Berkeley
LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Berkeley
LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/historicalsketch00cranrich

HISTORICAL
SKETCHES AND REVIEWS.

D7
C68
1862

TO

THE MOST NOBLE

JAMES BROWNLOW WILLIAM GASCOYNE-CECIL, K.G.

MARQUESS OF SALISBURY,

THESE PAGES

ARE

DEDICATED,

AS A TOKEN OF LOVE AND RESPECT,

BY HIS

VERY AFFECTIONATE SON

CRANBORNE.

M150492

PREFACE.

THESE "Historical Sketches and Reviews" have already appeared in the pages of the ST. JAMES'S MEDLEY, under the Signature of "THE BLIND TRAVELLER."

My reason for reprinting them is a desire that they may be preserved in a more complete and consecutive form.

Although I have been for years engaged in the study of History, and in the collection and arrangement of various materials of an historical nature, I still shrink from the responsibility of even appearing to teach others. I have only brought to bear on current contemporary history such stray information as I have acquired in my daily readings.

Defects of style and composition will no doubt be found in every page of the work. I must hope therefore that my readers will take into consideration the fact, that from my earliest childhood I have been blind, and that all my impressions have been derived from the lips and through the eyes of others.

I prefer to take my position amongst the unaided Blind Volunteers of Literature, rather than avail myself of the proffered assistance of those numerous literary friends who would gladly have lent me their valuable aid in putting a polish on my crude and imperfect Essays.

CRANBORNE.

20, Arlington Street,
January, 1862.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.
GUIZOT'S MEMOIRES POUR SERVIR A L'HISTOIRE DE SON TEMPS.
1.—Early Period—Napoleon and Louis XVIII . 3
2.—French Revolution of 1830 37
3.—Politics in France from 1832 to 1836 . . . 52
4.—Guizot's Fourth Volume of Events—to 1840 . 66
PRESCOTT, THE BLIND HISTORIAN 87
PHILIP II. First Notice 113
Second Notice 126
CATHERINE II AND THE COURTS OF RUSSIA 143
RUSSIA AS IT IS 167
LA CHINE DEVANT L'EUROPE 193
THE ROME OF THIS ERA 203
A DAY AT MAGENTA AFTER THE BATTLE 221
ROUSSEAU ET LES GENEVOIS 229
LOUIS XIV DANS SES RAPPORTS AVEC LA RELIGION . . . 247
L'ACADÉMIE FRANÇAISE 265
LES GIRONDINS DE MONS. J. GUADET 279

FRENCH MEMOIRS:

MADAME RECAMIER 303
MADAME DE CAYLUS 323
CARNOT, Engineer and Revolutionist 341

DIANE DE POITIERS 357
AGNES SOREL 377

GUIZOT'S MEMOIRES

OF

HIS TIMES.

MONS. GUIZOT AND HIS TIMES.*

Perhaps no history has furnished so many instances of the remarkable chances and changes of fortune to which high and low are alike subject, as that of France during the last eighty years. In that short period an ancient dynasty and a powerful aristocracy have been overthrown by an insolent mob; and soldiers of fortune, of the lowest origin, have not only risen to the highest civil and military dignities, but many of them, arrayed with crowns and sceptres of royalty, have become rulers over large territorial possessions. If we consider the history of the principal actors in this exciting drama, we shall find their romantic vicissitudes of fortune equal to anything related in the Arabian Nights or modern novels. Take, for instance, the life of Napoleon: what greater change can be imagined, than from such insignificance to unbounded power; from the highest influence to the lowest state of weakness and degradation? From the son of a poor lawyer, who could scarcely find sufficient means to support his numerous family, Napoleon rose, by a long and arduous military career, to the highest dignities of the state; becoming the regenerator and law-giver of his country, after a long period of revolution and disorder; extending the territory of his empire by conquest after conquest over nearly the whole of Europe; and at last falling a prisoner into the hands of his bitterest enemy, and ending his career as an exile at St. Helena.

The career of his Bourbon rivals is no less remarkable. Louis XVIII was early driven into exile by the troubles of the Revolution, and wandered from country to country for protection, until the events of 1814 recalled him to fill the vacant throne of France, which he relinquished almost as soon as he obtained it. The Waterloo campaign again gave him his just rights; though he was obliged to maintain his authority by the assistance of the foreign troops of those very nations who had been the bitterest enemies of his country during many of her most violent struggles. At length, when the monarch had succeeded in ridding himself of his unwelcome supporters, and had become an independent sovereign, he was immediately exposed to plots and conspiracies, and had thus "no bed of roses for his royal couch." At his death, in 1824, he was succeeded by his brother Charles, Count of Artois, who was looked upon by his friends—as an intelligent French acquaintance of ours lately observed—"as a good monarch, simply because he could ride well, and possessed those showy accomplishments so generally popular amongst Frenchmen." Charles soon lost both his popularity and his influence, and was dethroned in the revolution of July, 1830, by his cousin Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans.

---

* Mémoires pour servir a L'Histoire de mon Temps, par M. Guizot. Vol. I. Paris.

The career of Louis Philippe was, if anything, more extraordinary than either that of Charles X or Louis XVIII. Being the son of Philip Egalité, he had been brought up amongst the leaders of the revolutionary movement of 1789, and had imbibed many liberal ideas. He had seen his first service in the revolutionary army, under Dumouriez, at Jemappe, where he first displayed those qualities which obtained for him at a future period the esteem and admiration of so large a portion of the French people. Obliged, on the execution of his father, to fly into Switzerland, he there learned the bitter lesson of adversity, and, as is well known, maintained himself with great difficulty as a professor of mathematics, being obliged to wander from country to country, until the events of 1815 reinstated him in those large possessions which made him the wealthiest prince of Europe. His penetration and sagacity soon showed him that liberal opinions were still very strong in France, and that the arbitrary conduct of both Louis XVIII and Charles X could not enable them to maintain the influence of their house. He therefore wisely put himself at the head of the popular party; and thus, after the July revolution, obtained the French throne. Although his government was able and vigorous, and at that period much to the general advantage of the French nation, yet the turbulent spirits of his subjects proved too strong, and the troubles of 1843 drove him forth once more to be a wanderer and an exile to these shores, where, as is well known, he died in comparative poverty.

The fortunes of his great minister, Mons. Guizot, were not less varied, though perhaps less trying, than those of his master. His Memoirs, to which we shall now direct the attention of our readers, contain more of the history of his times and of his public life, than an account of his early career or his private struggles. The school-boy days and early impressions of such a man as Guizot would have been most interesting; although the later events of his life are considered as alone worthy to be chronicled. His career as a public man extends from the restoration in 1814, to the downfall of Louis Philippe, 1848—a most eventful epoch, both for France and Europe in general, and one during which liberal institutions may be said to have been on their trial throughout the continent. These liberal institutions failed everywhere in Europe, and for the most part ended in revolutionary excesses; democratic dawnings being replaced by more arbitrary and despotic systems than had previously existed.

No one is more fitted to write a history of these remarkable times than Guizot; as the elevated position which he held, both as a statesman and a man of letters, adds weight and importance to all he advances. His style throughout the volume now before us is both clear and vigorous, frequently rising to very high literary eloquence; his characters are drawn with a masterly hand; and even the commencement of his work abounds in reflections and observations which are scarcely to be met with in the more erudite histories of other times.

Of his early life, Guizot gives us but very slight information, merely stating that his education had been chiefly carried on in Geneva; and that he had thus acquired a greater taste for German than for French literature; a course of study which no doubt gave him those ideas of rational liberty so prominently brought forward in all works of that school. Early reflection and the Protestant faith induced those habits of close and solid reasoning which saved him from the visionary and revolutionary theories of French philosophers and politicians. He first entered the society of the brilliant French capital in the year 1807, and principally attached himself to the few Royalist literati who durst openly discuss and disapprove the policy of the Emperor. Although this sect was not sufficiently powerful and energetic to attempt the overthrow of Napoleon's government, yet it formed the embers of a mighty fire. Amongst those to whom Guizot gave his greatest friendship, was the celebrated writer, Mons. Chateaubriand; and one of his earliest literary attempts was the defence of that statesman's work, "Les Martyrs," which obtained for Guizot a great and early literary reputation. He, however, seems not to have been satisfied with the mere distinction of a man of letters, but yearned for a profession which might open to him a field of political influence. The occupation of arms, which in those days offered power and distinction to many aspirants, was such as did not suit the inclinations of our author; he preferred diplomacy and letters. Although Guizot much blamed the Emperor for his military and despotic government at home, and his project of universal conquest abroad, he nevertheless could not help admiring that genius which enabled Napoleon to restore order to France after the chaos of revolution, and made all Europe tremble before the strength of the French arms.

As Guizot saw but small chance of the Bourbon authority being speedily re-established, and little benefit as likely to result to his country from such an event, he resolved to seek service under that master whose power had been confirmed by so long a career of victory and so able and brilliant an administration. He therefore requested a mutual acquaintance to present him to the Duke de Bassano, the Foreign Minister, and to assist him by his good offices in obtaining a post in some foreign embassy. The acquaintance was duly made, and the Duke was so far favourably disposed towards the young aspirant, that he ordered Guizot to draw up a report upon the exchange of English prisoners, which he promised to lay before the Emperor. This order was executed, and the document duly presented to the minister; but, whether it was that Guizot too much frequented the saloons of his Royalist friends, or that the bold assertions of his political opinions were already too well known, he made no further progress in the way of obtaining employment from the ministers of Napoleon.

About this time he received an offer far more suited to his taste, one which he could accept without changing or compromising his political opinions. His notes on the decline and fall of the Roman empire, and various other historical subjects, had attracted the attention of Count Lally Tolendal, who sent a very flattering letter from Brussels, complimenting him on his writings; which correspondence Mons. Guizot has published amongst "Les Pièces Historiques," at the end of his work. It was through the same influence that, early in 1811, Mons. Fontanes, the Head of the Parisian University, obtained for Guizot the chair of Professor of Modern History, when he had scarcely completed his twenty-fifth year. In this difficult position he displayed extraordinary independence of spirit. On being told by his chief that it was usual, on assuming the chair of any new professorship, to pass an eulogium on the character and the government of the Emperor; Guizot replied that he could not submit to such servility; that it would be hypocritical in him to praise one whom he thoroughly blamed, and whose acts were contrary to his own political sentiments. Notwithstanding those opinions, Fontanes still allowed Guizot to retain the chair of History, though he cautioned him that such conduct at the commencement of his career might cost him his professorship, the government of that day being determined not only to prevent any criticism of their conduct by the press, or by those who had the direction of education, but to obtain from all employées the loudest praise.

Should the reader be desirous of knowing how so young a professor acquitted himself in his first lecture, he has only to turn to the end of the volume, where he will at once see that Mons. Guizot most happily attracted the attention of his young listeners by the terseness of his discourse on history, and by his dissertation on the difficulties of ascertaining its general truth. Whenever his subject would admit, he made the most strenuous allusion in favour of liberal institutions and opinions, which, had circumstances permitted, he might possibly have gradually disseminated and even made practicable in France.

When his country was invaded, and the power of Napoleon menaced on every side by the allies, it appears that some of Guizot's political friends laid a project before the Emperor by which he might treat with his enemies on honourable terms, and escape for a time the dangers which threatened his empire. These proposals were, however, too moderate for the ambitious Emperor; and he accordingly received the projectors with rudeness, accusing Mons. Lané, the Head of the Moderates, of a design to overthrow his authority, and to oblige his country to submit to humiliating and ruinous concessions.

Then occurred the disastrous events of 1814, when Paris was taken and occupied by the allied armies, when the French forces were defeated in every encounter on the frontiers, and Napoleon was at length reluctantly obliged to abdicate. Guizot, who just previous to that event had undertaken a journey to Nismes, gives a most vivid picture of the prevailing distress, and the unpopularity which was everywhere evinced towards the Emperor and his government. He states that, although labour was plentiful enough, both in the capital and in the provinces, and that in the former they were commencing those fine buildings and magnificent streets so well known to every Englishman who has visited Paris, yet both in the metropolis and the departments the labourers seemed to lack employment, and to be most terribly restless, unsettled, and discontented with a long war which had desolated their fields, ruined their commerce, and drained their population. Conscripts and recruits were, nevertheless, rushing to the scene of action, with whom Napoleon's powers and his wars were alone popular; as a life of glory, closed by a marshal's baton, a prince's crown, or the reward of territory, were sufficient inducements to make even ploughmen brave the perils and hardships of the battle field. We cannot think that Napoleon's government and policy so deeply displeased the French as Guizot would have us believe. The Emperor's unpopularity at this period was rather to be attributed to his want of success, than to any financial distress which his measures had occasioned, the French being the last nation in the world likely to be displeased with rulers who waste blood and treasure in attempts to extend their glory and their boundaries. So long as the French nation obtain glory and renown, they are satisfied. All their past history proves the fact that they adore those monarchs most who have most pandered to their vanity, and look with the greatest pride on those periods in which long and obstinate struggles have been made for the acquisition of territories never permanently retained. They never murmured when Francis wasted the resources of his kingdom in long wars to conquer the Milanese—they were ready to support Louis XIV, when closely pressed by the allies, after having been the disturber of the peace of Europe for nearly half a century—and, although his successor lost, towards the end of his reign, his reputation as "le bien aime," his subjects were more discontented with his measures at home, than with the long and expensive wars which were carried on throughout his whole reign, and in which they lost the greater portion of their territories. Notwithstanding these reverses, they failed to learn wisdom in the commencement of Louis the Sixteenth's reign; and were ready to rush into another war against their old enemy, England, and to assist the American colonies in gaining their independence. It is not, therefore, probable that Napoleon lost much of his popularity by his long wars and conquests; though it is more likely that the French found it impossible, in 1814, to support him against the combined and overwhelming forces of all Europe; and that they, therefore, as a necessity, submitted to the conditions imposed upon them by the allies, consenting to receive Louis XVIII as their king, and to regard the Rhine as their future boundary.

Guizot asserts that the Restoration was of real benefit to France, as it brought peace and liberal institutions in the shape of the Charter. Although we fully agree with him in this opinion, none of his countrymen seem to look upon the event in a similar light. The Royalists desired everything to be re-established as before the Revolution, not understanding that that state of things had been irrevocably swept away by the convulsions of 1789 and 1790, and could never again be restored; the Republicans, of course, wished for concessions on the part of the Monarch which would be incompatible with his dignity; whilst the Bonapartists were intent on their course of territorial aggrandisement, and could look upon no other chief, as a proper leader, than Napoleon. The Moderates, of whom there were very few, considered the Charter and the legislative Chambers as innovations which savoured too much of an English copy, and which had been brought over by the King from the country where he had so long resided during his days of exile and misfortune. Guizot observes that the character of the ministers and the King were ill calculated to advance the interest of liberal institutions in a country where they had never previously existed. Mons. Talleyrand, the famous minister, and one who was "all things to all men," was only "*able in a crisis*," and when important *negotiations* were to be carried out. He was a finished courtier, well versed in the art of pleasing, with a lively and witty conversation, thoroughly understanding his own interests, and the proper moment to forward them, on any change of party or of government; but, according to Guizot, indolent, disgusted with business, and possessed of but little administrative talent. The first part of this character is what his cotemporaries, both politicians and historians, ascribe to him; but we think Guizot has committed a great error in calling Talleyrand indolent, as various turnings in the political labyrinth through which he was obliged to wend his way did not, in our opinion, admit of an idle or unguarded moment; and his administrative talent must have been more effective than our author would allow, or how could he have been a useful man to every party, and a desirable acquisition to all governments? L'Abbé de Montesquiou, who gave Guizot his first post in public life, of Secretary-General of the Minister of the Interior, though a man of talent and application, and well disposed to liberal forms of government, was nevertheless weak and unenergetic. He was always inclined to look upon the old regime to a certain extent as his model, not reflecting that such a state of things could never again be restored.

Mons. Blacas, who was the third minister called upon by Louis XVIII to assist him with his councils, was one of those characters who resembled much the old cavaliers that surrounded Charles II during his residence in Kent. He was a Provinçal by birth, and possessed the usual ardent temperament of the inhabitants of the South of France. He was a courageous and enthusiastic Royalist, ready to suffer anything in defence of the Crown; but unable, as such a man would naturally be, to understand that it was necessary for the King to relinquish some of his power, if he wished to preserve the rest.

The qualities of these ministers of the Restoration, as Guizot well remarks, might have been rendered very effective in the hands of an able and resolute monarch; but Louis XVIII was what Guizot is pleased to call "a man possessing a negative charater." He was indeed well informed; but he lacked the energy to use his information, being one who would allow himself to be guided by others, rather than to form an opinion for himself. He was not unlike Charles II of England—a man who, though he might never have said a foolish thing, certainly never did a wise one. His bodily infirmities and his age prevented him from taking any very active part in state affairs; and although, like most of the Bourbon Princes, he had forgotten nothing of the ancient regime, without learning anything new, he had yet sufficient prudence to restrain his power within bounds. With such a king and such ministers, it was not to be expected that any great advances would be made in establishing a new government. Each minister was willing enough to bestir himself within his own department; but none of them seemed anxious to co-operate in forwarding the general measures of the whole council. Mons. de Talleyrand desired nothing better than to treat with the whole of Europe, and to carry on large diplomatic negotiations; he cared but little what became of the other departments of the administration, so long as he was allowed to conduct his business in his own way. The Abbé Montesquiou was equally satisfied to carry on the duties of his own department in an able business-like manner, without suggesting any new measures which might be introduced into the government; whilst Mons. Blacas did nothing at all, and would probably have found himself more at home, if he had been obliged to form a regiment of dragoons in La Vendee, to defend his master's rights, than be at the head of a department of the state.

The principal measures which first occupied the attention of the Government of the Restoration, were the finances, which, after the long wars of Napoleon, were in a most deplorable state. Mons. le Baron Louis, under whose management they had been during the last years of the empire, consented still to hold his post and to conduct the duties of his office; in which he diligently laboured to put the finances into something like respectable order. The other most important measure which came under the consideration of the French cabinet and legislature was "the liberty of the press;" and long debates took place whether it was to be freed from control, or whether some slight restrictions should be for a time imposed upon it. Guizot was in favour of the latter view, arguing that, however necessary a full liberty of the press might be in a country where a constitutional government had long been established, it was yet dangerous in one where a new government was on its trial. He quotes, as a precedent, the conduct of William III of England and his parliament in 1688, and subsequently in 1693, showing that restrictions might be placed on the press without injuring its liberty. Had all control over the press of France been removed at that particular period, it would have run into such license as might have renewed the worst revolutionary troubles of '89 and '90. We fully concur in these opinions, and consider that even in a well-formed constitutional state the unrestricted liberty of the press is often an inconvenience, and may be called the most dangerous and at the same time the most essential privilege of a free and independent nation, having before now occasioned a long and bloody war between England and France, and may at some other period engage the nations in a conflict of equal duration and difficulty. On the other hand, when the press is placed under a censor, public opinion does not easily express itself; and many an injustice and fraud might successfully be practised upon the public. In those countries, however, in which a free press exists, and where every political and domestic subject is well and thoroughly ventilated, public morality is enforced, and oppression rendered impossible. Another reason, however, most likely influenced Guizot in arguing against the uncontrolled liberty of the press, although he does not seem to have made use of it in the debate: he must have been struck with the obstacles which the French character opposed to a perfectly free press. What in England would only occasion a law suit, would in France, owing to the irritable disposition of its people, produce an *emeute*, or even a revolution.

These discussions, at the early period of the Charter, were suddenly cut short by an event which changed the political aspect of the whole of Europe—viz. the return of Napoleon from Elba. Guizot does not seem to be able to give any definite cause for so sudden a revolution. He thinks that the Emperor must have kept up a continual correspondence with the leaders of the army and a number of conspirators. Napoleon's return, in our opinion, was to be attributed to the following causes. It was a grave error on the part of the allies to permit him to retire to a spot so close to the coast of France as Elba, from whence he could so easily correspond with his friends, and be made acquainted with every movement which occurred in his country; still further was it a mistake to suppose that the mind which had been so long occupied with the affairs of the whole of Europe could be satisfied with superintending the government of so small an island as Elba, and remain contented with drilling and reviewing a small body of 8,000 men, after once having commanded armies of 200,000 and 300,000 men, and overthrown the most powerful states in Europe. It was not to be expected that so sensitive a nation as the French could tamely endure a wounded vanity, by having to submit to the authority of a king imposed upon them by foreigners,—that they would not be ready to give their support to any one who might free them from so unwelcome a yoke, much more so to one who, like Napoleon, had often led their armies to victory, and from whose brilliant administration they had derived so large a share of prosperity and glory,—whose vigorous hand had so firmly checked the revolutionary spirit which had threatened to overthrow everything like order or a regular government, and to plunge the country once more into the disasters and troubles of 1789. It is not, therefore, surprising that

Napoleon should have attempted to escape from Elba, and to revisit once more his much-loved French subjects,—that, when his endeavours had been crowned by success, and he had been safely landed at Toulon, he should be everywhere received with enthusiasm and acclamations,—that the number of his followers should be quickly increased to a considerable force,—that he should at length have been joined by the very army sent against him under Marshal Ney, with their chief at its head,—should once more enter the capital in triumph by their assistance,—and that Louis XVIII should again seek shelter in a foreign country.

According to Guizot's account, Napoleon's reception in Paris was by no means as warm as it had been in the provinces; and our author rather wonders that a man of Napoleon's sagacity should be again willing to risk all in the chances of war; for the Emperor must have been fully aware, when he left Elba, that no terms which he could offer to the allies would be accepted by them. Geniuses such as Napoleon are not, however, wont to yield to despair, until they had been overcome by signal defeats, such as Waterloo afterwards proved to be. Many of the old Republicans, as well as the Bonapartists, rallied round the Emperor, in order to assist him in his difficulties. Amongst those who offered their services, Carnot stood most conspicuous. He united to great administrative ability the most consummate talents as an engineer. He accepted the important office of Minister of the Interior, under the new Government, and hastened to put the towns on the frontier in a respectable posture of defence. He it was who rendered Antwerp what it has since become—one of the strongest maritime forts in Europe.

Guizot, according to his own account, was erroneously accused by the "Moniteur" of that day, and subsequently by many celebrated authors, of whom Mons. De Lamartine was the most eminent, of seeking service under the Emperor, and of accepting, under Carnot, his old post of "Secretaire General." It appears, however, that his name was confused with that of another member of his family, who accepted office during that government.

Our author, as we have seen, returned during this period, to his chair of Professor of History in the University of Paris, and to the labours and duties of that office, thus ending his early political career, which, for so young a man, seems to have been conducted with ability, and with, what is more rare in a French statesman, consistency.

Guizot gives a deplorable picture of the state of parties in France after the return of the Emperor to Paris. It appears that, during the Restoration, liberty had made great strides, and that the people became, on the sudden change from Louis XVIII to Napoleon's government, like some wild animals let loose. The Emperor found that, notwithstanding all his former glory, he must now treat with the popular party, if he intended to retain his newly acquired power; and he even went so far as to make overtures to the leaders of the rabble, who inhabited the Faubourg St. Antoine, and who had made themselves so renowned and so terrible in the first revolution of 1789. They paraded Paris, and formed a corps, called by the Emperor "Federal Soldiers." He, however, took the precaution of having a strong body of police to prevent them from committing the same excesses as in the early periods of the revolution.

