

2343

98-6

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*From the Author*

REPLY

TO

DR. LINGARD'S VINDICATION.

**REPLY**

TO

**DR. LINGARD'S VINDICATION:**

IN A

**LETTER**

TO

**FRANCIS JEFFRAY, Esq.**

FROM

**JOHN ALLEN.**

---

“HE THAT IS FIRST IN HIS OWN CAUSE SEEMETH JUST; BUT HIS  
NEIGHBOUR COMETH AND SEARCHETH HIM.”—*Prov.* xviii. 17.

---

LONDON:

JAMES RIDGWAY, PICCADILLY.

1827.

LONDON:

J. MOVES, TOOK'S COURT, CHANCERY LANE.

## LETTER

TO

FRANCIS JEFFRAY, Esq.

You will probably be surprised at receiving a letter from me in print. A short statement will explain my reasons. I have never made a secret of my being the author of the two articles in the Edinburgh Review on Dr. Lingard's History of England. Indeed, I have reason to believe the fact not unknown to that gentleman. But, forced by his late publication to enter into a controversy with him, I think it right to drop even the thin veil I have hitherto worn, and in my reply to his Vindication, to avow myself the author of the criticism that called it forth. I am sensible that, in quitting the character, I must quit the authoritative style which custom has sanctioned in a reviewer. But, whatever advantages my former position secured to me, I forego them all the moment I am compelled to descend from my place as a spectator, and enter the lists as a combatant. Whatever angry or irritating language I have received or provoked in my anonymous

character, I shall endeavour to banish from my thoughts. In my observations on Dr. Lingard as an historian I should be sorry to be deficient in the courtesy and urbanity due to his reputation and his profession.

Some circumstances attending my original engagement in the task of reviewing Dr. Lingard's History of England, it will be necessary for me to state in my reply. These circumstances are known to you; I have therefore thrown my observations into the form of a Letter to you, that you may be my voucher for statements unknown to Dr. Lingard and to the Public, should the Public take any interest at all in the petty wranglings between an Author and his Reviewer.

Dr. Lingard seems to imagine, that in writing my criticism on his book, prejudice guided my pen, and that I was influenced by private antipathies and resentments against him.\*

To this accusation I reply, that I am personally unacquainted with Dr. Lingard; that my first knowledge of his existence was derived from his excellent Reply to the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Huntingford, which I was at pains to disseminate; that the accounts I afterwards heard of him from many respectable individuals of his own persuasion, were calculated to give me a favourable impression of his character; and that, till I was led to a minute examination of his History of England, I had recommended it to all persons with

\* Vindication, p. 8.

whom my opinion was likely to have weight, as a work of talent and research, and worthy of a place in every library.

But, desirous as I am to repel the insinuation of personal malice, I am more anxious still to have it understood, that I have not been influenced in my judgment of Dr. Lingard's book by any prejudice against him as a Roman Catholic priest, or by any desire to countenance or strengthen the prepossessions entertained by many against what is called Catholic Emancipation. I might have had reasons for disliking the man; but I could have none, which I should not blush to own, for disliking him on account of his religion.

There is no right I hold more sacred than the right of private judgment in matters of religion; and no public principle to which I am more firmly attached, than to the maintenance of religious freedom. Without the slightest partiality for the peculiar doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, I see no reason why the members of that communion should be deprived of their birthright as Englishmen. Neither justice nor policy warrant, in my opinion, such disfranchisement. I will not deny that the constitution and internal discipline of the Roman Catholic church create a formidable power, which has been used, and may be used again, for mischievous as well as for beneficial purposes. But, the State having placed the Roman Catholic religion under the protection of law, I cannot approve the consistency of fixing a mark of reprobation on those who

believe in its tenets; nor admit the justice of excluding them, on pretence of possible but uncertain dangers, from those civil and political advantages to which their birth, education, and fortune, would otherwise entitle them: and still less can I understand the policy of placing one-third of the inhabitants of a great empire in a situation which must in the end make them indifferent, if not hostile, to its interests.

Thus far I have thought it right to express my opinions on the Catholic question, that no one may suppose I have been swayed in my unfavourable judgment of the Catholic historian by prejudice against the Roman Catholic church, or aversion to Catholic Emancipation.

A desire to serve Dr. Lingard, and to repel what I then thought an injustice done to him, first prompted me to become the reviewer of his works. I had read with pleasure and instruction his *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*,—a book at that time little known beyond the narrow circle of theological controversy: and from the variety of talent and extent of knowledge it displayed, I had formed a high opinion of its author. While full of admiration for the man, I met with a criticism on his book, dictated as it then appeared to me by a spirit of sectarian bigotry, charging him with insidious designs, accusing him of craft and misrepresentation, and insinuating that, though a priest, he was not a Christian. Indignant at these charges, which I thought uncandid and unfair, and desirous of extending

the circulation of his book, by making its merits, and, I may add, its existence, more generally known, I resolved to draw up an account of it for the *Edinburgh Review*. But, in preparing my article for the press, though strongly prepossessed in favour of Dr. Lingard, I was struck with various instances of what seemed to me disingenuous partiality, in his account of the saints and confessors of his church; and could not disguise from myself, that he had sometimes stooped to artifices beneath a candid historian, to exalt the merits, or throw a veil over the defects, of those holy personages. His vituperative language and petulant remarks on some modern historians, led me to look into the history of St. Dunstan, and more particularly to examine the tragical tale of Edwy and Elgiva. I detected, as it appeared to me, some mistakes or mistatements in Dr. Lingard's account of these transactions, and endeavoured to correct them; but not having thoroughly investigated the story, I left it in a state satisfactory neither to myself nor to my readers. Dr. Lingard replied to some parts of my criticism, in a note annexed to the first volume of his *History of England*. That reply led me to reconsider the question, and examine with greater minuteness the original authorities. I soon discovered, or at least convinced myself, that we were both in the wrong. The materials I had collected I put together; but as the subject was of little interest, and of still less intrinsic importance, I threw my essay aside, and most probably should never have looked at it again, if I had not been

a second time seduced into a review of one of Dr. Lingard's publications.

It was accident, as you are well aware, that made me the reviewer of Dr. Lingard's History of England. An article on that work had been sent to the Editor of the Edinburgh Review, with permission to make what use of it he pleased. At the suggestion of a common friend, with whom I had some years before discussed the merits and defects of Dr. Lingard's book, the article was transmitted to me. I found it executed with ability; but, though long since cured of my extravagant admiration for Dr. Lingard, I thought it did not render justice to his merits. After some hesitation, I resolved on writing an article myself; and that no wrong might be done to the author of the criticism I had laid aside, I determined to touch on no one topic which had been the subject of his animadversion.

I had ample materials for such a work. I had read with attention, and with a pen in my hand, Dr. Lingard's History of England to the period of the Reformation. Disgusted with the profligate and incredible stories he had retailed against Anne Boleyn and her family, I had there stopped my critical examination of his book, and read the remaining part of it in a more cursory manner. I had long made up my mind on his fidelity as an historian, and my opinion was confirmed by those I considered the most competent judges of the subject. But I was still fascinated with the felicity of his style, pleased with the clear and unem-

barrassed flow of his narrative, and often instructed and directed in my own researches by the acuteness of his critical sagacity. I was determined to do justice to his merits, without concealing his defects. His condition as a Roman Catholic priest in England strengthened every bias I still entertained in his favour. The hard and unprofitable duties of that station must be embittered by recollections on which it is unnecessary to dwell; and when one in so forlorn a state, languishing in obscurity and dependance, where his predecessors flourished in opulence and splendour, has strength of mind to devote his leisure hours to literary pursuits, it is impossible not to admire the force of character that raises him above the frowns of fortune. It was with most indulgent feelings, therefore, that I first opened Dr. Lingard's History of England. Though the illusion was long since dissipated which had led me to regard his labours as one of the most valuable additions made in recent times to our national literature, early impressions had not entirely lost their influence; and on a calm review of what I have written, I must confess they seem to have directed my pen in the general and too flattering picture I have drawn of his work.

With such impressions on my mind, I began my review of Dr. Lingard's History. What was good in his book I was disposed to magnify; what was bad, to extenuate; and it was with the utmost gentleness that I touched on some of its defects. I was content with slightly lamenting the want of dramatic interest in a

history so full of dramatic incident as that of England. It was with regret, I hinted that an obtuseness of feeling, whether derived from nature or from his professional habits and education, had made Dr. Lingard indifferent to the fate of those whose story he relates, unless his sympathy was awakened by a community of religious feeling. It did not escape me, though I was averse to enlarge upon it, that inexperience of the world had made him slow to penetrate through the artifices under which interested and ambitious men cover their designs; and where the honour or reputation of his sect or party was concerned, that his prejudices were strong, and his credulity boundless. I found him a diligent collector of what others had thought or written on the progress of our laws and manners, and was willing to overlook the want of an original and powerful mind, and the absence of all profound and philosophical views in his own lucubrations. I gave him due praise for diligence and critical sagacity; and, except by comparison with the first of historians, said nothing to depreciate his pretensions to a higher merit.

But there was one defect in Dr. Lingard's History which I could not soften or overlook, nor even suffer to pass without animadversion. It seemed to me, after a careful examination of his book, that in his desire to give a favourable impression of the clergy in former times, he had been on many occasions betrayed into the error of suppressing or disguising facts, and of adding or altering circumstances, so as to give a fallacious

colouring to transactions where the credit of the church or the honour of churchmen was concerned. To have proclaimed this defect in general terms would have been to set the opinion of a nameless critic in opposition to the authority of a learned and distinguished historian; and, as it deserved, so it would have obtained, no attention from the Public. I selected, therefore, for critical examination, a small portion of his history, and chose it from a period as remote as possible from the time of the Reformation, being unwilling to mingle in the controversies between Protestant and Catholic. I was aware that it was a part of our history not likely to interest many readers; but it was one which Dr. Lingard had studied with care, and examined with the scrutinizing eye of a theological polemic; it was one in which he had indulged in the most acrimonious strictures on modern historians, and, where, if seduced into the same error, I should have his example and authority to plead in my excuse.

Never was a work begun and ended in charity more ungraciously received by the person in whose favour it was written. I had praised Dr. Lingard, in my judgment, to the full extent of his merits. I had seasoned highly; but the dish, it seems, was not peppered enough to please his palate. He was indignant, as it appeared, that I had written what he called a laboured eulogium on Hume; and what seemed to have offended him the most, I had ventured to examine into his accuracy and fidelity as an historian. That he should be

alarmed at such an examination, I can easily understand; but on what pretence he should be offended with it, I am at a loss to comprehend. Historians, like others, are liable to error. No one has treated with less ceremony than Dr. Lingard his predecessors in the walk of literature he has chosen. If Hume, Carte, and Henry, are subjected to the ordeal of criticism, why not Dr. Lingard? It may be safer to attack the dead, but I know of no privilege that exempts the living. To be free from error is the attribute of none. The infallibility of the Pope himself, if I am rightly informed, is confined to his decisions *ex cathedrâ*; and excellent Catholic as Dr. Lingard undoubtedly is, I perceive from his *Vindication*,\* that when the Pope is not seated in his pontifical chair, our historian questions the infallibility of his memory, and refuses to believe him till he has consulted his notes.

The only effect that Dr. Lingard's angry and contemptuous expressions produced on his critic, was the conviction that he was in a passion, and that he had not read the article to an end, or had been so blinded with indignation that he did not comprehend what he read.

Some months after the first explosion of Dr. Lingard's wrath, I received at Paris a printed letter, in a newspaper, signed *Investigator*, abusing my unfortunate review in the coarsest terms; pointing me out, almost

\* *Vindication*, p. 59.

by name, as the author of it, and calling on me to have the candour to acknowledge a *supposed* error I had committed. From many circumstances, I had reason to believe that Dr. Lingard was the author of that epistle; and though I could hardly reconcile with this supposition the praise bestowed in it on his own book, or the contempt expressed in it for Anglo Saxon history, the presumptive evidence was so strong that I had little doubt of the fact. Dr. Lingard has since declared,\* "that he was not privy either to the writing or to the publication of that letter." I give entire credit to his assertion. Disowned by Dr. Lingard, the letter is undeserving of reply; but as some of my friends have thought otherwise, I have subjoined a note on the merits of the MS. which *Investigator* has undertaken to defend.†

Nettled at the manner I had been treated, and recollecting to have heard from one of the first literary characters in England, that Dr. Lingard's account of the St. Bartholomew was partial and prejudiced, I put that part of his book into the hands of a French gentleman distinguished for his intimate and critical acquaintance with the history of his country. On casting his eye over it, he exclaimed at once, that the whole was taken from Caveyrac; and as a proof that the author had borrowed from Caveyrac without even knowing the works to which the Abbé had refer-

\* *Vindication*, p. 8, *note*.

† See Appendix (A).



red his readers, he pointed out to me the ridiculous blunder into which Dr. Lingard had fallen, of classing among Hugonot writers the President de Thou, an archbishop of Paris, and an ex-jesuit, noted in France for the fury and virulence of his orthodoxy. Having nothing better to do at Paris, I resolved to make some inquiry into the history of the St. Bartholomew; and with the advantage which a stranger possesses in that capital, of consulting public libraries with every facility which the most liberal institutions, administered in the kindest and most courteous manner, can afford, I collected a body of materials on that subject, and on some other points of French history, of which my second review of Dr. Lingard's work was the result.

