

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1869.

ART. I.—TESTS OF A VALID MINISTRY AND A TRUE CHURCH.

It is one of the advantages and beauties of the Methodist Episcopal Church that there is nothing in her religious faith, or education, or polity, that embarrasses our fellowship with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. We can commune with them, work with them, and rejoice with them just as far as *their* catholicity will permit. General delight in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ is not incompatible with special delight in a particular branch of that Church. We may love a large circle of friends very sincerely and earnestly, and yet one of them may be the object of our special regard and joy. We do not love other Churches less because we love the Methodist Episcopal Church more. Nor in asserting the validity of her ministry and the genuineness of her Churchdom are we obliged to invalidate other ministries, or unchurch other denominations. It is in perfect charity toward others, therefore, that we assert our claim to be a true Ministry and Church on the New Testament basis. We select the Church of Corinth as a precedent for our argument.

I. The Corinthian Church possessed a valid ministry because of its divine appointment. They claimed this in words like these: "Paul, called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God." 1 Cor. i, 1. "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God." 2 Cor. i, 1. "For though I

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXI.—21

Notes on Matthew, but we could speak in like commendatory strains of the whole commentary on the four Gospels. The "great Lukean section," embracing what is peculiar to that Evangelist, is unfolded with special clearness and power. And no one has entered more fully than Dr. Whedon into the tender and loving feelings of John, his intense spirituality, and his profound reverence and affection for the divine Son of God.

These volumes ought to be in every minister's library, and among the few well-chosen books in every intelligent Christian household.

We sincerely hope that the author may be spared life and health "to complete," according to his purpose, "an entire exposition of the New Testament in the same style and proportional extent." It will be a good service to our holy Christianity, to the cause of sound biblical criticism, and to our Saxon-English speech. Such a work, we may add, embracing the result of modern scholarship, yet popular in its style and compressed in form, will, beyond all question, be accepted by the Church and public as fulfilling, in large measure, the blessed mission of diffusing God's word and "spreading scriptural holiness."

ART. IV.—WHITE'S MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Preceded by a History of the Religious Wars in the Reign of Charles IX. By HENRY WHITE. American Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.

THE study of the causes and effects of great national crimes is one of the most instructive that can engage the attention of a thoughtful man. However uncertain or incomprehensible the course of ordinary events may at times appear to our defective vision—whatever pauses, and even retrogressions, the majority of the orbs in our firmament may make—there is no such difficulty with regard to these. They are the flaming meteors that mark out their distinct and well-defined paths, leaving us in no doubt whence they came and whither they tend. If in the case of the less flagrant violations of the divine laws on the part of

great communities of men it is not always easy to point to the particular punishment meted out for each offense, the retribution that follows the commission of these atrocities is generally so prompt and unmistakable as to vindicate the justice of God even in the estimation of the skeptic and the scoffer. And, for this reason, the contemplation of the class of phenomena of which we speak is exempt from the demoralizing effects flowing from habitual familiarity with the annals of individual and personal crime. Vice does not attract, when its terrible consequences to the perpetrator can be seen written in characters of light; and the perpetrator himself stands as a beacon of warning to those who would copy his example of successful wrong-doing.

Nearly three hundred years ago Christendom was startled by the tidings of the commission of a stupendous crime which seemed to throw into the shade every similar, but less gigantic, deed of blood. A scheme of midnight assassination had been carried into execution, whose victims were not solitary men, but were to be counted by tens of thousands; which was not confined to a single neighborhood, nor even to a single city, but, commencing with one of the most populous capitals of Europe, extended to the utmost limits of the realm: a massacre for which its authors manifested no shame or compunction, which they exultingly avowed, which, with hands yet reeking with human blood, they magnified as an act of extraordinary justice and piety, upon which they invoked, and for which they obtained, the unhesitating approval and benediction of the head of their religion, and a self-styled vicegerent of God on earth. When we add, that the person under whose authority this carnival of blood was celebrated was the monarch himself, that he was instigated by a woman—his mother—that the sufferers were the most virtuous, and among the most exalted in rank of all his subjects, that not only was the deed consummated in a time of profound peace, but the occasion selected was that of the festivities attending the marriage of that king's sister, of that mother's daughter, to the recognized head of the party that was to be exterminated from the face of the earth, and that the revolting scenes of inhuman ferocity, so far from being confined to obscure neighborhoods or distant quarters of the city, were enacted in the courts and corridors of the palace,

by the side of the young bride, whose very bedchamber afforded an uncertain refuge to a single wretch escaping from the hands of his pursuers, we have before us a few of the circumstances that account for the undiminished interest which the recital of the events of the massacre that began on the morning of Sunday, August 24th, 1572, continues to elicit.

While the general incidents of this lamentable occurrence are well known and settled beyond the possibility of cavil, there is not a little uncertainty attaching to the current accounts in a number of particulars. But more important than any or all of these, is the question whether the massacre itself should be regarded as the result of a plot of long standing, perfected in all its essential features many months or years before, with whose existence the King of Spain and the Pope of Rome were acquainted, if they did not create it, and which, by a miracle of dissimulation, was kept secret by the large number of persons to whom it had been confided; or whether, on the contrary, the execution bears the unmistakable impress of having been the result of a sudden and almost frantic determination to extricate its authors from new and dangerous complications.

In the work, the title of which we have placed at the commencement of this article, Mr. Henry White has not merely undertaken to solve this important problem, but prepares the way for a clearer understanding of an eventful period by relating, with considerable detail, the transactions of the first three civil wars. Indeed, since he prefaces his work with a rapid sketch of the progress of the Reformation in France during the reigns of Francis I., Henry II., and Francis II., he has given a continued narrative of the history of the Huguenots, from their origin to the death of Charles IX. It is not too much to say that he has made a book which is far in advance of any thing which we previously possessed on this subject in the English language. The truth is, that we have until now had little or nothing deserving the name of a history of the brave Protestants of France. Mr. Browning's work,* indeed, met with remarkable success, and we believe was, at the time of its publication, forty years since, eulogized by the

* The History of the Huguenots during the Sixteenth Century, by W. S. Browning. Two volumes. London: 1829. History of the Huguenots, from 1598 to 1838, by the same. One volume. Paris: 1839.