Napoleon, in order to secure the services of the Republicans, accepted, as we have already stated, the offer of Carnot; and still further strengthened the influence of his party in the cabinet by appointing Fouché Minister of Police. Guizot, of course, objects to the former, as being a clever military man; and therefore not likely to fill an office, the duties of which were chiefly confined to the internal government of the country during a time of peace, and which therefore did not admit of any great display of Carnot's principal qualities; besides which, the information required was (he suggests) beyond the reach of any military man. Although Carnot's talents might have been out of place as Minister of Interior in ordinary periods, they were not only useful, but even necessary, at an epoch when the country was on every side threatened with invasion. Guizot, with great impartiality, therefore, admits that "though Carnot served the Emperor coldly, he nevertheless did so with honour." Fouché, on the other hand, served Napoleon as though he knew the Emperor's power could last but a short period. He showed, as Mons. Guizot rather happily expresses it, somewhat the same indifference in performing those duties which had been imposed upon him by the Emperor, as a skilful physician, who has long watched a case which he knows to be perfectly hopeless, but which he nevertheless is obliged to stand by and see the end of, for reputation sake. Fouché in his conversation displayed that thorough knowledge of human character and information on political affairs which the duties of his office would most naturally enable him to obtain. To this, he united a degree of insolence of manner which he had acquired in his early days, whilst he frequented the Jacobin Club, and assisted the leaders of that party in their progress to power. He had been appointed Minister of Police by Napoleon when he became First Consul; and was found by him not only to be useful in winning over the Republicans to his own cause, but also in carrying out his dark designs against Pichegru and the Duke d'Enghein. He was, however, always dangerous, even to his friends, owing to his love of intrigue, which ultimately obliged the Emperor, in 1807, to dismiss him from his post, and to send him in honourable exile as Ambassador to the Papal Court; though now again, in 1815, he is re-appointed to his old place, in order to ingratiate Napoleon with the popular party. He nevertheless took care to make use of this opportunity to gain influence with Louis XVIII, whom he clearly saw would soon resume his lost authority.

The Emperor, as is well known, discussed several forms of liberal government with eminent politicians of that day. He considered the Charter as too liberal a measure for him to adopt; and yet he felt that it was necessary to form some kind of constitution, as he would be unable to govern France in his former absolute manner, until his authority had been confirmed by the gaining of some brilliant victory. He believed that it would be impossible to organize a firm constitutional monarchy without an hereditary aristocracy; but he could not conceive from whence materials were to be obtained for the creation of such a body, after they had been wholly swept away by the revolution. He was desirous to reinstate some of the old families in their former dignities and honours, but was obliged to relinquish this project as impracticable. According to Guizot, the same irresolution and uncertainty reigned in the government of the departments as in that of the capital. Every thing was done on the supposition that the present power would not be permanent; even the police were not so strict in reality as they professed; for, although Fouché's emissaries were every where to be found in swarms, numerous pamphlets and papers were published throughout the provinces, blaming the Emperor's conduct; and civil war was every day on the point of breaking out. Had Guizot's friends been in a more united state, this disturbed and irresolute condition of their enemies might have been matter of congratulation to him. The Royalists were, however, quite as much divided in opinion as their opponents. One party of them supported the ancient regime, and were desirous of restoring the former military power of the crown as it had existed before the revolution of 1789. The more moderate of them, however, fully perceived the necessity of adhering to the conditions imposed on the King by the Charter. The King himself had retired to Ghent, whither he had been followed by his partizans and the representatives of foreign powers, who all supported his authority. In this retreat, his councils were chiefly guided by the Duc de Blacas, whose arbitrary and enthusiastic disposition on the side of royalty made him much feared by the Moderate partizans of the Monarch. Mons. de Talleyrand, who was engaged in the negotiations at Vienna, although not a Revolutionist by taste, nevertheless owed his rise to political power, to the events which had caused the revolution, and to the share which he himself had taken in bringing about those democratic changes; he was, therefore in some measure bound to support the Liberal cause. Although he had served at least fifty different masters, his political consistency could never be trusted by any one of them. Talleyrand clearly perceived at this period that there would be little to gain by forsaking Louis the Eighteenth's service; and his able conduct in re-establishing that Prince, and in the subsequent negotiations at Vienna, entitled him to be looked upon as the best leader by the Moderates. He was, however, little inclined again to give Louis XVIII the advantage of his councils, with such colleagues as the Abbé Montesquieu and Mons. de Blacas, both of whom he thought might prove dangerous rivals; whilst the policy of the latter he considered would again drive the King into exile. The Moderates, therefore, felt, both for themselves and for Talleyrand, that it would be necessary to remove Blacas from the King's councils. This difficult task was entrusted to Guizot, who, notwithstanding his extreme youth, did not fear to undertake it. His journey from Paris to Ghent was performed with the greatest ease, notwithstanding the numerous emissaries whom Fouché had placed on the frontier, and who do not appear to have discharged their duties with proper severity. On arriving at Ghent, Guizot first visited Mons. Munier, Baron Louis, and Chateaubriand, and the other leaders of the Moderate party, in order to ascertain their views. He then presented himself to the King, whose dignity and importance particularly struck him; for he writes, "I saw that miserable old man fixed immoveably in his arm chair, demanding as a right those prerogatives and that obedience which he had not the power to enforce." Guizot found that he had come on a delicate errand, and that if he wished to persuade the King, he must begin with caution. He therefore commenced his conversation by informing Louis of the unpopularity of the measures and conduct of the Emperor, and of the desire on all hands for the Restoration, every one in France being tired of the disasters of war, and being certain that peace could never be permanent until Louis was again placed on the French throne. He then represented to the Monarch that, however much this happy event might be desired by his own friends and the nation at large, they, nevertheless, feared that, so long as his Majesty's councils were influenced by Blacas, all the benefits which they hoped to derive from his return would be destroyed, and that the King's own power would, most probably, be of but short duration. The King became extremely indignant at these remonstrances, and wished to be informed what difference it could make to his friends or his subjects whom he chose to keep in his palace and about his person, so long as he adhered to the conditions granted by the Charter, which he affirmed he had no intentions of breaking. Guizot, after this conversation, quitted the royal presence, his representations seeming to have but slight weight with his Monarch. The impression left upon Guizot's mind by this interview was, that the King was sensible and extremely careful of appearances, and the opinions of persons immediately about him; that, in fact, what Hume says about Charless II could well be applied to Louis XVIII: "That, although he possessed both sense and penetration, they were rather of a kind suited to a private station than to a monarch on his throne."

Guizot gives but a slight account of the events of the Waterloo campaign; and it is much to be regretted that he does not enter into a more detailed narrative of it, as, from his impartiality, he would most probably have given a better account than French historians generally do, of the most eventful struggle. They are generally desirous to heap upon their own nation all the praise, without considering whether facts bear out their statements; and many of them attempt, like Mons. Thiers in his chapter on Trafalgar, to apologise for their want of success at Waterloo, by attributing it to causes over which they could have no control, rather than to errors committed by their leaders, or want of discipline and courage on the part of the troops. Guizot is, however, a statesman, and not a soldier, and has therefore confined himself to the political history of his country, and of the court and cabals of Louis XVIII and his followers.

The victory at Waterloo completely changed the prospects of Louis XVIII. He was now acknowleged King of France both by the allied sovereigns and by his own subjects. Soon after the announcement of the victory, he left for Tournay, on his way to France; and was followed thither by Guizot.

Intrigues now commenced on the part of the Duke de Blacas, which have never been fully cleared up by French historians, and which perhaps will never be thoroughly explained; they are therefore difficult to be either discussed or fully comprehended by foreigners. It appears, however, that Louis was desirous of retaining the services of both Mons. Blacas and Mons. de Talleyrand; and that, finding they could not act well in concert, he endeavoured to get rid of Blacas, the less able minister of the two, by sending him as Ambassador to Naples. Talleyrand, however, was determined to retain his post alone, or to resign it altogether, were the King bent on employing his obnoxious rival. Besides this, Talleyrand was but little anxious that the King should hasten his journey into France; whilst Blacas and the Count d'Artois were supposed to have advised his hurrying thither, thinking they should thus have him more in their power. Louis XVIII endeavoured, on the one hand, to reassure Talleyrand; whilst, on the other, he journeyed towards the English camp, that he might free himself from the importunities of his councillors.

In the midst of these difficulties, the Moderate leaders, who had some idea of the real cause of Louis XVIII's speedy journey into France, prevailed on Pozzo de Borgo, the Russian Envoy, to induce the Duke of Wellington to lay the state of matters before Louis, and to take some of the responsibility of guiding the councils of the Monarch. The able British General saw the King, whom he advised to propitiate Talleyrand, and wrote, assuring that minister of the Sovereign's good will, and explaining that he had himself advised the hasty journey of Louis. The British leader was of opinion that the King should be replaced on the French throne, and re-enter the French capital as soon as possible, after the events which had made so sudden a change in Louis' favour. He likewise feared that, if any great delay should occur in re-instating the King, a counter revolution might be produced, and that Louis might be re-established in his authority by the Prussians, whose excesses during their march into France had caused them to be looked upon by the nation as bitter enemies. In short, he felt that the Restoration ought rather to be effected by the assistance of England than by that of Prussia. Talleyrand was effectually appeased by these representations, and retained his post; whilst the Duke de Blacas was dismissed from the King's service, his fall having occurred, as Guizot well remarks, "rather from mediocrity of talent than from any want of zeal in the royal cause."

Fouché now became the principal intriguer at Louis' court; though neither he nor Mons. Talleyrand were long destined to guide the councils of their sovereign, as the King leaned towards the opinions and principles of the old Royalists, who had acquired a vast influence over him during his long exile. He, therefore, pressed on to Paris. Many of Louis' friends suggested the removal of Fouché from the council board; but, according to Guizot, both the Duke of Wellington and the Count d'Artois had strongly urged upon the King, before entering France, the necessity of retaining the services of so able a minister. The former had given Louis this advice, because he thought Fouché would be the King's best friend, and would, in order to advance his own interest, prepare the way for the King's entrance into France; the latter supported Fouché because that Prince was a "good-natured, easy man, ready to promise everything to any one," so long as it made life easy and saved himself or his brother trouble.

On the King's arrival at Paris, fresh cabals took place, of which, if we are to believe Guizot, the Emperor Alexander of Russia was the author. It was proposed, in order to ingratiate the Czar, that Pozzo de Borgo should be appointed Minister of the Interior. As he was a Corsican by birth, there would be but little difficulty in his becoming a Frenchman; in fact, he had been considered as such ever since the island had fallen under French dominion. Although he had, by his own account, materially assisted General Paoli in asserting the independence of his native country against the French—whose cause had been espoused by the Bonaparte family—and had nearly lost his life in these attempts, he now showed little objection to adopt France as his country, or to enter the service of Louis XVIII, the great enemy of his bitter opponent Napoleon, and the friend of Alexander of Russia. Pozzo, moreover, possessed those diplomatic talents so necessary to a Russian statesman, and which made him, in this critical period, indispensable to the Czar. In order, therefore, that the Emperor of Russia might be propitiated, and yet retain his able ambassador, Louis appointed the Duke de Richelieu as head of his council, a Royalist, who, besides being descended from a family who had played an important part in the former history of France, held a place in the King's household during the exile of Louis XVIII. Richelieu had, moreover, the advantage of being looked upon with favour by the Czar. His colleagues were most of them Royalists of the old school, and therefore too strong for Fouché and Talleyrand; Fouché, received with coolness by the King, was at length obliged to retire from his councils,—to leave Paris, never to return, and to content himself by ending his eventful career as Minister at the insignificant Court of Dresden. Talleyrand, although he retained his influence for some three months longer, found that the King and his cabinet were bent upon pursuing their own arbitrary course.

The Royalists were now all powerful in the kingdom, and desired to revenge themselves upon those who had so long and so unjustly deprived them of their rights. The Chambers, which were soon called together, consisted almost entirely of that party; although, like the faction itself, it was divided into Absolute and Moderate partizans; the former occupied the left side of the chamber, andsupported the ministers and their measures; while the latter formed the right division, and took up the line "that arbitrary measures were likely to lose for the King the popularity which his new government had then obtained."

The Chambers at once proceeded to elect their President, and chose Mons. de Lainé, a man of talent, moderate opinions, and great integrity; but who was wanting in the firmness and energy necessary to make him respected in any administrative post.

The first measures of importance which the Chambers discussed, was what Guizot calls "Exceptional Laws." The King, with his usual prudence, had, on his entrance into France, promised a general amnesty for all past offences against the royal authority—except to those persons who had *actually borne arms against the Monarch*. The ministers seemed to think that this act of grace extended over too wide a field, and that the King ought to proceed with greater rigour against his former enemies. They therefore introduced some stringent exceptional laws against both Bonapartists and Republicans, thinking thus to include many persons who were otherwise likely to escape. These measures were not carried without violent opposition; and their execution occasioned general discontent throughout the whole kingdom, as the great military leaders of course became the principal victims of Royalist suspicion and tyranny. Guizot blames his colleagues for their treatment of Marshal Ney. He is of opinion that he might have been treated with greater leniency, and that his death was unjustifiable. It should, however, be remembered that the Marshal, when he took the command of the army sent against Napoleon, most decidedly pledged himself to bring back Napoleon a prisoner to the capital; and, although this was perhaps a rash promise, it still showed that the leader left Paris with the full intention of thoroughly supporting the King, and that he had at all events intended not to give up his cause without a struggle. His joining Napoleon, therefore, as soon as he met him, could only be looked upon by the King as premeditated treachery, and as such, merited the greatest severity. The King and his government had, however, not as good an excuse for the vexations which they daily inflicted on the minor leaders of the army; and Guizot mentions, amongst other instances, the severe treatment to which a certain General Bernard was subjected, who seems to have been surrounded by spies and emissaries of the government, and forced to offer his services to the United States of America. Being an able officer in the artillery, he was well received in the States, where he rose to a considerable command. When he asked permission of the Minister of War to be allowed to join that service, he was peremptorily refused; the minister then tendered him a higher French appointment, which was indignantly declined; and the General soon after quitted France.

The Protestants, about this time, were treated with considerable rigour, under the ministry of the Duc de Richelieu; and the old laws in favour of the Catholic clergy were brought forward and revised in the Chambers; though not without a good deal of angry discussion. Mons. Decazes, the active and indefatigable Minister of Police, carried out these measures with unwarrantable severity. Guizot, being a Protestant, and a strong supporter of the followers of that faith, was thus, notwithstanding his loyal principles, obliged to resign his post as Secretary General to the Minister of Justice, and to retire for a short time from the government. His eminent services, however, enabled him soon to return to it as Master of Requests—in 1816.

These severe measures and the discontent which they occasioned out of doors, as well as the violent opposition with which they were met in the Chambers, at length made the King and his ministers reflect, whether it would not be wise to dissolve so unpopular a body. This step was, however, long under consideration before it was executed, and the ministers themselves were very divided as to its expediency. It was much blamed by the press, and many able pamphlets appeared against it from the pens of several illustrious writers, the most distinguished being Mons. de Chateaubriand. The King long hesitated over the course he should pursue; but when he had taken his resolution, he acted with firmness; for he possessed a dignity of character which, when he had fully made up his mind, overcame all opposition. The Chambers were dissolved at the end of the year, and it was not a little extraordinary to behold the same re-action in favour of Royalty and arbitrary measures, as after the English Restoration, centuries previously. The new Chambers, which were convoked in 1816, showed, by their measures, how difficult it was to establish freedom in France, after all its institutions had been swept away by revolutions. It had to sketch out a new constitution, and to begin, as it were, by constructing the very elements of liberty. According to Guizot, the Chambers were made up of three parties; the majority being in favour of the ministry, it formed what was called the "Côté Gauche;" and was, on the whole, for a Moderate policy. The "Droit" was formed of Royalists, who supported the ancient regime; whilst there was a large party of men who, voting under leaders of eminent political and oratorical ability, seemed to have chosen a middle course between the two parties; these, while they held some of the doctrines and principles of the revolution, contended that it had been pushed to too great extremes, and that, when the revolutionary principles were kept within moderate limits, they were perfectly compatible with a constitutional monarchy—the government of all others which was desired in France. The left side were neither Royalists of the absolute cast, nor Democrats; and therefore, to some degree, supported the King.

The first important measure which came under the consideration of this assembly was the Electoral Law; and it appears that Mons. Lainé, the Minister of the Interior, who was commissioned to draw it up, found considerable difficulty in arranging the electoral college in the various departments, and in so adjusting the qualifications of the electors, that the Revolutionary party should not have too much influence in the elections, and yet that they should be sufficiently popular to admit of the middle classes having their proper share of power. If he made the qualifications too dependant upon property, he would then place the elections entirely in the hands of the aristocracy; if, on the other hand, he introduced universal suffrage, he would hand over the elections to the power of the lowest of the community. In these difficulties, he called upon Guizot to give him an assistance, which that statesman gladly afforded. They decided that the possession of three thousand francs in the funds, and the attainment of the age of thirty, should be considered sufficient qualification to enable a person to vote in elections. This law was thus propounded to the chamber, and passed with much opposition. The qualifications not depending upon landed property, enabled the middle classes to acquire political influence; whilst it being indispensable for the electors to possess a respectable sum in the funds, prevented the mob from exercising any power.

Here Guizot boasts that he was frequently, during the period which extended from 1814 to 1848, the sole champion of the middle classes in the Chambers and the Government. We doubt, however, whether French freedom was either so durable or so general as Guizot would make us believe. Louis Philippe was often obliged, in the early part of his reign, to curb the over liberal spirit of his subjects by strong measures; and, had liberty been firmly established, it would not have yielded during the troubles of 1848; but French liberty at that period was in the same condition as in England at the death of Queen Ann. Had the Pretender been restored to the throne and to his just rights, the English constitution would have met with the same fate that French liberties have at the hands of Louis Napoleon; our popular institutions would have been crushed in the bud, and we should now be living under the tyranny of a military despotism. The electoral law having now been satisfactorily disposed of, a subject quite as difficult to deal with was brought under the consideration of the Chambers—viz. the "Recruiting of the Army." This was much opposed by the right side, who desired that all the highest offices and places of emolument and trust in the army should be given, as in the days of the ancient regime, to the nobility. The Portfolio of Minister of War was, however, held at this period by Marshal de Saint Cyr, an old officer who had seen much service in the days of the Revolution and the Empire. He united in his character much good sense, courage, and originality of thought; and, although he was a sincere Royalist, he clearly perceived that the exclusive principles of the supporters of the ancient regime could give satisfaction neither to the army nor the country. As an old soldier, bred in the wars of the Revolution, he had acquired some experience of what could be performed by officers who had risen from the ranks. He proposed to make all liable to military service, as in the days of the Empire; and the marshal's baton within the grasp of the soldier of fortune, as it had been in the times of the Jacobins, and of Napoleon. During the period of peace, he made severe examinations the test of merit; and what Guizot praises in him most, is the desire he had of retaining the services of the old soldiers of the empire, as a reserved force and a school, where the young recruit might learn discipline and obedience, instead of disbanding them and following the policy which Charles II and his minister Clarendon did towards the fifth-monarchy men, who formed the fine troops of Oliver Cromwell. Guizot affirms that these regulations not only satisfied the army, but kept it in a state of order and discipline from which it never swerved, until the Revolution in 1848.

The next important subject which occupied the attention of the Chamber was "the restriction to be imposed upon the press." Guizot made his first speech in defence of this measure, and confined himself rather to a clear statement of facts than to any attempt at rhetoric. Although the press had often been his ally, and the means through which he had been enabled to express his opinions, yet, on the other hand, it had quite as frequently proved his adversary. He therefore boldly stated his views, first expressed in 1814, "that the press could not remain completely uncontrolled, unless accompanied by a very strong social and political organization, as in England, in which country its unrestricted freedom had been well tried." This opinion clearly shows how little real advance the French had made in constitutional liberty, with all their revolutions and changes of government.

Students of English history well know how parliaments were assembled to carry out the arbitrary laws imposed upon the people by their monarchs, and to assist them in levying oppressive taxes. Even the arbitrary and capricious Henry VIII never disputed the acknowledged fact which had been so long established in the English mind; and all his oppressive taxes were attained through this constitutional means. His contradictory laws, also, concerning the sucession, received the sanction of parliament; and the influence of his arbitrary daughter, Elizabeth, which was stretched to a farther extent even than his own, is mainly to be attributed to her skilful management of parliaments. In this acknowledged authority of parliament was to be found the future material for a popular government in England, and may be said to have formed the source of our present happy constitution. Nothing similar, however, existing in France, it would have been well for them if some steady course of liberal measures, such as Guizot describes, had been followed in 1789; for they would have saved the country the disorders and horrors of the Reign of Terror, and the long and disastrous war with Europe of twenty-five years' duration.

Guizot shrewdly enquires how it happened that the Restoration, which had brought peace and prosperity to France, was, nevertheless, so little appreciated by the French people; and why discontents should everywhere have arisen against Louis XVIII. He believes that the ministry, which was at first so arbitrary in its government, had had its views moderated by several changes and by the admission of Mons. de Lainé and the Marshal de Saint-Cyr into its ranks; and although it did not reap the credit of possessing any particular vigour, or of displaying much ability in its administration, yet it set itself in earnest to amend the past, to erect buildings of utility throughout the kingdom, to undertake the establishment of schools, the making of roads, and various other improvements, which were much required after the country had been engaged in so long and so disastrous a war. It would appear, therefore, that the nation had no just reason to be dissatisfied with the Monarch and his Cabinet. Revolutionary opinions which had so long prevailed were, however, difficult to eradicate; and although much danger menaced the authority of the crown from this source, it was not the only one; for it was no easy matter to make the old administrative government of Louis XIV and Napoleon work well with the popular constitution of a legislative assembly. Guizot affirms that, in England, Belgium, Switzerland, and the United States of America, where the real power had been long vested in an assembly, the social affairs of the provinces were either left entirely to their own jurisdiction, or else, when of sufficient importance, were legislated on in the assembly. In France, however, where a new constitution was being organized and had scarcely commenced, the ministers of the state thought it necessary to busy themselves with many petty concerns in the provincial government. This interference, in the early port of Louis the Eighteenth's reign, did no good, while it often wounded many sensibilities better left alone, and created considerable discontent amongst the luke-warm supporters of the ministry. It never has been the practice of French orators and leaders of parties to commit themselves solely to the direction of any minister whose measures they may generally support; the consequence was, at that period, that any Cabinet might find itself suddenly attacked by those from whom it previously received the most strenuous support. The Cabinet could not always tell who were likely to be its friends and who its enemies of the three parties into which the Chambers were divided. The Doctrinaire, or centre, were the best able to give assistance to the ministry, owing to the known talent of their leaders, being more suited to the exigencies of the times than either the extreme left or the extreme right. The former, although Moderates, founded their principles in the turbulent days of the Revolution, and were therefore sometimes rather inclined to push their liberal ideas to extremes; whilst the latter still clung with invincible obstinacy to the old exploded notions of the ancient regime. Though the Doctrinaires held liberal ideas, they nevertheless saw the necessity of combating both the despotism of the ancient regime, and the ultra-democratic principles of the Revolution. The ministers were, however, too haughty in their conduct towards the leaders of this influential party; whilst they themselves were too independent to secure employment from any cabinet, however liberal.

Added to all this, the ministry were still more embarrassed by the negotiations which had been carried on at Rome for a new Concordat, and which had been committed to the Duke de Blacas, who executed his instructions in a most injudicious manner. The Concordat infringed so much upon the liberties of the Gallican Church, that, when it was presented to the Chamber, it was not only strongly opposed in that body, but also subjected to the severe animadversions of the press and the various periodicals of the day, to which Guizot contributed no small share.