I will not deny that I was led into this train of investigation by the epistle I had received from England; but, having speedily formed my opinion of the sources of Dr. Lingard's information, and of the extent of his researches, I continued my inquiries, to clear up, if possible, a difficult point of history, which no French critic, as far as I could learn, had fully or satisfactorily investigated. I was at one time inclined to acquiesce in the opinion of De Thou; and it was the letter of Cardinal d'Ossat which convinced me that Charles was a party to the plot, though he vacillated, and probably changed his mind more than once before it was ripe for execution. That fact once placed beyond a doubt, many stories told of him, and many sayings attributed to him, which might otherwise have been regarded as

party tales, become credible and consistent with the deceitful conduct he pursued.

Dr. Lingard expresses his surprise that my remarks on his work should be confined to a short note, and to a few other detached points of French history. He forgets that I had already reviewed his book; and that the article of which he complains was written at Paris, where I had no English authors to consult. He forgets, also, that where the credit due to a historical work is the question at issue, the critic must necessarily confine himself to a small portion of the work he undertakes to examine, as the commentary will in general be longer than the text. When a witness is cross-examined in a court of law, it is not required of the lawyer who examines him, that he should ask him questions on every part of his evidence; and, without intending any invidious comparison between a witness suspected of bad faith and an historian suspected of partiality and prejudice, that lead to a similar result, the same rule, I apprehend, must apply to both. The critic, like the lawyer, may select his topics for examination; and if he convicts his author of repeated mistatements and misrepresentations, and if these are all on one side, and all calculated to favour the political or religious opinions of the offender, he has gained his cause. The maxim *ex pede Herculem* will be applied in both cases; and, notwithstanding the murmurs of the delinquents, it will prove as fatal to the credit of the historian as to the credibility of the witness.

But, if the principle on which I proceeded in examining into the accuracy and fidelity of Dr. Lingard as an historian was just, the fitness of applying it to his account of the St. Bartholomew cannot reasonably be contested. The transaction, it is true, was French; but it was one he professed to have studied with care; for, in hazarding an unusual explanation of it, he had assured his readers, that "his opinion was not formed till after a diligent perusal and comparison of the most authentic documents on the subject."

Dr. Lingard complains that I have not said a word in his praise. He forgets that I had praised him already as far as my conscience would permit, and that he had received my praise so ungraciously that I had no temptation to repeat it. I had, in truth, exhausted in his commendation every topic that occurred to me; and if I had attempted to soften the edge of his resentment by flattering expressions, I had nothing left for it but to repeat what I had said before.

The questions at issue between Dr. Lingard and his critic may be reduced to the following heads:—

I. Was I justified in saying that Dr. Lingard had taken from Caveyrac the view he has given of the St. Bartholomew?

II. Was I right in my conjecture, that it was only through the medium of Caveyrac he had consulted the original authorities on the massacre?

III. After an examination of different passages of Dr. Lingard's History, was I justified in concluding

that "no fact is to be credited without examination, no impression to be received without doubt, on the mere authority of Dr. Lingard's statements?"

IV. Was the massacre of St. Bartholomew the result of accident, or the consequence of a premeditated plot to entrap and destroy the Hugonots?

I. Was I justified in saying that Dr. Lingard had taken from Caveyrac the view he has given of the St. Bartholomew?

On this head I have little to observe. Dr. Lingard, as far as I can discover, has not denied his obligations to Caveyrac; and though he would have acted a more generous part if he had acknowledged them more explicitly in his History, he was certainly entitled to profit by the labours of the Abbé without informing his readers from what source the view he had taken of the subject was derived.

But if Dr. Lingard in his History has neglected to discharge his debt of gratitude to Caveyrac, in his Vindication he has shewn a tender regard to the reputation of that author. In reply to a casual observation in the review, that "the work of Caveyrac had little success when it first appeared;" he remarks,\* "that the clamour raised against it among the infidel party in France," and their false representations of its object, "are powerful testimonies in its favour." The

\* Vindication, p. 12, note.

insinuation is adroit, but the impression it conveys is not just. Infidels are not the only persons who most hold the principles of Caveyrac in detestation. Every friend of religious liberty must be hostile to the doctrines he professes. The specimens I am about to give of his opinions will, I trust, enlist even Dr. Lingard among his opponents.

One of the sections of Caveyrac's book has for its title,\* "l'intolérance civile et rigoureuse, est-elle contraire à la raison, à l'humanité, à la politique, et à la religion?" and to this question a decided answer is given in the negative. The author affects to have a horror of persecution; but he justifies the declaration of 1724,† by which the King of France announces to his subjects, "Qu'il ne veut qu'une religion dans ses états, tout acte contraire à la religion Catholique est puni de la peine des galères perpetuelles pour les hommes, et de la prison perpetuelle pour les femmes; avec la confiscation des biens." An article in the same declaration, which punishes with death Calvinist ministers and preachers detected in France, he pronounces to be bad policy, but strict justice;‡ and the regulation which compels Calvinist parents to send their children for education to Catholic schools, he defends,|| on the ground, that the king being the father of his people, it is his duty to attend to their happiness in

\* Caveyrac, p. 358.

† Ib. p. 452.

‡ Ib. p. 449.

|| Ib. p. 456.

the world to come, as well as to their temporal welfare. "Cette intolérance," he exclaims, "trouve son principe dans la charité, sa justice dans le bon ordre, son exemple dans la conduite des empereurs Chrétiens."

I am far from imputing any participation in these sentiments to Dr. Lingard. He has entered his solemn protest against them; and though *my* observation in the review was directed against Caveyrac's book in general, it is possible that *his* remark was meant to be exclusively confined to the dissertation on the St. Bartholomew. Yet I cannot help wondering that a Catholic clergyman in England should betray zeal in defence of an author whose work, from beginning to end, is a justification of religious intolerance. There is hardly an objection urged against Catholic Emancipation which is not to be found, *mutatis mutandis*, in Caveyrac; and hardly an argument was used by Protestant zealots in 1780 against the toleration of Roman Catholics, which had not been previously employed by Caveyrac to oppose any religious indulgence to Calvinists in France.

Such being the principles maintained in Caveyrac's work, I am confident that Dr. Lingard will no longer sneer at me for "lending a helping hand to its opponents;" and let me advise him in return, when he next employs a friend to transcribe for him a page from a printed book, to make choice of a more careful copyist than the friend he selected to transcribe a page from La Popelinière. Not trusting to the notes I had taken at Paris, I have collated again the passage in La Popeli-

nière, which I had accused Caveyrac of mutilating by the suppression of two important words, and I find my former statement quite correct. The copy of La Popelinière which I examined is in the British Museum. The words omitted by Caveyrac affect the sense nearly in the same degree as if he had omitted the word *not* in the Ninth Commandment.

II. Was I right in my conjecture that it was only through the medium of Caveyrac that Dr. Lingard had consulted the original authorities on the massacre?

In support of this conjecture, I began by quoting a remarkable passage, where my antagonist has mentioned a number of authors, and without directly referring to them at the bottom of his page, has cited their opinions as one not unacquainted with their writings. From a ridiculous blunder he had committed in describing the whole of these authors as Hugonots, I inferred that it was only through Caveyrac he had examined their works; and if I understand him right, he admits the charge.

The mistake of classing among Hugonot writers an archbishop of Paris, an ex-jesuit, and a president à mortier, Dr. Lingard assures me was an error of the press. Be it so. But I cannot help remarking, that this extraordinary blunder had gone through two, if not three, editions of his book, before any observation was made upon it; and, while it passed unnoticed, that it left an impression on his readers that there was one Hugonot writer at least who had reduced the number

of victims to 10,000. If Dr. Lingard had consulted the reformed martyrologist, as he calls him, he would have seen that the compiler of that work states the number that perished at 30,000, and that it is only by an ingenious operation of the Abbé de Caveyrac that his estimate is reduced to 15,000; and if he had inquired into the character of La Popelinière's book, he would have found, that soon after its publication, it provoked the censure of the Protestant synod of Rochelle, as a work containing many falsehoods and calumnies against their religion.\* This is no proof that the censure was merited; but it lessens the authority of La Popelinière as a Hugonot writer.

Dr. Lingard complains, that in commenting on a passage of his book I have substituted the word "original" for "authentic;" and when he assured his readers, that his opinion of the St. Bartholomew "was not formed till after a diligent perusal and comparison of the most authentic documents on the subject;" he tells us, that, "by the most authentic documents, he meant documents of sufficient authority to deserve credit, as coming from men, who were either the original devisers, or received their information from the original devisers of the massacre."†

I must own, that I annexed to Dr. Lingard's words a larger and more extensive signification, and understood him to mean, that he had not formed his opinion

\* In 1581. Le Long, ii. 257.—Ed. of 1769.

† Vindication, 10.

without a careful examination of the evidence on both sides of the question. I had been taught by his preface to believe, that he had imposed on himself "the severe obligation to take nothing upon trust," to consult the "original documents and more ancient writers," and from these "authentic sources to present his readers with a full and correct relation of events;" and I was not aware, that in treating of the St. Bartholomew he thought himself justified in departing from these rules. When he assured his readers, that his opinion of that massacre "was not formed till after a diligent perusal and comparison of the most authentic documents on the subject," it did not, I must confess, occur to me, that this vaunting declaration was intended to disguise the fact, that he had consulted no authorities on the massacre, except the discourse attributed to Henry III., the Memoirs of Margaret and those of Tavannes, and a passage in Matthieu's History of France at variance with all the preceding part of that historian's narrative. If any one had put the interpretation on Dr. Lingard's words which he has now assigned to them, I should have rejected it with scorn, as implying a proposition too extravagant to be held by any one; that in examining into a charge of conspiracy, no evidence is to be deemed worthy of credit, except the confessions of the conspirators.

"A design," says Dr. Lingard,\* "supposed to

\* Vindication, p. 22.

"have been formed in privacy and concealment, unless it be necessarily implied in the result,—can be shewn only by the confession of the parties, or by the testimony of those who have derived their knowledge from those parties." If Dr. Lingard's meaning is merely this, that none but the conspirators themselves can give a full and particular history of their plot, explain the secret motives that led to it, and detail all the accidents that accelerated, retarded, or modified the execution of their design, he is in the right. But, if he maintains, as his words seem to imply, that the fact of a conspiracy having existed cannot be proved, except by the admission of the conspirators, or by the utter impossibility of the result having been brought about in any other way, the common sense and daily experience of mankind declare against him. Nothing is more frequent in Courts of Law, than to infer the existence of a conspiracy from circumstances, and from the concurring conduct of the parties, though they protest their innocence, though no accomplice bears testimony to their guilt, and though no single fact proved against them affords complete evidence of their crime. But, if the existence of a conspiracy may be established by circumstantial evidence in a Court of Law, how much more necessary is it that this kind of proof should be received in history, which has not the same advantages for investigating truth, and must therefore be content with inferior evidence. The his-

torian cannot summon witnesses before his tribunal to clear up what is obscure, or to explain what is doubtful in the transactions he relates. The actors have disappeared from the scene before he is called upon to pronounce judgment on their conduct, and no materials remain for his decision but what contemporaries have left behind them. He may sometimes obtain direct evidence of the secret designs of courts and cabinets from the private correspondence of the parties. But, where that evidence fails, he must be guided by probabilities, and exercise his judgment in balancing and comparing contrary statements and opinions. So far from giving implicit confidence to the memoirs, apologies, and vindications of kings and statesmen, he will consider them as documents to be used with caution and received with distrust.

Where the credit of the Church is not concerned, I find Dr. Lingard less difficult about historical evidence. He has no doubt that Arthur of Brittany was murdered by his uncle; though neither John nor the assassins he employed, ever confessed their crime. The young prince was in the custody of his uncle, and suddenly disappeared; John was accused of murdering him, and made no satisfactory defence. "If the manner of Arthur's death could have borne investigation, John for his own sake would have made it public. His silence proves that the young prince was murdered."—  
"Summoned to prove his innocence in presence of the

"French peers," he "refused;" on which "the Court pronounced judgment" against him.\* Now, let us suppose, that instead of refusing to prove his innocence, John had sent his procurators to the French Court, and had there given a circumstantial account of the death of his nephew, which he afterwards owned to be false, and had then given a second and a third account equally untrue; let me ask, would the decision of the Court or the judgment of the historian have been different? Would they not have answered, that the presumption of his guilt was increased by his prevarications; that, like the elders in Susanna, he was convicted of false witness by his own mouth; and that he who defends himself by allegations which he knows to be untrue, is no longer to be believed on his word? Would any subsequent declaration of John, unsupported by other evidence, have been considered testimony worthy of credit? Would his dying without confessing his guilt have been taken as proof of his innocence? Let us apply these principles to the St. Bartholomew.