Gentleman's Magazine as "one of the most interesting and valuable contributions to modern history." But, not to speak of the defects of style, it is not unfrequently superficial, and sometimes inaccurate. At best, it contains only a record of the civil wars of the Huguenots—by no means the most precious part of the legacy left us by that race of sturdy champions of the truth. Rejecting the idea of writing any thing that might seem to approach a martyrology, the author made little use of even that scanty fund of materials for the composition of a history of the origin of the French Reformation which was then accessible. Professor De Felice's "Protestants of France," although free from the last mentioned defect, and sufficiently full on that portion of Huguenot history on which recent investigation has thrown so much light, has the disadvantage of having been written originally as a purely popular work, and of having been subsequently enlarged in its scope. It is based on no exhaustive investigation. Besides, the translation of Dr. Lobdell, through which it is exclusively known in this country, is very imperfectly executed, and preserves so many French idioms as to be frequently obscure, and rarely forcible or elegant.

Mr. White's volume, on the contrary, is not only well written, but exhibits on every page the results of extensive reading, laborious research, and judicious weighing and comparison of authorities. He has evidently given a good share of his attention to the writers of the sixteenth century, upon whose memoirs and histories our information must, after all, chiefly be based. No study of later compilations—not even the examination of municipal records or contemporary letters—could supply the place of the invaluable guidance of La Place and La Planche, of Jean de Serres, of de Thou, and of that much abused soldier of fortune, Agrippa d'Aubigné, or of that long series of contributors to the national collections of memoirs, many of whom were prime actors in the scenes they describe, and knew as well how to handle the sword as to use the pen. Mr. White has also made excellent use of the masterly works of Professors Soldan and Baum, whose enthusiastic and life-long labors in the field of the history of the Reformed Church have afforded a most pleasing proof of the true unity of evangelical Protestantism in all its forms, and have demonstrated

that a Lutheran, in spite of the hostility of High Churchmen, may be as much interested in the welfare of another branch of the great Christian brotherhood as he would be if no doctrinal differences separated them. Our author appears, moreover, to have visited many of the most important localities that figure in the narrative, and to have instituted some research for original documents in the archives of the departments. But of this we make little account. For in a country like France, where a thousand native investigators are busily ransacking every repository of materials for history—where the results of their industry are every year given to the public, either in special publications or in the proceedings of the great historical societies and of local associations—the historian can scarcely hope to do more than to attempt the task (itself almost a Herculean one) of mastering, digesting, and combining the multitudinous fruits of so much patient and protracted toil. He may, by personal investigations among the manuscripts of the imperial and other libraries, add a little to the *éclat* of his work; he will not be likely to enhance its real value.

We shall, in the present article, confine ourself to an examination of the earlier portion of Mr. White's history.

The reign of the first Francis, whose good fortune it has been to obtain credit, even with posterity, for far greater magnanimity than he really possessed, was full of alternate encouragement and rebuffs for the nascent Reformation. The purer faith, Mr. White shows us, enjoyed the favor of one sincere friend at court, and that was Margaret, the sister of the King. Yet even this solitary patron was scarcely assured in her own mind, and injured her influence by the adoption of quixotic theories. "She was not a Protestant," says Mr. White with justice, "and shrank from any rupture with Catholicism. She would have liked to see the old and the new Church united, each yielding something to the other. The age, however, was not one for compromises. Day by day the lines of demarcation became more strongly marked."* The knowledge that they possessed even so inconsistent a supporter as Margaret, fed the early reformers with hopes that were doomed to disappointment. She never could succeed in persuading her brother to give his hearty adhesion to the Gospel. True, he entertained

* *Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, p. 6.

a thorough hatred and disgust for the monastic orders, and had so little faith in the Papacy, that, in moments of extraordinary provocation, he would threaten to cast in his lot with the "new religion," as it was called. But political motives, especially that doctrine which the prelates were never tired of inculcating, that change of religion inevitably involved an overthrow of the State, were more than sufficient to counterbalance any inclinations which he may have had in that direction. "You would be the very first to rue the experiment," was the ready reply of the ecclesiastics to the royal menace.* And Francis believed them, and learned to make their words his own. "He used often to say, if we may credit Brantôme, that this novelty—the Reformation—'tended to the overthrow of all monarchy, human and divine.' Yet none of the kings who embraced the new creed," Mr. White well remarks, "lost their thrones; while the devotee Henry III., and the converted Henry IV., both fell by orthodox daggers." † "We need not stop to show," he says elsewhere, ‡ "that the kingdom which has always put itself forward as the champion of Popery, both in the East and in the West, "is that in which the Church and the State have suffered more from revolution than any Protestant country."

Yet the reformatory movement went on, if not with royal assistance, in spite of it. Its supporters were men, and therefore fallible. They made some mistakes. They were certainly ill-advised in drawing up so bitter an invective against the absurdities of the Mass, as the celebrated placard of 1534; and, if it was one of their number that posted it by night upon the very door of the bedroom of Francis in his barred castle, he undoubtedly manifested little common sense in supposing that the document would hasten the conversion of that trifling and superficial prince. It is, however, by no means clear that the reformers committed one tithe of the blunders that were perpetrated by crowned and anointed kings and by sapient bishops, when they undertook a work for which they considered themselves admirably adapted by native endowments and by the gifts of heaven. They taught the truth, for the most part,

* "Franchement, Sire," said a nuncio of Clement VII., "vous en seriez marri le premier, et vous en prendroit très mal, et y perdriez plus que le Pape; car une nouvelle religion, mise parmi un peuple, ne demande après que changement du prince."—*Brantôme*, vol. ix, p. 202.

† White, p. 20.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

calmly, soberly, and persuasively. They gathered converts from the classes that were most open to conviction, succeeding particularly well with the intelligent middle classes, with the industrious artisans, with the young whose minds were un-biased. Even their adversaries were forced to acknowledge, that wherever a man was found more than ordinarily skillful, or industrious, or successful, there you would be almost certain to find a Huguenot. "In France," says Mr. White, "it was long before the Reformation reached the lower classes—the masses, as it is the fashion to call them; the rural gentry, the men of education, the well-to-do tradesmen, artists, and 'all who from their callings possessed any elevation of mind,' were the first converts. They were naturally opposed by the clergy and the lawyers, for corporate bodies are always great enemies to change."* And yet these remarks must be taken with some qualification; for, although it was never among the debased and brutalized rabble of the cities that the new faith flourished, it was successful from the very beginning pre-eminently with the *poor*. When Bishop Briçonnet, in his short-lived zeal for a Gospel which he was soon to betray, caused it to be preached in his diocese by evangelical men, among whom Lefevre and Farel were prominent, it was precisely the poor wool-carders of Meaux, and the day laborers that flocked to the neighborhood to aid in the harvest, who most readily embraced the doctrine of justification by faith. And it was they who, when others forsook the profession of the truth upon the approach of persecution, testified with constancy in the midst of the flames.

