

whose subjects must not "fight" for him? It was their vocation to compel, not to persuade. They must have law, and penalty, and force. Instead of appealing to the heart and the conscience, they would point to the statute book, the prison, and the scaffold.

And they did so. Different policies were adopted:—the creeds of the Lutherans and the Reformed were discordant on various points, and neither would commune with the other. But there was a fearful agreement in the use of coercion and restraint. Both sought establishment from the civil power. Both demanded exclusive privileges. The Lutheran would not tolerate the Reformed nor the Reformed the Lutheran. Neither of them would allow the Anabaptist (as they called him) to dwell in their borders. They claimed the right to fine, imprison, banish, burn, hang or drown all who could not pronounce their Shibboleth.

When England received the Reformation, it was in this way. There was no proclamation of freedom to the people, nor was their consent to the change asked. They were bidden to be Protestants because the State had adopted Protestantism. They were commanded to serve God in a prescribed form or suffer the consequences. Henry VIII. was neither Protestant nor Papist, and so it would be unfair to cite *his* laws. But the introduction of Protestant worship under Edward VI. was signalised by the ordinary legal sanctions. The parish churches were the appointed places of religious assembly, and no other prayers were to be offered in them than those which were enjoined by authority, the use of them being enforced by fine and imprisonment. The restoration of the kingdom to the Pope's rule was distinguished by still sharper penalties, agreeably to the genius and spirit of the "mystery of iniquity." This excites no surprise because it was natural. But the re-establishment of the purer faith and service, on the accession of Elizabeth, revealed no progress. It was fine and imprison-