

THE

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY

AND

United Presbyterian Review.

OLD SERIES, }
VOL. XLIX. }

DECEMBER, 1872.

{ NEW SERIES,
VOL. XI.—No. 7.

THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW.*

BY REV. ALEXANDER YOUNG, D.D., LL.D.

Men naturally feel an interest in events which fire the imagination or move the feelings. Wheresoever events are the manifestation of great principles, men perpetuate them by history, poetry, statuary and institutions commemorative of their nature. Through the record of the persecutions and trials of the children of God in the narratives of the Old and New Testaments, we profit by the things "written for our learning." The Jew had his religious feeling kindled by the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles, and the solemnities of the Great Day of Atonement. When enemies plotted the destruction of all the Jews in Assyria through the wounded vanity of one man whom Mordecai would not honour, and God sent them deliverance, they did well to institute and observe, as they still do, the feast of Purim as a testimonial of their gratitude.

A corrupt system, wide-spread and powerful, bearing unceasing hatred to the evangelical faith, has a history in which it glories, written in the blood of the saints through many centuries; and the persecutions, imprisonments, exile and death of the multitudes who suffered, are the common heritage of Christendom. It is well to meditate on the principle from which these sufferings have so largely sprung; and, as one important manifestation of it appears in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, our church has done well in calling the attention of this audience to the infamy which still clings to it in the three hundredth year since its occurrence.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew was an attempt to suppress evangelical truth in France. To some extent the Waldenses and Albigenses

* An address delivered by appointment of the Thirteenth General Assembly before the Fourteenth General Assembly in Washington, Iowa, in informal session, and published according to a resolution passed at the same session.

The address was written during an absence from home, from notes made from many authorities not marked at the time, and which cannot now be examined. Hence the absence of specific references and the general nature of many statements—Y.

had spread their principles, and many had fallen by the power of the persecutor, before the Reformation commenced by Luther. The translation of the Scriptures, and their circulation among the people, was the great instrument of success in establishing the truth. James Lefevre as translator, and Farel as preacher, gave the Bible and its doctrines to France. Acquainted as we are with the great truths of the Bible from infancy, and living in a land whose institutions have been so largely moulded by divine truth, we can hardly estimate the influence produced by the circulation of the Scriptures in those days. To the great mass of the people the Bible was a new revelation,—really a revelation of the divine will. It was read by the more intelligent,—heard and carried in the memory of others, and taught to the audiences which assembled to hear and examine. Converts weary of the superstitions of Rome, and disgusted at her perversions of truth, formed organizations and churches on a Scriptural plan. The presses of Geneva and Holland multiplied the Scriptures and religious works illustrating their doctrines; and colporteurs, at the risk of life, zealously spread them. We have an illustration of the work of that day in the one now going forward in Mexico, and in the Republics of Spanish America, and in Italy and Spain, as well as among the people under the Mohammedan and Brahmanic systems of government and belief. Truth had its receivers, its defenders, its propagators and its martyrs. Rome, through its priesthood, stirred up an earnest and furious opposition; and the power of the magistrate and the influence of the church combined to hinder the spread of the truth by *exterminating* all who embraced it.

This conflict was waged for more than half a century. Suffering constant persecution, the Huguenots still increased in strength; but numbering only a twentieth part of the population, it would have been both foolish and unscriptural to propagate their views by the sword. Calvin and other reformers counselled endurance of wrong; yet, in many cases, they were compelled in self defence to protect themselves; and this, in connection with the complications of various states growing out of the extent to which religion, the existence or the extermination of Protestantism, entered into all political movements, led to armed combinations for the defence of Protestantism; and Switzer, German, Spaniard, Italian, Englishman, Irishman and Scot, fought in France, on one side or the other, in the interests of religion.