The ordeals through which French Protestantism was called to pass during the reign of Francis it does not comport with Mr. White's plan to exhibit in detail. He gives, however, a somewhat extended notice of the savage butchery exercised upon the unoffending Waldenses or Vaudois of Provence, an offshoot of the community established in the "Valleys" of Piedmont. Mérindol, Cabrières, and a score of less important places were, by order of the sanguinary Parliament of Aix razed to the ground, their inhabitants, without discrimination of age or sex, slaughtered or burned in their homes, or hunted to the mountains, only to be suffocated in the caverns in which

* White, pp. 6-7.

they had taken refuge. No contemporary writer was sufficiently bold even to palliate these enormities and others which the pen scarcely dares to record. That honor—if such it be—was reserved for one of that class of persons, too numerous, unfortunately, in France, who rewrite history to suit their preconceived ideas. On this point Mr. White's observations are excellent. "A Catholic historian of these days has ventured to apologize for cruelties which could find no defender in the sixteenth century. 'Certain names,' he says, 'are branded for what is the result of a popular force and movement by which they are carried away. In a religious and believing state of society there are necessities, as there have been cruel political necessities at another epoch. Exaltation of ideas drives men to crime as by a fatality.' (*Capefigue, Hist. de la Réforme*, ch. xvi.) Such reasoning will justify any crime, public or private. To admit the cowardly doctrine of 'necessity' is to destroy moral responsibility, to make intellect subservient to matter, and justice to brute force. It makes the usurper or the murderer accuser, judge, and executioner in his own cause. It is a vindication of *coups d'état*—a deification of successful villainy. If generally admitted it would induce a moral torpor fatal to all intelligence. There were men living in the Catholic communion in the sixteenth century who thought very differently from the paradoxical historian of the nineteenth. Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras—a man so full of kindness and charity that a modern writer has called him the 'Fénélon of his age'—interfered to suspend the execution of the first decree against the Vaudois of Mérindol." *

The leader in the massacre of Mérindol and Cabrières was Jean d'Oppède, first President of the Parliament of Provence; the most prominent military officer of the force which executed his commands was Poulin or Polin, better known as Baron de la Garde. Respecting the latter, Mr. White says that he was "the famous sea-captain, the same who disputed the command of the Channel against Henry VIII., and occupied the Isle of Wight in 1533. In the religious wars *he sided with the Huguenots.*" † Unless, as we suspect, the types have played him false, Mr. White must have confounded Poulin with some one else; for if the Baron sided with any one it was assuredly not

* White, pp. 14, 15.

† *Ibid.*, p. 14.

with the Huguenots, but with their opponents. After the conspiracy of Amboise he fought against the Huguenots in Provence, where he attacked Mouvans after he had capitulated with the royal Lieutenant, the Comte de Tende, and drove him to Geneva.* In the third civil war, being in command of naval forces, he protected Bordeaux and threatened La Rochelle; † and after the St. Bartholomew Massacre, a letter of his intercepted by the Protestants of this city, in which he uttered menaces against it, contributed much to determine them to refuse admission to the Governor sent them by the King. ‡

With the accession of a new monarch, it was hoped that there might come some alleviation of the sufferings of the reformers. The reverse took place. Like too many of the other kings of France, Henry II. was not only frivolous, but dissolute. Like them, he was content to attempt to compensate for his vices by persecuting the luckless heretics with an orthodox severity which prelates were quite satisfied to accept as a full discharge of all liabilities incurred through violations of the moral code. Besides, if Henry ostensibly held the reins of state, the regal authority was in effect enjoyed by others—his mistress, Diana of Poitiers, and his favorites, the Chancellor Montmorency and the Guises—and these were all from interest, if not from conviction, the enemies of change. Accordingly new and more rigorous edicts were launched against the "Lutherans," as they were still styled. Nor were these enactments suffered to fall into neglect. "On Thursday, July 4, Henry quitted the Tournelles"—his favorite palace, but since forsaken and torn down by his widow, Catharine de Médici, after it had acquired so melancholy an association from his fatal tilt in the tournament held in front of it—"at seven in the morning, and rode in grand procession to the great cathedral, where he heard high mass, and then went to dine at the episcopal palace, after which the royal digestion was gently stimulated by the burning of some heretics. . . . Heretic-burning was one of the popular sports of the day, at which—if contemporary engravings are any authority in such matters—high-born dames attended in full dress."§ But when will rulers learn the universal truth, that no persecution short of extermination ever

* Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Hist. Univ.*, vol. i, p. 100.

† *Ibid.*, p. 326.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 35.

§ White, p. 30.

accomplishes its design! The Protestant community, which had grown slowly during the father's reign, under the more severe rule of the son received large accessions, and began to strike its roots deep into the soil which alone could secure it permanence—the despised people:

Extending beyond the small circle of nobles, scholars, and Church dignitaries, by whom they (the reformed doctrines) were first taught and defended, and making their way into the lower strata of society, they had become more definite and radical. The uneducated shoemaker or plowman could not appreciate such nice distinctions as Margaret of Valois drew in her "Mass of Seven Points," and would not have cared for such subtleties if he had understood them. These simple men heard the Bible read and explained to them, and the doctrines of free grace and of the atonement sank straight into their hearts. There was very little but habit to keep the people faithful to the old Church. "They are more affected," says Matthieu, unconsciously imitating Horace, "by example than by instruction, and estimate the truth of a doctrine by the purity of a man's life." Such an example was rarely found in the Catholic clergy. . . . The cities along the course of the Rhone, and those lying at the foot of the Alps, were strongly Calvinistic, as was also Languedoc, where probably some relics of the old Albigensian spirit of revolt still lingered. In this province the Romish Church was especially hateful, as it had been enriched by the confiscated estates of the Albigensian nobles. . . . In Paris the mass of the population was Catholic, the dangerous classes being especially demonstrative in their orthodoxy. The progress of religious reform might have been more rapid but for certain peculiarities in the state of society, which made every innovation difficult. The guilds in the towns had their patron saints and annual festivals. If a man adopted the reformed faith he must renounce these, and become a sort of outcast among his comrades, and perhaps the severest persecution he had to undergo was that he endured at the hands of his fellow-workmen.*

Mr. White is undoubtedly correct in making the statement that "although the persecution never ceased in France during the reign of Henry II., there were intervals of reaction when the fires burned dim and the sword of the executioner hung idle on the wall." It is equally true that "these were usually connected with the foreign policy of the Government." But he is less fortunate in supposing that there was any such tendency to pardon, or even to reprove, the Huguenots in connection with the atrocious episode of Henry's rule, known as the

* White, pp. 31, 32.