Coligny and his friends were invited to Paris on the most solemn assurances of safety, and were received by the king with every manifestation of favour as his faithful and loyal subjects. While there assembled, and under the protection of his guards, they were

\* Lingard's History of England, iii. 12, 13.

murdered by his orders. No sooner was this massacre perpetrated, than he and his counsellors were charged with premeditated treachery. They were not summoned to answer the accusation in a court of justice, because there existed no court that had a right to try them. They were cited before the tribunal of public opinion, and this citation was repeated in every language and heard in every Protestant state of Europe. What was their conduct in these circumstances? Did they, like John, remain obdurately silent, and refuse to enter on the vindication of their innocence? No; anticipating the charge against them, on the very night of the execution they issued a declaration, lamenting and attributing to the house of Guise the whole guilt of the massacre, and representing the king and royal family as having been themselves in danger from the swords of the assassins. Next day they retracted this story in part, accused the admiral of a conspiracy, and admitted that it was with the tacit permission of the king that the Guises had murdered him, but still represented the king as having been exposed to danger during the tumult. On the third day came out a fresh declaration, abandoning the former stories as utterly false, and stating that the admiral and his adherents had been put to death by express orders from the king, on account of a treasonable conspiracy they had formed to murder himself, his mother, and other members of his family. After such contradictory statements, are we to be told that the

confessions of these men are the only authentic evidence that can be admitted of their guilt?

Dr. Lingard has ingeniously argued that the falsehood of their first declarations is a proof of the innocence of the parties. But what shall we say to the excuses published weeks and months afterwards, when there had been time for reflection, and when every inducement existed to give a true account of the transaction, if a true account could have been given, that would have saved the honour of Charles and his counsellors?

Pibrac, avocat du Roi before the Parliament of Paris, composed a laboured vindication of his master, which was published by authority about two months after the St. Bartholomew, and extensively distributed through Germany and Poland. Pibrac pretends that orders for the massacre were given, in consequence of information communicated to the king, that the admiral and his accomplices had entered into a conspiracy against the royal family, which was to be executed in the following day; and he asserts, that three separate witnesses, men of rank and character, who were present when the conspiracy was arranged, gave evidence of the fact; and when examined apart, agreed in all the circumstances of the plot. That this story is utterly false, requires no other proof than that these witnesses were not produced before the Parliament of Paris in the trial of Briquemaut and Cavagnes, for this imagi-

nary conspiracy; that they are not mentioned in the sentence against the admiral; that their names are unknown; and having served the purpose for which they had been created, that the three witnesses disappeared and were never more heard of.

Bellievre, who was sent to reconcile the Swiss Cantons to the massacre, does not venture to assert the reality of the plot, but justifies the king on the ground, that the admiral was a dangerous person, from the influence he possessed in his party, and that he had grossly insulted his master at the council-board, by menaces which no sovereign could endure from a subject. Admitting the validity of this excuse, how is it to be reconciled with the story that Charles was to the last enamoured of the admiral, and with difficulty persuaded to his death?

Monluc, whose business in Poland was to obtain the crown of that kingdom for the Duke of Anjou, maintains in his address to the Polish diet that Henry took no part in the massacre. "J'ay pour temoign le duc  
" très-illustrissime, qui m'ayant escrit de sa main fort  
" amplement, tesmoigne que le roy estoit fort esloigné  
" de la coulpe de ce faict, et afferme constamment que  
" quant à lui, il n'a jamais esté autheur ni approbateur  
" de tel conseil." If this letter was not an invention of Monluc, what are we to think of Henry's veracity, who was undoubtedly one of the chief authors and counsellors of the massacre?

The story told by Pibrac was repeated by La Motte Fenelon in England, with this addition, that the king his master was disposed to inquire into the truth of the informations laid before him; and if he found them false, to punish those who had so grossly and wickedly imposed upon him. Deceived by these artful representations, and by the outward shew of grief and shame put on by the ambassador, the English ministry were inclined to believe that Charles was not the author or deviser of the massacre, but had been brought by sudden fear and practice to consent to it. This delusion, however, was of short duration. The first despatch from Walsingham conveyed the opinion of that able and intelligent minister, that from the language and subsequent conduct of the king, he was convinced "the  
" accident proceeded from himself, though her majesty  
" had been otherwise informed by the ambassador." This judgment was not pronounced by Walsingham till he had heard both from the queen-mother and her son what they were pleased to urge in justification of their conduct. It is no wonder that he gave no credit to their words, when one of the stories told him by the queen-mother was the extravagant tale, that information had been given to them by "persons attached to  
" the admiral both by religion and amity, that those of  
" the religion, had they not been prevented at the time  
" they were, had seized, within two hours after, one of  
" the gates of the Louvre," and so made the royal family their prisoners: in corroboration of which, she



related to him circumstances which he knew to be false or misrepresented.\*

Burleigh was convinced by the contradictions in the French declarations of the falsity of the statement made by their ambassador. Walsingham never varied in his opinion. In a subsequent despatch he remarks, "they are here so far imbrued in blood, as there is no end of their cruelty; for no town escapeth where any of the religion is found, without a general murdering and sacking of them; and yet they protest all this to be done against their will, though it be evidently known that it is done by their commandment." How could Walsingham be deceived by their professions, who was on the spot, and heard them talk jocosely of "a Bartholomew breakfast and a Florence banquet; so they term the execution here."—"The king," he remarks in another place, "is grown so bloody-minded, that they who advised him thereto do repent the same; and do fear that the old saying will prove true, *malum consilium consultori pessimum*."†

Walsingham, it is true, was not one of the devisers of the massacre, nor had his information from those that were; but he was reckoned a sagacious and sharp-sighted observer in his day, and, with due submission to Dr. Lingard, his judgment is worth regarding on transactions that passed under his eyes. Let us see how Dr. Lingard disposes of his evidence.

\* Digges, 247, 251, 253, 254, 255.

† *Ib.* 264, 267, 269, 279.

From a despatch of Charles to La Motte Fenelon, his ambassador in England, Dr. Lingard has published\* a long extract, "to point out to his readers three things corroborative of his preceding statement; for the truth of which, Catharine appeals to the personal knowledge of Walsingham: that a real inquiry had been set on foot to discover the origin of the attempt on the admiral's life, that the subsequent massacre was provoked by the *intemperate conduct*† of his adherents, and that the king, as soon as possible, gave orders to stop the fury of the populace. Walsingham, from his residence at Paris, and his relations with the chiefs of the Hugonots, must have known the truth. Can we then believe that Catherine would have had the face to appeal to him; or that he, when thus called upon, would have silently acquiesced, had her statements been untrue?"

In answer to this question, I have to inquire, what reason have we to believe that this despatch gives a fair report of the conversation that passed between Catherine and the English ambassadors? The account must have been drawn up by herself, for even her son

\* *Vindication*, p. 41—43.

† If the reader will take the trouble to look to the extract given by Dr. Lingard, he will find that it was not mere intemperance of conduct the Hugonots were charged with, but with a conspiracy to attempt the lives of the king, his mother and brothers, and to endanger the state. But it was necessary to soften the charge, as the story of the plot is abandoned.

was not present at the audience. Regard to truth formed no part of her character; and vanity might prompt her, in telling her own story, to give herself the appearance of having had an advantage over Walsingham. She knew he did not believe the story she pretends to have repeated to him. There is not an allegation in this pretended dialogue which had not been made to him before, and communicated by him to his court, with a strong opinion of his own that the whole was a tissue of falsehoods. In this conversation, as reported by herself, there is one direct falsehood put into her mouth, and one falsehood conveyed by insinuation. She is made to say to the English ambassadors, that the attempt on the admiral had been made "à notre desceu,"\* (without our knowledge,) though she had herself employed the assassin to murder him; and in excuse for having infringed the edict of pacification which had permitted the public exercise of the Protestant religion, she is made to say, that it had

\* M. D'Israeli, from whose translation of part of this despatch Dr. Lingard has made his extract, appears to have read "à Notre Dame" instead of "à notre desceu;" and Dr. Lingard has copied the mistake, without recollecting that the admiral was not wounded at Notre Dame, or near to it. The original despatch is in the possession of Mr. Murray, bookseller, Albemarle Street; but it had been long ago published in French, in the Brussels edition of the Memoirs of Castelnau, in 1731, folio, iii. 289—293. I have compared the print in Castelnau, which has the words "à notre desceu," with the original in Mr. Murray's possession, which he was so good as to allow me to inspect, and I found it correct.

been done for a good and holy purpose, "à fin de faire cesser plutôt la furie du peuple Catholique;" a reason that could be only of temporary operation, and therefore inconsistent with the declaration she had herself not many months before made to Walsingham, that "her son would have exercise but of one religion "in his realm," as well as with a recent despatch from the king to La Motte Fenelon, notifying to him his royal determination, "de n'admettre dores en avant en son royaume aucun exercice de la religion que la sienne."\* Such was the regard to consistency and truth of the persons whose declarations Dr. Lingard regards as the only authentic evidence on the St. Bartholomew.

I shall only add, that a despatch from Walsingham, giving an account of this very audience, has been published,† in which there is no mention of the particulars relating to the admiral, to the massacre, or to the violation of the edict of pacification, which occupy so prominent a part in Catherine's account of the conversation.

It is evident by these extracts from Walsingham's correspondence, that in his opinion the massacres of the provinces were produced by orders from Court; and it is equally clear, that according to the information he received at Paris, they were committed in a greater number of places than Lingard and Caveyrac are willing

\* Digges, 242. Castelnau, iii. 269.

† Digges, 329—331.

to allow. These authors pretend, that the sacking, ransoming, and murdering of the Protestants, were confined to about a dozen places; but I know of no ground for this limitation, except that the *Mémoires de l'Etat*, in giving an account of the outrages that followed the St. Bartholomew, enter into no details with respect to other parts of the kingdom. The compilers of that work, however, repeatedly declare, that they are able to give only a small specimen of the cruelties that took place; and in several parts of their book they allude to murders and other acts of violence in detached villages and hamlets, which they do not attempt to particularise. The king, in one of his proclamations, admits, that outrages had been committed "tant aux champs qu'aux villes;" and in another, he states, that they had occurred "dans la plûpart des villes de ce royaume."\* These expressions from Charles himself seem to warrant the assertion of Walsingham, that "no town escapeth where any of the religion is found."

On the question, how far these outrages in the provinces were occasioned by secret orders from Court, at variance with the public proclamations of the Government, I shall not fatigue my readers with repeating the statements and reasons given in the Review. I shall mention only one additional fact, which I have lately met with in the excellent History of Brittany recently published by Count Daru. There is preserved, as we

\* *Mém. de l'Etat*, i. 416, 580.

are informed by that learned and accurate historian, in the archives of Nantes, a letter from the Duke of Bourbon-Montpensier, governor of that city, dated the 26th of August, 1572; in which, that nobleman, who had eminently distinguished himself in the massacre at Paris, directs the seneschal and magistrates of Nantes to follow the example of the capital; "par là, leur dit il, l'intention de sa majesté est assez connue pour le traitement qui se doit faire aux Huguenots des autres villes."\* To the credit of the seneschal and magistrates, it should be added, that they had the courage to disobey this sanguinary order. From this specimen of the private instructions which accompanied the public proclamations of the Government, Walsingham appears to have had reason for his conclusion, that "though they protest all this to be done against their will, it is evidently done by their commandment."

To return to the question immediately before us; it follows, from the judgment he has pronounced against John, that if Charles and his counsellors had remained silent amidst the general execrations of Europe, Dr. Lingard must have declared them guilty. Does it add to the probability of their innocence, that they invented false accusations to justify their conduct? Are the inconsistencies in their vindications to be regarded as reasons for believing their testimony? Is no document to be considered worthy of credit but the confessions of persons convicted of falsehood?

\* *Histoire de Bretagne*, par M. Daru, iii. 288.

But, narrow as the limits within which Dr. Lingard has circumscribed his notion of authentic evidence, he has admitted into his circle a work which has no pretension to a place in it, and excluded others, as well entitled to admission as those on which he has conferred that honour.

In mentioning the Memoirs of Tavannes, Dr. Lingard had remarked of the author, that he was in the Louvre at the time, and one of the devisers of the massacre. Knowing that the author of that work was not Marshall Tavannes, to whom Dr. Lingard's description applied, but his youngest son, a lad of seventeen years of age at the time of the St. Bartholomew, I conjectured that Dr. Lingard, instead of having diligently perused the Memoirs of Tavannes, was acquainted with them only through the medium of Caveyrac. In his Vindication he admits, what could not well be denied, that the son, and not the father, was author of the Memoirs; but he "conceives that there is to be found in them that which may be fairly taken for the testimony of the Marshall himself, transmitted to us through his son;"\* and in support of that opinion he quotes from the son, "J'ai veu, j'ai sceu partie des faits de M. de Tavanès mon pere;"† but he omits the words immediately following, "*non de tout par luy.*" The omission is "ingenious." Tavannes "is made to say the very reverse of that which he really

\* Vindication, p. 23.

† Ib. p. 24.

"said." He is made to say, by Dr. Lingard, "there is one part of the facts which he relates, of which he was the eye-witness, and of which he derived the knowledge from his father;"\* whereas he really says, "I have seen, I have known, some of the acts of M. de Tavannes, my father, *but not at all through him.*" To characterise this most singular perversion of testimony, I shall use none of those offensive terms, which Dr. Lingard disdains to borrow, though he condescends to repeat. "I will not call it carelessness or ignorance, bad faith or misrepresentation, indifference to historical accuracy, or an attempt to deceive the reader. I shall admit that it was perhaps no more than an oversight, occasioned by precipitancy, that eagerness for victory which so often blinds and misleads the judgment."† But I may be permitted to express my surprise, that Dr. Lingard should have made this mistake, as the entire passage he has mutilated was before his eyes in the Review he was employed in answering.