Things were in this gloomy state, when the Duc de Richelieu was called upon, in 1818, to attend the conferences of Aix la Chapelle. He was a minister who, destitute of the more brilliant talents, had, nevertheless, made himself respected more than any who had governed France for a long period. His moderation and prudence in the internal administration, his sincerity and honour in the management of foreign affairs, and his tact and prudence, had enabled him to obtain more advantageous terms from the allies than they were at first inclined to impose upon France. During his absence at Aix, the ultra-Royalists in the Chambers, and even some of the members of the Cabinet, wished to modify, if not to abolish altogether, the electoral law. They had never been able to submit willingly to the Charter, and were still more adverse to liberalism in a monarchical constitution. Many of the ministers, as well as the inferior functionaries of the Government, threatened to resign if modifications were attempted; and the Duc de Richelieu, on his return from Aix la Chapelle, found that disputes had arisen so high in the Cabinet, that he thought it necessary to tender his resignation to the King. The Count d'Artois and the ultra-Royalists, who were always ready to take advantage of any false step of their opponents, now intrigued to form a new ministry, and circulated secret notes addressed to foreign sovereigns. Their cabals were, however, counterbalanced by those of the Liberals. Louis XVIII scarcely knew at this crisis who to call to his councils. The Duke of Wellington, if we are to believe Guizot, advised the King to ally himself more closely to the Royalists. This we, however, doubt; as so clear-headed and judicious a man as the British leader must have perceived how distasteful to the nation their principles and policy had become.

Louis seems, in this crisis, to have exercised his usual prudence, as he accepted the resignation of the Duc de Richelieu, but did not discard all his colleagues. The King, therefore, commissioned Decazes, one of the ablest statesmen of Richelieu's cabinet, to form a new one. It was unnecessary to make any great changes at first, supported as he was in the Chamber by the Doctrinarians and the moderate "right and left." He was soon deserted, however, by Saint-Cyr and Lainé, who both declared that they would not vote for the abolition or modification of the electoral law. Decazes now filled up these vacancies; but, owing to the confusion of parties and to the opposition occasioned at his attempt to modify the electoral law, he could not hold the government with any firm hand.

Mons. de Serre, one of his ablest colleagues, wished the King to recall Richelieu, who was then travelling in Holland. His friends, however, declared that he was little inclined to resume his former post. The Decazes ministry became, however, each day weaker and more embarrassed, and the scandal of the election of Mons. Gregoire, an old regicide, together with the assassination of the Duc de Berry, hastened its downfall. Decazes continued throughout his whole administration to press the modification of the law of election, for which he was not only much blamed, but strongly opposed by his inferior supporters in the council, and by none more so than by Guizot himself, who paid the penalty of his violent opinions by being dismissed from the council of which he was a member. If Guizot had studied his own interest, he would have remained silent; for, not being a member of either Chamber, and holding only a *seat* in the Council, he need not have spoken at all on the matter. It was certainly unnecessary for him to have stirred up the opposition.

Decazes' ministry was followed for a short interval by that of the Duc de Richelieu, who again with great reluctance took office. He was, however, too diffident of his own power, and too weak in party to keep the violence of the *right* within proper bounds; and was, therefore, unable long to retain his influence. Mons. de Villèle followed in the ministry; who, according to Guizot, had obtained political power by adhering closer to party principles than any other French statesman of that day. He had often paid dearly for his consistency as a partizan, as he was frequently obliged to support measures which were contrary to his better judgment, in order not to lose the confidence of his party. He had been all along a violent ultra-Royalist, and had defended these principles against the Moderates. He and his party were now most necessary to the crown, as a spirit of agitation had everywhere risen through the country; and the King rather required a cabinet that would pursue a course of severe measures with firmness, without fearing consequences, than counsellors who might be induced to adopt reforms. According to Guizot, the parties in the Chambers now consisted of three sections—first, the ultra-Royalists, who formerly supported Mons. de Vilièle in all his most stringent measures; secondly, those who supported the liberal ideas of the different malcontents, but who were not directly in league with them, or made aware of their conspiracies to upset the government. Thirdly, a section consisting of those who not only openly declared their revolutionary opinions, but who also connived at the many insurrections which were then occurring in different parts of France. This third party was headed by the famous La Fayette, of revolutionary note, who had fired upon the populace in 1792, and who had throughout the early part of the first great Revolution led the National Guard. His character is well pourtrayed by Guizot, who says that he was courageous, generous, but rash; that he wanted political judgment, but had throughout his whole career shown great political rectitude and consistency. He was, however, carried away by his desire of popular favour. This made him useful to Louis XVI and the royal family, in the early part of the revolution, as it often enabled La Fayette to place himself between the monarch and the people, and so to protect Louis and his family from the insults of the mob. La Fayette was, like most of the revolutionary leaders, desirous of obtaining power for himself. Nothing could be more disinterested in his early career than his abandonment of all his brilliant prospects at the gay French court, in order to serve the doubtful cause of American freedom, which had not at that time received the open support of governments: and his generous support of the sinking royal cause during the most terrible part of the Revolution. La

Fayette stood alone during the days of the empire; and he opposed the return of Louis XVIII, in 1814, because he feared that he would bring back the absolute principles which he had combated during his whole life. He supported the Emperor in the Cents Jours, because he believed his cause to be that of the people; and he was again inimical to Louis XVIII on his return in 1815.

The other leaders were men of very different stamp to La Fayette, and were easily induced to launch out into all the excesses of revolution. They were mostly men of energetic but uncultivated minds, but prone, like all Frenchmen, to be carried away by their ideas, however chimerical or visionary; who, had they been successful in gaining their ends, would have been equal in tyranny to Robespierre, Danton, and their associates.

Conspiracies everywhere broke out in the country, but were soon happily suppressed by Villèle. The executions, which occurred in great numbers, must have been sufficient to strike terror amongst the insurgents, however bold in character, and however well organised their plans. Villèle, owing to his firmness and ability, and to the strong support of his party throughout this period, was enabled to overcome all obstacles; though his talents rather fitted him for the administration of local affairs than for conducting any difficult negotiations with foreign states. Such abilities were, however, not much required during the earlier part of his administration, as the dangers occasioned by the insurrections in the interior of the country had wholly engrossed the attention of the government, and excluded all consideration of foreign politics. Indeed, Villèle had no one in his cabinet capable of conducting foreign affairs. He had learned, during the administration of the Duc de Richelieu, that a non-intervention policy with neighbouring states was the most prudent and most acceptable to his country; but as Italy and Spain participated in the revolutionary ferment, France could not long continue indifferent to her foreign relations.

In Italy, the revolution had been put down by the strong and able policy of Prince Metternich; whilst Spain gave great anxiety to the rest of Europe. Ferdinand had, with the usual bad faith which characterised the Bourbons in Spain, promised to give his consent to the liberal constitution which had existed during the Peninsular war. As soon, however, as he found himself firmly seated on the Spanish throne, he annulled his consent, and passed most absolute and tyrannical laws. This created much discontent; and Louis XVIII therefore felt it necessary to assist the King of Spain in suppressing these insurrections, and in upholding the dignity and power of his family. Under these circumstances, he collected a large force on the Spanish frontier, which was to be ready to march into Spain in case of emergency; and therefore alarmed the other powers of Europe, and called forth their intervention; Villèle was therefore obliged to adopt some more decided policy than had hitherto distinguished his cabinet. He was desirous of procuring some one who would aid him in his foreign policy, who would not outshine him in talent, and yet meet with the approbation of his King and party. Believing that Mons. Montmorency possessed all these qualifications, he solicited the King to appoint him to the post of Foreign Minister. Louis was, however, extremely averse to this plan, and answered: "We must be cautious in conferring this office upon Montmorency, as he is a man of narrow mind, whom we can never trust, and who will inevitably betray us." If Montmorency had not the good-will of the King, he nevertheless possessed the confidence of the ruling party, and the Premier persisted in his request. Villèle had soon to regret this appointment, and further became anxious to remove another rival, Mons. de Serre, from the Chambers, for which purpose he offered him the post of French Ambassador at Naples, which duty was gladly accepted.

In the mean time, however, Mons. de Montmorency had applied for the same post for his nephew; and Villèle was anxious not to offend a new minister who had just entered the Cabinet. He found, however, that it would be more important to silence such an opponent as Mons. Serre, than to ingratiate himself with the new Foreign Minister.

Chateaubriand, whose opposition was neutralized by his appointment as Ambassador to England, where he was looked upon rather as a distinguished writer than as a great politician, did not receive that enthusiastic adulation to which he had been accustomed elsewhere. Indeed, he tells us, in his Memoirs, that, although the banks of the Thames drew all sorts of talent to their vicinity, yet they as quickly repelled it; and he exclaims, "What a world is London society! and what a life is a London season! I cannot endure it, and would rather be confined in the galleys than be doomed to remain there." Besides his dislike of England and its society, he pined for some more active occupation than could be furnished by the easy routine of the Embassy. He therefore solicited another appointment; and Villèle found something more suited to his taste at the court of Madrid, where Spanish affairs were to be settled by the representatives of the great powers of Europe. He and Mons. de Montmorency were sent thither to represent France; though with opposite instructions, and as a check on each other. Neither Ambassador was much trusted by Villèle; though Chateaubriand, being backed in his views by the Emperor of Russia, was soon enabled to carry out his warlike policy in opposition to his colleague.

Guizot seems to think that the war in Spain was unnecessary, as neither the life nor the government of Ferdinand VII were much endangered by the machinations of the liberal party in Spain; and contends "that subsequent Spanish history has proved that country to be hostile to the growth of revolutionary spirits." He also affirms that it would have been more creditable to French honour if its government had allowed events to take their own course, as we did in 1848. The French interference was infinitely more dangerous to the stability of their government, than the commotion in Spain in 1823 could have been to that of France. We fully concur with Guizot in the opinion that it is an evil for any one state to interfere in the internal affairs of another without good cause. The war in Spain was, however, attended with success to the French arms, and strengthened the power of the house of Bourbon. Although Chateaubriand was dissatisfied with the policy that had been pursued by his Cabinet, he, notwithstanding, sanctioned it. He was less satisfied with the General who had been sent to carry it out, than with the measures that were taken; and he complained bitterly, both in his own Memoirs and in the correspondence continually kept up with the Emperor Alexander, of the coldness and contempt with which he had been received by the Duke and Duchess d'Angouleme; which, together with the distrust showed towards him by Villèle, made him a powerful rival, though not yet an open enemy. He and Montmorency showed their spite by intriguing with the Emperor of Russia for the much-coveted honour of the Cross of St. Andrew, which they both obtained, to the exclusion of their chief, Villèle, on whom the King at once bestowed the French Order of St. Louis, observing that it was more valuable than any foreign order of knighthood. Mons. de Montmorency and Mons. de Chateaubriand, perceiving how much they had hurt the feelings of Villèle, and fearing that, instead of being merely rivals in the same Cabinet with him, they might become enemies in the opposition, now did their best to induce the Emperor of Russia to confer the much-desired order on the French Premier; and their solicitations were listened to by the Czar. Although this was but a trivial piece of spite on the part of Chateaubriand, it appears that it filled up the measure of offence against him on the part of the King and his first minister, as Chateaubriand was soon after dismissed from his post without apparent reason; and as Villèle made no effort to prevent his dismissal, and displayed more temper about it than his wont, the blame of this measure was thrown upon him; though whether he advised it or not, seems never to have been clearly ascertained.

No two men, if we are to believe Guizot's account, could have been more different in character than Villèle and Chateaubriand; and they seem to have been much better matched as opponents than as ministers in the same Cabinet. Villèle was a man of great perseverance and resolution, who calmly pursued an object until he had attained his end. His ambition in political life had been to obtain power by closely adhering to the principles of his party, and, when acquired, to hold it with a firm grasp. Chateaubriand, on the other hand, although a man of brilliant and varied talents, was wanting in close application. He had tried every career; he had distinguished himself as a man of letters, a statesman, and an orator; and yet, when he attained success in his various pursuits, he became disgusted with them. He was so thoroughly *blasé* with his various occupations, as to be unfit to give the close attention to affairs which the office of a minister required; whilst it deprived him of all energy of action. As a leader of opposition, however, his eloquence and sarcasm were of an extraordinary kind, and his peculiar happiness in hitting on the weak points of the ministry, and placing them before the public in a disadvantageous light, made him particularly dreaded. It was one of the false steps of Villèle to dismiss him from his Cabinet, and to irritate so dangerous an enemy into opposition, when his powers so eminently fitted him to play so conspicuous a part in debate. Villèle had nothing to fear from the other politicians opposed to him, had not Chateaubriand become a leader of the opposition, his most formidable rival, the Duc de Richelieu, being dead, as well as his most important colleagues; whilst Villèle had contrived to get rid of his old adversaries, La Fayette and Manuel, leaders of the Republican party. He was also relieved from all opposition from foreign courts by the death of the Emperor Alexander of Russia; but when Chateaubriand joined the ranks of the opposition, Villèle found that he had not only to contend against the liberals, but against a section of his own party, who pushed their principles in favour of absolute royal authority to the greatest extreme, and carried with them the support of the ecclesiastical authority, to which even many of the old Royalists refused to yield. Guizot, although a Protestant, remarks, "that the restoration of the old church, after the infidelity of the revolution, had produced many beneficial results upon the national mind, by once more turning its thoughts towards religion, and thus giving it a respect for social order and a tranquil government." As long as the priesthood bent the ideas of the people towards religion, and did not interfere with political affairs, they were an advantage to the state; but the papal clergy could not abstain from attempting to combine the acquisition of power with the teaching of religious doctrines. As long as Napoleon and his marshals governed France, they had checked this priestly ambition, and reduced the ecclesiastical orders to proper discipline. When, however, the restoration was effected, the interests of Louis XVIII and the clergy were too much bound together for the influence of the latter not to gain ground; and by the end of his reign they had increased their power to a most intolerable height.

Villèle introduced into the Chamber about this time a Bill of Indemnity, which gave back to the emigrants much of the property they had lost by the Revolution. It caused a great deal of debate in the Assembly, and much indignation out of doors; though it became law and reconciled many of the wavering followers to the party of Villèle. In this state of affairs, Louis XVIII died, in 1824, and was succeeded by his brother, the Count d'Artois, under the title of Charles X. This Prince pushed his absolute and ecclesiastical principles to most absurd extremes, and thereby lost his throne, like James II of England. Villèle had long expected this event, and had skilfully prepared to meet it, by ingratiating himself with the Count d'Artois, by gaining the favour of the ultra-Royalists and ancient noblesse, by passing for the first a Bill of Indemnity, and by promising that steps should be taken to re-establish the old law of primogeniture which had existed before the Revolution. He had no one but Chateaubriand and some of his followers to dread; although he soon found that he could not count upon the King's friendship, who was bent upon giving the clergy more power than even he, with all his veneration for royalty, could ever sanction. Villèle endeavoured as long as possible to support his master and his intolerant ecclesiastical measures. Thus he had no easy task to perform, as he was attacked on all sides in the Chambers. He was accused of mismanaging the affairs of Spain, of not having properly supplied the army, and of having used for his own purposes some of the money voted for carrying on the expedition. He could well have proved the falsehood of these statements; but he looked upon them as calumnies without foundation, put forward simply to undermine his reputation, and, as such, scarcely worth an answer. In addition to these obstacles in the Chambers, his influence was daily waning at Court: and although Charles X was much disgusted at the constant attacks made against his administration, yet he could not well counteract so much opposition, nor make his minister popular. Villèle, feeling that his power was thus declining, made use of the conditions of the Charter, which enabled him to have a dissolution and a new election.

The new Chamber being adverse to his policy, he at once tendered his resignation to the King. He had certainly showed both ability and sincerity in his administration, although his opinions were none of the most popular. He lived in days when it was necessary to reconcile the arbitrary principles of monarchy and the old regime to the democratic views of the Revolution; and although his policy and views inclined towards the former, he could not entirely neglect the latter while in office. Thus, by his prudence and vigour, he had continued to remain in for five years of the most difficult period of the Bourbon power, when it was menaced on all sides, and when the most trivial check might have overthrown it.

Guizot here breaks off from the political history of his country to give us the narrative of his own proceedings, which he takes up from the time he was dismissed the Council, in 1820. Having yet no place in the Chambers, he had few means of expressing his opinions to the public, except through the medium of the press or his lectures. Madame la Comtesse de Condorcet, the wife of one of his colleagues in the ministry, offered him an asylum in her country house, which was prettily situated not far from Paris. Thither he retired, with his wife and his son Francis, now about five years of age, "to throw off," as he states. "the cares of a political life, and to amuse himself with study and philosophy in the quiet shade of retirement." He does not seem to have been really satisfied with his supposed quiet, and exclusion from the management of public affairs; though he gives a long description of the charms of his new residence in the country, and of the pleasures which he derived from literature. During this period, he did not wholly neglect to inform himself on the state of politics and parties; but wrote several political works, the tendency of which was to prove, by reference to the past history of his country, that French society had always consisted of two classes, or, as he is pleased to call them, two different races—*victors* and *vanquished,* the *governing* and the *submissive bodies.* The object of his writings seems to have been to maintain and augment, if possible, the powers of the middle classes; and they accordingly attracted the attention of many of the leaders of conspiracy of that day, many of whom visited him in his retreat. Amongst the most distinguished of these visitors was Monsieur Manuel, the chief leader of the Republicans, after La Fayette, who declared that nothing was to be gained on the part of the people by the support of the Charter under Louis the Eighteenth—that all the princes of the Bourbon line maintained absolute principles, and would be ready at any time, when it suited their purpose, to throw off the mask and to betray their too-confident subjects. He proposed, therefore, that the throne should be given to any other dynasty rather than to that of the house of Bourbon, "considering that the privileges of the people would be safe in the hands of any other European royal family," and ended by suggesting Napoleon the Second. Guizot answered "that the Charter furnished the best defence to liberal institutions, and that the restoration of the Bourbons gave a spur to the energies of the people in securing their privileges; whilst the well-known opinions of the Bourbon princes served to put them on their guard against encroachments—that, were the Charter abolished, and the Bourbons expelled, liberty would again degenerate into the excesses of revolution—and that whoever should be called upon to take the reins of government and restore order, would most probably establish, not a constitutional monarchy, but a despotism. He ended by assuring Manuel that his efforts in favour of liberty would end in smoke, and prove injurious to the cause. After this reply, Guizot and his visitor conversed with great cordiality upon general topics, and parted with mutual respect, though with the firm conviction that they could never act well together.

Guizot now endeavoured to give publicity to his sentiments by lecturing, as well as writing; and resumed his chair of history at the University, taking care, however, to exclude political opinions of the day from his remarks. Nevertheless, Villèle feared their effects, and caused Guizot to be superseded in the University. This measure was not unexpected by our author, who now found that he had scarcely any means of expressing his opinions, and therefore turned his attention to the study of English history and its constitution. In this portion of his memoirs, he gave us many observations on the influence which the two countries exerted over each other's moral, social, and political conditions, notwithstanding the constant wars which were being carried on between them. He seems much struck with the similarity in the past histories of both nations, and the resemblance in their struggles for freedom. He applauds the wisdom of the English people for making such good use of the advantages which their circumstances had afforded, and for progressing so steadily and firmly in the formation of free institutions; and asks, "how can the classes in France expect to obtain the same results, whilst they neglect to take advantage of passing events?"

Guizot, about this time (1826), gave his impressions to the public through the medium of the press, and contributed to many of the most important journals of France, amongst which the *Review Français* and the *Globe* seem to have been most favoured. His views, of course, remained moderate, and he seems to have been associated in these publications with the most eminent literary and political men of that day. In 1828, he was elected a member of that celebrated scientific body, the Sorbonne, where he seems to have continued his historical lectures, and to have been as careful as formerly not to mix any political opinions with his historical teaching.

After the dismissal of Mons. Villèle, the King commissioned Mons. Martignac to form a Cabinet—a man of persuasive eloquence, moderate views, and amiable private character, who would have been an able minister in a firmly established and popular government. He wanted, however, strength of character to rule in such uncertain times; and the rest of his colleagues do not seem to have been either men of great ability or of much vigour of character; their views were generally liberal, and they found but little support either in the Chamber or from the King. Their ablest friend in the former was Mons. Royer Collard, who had for many years filled the important post of President of the Chamber of Deputies, and who in that capacity had obtained much political influence. His experience and talent enabled him to give much useful advice and assistance to the ministry. He had held a place in the council in 1820, from which he had been dismissed through the opposition of Mons. Serre. Royer Collard, since that event, had sunk into the deepest despondency, which he in vain tried to overcome by the pleasures of retirement and study, like his friend Guizot. However, he did not in the midst of his solitude give up the idea of political advancement. Nothing seems to have been too high for his aspirations: though he was of a despondent nature. He seems, in his younger days, to have been an eloquent debater, and to have exercised no small influence over the Chamber; to which fact may be attributed his election to the office of President.

The ministry, owing to their general weakness and to the want of sympathy between them and Charles X, were soon obliged to resign; and it now became extremely difficult to find any statesman able or willing to undertake the task of forming a new government. It was supposed by the most intelligent men in France that there were only three persons in the whole kingdom who were capable of executing such a task—viz. Chateaubriand, Villèle, and Royer Collard. As for the first, he was at Rome, to which capital he had been sent as Ambassador; Mons. Villèle had, since his dismissal, resided at his country house in the neighbourhood of Toulouse, and paid little attention to political affairs; and as for Mons. Royer Collard, although he might have conceived the idea of becoming Prime Minister of France in his most ambitious dreams, he never really intended to aspire to such power.

In this state of politics and parties, the Prince Polignac, who had long filled the post of French Ambassador at the court of St. James's, having obtained a few days' leave of absence, came over to

Paris. On arriving in the French capital, he was immediately ordered to present himself before his Sovereign, by whom he was commissioned to form a new government. All parties were surprised at this appointment; all equally wondered what policy could be taken up by the King and his new ministry. The most intelligent French politicians, however, clearly perceived that an approaching and serious struggle was about to occur between the King and the people, and all parties quickly assembled round the scene of action.

In 1830, Guizot was elected, for the first time, a member of the Chamber of Deputies, and received the news of his election whilst delivering a lecture at the Sorbonne. This intelligence was welcomed by his hearers with acclamation, and he was generally congratulated upon his success.