"*affaire de la Rue Saint Jacques.*" A few words are necessary to elucidate this historical point. A company of three or four hundred Protestants, in defiance of the edicts fulminated against them for an entire generation, and not ignorant of the fearful death by fire (not at the stake, but by means of the more cruel *estrapade*) awaiting them if discovered, met on the night of September 4th, 1557, in a private house in the Rue St. Jacques, immediately in the rear of the College of the Sorbonne, to worship God and to celebrate the holy communion. But the suspicions of the neighboring priests had been aroused, the house was beset, and although some of the worshipers made their way through the crowd of their assailants and escaped, the more defenseless portion of the Protestants—the women, and the aged especially—were captured, and to the number of about one hundred and twenty, after being treated with the utmost contumely, were thrust into loathsome dungeons. This was but a prelude to greater severities. Several of the men, and particularly a noble lady, were to seal their testimony in blood.

Here Mr. White has accidentally been misled into imagining that the execution of these martyrs for the faith was *unaccountably delayed*; whereas, on the contrary, *rarely had there been an instance of greater precipitation!* Mr. White says:

The Reformed Church of Paris was in a pitiable state, so many of its members being in peril of their lives. Extraordinary prayers were offered up in every family for the delivery of the martyrs, and a remonstrance, drawn up by the Elders, was presented to the King, who put it aside unnoticed. *But, strange to say, there was no eager haste to punish the prisoners any further, the example of their seizure having frightened many back to orthodoxy. . . . When the excitement had abated, and the affair was almost forgotten, the prisoners of the Rue St. Jacques were brought to trial. Their lives were forfeited by the mere fact of their presence at an unlawful assembly, and the alternate of recantation or death was presented to them; but they would not yield an inch. They found that man's weakness was God's strength. Among the captives was Philippa de Lunz, a woman of good family, a widow, and only twenty-two years old. She was interrogated several times, but her answers were such as to destroy all hope of pardon. On the 27th of September, 1558, more than a year after her imprisonment, she was led out to death.**

* White, pp. 41, 42.

It is not necessary to repeat the story of the more than heroic courage which this noble woman displayed, and by which she seemed to triumph over every refinement of cruelty which the perverted ingenuity of man could devise. Mr. White has very faithfully drawn the harrowing picture. The important point to which we call attention—important as showing that the French court, so far from being lukewarm in the work of persecution, as Mr. White supposes, was in reality (whether its motives were political or fanatical need not here be discussed) extremely zealous—is, that this martyr and her companions, instead of being imprisoned for the long term of a year, were tried, condemned, and executed *within the brief space of about three weeks*. Mr. White has given the *day* correctly, but has unfortunately overlooked the true *year*, which was 1557, *not* 1558.* The author of the history of the Reformed Churches, commonly attributed to Beza, instead of representing the case as dragging along slowly, informs us that the popular voice demanded a speedy trial; that the prosecuting officer was more than usually urgent, hoping by his zeal to divert attention from his own past crimes; that on the 17th of September, less than a fortnight after the meeting in the Rue St. Jacques, the King ordered Parliament to try the accused by commissioners, whom he at the same time named; and that he commanded the postponement of all other judicial proceedings that these might have dispatch.† The fruits of this pressure were seen before long. Three suffered martyrdom September 27, two more October 2. Objection being made to the judges because of their cruelty, and a demand offered for other judges, the King overruled the appeal October 7, and the remaining cases proceeded with still greater haste. So far was the court of Henry II. from being lukewarm in the prosecution of those accused of heresy.

The affair of the Rue St. Jacques occurred just after the disastrous rout of the French army near St. Quentin, which Prescott has so well described in the "History of Philip the Second." After a year and eight months more of warfare the contending monarchs and their allies made a settlement of their differences in the peace of Câteau Cambresis. With the

* See the *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, (Beza,) ed. of Lille, vol. i, p. 80, etc.

† *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, *ubi supra*.

general terms of the treaty, so disgraceful to France, the historian of the Huguenots has nothing to do. There can be no doubt that both monarchs were influenced not only by the exhaustion of their pecuniary resources for carrying on the war, but by a desire to attend to the extermination of Protestantism at home. Mr. White goes further, and asserts that "by the treaty of Câteau Cambresis Henry and Philip *had bound themselves to maintain* the Catholic worship inviolate, to assemble a general council, and to *extinguish heresy in their respective dominions.*" If this agreement, of which the younger Tavannes and others make mention, writing in accordance with the current reports rather than basing their statements on any authoritative documents, existed at all, it must have been contained in secret articles, for the public terms, as given by Du Mont and other collections of treaties, contain nothing of the kind. Professor Soldan has exhibited with great force his grounds for not believing the compact, and we do not see that Mr. White adduces any reasons for supposing that the conferences ever assumed so definite a shape. Certainly the Apology of William of Orange, while proving that Philip had already conceived in his mind, and communicated to Henry, the design of introducing the Spanish Inquisition into the Netherlands, is far from asserting that such international obligations had been entered into. However this may be, there is the utmost improbability in the supposition that there was a connection between the treaty and the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Yet this is what Mr. White seems to imply when he speaks of the "knowledge of this projected massacre, delayed for thirteen years," as converting the Silent Prince into the liberator of the Netherlands.* The idea is, however, so diametrically opposed to Mr. White's own theory of the origin of the horrible scheme of 1572 that we are at a loss to know how to understand his words. The manuscript relations, by Philip's own ministers, of the proceedings at the Conference of Bayonne in 1565, as we may see hereafter, have blown to the winds the stories that were so confidently believed, both by Roman Catholics and by Protestants, that the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was planned there by Alva and Catharine. It could not possibly have been sketched out six years earlier.

* White, p. 53.

Without doubt, however, Henry II. had determined on employing the most extreme measures to secure the utter destruction of the Protestants. His arbitrary arrest of members of the Parisian Parliament, for simply expressing themselves in favor of a tolerant policy, when deliberating in his presence in a judicial capacity, amply proves it. With good reason, therefore, the reformers saw in the extraordinary and opportune death of Henry an interposition of Heaven in their behalf, even more signal than had appeared in that of the first Francis. Mr. White has described the incidents of the fatal tournament in a picturesque manner, putting to good service the correspondence of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, who tells us that he was the only one of the foreign ambassadors that chanced to be present on the remarkable occasion.* The English envoy, writing the very evening of the disaster, and before its full peril was apprehended, could not but be struck with its providential character. "Thus your lordships may see," said he, "what God sumtymes dothe to shew what he is, and to be knowne; that amongst all these triumphes, and even in the verry middst and pride of the same, suffereth such mischaunce and heavines to happen."