Young Tavannes was in Paris at the time of the massacre. What he relates as an eye-witness I believe. But what he relates in the character of an eye-witness is of little or no importance, and not half so interesting as the particulars to be found in Sully, De Mergez, and many others. The discourses he has published as his father's, I believe to be genuine. I see no reason to

\* Vindication, p. 24.

† Ib. p. 50.

doubt their authenticity. But when he enters on the causes of the massacre, and gives an account of the private councils that led to it, I ask, on what authority his information rests? That it is not derived from his father, he has himself informed us. That it is inaccurate in many particulars, I have shewn in my Review;\* and it would be easy to multiply examples of carelessness or defective information in the account he has left of the transaction. The stories he relates, and the parts he assigns to the different actors in this scene of perfidy and bloodshed, are inconsistent with the account given by Henry III. in his supposed discourse addressed to Miron. Both cannot be true; and Dr. Lingard must make his choice between them. Tavannes makes De Retz the most bloody-minded of the counsellors, and his father the most merciful. According to Henry, of all the council, De Retz was the only one who opposed the murder of the Admiral. From the complaints of Tavannes the son,† it is clear that Henry IV. gave no credit to the story, that his own life and that of the Prince of Condé were saved by the interposition of Tavannes the father; and both Le Laboureur and Griffet disbelieve the statement of the son upon that point. But whatever may be the value of these Memoirs, they cannot be considered as authentic documents, in the sense of Dr. Lingard. They do not come, nor do they pretend to come, from one who was

\* Ed. Rev. No. lxxxvii. p. 148. † Mem. de Tavannes, pp. 388, 418.

an original deviser, or who had his information from an original deviser of the massacre.

But if Dr. Lingard has deviated from his rule by admitting among his authentic documents the Memoirs of Tavannes, he has been guilty of an opposite error, in passing over in silence the evidence furnished by Cardinal d'Ossat and the Chancellor Calignon. I was surprised, I must confess, at these omissions, which could not have happened to one who had really studied the History of the St. Bartholomew; and saw no explanation so creditable to Dr. Lingard, as the supposition that all his knowledge of the massacre was borrowed from Caveyrac, who had taken notice of neither of these authorities in his dissertation.

It is unnecessary to expatiate on the merits of Cardinal d'Ossat, as no one who has the slightest tincture of French literature can be ignorant of his reputation. As a man, he was not less distinguished for his integrity, than as a politician for his prudence and successful management of affairs. By his diligence, probity, and talents, he raised himself from the condition of an indigent orphan, supported and educated by charity, to the rank of cardinal, and to the station of ambassador from France at the court of Rome. His letters, though their style is become somewhat antiquated, are still regarded as one of the best models of diplomatic correspondence. Among other important missions intrusted to his care, he was employed at the papal court to obtain a revocation of the sentence of

excommunication pronounced by Sixtus V. against his master; and, notwithstanding the opposition of the Spanish faction, which then predominated in the College of Cardinals, he attained his object. He was afterwards charged with a still more delicate negotiation, in which he was equally successful. After a separation of fourteen years from her husband, Margaret of Valois was persuaded to sue for a dissolution of her marriage, on the ground that it had been contracted without a dispensation from the Pope, and that she had been constrained by her mother and brother to consent to it against her will. When the case was laid before the cardinals of the congregation, the Pope himself, Clement VIII. (Aldobrandini), came forward an unexpected and important witness in favour of her suit. He stated to the cardinals, judicially assembled to consider the question, a fact that came within his own knowledge, which confirmed her allegation, by explaining the motives that actuated her mother and brother in putting a force on her inclinations. He reminded them, that, while the marriage of Henry and Margaret was in agitation, Cardinal Alessandrino, nephew to Pope Pius V., had been sent by his uncle to Blois, to negotiate, if possible, a marriage between Margaret and Sebastian, king of Portugal; and, at all events, to refuse a dispensation for her marriage with the Prince of Navarre, except on conditions to which his mother, the Queen of Navarre, would not consent. He informed them, that Charles, anxious to obtain a dispensation,

without which Margaret would not submit to the marriage, after attempting in vain to overcome the objections of the Cardinal, took him by the hand, and said, "You are in the right. I acknowledge it, and I am obliged to you and to the Pope for what you have said; and if I had any other means of taking vengeance on my enemies, I would never consent to this marriage; but I can find no other way." Satisfied with this reply, the Cardinal returned to Italy, and when the news of the St. Bartholomew arrived at Rome, he exclaimed in a transport of joy, "Praise be to God, the King of France has kept his word with me!" This conversation was repeated at the time by Cardinal Alessandrino to Pope Clement, who was then his auditor, and had accompanied him to Blois, and by Clement it was immediately committed to writing.\*

To question the truth of this statement would be to impeach the veracity of Pope Clement in a judicial process before his court; and to suppose that the cardinals gave credit to his testimony without due examination, would be to declare them incompetent to the judicial functions they were called upon to exercise. Some time after this communication to the cardinals, the Pope imparted to d'Ossat the particulars above related; and by d'Ossat they were thought of such importance, in corroboration of the plea of constraint advanced for Margaret, that he inserted them, on the

\* See Appendix (B).

authority of his holiness, in his written argument addressed to the court. When first informed of them by the Pope, he was not aware that they had been already communicated to the cardinals, and hastening to impart to his friends in the sacred college the valuable disclosure that had been made to him, he was informed by Cardinal Borghese, that the facts had been stated to them by the Pope himself, when he first assembled them to consider of the divorce.

It follows from this conversation with Alessandrino, that Charles either deceived the Cardinal, or meant to entrap the Hugonots by the marriage of his sister, in order to gratify his vengeance at their expense. His real purpose may be reasonably inferred from the event; but in either case, it cannot be denied, that though a youth not two and twenty years of age, he was already a proficient in simulation.

The objections Dr. Lingard has started\* to this decisive evidence, utterly subversive of the hypothesis he has adopted, are so frivolous as hardly to deserve a reply. "The anecdote was not new; it had been often told; it had been published by Capilupi and Catena, and by the author of the Mémoires de l'Etat." It was disbelieved by De Thou.

The anecdote was not new. It had been told before, but not with the authority which it derives from Pope Clement VIII.; and though related in historical

\* Vindication, 58-60.

works, it had not been stated in a judicial proceeding, as evidence of a fact on which a court of justice was to pronounce sentence.

That it should have been known to Catena is not at all surprising. Catena had been secretary to Cardinal Alessandrino, and had for many years enjoyed the confidence of that prelate, and of his uncle, Pope Pius V. His assertion of the fact is therefore a confirmation of its truth. The judgment of Catena was weak, and his bigotry strong. But the materials for his work were collected from personal observation of the papal court, which he had served for thirty years; from confidential communications with Pope Pius and his nephew; and from the instructions and correspondence of nuncios at foreign courts to which he had access. Before the publication of his book, it was submitted to Sixtus V., approved of by him, and ordered to be printed.

That a conversation of so confidential a nature was known to Capilupi, is a proof that author was well informed on the subject on which he wrote; and ought to teach Dr. Lingard not to reject his evidence on other points.

The author of the Mémoires de l'Etat has manifestly taken his account from Capilupi.

The story was disbelieved by De Thou, because the correspondence of Cardinal d'Ossat had not then been published.

Not satisfied with these feeble and frivolous objections, Dr. Lingard argues that the story is to be re-

ceived with caution, because it was told from memory, after the lapse of seven and twenty years. He forgets that it was committed to writing at the time, and that it was told, not in idle conversation as an amusing anecdote, but stated deliberately by the Pope to the cardinals assembled for a judicial purpose, as a confirmation of the allegations made to them in a judicial proceeding.

It is amusing to contrast Dr. Lingard's distrust of the papal memory with his unhesitating acquiescence in the reminiscences of Queen Margaret, who did not begin her Memoirs for twenty years after the St. Bartholomew, and had in the interval led a life of profligacy, and passed through a succession of adventures more likely to jumble her recollections, than could have happened to the sovereign pontiff. It is impossible to read her book and have the slightest confidence in her accuracy or veracity. Not content with believing her facts, Dr. Lingard quotes her opinions as authority; and on no better foundation insinuates,\* that it was not Charles who dissembled in the St. Bartholomew, but the victims that perished by his assassins.

Let me here take the liberty of asking Dr. Lingard, on what ground he believes the discourse of Henry III. on the St. Bartholomew to be a genuine work? It is not known to whom the discourse was addressed; some say to Miron; others to M. de Souvré. No one

\* Vindication, p. 16, note.

has told us where the original MS. exists. I have seen many copies of it in the King of France's library; but none that pretended to have been the original, written at Cracow, or to have been copied from that original. It was unknown to De Thou and other historians for fifty years after the St. Bartholomew. It was first printed at Paris, in 1623, in a supplement to the second edition of the Memoirs of Villeroy; and soon after it appeared, with some variations, in Matthieu's History of France, but without any information of the quarter from which it was obtained, or of the authority on which it may be received as a genuine work. Voltaire alleges that it is any thing but authentic; and Meuselius, who is better authority on a point of this sort than Voltaire, expresses himself doubtfully on the subject.\* To me it is a matter of indifference, whether it be a genuine work or a forgery. In my view of the matter, though it may be useful for explaining some difficulties in the history of the St. Bartholomew, it does not affect the main question, whether the massacre was premeditated or accidental. But to Dr. Lingard it is of infinite consequence to trace the discourse to some authentic origin. It is the key-stone of his arch; and if it fails, the whole fabric must tumble to the ground.

The Memoir of Calignon is of less importance than the letter of Cardinal d'Ossat; but it ought not to have escaped the researches of an historian intent on

\* Bibliotheca Historica, vii. pars 2da, p. 313, Lipsiæ, 1795.



perusing all the authentic documents that relate to the St. Bartholomew. Calignon, though a Hugonot, was a man of probity, and so highly esteemed by Henry IV., that if he would have become a Catholic, that prince often declared he would have made him Chancellor of France. Calignon relates, from the mouth of Henry himself, the particulars that prince overheard of the private conversations at Bayonne between the Duke of Alva and Catherine of Medicis. The young prince, says Calignon, "ouyt tout ce que fut proposé de part et d'autre contre ceux de la nouvelle religion, et retint fort bien ces paroles du duc, qu'une teste de saumon valoit mieux que celles de cent grenouilles." This conversation he repeated to Calignon; and, young as he was, he appears to have had sagacity enough, notwithstanding Dr. Lingard's sneer,\* to distinguish between cooking a dish in the kitchen, and preparing materials for it in the slaughter-house.

When we consider that the interview at Bayonne is the epoch from which all Protestant and many Catholic writers date the first machinations to destroy the chiefs of the Hugonot party, this conversation is of importance, not only because it discloses the subject on which Alva and Catherine held their secret conferences, but because it shews the opinion Henry IV. subsequently entertained of the connexion between the meeting at Bayonne, and the plots afterwards formed to surprise and cut off the

\* Vindication, p. 48, note.

heads of his party. He was only twelve years of age, it is true, when he overheard the conversation. If he had been older, he would probably not have heard it at all.

The Memoir of Calignon, containing these particulars, was published by Gomberville in his supplement to the Memoirs of Nevers;\* but the substance of it had been long before given by Matthieu,† to whom it was communicated by Calignon himself.

Papyr Masson is an author whose life of Charles IX. it appeared to me, Dr. Lingard ought to have consulted before he wrote on the St. Bartholomew. Though a furious zealot, Papyr Masson was a contemporary, resident in Paris at the time of the massacre, and in a station of life that gave him opportunities of knowing what was passing or was credited among his party. Dr. Lingard had referred to him on the authority of Caveyrac; but it now appears, by his own admission, that he had not read his book, and knew not whether he was Protestant or Catholic. Having since examined the work of Papyr Masson, and finding it adverse to the view he had given of the St. Bartholomew, he starts various objections to it.‡ He says it is very short, which is true; but he should consider, that Cornelius Nepos is reckoned good historical authority, though none of his lives be longer than that of Charles IX. by Papyr Masson. He says the book

\* Vol. ii. p. 577, published in 1665. † Histoire de France, i. 283.

‡ Vindication, p. 11, note.

abounds in errors; but he has not pointed them out, and therefore it is impossible to judge how far he is right in that assertion. He says, that, though written immediately after the death of Charles, it was thrown aside by the author, who lived five and thirty years afterwards, and yet never thought proper to send it to the press. He is mistaken. It was printed in small 8vo. in 1575, the year after the king's death. It was well known to Brantome, who has extracted from it many of the anecdotes he relates of that prince's life and conversation. De Thou refers to Papyr Masson in his fifty-seventh book, where he treats of the death of Charles; and in his character of that monarch, though he has softened the portrait given by Papyr Masson, and suppressed some of the more odious and disgusting traits which that author had exhibited of his hero, it is evident that he has borrowed freely from his work.

Capilupi's *Stratagema* is another book, which, in my judgment, it was the duty of Dr. Lingard to have consulted, before he gave his opinion of the St. Bartholomew as the result of deliberate inquiry and reflection. It was a work, indeed, of which no mention was to be found in Caveyrac, and it might therefore escape the notice of one who had studied the subject only through the medium of that author. Introduced to his acquaintance by the *Edinburgh Review*, Dr. Lingard is facetious at the expense of Capilupi,\* and

\* *Vindication*, p. 21, *note*.

borrowing a pun from the Hugonot d'Aubigné, he calls him "the Wolf-catcher." If such be the vocation of Capilupi, no wonder Dr. Lingard should seek to deprive him of his fangs; but he may perchance find it is not so easy as he imagines to withdraw his clothing from the Wolf-catcher's gripe. The stuff he has published as Capilupi's, forms no part of that author's book. It is from another letter, in a different language, which makes no pretension to have been written by Capilupi. Dr. Lingard would have done better to have consulted the *Stratagema*, than to have taken his impression of it from d'Aubigné.