Although great political excitement was felt by all parties in the short period which intervened between Polignac's accession to office and the assembling of the Chambers, yet none showed it by the usual attempts at conspiracy or rising. Every one was quiet, awaiting with the greatest anxiety the next change, fearing that it would end in revolution at home, and perhaps a long war abroad. The Moderate and Liberal parties were firmly resolved to resist any encroachment on the part of the crown, and to give their support to the Charter and Constitution. Guizot was not called upon by his election to take any immediate steps as an active politician. He continued his lectures at the Sorbonne, and quietly viewed what was going on around him. He prepared for what he believed an obstinate contest between absolute monarchy and liberal institutions, and made himself popular with the young men. The public expectation was now at its height, and every one speculated as to the conduct the King and his ministers would really adopt when the Chambers met. The King at length made a speech of a most arbitrary kind, the principles of which were alone supported in the Peers by Chateaubriand, whose eloquence and talents might have made him a host in himself, had he been a minister, and could he have found a few voices to cheer him with their support; of course they were of no avail against the whole chamber. In the Deputies, a strong address, containing very liberal opinions, was drawn up, and voted in answer to the King's speech. Royer Collard attempted to soften down the members in favour of his Sovereign. He did not, however, much relish supporting the address, which he thought a great deal too violent, although, as President of the Chamber, he was obliged to give it his consent. Guizot defended it in his maiden speech, as a member, and was also one of those who attended the deputation that laid it before Charles X. The King gave no immediate answer, but showed his indignation by proroguing the

Chambers, which were immediately dissolved. Many of the Moderates enquired of Guizot and his friends what steps should next be taken; as they did not wish to involve the country in a revolution, and yet they were unwilling tamely to submit to the arbitrary measures of the King. During this anxious interval, Guizot spent some time at his own native place of Nismes. Many of the ministers at this crisis became frightened, when they perceived that an open rupture was likely to take place between the monarch and his subjects, and resigned their posts. Amongst this number was the Chancellor Dambray, with whom Guizot was intimately acquainted, and with whom he kept up a continual correspondence. In one of his letters, the Chancellor informs Guizot that affairs, in his idea, had assumed a very gloomy aspect, and that he had had a very long conversation on the political state of the country with the Russian minister, Pozzo de Borgo, to whom he had remarked, that the only effectual means left of persuading the King not to abolish the Charter was an autograph letter from the Emperor Nicholas, then residing at Warsaw. "He shall write it," replied the envoy, "from his present residence." Guizot doubts if the letter was ever written, much less sent, as the Czar, when asked his opinion respecting matters, replied, "If Charles attempts to abolish the Charter, he will not only lose his crown and the kingdom of France, but also bring about another general war throughout Europe." Charles X at length called together the Chambers to give validity to and confirm his measures.

At this interesting and eventful point Guizot ends his first vol. His narrative of events up to this period is on the whole impartial, though mixed with a good deal of egotism and vanity; and, in a political sense, Guizot's book disproves what he himself is anxious to assert. Our readers must have remarked that Guizot's readings of French history clearly show that the nation was not, up to 1830, in a condition to enjoy free institutions, apart from the fact that all principles of government upon which new laws might have been based had been swept away by the French Revolution of 1789, and that statesmen had to form an entirely new constitution. It is not in the nature of the impatient and lively French character to work out steadily and gradually their freedom, and to know where to draw the exact line between liberty and licence. Had the French nation understood its position, the people might slowly have worked out their freedom through the peaceable and prosperous reign of Louis Philippe, and have formed a solid government; instead of once more passing through the uncertainty of revolution, and falling again under a despotism which is quite equal in its severity to that of Louis XIV, or the first Napoleon.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1830.

Guizot concluded the first volume of his Memoirs* at a most interesting point, just when Charles X had called the Prince de Polignac to his aid—a minister in every way willing and able to carry out his arbitrary designs, now that the king had incurred the general dissatisfaction of his subjects, and had been openly opposed in the Chambers by many sincere Royalists. We have already seen how Monsieur Guizot journeyed back to Nismes and pondered over the effects of the coming storm, and we are now invited to listen to him as the Historian of the Revolution of 1830, a far more difficult task, as he is obliged to narrate the events which occurred during a period when he held the important post of Cabinet Minister, and when he had himself a principal share in suggesting the measures undertaken by the Government.

On Guizot's return to Paris he found every thing in a most unsettled state—the people and the Chambers were discontented with Charles X and the Government, though neither the one nor the other had any fixed idea as to what Constitution should be established. The Chambers were frightened at the clamour and insolence of the mob, and their fears deterred them from calmly deliberating on their future policy, whilst the mob was equally undecided in its opinions. At first, its cry was "*down with the Bourbons*," which, however, was soon exchanged for that of the "*Revision of the Charter!*" and at last seemed ready to break out into revolutionary excesses like those of '89 and '90, and to demand a thorough Republican Constitution. In this disordered state of affairs, the Duke of Orleans, who had long lived in retirement, suddenly appeared at Paris, and the post of Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom was offered to him. Guizot endeavours to excuse his tardy acceptance of this office, and the subsequent elevation of the Duke of Orlèans to the throne, by stating that affairs in France were so critical, that it required some one of high position and talents, and who was also connected with the Sovereign, to take the helm and guide the State, and that the sovereignty of Louis Philippe, after the abdication of Charles X, was an expedient and an inevitable step. All impartial observers, however, must look upon the conduct of Louis Philippe as questionable; and allow that he created difficulties as a plausible excuse for executing his own ambitious designs. When young, he had been surrounded by men of ultra-republican principles, he had commenced his career as a soldier in republican armies, had, during his exile in England and the United States, studied the advantages of a Constitutional Government, and had learned that any attempt on the part of his family to return to the old order of things would be impossible; he was also surrounded by many of his old followers and companions, who advised him to adopt liberal measures quite unsuited to such times. Thus he wavered between the liberal measures which were suggested to him by these men and which suited his own inclination, and the vigorous conduct which the unsettled condition of France then required.

---

* Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de mon Temps, par Monsieur Guizot. Vol. II.

Again, after the dignity of Lieutenant-General of the Kingdom had been conferred upon him, his Government rested on no sure foundation. Charles X had not yet left the country, and was an encumbrance both to his own supporters and his adversaries; whilst the power of the Duke of Orleans was on the other hand daily threatened by a still more formidable competitor in the person of Monsieur de La Fayette, whose former services in the cause of American independence, and the revolution of 1789, had acquired for him many zealous supporters amongst the revolutionary and moderate republicans. It was even openly mooted to La Fayette, that the contest lay between him and the Duke of Orleans; that if the moderates were victorious, the latter would become King of France; but that if the Republicans gained the day, La Fayette would be appointed President of a Republic then to be established. Experience and good sense, however, taught the General that little was to be gained by the assumption of such a dignity, and that if a Republic was established in France, it would be but of short duration. La Fayette, therefore, wisely determined to exert his influence and his popularity in support of the Duke of Orleans, and the cause of order, and thus proved most useful in strengthening the authority of the Duke, and in securing to him the support of the more respectable of the Republicans. La Fayette was rewarded by being made Commander-in-Chief of the National Guard, and the Duke of Orleans immediately formed a provisional government, of which Guizot was appointed Minister of the Interior. The Cabinet, however, was but of little real assistance to the Duke, as its members did not agree among themselves. Besides this trouble, there was a still more formidable difficulty to contend with in the presence of Charles X; who, although too terrified and too weak to wield any power, yet still remained in the country. It, however, soon became apparent to the ministers that their best policy would be to escort the King to a seaport, from whence he could embark for a foreign country. This delicate task was entrusted to Guizot, who was authorized to treat with the monarch, and to appoint Commissioners who should accompany him to any port agreed upon. Charles X was thus persuaded to accompany Monsieur Odilon Barrot to Brest, from which place he embarked for Scotland.

The new Government was again troubled by La Fayette, whose command had not been properly defined. Guizot might request, but he could not command the assistance of the General and the National Guard, in case the Government was menaced by the violence of the populace. The Minister, however, soon overcame this obstacle by great civility to the General, and by promising to abstain from interference in military matters. In this way La Fayette was appeased, his duties were definitely settled, and the Government became more firmly established.

Guizot's responsibilities, as Minister of the Interior, were, if we are to credit his own account, of an overwhelming nature. He had to dismiss and reappoint nearly one hundred Prefects, and to superintend the appointments of professors in the various departments of arts and science, as political disputes prevailed, even amongst artists and men of letters, who relied on political interest more than actual merit for advancement. He was also obliged to look to the defences of the country against foreign enemies, the revolution in France having occasioned movements on the frontiers; and also to restrain his countrymen in their desire of territorial aggrandisement. Both he and his colleagues felt that a policy of aggression would be injurious to France, and the only case in which they gave assistance to those who endeavoured to gain independence by open hostilities, was that of Belgium; though even here the French Government confined itself to acting an auxiliary part, and did not attempt to acquire new possessions. The French policy, with regard to Belgium, if not entirely just, was at least wise, and formed the basis upon which the whole foreign policy of the country was conducted during the subsequent reign of the Duke of Orleans as King of the French, and which may be briefly summed up in the following remarks:—Belgium, whilst united with Holland, constituted a formidable barrier to French ambition, as it contained within its boundaries many of the strongest forts in Europe. The Duke of Marlborough, long before this era, had, it seems, often contemplated the possibility of a union of the whole of the low countries into one kingdom, and had predicted that if such an occurrence should take place, it might strengthen the position of Holland against France; but that it would, nevertheless, be of little avail, owing to the great hatred which the inhabitants of the Spanish Netherlands had always felt towards the Dutch, and which would be difficult to overcome.

The Spanish Netherlands, in Marlborough's time, were held by the German branch of the house of Austria, from the treaty of

Utrecht until the invasion of the Netherlands by the French in 1792. At that time the Netherlands were a burdensome and expensive possession, and it is thus rather surprising that the suggestion of uniting them to the Dutch portion of the low countries should have first emanated from so sagacious and far-sighted a statesman as Lord Chesterfield, who seems to have overlooked the only utility of the measure in the firm barrier it would thus raise to French aggression. The mutual hatred of the two people thus politically brought into union counterbalanced all the advantages proposed. The Netherlands were an easy prey to the French invaders of 1792, and remained under their rule until the treaty of 1815, when the allied powers, overlooking national predilections, erected a firm barrier against French ambition, and a solid support to monarchical power, in a union under the Dutch crown.

The Belgians, however, were never content with this settlement of their affairs by foreign powers, and thought that the July revolution in France furnished a fitting opportunity for them to assert their independence, to throw off the Dutch yoke, and to erect their country into a free constitutional monarchy. They accordingly asked assistance of the French monarch; and proposed to elect his son, the Duke de Nemours, as their future sovereign. Louis Philippe was too wise a man to listen to the last of these proposals, but had no objection to aid them in gaining their independence, both with men and money. He wisely judged that when once freed, the Belgians would prove useful allies; and he accordingly marched a force of 36,000 men across country to Antwerp, in the siege of which fortress they took a considerable share, and, as is well known, obliged the Dutch general to surrender, after a long and hard-fought struggle.

The French gave no act of assistance to the Spanish revolutionists, but allowed them refuge in France; and to a certain degree supported their cause with money and good wishes. The revolutionary spirit which had originated in France, also agitated, at this period, the kingdom of Sardinia, the States of the Church, and the other Italian principalities. The French government abstained, however, from directly assisting these patriots, though the revolutionary fever, like an epidemic, spread with surprising rapidity even to the East, undermining the Turkish power, which was already menaced by Russia, to a degree injurious to the future safety of Europe. If France did not aid the Greeks in their insurrection by actual hostility towards the Turks, she at least assisted them by consenting to become one of the protecting powers, and thereby establishing their freedom.

Guizot talks much of the peaceable intentions and counsels of Russia and England, to which, he asserts, the tranquillity enjoyed in

Europe until 1848 was entirely due. As to Russia, she might have been willing enough to attack the new authority of the Duke of Orleans, as she looked upon his rise with no favorable eye; yet she was too much occupied near home, in bloody contests with her Polish subjects. Again, after the Polish rebellion had been successfully crushed, she was obliged to carry on her Persian and Circassian wars. The English, on the other hand, have never felt it their interest to engage in war, unless substantial advantages were to be acquired, or some old ally protected. Guizot takes credit for the appointment of Talleyrand as minister in England, and reckons it as one of the chief acts of his new government. Thus he says that Talleyrand's agreeable qualities and thorough knowledge of diplomacy qualified him to soften those feelings of aversion which the two nations had always felt towards each other, and which were likely to be much increased by the recent revolutionary outbreak in France. Talleyrand, also, carried out the desire of his sovereign, of making powerful foreign alliances; for he had the wisdom to see that a government beset with difficulties at home, could not hope to obtain much by foreign hostilities. In spite of grave complications, many important measures were passed, and the internal arrangements of departments and other matters of debate carried out, during the short period in which Guizot held the post of minister of the interior; and whatever the disturbed state of opinion might have been out of doors, it seems that all parties in the Chambers were strongly impressed with the necessity of speedily forming a strong and settled government, to oppose the violence of the mob. The ministry, however, as we have already remarked, were very much at variance on many important points of policy; the chief of which seems to have been the management of the clubs, and the treatment of political offenders. With regard to the former, Guizot considered that they ought to be coerced by strong measures from discussing public affairs; while, on the latter, he was very unwilling that political offenders should suffer capital punishment. The former of these opinions occasioned great dissatisfaction out of doors, and caused many riots, which were put down with a vigorous hand, though Guizot and the Duc de Broglie escaped the responsibility of these measures, by resigning their posts in the cabinet.

Guizot ends his account of this period by a description of the character of one of his greatest opponents, M. Odilon Barrot, who had held the post of Prefect of the Seine under the Guizot administration, but who had relinquished officc previous to the ministerial resignation. He seems to think him a man of great eloquence and sincerity, though differing from him as to the mode of carrying out the grand principles of the revolution—Guizot being for physical force, and Odilon Barrot for milder measures. The character of this statesman, as painted by our Author, is an extremely candid and creditable one. He describes him as a man of crude notions, whose principal excellence lay in eloquence and sincerity, who was in opposition to every ministry, and who scarcely knew what he actually desired.

The narrative of the July revolution, as pourtrayed in this second volume of Guizot's Memoirs, although tolerably impartial, is not entirely devoid of that egotism and vanity which mark the historical writings of Frenchmen, when they chronicle the acts of their own nation, the events of the period in which they have lived, or the scenes in which they have taken a prominent part. If we were to believe all that Guizot says of himself in these records, it would lead us to suppose that he, and he alone, had brought about these changes in the French constitution, that he had prevented their being injurious to the country, by checking over-liberal excesses, and by achieving all the good deeds that had been performed during the whole period. Of course, his ability and his experience as a politician rendered great service to the liberal party; though we think he ought to allow more merit to his colleagues than he is willing to give them. We fully agree with him in his observations that the Revolution in France is not to be compared with that of 1688 in England, which placed William III (of Orange) on the British throne. The latter was effected without bloodshed, with the consent of all classes of the community who desired reform, whilst they confirmed old but valued institutions. The French changes were accomplished with much bloodshed, and were only partially established, amid the discontent of a large portion of the nation, and a vast change of its institutions.

The account of Lafitte's new ministry is given in bitter and sarcastic words. Guizot considers Lafitte a man of superficial talent and agreeable conversation, who might have adorned an inferior post in either the ministry or the court, but who was totally unfitted by a superficial mind for the office of first minister of so great a state as France. He and his colleagues listened to the cry of the majority in the Chambers, that the ministry of Charles X should be brought to trial, though they opposed the popular notion of punishing them by death. The most violent members, as well as the most influential popular leaders, considered them guilty, and accordingly strongly urged upon the ministry the necessity of capital punishment. Guizot made one of his ablest speeches in opposition to so cruel and rash a proceeding, proving not only its bad policy, but even its inutility. He thus carried with him the ministers, and all the most moderate men of both chambers. The hatred of the people, however, was so strong that it required all the efforts of the ministry, of the various leaders of both chambers, as well as all the popularity which La Fayette could command, to persuade them to refrain from taking justice into their own hands. The trial was accordingly legally conducted, and it brought to light the talents and eloquence of two men hitherto unknown to the public: Sauzet, who was the legal counsel of the ministers, and who displayed in their defence a degree of oratory and legal knowledge seldom seen at the French bar; and Montalivet, who was appointed to fill the vacant post in the cabinet, as minister of the interior, whose tact and courage enabled him to render eminent services to the king at this critical state of affairs. He took upon himself, after some hesitation, the responsibility of saving the unfortunate ministers of Charles X from the violence of the mob, and removed them, under a strong escort, to Vincennes, where he placed them in the care of the commander of the garrison, who had already shown himself a firm supporter of the king's authority when the fortress was threatened by an attack from the people of Paris, during Guizot's ministry. Many of the republicans were, however, enraged that Polignac and his colleagues should have been thus rescued from the fury of the mob, and conveyed to a distance from Paris, in the dead of the night. A number of young men, students of the University and the Polytechnic School, arose in consequence, and La Fayette, who found no means of fulfilling the many promises which he had made to his republican supporters, in order to facilitate the removal of the unfortunate ministry from Paris, was very unwilling to take any offensive measures against these malcontents, and complicated matters by tending his resignation as commandant of the national guard, believing that his influence was so strong, and so necessary to Louis Philippe, that he would not dare to accept it. The sovereign did not at once give him a decided answer, but asked Montalivet to treat with him. In this interview La Fayette stated that he could not possibly take upon himself the command of the national guard against the people, and that he would therefore again send in his resignation to the king; this time in a more decided manner than he had previously done. The king, without hesitation, accepted it, and although it was midnight, sent at once for the Count Lobau, an old soldier who had seen much service, and distinguished himself in the wars of the empire, to confer upon him the vacant command. When the messenger arrived at Lobau's house, he found the veteran general in bed, and when he delivered the king's command the stout old warrior exclaimed, with the contempt of a thorough soldier, "I know nothing of the national guard; I have never commanded them, and I do not wish to have anything to do with them." "But," said the messenger, "you are requested to take this post in order to drive away a tumultuous mob, who have surrounded the Tuileries, and who are likely to carry everything before them." "Oh, that is quite another thing," replied our old officer; "I shall be at your service *à la minute*." The king thus escaped from a very awkward position, though he and La Fayette were much blamed for their conduct in the matter. La Fayette's party accused the king of ingratitude and insincerity to their chief, whilst the adherents of the monarch insisted that La Fayette had conspired against the authority of his sovereign. Guizot, however, affirms that both were sincere in their intentions. The king probably felt that he owed much to La Fayette's popularity and influence, but that policy rendered it necessary to deprive him of his command, when it no longer supported the kingly power against the mob. La Fayette, on his side, was fully desirous of supporting the king; was proud of his own power, and wished to show by his resignation that the king could not do without him, and would be obliged to retain him in his command, without curtailing his powers.

As to Lafitte himself, Guizot is furious against him; charging him with being ill informed on foreign affairs, and having become much alarmed at the late change of government in England; and adding, that though it was Lafitte's business to draw up the financial reports, he was nevertheless too indolent to discharge these duties, and permitted Thiers to compile them, and only presented them to the king. Thiers had already made himself eminent by his eloquence in debate, and by immense financial information; and, as every one knows, has since played an important part in the history of Louis Philippe's reign. Guizot's account of the disturbances which occurred during Lafitte's administration, shows how little the French had learned of the science of self-government, and how unfitted they were for the enjoyment of liberal institutions. It is much to be feared that the unstable nature of all the governments which they have attempted to erect since the days of Louis XIV, will prevent their constructing a really strong and popular constitution for many ages to come, from their want of a good foundation. Lafitte's administration became every day more feeble, and his knowledge of foreign affairs was so defective, that he recalled Talleyrand from England in order to strengthen his government, and to assist him in his foreign policy. Talleyrand felt that it would be impossible to leave London, and accordingly employed one of his ablest and most confidential agents to induce Louis Philippe to confirm him in his appointment; and his request was granted.

If Lafitte's management of foreign affairs was bad, his conduct at home was still more vacillating, and more likely to produce injurious effects, as he offered no firm resistance to the revolutionary spirit of the day. An occurrence soon took place which occasioned great discontent among the revolutionary party. On the 4th of February, 1831, the legitimists assembled in the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois, in order to celebrate the anniversary of the death of the Duc de Berry, which had taken place some thirty years previously. Just as they had commenced mass, the church was surrounded by an infuriated mob, who burst into the building, tore down the crosses, injured the ornaments, and ransacked the archiepiscopal library, throwing many valuable works into the Seine. The authorities and ministry did not stop this outbreak until it had reached its height; and Lafitte is justly blamed by Guizot for not having taken a more decided part in the matter, remarking, "that if the government knew that a religious ceremony of the kind was in contemplation, and if they supposed that an outbreak would occur, they ought to have forbidden it altogether; but if, on the other hand, they argued, from the tranquillity which had accompanied the celebration of the anniversary of the death of Louis XVI, on the 21st of the previous January, that no violence would be attempted at a ceremony of a similar nature, they ought at least to have been prepared for any emergency."

These riotous scenes in Paris were followed by equally disgraceful proceedings at Arles, Nismes, Montpellier, Angouleme, and many other towns in the south and west, which caused Lafitte's ministry to be violently attacked by Mons. Delepert, who, though a Protestant, was shocked at the sacrilege which had been committed on the Roman Catholic churches, and who, though not a formidable political rival, was nevertheless a man of considerable oratorical and literary abilities. His views were supported by Guizot and his friends, who, in our opinion, were much to be blamed for thus hampering a ministry which they had no chance of superseding; as, whatever their opinion of Lafitte's conduct might have been, they could not command sufficient support in the Chambers to enable them to form a lasting government.

The talent of Cassimer Perier, who at this time held the post of president of the chamber of deputies, made him a fitting successor to Lafitte. He possessed great firmness of character, was an able man of business, and a clear and vigorous, though not an eloquent, speaker. The struggle with his political rival then in power was long and obstinate, Lafitte feeling that should he lose his present post, he must sink into a hopeless obscurity. Perier, on the other hand, pressed on with renewed vigour, being supported in his views by the experienced and well-informed General Sebastiani, who had proved a firm ally to his friend whilst out of office, and a most valuable acquisition to his new administration. The contest was at length terminated in favour of Casimer Perier, who, sent for by the king, was commanded to form a new ministry, in which he became minister of the interior, vice Montalivet, who was removed to that of minister of public instruction. General Sebastiani received the portfolio of foreign affairs, and Baron Louis was appointed minister of finance;

while Marshal Soult was made president of the council. Perier, owing to his firmness of character, his business-like habits, and his knowledge of internal administration, soon became the real head of the cabinet. Though not violently opposed by Soult, he was but feebly supported by that general. He, nevertheless, early seems to have made up his mind to the course he intended to pursue, and to have at once bound his colleagues to the cordial adoption of his policy.

When the Chambers met, Perier gave a clear exposition of his views on political matters, both interior and foreign, and of the plan which he and his colleagues intended to pursue. He also addressed a very vigorous circular to the different prefects of departments, recommending them to adopt prompt measures in putting down insurrection; and thus, under a strong hand, France assumed a firm attitude, both towards foreigners, and to the internal disturbers of her tranquillity. It appears, however, that Perier's vigour as a minister often led him to acts by no means agreeable to his sovereign. Thus he frequently assembled the cabinet and discussed important questions, without the presence of the king, which conduct has furnished Guizot with the material for a long discussion as to the rights of a constitutional monarch. According to Guizot, it appears that Perier was somewhat jealous of the interference and influence of the young Duke of Orleans. He nevertheless advised the King to employ him, together with Marshal Soult, in putting down the serious riots of 1831, at Lyons.

Perier showed good taste in bringing to the notice of the Chambers the judgment and courage displayed by the young Duke in those expeditions, though his manner in debate was marked by the same haughtiness and impatience as in his own department. Thus he at one time sanctions and then blames the conduct of those who had filled offices in the previous cabinet, demands an account of the finances, and the extravagances of his predecessor. At another, he calls in question the conduct of the chief Prefect of Police, and at a word supersedes him. His unscrupulous energy even goes so far as to demand that the King should change his residence from the Palais Royal to the Tuileries. It was not the advice which Perier offered that so insulted his master, as the manner in which he gave it. His reasons for this change of residence were, that the Palais Royal, by its situation, was more accessible to the mob than the Tuileries, that it was less strictly guarded, and that its association as having been the residence of Philippe Egalité attracted the mob more than any other palace would do. Although the monarch disliked to abandon a palace in which so much of his early life had been passed, he nevertheless saw the wisdom of his minister's counsel, and accordingly made the desired move.