The accession of Francis II., a puny boy of sixteen, brought into power the uncles of his blooming and much more intellectual queen, Mary Stuart. Never was power more boldly seized, or more recklessly wielded, than by the Guise brothers. For some months there was a reign of usurpation for which there are few parallels in the annals of modern Europe. The two older Guises absorbed the entire administration. The Duke Francis installed himself as generalissimo; his brother the Cardinal of Lorraine, assumed charge of the treasury, and in fact of the whole engine of civil government. All this by pretended appointment of a minor prince. The scheme would probably have failed, had the claim to the regency fallen to the portion of a less frivolous and untrustworthy person than Antoine of Bourbon Vendôme, by marriage King of Navarre. But this unworthy husband of the heroic Jeanne d'Albret, had too little resolution to keep the promises he lavishly made to the Protestants, with whom he had pretended

* Forbes' Full View of the Public Transactions in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, (London, 1740,) vol. i, p. 151.

identify himself, and was too craven even to resent the studied indignities put upon him when he came sluggishly from Gascony and made his tardy appearance at court. As first prince of the blood, he was entitled to the foremost place in the board of regency; in fact, to be sole regent, although with a board of counselors to assist him in his functions. The only crumb of power which the ruling family deigned to throw him was the privilege of a seat in the royal council, where he had no influence whatever. Mr. White overstates the amount of this concession. Constable Montmorency and the Châtillons, and other leading Protestants, had not urged him "to assert his rights as prince of the blood to be one of the new council," but to demand the very first position until Francis II. should attain his majority. Hence Mr. White is mistaken when he seems to assert that Antoine of Navarre obtained for a time what he was entitled to demand. "At length Condé joined him, and instilling some of his own spirit into his brother, urged him to assert his claim. *It was granted after some little demur*; but he was too much in the way, and to get rid of him honorably he was commissioned to escort the Princess Elizabeth to Spain. He fell into the trap so cunningly laid for him, and the Guises were *once more* solé masters."* One need go no further than to the invaluable history of Francis the Second's reign, by Regnier de la Planche,† to see that the Guises never for a moment conceded to the King of Navarre the authority which, in defense of the usages of the kingdom and of his persecuted fellow-Protestants, he might justly have demanded at the point of the sword.

Under such a government persecution went on apace. The most distinguished victim was Du Bourg, one of the members of Parliament whom the late King had arrested. His speeches just before being led to execution, of which we could wish that Mr. White had given longer extracts,‡ are among the most pathetic on record, and breathe the very spirit of Christian manliness. During the course of his trial, Minard, one of his judges, was murdered by night in the streets of Paris. The

* White, p. 72.

† Histoire de l'Etat de France, etc. Edition Panthéon, pp. 214, 218.

‡ See La Place, Commentaries, etc., pp. 22, 23; Crespin, Galerie chrét., pp. 2, 3, 18, etc.; La Planche, pp. 227, 235; Histoire Ecclésiastique, pp. 1, 153, etc.

crime was attributed by common fame to a Scot by the name of Stuart, a blood relation, apparently, of the Queen. Mr. White does not hesitate to adopt the popular belief as his own, and to incorporate it in his history; and, with equal certainty, he pronounced him guilty of having fatally shot Constable Montmorency in the battle of St. Denis, in the second civil war, November 10, 1567.* But neither statement is capable of being proved. When Henry of Navarre, at a later time Henry IV., wrote to the Duke of Anjou, soon after the battle of Jarnac, where Stuart, having surrendered on promise of having his life spared, was killed in cold blood, probably by the Duke's secret orders, the prince reproached him with the barbarous deed; and, as to the assassination of Minard, adduced the fact that Stuart had been examined by torture, but nothing had been extracted from him, and that he had lived six years subsequently at court without even being subjected to trial, as a proof of his innocence. Whether he slew the Constable or not, Henry professed entire ignorance, but maintained that if he did it was in honorable combat. †

The usurpation of the Guises at length became insufferable, but there was no legal redress. No constitution laid down methods of consulting the popular will, and of giving it the force of law. A revolt of some kind or other was inevitable. "In these humaner and more civilized days, obnoxious ministers and administrators are got rid of by dismissal, or by a vote in Parliament: in ruder times they were removed by revolt or assassination. *In the middle of the sixteenth century the government of France was a despotism moderated by the dagger.*" The Huguenots—for so they began about this time to be called—were of two kinds. The one class was composed of persons exasperated almost beyond endurance by the unconstitutional power assumed by the Guises, whom they still regarded as strangers in France. The other consisted of the Protestants, who, however patiently they might bear the persecution from which they had for nearly forty years been suffering, so long as it was inflicted by command of their legitimate monarch, would not suffer themselves to be hung or

* White, pp. 74, 84.

† Letter of July 12, 1569, *apud* "Lettres inédites de Henry IV., recueillies par le Prince Augustin Galitzin, pp. 4-11. Paris: 1860.

burned merely to gratify the whims or the ambition of the two brothers who really reigned in the name of their niece's husband. "Even within a month of the death of Henry II. a union of the malcontents was meditated, the Reformed only holding back until they should be assured of its lawfulness. They consulted Calvin, who declared that 'it would be better they should all perish a hundred times over rather than expose the name of Christianity and of the Gospel to the disgrace of rebellion and bloodshed.' They were more successful with some German divines, who thought 'they might lawfully oppose the usurpation of the Guises, even with arms, if the princes of the blood, their lawful magistrates by birth, or even one of them, should be at their head.' " *

And now the outbreak followed. The spirit of dissatisfaction came to a head in the unfortunate "Conspiracy of Amboise;" unfortunate, not that it was not perfectly justifiable in view of the enormities of the persons that had seized the reins of State, but because it afforded the enemy the excuse he wanted for accusing the adherents of the purer faith of insubordination to constituted authority, and for throwing upon them the blame of being the first to have recourse to civil war. Probably it was much the smaller part of the Huguenots that knew of the plot, or took part in it. Its bold plan, the reasons of its failure, the fear and confusion of the Guises at the first discovery, their considerable concessions, and the barbarous punishments they inflicted upon the conspirators that fell into their hands, are a fruitful theme of discussion for contemporary chroniclers, and are unfolded at considerable length by Mr. White. And he calls attention to the circumstance that the first pardon, hypocritical as it was, offered to the Huguenots that had taken part in the affair of Amboise met with uncompromising hostility on the part of Rome. "The Pope sent a special envoy to France complaining of the amnesty, and to point out that 'the true remedy for the disorders of the kingdom was to proceed judicially against the heretics, and if their number was too great, the King should employ the sword to bring his subjects back to their duty.' He offered to assist in so good a work to the extent of his ability, and to procure the support of the King of Spain and the Princes of Italy. †

* White, pp. 77.