The earliest edition I have seen of Capilupi's book must have been written before the 18th of September, 1572, within little more than three weeks of the massacre; and a second edition, with some variations and additional particulars, which was reprinted in 1574, with a French translation, appears to have been finished before the 22d of October, in the same year. It was written for the private satisfaction of his brother, and not originally intended for publication.\* Having been seen, we are told, in the advertisement to the French edition, and thought good by the Cardinal of Lorraine, who was then at Rome, it was begun to be printed, with his approbation; but on further consideration the publication was stopped. The impression,

\* So we are assured by Ferrari, printer of the first edition. On what authority Dr. Lingard asserts the contrary, he can best inform us.

however, was finished; for there is a copy still existing of the original edition in the King of France's library. It is in small 4to. and contains twelve folia, besides the title-page and dedication. That it was seen and approved of by the Cardinal of Lorraine, I will not venture to affirm. The story rests on the authority of the Hugonot editor of 1574; but his assertion, as far as I have been able to find, has not been contradicted.

De Thou, unwilling to admit in its full extent the guilt of Charles, which had not then been established by the decisive evidence of Pope Clement, makes some objections to Capilupi's statements, and points out some trifling inaccuracies in his work; but these relate either to mistake about the French peerage, excusable in a foreigner; or to recent events in Flanders, which might easily be misrepresented at a distance. A fact related by Capilupi, which was unknown to De Thou, shews the accuracy of his information on matters not publicly divulged, and confirms the general credit of his work. He tells us, that Charles, despairing of a papal dispensation for the marriage of his sister with the King of Navarre, forged a letter from his ambassador at Rome, stating that the dispensation had been granted, and that it should be expedited to France as soon as the forms of office would permit. And he adds, that the queen mother, pretending to be satisfied with this letter, prevailed on her daughter to submit to the marriage, and persuaded the Cardinal of Bourbon to solemnise the nuptials; for which the Cardinal had

since solicited and obtained forgiveness from the Pope. De Thou sneers at this story,\* which he entirely disbelieves, and yet nothing can be more true. A despatch from Charles to M. de Ferrals, his ambassador at Rome, acknowledges that the marriage had not only been celebrated without a papal dispensation, but with a certainty that no dispensation could be obtained, except on terms which the King of Navarre could not grant; and the instructions to M. de Beauville, who was sent to Rome immediately after the massacre, direct him to state as an excuse for this irregularity, that the delay of the marriage was exciting distrust among the Hugonots, and enjoin him to solicit forgiveness for the Cardinal of Bourbon and other prelates who had assisted at the ceremony.†

It is a further confirmation of Capilupi's book, that he was the first to relate the conversation between Charles and Alessandrino, which was afterwards confirmed by Pope Clement. If the other anecdotes he recounts have not received the same confirmation, let it be recollected, that they were not denied or refuted at the time, and that he appeals for the greater part of them to persons of consequence then alive, or refers to letters of the queen mother, which were still in existence at Rome. The story he relates was unquestionably the belief of the papal court. The extra-

\* Thuan, lii. 2—liii. 4.

† MSS. Bibl. du Roi.—Desnemes. 267, Reg. <sup>8677</sup>/<sub>3</sub>

vagant joy expressed at Rome on receiving news of the St. Bartholomew, was not, as Caveyrac pretends, because the King of France had punished his rebellious subjects, "sed ob deletos in Galliâ veritatis et ecclesiæ hosteis." It was for this achievement that a solemn procession was made by the Pope and Cardinals to the church of St. Mark; that a jubilee was proclaimed over the whole Christian world; that fire-works were let off from the castle of St. Angelo, and a general illumination ordered at Rome. It was for this nefarious act, that thanks were addressed to Providence in the church of St. Louis, and that medals were struck and inscriptions affixed on the gates of the church in perpetual commemoration of the deed.

It would be easy to multiply authorities which it was the duty of Dr. Lingard to have consulted before he pronounced a judgment on the St. Bartholomew, different from all preceding historians, with the exception of the Abbé de Caveyrac. When first the massacre was perpetrated, Protestants accused the Court of treachery; and many Catholics, while they admitted, gloried in the charge. It was the policy of the Court of France, for obvious reasons, to deny, and if possible to refute, the accusation. But instead of telling the truth, if the truth could have served their purpose, they invented false charges against the Admiral and his adherents, which no one in the present day will main-

\* Thuan, liii. 4.

tain. After the fury of religious bigotry had abated, Catholics, and especially French Catholics, became ashamed of the act, and attempted to palliate its enormity; or, by dividing it among many, to weaken the guilt of the transaction. De Thou, while he expressed his abhorrence of so detestable a crime, is anxious to save the king's honour at the expense of his mother. Matthieu, after acknowledging in the most explicit terms the treacherous designs of Charles and his accomplices, after making a variety of reflections that imply his belief in their guilt, and after stating a multitude of facts irreconcilable, if true, with any opinion of their innocence, adds, that many persons have heard Villeroy declare, "que cette journée ne fut pas préméditée, comme on le rapporte;" and then gives an account of the private deliberations that preceded the massacre, from which it would follow, that the conspiracy was confined to the queen mother and to her confidants, and that the consent of the king was extorted from him by working on his fears, and exaggerating the dangers, of his situation.\* Père Daniel has pursued the same wavering and middle course. He relates facts and makes reflections, which imply his belief of a premeditated plot against the Hugonots, and then adopts the opinion, that the final execution of the massacre was accelerated, if not occasioned, by accident. Caveyrac then appeared, who,

\* Matthieu, l. 331—343.

with greater boldness and more consistency than his predecessors, denied the plot entirely. Dr. Lingard follows in his wake, and has added little or nothing to the force of his arguments, or to the extent of his researches.

III. Was I justified in my conclusion, that no fact is to be credited without examination, no impression to be received without doubt, on the mere authority of Dr. Lingard's statements?

This is a topic on which I enter with reluctance. The opinion I have delivered of Dr. Lingard's book I can neither modify nor retract; but he may accept, or, if he is disposed, triumph in my frank acknowledgment, that I could wish it had been expressed in less harsh and offensive terms. I have no desire to give unnecessary pain, or to wound the feelings of Dr. Lingard. No insult was intended in the sentence that appears to have provoked his indignation: arrogance there could be none, in drawing an inevitable inference from a copious deduction of particular facts. Had I stated my conclusions without any premises, he would have had better reason to complain; but I cannot help suspecting, that in that case I should have offended him less, and have been saved the trouble of this reply. If my conclusions had stood alone, he would have been content with calling them "moonshine." It was my detections, and the impression they produced, that called forth his Vindication. My present business, however, is not to palliate or excuse, but to justify the sentence his reviewer had ventured to pronounce.

No one can have read attentively Dr. Lingard's history without receiving impressions which appeared to him, on reflection, unwarranted by facts; and inconsistent with truth; and yet, on reconsidering Dr. Lingard's words, he must have found that, like the oracles of old, they were so skilfully selected as to convey a double meaning; one likely to strike a careless reader; the other less obvious, which the author was prepared, if necessary, to defend. This mode of insinuating, without being obliged to justify, an unfair impression, if it happened rarely, might be a mere slip of the pen, proceeding from carelessness and haste. But when it occurs frequently, and is always on one side; and more especially when it is effected by relating some facts and disguising or suppressing others, it has the appearance of that species of deception which, for want of a better name, we are accustomed, in English, to call Jesuitical. In reviewing Dr. Lingard's work, I thought it my duty to warn his readers against this practice, and to caution them not to acquiesce in the first impressions they received from his statements, without an examination of his authorities. To illustrate my meaning, and to justify the precautions I had recommended, I shall select a few examples from his book, confining myself strictly to the points of controversy that have been raised between us.

*Authentic documents.*—When Dr. Lingard assured his readers that he had diligently perused the most authentic documents on the St. Bartholomew, they must

necessarily have understood him to mean, that he had diligently studied the subject. When it was shewn that he had not diligently studied the subject, his reply was ready, that by authentic documents he meant nothing more than the confessions of those who were accused of having devised the massacre.

*Contemporary evidence.*—When he said that the *hypothesis* of a premeditated plot was unsupported by contemporary evidence, his readers would naturally understand him to mean that the charge of premeditation was not made for some time after the massacre, and not having been made, that it could not be answered. When it was shewn that the charge was coeval with the massacre, he replies,\* that none of those who made the accusation were privy to the plot, or pretend to have had their information from persons that were privy to it. He forgets, that the question is not, whether the charge was true, but whether it was made; whether the *hypothesis* of a preconcerted plot was proposed at the time, on such plausible grounds, and maintained by such respectable authorities, as to put the accused on their defence. That it was advanced on such authority, and that the accused attempted to vindicate themselves, there is not a doubt. That they failed in this attempt, and that their vindications are replete with inconsistencies and falsehoods, Dr. Lingard is himself compelled to admit.

\* Vindication, 20—22.

*Preparations for, and execution of, the massacre.*—“Four hours,” says Dr. Lingard,\* “had elapsed” (after the resolution to perpetrate the massacre) “before the plan was arranged, and the necessary orders had been given: it wanted two more of the appointed time. To sleep in such circumstances was impossible; and the king, his mother, and brothers, repaired to an open balcony, where they stood gazing at the stars, and waiting the result.” To shew the fallacies in this picturesque description, I pointed out to him, from his favourite authority, the discourse of Henry Third, that the determination to execute the massacre was adopted after the king’s dinner, which was an hour before noon; and that the time employed in making preparations for it, was “le reste du jour, le soir, et une bonne partie de la nuit;” and that instead of finding it impossible to sleep, it was “après avoir reposé deux heures la nuit,” that the royal party repaired to the balcony, at break of day, to witness the commencement of the slaughter. I might have added, that Charles had, in the interval, amused himself at his forge, and employed as his assistants some of the persons whom he had doomed next morning to be his victims.†

“The massacre,” according to Dr. Lingard,‡ “had been infinitely more extensive than had been foreseen;

\* History, viii. 518.

† Review, 101, 102, 138.

‡ History, viii. 519.

“ even its original projectors stood aghast at the multitude of the slain :” on which I could not forbear to remind him, on the same authority, that when Charles consented to the murder of the Admiral, he had exclaimed, “ puisque nous trouvions bon qu’on tuât l’Admiral, qu’il le vouloit—mais aussi tous les Huguenots de France\*—et que nous y donassions ordre promptement ;” and that, in obedience to this sanguinary order, his counsellors had secured the co-operation of the “ prévôt des marchands, des capitaines des quartiers, et autres personnes que nous pensions les plus factieux, faisant un département des quartiers de la ville, desseignans les uns pour exécuter particulièrement sur les autres.”

As a proof that Charles was most intent on putting a stop to the massacre, Dr. Lingard inserted† the following sentence, as a passage from La Popelinière,—“ à diverses fois le roy itera vers le soir les premières defences à tout homme sous peine de vie, &c. ;” on which I remarked, that no such passage existed in La Popelinière; that the words, indeed, were to be found in that author, (and so far Dr. Lingard has the advantage of brother Peter in his search for shoulder-knots), but that they were picked out from different sentences,

\* Meuselius concludes from this passage, that if the discourse attributed to Henry Third be genuine, “ ipse cum matre reginâ minimè cædis detestandæ particeps habendus esset, sed solus rex Carolus IX. eandem animo concepisset.”

† History, viii. 319, note.

and put together so as to convey a meaning not intended by that author. Dr. Lingard is very angry at the observation I had made on his &c., but he takes no notice of the more serious charge of fabricating a quotation, which has no existence, as it is cited, in the original.

Taken singly, these deviations from the authorities he used in composing his narrative, are of no great importance; but the tendency of the whole is to give a false colouring to the transactions he relates; to shorten the time for deliberation after the massacre was resolved upon; to heighten the agitation of the parties while their bloody purpose was in preparation; to represent Charles as shocked with the number of victims, when he had expressly ordered that no Hugonot in France should be spared; and to exhibit him as so much in earnest to put a stop to the massacre, as to issue repeated proclamations to that effect on the very day it commenced, while, in truth, they were issued without effect, day after day, while it was going on, and were uniformly qualified with an exception in favour of those who had permission to kill, pillage, and torment.

*Assassination of Lignerolles.*—“ The leaders of the French Protestants,” says Dr. Lingard\*, “ forwarded the project with all their influence. Lignerolles, the duke’s favourite, and the supposed enemy of the match, was assassinated; and a confident hope was

\* History, viii. 93.

“entertained that the prince, no longer under his influence, would accede to the proposed terms.” Doubtful of the impression which this passage had made on myself, I shewed it to one not unversed in literary composition, and asked him, who were the persons he should conceive, from Dr. Lingard’s words, to have been concerned in the assassination of Lignerolles. Without hesitation, he answered, the French Protestants; and yet nothing can be more certain than that the assassins of Lignerolles were Catholics, and that the murder was perpetrated, not by the friends of the match, but by courtiers acting under orders from the king. Dr. Lingard assures us he had no intention to insinuate that the murder of Lignerolles was the work of the French Protestants; and though his words are calculated to make that impression, I must admit that they do not affirm the fact.