At this portion of his Memoirs, Guizot gives us a description of the political parties likely to become dangerous to the government and to the friends of order. The legitimists were an influential body in France, on account of their numbers, and the men of ability comprised in their ranks. They supported old institutions which had been long respected in the country; but they never expected to succeed in re-establishing a family who had attempted to restore the arbitrary power of Louis XIV and XV. In short, the policy which they had advocated was neither suited to the times nor to France. The Republicans were still more formidable and dangerous to the existing government, from their great numbers and the popularity of their opinions. It appears, according to Guizot, that the writings of a certain Saint Simon, whose views were extremely chimerical and absurd, greatly influenced the political sentiments of the republicans; and that their various leaders took the opportunity, during the stagnation of trade and the want of labour, in the beginning of 1831, to excite the artizans at Lyons and Grenoble to rise against their employers, and to demand higher wages. These insurrections were not put down without a severe struggle, and a considerable loss of life; whilst, at Paris, every street was the scene of a bloody conflict between the military and the people, during which order was restored chiefly by the determination of Perier.

The Buonapartists were equally numerous and as influential as the other two parties who threatened the government. They, however, do not seem to have been so much dreaded, from the fact of their clinging to a name, which, although it had surrounded the state with former glory, and had added to France large territorial possessions, was apparently never to rise again. Queen Hortense, it appears, had sought a refuge in Paris, with her eldest son, Louis Napoleon, then flying from Italy; and Perier and his master granted her a generous protection as long as her name did not excite revolt amongst her partizans. The mob, however, at length joined her name with their cries for liberty, and Perier was obliged reluctantly to order her to quit the country. She at once left for England, where, after a residence of a few months, she obtained a pass through France for Switzerland, where she ultimately resided.

Guizot now tells us that long and angry discussions took place in the Chambers upon the propriety of erecting a monument to Napoleon, on the column of the Vendôme, and on the expediency of demanding his remains from the English Government, in order that they might be reinterred with due honours in the Invalides. The adoption of both these measures seems to have been carried by a considerable majority, although they were not fully put into effect for a considerable period.

Guizot thinks that Louis Philippe showed a liberality of mind and a generosity of character hardly to be expected from a sovereign who acquired his power in such troubled times, by his consideration for the Buonapartists. Although we agree with Guizot in his commendation of the conduct of the King generally, we yet cannot help thinking that this liberality of policy went far towards strengthening the influence and importance of the Buonapartists, enabling them at length to secure to their chief the election of President of the Republic, and thus prepare the way for his elevation to the French throne.

Perier busied himself a good deal with the examination of the civil list, against which he absurdly complained; for Louis Philippe was not an extravagant prince, and did not indulge in many of the expensive pleasures of sovereigns, although his own personal revenue was sufficiently ample for him to do so without the supplies from the Chambers. Perier soon became unpopular, and anxious to resign. Notwithstanding his firmness, and his haughty demeanour towards his sovereign and his colleagues, he yet learnt the galling fact that it would be both impracticable and unconstitutional to endeavour to carry on the government with a minority in the Chambers, which he had dissolved with a view of strengthening his own party, but which reassembled with renewed opposition to his policy. The King, as well as the ablest leaders, persuaded Perier to retain his post, being sensible that, were his firm grasp once relaxed, it would be difficult to prevent the nation from falling into a state of anarchy. Perier, however, had always been diffident of his own abilities, although he had shown great firmness in action; and it was not until the country had been threatened with danger by Belgium, that he was prevailed upon to remain in office. English readers may admire this moderation and sacrifice of personal ambition, in order to retain what might be considered constitutionally right; but they should remember that what was right according to constitutional ideas, was nevertheless surrounded by grave disadvantages in a country like France, where the government was subject to radical changes by the slightest revolutionary advances. Having resolved, therefore, to remain at the head of affairs, Perier at once acted with vigour, and sent a large army to Belgium, to oppose the King of Holland.

Two anecdotes are related by Guizot, which well illustrate the conduct of this minister, both to his sovereign and to the mob. During General Sebastiani's illness, Perier conducted the foreign affairs of the country, with the assistance of the superintendent of that department, and promised to the Count de Reinvelt the post of ambassador at Madrid, although that office was already filled by a diplomatist of whose conduct there was nothing to complain. Perier accordingly drew out the order conferring on Reinvelt the appointment of minister at Madrid, which he sent, with a number of other documents, by one of his confidential agents, to the King, in order that it might be countersigned. The King was, however, unacquainted with the minister's intentions, and refused to sign, directing the agent to return to Perier, who was then in bed, and who received the messenger with anger, exclaiming "Leave me alone to take my rest." The messenger, however, expostulated, and urged that his majesty had never been told of the vacancy. Perier replied, with much ill-humour, that he would explain to his majesty on the following morning, and that Reinvelt's appointment *should be confirmed.* Perier, however, thought better of it, and Reinvelt did not get the post.

When the fall of Warsaw was announced, an infuriated mob met Perier and General Sebastiani; they dragged the Premier with violence from his carriage, and reiterated loud shouts of liberty and long life to Poland! The minister, putting on his boldest face, demanded their wishes. They replied, "Our liberties and Poland!" "As to the former," said Perier, "they have been secured to you long ago; and as to the latter, the government will take care that proper justice shall be accorded to it. But you are most insolent in thus treating Sebastiani and myself, who have done all in our power to secure to you your present rights." This bold speech and firm demeanour thoroughly awed the mob, and gave time for the guard to arrive, whom General Sebastiani had gone to the nearest station to summon.

Perier was remarkable for his practical judgment in the business of the Chambers, and in adopting the ideas of other speakers. He, however, possessed little power of logical or historical argument, or eloquence in debate; his firmness generally enabling him to overcome all opposition. Some of his most important measures he was unable to carry. Amongst the most remarkable of these was the bill constituting the Peers an hereditary body in France. He seems to have been fully impressed with the necessity of giving this part of the legislature a greater degree of power and strength than it then possessed, in order to form a firm buttress to the monarchy; and many who were opposed to him on matters of general policy, were yet willing to give him their support on this point. Guizot informs us that he himself, Roger Collinet, and Thiers, who all belonged to the middle classes, and frequently opposed the minister, felt the full necessity of giving a check to the violence and encroachments of the mob, by strengthening the position of the Peers. The measure was nevertheless lost, by a very small majority.

Perier's foreign policy hinged on the settlement of Belgium and Poland: the former was brought to a prosperous conclusion by the abilities and joint efforts of General Sebastiani and M. de Talleyrand, who still held the post of minister at the Court of St. James. The French government seems wisely to have declined giving any assistance to the unfortunate Poles, whose leaders, refusing to believe in the repeated warnings of the French Ambassador, wrecked their cause by hopeless reliance on French support. Perier at the same time treated with a high hand the insults which had been offered to the French citizens in Portugal, and received the assistance and co-operation of the Whig ministry in England. His armed interference in Portugal and Italy, however, deprived him of his moral superiority in those countries, and all but produced a European war—a contingency which it was evidently the interest of a government, such as that of France in 1831, to avoid. Had the reforms which he pressed in the Papal states been practicable, he should have brought them about by diplomatic persuasion, instead of by armed intervention. He should never have sent a large naval expedition to cruise along the Italian coast, nor have threatened Tuscany and the ecclesiastical states with invasion, if their rulers did not adopt his policy. The King of Sardinia gave the French no good reason for interfering in the affairs of that country; and the young King of Naples, who had just come to the throne, was then willing enough to listen to the advice of his uncle, the King of the French, and to promise those liberal measures which he afterwards doggedly repudiated.

The Turkish question had not yet become of sufficient importance to involve the French and the other powers of Europe in those complications to which it afterwards gave rise.

Turning from political questions, Guizot now gives us a touching account of the frightful effect of cholera, in Paris, during the year 1832, together with a feeling eulogium on the charitable exertions of Madame Eliza Guizot in aid of those who perished from that malady. Many of the principal functionaries and members of the state were afflicted by it; and, amongst others, it caused the death of Perier himself. He seems to have been alike harassed by his own followers and by his opponents. The former were quite unable to carry on the government, now that his vigorous hand had ceased to grasp the helm—Sebastiani was disabled by the effects of a long illness, under which he was still suffering, and could not attend to foreign affairs—Baron Louis had become old and feeble, and could no longer carry on the busines of the financial department; and Montalivet was unequal alone to support the entire responsibility of the government. Lafitte and his friends were also, on the other hand, unable to form a strong government, and the people became much agitated. The King, however, acted with great firmness and discretion, and sent for Marshal Soult, to whom he confided the duty of forming a new cabinet. This task, however, proved a difficult one, and it was long before he could prevail on the Duke de Broglie to accept the post of minister of foreign affairs; and Mons. Guizot, and several influential men of that party, made it a *sine quà non* that Broglie should become a minister, before they would accept any office, or give the new cabinet any support. Broglie being at length persuaded to accept the post of minister of foreign affairs, his friend Guizot was easily induced to join the cabinet as minister of public instruction, a post which he informs us brought many pleasing associations and reminiscences to his mind, and with an account of which he terminates his interesting and eventful second volume.

On calmly reviewing the diversity of subjects treated of in the volume before us, we must do Mons. Guizot the credit of saying that he has stated his facts in a candid and impartial manner, and that he alone, of all the host of French historians of those troublous times, has painted a true and dispassionate picture of their events. He has certainly shown that the French are not fitted for self-government at home, and that they cannot refrain from disseminating their reckless ideas, abroad, by force of arms; nor from seeking accession of territory at the expense of their neighbours.

In conclusion, we cannot help expressing a hearty wish that Mons. Guizot, who has already reached a considerable age, and played an important part in the political annals of his country, may be spared for many years to come, to complete his very valuable contributions to the history of his times.

POLITICS IN FRANCE, FROM 1832 TO 1836.

We left Mons. Guizot, at the end of his second volume, at a critical moment both for the monarch and the French nation, just when the formation of the new ministry of October 11th, 1832, was on the tapis. As we have seen, it was no easy task to overcome the scruples of the Duc de Broglie, and others, and to induce them to take office under Marshal Soult, though many were at length persuaded to join that celebrated man in the formation of a new cabinet. Soult's personal character and former achievements gave him a prestige in the eyes of the people which could hardly have been obtained by any other chief; as he had acquired experience both under the rulers of the republic and the empire, and possessed the necessary energy and sagacity to become a great leader.

M. Thiers, who also accepted office, gave to the new cabinet the advantage of eloquence of debate, financial knowledge, and an ingenious mind. The Minister of Marine, an old admiral of the imperial wars, likewise added considerable weight to his department. Guizot himself was well selected for the post of Minister of Public Instruction; whilst the Duc de Broglie was an able debater and thoroughly acquainted with Foreign Affairs. The other posts in the government were efficiently filled up by men of respectable talents, whose plans of operations were maturely formed.

M. Guizot was at once chosen to draw up the king's speech for the opening of the session, "a pleasing task," as he himself observes, "to a man of sound literary abilities." The chief topic on which it touched was the happy termination of the war in Belgium, and the taking of Antwerp. Had a longer continuation of hostilities been required, Marshal Soult and his colleague, Admiral de Rigny, had so exerted themselves to place the defences of the state on the most efficient footing, that France might have defied the most powerful of enemies. Mons. de Broglie had also used his best endeavours to strengthen the alliance with England, the only state which was formidable to France.

After having touched on the character of the ministry, and the effects of the parliamentary constitution, when first adopted, Mons. Guizot,[*] turns with considerable gusto to his own particular department. Although his account of "*Instruction*" is not free from the egotism and vanity which are to be met with throughout

---

[†] Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de mon Temps, par Monsieur Guizot, Vol. III. Paris, 1860.

his works, it yet gives a clear, well-arranged, and succinct narrative of the Educational Instruction of the country from 1789. He has likewise drawn a useful comparison between Public Instruction in Holland, the United States, and the other countries of Europe; remarking that, when in England, he had discussed with many of his friends the desirability and advantage of placing schools and universities more immediately under government." This proposition, however, met with the reply, "that as most of the institutions in England were corporate bodies, which had in many instances been founded by private individuals, their laws were of ancient date, and that a greater interference on the part of government would prove rather a hindrance than an assistance to the highest grades of academical education." Matters have been far otherwise in France; for, had the management of education escaped the centralizing hands of the government, there would have been no means of enforcing it. All the old corporate bodies and monastic institutions which formerly educated the young have been overthrown, and the rulers who followed the Revolution were thus obliged to enact a new order of things in public instruction. Three men, M. de Talleyrand, M. Condorcet, and M. Daunou, conspicuous for their talents and learning, had early been called upon by the National Constituent Assemblies and the National Convention to draw up reports on the state of education in France, and to give their suggestionsand recommendations as to the best mode of making instruction efficient.

M. De Talleyrand's report, as might have been expected, was copious and clear; but he did not recommend any moral or religious teaching. He seemed to look upon *mind* as the great thing to be cultured, while such an influence as an Almighty Ruler over men's destinies he hardly believed to exist.

M. Condorcet's report was equally able, but seemed to be filled with the one leading idea, that all men were equal, and that the only distinctions that could be made in worldly position were created by education. M. Daunou's views were simply republican.

Notwithstanding these reports, nothing was done in the way of "Public Instruction" until the period of the empire; and then, although Napoleon established a tolerably good system of education, it was so restricted by his absolute ideas, that it could not be sufficiently developed to meet the wants of all classes. Discipline was, however, introduced; and education was thus saved on the one hand from falling into the licence which prevailed during the Revolution, and on the other from being overpowered by the influence of the Roman Catholic Clergy, a set of narrow-minded and bigoted men. Of course, at the restoration of Louis XVIII, the priestly power regained its full strength; whilst that able and formidable body, the Jesuits, gained ground and assumed the direction of the whole instruction of the country. Louis XVIII's government, however, turned much of its attention to this subject, and several universities were erected in different parts of the kingdom. The portfolio of Public Instruction was at that time bestowed upon Mons. Royer Collard, a man who was every way fitted for the post, by his brilliant talents, his eloquence in the chamber, and his loyalty to moderate monarchy. His reforms gained so much ground that he even succeeded in persuading that bigoted, well-intentioned, but ill-advised sovereign, Charles X, to grant a most liberal decree on the subject of Public Instruction. The revolution of July threatened to bring about still more vital changes. All previous institutions and rules were threatened with annihilation, and matters were fast drifting into that state of license into which they were plunged in 1789 and 1790. M. Casimer Perier's vigorous hand arrested the coming ruin, and M. De Montalivet endeavoured to establish Public Instruction on a sure and sound foundation.

Things were in this state when Mons. Guizot accepted the portfolio of Public Instruction, on the 11th of October, 1832. Although he was prevented from immediate action by an illness which for some time confined him to his bed, and was unable to attend in the chamber when the king's speech was finally adopted, yet he laboured on in his retirement.

The chambers at once set to work, and passed without delay a severe act for the punishment of political criminals. Many different partizans thought that the royal family and their followers were sufficiently punished by exile, and in this spirit urged that capital punishment should be for ever abolished for political offences; whilst others still adhered to the contrary opinion. A bill, which considerably increased the severity of the political criminal code, passed through both chambers, and received the royal assent, although it was never fully carried into force, as the king seems to have been adverse to strong measures against his royal opponents, fearing to make them martyrs.

During his illness, Mons. Guizot was carefully nursed by his devoted wife, who seems to have been a most excellent and useful partner during all his ministerial cares, from her tact and knowledge of the world. He was, however, soon to be deprived of her tender care and affection, as she died in giving birth to a son. Her loss occasioned Guizot the greatest grief, and he continued to mourn for her long after the event. Tried by adversity, he again returned to his labours in behalf of Public Education; his thoughts, during the whole period of his illness and his affliction, having been principally turned to this subject. Now that his wife was no more, he seemed to derive consolation by occupying himself with the business of his office and the benefit of his fellow citizens. He was not sufficiently recovered even to move his own bill on Public Instruction, but left this duty to be performed by one of his party. He, nevertheless, conducted the debate upon it with his usual ability and clearness, and had the satisfaction of seeing it pass, with but slight alteration.

Having now obtained the consent of the legislature and the crown, Guizot set about inaugurating the necessary reforms in the public instruction of the country, and called to his aid a council, composed of Messrs. Villemain, R. Cousin, M. Poisson, M. Thenard, M. de Mussy, M. Rendu, M. Cuvier, and many others conspicuous for their literary and scientific abilities. The two questions which early presented themselves for decision in "Elementary Education" were, Whether it should be compulsory? and Whether it should be freely given to all French subjects by the government? In the solution of the former of these, Guizot differed with his colleagues, contending that compulsory education was only applicable to such countries as Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, where the reformation of the 16th and 17th centuries had placed the church under the rule of the state, and where such education had been constantly adopted from that period. In England and in the United States, he argued, that it had never been so applied, and that it would be impolitic to adopt "compulsion" in a Catholic country like France. In the decision of the other question, his path had already been decided for him by "*the charter*," which had *promised free education to all French citizens.* He arrived, however, after long discussion, at the conclusion, that the state was only bound to assist those who had no pecuniary means of paying for the education of their children. Guizot here enters into a long avowal of his love for the people, and the different definitions which have been given to that expression by different writers and politicians. "If by the love of the people," he says, "is meant an unfettered indulgence of all their passions and desires, then I do not possess it; but if it is that feeling which binds a man to endeavour to guide his neighbours aright by good morals and education, and make them contented with their position in society, then I not only possess, but perfectly appreciate what the love of the people is like." With these views, Guizot seems to have striven to give to the youth of France a simple, but good elementary instruction. He divided *elementary education* into two branches, the more simple for the labouring man, and the more complicated for the higher class. He established good preparatory schools for the training of masters who were to aid in giving elementary instruction; and proved that public opinion was somewhat in his favour, by saying that when he received the portfolio of public instruction, in 1832, there existed but 33,000 schools of an elementary kind in France, giving instruction to about 1,200,000 pupils; whilst in 1847, fifteen years afterwards, the elementary schools had increased to 43,000, and the pupils to 2,300,000. After the revolution of 1848, he gives us rather a surprising piece of information on this subject, telling us that elementary education was not only overlooked at that period, but even discouraged, that it had sensibly diminished until very recently, and that intelligent persons in France were only then beginning to turn their attention to this important matter.

From his elementary education scheme, in which we think Mons. Guizot acted very prudently, he turned to that of a more superior kind. Here he met with much opposition from the ultra Catholic party in France, which, barely tolerated in the days of the Empire, had now become most powerful, numbering amongst its ranks many of the eminent jurists, politicians, writers and scholars of the day. Mons. Guizot found that private individuals were erecting schools, independent both of the minister and of the university; and that the greatest efforts of the kind were set on foot by Montalambert and an influential Abbé, both of whom had already been prosecuted in the Chambers for their free scholastic opinions. After a long struggle with the clergy, the matter was referred to the Court of Rome, which agreed to overrule the ecclesiastical party and to support the French government.

Our author praises the discipline which had been introduced into the universities and schools by the Emperor Napoleon I, and makes many sensible observations as to the necessity of universities being assisted by learned and scientific *societies* throughout the country, remarking, "that it is useless to found isolated universities in different parts of the country, as proposed in the days of Louis XVIII."

In the highest walks of "superior education" in the universities, he found little opposition in erecting professorships of history, law, philosophy, and other sciences. He gives us some interesting particulars as to the character of M. Burnouf, Jouffroy, Ampère, Rossi, and Cuvier, all of whom he considers the ablest men of the period. Connected with these professorships, Guizot also talks of the different literary associations which were established throughout the country, eulogizing M. Jacquemont, Champollion the younger, and the other energetic and talented supporters of the movement. These various societies were obliged to furnish reports from time to time, and thus a good idea was gained of the intellectual progress of the nation. Guizot goes out of his way to praise the universities of Oxford and Cambridge for having combined ancient usages with modern ideas and morality, perfect discipline with close study and domestic economy. He laments that their systems cannot be applied to the French universities: "Why should we not place by the side of our great colleges of superior education," says Guizot, "establishments in which our youth may recognise some traces of the domestic hearth, and live in a certain communion, with enough of personal independence and liberty, but subject also to prescribed discipline, watched and restrained in their conduct, whilst assisted and encouraged in their studies, as at Oxford and Cambridge."

His next endeavours were directed to the formation of the class of moral and political science in *The Institute.* Such an association had been founded in 1795; though most of the members had died off before this period. There still, however, remained a small remnant of 30 associates, all of whose opinions were revolutionary. On this account, M. Royer Collard and many of M. Guizot's old friends strongly opposed the reformation of such an Institution, fearing that they could not well overlook the claims of old republican members. Guizot, however, was firm in his determination, and summoned to his aid one of the old but more moderate members of the Institute, with whose assistance thirty members who remained of the original body of 1795 were called together, and fifteen new members were elected, with the consent of the Minister of Public Instruction, others being added under the class "Philosophy of History." Amongst the old members there seems to have been a veteran of the name of M. Lakanal, who had belonged to the association in 1795, but who was supposed to be dead. He, however, heard of the resuscitation of the association under its new regulations, and even wrote from Alabama, in America, laying his claim of membership before the government. He had been for some time denied his rights, in consequence of his strong revolutionary notions; but, returning to France, pleaded his own cause, and having at length succeeded, died at an advanced age, in 1845. M. Talleyrand was included amongst the new associates; and thus Guizot judiciously contrived to bring together the men of experience of all parties, and to organise a society which has become vastly beneficial to science during its subsequent existence of twenty-seven years. Branches in correspondence with it have been established all over the kingdom, though they are not so easy to administer as the parent institution.

The cost of buildings for the accommodation of literary and scientific societies seems to have given rise to much discussion in the chambers, and it was decided that no officer should be allowed to live within the precincts of such apartments. This step Guizot considers to be injurious to the cause of science; as it deprives men of learning of the means of easy reference to those works on which their attention should be concentrated, and of course lessens the local interest they should feel in the various museums and libraries. As to historical studies, Guizot justly remarks, "that they bring back the past and add to our existence the lives of our fathers; our perceptions rise and extend, and we acquire a better knowledge and comprehension of ourselves." Such a study is most important in the present age, when politics occupy so prominent a place, and history forms so useful a guide. In France, nothing had been done for historical studies until the end of the Empire, and then history as a science was only taught for a short period during the summer months. In 1821, it was feared that historical lectures might lead to political discussions, a result not at all desirable at so turbulent a period; and thus they were not resumed until after the accession of Charles X. On Mons. Guizot taking the portfolio of Public Instruction, "Historical Studies" received an earnest and steady support, whilst a small association was formed of the "lovers of history," who elected a council of management, and ransacked the provincial towns as well as the capital for old MSS. Guizot experienced much difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds, and it was not until after a very violent debate in the chambers, in which Mons. Thiers supported his literary fund, that 190,000 francs was voted as a subsidy for the furtherance of historical research. Mons. Guizot does not stop here, but gives the report of his successor in 1836, from which it appears that many interesting documents on various periods of French history have since been collected, concerning the times of Louis VII and Charles VIII, together with many provincial documents on the history of Loraine, of the League, and of Louis XIV. These collections, which are still being continued, furnished ample materials for the study of history.* M. Guizot thus terminates his account of the rise and progress of education, from the time when it was overthrown by the Revolution, to the efforts which he made to advance and encourage it. On the whole, he may be justly proud of the course he adopted during his administration, and his narrative will furnish a good idea of what he actually accomplished.