France was not then the united and compact government which it is now. Local parliaments and local interests made combined and energetic efforts impossible. In all countries the power of Rome was exerted to suppress heresy, or to disturb the peace of Protestant states. France gave what assistance and encouragement she could to Mary Queen of Scots, aiding her in her pretensions to the English throne. Elizabeth retaliated by helping the French Protestants. By unity of feeling and action, although comparatively few in numbers, they carried on war against the government of France with a boldness and a success approaching the marvellous. Their aim was not the overthrow of the existing government, and the setting up of a Protestant power. They simply sought freedom of conscience and protection for their persons and their property. In one of three wars, waged within ten years, they nearly seized the royal family; and in another, for six weeks besieged Paris, and came very near capturing it. Three times

in ten years they made treaties of peace, in which the rights for which they fought were fully promised,—treaties which the Romanists never meant to keep, and which the Huguenots never expected they would keep.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew cannot be understood without a sketch, necessarily very brief, of the prominent persons concerned in it. These were, on the side of the Romanists, Charles IX., King of France; his brothers the Duke of Anjou and the Duke of Alençon; his mother, better known by her father's family name, Catherine de Medici; the Duke of Guise, leader of the forces, and the princes of the family of Guise, and the Cardinal of Lorraine.

On the Protestant side were the prince of Conde and the king of Navarre, of the Bourbon branch of the royal family. The Protestants long endured persecution without resisting by arms; but being advised by prominent German theologians that resistance, without intending injury to the person of the king, would be lawful, if directed by a prince of the blood, they gave their services to Conde and Navarre.

Admiral Coligni was their chief leader. Coligni, great in council, great in success, and greater still in defeat, stood the invincible champion of the Protestant cause. Incorruptible by bribery, unswayed by friendship or flattery, unharmed by attempted assassinations, desiring only the good of his countrymen, Romanist and Protestant alike. It was considered useless to continue a war against such a leader and such followers, at so great cost of treasure and life. A new policy was adopted. Under pretence of humanity, Charles IX. proposed a scheme by which the power of the Protestants should be broken, their leaders destroyed, and their religion suppressed by their extermination. This plan required the presence of the Protestant leaders in Paris. Coligni was too wary to trust the promises of the king rashly, and craftiness and dissimulation were used to the great man's ruin. Treated with marked kindness, and seeing in the plan proposed a relief to his country from the evils which afflicted her, he considered only how his piety as a Christian and his fidelity and patriotism as a subject, might be used for the welfare and honour of France, and the peaceful success of the Protestant cause.

The king's scheme contemplated the marriage of his sister Margaret and king Henry, of Navarre; liberty of conscience to the Protestants, and the employment of Coligni in conducting a war for the recovery of Flanders. Completely freed from distrust, Coligni used his influence to remove the disquietude and fears of his friends who suspected treachery under this show of excessive kindness.

The marriage of the king's sister with Henry IV. was fixed early in June, 1572, and its celebration was the pretext for drawing many Protestants to court. The mother of Henry was taken ill and died on the fourth day under strong suspicion of having been poisoned through means affecting the brain only. An examination of the body showed an abscess which might have proved fatal; still, death may have resulted from both causes combined. This delayed the marriage, and many influential Protestants returned home.

On the 18th day of August, 1572, the marriage was celebrated, and Paris was filled with the customary rejoicings of such an occasion. On Friday, August 22d, the king's assassin, Merauvalle, instigated by the

young Duke of Guise, fired at Coligni as he passed along the street from the palace to his residence. The assassin's aim failed in its object, and one arm and a finger of the hand of the other received the balls intended for the heart of Coligni.

Merauvalle escaped on a horse from the king's stables. This aroused the suspicion and the anger of Coligni's friends. They pressed the king to see that justice should be done; and to remove all distrust, the king and all his court visited the wounded man in the afternoon, and were profuse in their condolence. This overacting of their part had its effect on some of Coligni's friends, resulting in their safety by their withdrawal from Paris.