*Massacre of Vassi.* — Catholic, as well as Protestant, writers have agreed that the massacre of Vassi was the cause or signal of the religious wars that ensued in France; on which Dr. Lingard remarks, that this “affray” (as he twice calls it, and not once a massacre, as asserted in his *Vindication*,\*) “happened on March 1; “yet the Calvinists began to arm on the 19th Feb. at “the sound of the drum. They were in the field, and “defeated de Flassans on March 6.—See Ménard; “*Histoire de Nismes*, iv. preuves 6.”

\* *History*, vii. 417—*Vindication*, 51.

The obvious purport of this remark, without which it has no relation whatever to the matter in hand, is to convey to his readers the impression, that before the massacre or affray of Vassi, the Calvinists of Languedoc were in arms, and that they had fought with, and defeated, the Catholics, before any account of the affair at Vassi could have reached Provence; the conclusion from which would be, that in the religious war that followed, the Protestants, and not the Catholics, were the aggressors.

If such was the impression intended by Dr. Lingard, nothing can be more remote from truth; and the only excuse I can offer for his error is, that he has been deceived, as usual, by trusting to Caveyrac.\* No events can be more unlike than the massacre of Vassi and the affair at Barjols, in which the Flassanists were defeated. At Vassi, a congregation of unarmed Hugonots, assembled to celebrate divine service, under the protection of the edict of toleration, were assaulted by armed men, acting without legal authority, sixty of them murdered, and two hundred in all killed or wounded. At Barjols, a body of armed men, in open rebellion against the royal authority, were attacked by the king’s lieutenant and his governor of Provence, the town in which they had fortified themselves taken by assault, and themselves dispersed or cut to pieces. The one affair was a battle, the other a massacre. The battle was fought in maintenance of a royal edict,

\* Caveyrac, *Apologie*, p. 29. *Dissertation*, p. lv.



against persons who resisted the royal authority, and who had defeated a detachment of the king's troops. The massacre was perpetrated in violation of a royal edict, against persons peaceably assembled in a place of worship authorised by law. There is the same difference between the two cases as between the conduct of Lord George Gordon's mob, which pillaged and burned the Roman Catholic chapels;—and that of the guards, who marched into the city to suppress those illegal and disgraceful proceedings.

*Meeting at Bayonne.*—Before I enter on this subject, I must frankly confess, that in his correction of one passage of my Review, Dr. Lingard is in the right. I shall not attempt to justify my exposition of a sentence in Strada, which I had misunderstood, but simply explain how the mistake arose; and to make my explanation intelligible, I have subjoined at the bottom of the page\* the passage I had misinterpreted, carefully collated with a copy of Strada in the British Museum, printed at Rome in 1640. While preparing my Review, I had no opportunity of consulting that

\* “Et verò ingentem illam Hugonotorum cædem, septennio post actam Parisiis, in hoc decretam esse conventu, multi sentiunt. id quod mihi neque abnuere neque affirmare promptum fuerit. potiùs inclinatus animus ut credam, et mutua Gallorum in Belgium, atque hinc in Galliam adversum religionis Principumque rebelles auxilia, quæ sæpiùs submissa deinde vidimus: et Caroli regis cum Elisabethâ Maximiliani Imp. filiâ matrimonium, quinto post annum celebrato, ab eo colloquio provenisse.”—*Strada de Bell. Belg.* p. 109.

work, excepting in the king's library at Paris. When I came to the passage in question, I translated it thus:—  
 ‘ Many, indeed, are of opinion, that the great slaughter  
 ‘ of the Hugonots, perpetrated seven years afterwards  
 ‘ at Paris, was settled at this meeting: an opinion  
 ‘ which I am not prepared either to affirm or to deny: I  
 ‘ am rather inclined to believe it, and that the mutual  
 ‘ aid which since that time we have seen repeatedly  
 ‘ furnished from France to the Netherlands, and from  
 ‘ the Netherlands to France, against the rebels to religion and government: and that the marriage of King  
 ‘ Charles with Elizabeth, daughter of the Emperor  
 ‘ Maximilian, solemnised five years afterwards, originated from that conference.’ My mistake arose from having overlooked the effect of the double “et” in the last member of the sentence, which limits the words “potiùs inclinatus animus ut credam,” to what follows, and disconnects it with what went before. Having fallen into this error in the construction of the passage, I extracted that part of the sentence only which related to the point I was considering, omitting the rest as immaterial to my object; and printing afterwards from the notes I had made, without again consulting the original, I had no opportunity of discovering and correcting my error. Dr. Lingard is pleased to consider this mistake as a fraud.\* It is singular enough, that in exposing that fraud, he has been so careless in reprinting the passage, as to commit what has something of a

\* Vindication, p. 49.

similar appearance. He has prefixed a capital P to "potius," and thereby converted the preceding colon into a full stop. This slight, and, as his printer might hope, imperceptible change, does not affect the construction of the sentence; but it makes my error appear more extraordinary to his readers, and more difficult to explain on any other principle than that of a fraudulent intention to deceive. That I had no such intention, I trust it is unnecessary for me to assert. After so many detections of Dr. Lingard's errors, can it be supposed, that to add one to the number I should have risked a false quotation, which was sure to be discovered and exposed? But, in whatever manner my mistake originated, I should be a churl to grudge Dr. Lingard his triumph at this advantage, the only one he has obtained in the whole course of his *Vindication*. Yet there is one reflection I might suggest to him in abatement of his joy. A merchant may be forgiven a single error in his accounts; but if he commits an error in every page, and every error tells to his own advantage, he must expect to lose his character and credit.

Admitting, then, that Strada was rather disinclined to the opinion that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was projected at Bayonne, I have still to complain of Dr. Lingard, that, professing to give Strada's account of what passed at that interview, he has omitted several important particulars, unfavourable to his own view of the question, which Strada has thought worthy of insertion in his *History*. I shall not repeat what I have stated at length in my *Review* on the conference at

Bayonne. I am ready to allow, that we have no evidence of a formal treaty having been concluded on that occasion between the two crowns. But the subjects of deliberation indicated by Strada, and the consequences that followed—the conversations overheard by the Prince of Navarre—the admissions of Tavannes the son—the private information given to the Protestants by their friends at Court before the enterprise at Meaux—and the subsequent attempt to surprise the Admiral and the Prince of Condé at Noyers, which was defeated by the cunning and caution of Tavannes the father—conjoined with the opinions of the best informed writers of the age, and with the characters of Catherine and Philip, leave no doubt on the mind, that plans were there discussed, and mutual promises of assistance given, for the destruction of heretics, and extirpation of heresy. To pronounce the suspicions of the Protestants to have been chimerical, and their fears pretended, because no formal treaty was signed and sealed, would be as preposterous as to maintain, that no deliberations to check the progress of the French Revolution were held at Pilnitz, because no treaty of confederation against France was actually concluded.

*Misquotation from the Edinburgh Review.*—In page 155 of the *Review* the following passage occurs:—"On the day before the massacre, he (Charles) appointed a detachment of his guards for the protection of Coligny, stationed them around his lodgings, and ordered them to permit no Catholic to approach

“ the house; and on pretence of affording further  
 “ security to the Admiral, he directed that all the  
 “ houses in the neighbourhood should be abandoned  
 “ by their Catholic tenants, and occupied by Hugonots,  
 “ who were ordered, by public authority, to repair to  
 “ that quarter from the different parts of the town  
 “ where they resided. The guards thus stationed for  
 “ the protection of Coligny, were employed next morn-  
 “ ing to murder him; and his friends, collected within  
 “ a small space, were slaughtered, without the possi-  
 “ bility of concealment or escape. *But it is doubtful,*  
 “ *or at least we have been unable to satisfy ourselves*  
 “ *from the recital of historians, whether these orders were*  
 “ *given before or after the final resolution to perpetrate*  
 “ *the massacre next morning. It is a suspicious circum-*  
 “ *stance, however, that the command of the guard was*  
 “ *confided to Cosseins, a known and determined enemy of*  
 “ *Coligny.*”

This passage Dr. Lingard has inserted in his Vindi-  
 cation,\* *omitting the words printed in Italics*; after  
 which he gravely remarks, as if the observation had  
 escaped the reviewer, that “ it is of importance to deter-  
 “ mine at what time of the day the request” (for a guard  
 to Coligny) “ was made by Cornaton, and granted  
 “ by the king. For, if this took place before the design  
 “ of the massacre was communicated to the latter, there  
 “ can be no pretext for charging him with dissimu-

\* Vindication, p. 67.

“ lation.” Having decided to his own satisfaction that  
 the orders were given before the massacre was resolved  
 upon, he asks, “ What could induce the reviewer to  
 “ bring this charge against the king; to accuse him of  
 “ issuing orders for the purpose of facilitating the mas-  
 “ sacre, though they were issued at a time when  
 “ Charles could have no knowledge of any such  
 “ design?”

That the reviewer was doubtful at what hour of  
 the day the order was given, is apparent from the  
 words Dr. Lingard has suppressed in his extract of the  
 passage; and after reconsidering the subject, he is still  
 in doubt. The recital of De Thou is in favour of  
 Dr. Lingard’s opinion; that of the Mémoires de l’Estat  
 directly the reverse. But what contributed chiefly to  
 make the reviewer hesitate, was the following passage  
 in the Memoirs of Tavannes :\*—“ La resolution prise ”  
 (to commit the massacre next morning), “ les Hugue-  
 “ nots semblent ayder à leur ruine, aveuglez deman-  
 “ dent les gardes du Roy, qui leur furent accordées  
 “ pour garder l’admiral, autour duquel les principaux  
 “ se logent, autres avec le Roy de Navarre dans le  
 “ Louvre, pour le conserver (disoient ils) de ceux de  
 “ Guise. Ils facilitent leur massacre.”

That the detachment of guards was assigned to  
 Coligny at his own request, was not unknown to me;  
 but the fact, so far from affording an excuse to Charles,

\* Tavannes, p. 418.

is an aggravation of his guilt. It shews the confidence of the admiral in the justice and protection of his sovereign. The employment of these troops to murder him, is one of the blackest instances of treachery on record; and that they were originally intended for that purpose, many circumstances prove. What Cornaton asked, were six archers of the guard, to keep the populace in awe. At the suggestion of the Duke of Anjou fifty harquebuziers were appointed, and the command of them given to Cosseins, a partisan of the house of Guise, and declared enemy of the admiral. Cornaton remonstrated, but he was silenced by a positive order of the king. As he retired, Thoré, brother of Marshal Montmorenci, whispered in his ear, "On ne vous pouvoit baillir à garder à un plus grand ennemy qu'à celsuy là:" to which Cornaton replied, "Avez-vous considéré avec quelle autorité le roy a commandé cela? Nous nous sommes appuyez sur sa bien vueillance."\*

*Unfounded assertion with respect to the reformed martyrologist.*—This is the last instance I shall give in justification of my general assertion, that no fact is to be credited without examination, on the mere authority of Dr. Lingard's statements.

In estimating the number of persons slain throughout France during the massacre, Dr. Lingard has the following passage:†—"But the martyrologist adopted a measure which may enable us to form a probable

\* Mem. de l'Estat, l. 204.

† History, viii. 520.

"conjecture: He procured from the ministers in the different towns where massacres had taken place, lists of the names of the persons who had suffered, or were supposed to have suffered. He published the result in 1582."

Now, I wish to know from Dr. Lingard on what authority this circumstantial story is related? I have already asked the question, and have received no answer whatever. I believe the tale to be entirely destitute of truth. If Dr. Lingard can either prove the fact, or produce the authority that misled him, he is acquitted. If he can do neither, the story must be considered as his own invention; and the reader, who afterwards gives credit to his statements without examination, must have some other principle than reason to govern his belief.

IV. Was the massacre of St. Bartholomew the result of accident, or the consequence of a premeditated plot to entrap and destroy the Hugonots?

Instead of recapitulating facts already stated, or attempting a minute history and explanation of all that passed between the peace of 1570 and the completion of the tragedy that followed, I shall content myself with some general observations, which will convince, I trust, every unprejudiced reader, that the King of France meditated the destruction of the Hugonots, when he loaded them with favours and marks of confidence, and that the massacre perpetrated by his order was not

a sudden thought, but the result of premeditated treachery.

To prove the existence of a preconcerted plot, it is not necessary to shew at what time it was formed—how many persons were privy to it—what variations the original design underwent—what contrarieties it experienced—what prevented the execution of it at an earlier period—what determined the court to carry it into effect at the time it happened—from what causes the life of the admiral was first attacked—and that attempt failing, why the whole of his adherents at Paris, and many thousand Hugonots throughout France, were included in the massacre. Plausible answers may be given to many of these questions; but as they must be founded on probabilities, they are liable to error, and exposed to contradiction. The contrivers of the plot were the only persons who could have given such a history of its progress as would have removed every objection, and solved every difficulty. For my purpose, it is sufficient to shew—

1. That, while the King of France was flattering the admiral with apparent marks of confidence, and showering favours on his followers, he was secretly meditating their destruction: and,
2. That the language and conduct of Charles and his counsellors, after the massacre, contrasted with their previous professions and declarations, were such as to convince their contemporaries that the design of

the massacre had been entertained before it was carried into execution; and that the Hugonots had been enticed to Paris, with a premeditated intention to cut off their leaders, suppress their religion, and disable them from opposing any resistance in future to the exercise of the royal authority in France.