M. Guizot, lastly, turned to the consideration of the internal administration of the country. It was to be expected that a constitutional monarchy which had been established immediately after that revolution which had threatened the state with annihilation, should have to encourage liberty, and yet confine it within proper limits. Our author, in order to give a correct idea of the progress which liberty had made during the period which elapsed from 1832 to 1836, gives us a report of those laws which were passed by the Chambers, resisting popular clamour, and those which supported rational liberty.

---

* Société de l'Histoire de France.

As might have been anticipated, he glides into a long dissertation as to the necessity of *"parties"* in a constitutional and deliberative government. It is of course clear, from the very nature of a legislative constitution, that two parties must exist—the ministerial and the opposition, and it is clearly an advantage that this should always be the case. Thus one party can hold the other in check by the fear of overthrow; measures are fully discussed before they become law, full time is given for calm consideration, and suggestions are thrown out by the speeches of opponents. It appears, however, that no such principles existed in France as led to the formation of the Whig and Tory parties in England. It was difficult to form a strong political party in France, as different statesmen of the same school was disinclined to follow their leaders in all the views they might adopt. No party could be kept together, it being contrary to the lively and volatile nature of a Frenchman's character to support for any length of time a regularly defined policy. Every Frenchman is apt to declare his suggestions, whether right or wrong, and he usually ends in forming a plan of his own, to which, however impracticable, he adheres with impunity. Besides these difficulties, the cabinet had another obstacle to overcome, in the formation of a good upper chamber, which might on the one hand, successfully resist the encroachments of the crown, and, on the other, contend against the clamorous populace. They had no materials with which to replace the old French Noblesse, and they could not easily erect out of what little remained of that body an hereditary aristocracy. Mons. Guizot and many of his friends had desired, even when in opposition, to establish an upper chamber, and had even supported the minister of the day in the consideration of such a measure. The noblesse, however, were not even in so respectable a position as they had been at the restoration; and the Chamber of Peers, since the Revolution of 1830, could count amongst its members few names either of ancient descent or of brilliant reputation. In order to remedy these deficiences, Marshal Soult and his colleagues adopted a measure which would have been dangerous to *the order* at any other period. They created sixty new peers, amongst whom were military officers of distinction, eminent writers and journalists, celebrated statesmen, and great lawyers. The ministry had now nothing to fear from the upper chamber, though they had much to contend with in the deputies. In that assembly there were three distinct parties, though they had not as yet openly declared their principles. Between the ministerialists and the regular opposition there appeared a few determined spirits, who had all but formed themselves into a party professing ultra-republican views. They seem curiously enough to have chosen as their leader Mons. Dupont, who, though he sided neither with the ministry nor their opponents, was, nevertheless, a supporter of the Constitutional Monarchy of Louis Philippe. Although not actually allied with the regular opposition, this section very frequently hampered the ministry. The first Cabinet measure which it opposed was the budget for the payment of pensions to military and naval officers. This occasioned a very long and hot debate, in which Guizot and his colleagues were strongly opposed by Mons. Dubois, the Chief of the University, and by M. Baude. The Cabinet, nevertheless, successfully carried its measure, and resolved, much against Guizot's inclination, to dismiss the two traitors from government employ. Guizot knew the difficulty of replacing them, and showed no inconsiderable tact in announcing to them the resolution of the Cabinet,

Many measures of great importance were thus passed during the session of 1832 and 1833; amongst which, those on Education, on Public Works, and for the better administration of the Army and Navy, were most conspicuous. The country, in 1834, seems to have been in a most prosperous condition, having no external wars to damp its prosperity. The people were apparently contented with the vigorous and able government which had been established by Marshal Soult, and the ministry were so strong that many of its friends advised it to augment its power by a dissolution of the Chambers. The Cabinet perceived that this suggestion was merely a snare put forward by some of its most bitter opponents, and scouted the idea that a larger and more subservient majority could be gained by a new election. They, secretly, feared to risk the excitement of a fresh election, in consequence of the hostility of the press, and the machinations of the republican party out of doors.

Mons. Guizot reverts in bitter terms to the attack made by the press upon its own government, and of his fruitless attempts to obtain really able writers to oppose the vituperation hurled against him by the best periodicals and journals of the day. The "Débats" was the only paper which supported his policy, though it was too weak and isolated to afford him any real assistance. If the attacks of moderate journalists were to be dreaded, those of the republicans were still more formidable. They had organized a secret society at Paris, under the appellation of the *Society of the Rights of Man,* which corresponded with clubs and associations of a similar nature in every town of France. Of course, its principles, as its name implies, tended to the overthrow of all monarchical government, in whatsoever hands it might be placed, added to which, it desired to re-establish the government of 1792. Many of its chief men were related to those who had formed the National Convention, and they availed themselves of the means afforded by the liberty of the press to propagate their fatal doctrines.

Thus the people were so inflamed by these journals and by the publication of the papers of Robespierre, that an outbreak was every day anticipated. The Cabinet had no means of stopping these dangerous publications but by prosecuting the publishers, a course which made matters worse. At length, in 1833, the evil had reached to such a pitch that a secret plot was discovered, and serious disturbances in Paris were suppressed with difficulty and bloodshed, only to be renewed at Lyons in the following spring. M. Mazzini and several Italian refugees had taken up their residence at Lyons, after the failure of their attempts in Italy; and here the labourers had become so generally republican that many of them refused to work during the winter months. Thus idleness brought on the usual consequences of famine and discontent. The more industrious at length desired to return to their labour; but were violently restrained by their fellow workmen. Luckily for the Lyonese, the Prefect during this period was a man of much prudence and firmness of character; he arrested several of the leaders of this republican movement, and called together a court to try them for their offences on the 9th April, 1834. This court had no sooner commenced its proceedings than the building in which it held its sittings was surrounded by a vast and furious mob. A small force which the Prefect had at command was immediately called out, and was received by the populace with the cry of *Pas de Baïonettes.* The force was too insignificant to effect much; and after a time, most of the soldiers fraternised with the people, and the court was obliged to adjourn its sittings. Of course the republicans were much elated at this supposed victory, and resolved further to secure their success by a more organised riot on the re-assembling of the court. When that event occurred, the Court-House was surrounded by an armed mob, better led and more terrible than the previous. A larger military force was collected from the neighbouring towns, and a conflict of five days' duration ensued. In the mean time similar riots occurred at Marseilles, and in most of the southern towns of France, which eventually extended to Paris itself, where barracades were raised in the narrow streets, and several points were hotly contested both by the military and the populace. Affairs at length became so critical all over France, that it was resolved to send a large part of the army, under the Duke of Orleans, to the south, whilst the rest remained at Paris, under the King's orders. This unhappy juncture of affairs was the means of re-uniting the members of the Cabinet, who thus turned their undivided attention to quelling the riots. Several of the members of the Society of the Rights of Man were arrested, and a very sharp bill was drawn up against all secret societies, which passed the Chamber of Deputies, after a violent debate.

The financial measures of the government, on their army and navy estimates, were now about to be vigorously attacked—the opposition considering the outlay as unnecessary in time of peace. Added to these complications, the deputies were dismissed, and a new election was declared. The new Chamber, though generally favourable to the Cabinet, early showed symptoms of opposition amongst the third party. The ministry was, also, weakened by the loss of Mons. de Broglie, who did not agree with his colleagues as to the American payments.

The ministry had no sooner regained its usual firmness, than a circumstance occurred which threatened its complete annihilation. Algeria had deeply occupied the attention of the Chambers, and a commission under the Duke Decazes had been sent over to Africa to enquire into the administration of the province. They drew up a most voluminous report, and recommended a civil, instead of a military government for the colony. M. Guizot, M. Thiers, and nearly all the government, with the exception of Marshal Soult, supported the measure. Much unpleasant discussion took place in the Cabinet, and Marshal Soult resigned. The King was at first indisposed to part with so useful a public servant; but at Guizot's recommendation the vacant post was offered to Marshal Gérard, and accepted with reluctance. The whole Cabinet, however, lived to rue the day of their quarrel, and Guizot is honest enough to avow the fact.

Marshal Gérard, the new President of the Council, did not long retain office, as his task of reconciliation was herculean.

During these complications in French politics, great changes had occurred in England. Lord Grey and his friends had been thrown out, and were succeeded by the Tories. Mons. Talleyrand, who had always been on friendly terms with the Whig ministry, determined to retire from his post in London, "being no longer able to make himself useful in preserving the alliance between the two countries." The Duke of Wellington, who was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, wrote a very pressing letter in order to persuade Talleyrand to remain; his determination, however, was not in the least changed, and he returned to France, where he retired into private life. He was replaced by General Sebastiani, whom M. Guizot considers to be an abler diplomatist.

Mons. De La Fayette, about this time also, disappeared from the political stage. His romantic death resembled the varied and striking incidents of his strange life. "Ill for three weeks, he approached his last hour. His son George observed that with uncertain gestures he sought for something in his bosom. He came to his father's assistance, and placed in his hand a medallion which he always wore suspended round his neck. M. De La Fayette raised it to his lips. This was his last motion. The medallion contained a miniature and a lock of hair of Madame De La Fayette, his wife, whose loss he had mourned for twenty-seven years." Notwithstanding his republican opinions, he was respected by men of all parties, and his funeral was attended by a vast concourse of persons: The government was for some time without a responsible head, until Marshal Mortier attempted to reconcile conflicting parties. He, however, utterly failed; and the King was in despair, as to "how the government was to be carried on." "I shall again try Soult," exclaimed the King. "If I fail, then I must submit to your yoke." "Ah, Sire!" was M. Guizot's reply, "will your Majesty allow me to protest against that word." * * * "I left the King," continues Guizot, "convinced in my heart that he saw already in the Duc de Broglie his necessary resource."

Messrs. Thiers and Guizot were often at variance on many important topics, and it now became evident that they could no longer be associated in the same government. At length, however, the Duc de Broglie assumed the post of President and Minister of Foreign Affairs; and the Cabinet was reconstructed with modified opinions. Thus Marshal Maison replaced Mortier in the war department. Admiral Rigny had a seat without a portfolio. Duchâtel, Duperré, Humann, Thiers, and Guizot, retaining the posts they had previously occupied. The policy of the members now became vigorous and effective; they settled the indemnity to be paid to the United States; they successfully confirmed the sentences against the rioters of Lyons and Paris; and disposed of several other most important bills.

In spite of this apparent lull, the ministers were inwardly disquieted by the many rumours which reached them of the contemplated attempts on the life of the King. These rumours were at first discredited, but their truth was made most painfully apparent by the diabolical and unsuccessful attempt of Fieschi, whose infernal machine nearly killed the King. The terrible consequence of this murderous attack not only cast the nation into mourning, but wonderfully strengthened the King's government. The ministry had now nothing to fear; all their most important measures had passed the Chambers. They had successfully put down the rioters of Lyons and Paris, and they had nothing to apprehend from insurrection, after the unsuccessful attempts on the King's life. There appeared to be no vital question on which their opponents could force them from office, whilst perfect tranquillity prevailed abroad.

During this political amnesty in France, and the general tranquillity of the European continent, Marshal Clauzel, the Governor-General of Algeria, undertook a vast expedition against Mascara, in the province of Oran. The Duke of Orleans, the King's eldest son, was desirous of serving against the real enemies of the state in Africa, though the ministers were very unwilling that the heir to the crown should unnecessarily expose his life. The King fully shared in his son's noble desires; in which views he was seconded by Mons.

Guizot. That minister at length overcame the scruples of his colleagues, and the Duke of Orleans embarked for Algeria, where he took a conspicuons part in the expedition to Oran. Here he distinguished himself by his courage, his judgment, and his military talents, and returned home crowned with success.

The next meeting of the Chambers took place on the 29th of December, 1835, and the ministers counted on but little opposition. The address on the King's speech was almost unanimously voted; but when the budget was discussed, on the 14th of January, 1836, Mons. Humann proposed a financial measure which met with much opposition, both by the government and their opponents, and which placed the ministry in a very awkward position. It ultimately led to their resignation, which the King most reluctantly accepted. The Duc de Broglie's influence had long been undermined by the efforts of Talleyrand, and by a large party at court, who had never forgotten the opposition, which the Duke had made both to the monarch and his representative in England, on the Anglo-French alliance, and they were glad to obtain the dismissal of the obnoxious minister at any price. The Duc de Broglie and his colleagues were not easily replaced, and the King sent for Marshal Gérard, Mons. Molé, Mons. Passy, Mons. Dupin, and Mons. Thiers; all of whom in turn endeavoured to form a Cabinet.

Mons. Thiers at length, on the 22nd of July, 1836, undertook, with the assistance of M. de Montalivet, the duties of the new Cabinet. Thiers took the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs; Montalivet, that of Minister of the Interior; and Pelet de Lozère succeeded Guizot as Minister of Public Instruction. Thiers and Guizot, although they became staunch private friends, now entertained directly opposite political opinions, though their main object was the preservation of Constitutional Monarchy.

Guizot concludes this vol. with the following impressive words: "The unity and common action of men were the imperious condition of Government success in 1832. This dominant idea, this great light of 1832, disappeared in 1836, and was extinguished by a most trifling agency, before a very secondary question, and through motives extremely trivial or personal. The conversion, more or less immediate, of the funds was assuredly far below the value of the union of persons who from 1830 had united together to establish the government. This was the fault of the epoch. The Revolution of 1830 had already narrowly restricted the circle and broken the ranks of the effective admirers of royalty under the constitutional system. The ministerial crisis of 1836 severed the coalition, which, through the influence of a lofty and provident idea, the crisis of 1830 had bound together."

In bidding adieu to the third vol. of the Memoirs of Mons.

Guizot, we have the satisfaction of feeling that it is equal, if not superior, to the two preceding ones, in style and arrangement. It gives much information upon a most engrossing topic; viz. general education and intellectual progress. It also proves that the revolutionary tendency in France existed throughout the reign of Louis Philippe, and prevented the French from enjoying the advantages bestowed upon them by a Constitutional Monarchy. The effect of such a tendency has at length, in our day, reduced them to a despotism, as their only safety from anarchy and revolution.

GUIZOT'S FOURTH VOLUME.*

In former numbers of this journal we have noticed M. Guizot's excellent account of the events of the revolution of July—of the difficulties which the French Ministry had to encounter consequent on those changes—the differences which occurred amongst the members of the Cabinet from 1832 to 1836—his remarks on what he effected in the various branches of administration, and more particularly in that of education over which he presided. It was difficult for him to sketch a correct and impartial picture of the characters of his colleagues, and of the measures which he mainly advised and carried out; and far more embarrassing to trace the political conduct of the sovereigns and ministers of surrounding states, and describe their connexion with the French Government and its newly-established monarchy. Mons. Guizot has, however, overcome all these obstacles; has obtained and clearly detailed much novel information, both as to the affairs of his own country, and its diplomatic relations, and has conquered those national prejudices which so abundantly prevail in the narratives of other French historians. In this fourth volume we have a graphic sketch of the political connexion between France and the surrounding states from 1832 to 1836, and the causes which led to the crisis of the Eastern Question in 1840; together with the opinions and prejudices of the different statesmen and sovereigns of the day. Our author never loses sight of the fact, that all Europe was opposed to French politics, because of their revolutionary basis and their possible tendency to produce anarchy and confusion. In our opinion, he judges that policy by his own predilections, and talks a great deal too loudly of the moderation and peaceable disposition of the French nation and its sovereign. Louis Philippe was a pacific prince by circumstances rather than inclination, for he was well aware of the uncertain tenure by which he held his dominions, and the difficulty he would experience in retaining them, from the uncertainty and expense of war. Mons. Guizot, however, would have us believe that his Sovereign was by inclination the most peaceable and the most moderate of kings. Thus he launches out into a thoroughly French dissertation on the evils of war, and tries to force our convictions to the point "that the only aim of Frenchmen in all their wars has been to enlighten surrounding states by the introduction of civilization." Whatever the truth of his argument may be, some of his observations are nevertheless very just, and are supported by excellent historical examples. Of course, as we may expect from a man who had commenced his career as a French professor of history, he goes far back for his instances of the evils of war, and the want of durability in those empires which have been rapidly raised by conquest. He tells us that, notwithstanding the surprising extent which Alexander the Great gave to the kingdom of Macedon by conquest, his empire was nevertheless divided and weakened by the ambition of his generals, as soon as he was removed by death. He then shows that, in like manner, the empire of Charlemagne, when the vigorous hand which had so long guided it had relaxed its hold, was weakened by the feebleness of his Carlovingian successors, and by the subsequent disturbed condition of the world. In more modern times, he quotes the examples of Charles V, of Germany, Louis XIV, and Napoleon I, all of whom, he affirms, have been stopped in their attempts at universal conquest by the general opinion of Europe. He also maintains that the conquests of Bonaparte have had a greater hold on mankind than preceding campaigns, though they were in some degree swept away by the treaties of 1815, and by the powers which formed the holy alliance, the chief object of which was doubtless to oppose all revolution, in whatever form it might appear. It is therefore little to be wondered at that the many sovereigns who helped to make up so irresistible a force should be adverse to the accession of Louis Philippe. After showing what temptations for national aggrandisement were placed in the way of the French Government in Belgium, and the similarity of policy which was followed out by England, as well as France, in that question, M. Guizot proceeds to the consideration of the characters of the Prussian, Austrian, and Russian Sovereigns, and to the policy adopted towards France by their chief counsellors. We are told that Frederick William III of Prussia, though a Prince of no striking qualities, was nevertheless a sensible sovereign; who, after having regained his dominions from Napoleon by hard-fought campaigns, was desirous of preserving Prussia within the limits prescribed to it by the treaty of Vienna. As a conservative Sovereign, he at first looked with some degree of apprehension upon the succession of Louis Philippe to the French throne, and received with some degree of hesitation the friendly advances made to him by the new King of France. As soon, however, as he perceived that Louis Philippe's policy was likely to be a peaceable one, he not only readily acknowledged it, but entered into very intimate relations with his ministers. The Prince of Wittgenstein, the Prince of Hardenberg, and M. Ancillon, induced him to adopt this conduct, having great influence over their master's mind, being men of great administrative and diplomatic abilities, and possessing sympathy with the French nation and its Sovereign. Of the Austrian Emperor and his chief counsellor, Mons. Guizot gives a less favourable account as regards their sympathies for France; Francis II. according to Guizot, being one who had acquired considerable experience during the wars with the Emperor Napoleon, and was little inclined to enter into hostility with France, unless actually forced by circumstances to do so. He neverthelesss looked with no favourable eye upon the change of dynasty, and strove as much as possible to maintain *absolute authority* within his own dominions and those of his allies, and disliked anything approaching to liberalism. Prince Metternich, who chiefly directed his councils, is admitted by all writers to have possessed, beside the great diplomatic abilities already displayed in the days of Napoleon, when the empire was threatened with ruin, a very philosophic mind, and a tendency to liberal opinions, which he durst not put into practice. He was as peaceably disposed as his master, and used his best endeavours to promote a good understanding, if not a close relationship, with France. He seems, however, chiefly to have feared the power of Russia, and to have yielded too much to its influence. The Russian Emperor is described as "a monarch by no means possessed of those superior talents which would enable him to overawe either subjects or allies." He, nevertheless, exercised great influence over both. His handsome person and presence of mind during the insurrection which occurred at the commencement of his reign, together with the old Russian policy which he followed, obtained for him great moral influence in his own states, whilst his vast territories and the immense power which their geographical position gave him, brought both respect and fear to his throne. He seems, from the first, to have positively refused to acknowledge Louis Philippe's right to a place amongst the old Sovereigns of Europe, and he even treated his minister with rudeness. This conduct may perhaps be in some measure ascribed to the troubles of Poland in 1831-2-3, which were doubtless occasioned by the revolutionary movement of July, although the French did not *actually* assist the Poles in their attempts to shake off the Russian yoke. As the power of the French King became more firmly established, however, the Russian Czar seems to have thought it worth his while to assume a more friendly tone; and we thus find that intrigues were entered into for the purpose of arranging a marriage between the young Duke of Orleans and a Russian Grand Duchess. These negotiations were, however, only carried on as a means of conciliating the French Government, and obtaining their consent to the ambitious designs of the Czar on the East. All the powers of Europe were viewing with anxiety the Eastern horizon, now that Mehemet Ali, after having successfully raised the standard of revolt in Egypt, had invaded Syria, overrun Asia Minor, and pitched his camp at Smyrna; from whence he, like the Arabs of old, threatened to lay siege to Constantinople, and overthrow the Sultan's authority and empire. Mehemet Ali intimated to the French envoy that he would be well satisfied if he could obtain from the Sultan the concession of the Syrian territory which he had conquered, and of the authority which he had established in Egypt as an hereditary right to his family. Terms were actually agreed upon between Mahmoud Sultan and Ibrahim Pacha, in which these concessions were guaranteed to Mehemet Ali, and the Egyptian General had commenced the evacuation of Asia Minor, when the Czar Nicholas, through his minister, Count Orloff, took the side of Turkey and argued for more advantageous conditions, "provided the Turkish Sultan would place himself under the protection of Russia, and shut the ports of the Dardanelles against the ships of all other nations." These stipulations were fully agreed to, and a Russian fleet was sent to Constantinople, in order to protect the Ottoman port from all encroachments of Mehemet Ali. The treaty was strongly remonstrated against by both the English and French Ministers; but the Sultan cared little what risks he ran, provided he could keep the Pacha at bay. The Czar, on his side, was furious against England and France; whilst the Austrian Minister, Prince Metternich, who feared that the Czar's indignation might terminate in an European war, endeavoured to mediate between him and the western powers, and was successful.

---

* Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de mon Temps, par M. Guizot, Tome IV. Paris: Michel Levy frères, Rue Vivienne, 2^{bis}—1861.

M. Guizot then turns to a much more important question—viz. the affairs of Spain. King Ferdinand VII was dead at Madrid, and Spain was in the midst of a revolution. He tells us that at the early periods of Spanish history, females were allowed to succeed to the Spanish throne; but that when Philip V, the first Bourbon monarch, ascended it in 1713, it was considered necessary to make a Pragmatic, or modification of the Salique law, binding in Spain, as well as in France, by which "no female could inherit the Spanish Crown, so long as male issue existed." The law remained in this condition until 1789, when Charles IV, fearing a lack of male heirs, revoked the edict, and the law returned to its original state. When Ferdinand grew up, however, and came to the throne, it was considered doubtful whether his father had possessed the legal right to make this change, and the question became more complicated by the disturbed state of things from 1808 to 1814. When Ferdinand returned to Spain, and his authority was fully acknowledged, he at first resolved to follow the example of Louis XVIII, and confirm those liberal reforms which had been effected in the Spanish government during the war. He was sincere in these resolutions, until the revolution of 1820 and 1823 (which, as we have seen in an early volume of Guizot's Memoirs, was arbitrarily put a stop to by the interference of the French government), when he became as absolute a sovereign as any of his predecessors of the Bourbons or Austrian line. Towards the year 1832, Ferdinand's health becoming considerably impaired, the succession to the crown was contested by his brother Don Carlos, and his daughter Isabella, who, though extremely young, was protected by her vigorous and licentious mother, Christina. Thus Spain was sadly divided into parties. The Carlists, besides asserting that Charles IV had no right to alter the law as established by Philip V, also supported the absolute power of the Crown, together with all the prerogatives claimed over the laity by the most bigoted Roman Catholic clergy; whilst the moderate liberals, who had, with the assistance of England, defended Spain against Napoleon, united themselves to the cause of Christina and her infant daughter. Up to the year 1832, when Ferdinand died, many intrigues were carried on by the respective candidates; and, strange as it may appear, the King of the French, although a liberal, nevertheless looked with greater real favour upon the male heir than on the young Queen, and used all his efforts with Charles X, while yet Duke of Orleans, to induce him to prevail upon Ferdinand to support the male succession. Thus, when Louis Philippe came to the throne, and Ferdinand died, the French Monarch was placed in a very awkward position with regard to the Spanish question. As an old Bourbon, his inclinations led him to support Don Carlos and the male succession; but as a liberal Sovereign who had just established a new order of things in France, and as the representative of all monarchs who maintained popular opinions abroad, he felt great interest in the cause of Queen Christina and her daughter, and was obliged to give her some degree of countenance. Besides, he was fully aware that an armed support of either candidate would bring upon him the hostility of the northern courts, whilst it would hurt the sensitive pride of the Spanish people, and bring the question to an issue with much bloodshed and confusion in Spain itself. Mons. de Rayneval, the French Ambassador in Spain, was therefore instructed to support Don Carlos, should his party acquire any degree of strength. He might then offer a refuge to the Queen Regent and her daughter, though he was forbidden to make any promise of French assistance *by arms* to either party. This was a most difficult task for any diplomatist to accomplish, and perhaps had it been entrusted to one less acquainted with the Spanish character than Mons. de Rayneval, it might have been impossible of execution. He was obliged to use the utmost caution and judgment, as the Spaniards were, and always had been, jealous of foreign interference. We have even heard it said, during our residence in Spain, "that all Spanish revolutions are to be traced to English or other foreign interference."