So well had the plot been laid,—so well the measures taken, that the Protestants of Paris had no suspicion of the impending danger, especially of such a danger. As the time drew near, Charles showed great reluctance to give the order for the massacre. His mother, the heartless creature of Rome, represented to him the danger to which he was exposed from his own brother and from the Protestants if he hesitated. The order was given; and, according to previous arrangements, the Duke of Guise, the champion of Rome, was intrusted with its execution.

The first victim was Coligni. Aroused from sleep by the noise, he asked an attendant what it was. "Honoured master, the Lord calls for us." While he was addressing a brief prayer to God, the foremost of the assassins asked him if he was Coligni? Acknowledging that he was, he added, "Young man, respect these gray hairs;" and was pierced through the body. The Duke of Guise ordered it to be thrown out of the window, and wiping the blood from the face, as soon as he recognised it, kicked the corpse. The head was cut off, sent to the king's mother, embalmed and sent to Rome. The body was hanged on a gibbet, partly burned, gazed on by the king and his friends, but afterwards interred by friendly hands.

The guards were under arms, the city officers were to dispose the militia to execute the king's orders, of which the signal was to be the ringing of a bell near the palace. The signal was given, and repeated from every steeple. The Romanists, each marked by a white cross, made visible by the illumination of their houses, rushed armed into the houses of the Protestants and murdered all ages, sexes and conditions. In the palace itself, under the eye of the king, attendants of king Henry of Navarre, who, with his wife, was the guest of Charles IX., were shot down. It was with difficulty that Henry had been excepted from the slaughter when the plot was formed. Charles used his own gun in shooting the fugitives, and exulted with fiendish joy over the success of the plan which he had formed, and which he boasted "*would bring them into his net.*"

For a whole week all Protestants who showed themselves or could be found in Paris were killed. Their bodies were dragged through the streets and thrown into the Seine,—denied Christian burial,—the utmost indignity which a Romanist could inflict, and their houses were pillaged.

On the eve of St. Bartholomew, orders had been sent to the governors of the provinces to let loose the Romanists on the Protestants. The Protestants were assured that the king did not mean to extermi-

nate them because of their religion, yet orders were privately sent to their murderers, so that in the space of two months, in various parts of France, between thirty thousand and sixty thousand persons were destroyed. To the honour of some of the governors, they gave little countenance to these cruelties, and some of them regarded the orders as forgeries issued in the king's name, and refused to execute them at all, giving for an answer, "Our swords are at the king's command against his enemies, not against his subjects."

As Pope after Pope had urged the slaughter, Rome rang with rejoicings at the destruction of the Protestants. Gregory XIII. ordered guns to be fired from the castle of St. Angelo, bells to be rung, bonfires to be lighted; and, accompanied by cardinals and priests, led a magnificent procession to the church of St. Louis, where the cardinal of Lorraine, brother of the Duke of Guise, the murderer of the Protestants, chanted the "*Te Deum Laudamus*." A medal was struck bearing the motto, "*Strages Huguenotorum*,"* and, by the Pope's direction, the pencil of Vasari perpetuated the chief incidents of the massacre in a picture which still hangs in the Vatican.

For the first two days the king denied that the massacre had been ordered by him, throwing all the blame on the Duke of Guise. Four days after the murder of Coligni he went to the Parliament House, avowed the ordering of the massacre, was complimented for it, and directed a process to be instituted against Coligni, by which his memory was stigmatized as a traitor, and two innocent men of respectable character were executed as accomplices of Coligni in a conspiracy against the life of the king, his brothers, his mother, and the king of Navarre, in order to set the prince of Conde on the throne. These men died denying the charge. Their lives could have been saved by acknowledging it.

A feeling of horror spread in all Protestant lands against the perpetrators of such cruelties, and all Protestant courts expressed their disapprobation of the act. The ambassadors of the French court gave specious accounts of the occurrence, and Romanists and their apologists describe the massacre as an unpremeditated outbreak of feeling, differing from many others often happening, only in the greater extent of the injury. Others attempt its justification on the plea of the general turbulence and warlike disposition of the Protestants keeping the nation in turmoil by continued breaches of the peace, and pleading the policy of exterminating them as the only way of securing peace.