† Ibid., pp. 85, 86.

Happily the reign of Francis II. was brief—briefer, in fact, than any other in the tables of French kings. Its conclusion found the Protestants in great peril; Condé, their real head, a prisoner under sentence of death, and reserved for execution at the opening of the approaching States General; and Navarre exposed to almost equal danger should he attempt to show any manly resentment. Whereas, a few months before, any one that proposed the convocation of the States would have been punished as seditious, now the Guises had themselves adopted the proposition of Coligny at the Assembly of Notables, held at Fontainebleau, and consented to the summons of the three orders. Not that they had any intention of submitting an account of their administration to the representatives of the nobility, clergy, and commons; but they counted upon controlling a large majority of the elections of delegates, and expected to secure without difficulty so preponderating an influence as to insure the formal indorsement of their conduct and the destruction of their antagonists. After the heads of the Huguenots had been disposed of they imagined that it would be easy to compass the ruin of the masses.* The death of Francis II., almost as sudden as that of his father, although resulting from a natural cause, disarranged these well-matured plans.

One of the most readable chapters in Mr. White's book is that which treats of "France at the accession of Charles IX.," (1560.) Within the compass of thirty-two or three pages he has succeeded in giving us an attractive and intelligent account of the country and its inhabitants. France was a sparsely-peopled country containing about fifteen million souls—a large estimate in our opinion—and of this population nearly one third lived in towns. The roads were bad, and all means of communication so slow and costly as to paralyze commerce, and produce the most striking inequalities in prices in districts not very far distant from each other. Paris, the marvel of Europe, contained between four and five hundred thousand inhabitants. The people—the *tiers-état*—were ground down with oppressive taxes, far more burdensome in proportion than

* Even the Spanish ambassador, favorable as he was to all measures of repression, expressed solicitude lest the Guises, in their reckless haste, should run too great risks by their indiscretion.—*Mignet, in Journal des Savants, 1859, pp. 39.*

those of modern France even under the second empire. The nobles were exempt on the plea of being subject to do military service, the clergy because of their sacerdotal office ; although both classes, and particularly the latter, in return for the regal protection, were wont to make voluntary contributions. The government was harsh and tyrannical, the punishment of crime severe and often horribly barbarous, the populace cruel and superstitious. We shall not, however, undertake to give even a synopsis of the contents of this interesting disquisition.

The reign of Charles IX. opens with the Convocation of the States General ordered by his brother, and with brilliant anticipations on the part of the reformers respecting the rapid spread of the Gospel until it should become universal throughout the kingdom. It is hard to say what might have been had the King of Navarre proved courageous and true to his convictions. But he first basely surrendered to Catharine the position of influence he might easily have maintained, and then openly apostatized from the faith. Still the reformed doctrines, practically, if not legally, enjoying a measure of toleration, spread from town to town, from family to family, with the speed of contagion. Within a few months there were those who, misled by this rapid growth, were confident that half France was already Huguenot, and the Spanish and Pontifical envoys wrote home letters full of vaticinations of the approaching downfall of the State. The very court of the King and his mother appeared to share in the common movement. Marot's and Beza's versified Psalms of David, which, if sung in the streets a few months since, would have sufficed as ground for a capital accusation, were boldly sung in the halls and corridors of the palace. Soon Huguenot ministers, whom unrepealed edicts consigned to the flames, were to be seen preaching openly to listening crowds in the quarters of the Queen of Navarre or of Admiral Coligny. Catharine de Medici was deaf to the warnings and threats of the Pope, his nuncio, and his legates. She had conceived the idea that it was possible, by some partial reformation, to accommodate the differences between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics ; and, accordingly, she assembled at Poissy, in September, 1561, a large number of divines of both persuasions, between whom she hoped that some accord might be framed. This

“Colloquy of Poissy,” as it was called, in order to avoid the suspicions which the use of the term “Council” might give rise to, was a moment of the greatest interest and of critical importance to the future of France.* A reformation accomplished and harmony secured might have saved France the sufferings and the bloodshed of thirty years, not to speak of the vast difference in the moral history of the land. But the Romish clergy was in no temper for concession. There is in Montfaçon’s *Antiquities of France* a copy of an ancient print of the period, representing the Colloquy in session. The disposition of the parties sufficiently reveals the attitude which the Roman Catholic Church meant to assume to the Reformers. Six chairs of state stand toward the upper end of the spacious conventual dining-room, one occupied by the King, having on his right the Duke of Anjou and the King of Navarre, and on the left his mother, his sister Margaret, and the Queen of Navarre. Behind them are seated other princes and princesses of the blood. The Chancellor, the Cardinals, the Prelates and Doctors of the Romish Church occupy benches on either side, corresponding to their dignities. But the Protestant Divines, twelve in number, are merely admitted to the lower end of the room, and stand leaning on the railing that bars their further advance. The chief spokesman of the Reformers, it is well known, was Theodore Beza. “Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, and other ministers were invited, under safe conduct, from Switzerland,” says Mr. White.† The very natural inquiry, why the first mentioned, the acknowledged leader of the Genevese theologians, did not make his appearance and assume the position in the conference to which his eminent intellectual abilities, his dialectic skill, and his wide spread reputation entitled him, Mr. White does not undertake to answer. Mr. Bonnet, in his “*Lettres Françaises de Jean Calvin*,” merely informs us that “the Protestant princes of France, eager to attract to the Colloquy of Poissy the most distinguished ministers, wrote to the Lords of Geneva, asking them to send Calvin or Theodore Beza. The Seigneurie refused the former, and consented to grant the latter.” Informed of this favor-

* Mr. White has scarcely given sufficient space (pp. 167-172) to a transaction of such vital relation to the subsequent fortunes of the Huguenots.

