing “the monstrous government of women?” No, no; he was made of sterner stuff. During the following month the Parliament met, and the young queen delivered the opening address, surrounded by a crowd of gay ladies dressed in all the gay and gorgeous drapery of France. Many a stern Baron looked tenderly upon Mary, as he gazed upon his youthful queen addressing her subjects. So young, so graceful, need we wonder that whisperings ran through the crowd, “God save that sweet face; was there ever orator spoke so properly and so sweetly!” Yet there was one, at least, who did not catch one spark of this enthusiasm. The stern Reformer saw nothing in all this but another terrible instance of “the pride of women,” and denounced all the labors of those French milliners just as strongly, at