It is not worth while to spend time in settling the question whether the massacre was premeditated or not. The popes had constantly urged the extirpation of the Protestants as a necessary and pious work. The standards of the Protestants taken at the battle of Jarnac were sent to Rome. Pius V. wrote a congratulatory letter to the king of France, March 28, 1569, only three years before the massacre, in which he says, "But the more the Lord has treated you *and me* with kindness, the more you ought, with care and diligence, to take advantage of the opportunity which this victory offers you for pursuing and destroying all the enemies which still remain; for tearing up all the roots, and even the smallest fibres of roots, of so terrible and confirmed

* The slaughter of the Huguenots.

an evil. For unless they are *radically exterminated*, they will be found to shoot out again; and as it has already happened several times, the mischief will reappear when your majesty least expects it. You will bring this about if no consideration for persons or worldly things induces you to spare the enemies of God who have never spared yourself." All this is fortified by mention of the judgments inflicted on Saul for sparing the Amalekites.

In writing at the same time to the mother of the king, he assures her majesty that the assistance of God will not be wanting, if she pursues the enemies of the Catholic religion "until they are all *massacred*; for it is only by the *entire extermination* of the heretics that the Catholic religion can be restored." Two weeks later, having heard that her favour was desired to save some persons of influence, he writes,— "We have heard it stated that some persons exert themselves to save a small number of the prisoners, and to obtain their liberation. Be careful that such a thing do not take place; and neglect no means, no efforts, that these abominable men may suffer the punishment they deserve." This advice is also enforced by reference to the disobedience of Saul. A medal was sent to the king, commemorating his agency in the massacre with the motto, "*Pietas excitavit justitiam.*"* Such clear, unequivocal, and decided inculcation and approval of the massacre and the celebration of its occurrence, continued also from year to year, make it a matter of no consequence whether it was premeditated or not; but make doubt about it impossible.

Further: If Coligni, as charged, had formed a conspiracy against the life of the king and the royal family, it might have formed some sort of justification for putting him to death; but the ends of justice would have been far better subserved, and the king's party strengthened, by the trial, conviction and punishment of Coligni. The king's assertion seems to have been the only proof of Coligni's guilt; and a subsequent parliament removed the stain from his memory and restored his estates to his family. Besides, if Coligni had been really guilty, why massacre the men, women and children of Protestants in such numbers, and over all France? How are we to account for the refusal of so many governors of provinces to execute the orders sent them,—some of them refusing to believe them genuine, and desiring to be assured that men had not attempted to impose on them in the king's name? How account for the thorough preparation for the massacre in Paris; for illuminating the houses of Catholics, and the wearing the badge which enabled one Catholic to know another? How account for the want of arms among the Protestants and their helplessness in consequence of it?

Shortly before the massacre of St. Bartholomew, a young man, Lignerolles, a friend of the king's brother, congratulated the king, who was angry at the demands of some of the Protestants, by remarking, "Your majesty will have them in your net in a few days, and can punish them as you please." Inquiring of those in the secret, who had confided it to Lignerolles, he was told it could be *safely* trusted with him. "I will make sure of that," said the king, "for before he has time to speak of it again, it shall cost him his life." Viscount de La Guerche was summoned by the king, and commanded to get rid of

Lignerolles that day in any way whatever. This was done by the king riding away from Lignerolles while hunting, leaving him in the company of de La Guerche, who, joined with Count Mansfeld, did their work as assassins, and were liberated after a short imprisonment.

The Duke de Nevers, a hater of the Protestants, speaking of the war which Coligni desired to carry on in Flanders under the king, says,—“His majesty, wishing to avoid such a misfortune, and thinking to destroy the Protestants, rather than their heresy, ordered the massacre of St. Bartholomew in August, 1572.”