† Page 167.

able disposition, the King of Navarre wrote to the Genevese magistrates to thank them and to hasten Beza's departure.* Fortunately, by the aid of a letter in the public library of Geneva that has recently come to light, we are able to explain the motives of a course which, at first sight, appears somewhat strange. It was no excess of caution, but a proper regard for the reformer's safety, that led the Syndics and Council of Geneva to exercise a right which, according to the theory almost universally held in the sixteenth century, they possessed, to decline to permit their pastors and theological professors to leave their territory. The letter is one written by M. de la Rivière, in the name of the entire body of Reformed ministers of Paris, or perhaps of France, to Calvin himself. The date is July 31st, 1561. The Colloquy, it is well known, opened on the 9th of September. After praising God that, even beyond their hopes, the venerable Peter Martyr was to be sent to support Beza in the discussion with the Romish Doctors, the writer adds :

As to yourself, sir, as we have not yet seen much prospect of being able to have you here, so we see no possibility of your being here without serious peril, in view of the rage which all the enemies of the Gospel have conceived against you, and the disturbances which your very name would excite in this country were your presence known. In fact, the Admiral (Coligny) is by no means in favor of your undertaking the journey, and we have learned with certainty that the Queen (Catharine de Medici) would not either be glad to see you, and that she frankly admits that she is unwilling to pledge herself for your safety in these parts, as for that of the rest. The enemies of the Gospel, on the other hand, say that they would willingly hear all the others speak, but that as to you they could not bring themselves to listen to you nor to see you. This, sir, is the estimation in which you are held by these venerable Prelates. I opine that you will not be very much troubled by it, and that you will not consider yourself dishonored for being in such repute with this sort of people. In respect to the others, we are constrained to beg you anew to entreat them to set out with the greatest diligence possible on receipt of the safe-conduct which we send you. In our judgment it will be easy to come hither without being much recognized. Moreover, on arriving here we can assure you that we shall be able to find three or four hundred gentlemen, if they are needed, to keep them company. And yet we have no thought that there will be any necessity for so large a force, seeing that there is no prospect that any of the princes or lords of this kingdom will undertake any thing in violation of the permission and

* Bonnet, *Lettres Françaises*, vol. ii, p. 424.

safe-conduct given by the King and decided upon in his Council.*

So Calvin remained at Geneva, and Theodore Beza went to the French court, to make the first defense of the Reformed doctrines and their professors which the ears of French monarchs had ever been open to hear. And so noble was his appearance, so courtly his bearing, so polished his manners, that he produced from the very first the most favorable impression. Even the Guises affected to greet him in a correspondingly polite manner. The Cardinal went further, and, in the course of a friendly discussion, made such professions of a desire for conciliation, and took such almost Protestant ground, that one who knew not that his affable exterior covered a treacherous heart might have supposed him on the point of conversion. Beza had traced his course too long to be deceived, and there were others who were equally astute. After Beza had explained his view of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Cardinal, turning to the Queen mother, who was present, observed, "Such is my belief, madam, and I am satisfied." † Madame de Crussol, who had listened to the entire conversation, as she shook the Cardinal's hand at the close of the evening significantly said, in a tone loud enough to be heard by all, "Good man for to-night; but to-morrow what?" There was sober truth couched in the witty question. The next day Lorraine was already busy, circulating the story that Beza had been signally discomfited in the very first encounter. ‡ But there were happily plenty of witnesses to prove the contrary, and Catharine herself contradicted the vain rumor when she heard it from Constable Montmorency's lips. §

With so deceitful an opponent it was impossible to expect fair play, even had the Prelates been willing to listen patiently to an honorable discussion. || The Cardinal's sole object, as it

* Original MS. in Library of Geneva, Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, 16,603. (December, 1867.)

† White, p. 68.

‡ Letter of Beza, August 25th, 1561, *apud* Baum, Theodore Beza, 2 App. 52. Mr. White does not mention the latter circumstances.

§ Hist. Ecclés, vol. i, p. 312.

|| "Here come the Genevese curs," exclaimed one of the Cardinals when the twelve Protestant divines made their first appearance in the refectory at Poissy. "Certainly," quietly retorted Beza, whose ear had caught the insulting expression,

developed itself shortly, was to involve the Protestants in disputes with each other. He went so far, at one time, as to demand of the Reformed pastors a subscription to the Confession of Augsburg. To which their orator pertinently replied, by asking whether the Cardinal was himself prepared to give that Confession his unqualified approval.

So the Colloquy came to an end without effecting any thing, perhaps, with the government, except proving pretty conclusively that it was hopeless to attempt to reconcile such divergent views as those of the hierarchy and those of the reformers. As a last trial of the virtue of theological discussion, Catharine assembled at St. Germain, a few months later, a more quiet gathering. But the results were equally unsatisfactory. One point, however, had been demonstrated conclusively in the minds of all prudent men, that the only mode of preventing the outbreak of civil war in France was to grant some measure of religious liberty to the reformers. And this measure was carried, in a body of representatives of the three orders, and formally promulgated in the celebrated royal edict of January 17th, 1562. Incomplete and unsatisfactory as it was, the "Edict of January," as it was henceforth known, became the charter of Protestant liberties, continually infringed upon by the kings, under the influence of their opponents, but continually demanded and vindicated by argument, and, when need be, by the sword.

The Guises, however, had no thought of submitting passively to the execution of so tolerant a law. They were resolved to destroy the edict with the sword. It matters little in the eye of the impartial judge of their conduct whether the massacre at Vassy, (March 1st, 1562,) within six weeks of the promulgation of that edict, was long premeditated, or an accidental occurrence, as they and their advocates maintained. The crusade against Protestantism in France was premeditated, whether the act with which it was to be commenced had been included in the plan or not. It is idle seriously to discuss the problem whether the conspirators who had laid the explosive train intended to fire it at one point or another.

turning to the quarter whence it came, "*faithful dogs are needed in the Lord's sheepfold to bark at ravening wolves.*"—*Fragmentary MS. in the Collection of the late Col. Henri Tronchin, Baum, vol. ii, p. 238.*

Their guilt is not affected by a mere prudential question. They thought it best, however, to prevent the German Protestants from lending assistance in the coming contest to their French brethren. And Cardinal Charles of Lorraine believed that he had discovered a capital method of accomplishing this. He would sow discord between the two by persuading the German princes that the Huguenots were in no sense their brethren in the faith, while he and his brothers were really perfectly in accord with the Lutherans on every essential point. And so early in the February that intervened between the promulgation of the edict and the affair of Vassy four Guise brothers began their pilgrimage to the borders of Germany—Duke Francis, Cardinal Charles of Lorraine, Cardinal John of Guise,* and the Grand Prior of the Knights of St. John. In the little town of Saverne, in Alsace, not far from Strasbourg, they met Duke Christopher of Wurtemberg, who came, as they had invited him to come, accompanied by two of his theologians, Brentius and Andrea. An interview of several days' duration ensued, in which the Guises surpassed every previous effort of their own in dissimulation. "The Cardinal of Lorraine," says Mr. White, "twice preached sermons so Lutheran in spirit that his open adoption of the Confession of Augsburg was eagerly looked for; and the language of the Duke of Guise and his brother Charles in their conferences with Duke Christopher and his chancellor, Brentz, is so extraordinary, and, as regards Duke Francis, so unlike what we read of him at other times, as almost to shake our faith in the genuineness of the report of the conference." †

We should not be surprised at Mr. White's partial skepticism were it not that there is, as we shall see, no doubt whatever that the transaction is faithfully related. The acting was certainly clumsy, and the disguises too flimsy to answer their ends. Soon after they met, the Duke of Guise held a long conversation with the Duke of Wurtemberg, in which he endeavored to persuade him that the unhappy situation of France

* There has arisen considerable confusion in the histories from the circumstance that two of the brothers were Cardinals. It was John, not Charles, who was present with the Duke at Vassy. He died in 1578, at the early age of forty-eight, yet the last of the six brothers. From his convivial habits, l'Estoile tells us, he had earned the cognomen of "le Cardinal des Bouteilles." *Memoirs*, p. 96.