The declaration of Charles to Alessandrino, in February 1572, establishes the fact, that six months before the massacre, it was the intention of the king, on pretence of marrying his sister to the Prince of Navarre, to insnare the Hugonots, and avenge himself for the injuries he had suffered at their hands. It appears, also, from this declaration, that he was so intent on taking vengeance on his enemies, that he was willing to sacrifice his sister to gratify that passion. Nothing, he owned, would have made him consent to the marriage, but the impossibility of satisfying his revenge in any other way.

This declaration is one of those leading facts in a historical investigation, which, like an *experimentum crucis* in physics, settles many a doubtful point. It gives credibility to stories, which, though not improbable in themselves, rest on less certain evidence. When we are assured on such undoubted authority, that Charles was actuated by these deep-rooted sentiments of revenge, we can believe the vindictive character attributed to him by his contemporay biographers; and credit the declarations ascribed to him, that he would never forgive the enterprize at Meaux.

When we find him harbouring projects of vengeance against the admiral, after the caresses and favours he had bestowed on that nobleman, we have no difficulty in believing the speech he is said to have addressed to his mother, after the affectionate reception he had given to his aunt, the Queen of Navarre, at Blois; and may trust to the anecdote related of him, that after the massacre was perpetrated, he complained of nothing so much as that he had been compelled to dissemble so long.

The sudden burst of fury to which he gave way, when, according to the discourse attributed to the Duke of Anjou, he consented to the murder of the admiral, exclaiming, that all the Hugonots in France must perish with him, could hardly have originated with one who, for the first time, contemplated so bloody an execution; and the ready acquiescence of his counsellors, shews that the project was already familiar to their minds. Is it credible, that so horrid and extensive a massacre should have suddenly occurred to any one, through whose mind it had not previously passed; or, that grave and experienced counsellors, who had been urging the death of the admiral as the only means of preventing greater calamities, would have obeyed, without remonstrance, this frantic and sanguinary order, if the measure had not been already in agitation?

The stories told of the ferocious and cruel disposition of Charles, and of his morbid thirst for blood,

are related by persons who were not his enemies, and who lived at his court in familiar intercourse with his most intimate associates. They are confirmed by his parade through the streets of Paris on the evening after the massacre—by his visit to Montfaucon, to contemplate the mangled and disfigured remains of the admiral, and by his savage curiosity to witness, with his own eyes, the execution of Briquemaut and Cavagnes. No fact in history is better attested than the last and worst of these anecdotes.\*

The consummate treachery and profound dissimulation of Charles, at so early an age, have been urged as objections to a premeditated plot, to which he was a party. Maturity in fraud at the age of Charles is indeed uncommon, though not unexampled. If we are to believe the unanimous voice of his contemporaries, he had been educated in dissimulation and perfidy from his childhood, and was an adept in those arts. They who represent him as a frank open character, incapable from temper of concealing the emotions that passed

\* The authorities which relate this fact are numerous. I shall content myself with Walsingham's letter to Sir Thomas Smith, which begins thus:—"Sir, it may please you to advertise her majesty, that the young queen was brought to bed of a daughter on the 22d October, whose nativity was consecrated with the blood of Briquemaut and Cavannes, who the same day, between the hours of five and six in the evening, were hanged by torch-light, the king, queen-mother, and the King of Navarre, with the king's brethren and the Prince of Conde, being lookers on."—*Digges*, p. 278.

through his soul, seem to have forgot, that while preparations were making for the massacre, he redoubled his caresses to the King of Navarre, repeated to the admiral his assurances of safety and protection, and had such command of himself on that trying occasion, as to resume in the evening his ordinary amusement, and employ, as his assistants, the persons he was to waken next morning by tolling the fatal knell of their friends.

Had the massacre arisen from accidental circumstances, Charles and his counsellors, pressed as they were on all sides to justify their conduct, could not have failed to give a satisfactory explanation of the unforeseen and fortuitous causes that led to so deplorable a catastrophe. But the excuses they made, the pretexts they alleged, were false, inconsistent, and contradictory, and were not even credited by those who thought it their duty to circulate them over Europe. "Sanè deplorandum fuit," says De Thou,\* "viros dignitate, pietate, integritate, ac doctrinâ præstanteis, et ab omni fuco et vanitate alienos, Morvillerium, Thuanum, Monlucium, Pibracium, et Bellevreum, ut regni bono inservirent, eo non metu aut spe, sed præsentis rerum statu adductos, ut rem, quam intrâ se detestabantur, aut simulate laudarent, aut officiosâ excusatione obscurarent." Let it be remembered, that these men were

\* Thuanus, liii. 8.

the father and intimate friends of De Thou, whose private opinions he has here expressed in opposition to their public declarations and apologies.\*

Dr. Lingard, at the distance of two hundred and fifty years, calls for evidence of the plot. The evidence is the charge brought against the criminals at the time, which they endeavoured, but unsuccessfully, to repel. Their contemporaries had no doubt of their guilt. Protestants accused them of the crime; and, while many Catholics deplored the act, the greater number gloried in the treachery, and exulted in its success. What has happened to alter this judgment of contemporaries? A discourse, ascribed to Henry III., has been published, which attributes the first attempt on the admiral's life to the joint contrivance of himself and his mother, and

\* Indeed; the speech of De Thou the father, when the king went in state to the Parliament and avowed the massacre, implies his belief, that Charles had dissembled with his enemies in order to get them into his power. What other sense can be affixed to the ambiguous compliment he made to his sovereign, *Qui nescit dissimulare, nescit regnare*. That he held the massacre in abhorrence, and wished to obliterate every memorial of so detestable a crime, we are informed by his son, who tells us that, in speaking of the St. Bartholomew, his father used to apply to it the following lines—

Excidat illa dies ævo, ne postera credant  
 Sæcula; nos certè taceamus, et obruta multa  
 Nocte tegi propriæ patiamur crimina gentis.

represents the king as at that time unwilling to give up the admiral; but, when induced to consent, as directing that every Hugonot in France should be included in the massacre. But this discourse, admitting it to be genuine, gives no account of the previous deliberations of the queen-mother and her confidants, nor of the dispositions and secret designs of Charles when he invited the Hugonots to Paris. The Memoirs of Queen Margaret may be believed on one point, that her brother Charles told her he had been with difficulty persuaded to the murder of the admiral, but on no other material fact are they worthy of credit. She was, by her own account, ignorant of what was going on, and her story is, in many particulars, at variance with that of her brother. What, indeed, was to be expected from a woman of gallantry, writing, amidst a seraglio of lovers, the history and apology of her scandalous adventures? The correction of Matthieu relates only to the final catastrophe, which, he says, many persons had heard from Villeroy, was brought about differently from the story usually told. The Memoirs of Tavannes are a controversial work, written many years after the events they relate, full of blunders, and with no better pretence to authority than twenty other works of the same period.

Brantome and others have represented Tavannes the father as one of the devisers of the massacre. In a memorial addressed by that crafty and unprincipled politician to the king, soon after the peace of 1570, I

discovered what seemed to me a confirmation of the charge. Dr. Lingard\* disputes the inference I have drawn from this paper. I am not satisfied with his reasons, and am still of opinion that the words, "il n'y a moyen que de prendre les chefs tout à la fois pour y mettre un fin," apply to the Hugonot chiefs as well as to the royal family. But the point is not of sufficient importance to argue it at length.

Dr. Lingard† quotes with complacency a passage from the *Mélanges Littéraires* of the Viscount de Chateaubriand, where that author asserts he had examined the secret papers of the Vatican, while they were at Paris, and the result of his examination was a positive conviction in his mind, that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was not a premeditated design, but a resolution suddenly adopted in consequence of the wound of the admiral. The Viscount de Chateaubriand is a man of eloquence and imagination; but how far he is qualified for historical investigation we have yet to learn. It would have been more satisfactory if he had published the documents which convinced him that the massacre was the result of the unsuccessful attempt on the admiral's life. That he found no papers which proved it to have been a preconcerted plot I can readily believe. I have it in my power to communicate a still more extraordinary fact to Dr. Lingard. There is not a trace of the St. Bartholomew to be found on

\* *Vindication*, p. 53.

† *Ibid*, p. 69.



the archives of the parliament of Paris, though we know from De Thou, that, besides other documents on the subject, the king's declaration of the 26th of August was inserted in the records of that assembly. Not a scrap, however, remains; every vestige of so abominable a transaction has long since disappeared; and probably for the same reason many papers relating to that event have been withdrawn from the records of the Vatican. When the rancorous bigotry of the sixteenth century had subsided, which priests of different sects are striving now a-days to rekindle, Catholics became ashamed of the execrable act, which their ancestors had extolled as meritorious, and, under the influence of better feelings, they destroyed every document that could throw light upon it. As an historical question, it was supposed to have been settled, and the subject had been long suffered to rest in oblivion. That it should have been revived at the present moment I most deeply lament; but, if Catholics unjustly suffer from the recollections it excites, they have to blame the indiscreet and officious zeal of their historian.

I am aware, that to dwell on the crimes which a bigotted zeal for the Roman Catholic religion occasioned in times comparatively remote, may appear unseasonable to some, at a period when English Roman Catholics are petitioning for the restoration of their rights. The just indignation which such discussions inspire or recall to the mind, must have a tendency to confirm prejudices, and give a colour to alarms which every

good citizen would seek to banish or allay. But I know that indignation and disgust at the cruelty and perfidy that led to the St. Bartholomew, are consistent with a sincere and earnest desire to see the last vestige of the penal code against Roman Catholics erased from our statute-book; and I believe and trust that they are equally compatible with a conscientious adherence to the doctrines, and a practical submission to the discipline of the Church of Rome. Certain I am, that with the Protestant part of the community Roman Catholics will better promote their cause, by expressing their abhorrence of religious persecution, from whatever sect or party it proceeds, than by impotent, unnecessary, and ill-judged attempts to disguise or palliate the crimes and bigotry of their ancestors. That Dr. Lingard should have taken the latter course, ought to be matter of regret with those of his communion, who sincerely desire to conciliate the affections, and quiet the fears of their Protestant fellow-subjects. That he should be answered, and his errors exposed by Protestants, was to be expected; and none are so imperatively called upon to the performance of that duty, as those who have unsuccessfully, but strenuously, exerted themselves to remove the odious and cruel exclusions under which Roman Catholics in England unjustly and unnecessarily suffer.

In taking leave of Dr. Lingard, I repeat my assurances, that in what I have said of his book, I have been actuated by no private pique or personal ill-will

against him. I could willingly have been dispensed from the task which I have now finished ; but having brought it to a close, I cannot refuse my thanks to Dr. Lingard for having compelled me to reconsider the subject. It has enabled me to place in a stronger and clearer light the decisive evidence furnished by Cardinal d'Ossat, which, in the multiplicity of matter I was forced to crowd into the narrow compass of a review, I had stated more slightly in my former essay than its importance deserved.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A, (SEE PAGE 11.)

IN the Review, I had said that a MS. in the Royal Library at Paris, marked 8448, Ambassades, which Dr. Lingard had attributed to a person in the suite of Richard the Second, made no pretension to that character; and as an historical document I had rated it very low — considering it a collection of tales and hearsays, unworthy of credit. *Investigator* (to borrow a phrase from Dr. Lingard) “ pounces” on this passage, accuses me of having “ paraded a knowledge of what I had “ never seen,” appeals from the unfavourable opinion I had expressed of the MS. to the authority of M. Buchon, and exhorts me to “ make a candid and manly retraction of my error.”

It so happened, that many years ago I had examined with care the MS. in question, and had compared it with several other MSS. in the same library, which profess to tell the same story, and which, indeed, generally relate it in nearly the same words. These collations I had communicated to Mr. Webb, when that gentleman was preparing for the press his translation of Creton's Metrical History of the Imprisonment of Richard the Second ; and the copious extracts from my notes,

which he has published in the twentieth volume of the *Archæologia*, prove, at least, that I was not totally unacquainted with the MS. I had ventured to criticise.

I had not, therefore, "paraded a knowledge of what "I had never seen:" nor was I mistaken in my assertion, that the MS. contains no pretensions of having been written by a person in the suite of King Richard. M. Buchon has lately printed one of the MSS. on the fall and deposal of Richard, which I had consulted in the King of France's library. He has selected, for publication, not the MS. *Ambassades*, but a MS. marked 97<sup>45</sup>, "dont le style porte plutôt l'empreinte" des temps, et où quelques évènements sont racontés "d'une manière plus circonstanciée;" but, that nothing might be wanting to his edition, he has subjoined, from the MS. *Ambassades*, the passages suppressed or abridged in the other.\* Any one who will take the trouble to peruse the publication of M. Buchon, will find that I was in the right in asserting, that the MS. *Ambassades* makes no pretension to have been written by a person in the suite of Richard; and if *Investigator* will examine the other MSS. referred to by Mr. Webb, I am mistaken if he will discover in any one of them such a pretension; or find in any one of them, with the exception of the MS. published by M. Buchon, any hint or information concerning the persons by whom they were written, or the authority from which they were derived.