Besides, is it more incredible than the combination of the Scribes and Pharisees against our Lord? more incredible than the persecutions of the early followers of Christ? Is it not of a like nature with the gunpowder plot in Great Britain? Besides the gratification of a feeling of bigotry in the extermination of heresy, it had long been the practice to confiscate the estates and property of the Protestants; and gain increased the unholy zeal of the nobles who profited by the confiscations.

The intolerant spirit of Romanism is shown even more than a century later, and under the reign of Louis XIV., commonly called Louis the Great. By a treaty formed at Nantes in 1685, after severe conflicts between Romanist and Protestant, the latter were allowed the most ample liberty of conscience, but the public exercise of their religion was limited to certain parts of the kingdom. They were compelled to keep the Romish festivals and to pay tithes, but were eligible to all offices; and mixed chambers, partly of both religions, were to be established in all their parliaments.

Under this compact, with many privations of privileges, protestantism flourished for more than a century. Very largely the intelligence, thrift, and wealth of France were in Protestant hands. Unquestionably they formed a very important and useful part of the state. Louis became troubled in his conscience, and greatly desired the conversion of the heretics. Protestants were required to renounce their religion by a certain date. Large bodies of troops were sent into the Protestant regions to be supported at their expense. Protestant children were taken from their parents: Protestants were prohibited from practising any art or trade; were refused admittance as apprentices, and forbidden to act as advocates or as physicians.

So bent was the king on their conversion, that he told the deputy general of the Protestants, who pleaded on their behalf, that he did not think his measures would cause great loss of life, “but he felt so indispensably bound to attempt the conversion of his subjects and the extirpation of heresy, that, if the doing it required that one hand should cut off the other, he would submit.”

Acting on this principle, Protestants were tortured, worried, pillaged, hindered, where it was practicable, from leaving their country, and made every way wretched. Multitudes escaped to other lands and found a welcome and a home; and all this was praised by such preachers as Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon and Flechier. Vain attempt to extinguish truth! Well did Robert Hall say in substance,—“The revocation of the Edict of Nantes procured for the Roman Catholic Church of France unity,—but it was the unity of death, and her pu-

treifying and loathsome carcass became a nuisance in the nostrils of all the world."

In this peaceful age we can scarcely conceive to what an extent religious questions gave colour and spirit to public feeling and political action; and how far high-handed acts of violence towards subjects of one sovereign could be overlooked by the relation in which the parties concerned stood to the religion of the state.

Froude, in his "*Forgotten English Worthies*," mentions this principle as one on which the English buccaneers acted; and their lives cannot be understood without it. Romanists, acting on the principle that no faith was to be kept with heretics, treated all who fell into their hands with the utmost cruelty. The English buccaneers retaliated and compelled respect for justice, available in no other way.

At a later period there was a colony of more than five hundred French Protestants in Florida. The Spaniards came upon them unsuspected, flayed them alive, sparing neither age nor sex, and hanged them up, leaving them with the label,—"*Not as Frenchmen, but as heretics*;" and quietly took possession of the colony. A vessel under a suitable man was fitted out by the Protestants at Rochelle; the leader of the expedition conferred with some of the Indians, used them as allies, attacked the Spaniards, killed them all, and hung them up with the label,—"*Not as Spaniards, but as murderers*," and all this produced no breach of the peace between France and Spain.

The casuistry of Rome goes far to account for such events as St. Bartholomew, and why the legitimate fruit of her teachings should be questioned, is a wonder. Believing that she alone has the truth, and that Protestantism is a damning heresy; persecutions, massacres and all the horrors of the Inquisition are the legitimate fruits of her teaching; and until Rome disclaims these and changes her course, let no one be her apologist. This she never has done; never will do.