The duplicity of the French embassy gave both parties the idea that its opponents were encouraged with some promise of assistance from France, whilst the offer of refuge made to Queen Christina and her partizans was misconstrued by the Spanish journals and politicians into an open and vigorous support of her claims. It was necessary, as M. Guizot shows, for the French Government further to repeat and explain its intentions, before the Spanish Government could comprehend that only a moral support could be expected from France. Besides the rising of Don Carlos in the Basque Provinces, the Queen Regent had to contend with the differences which divided the liberal party. Two factions held very opposite opinions; one was desirous of a constitutional monarchy with Queen Isabella at its head; whilst the other was for supporting the ultra-liberal constitution of 1812. Both divisions lacked the experience on which to build their theories of government, and were thus obliged hurriedly to put forth novel but hurried schemes, as the state of confusion did not admit of much deliberation. Besides these obstacles, the Queen's party, who then formed the government of the country, had to pass new laws to determine the mode of electing members to the Cortes; and the finances being in a bad condition, it was impossible to raise sufficient money for carrying on the contest against the Carlists. Thus it was necessary to borrow largely from foreign States; and, as Spanish credit was at a low ebb, it was absolutely necessary that

Spain should pay her old debts before she could contract new foreign ones. This was a difficulty which had never been effectually solved.

Again, the laws of election were, after a very long delay, disposed of in a report, and statute, drawn up by Mons. Martinez de la Rosa, a man who seems to have possessed both courage and eloquence. This statute gave satisfaction to many of the ultra-royalists and the immediate supporters of the Queen, though it did not quiet the republicans, who desired nothing less than the constitution of 1812, which had appointed a number of Juntas, or city municipalities, to govern the towns and provinces during the exile of the reigning princes. Although Ferdinand swore to maintain the constitution of 1812, he annulled it as soon as he could; and thus produced those disturbances in Spain, from 1820 to 1823, during which Martinez de la Rosa first began that liberal policy which obliged him to seek refuge in France, where he made the acquaintance of Mons. Guizot. Our author was much struck with the literary talent of his new friend, and prognosticated for him a brilliant career in letters, although he never expected to behold him at the head of the Spanish government. It seems, however, that Martinez de la Rosa's early political life had taught him experience, and a degree of moderation which deterred him from supporting the opinions of the ultra liberals, and made him desirous of uniting moderate liberals and moderate royalists in a firm constitutional party, to resist alike the efforts of republicans and the old absolute Spanish government. Mons. de Rayneval, however, seems to have considered Martinez de la Rosa to be a man rather of excellent parts and speculative opinions, than of practical action and determination, whilst he assures us that he had great difficulty in managing the heterogeneous materials of which his party was composed. Some of the Spanish ministers, however, possessed the necessary firmness and practical ability in which he was deficient; and so enabled him to oppose all foreign interference, and to rest on the moral support of England and France. In Portugal, the party who entertained similar political views to Martinez de la Rosa was now in office. Don Miguel had, with the consent of the powers, been expelled from that country, and a like demand was now made in Spain against Don Carlos. His friends, however, progressed in the Basque provinces; and many intelligent men, both in Spain and France, considered that his efforts could not be put down without foreign intervention. Martinez de la Rosa being firmly opposed to foreign assistance, and the French ministry and King being equally adverse to an armed intervention, it was declared from Paris that the French could only look on as spectators; for, as Louis Philippe naively remarked: "If we embark in the same boat as the Spaniards, we must take the rudder, and be responsible for the ship's course, though no one can possibly foretell what that course will be." Mons. Guizot seems fully to have concurred in the non-intervention policy of his master, and to have been convinced that the Spaniards could save their country by their own exertions. We beg to differ from these opinions; as the Spaniards, like all other nations who have endeavoured to establish a constitutional monarchy after long years of absolute sway, have been exposed to continual revolutions whilst attempting to acquire freedom; and have, not unfrequently, overshot the bounds of moderation. But for foreign influence, anarchy instead of good government would now exist; and they could not have enjoyed their liberties in the face of a prolonged contest between Carlists and Christinos, any more than the English, at the beginning of the last century, could have done so during the unhappy conflicts between the Stuarts and the house of Hanover. Although our author is perfectly correct in saying that "the safety of the Spanish state is within the hands of the nation itself," we think he is rather hasty when he affirms that they have already acquired security in their institutions.

Mons. Guizot terminates the first chapter of his new volume with some apparently philosophical remarks on the condition of the neighbouring states, and the moderation with which France has abstained from augmenting her territory; and goes on to declare that, while she internally endeavours to work out the difficult problem of freedom, without launching into the excesses of revolution, she attempts, by her peaceful diplomacy, to bring about beneficial changes in other states. These remarks display much of that vanity and self-satisfaction to be met with in the writings of the most sensible and talented men of France, and forms an introduction to the observations on the policy of his successor, Mons. Thiers, whom he praises in his personal capacity, though he blames his administration. Our author tells us that he retired "with much satisfaction" into private life, and amply consoled himself for his loss of power by literary occupations and the honours which were crowded upon him. We find him, nevertheless, sometimes taking a part in public debates, but only in the defence of his colleagues, or the discussion of some subject which had reference to arts and letters. About this time he was appointed a member of the Académie Française, and of the Académie de Science, to the latter of which he made a long address on the "Philosophy of the eighteenth century." His views were, however, considered to be rather severe by many of the Academicians, old disciples of the by-gone philosophy. He made many literary and scientific acquaintances, and passed his time of leisure more agreeably than a man of ambition and political eminence could be expected to do. He somewhat reminds us of our own celebrated statesman, Lord Bolingbroke, who always wrote and spoke of the pleasures he experienced at his country farm in France, surrounded by his friends and his books, quit of the troubles of that office which he in reality sorely regretted, and left no stone unturned to regain. In like manner Guizot deceived himself with the idea that he was amusing himself with his writings, his philosophical studies, his literary friends, and his country place. He was in reality constantly keeping an eye on the political movements of his opponents, ever ready to profit by their faults, and to acquire for himself renewed power and celebrity; though he was, no doubt, gratified at the honour which was conferred upon him by the Swedish nation, in electing him a member of the Academy of History and Belles Lettres of Stockholm, and by the very complimentary letter of congratulation from Charles John Bernadotte, King of Sweden.

All this took place at a small property which he had just bought in Normandy, and which had formerly been the abode of an order of monks founded by St. Bernard. The locality appears to have been full of historical tradition connected with this famous saint; and even the celebrated Thomas a'Becket of England had resided and performed his devotion in it, when exiled from England in 1164. It was, indeed, a place peculiarly suited for retirement; and Mons. Guizot devoted himself to the study of history and to the composition of those works for which he is now famous. Deep as his studies may have been, he certainly did not neglect his political schemes, but seems to have kept himself wonderfully au fait with all that was passing in the Spanish Peninsula and in France.

After giving us a long account of the different administrations which succeeded each other in the Peninsula, he informs us that the Northern Courts felt no inconsiderable anxiety concerning the Republic of Cracow; and that Mons. Thiers endeavoured to gain éclat for his administration by negotiating a marriage between the Duke of Orleans and the Archduchess Maria Theresa, daughter of the Archduke of Austria. The Archduke was not opposed to the match; but his relative the Emperor manifested the greatest repugnance to it notwithstanding the diplomatic tact of M. St. Aulaire, and the project failed. M. Thiers also met with considerable opposition in his Spanish policy. The Cabinet of St. James, according to Mons. Guizot, had now declared an armed intervention on behalf of Queen Isabella, and he accuses England of a desire to obtain the mastery of some port in Biscay. Of course this latter charge required more substantial proof. In fact, the account of this part of the Spanish question seems to have been more than usually embittered by national prejudice, a vice which even Mons. Guizot is not free from. He is evidently peaked at Mons. Martinez de la Rosa having relied more upon English than upon French assistance, and at the Spaniards having made a secret though very advantageous commercial treaty with the English. They soon found, however, that the French were quite as necessary as their English ally; and the Ministry solicited the aid of the French to put down the Carlist insurrection in the provinces, and the revolutionary movement in Madrid; though Louis Philippe was firmly resolved to refrain from armed interference in Spain. He offered to advance money, but refused to allow a French force to pass the Spanish frontier. This decision brought about the resignation of the French Ministry; and Mons. Thiers, notwithstanding his brilliant talents and conversational powers, was obliged to relinquish office, after having held it but a very short period.

Before we turn to the ministry of Mons. Molé and Mons. Guizot, we may remark that Thiers's administration was noted for one of the many attempts made on the life of the King. Louis Philippe was suddenly fired upon, whilst driving to the Tuileries; but the ball happily missed its mark, and passed from one side of the carriage to the other without touching the King. Of course, the death of so important a personage as Louis Philippe would have been much felt in every state of Europe, as removing the only obstacle to the success of the ultra-revolutionary party in France. It was therefore a matter of congratulation that the King had escaped this cowardly attempt; and, although we are not inclined to re-echo the unbounded praise lavished on Louis Philippe by Mons. Guizot, we yet believe that he was *the man of the period.* Sufficiently moderate in his views to remain a constitutional sovereign, he was firm and energetic enough to put down revolution at home, and to inspire other nations with a proper respect for the French name without the éclat of military glory or territorial aggrandisement. His ministers were well chosen; and the qualities of his son and of the rest of his family were such as to contribute much to the strength of his authority. He was, however, in the embarrassing position of "wanting a Ministry," and he naturally turned to his old friends of the Broglie party, and discussed with the Duke many plans of policy, though he was not sufficiently in accord with that statesman to admit of his taking the helm of state. He, however, advised the King to call together a perfectly new set of men with one or two great leaders. The King accordingly entrusted the formation of the new cabinet to his friends, Guizot and Molé. These statesmen were, in most instances, agreed in their political views, and had been colleagues in several cabinets from the time of Louis XVII to that of Louis Philippe. Mons. Guizot was, however, unwilling to form or join any cabinet of which Mons. Broglie was not a member, though this scruple was at length overcome by the urgent solicitations of the King.

The policy of the new ministers, with M. Molé as president, was peaceful and moderate. Guizot, however, refused to take a first place in it, but contented himself with filling his old office of Minister of Instruction and cabinet leader in the chamber of deputies. General Barnard was appointed War minister, and Mons. de Montalivet kept his post as Minister of Public Works. This ministry, of course, fully agreed with the King in his indirect policy with regard to Spain, and allowed that country to proceed with its civil wars unmolested, whilst it kept up friendly relations with the northern states and England. Its chief measure was the administration of Algeria. Mons. Thiers had always been of opinion that the French ought not only to retain what they had already acquired in that quarter of the world, but should also increase their possessions. We have even been told by well-informed Frenchmen that Thiers recommended that the influence of England in the Mediterranean should be counterbalanced by the formation of a good harbour and ports at Algiers and along the coasts. Be this as it may, he fully entered into the views of Marshal Clauzel, then governor of Algeria, and encouraged him in his plans of conquest. When the ministry changed, however, Guizot and his colleagues, who had always considered it necessary to keep on the defensive, replied to Marshal Clauzel's propositions, that the schemes were too vast to be proposed with any hope of success, and that they did not fall within the views of the cabinet. The Marshal, however, who was a regular French soldier of the old stamp, resolved to undertake the capture of Constantine on his own responsibility; and, having collected a small number of Spahis at Bona, under Joussouf, ordered the general at Algiers to send on his battalion, under Changarnier, and commenced a march, at the end of October, for Constantine. The season was, however, ill-chosen, and the force too small and scantily provided for such an expedition; and although the rain had much broken up the roads, the French Marshal wrote in his despatch to his government that it was only "pluie de culture" and not "pluies d'hiver." The troops, dispirited by this bad weather, found it no easy task to move their artillery and baggage through the mountain passes, and many of the men fell out of the ranks and were cut down by the surrounding tribes. Notwithstanding these obstacles, the Marshal determined to push on to Constantine, and a change in the weather enabled the troops to conclude their terrible march. None of the generals were fully aware of its strength until they had actually arrived before the town. Situated on a high table land, with unapproachable roads, with a deep chasm traversed by the torrent Rummel which almost surrounded it, it was no easy place to take. The French found a large garrison, commanded by Achmet Bey, one of the most courageous of the Turkish governors, who made a determined resistance. Besides this, they were exposed to the inclemency of the weather, which, in these elevated regions, was most trying. Their numbers were thinned by hardships and privation, as they had to bring their provisions from Bona, some considerable distance from the seat of operations, whilst the country through which they had to pass was entirely possessed by the enemy. The French general, however, believed that he could surmount all these obstacles by a simultaneous assault on three sides of the town at night, which, though gallantly made, signally failed; and Marshal Clauzel was severely wounded. It now became necessary for the army to undertake that most difficult of all military movements, a well-sustained retreat before a victorious enemy. Although the French evacuated their camp at midnight, the enemy soon discovered that they had commenced a retrograde movement, and Achmet Bey's cavalry attacked them on all sides. Changarnier, who commanded the vanguard, perceiving that the French army had no chance of conducting its retreat in safety and good order, and that forty men had just been cut off from his own battalion, commanded a halt, and practised the same tactics on the Arab cavalry as had been used with so much success by Napoleon on the Mamelukes of Egypt. Thus the rolling fire of the infantry square was most effectual against the Moorish horse, who were put to flight, and the retreat was successfully accomplished to Bona without any further molestation on the part of the Arabs.

This disastrous campaign gave rise to great indignation in France, and the ministry, who disapproved of Clauzel's conduct, at once recalled him. The government were obliged to defend themselves against a very severe debate on this point in the chambers; whilst the Marshal, though he was a thorough soldier, and ready to serve his country under any government, was unable to defend himself. He blamed the ministry for withholding the necessary means of carrying out the expedition; and refused to understand that his plans of conquest were totally at variance with the views of the ministry.

Relieved of this question, the government was alarmed by the attempt of Louis Napoleon to subvert the reigning dynasty, and to place himself on the French throne. Mons. Guizot has been very bold in his account of this insurrection, affirming it to be scarcely credible that a young lieutenant of artillery should now fill with credit the throne of his uncle. At the time of the *émeute* Prince Louis was only known by a few articles in the journals on the political rights of his family, and some essays on military tactics. He was, however, imbued with the conviction that he was destined to restore the lost power of his dynasty. With such impressions, our author thinks it quite rational that Louis Napoleon should have run the risk of overthrowing the King's government, and attributes his success of 1848 to the necessity which Frenchmen then felt of obtaining some strong hand to stop the excesses of the republicans. The insurrection and entry into Strasbourg were at first successful, as many of the artillery corps were prevailed on to join him, though the infantry regiments refused to do so. This gave time for the Mayor to obtain auxiliary force, and oppose the movement with some degree of vigour. The Prince was not only frustrated in this attempt, but, together with his comrades, was made prisoner. The King dealt too leniently with him, simply banished him to New York, and treated him as a royal prince. His accomplices, however, were punished with the utmost severity of the law.

The other measures which chiefly occupied the ministry at this period were the negotiations for a marriage between the Duke of Orleans and the Princess of Mecklenburg, and the settlement of the income of the Duc de Nemours and other members of Louis Philippe's family. On this point the King was most sensitive, remarking to Mons. Guizot "that his children might hereafter want bread." He seems to have feared the state of parties in France, and to have foreseen the difficulty of preserving the constitution when he should be removed by incapacity or death. Notwithstanding the vast property which the Orleanists possessed, and the apparent stability of their government and authority, these forebodings have unfortunately been realized.

The revision of the criminal law and the treatment of political offenders next occasioned violent debates in the chambers, and some difference of opinion amongst the ministers themselves, Guizot siding in favour of what he calls "the policy of resistance," whilst Molé supported that of "conciliation." These differences again led to the resignation of most of the cabinet. The King, however, seemed desirous to bring about an understanding between MM. Guizot and Molé, but without effect; and he sent, in turn, for Mons. Thiers, Marshal Soult, Sebastiani, and Mons. Dupont, all of whom he solicited to form a cabinet. None of them, however, were disposed to undertake so difficult a task, and Louis Philippe was again driven to ask the advice of Mons. Guizot, whose policy and opinions, being still too bold and vigorous, did not meet with the approval of the King. Mons. Molé was therefore desired to retain his post, and to form a new cabinet; from which Mons. Guizot, his friend, M. Gasparin, and several members of the old cabinet, were excluded.

During Mons. Molé's administration, on the 27th of December, 1836, another attempt was made upon the life of the King, whilst on his way from the Tuileries to the chambers. It, however, proved unsuccessful, and the assassin Meunier was captured, tried, and condemned. He had no accomplices, made no confession, and died impenitent.

In pausing to review the reign of Louis Philippe, the wonder seems, not that his authority was at length destroyed, but that it should have stood so long against conspiracies of all kinds, and that he should have escaped with his life. It must have required considerable prudence, vigilance, firmness, and personal courage, for the old King to have borne up against the troubles which were daily gathering round him; but, with all his faults, Louis Philippe was really an able and vigorous constitutional monarch, who saw what the age and the nation required, and, for a considerable period, carried out his views with energy and firmness. Mons. Guizot saw, with the sagacity of his master, that though liberal reforms were required, they could only be carried out with firmness: "thus," says Guizot, "I always leaned to the policy of resistance."

After our author's rupture with Monsieur Molé, he took little interest in political affairs for some considerable time, owing to a great family affliction. His son, a student of great promise at the Polytechnic School, died suddenly, at the age of twenty-two. His loss was not only keenly felt by his father, but was regretted by a large circle of friends and acquaintances. Political men of all classes evinced the most cordial sympathy for Guizot; and even Mons. Dupont, president of the chamber of deputies, a man who was wanting in consideration for others, condoled sincerely with him: a fact most gratifying to Guizot, and soothing his affliction. His attention was soon to be distracted by the marriage of the Duke of Orleans with the Princess of Mecklenburgh Schwerin, an event which took place at Fontainebleau. The historical associations which presented themselves to Guizot's mind, when visiting this ancient palace, are vividly described. The marriage was celebrated by civil contract drawn up by M. de Passy, the 170th chancellor of France (counting from the time of St. Boniface, the first who had held the office, 1100 years ago, under

Pepin le Bref). The ceremony was performed before the assembled guests in the Galley of Henry II. Then came the Catholic sacrament of marriage, performed by the Bishop of Nantes and a number of Abbés and Priests: and lastly, the Protestant ceremony, which was effected in the Hall of Henry IV by Monsieur Cuvier, the Principal of the Protestant Church of Paris. From Fontainebleau Guizot was invited by the King to assist at the ceremony of opening the Museum of Versailles. That palace perhaps possessed as many interesting historical associations as Fontainebleau, though erected at a later period; most of the conspicuous events which occurred in the latter part of Louis XIV's reign having been enacted there; the rooms occupied by Montespan and Maintenon still remaining untouched. Many a nook recalled the doings of Louis XV and XVI, and the terrible misfortunes which befel the latter. We have a long dissertation from Mons. Guizot as to the impressions produced on the King's mind, as well as on his own, by this ceremony. It savours much, however, of French vanity, which is ever prone to moralize on the veriest trifle. He might very well have omitted this sermon, though he seems to think that the public require a confession of private feelings, as well as the details of political events. From Versailles he goes to join the Duke of Orleans at Compiegne, where he witnessed a review of 20,000 men. This royal palace again suggests to Guizot further historical association, while he extols the urbanity of his host, and indulges in rhapsody at the fascination, charming conversation, agreeable manners, highly cultivated mind, refined taste, and generous heart of the Princess.

From these joyous scenes, Mons. Guizot goes on to mention the deaths of some of the eminent personages with whom he had been associated in political life during the earlier part of his career, and who had been removed by age from the active struggles of party life. This is perhaps the most interesting portion of the volume. The first two names in his obituary are those of Mons. Raynouard and Mons. Flaugergues; the former a man of considerable literary talent, who, having retired from politics, resided in Provence, of which district he was a native, and on the literature of which his writings threw considerable light. Flaugergues, on the other hand, had devoted himself exclusively to politics, in which his great experience, honesty, valuable information, and conscientious discharge of duties, made him a useful servant alike to the Emperor Napoleon, Louis XVIII, Charles X, and Louis Philippe, and caused him to be much lamented by all parties. Mons. Le Baron Louis followed next, and his loss was felt as a great financial authority.

Besides much experience in that department, his general knowledge of political affairs was most extensive, his views sound and in accordance with the requirements of the age; whilst his clear mind and his political honor were a wonder to his countrymen. Amongst the military deaths, those of Marshal Lobau and General Haxo are noticed, as well as the high qualifications of Mons. de Sacy, Mons. Laromiguiere, and Dr. Broussais.

Our Author then records the death of the celebrated Prince Talleyrand, the ablest of diplomatists, and most hypocritical of statesmen. No man ever passed through so many changes of fortune as Talleyrand; whilst none of his cotemporaries had so long a career, or reached so advanced an age with all their faculties. Born of noble family, he entered the church and soon rose high in the profession. When the Revolution began, he was already a bishop. He soon, however, subscribed to the new constitution, and seems never to have forgotten the part he took with the mob when all titles and distinctions were abolished. He swore allegiance to every subsequent government, was employed by the Directory as Minister of Foreign Affairs, and originated the expedition to Egypt. He served Napoleon as First Consul and Emperor, until 1812, when his sagacious eye detected the decline of the Imperial authority, and he commenced a secret correspondence with the Bourbons, which, being discovered, caused his exile. He returned to France with Louis XVIII, in whose service, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, he made the acquaintance of Mons. Guizot; though, as we have seen in the first volume, our author was little impressed with his talents. When Napoleon returned in 1815, Talleyrand fled with Louis XVIII, and remained attached to that monarch throughout the rest of his reign, though he did not long hold any prominent office in the monarch's councils. He was in turn employed by Charles X, and sent by Louis Philippe as minister to England, where he won diplomatic laurels by the course he pursued with regard to the affairs of Belgium. He remained at his post in England until 1834, when he requested his recall. From this period he intrigued against the Cabinet of the Duke de Broglie, and thus furnished Guizot with a just cause of dislike. The latter portion of his life was passed in retirement, and in the study of Social Science. He nevertheless suffered from want of occupation, though he was occasionally invited to Court, where the King received him with coldness. At length, in the year 1837, at the age of eighty-seven, a strange fancy seized this vigorous old man. He appeared on the tribune of the Society of Social and Political Science, and there delivered a lecture. It was attended by a large assembly of literati, and was a complete success. Soon after this event, his friends received the news of his dangerous illness. The old man, according to Mons. Guizot, set about making his peace with the Pope and the Church, and wrote a letter to his Holiness, praying for absolution. The signing of this letter was the last act of his life. No one can as yet discover what Mons. de Talleyrand's religious belief was; but, "in submitting to an acknowledgment of his errors," says M. Guizot, "and in avowing his penitence, he performed an act honest in itself and in accordance with the opinion of the world. It was a solemn apology, after notorious irregularities." Every one is aware that M. De Talleyrand's papers contained matter so compromising to every sovereign of Europe that they were placed under the public seal of France, and he himself requested that they should not be published until thirty years after his decease.

