

were still in nominal existence—ere night, the hierarchy under which they were enforced was abolished, and it was enacted “that no manner of persons say mass nor yet hear mass nor be present thereat, under the pain of confiscation of all their goods, moveable and immoveable; and punishing of their bodies at the discretion of the Magistrate within whose jurisdiction sic person happen to be apprehendit for the first fault, banishing of the realm for the second fault, and justifying to the dead (that is, being to death) for the third fault.” This Act was passed under extremely suggestive and curious constitutional conditions. The Parliament which passed it was not called by Royal authority. The Act itself never received the royal assent. This gave ground for a convenient equivocation by the young Queen when she came over a year afterwards. She engaged to support the form of worship which she found established, and during her short and shaken administration of the realm, each party had its own interpretation of this obligation to bring forth when occasion offered, and each was afraid to let the other know its secret. When the Protestant part triumphed, it was deemed decorous and expedient to repeat the Act in a formal shape, and accordingly it was passed again in 1567, with assent of the Regent Murray in name of the infant King.

But, in fact, the promoters of the Reformation cared very little whether their proceedings were sanctioned by such an idle ceremony as the royal assent or not. They questioned whether the monarch had any right to resist or dispute a measure which had passed the three Estates of the realm, and were quite content to dispense with the services of a monarch who treated this as a vital part of the prerogative. The progress which opinion was making had a strong dash of political as well as ecclesiastical republicanism in it. Both features—the enmity to the Romish hierarchy, and the jealousy, to say the least of it, of the royal prerogative—were fruits of the political conduct of Scotland’s great ally France. It had become evident that the poorer country was to be used as a resource by the greater. Rich ecclesiastical livings and high offices in the State had been conferred on Frenchmen. And although some Scottish potentates like the House of Hamilton and the Beaton got dukedoms and bishoprics in France, yet this reciprocity was no gain to the people at large, and rather tended to weaken than to strengthen the national independence. Things looked more and more alarming when the young Queen of Scotland became Queen of France. The prospect, indeed, was that Scotland would become an appanage of the French crown, and the Act of 1560 was as a declaration alike of national independence as well as spiritual emancipation, not at all the less emphatic that it was done without the consent of the King and Queen of France. It was natural enough

that Queen Mary should grumble when she was required to institute prosecutions against her subjects for the observance of her religion, and that she should consider it harder to be called on to abandon it here. It was equally natural that the Protestant party should demand all they could get. It is as useless to talk of the principle of toleration in connection with such a struggle as about fairplay in a battle. Each tried to exterminate the other, and looked at no other principle of action. The resolution of the Reformers was avowed—“The idolatrous shall die the death,” was the simple proposition which Knox was ever thundering. As the Reformers knew, as every one who reads history knows, that if the beauty who queened it in Holyrood did not find it convenient to make proclamation of such a fact, she was prepared whenever the means were at hand to extirpate heresy. It is seldom a very profitable task to strike the balance of intolerance between the parties engaged in such deadly contests. When a Church can be traced through long ages of barbarism and ferocity, it is not difficult to attach to it the scandal of intolerance. If we vindicate, as people sometimes do, Protestant severity on the ground of ignorance and of barbarous times, a much longer sojourn under the influence of these deteriorating conditions should entitle the Old Church to greater allowances for its evil deeds. At the same time it is an unmistakable, as it is a satisfactory feature in Scottish Protestantism, that its bark was worse than its bite—that it did not act up to its cruel principles, and was sparing of blood. To account for this it is almost sufficient to remember that our Reformers learned their principles and the phraseology in which they were embodied from the Huguenots of France. In their wars of religion, as in those of politics, the French have never known what toleration is. Our own people might repeat their words but not their deeds, and Knox himself, rough-tongued as he was, would have found a cruel act difficult to perform.—*Scotsman*.

---

#### THE THUGS OF INDIA.

Christianity has a mighty work before it in India, and seems to be partially girding itself up to the important duty. Never was British *prestige* so great as it is at this moment in that myriad-crowded land. The dreadful mutinies have been crushed out. The Christian name is once more a name of power from the Himmalehs to Cape Comorin. Let us be earnest to make it in time become a name of love. As yet, we have made but the faintest possible impression, but the dawn of a brighter day, we should fain hope, is rising. Not only are missionaries from every section of the Christian Church devoting themselves to the work of the conversion of India, but the