† White, 186.

resulted in great part from the position of the Huguenot ministers, whose unconciliatory demeanor had rendered abortive the Colloquy of Poissy. Wurtemberg did not suffer the calumny to pass unchallenged, for he replied that the very accounts of the Colloquy sent him by Guise proved that the unsuccessful issue was due to the Prelates, who had come determined to prevent any accord. He ascribed the misfortunes of France rather to the persecutions which had been exercised on so many guiltless persons. "I cannot refrain from telling you," he added, "that you and your brother are strongly suspected in Germany of having contributed to cause the death, since the decease of Henry II., and even before, in his lifetime, of several thousands of persons, who have been miserably executed on account of their faith. As a friend, and as a Christian, I must warn you. Beware, beware of innocent blood! Otherwise the punishments of God will fall upon you in this life and in the next." "He answered me," writes Duke Christopher himself, "*with great sighs*, 'I know that my brother and I are accused of that, and of many other things too; but *we are wronged*, as we shall both of us explain to you before we leave.'" The Cardinal's profession of faith, especially on the matter of the presence in the sacrament, was equally politic. He acknowledged that his party went too far in calling the mass a sacrifice for the living and the dead. The mass was not a sacrifice, but a *commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the altar of the cross*, (non sacrificium, sed memoria sacrificii præstiti in ara crucis.) With a solemn appeal to God, he declared that he heartily approved of the Augsburg Confession. "But," said he, "*I am compelled still to dissemble for a time*, that I may gain some that are feeble in the faith." A little later he adverted to Wurtemberg's remarks to Guise, and said, "You informed my brother that in Germany we are both of us suspected of having contributed to the execution of a large number of innocent Christians during the reigns of Henry and of Francis II. Well, I swear to you, in the name of God, my Creator, and pledging the salvation of my soul, *that I am guilty of the death of no man condemned for religion's sake*. Those who were then privy to the deliberations of state can testify in my favor." Likewise protested the Duke of Guise, "with great oaths." After such

fair assurances respecting the past, it is not astonishing that when Wurtemberg repeated his warning in relation to the future both the Cardinal and the Duke gave him their right hands, and pledged their princely faith and the salvation of their souls that, neither openly nor secretly, would they persecute the partisans of the "new doctrines." Nor is it strange that when Christopher of Wurtemberg came to read over his memorandum of the conference with the Lorraine brothers, in the light of the events that transpired only about a fortnight later, he added to his manuscript this brief comment: "Alas! it can now be seen how they have kept these promises. *Deus sit ultor doli et perjurii, cujus namque res agitur!*"

Notwithstanding the remarkable character of the professions and assurances made by the Guises, there is, as we have already said, no reasonable ground for even that amount of uncertainty respecting the authenticity of the document containing them which Mr. White expresses. The manuscript account drawn up by the Duke of Wurtemberg himself was discovered by Sattler, and printed in his "Geschichte von Wurtemberg unter den Herzögen." It has been translated into French, and published in the "Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme François," (1856, vol. iv, pp. 184-196.) If, in spite of Sattler's authority, the document be suspected of being a forgery, the following circumstances will, we presume, dissipate that suspicion. This was by no means the first time that the Cardinal of Lorraine, although notoriously the leader of the persecutions in France for many years, had the effrontery to pretend that he was an advocate of toleration; and this even with those who knew him better than did Christopher of Wurtemberg, and who saw at a glance through his paltry lying. As early as September 10, 1559, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton wrote to Queen Elizabeth from the French court, "I am informed that they here have begun to persecute again for religion more than ever they did; and that at Paris there are three or four executed for the same, and divers great personages threatened shortly to be called to answer for their religion. Wherein the Cardinal of Lorraine having bene spoken unto, within these two daies, hath said, that it is *not his faulte*; and that there is no man that more hateth extremities then (than) he dothe; and yet it is knowne, that it is, notwith-

standing, *altogether by his occasion.*"* A few months later, in February 1560, the same prelate indulged in a strain of similar hypocrisy in conversation with the ambassador himself, much to the good knight's disgust. He declared himself in favor of a general council, and spoke with satisfaction of an edict just dispatched by Francis and Mary to Scotland, "to surcease the punishment of men for religion." "And of this purpose," adds Throkmorton with pardonable sarcasm, "he made such an oration as it were long to write, *even as though he had bene hired by the Protestants to defend their cause earnestly!*" † Not only, however, does the course of the Cardinal of Lorraine in previous years show that such immoderate dissimulation as he is said to have exhibited at Saverne was not foreign to his character, but fortunately there is a well-known letter, written by Christopher of Wurtemberg, which furnishes irrefragable proof of the authenticity and credibility of the report of the conference. After the massacre of Vassy the Duke of Wurtemberg wrote to the Duke of Guise a long letter which has come down to us. In this he reminds him of the advice he had given him, and of the asseverations he had received in return. A single sentence will suffice to put the matter beyond controversy. "You know also," he says, "with what assurance *you answered me that great injustice was done you, in that the attempt was made to represent you as the cause and author of the death of so many poor Christians who have heretofore shed their blood,*" etc., (*que l'on vous faisoit grand tort de ce que l'on vous vouloit imposer estre cause et authour de la mort de tant de povres Chrestiens,* etc.) ‡

In conclusion, we must say that Mr. White's book, although written principally with the design of elucidating the events immediately preceding the catastrophe of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and of exhibiting in their true relation the successive acts of that remarkable tragedy, furnishes a very readable, satisfactory, and trustworthy account of the early history of the Protestants of France. We may hereafter take occasion to examine the main portion of his interesting work, and the views it presents of the premeditation of the *conspiracy* of the "bloody nuptials."

* Forbes' Full View, vol. i, p. 226.

† Forbes, vol. i, p. 337.

‡ Mémoires de Guise, (Michaud,) p. 494.