Men say, all that was due to the "spirit of the age." "Romanism is modified by the sentiment of our time." The spirit of the age modifies the feeling of *abhorrence against Rome*; but has *Rome* changed? Is not her motto still, "*Semper et ubique idem*."* She disdains the apologies framed for her by short-sighted or ill-informed defenders. Her press still maintains every claim of the councils, and boldly declares that the church in our country, if it had the power, *ought* to suppress heresy; that is, require the state to do so by force. She is as much the enemy of the circulation of the Scriptures to-day as ever, and still adhering to the danger of error arising among the people from searching the Scriptures in any other way than under the guidance of the church. To day, in every land where she has power, opposing freedom, civil and religious; opposing, mark you, not only Protestant public schools in Protestant America, but popular education in papal France, where, from the nature of the case, it must be very largely what she wishes it to be; persecuting the colporteur and the congregation, and lamenting that she has not the command of all. Let us judge her according to her own estimate of herself, and where she has not repented conclude that she approves; and where she does not blush, let her bear her sin and her shame.

* Always and every where the same.

Let us not be thrown off our guard by the idea that the spirit of the age has modified Romanism. The contact with Protestantism has compelled a modified policy. Tolerated in Protestant lands as Protestantism never has been in Catholic countries, Rome still adheres to her principles and agencies; and remember, this is not the feeling of the uneducated only. Her priesthood,—better educated in Protestant than in Catholic lands, administer the policy with a sternness like fate, and an energy and a perseverance strangers to relaxation. Opposition to the Bible in schools; opposition to the freedom of the press; opposition to all material and spiritual progress except of her own type, is constantly maintained. Put it down that, but for Protestant institutions growing out of the Bible, the civilization of to-day, every where, would be the civilization of exclusively Catholic countries every where. Will our people heed the lesson?

Macauley has said it is a singular thing that Protestantism has not spread territorially or relatively since fifty years after the Reformation. The countries Catholic then are Catholic still; the countries Protestant then are Protestant still; and the infidels of our day take up the statement and boldly declare Protestantism a failure. Macauley does not regard Protestantism as a failure. He shows the difference between Catholic and Protestant nations: how the traveller can draw the lines of countries and communities between each religion, by the thrift of the one and the want of it in the other; but it is singular that, in making this statement, he forgot that elsewhere he had accounted for it all by the intolerance of Rome.

For a long time the struggle of Protestantism was for *existence*; and in many places Rome crushed out the Protestant life. France banished the Protestants from her borders; and from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 until the revolution of 1792, no Protestant dared to teach his views of the truth. In Italy, Spain, Portugal, neither reader of the Bible nor proclaimer of its truth could escape the vigilance of the Inquisition or the sword of the state. China, that great world of souls, containing one third of the world's population, was sealed against the entrance of the gospel. In Mohammedan lands men dared not preach it; and in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, until recently, you find supplications for defence against the "Turk and the Pope." There was no "sick man" on the Bosphorus then; and even to day, no Mohammedan, in a Mohammedan land, dare profess Christianity except to forfeit his life. India, with its many millions, was, by treaty stipulation between Great Britain and the native powers, to have the undisturbed enjoyment of its religion; and only recently has the restriction been removed: and while all these lands are now open to the missionary, recent experience in Syria, Egypt and India shows that nothing but the fear of the civil powers of Christendom makes any safety to Protestant teacher or professor of Protestant faith. How was Protestantism to spread, when the preacher's first sermon must be his last?

Romanism had its own field under secure, exclusive control, access to most Protestant countries on very liberal terms; and in heathen lands, on that politic principle which leads her to become "all things to all men" until she is nothing to any one; persuading the people to accept her ceremonies instead of their own: Mary and the saints as their own

deities under another name; and trusting in the inherent efficacy of the sacraments to secure salvation, she has extended her territory and multiplied the votaries of her faith; but has left the people, after hundreds of years of opportunity to bring forth her fruits and proclaim her praises, nearly as much savages as she found them. Without the Bible there is no high educating and spiritualizing power; and in the richest regions of the world there is no high literary culture, no ennobling morality, no Roman Catholic kingdom, empire or republic on a stable foundation; and the people of the European races, while doing little to elevate the native races among which they dwell, have sunk below the level of the land from which they came,—in the age in which they took possession.