\* Collection des Chroniques, &c. par J. A. Buchon, tom. 15.

The value of the MS. *Ambassades* is another question. M. Buchon, while he acknowledges its incorrectness in its account of the Parliamentary proceedings on the deposal of Richard, thinks this single error insufficient to destroy its authority on other points. Mr. Webb, admitting its inferiority as an historical document to the account of Creton, is of opinion, that it must have been "penned by one who was either "present at a great part of what he relates, or had "immediate intercourse with many of the actors." I am sorry to differ from these gentlemen; but I retain my former opinion of the MS.

Like the metrical narrative of Creton, the MS. *Ambassades* enters into a minute and circumstantial detail of occurrences, and frequently recounts conversations in a style more approaching to romance than to history. But Creton authenticates his details, by interweaving his own adventures and personal feelings with the scenes he describes; and when not an eye-witness of the transactions he relates, he is careful to inform us of the fact. He gives an account of the motives that led him to England; tells us of his arrival in London after the departure of Richard for Ireland: and informs us, that he followed that monarch to Milford Haven, attended him in his expedition, and remained with his army till the Earl of Salisbury was sent back from Dublin, to collect forces against Henry of Lancaster, when he accompanied that nobleman into Wales. With Salisbury he remained till the arrival of Richard at

Conway; after which, he continued in company with both till their imprisonment at Chester. He was then separated from them, and taken to London under the protection of Henry. He had, soon after, permission to go back to France; and on his return to his own country, in fulfilment of a promise he had made to the Earl of Salisbury, he composed his narrative, while the scenes at which he had been present were still fresh in his recollection. He is, therefore, a competent witness of many of the transactions he relates; and where his account differs from that of the MS. Ambassades, there can be no doubt that his authority for occurrences of which he was an eye-witness, is to be preferred to that of a nameless author, of whom we know nothing, except that he compiled a chronicle, for the truth of which no voucher is produced. But, if we try the MS. Ambassades by comparing the statements it contains with the facts related by Creton, we shall find, that not only it could not have been written by an eye-witness, but that it must have been composed by one, who, with every affectation of minute accuracy, was ignorant or regardless of the truth.

1. The MS. Ambassades\* gives an account of a consultation held by Richard with his friends at Milford Haven, two days after his arrival from Ireland, at which the Earl of Salisbury was present, and represents that nobleman as advising the king to make his escape to Bourdeaux. According to Creton,† who was with the

\* Buchon, 68. † Archaeol. 96.

Earl of Salisbury at that period, the king and earl met, for the first time after the return of Richard, at Conway Castle, the king having previously abandoned his army at Milford Haven, and with only thirteen attendants accomplished his journey to Conway.

2. The MS. Ambassades relates,\* that before Richard quitted Milford Haven, his army had been reduced, by desertion, from 32,000 to 6000 men. Creton, who was at Conway when the king arrived there, and had opportunities of knowing the truth from his followers, tells us,† that the army brought by Richard from Ireland, though dispirited, was entire when he stole away from them; and according to the information he afterwards received, it was not till after the discovery of the king's flight that they were disbanded.‡

3. The MS. Ambassades|| makes the king remain two days at Milford Haven before the desertion of his troops, and assigns the night of the third day for his secret departure to Conway. Creton tells us,§ that he was two days in crossing from Ireland, and that on the night of his arrival he fled from his army.

4. When the Earl of Huntingdon repaired to Henry at Chester, in order to obtain terms for the king, the MS. Ambassades¶ makes Henry assign as a reason for detaining him at Chester, that he must wait for the return of Northumberland, who had been sent to Con-

\* Buchon, 67. † Archaeol. 76, 77. ‡ Archaeol. 99.  
|| Buchon, 67, 69. § Archaeol. 75, 77. ¶ Buchon, 69.

way to negotiate with Richard. But it appears from Creton\* that the resolution to send Northumberland to Conway was not adopted for many days afterwards.

5. The MS. Ambassades† pretends that Northumberland set off from Chester to Conway on the same day that Huntingdon arrived at Chester. According to Creton,‡ eight days elapsed between the departure of Huntingdon and the arrival of Northumberland at Conway.

6. The MS. Ambassades§ makes Northumberland bring letters of credence to the king from his brother the Earl of Huntingdon. Creton, who was present at his arrival, makes no mention of this circumstance;|| nor could it have happened in the way related by the MS. Ambassades, as Northumberland could not have pretended to the king, that he had met Huntingdon on the road to Chester, for that nobleman had left Conway eight days before, to go to Chester,—a distance of less than fifty miles.

7. According to the MS. Ambassades,¶ Northumberland proposed to Richard on the part of Henry, that all differences between them should be submitted to the arbitration of four of the king's friends; viz. the Bishop of Carlisle, the Earl of Salisbury, a priest of the name of Maudelain, and the Earl of Westmoreland. According to Creton,\*\* who

\* Archæol. 125. † Buchon, 70. ‡ Archæol. 130. § Buchon, 71.  
|| Archæol. 132—137. ¶ Buchon, 71. \*\* Archæol. 132—137.

was in Conway Castle at the time, the demands of Northumberland were, that Henry should be restored to his hereditary rank of High Steward of England, that a parliament should be held at Westminster, and that the Earl of Huntingdon, the Duke of Surrey, the Earl of Salisbury, the Bishop of Carlisle, and Maudelain, should be there tried for having advised the murder of the Duke of Gloucester, Henry presiding as Lord Steward at the trial: and on these conditions, Northumberland engaged in the name of Henry, that Richard should be again received and acknowledged as King of England.

8. According to Creton,\* Northumberland, of his own accord, offered to swear on the consecrated Host to the sincerity with which he made these propositions. The MS. Ambassades† makes this additional precaution to have been the suggestion of the Bishop of Carlisle. Both agree in representing the king as equally insincere with Northumberland; and describe him, at the moment he was consenting to terms of peace, as planning with his friends how to elude the articles and take bloody vengeance on his enemies.

9. The MS. Ambassades‡ makes the king set off from Conway after dinner. Creton, who was in his company, says they dined sumptuously at Rhuddlan between Conway and Flint.||

\* Archæol. 137.  
‡ Buchon, 72.

† Buchon, 71.  
|| Archæol. 147.

10. The MS. Ambassades\* pretends that Richard was torn from his friends before he was immured in the castle of Chester, and gives a pathetic description of the Earl of Salisbury and Bishop of Carlisle clinging to his knees when forcibly separated from their master. Creton,† who was present, tells us they were shut up with him, and informs us, that while Henry remained at Chester, Richard abode in the castle with his good friends Salisbury and Carlisle, and with the two knights Scroop and Ferriby.

11. Both relate the wailings and execrations of Richard during the night he passed at Flint Castle, in expectation of the arrival of Henry on the following morning. Creton, who heard them uttered, has clothed them in a dress sufficiently poetical; but if any one wants an example of the talent for embellishment possessed by the author of the MS. Ambassades, more suitable to a romance of Madame de Scuderi than to the sobriety of history, he cannot do better than consult the improved edition that author has given of the king's lamentations. The passages are too long and too tiresome for transcription. They will be found in Buchon's Froissart, xiv. 366, and xv. Supp. 73.

After these discrepancies from the authentic account of Creton, it cannot be pretended, that the author of the MS. Ambassades was present at the transactions he has so disfigured; nor can it be said, that in collecting

\* Buchon, 77.

† Archæol. 175.

his materials from others, he has shewn that regard to accuracy which the nature of his plan required. Circumstantial details are confirmations of a story when agreeable to truth; but, when fictitious and imaginary, they destroy the credit of the narrative they were meant to adorn, and degrade the author who invents them from the rank of an historian to a novelist.

There are only two passages in the MS. Ambassades, which furnish the slightest ground for believing that the author was present at any of the scenes he delineates. They seem to me inconclusive; and at any rate they apply only to two detached occurrences in his book. His blunders on other occasions shew, that he neither witnessed the transactions he describes, nor had an accurate account of them from those who did.

I should fatigue my readers if I were to prosecute the subject further. I shall add only a few words, to complete the parallel between the two works I have been led to contrast.

Creton having left England soon after the arrival of Richard as a prisoner in London, the remainder of his narrative is derived from the information of a French priest, who had accompanied Henry from the Continent, and who quitted his service in disgust soon after his establishment on the throne. But, though obtained from a quarter unfriendly to England, the account Creton has given of the transactions that followed his own departure to France, is far from being incorrect, and accords on the whole with the rolls of Parliament.

The author of the MS. Ambassades pursues his former course in the remaining part of his narrative, and continues, as before, to dramatise events and make speeches for his principal performers. But he gives no authority for the stories he relates; and where it is possible to compare his statements with authentic documents, such mistakes are visible at every step, as to destroy entirely the credit of his work. It is unnecessary, however, to enter into details till some one comes forward to vindicate his fame. Neither Mr. Webb nor M. Buchon defend him in this part of his narrative.

NOTE B. (See page 39.)

The correspondence of Cardinal d'Ossat, though not an uncommon book, is not in the hands of every one. For the satisfaction of my readers, I have therefore extracted from it the passages referred to in the text. The edition I use is that of Amelot de la Houssaie, published in five volumes 12mo., Amsterdam, 1732.

Cardinal d'Ossat relates to Villeroy, Secretary of State to Henry IV., in a letter of the 22d of September 1599, that having had an audience of the Pope on the 13th of the month, he had stated to His Holiness, in discussing with him the mode of procedure to be adopted in investigating the allegations for the divorce, "Et quant au fait, outre que toutes les choses par nous

"alleguées, étoient vraisemblables, S. S. en avoit déjà  
"une grande lumière, et nous avoit elle-même appris  
"la cause que le Roi Charles IX, et la Reine sa mere,  
"avoient eue de contraindre la Reine Marguerite à ce  
"mariage;" in explanation of which he enters into  
the following details, for the information of Villeroy, in  
the concluding part of his letter.

"Je vous ai mis ci-dessus, comme j'avois dit au  
"Pape entre autres choses, qu'il nous avoit appris lui-  
"même la cause, que le Roi Charles IX, et la Reine sa  
"mere, avoient eue de contraindre la Reine Marguerite  
"à ce mariage; et que je vous expliquerois cela en  
"quelque autre endroit de cette lettre. Vous saurez  
"donc, s'il vous plaît, qu'une de tant de fois, que le  
"Pape m'a envoyé appeler pour cet afaire, il me dit,  
"que lorsque l'on étoit après à faire ce mariage, Mon-  
"sieur le Cardinal Alexandrin, envoyé légat par le  
"Pape Pie V son oncle, se rencontra en France, et fît  
"tout ce qu'il put pour le détourner; et qu'après en  
"avoir parlé plusieurs fois au dit Roi Charles, S. M. le  
"prit un jour par la main, et lui dit: *Monsieur le Car-*  
"*dinal, tout ce que vous me dites est bon. Je le recon-*  
"*nois, et en remercie le Pape et vous; et si j'avois*  
"*quelque autre moyen de me vanger de mes ennemis, je*  
"*ne ferois point ce mariage; mais je n'en ai point d'autre*  
"*moyen que celui-ci.* Ajoûta S. S. que lorsque la  
"nouvelle de la S. Barthelemi vint à Rome, le dit  
"Cardinal Alexandrin dit: *Loué soit Dieu, le Roi de*

“ *France m’a tenu promesse.* Disoit S. S. savoir tout  
 “ ceci, pour ce qu’il étoit auditeur du dit Sieur Cardinal;  
 “ et fut avec lui en tout le voyage, que le dit Sieur  
 “ Cardinal fit en Espagne premièrement, et puis en  
 “ France; *et qu’il avoit lui-même écrit cela des lors,* et  
 “ se pourroit encore aujourd’hui trouver écrit de sa  
 “ main, parmi les papiers du dit Sieur Cardinal Alexan-  
 “ drin. Et est bon, que vous sachiez encore, que comme  
 “ j’allois informant les cardinaux de la congregation,  
 “ un d’eux, à savoir Borghese, me dit, que le Pape leur  
 “ avoit compté cette histoire le jour qui les assemble  
 “ devant soi pour ce fait: dont je suis très-aise. A  
 “ quoi vous pouvez connoitre, entre autres choses, la  
 “ très-bonne inclination de S. S. au bien de cet affaire;  
 “ et la gratitude, que le roi et nous tous lui en devons.  
 “ Aussi me suis-je servi de ce récit, que S. S. me fit,  
 “ en mon ecriture en droit, pour rendre vraisemblable la  
 “ crainte, qu’on avoit faite à la Reine Marguerite, pour  
 “ lui faire faire ce mariage.”\*

This statement had been communicated by the  
 Pope to the Cardinals on the 31st of August, when he  
 opened to them the subject of the divorce, and stated  
 to them the reasons for and against it, “ exhortant les  
 “ dits cardinaux de bien voir et considérer le tout, chacun  
 “ à part, et puis s’assembler tous, pour deliberer en-

\* Lettres d’Ossat, iii. 418—420.

“ semble de ce qui seroit à faire, et le lui rapporter.”\*  
 From the silence of d’Ossat, in his Letter to Villeroy of  
 the 8th of September, it is probable that the fact had  
 not then been disclosed to him.

\* Lettres d’Ossat, iii. 401, 402.

THE END.

LONDON:

J. MOYES, TOOK’S COURT, CHANCERY LANE.



0391

*[Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]*