France, as a Catholic country, *tolerates* Protestantism; but let us not be deceived by the name. In this land of unequalled religious freedom, men hold and proclaim their opinions unmolested by the state, if they do not disturb the public peace in doing so; but the toleration of Protestantism in France to-day, is simply leave to propagate and defend opinions. The moment Protestants open their mouths, or use the press to show the errors of Romanism, they are liable to fine and imprisonment.

Let us rejoice that the yoke of Rome is, for a time at least, taken off the neck of the Italian and the Spaniard. Let us hope and pray that the word of God may find speedy and glorious entrance; that its prophecies respecting the overthrow of the "woman drunk with the blood of the saints" are about to receive their fulfilment; that the kings of the earth are about to "eat her flesh as it were fire;" and that God will fulfil his declaration concerning his word: "As the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper *in the thing* whereto I sent it."

And also that other prophecy: "And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth. And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia! Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God; for true and righteous are his judgments; for he hath judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke arose up for ever and ever."

The *massacre* of St. Bartholomew is not the only incident of the name which we, as Protestants, should connect with its annual return. The imperfectly reformed church of England retained much of the intolerance, and much of the persecuting spirit of Romanism. Despotism in the state and persecution in the church cost one king his head and another his crown. Prelacy was abolished, and a different form of government and order had taken its place. In the course of events Charles II. was restored to the throne. Along with that restoration came a change in the order of the church, requiring the reception of the rites and ceremonies ordained by the civil authority under the claim of divine power, and believed by many 'o be of such a nature as almost

certainly to lead to the restoration of Popery. By the 24th of August, 1662, all ministers throughout England must conform to the requirements of the state or retire from their homes, give up their ministry, hold no religious meeting within five miles of any parish church,—equivalent to closing their mouths entirely,—must give up their worldly support, and throw themselves and all who were dear to them upon the providence of God for the means of securing a living. Magistrates and worldly-wise prelates reasoned against making trouble about the dress to be worn by the clergy in public services,—regarded the receiving of the elements in the Lord's supper kneeling or sitting, and making the sign of the cross in baptism a matter of indifference or of forbearance. "Why cause yourselves trouble about *little things*?" The answer to this was, "If these are little things, or matters of indifference, treat them as such. Give us the liberty to use or not use, as conscience may require. Christ alone, as head of the church, has power to legislate, and where he has left free, man may not ordain. We fear the return of Romanism if its ceremonies are continued, and we cannot comply."

They believed in the wisdom of the advice given by an old Reformer, perhaps John Knox, to those who broke down the statues and images in the churches and cathedrals: "Well done. Pull down the nests, and the rooks will fly away."

St. Bartholomew's day,—*black* Bartholomew's day, as the Puritans called it, came, and two thousand pious, learned and faithful ministers went forth from their churches, their homes, their means of living, a mystery and a wonder to the worldly minded, and the glory of our Protestant Christianity.*

The parallel of this, on a smaller scale, has been seen in the formation of the Free Church of Scotland; and in a land whose institutions have been so largely moulded by Luritan and Presbyterian; where persecution for religious opinion is an alien and an enemy; where the Romanist and the Protestant are equally free to propagate their forms of faith, let us see to it that no act of ours shall be false to the priceless privileges which we enjoy; and that we be faithful in doing our part in extending that kingdom which shall bring down the Man of Sin, destroy the false prophet, and all systems of heathen superstition and delusion, and make a repetition of St. Bartholomew an impossibility, by using the means divinely appointed for making the "earth full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."

THE GREAT SALVATION THROUGH FAITH.

Salvation is through faith as the means of obtaining it. In common language, faith is "The assent of the mind to the truth of what is declared by another, resting entirely on his authority and veracity." In theology, it signifies "The affectionate and cordial assent of the mind to the truth of revelation, founded on the veracity of the sacred writers."

* Similar scenes, in the Church of Scotland, at the same time, are well known to all who are acquainted with her history.