Mons. Guizot gives us an obituary of several other persons eminent in literature and science, too numerous, however, to be mentioned here, and then glances at the more active world of politics in which he was so distinguished an actor. We learn that M. Molé's administration was wanting in defined policy, though many able and important laws were passed through the Chamber. Foreign relations were on a satisfactory footing, except a coolness between England and France which was fostered by the northern courts. The colonies were prosperous, and the subsequent capture of Constantine, under Marshal Vallé, added to its popularity. The opposition in the Chamber, though strong, was by no means united. It was formed of what Mons. Guizot is pleased to term a number of political groups, around MM. Thiers, Odillon Barrot, and himself. He assures us that he endeavoured to form a strong party with the assistance of these leaders; but his own political opinions and those of M. Odillon Barrot were so at variance with each other that it was impossible for them to sit in the same cabinet. Between M. Thiers and himself there was no such difference of opinion, and Guizot therefore proposed that he and Mons. Thiers should form a cabinet, whilst Mons. Odillon Barrot should be made President of the Chamber of Deputies, a post for which his eloquence well fitted him. Thus he could render effectual services to the ministry, without either expressing or compromising his political principles. Before this cabinet, however, could be arranged, the Chamber of Deputies was dissolved, for the third time within three years, and Mons. Molé's cabinet fell into discredit, such as had not arisen since the revolution of July. When the Chambers were again assembled, the want of confidence in the administration was so great that it was obliged to resign, and a number of politicians were sent for and commissioned to form a new ministry. The task was at length accepted by Marshal Soult, whose ministry was formed of a *coalition* of the chief political leaders of the day, with the exception of MM. Guizot and Thiers, neither of whom could be induced to join it, unless certain posts, already filled, were conferred upon them. Mons. Guizot, however, feebly supported the new ministry in the Chamber, and devoted his leisure to the translation of the Life of Washington by Mr. Sparks.

The Eastern question, May, 1839, to February, 1840, occupies the last chapter of Mons. Guizot's able volume. This vexed question had only slumbered, and now, like a conflagration, again arose to occupy the attention of Europe. The French were for supporting the hereditary claims of Mehemet Ali to Egypt, though they were adverse to the cession of Syria. Long negotiations were set on foot in England and Austria to obtain these conditions, whilst Russia intrigued to profit by the downfall of the Ottoman empire. Thus the powers resolved to combine against her, should she attempt any such mediation as she had done a few years previously. A coolness, however, arose between the English and French governments on the question of ceding Syria to Mehemet Ali, which the Russians seized as a favourable opportunity for obtaining concessions for themselves. Although they had already forestalled other states by announcing their readiness to accept any terms proposed by England and France, they yet sent one of their ablest diplomatic agents to London to foster and strengthen the Anglo-French antagonism. General Sebastiani, the French ambassador, who was absent from England, was at once ordered to return to his post, and endeavour, if possible, to regain the friendship of England. During these negotiations, Sultan Mahmoud died suddenly at Constantinople, on the 30th June, 1838, and was succeeded by his son, yet a minor, who was little likely to be able to contend successfully against the numerous difficulties which surrounded his empire. Nothing definite was therefore arranged on this Eastern question during the year 1839. It was proposed, however, that Austria and Prussia should join their small marine force with the powerful English fleet in the Mediterranean, and defend the Sultan's dominions against his enemies. Mons. Guizot, who had violently attacked the foreign policy of the Government, was now, in order to quiet and satisfy his ambition, offered the post of ambassador to London. He for some time hesitated, as he had already refused to be Envoy at Constantinople; which, by the way, was a wise decision, considering his opinions on the question. On perceiving, however, that this post in England would not compromise any political principle, and that it would save him from much contention with the Cabinet at home, he at length accepted it. He well represented the French nation at the Court of St. James's, and did his best to bring about a good understanding between the English and French governments, notwithstanding that the King, his master, had reluctantly agreed to his appointment.

With our author's arrival in London, to take possession of his new duties, in February, 1840, closes the fourth volume of these Memoirs, which is equal in detail and style to any of the preceding ones. As we have seen, it contains the narrative of many interesting events, both in the private life of the writer and the political history of his country, and adds lustre to the pen of an honest and enlightened French historian.

PRESCOTT,

THE BLIND HISTORIAN.

PRESCOTT,

THE BLIND HISTORIAN.

Many qualifications are necessary for writing history, a *métier* now considered as much a science as astronomy or chemistry—made up as it is of as many causes, and producing as certain effects as any known chemical combination of sideral calculation. An educated mind, close research for information on particular and disputed points, great impartiality in portraying events and characters, are some of the necessary acquirements for starting as an Historian. Few of these qualities, however, are strongly marked in the writers of the present day, if we except Sir Archibald Allison, whose reasonings on the causes and effects of history would be clear and intelligible, were they not somewhat mingled with speculative calculations as to what Providence might or would do under certain circumstances. Few historians have attained so high and deserved an eminence as Gibbon and Hallam, who surpass their brethren in learning and research—so vast has been their subject, and so wide the period over which their labours have extended. Thus it is beyond doubt that all the reputation of modern historians has been achieved by hard, diligent study—the goal of success being difficult to attain, the energy to become a great historical authority needing no ordinary exertion.

If, then, it be so difficult for an author, in the possession of his five senses, to compile a really good historical work, must it not appear almost an impossibility for a blind man to make such an attempt. Mr. Prescott has, however, proved that such an undertaking is not only possible, but that it may be engaged in with the greatest success, by one labouring under such an affliction.

It is scarcely necessary to mention Mr. Prescott's many literary productions, as they are well known and justly popular, both in America and England. They are astonishing from the many different subjects upon which they touch, the extent of the information they contain, the clearness of their views, and the excellence of their style; and have undoubtedly gained for Mr. Prescott, notwithstanding his want of sight, a high rank amongst the greatest historians of his day.

As America has just lost this brilliant literary son, we shall endeavour to furnish our readers with a short sketch of his life and labours. Descended from respectable ancestors, who had emigrated to Massachusetts in the days of Charles I, in order to escape the religious persecution which was inflicted by that monarch on the Puritans, it appears that Prescott's grandfather was one of the early heroes of Bunker's-hill. His father long filled, with great ability, the important post of judge in his own state, having first lived at Salem, and afterwards at Boston; at the former of which places Prescott the historian was born, and spent the early part of his youth. It appears that, like most young men of good family in that state, he was sent to the University near Boston to complete his education for the bar, where, by an accident, he lost the vision of one eye, while the other was so much impaired that he was unable to use it for any length of time, and was obliged to continue his studies by the assistance of other students. This affliction seriously injured his prospects in life; for, in a country like America, a man without professional rank or wealth is looked upon with little consideration—position and success mainly depending on individual exertion and industry. Prescott judiciously saw that the pursuit of literary eminence would at once make up for any loss of professional reputation and pecuniary wealth. He therefore early turned his thoughts to literature, and wrote, soon after graduating at the University, on various subjects in the best American periodicals of the day. If we may judge from his miscellaneous productions, some of which he has since published in a collected form, his style, at that early period, was distinguished for its vigour, clearness, and its pure plain Saxon, which the most eminent English authors consider preferable to the high-flown style and lengthy periods of Dr. Johnson or of Gibbon.

His articles in the *North American Review* show the tendencies of his mind and his favourite studies. In October, 1824, he contributed a paper on "Italian Narrative Poetry," which called out some strictures from an Italian teacher in New York, to which a reply was made in the *North American Review* for July, 1825. A paper on "Scottish Song" appeared in July, 1826; one on "Molière" in October, 1828; one on "Irving's Conquest of Granada" in October, 1829. The titles and dates of his other contributions are as follows: "Instruction of the Blind," July, 1830; "Poetry and Romance of the Italians," July, 1831; "Cervantes," July, 1837; "Sir Walter Scott," April, 1838; "Chateaubriand's English Literature," October, 1839; "Bancroft's United States," January, 1841; "Madame Calderon's Life in Mexico," January, 1843; "Ticknor's

History of Spanish Literature," January, 1850. These essays, except the last, were printed in one volume in London and Boston in 1845, and several editions have since been called for.

Soon after leaving the University, Prescott, like many other eminent men, derived much useful and extensive information by visiting foreign countries. He did not agree with most of his countrymen, that "the almighty everlasting republic" was the only spot on the face of the earth worth inhabiting, and that all other places were inferior in every respect as compared with it; although he might still have thought that freedom was no where to be equalled out of the United States, that no government was superior to it, and that none could compete with the Americans in energy, resource, and perseverance. Yet he was well aware that his country was a new one; that it had not had the same time to progress in politics, science, and art, as many of the countries of the old world; and that it was far behind even the second-rate kingdoms of Italy and Spain, in all that makes history charming and attractive. Of course, like every American, Prescott's steps were first turned towards England, as the country which had given birth to his own, and which was still similar to his native state in religion, language, civil institutions, and national character. From thence he visited France and Italy, and seems to have made himself thoroughly acquainted with the language and literature of the latter country; so much so, that it is said he intended, at one time, to write a work on Italian literature—a subject which, in our opinion, was almost too vast for one who only had the use of his sight for a few hours of the day, and who had to depend so much on others for information. Historic associations, such as Rome, Florence, or Venice afforded, must have nerved him up to undertake most difficult tasks in historical composition; and we accordingly find that, soon after his return home, he began to look for a subject which might prove worthy of his energies. Whilst, however, he was deciding this knotty point, where to direct his pen, an event occurred, which for some little time put history from his thoughts. He fell in love with and married a good and amiable lady, who bore him several children, amongst whom we may mention his two surviving sons, and his daughter, the wife of that intelligent and good man, Mr. James Lawrence, of Boston, who is so well known and esteemed both in America and England.*

---

* Mr. James Lawrence is the eldest son of his Excellency the Honourable Abott Lawrence, who, for a lengthened period represented the United States at the Court of St. James's, and who, as a philanthropist and diplomatist, did more to cement the bonds of friendship between the two countries than any other American or English statesman before or since his time; and whose death, which occurred soon after his return, was as deeply felt in English society as it was throughout the Union.

Prescott, in the year 1838, produced his work on *Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile.* He could not have chosen a period more full of interest, or more important, on which to exercise his extraordinary historical talents—when the disorders of the middle ages were just subsiding—when the feudal system and the baronial power was giving way before the order and civilization of the large and absolute monarchies which were then forming in Europe—when, in Germany, excesses in religion were beginning to bring about the changes which ended in the great Reformation—when, in England, that commercial spirit was just dawning, after the horrors of the wars of the two roses, which led to such glorious results, and made the country, in civil government and naval supremacy, what it is—when, in France, English invasion had been successfully overcome, when all her great fiefs, united in one strong monarchy, thus enabled her to take her proper place as an European state, and to prosecute her schemes of aggrandizement and ambition in Italy—when in Italy itself, the various republics into which it was divided had reached their greatest splendour in arts and civilization, and had given birth to those geniuses which were to produce the future enlightenment of Europe—when the Medici, and other distinguished families had reached their greatest power—when the Pope had just attempted to unite the Greek and Roman churches under one head, and had invited for that purpose many of the most illustrious Greek scholars to Italy to bring over their philosophy and literature with them—when Constantinople was taken by the Turks, and the knowledge and science of the ancient Greeks thereby still further diffused over Europe—when the Scandinavian kingdoms were overcome by Margaret, the Semiramis of the North, and the brilliant patriotic efforts of Gustavus Vasa in the defence of Sweden against the cruelty and oppression of Christian II of Denmark—when the independence of the Swiss republic was acknowledged by their dreaded Austrian enemies, after a century's desperate contest—when Portugal commenced and completed her great discoveries on the coast of Africa, which solved the difficult problem of a new and safer route to India—and, finally, when Spain herself, united under one monarch, successfully drove out the Moors, and assisted Columbus in prosecuting those discoveries in the New World which were destined to open a new and more extended field for European invention, enterprise, and civilization. —This was the time and these the events which Prescott nerved himself to describe; this stirring period which had witnessed the invention of printing, and when the mighty writings of Macchiavelli, Ariosto, and Tasso, dawning upon the world, proclaimed to posterity what eminence the intellect of that age had already attained, and what it had done for the cause in knowledge, commerce, and civilization.

The characters which he had to describe were the most remarkable of the age; and Spain, the kingdom over which they ruled, was, owing to the acquisitions which she made in the new world and her possessions in the south of Italy, the most influential and wealthy country of Europe. In the commencement of his work, he gives us a short but admirable sketch of the previous histories of Aragon and Castile, in which he fully bears out Mr. Hallam's assertion of their having received liberal constitutions earlier than any other state in Europe; confirming the account of other historians as to their deeds of daring in the wars against the Moors; of their early progress in literature and science, and their proficiency in astronomical observations. Indeed—if we may judge from the men who were produced during the reign of Ferdinand, and that of his grandson Charles V of Spain, generals, statesman, and literary men—the intellect of the Spaniard, like the soil of his country, only requires cultivation to produce the richest fruits. The great men who have appeared in Spain are few; but those who have distinguished themselves have attained to the highest eminence, and any country might well be proud of Gonsalvo di Cordova, the Duke of Alva, Cardinal Zimenes, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, or Calderon.

This work of Prescott displays those powers of description which enables us to become thoroughly acquainted with the manners and customs of the people, and the era about which he wrote, and renders his writings and those of Dr. Robertson more like interesting novels than the grave details of historical narrative.

Prescott's "Ferdinand and Isabella" was everywhere deservedly popular; and, besides passing through several editions, both here and in America, was translated into French, German, Spanish, and several other European languages, and acquired for its author the distinction of being made a Member of the Academy at Madrid.

Although this particular history had given him much labour in compilation, Prescott did not rest satisfied with the success which he had thus obtained, but, almost as soon as it was completed, turned his attention to a subject which was quite as interesting, and, if any thing, surrounded with greater difficulties, there being but scanty materials to work upon. The History of the "*Conquest and Discovery of the Empire of Mexico*," together with a narrative of its foundation, and a notice of the early life of its conqueror, Cortes, whose genius and remarkable qualities would have done honour to any country and any age, now became his absorbing idea. The account of the discovery of the New World had already been given by Washington Irving, or else it is not at all improbable that Prescott might have taken, as his next subject, the life of that famous old navigator, Christopher Columbus, together with a description of the adventures and obstructions which he met with in his great enterprise. This, however, had already been so well done by Washington Irving, that any fresh narrative would have at once been thrown into the shade.

Before considering this work of Mr. Prescott, it will be as well to glance at the doings of the early explorers who visited the New World. It is doubtful whether the inhabitants were capable of forming any extensive empire or monarchy, or even undertaking any great work in art or arms. They lacked the energy and perseverance which has been shown by nations which have attained any degree of civilization; and they were even too weak to perform the task imposed upon them by their Spanish discoverers. Found in a state of nakedness, living upon the produce of the sea and the tropical plants which were brought forth in abundance in their genial climate; they seem to have been divided into a number of petty tribes, ruled over by chieftains of their own election, who were all more or less warlike, and who soon found cause to detest the Spaniard for his haughty and cruel conduct, and for his intense love of gold, which they could not at first comprehend, as they seem to have had but small notion of barter, and less of trade. Their implements of war were rude and primitive; their canoes were simple and ill-adapted for making long voyages; whilst their religious ideas were confined to belief in a First Cause, from which every thing had sprung, and to which man would hereafter be responsible. They also had an idea of a general flood, which had involved the world and all its inhabitants in one common destruction, together with many early traditions.

At this point, Prescott takes up the narrative, by telling us that some of the Indians, when they saw how attractive gold was to the Spaniards, informed them that they might obtain a great quantity of the precious metal if they bent their steps further towards the West; that a large empire existed which was noted for its riches and its power, which would amply repay them for the dangers they might encounter in their voyage thither, and their hostilities with the natives. Hernando Cortes—a native of Estremadura, who had distinguished himself at home by his showy accomplishments and legal talents, and in the West Indies by his courage as a soldier and his capacity as a leader, where he had acquired much experience in the Indian mode of warfare—resolved to undertake this difficult and dangerous enterprise.

Cortes reached the Mexican coast within a very reasonable time, when we take into account the slow navigation of those days, the stormy currents of those seas, which have been found to be no inconsiderable impediment even with the assistance of steam, and the fact that the land he was visiting was entirely a new discovery. He even coasted along the shores of Mexico for some distance before he could find a good harbour for his ships, which were fortunately uninjured by so long an exploration of an unknown coast. He at length found good anchorage for them, somewhere within the vicinity of the present situation of Vera Cruz, and proceeded to land a small force of 100 men. This may seem to have been a number too small to encounter any enemy, however raw and undisciplined; but Cortes relied on the effect that had already been produced on the Indians by the horses and fire-arms of the Spaniards; which had already enabled the Europeans to perform wonders, only equalled in romance and by the fabulous tales of ancient mythology.

He found the Mexicans a people who had already obtained a very considerable degree of civilization, and furnished more worthy enemies for the Spanish Hidalgos to contend with, than had yet been met with in the New World. Their roads and canals were as excellent as any which the engineers of Spain could have constructed; and the people were a hardy race, easily turned by skilful diplomacy from invincible foes to useful allies. Cortes and his Spaniards had to encounter the difficulties of high mountain passes and extreme severity of climate; which, after the tropical heat, somewhat thinned their ranks. The intrepidity and perseverance, however, of his followers overcame all obstacles; and, although his little band had been somewhat diminished, yet, their compact and disciplined appearance made them formidable foes in the eyes of the unwarlike inhabitants of the new country.

When they arrived at the capital, the Spaniards were astonished at the splendid appearance of the city, and the magnificence with which Montezuma and his subjects were surrounded. This has all been most graphically described by Prescott; who tells us that the temples, palaces, and public buildings, were of a grandeur and solidity resembling the structures of the ancient Assyrian or Egyptian empire; whilst the plate and furniture used by people even of a very inferior grade were composed of silver and precious stones. As for the civilization and institutions of this remarkable nation, it somewhat resembled that of the early Eastern countries; but it was not so fully developed, owing to the shortness of the period which had elapsed between the foundation of the Mexican kingdom and its discovery and conquest by the Spaniards. Prescott goes on to assure us that the Mexicans, like the early Egyptians, corresponded with each other by means of hieroglyphics. They had also made great advance in the science of astronomy, had been able to institute for themselves a calendar, and had determined with certainty the date of the foundation of their empire, which seems to have answered to 1075 after Christ. Thus it had barely been established five centuries, when it was overthrown by Cortes. The Mexicans also possessed a regular code of laws and courts of justice, and carried on an extensive commerce through itinerant merchants, who travelled in parties in order to protect their goods. Cortes did not long remain master of the capital; the jealousy of the Mexicans induced them to rise suddenly against their Spanish conquerors, who, being surprised by this sudden attack, fled precipitately before them. Every one is aware of the success which afterwards accompanied the efforts of Cortes, and of the courage and enterprise, the sagacity and foresight, which enabled him, at the same time, to put down all rebellion amongst his own followers, to turn the hearts of competitors for power towards himself, and, at length, to acquire the extensive territories of the empire of Mexico for the Spanish crown. He was finally rewarded with the title of a Spanish Marquis, and died at a good old age, respected both by his own countrymen and the Mexicans.

Prescott has displayed his usual clearness and research in the narrative of these events, and has left behind him a picture of Mexican manners, customs, life, and history, as remarkable for its accuracy, as for its being the production of a blind man. He is more accurate in his details than Dr. Robertson, probably from having had greater access than that celebrated historian to the various works on the conquest of Mexico brought together in the great libraries of Spain.

It might have been supposed that he would have remained contented with the reputation he had everywhere acquired as a writer and historian, and with the honours which were heaped upon him by the various literary bodies of Europe after the appearance of his Mexican History; that he would at least have refrained from attempting so difficult a task as the history of the other Empire of the New World. His active mind, however, could not rest satisfied under the laurels it had already gained; and he therefore, with his usual energy, set about collecting the scanty materials which Spanish libraries furnished, for writing a history of the "*Discovery and Conquest of Peru*," together with a notice of the life of its extraordinary conqueror, Pizarro—a hero, who was, perhaps, a more remarkable man than either Cortes or Columbus, although in some respects less brilliant than either. Pizarro had not, like those two great discoverers, the grand advantages of a good education, and he was thus unable successfully to prosecute his discoveries, to execute his schemes of ambition, or administer the affairs of a great empire like Peru, after its conquest had been successfully accomplished.

His career resembles, even more than that of Cortes, the wildest tales of romance; and had any one told the great men of that day that a poor foundling of the province of Estremadura in Spain, who had great difficulty in gaining a livelihood as a swine herd, would become the discoverer and conqueror of a mighty empire, situated so many thousand miles from his native shore, he would have been considered a madman. Nevertheless, such was the future destiny of this distinguished man.

Prescott tells us that Pizarro left his country at an early age, and enlisted in one of those bands of adventurers which were so commonly met with in the Eldorado age, and sought wealth and distinction under the most renowned leaders in the New World. In such a school, he first learned to contend with the Indians, and to make himself thoroughly master of their mode of warfare, whilst his poverty and low origin had inured him to privation and hardship. After witnessing many a conflict with the wild Indians, in which he and his comrades were generally the victors, he settled on the Isthmus of Panama, and there lived for some considerable time in tranquillity and obscurity. The Indians, however, informed him, as well as many of his countrymen, that a vast empire in the south, which was fertile in the produce of gold, and in valuable mineral and vegetable productions, would quite as amply repay his exertions as Mexico had done to Cortes. Most of the Spaniards, however, who were settled in Panama considered the information thus given as a mere idle tale, and, if at all entitled to belief, far too hazardous an expedition to be undertaken by any of them. Pizarro, not only fully credited the narrative of the Indians, but resolved to go forward himself in search of a land which promised to give him so much treasure and so many excitements. Two of his former comrades shared his views, and assisted him by collecting followers and contributing money to defray the expenses of the enterprise. Thus helped, as Prescott so amusingly tells us, Pizarro left the coast of Panama with three ships and a small body of gallant Spanish adventurers, resolved to conquer, or to die in the attempt. He safely landed his small army on the coast (of what has since been known as the empire of Peru), at once marched to the capital, and met with less opposition from the Peruvians than Cortes had done in his march to Mexico. It appears that, although the Peruvians were a highly civilized race, they were neither so warlike nor so courageous as the tribes that had become tributary to the Mexicans, and which contested with such valour and determination for their independence with the Castilian Hidalgos. The Peruvians, however, astonished their conquerors, by the excellence of their roads and canals, by the splendour and magnificence of their temples and public buildings, and by the luxury which surrounded them in their ordinary life. They carried on a considerable trade with the neighbouring Indian tribes, and possessed an advantage over the Mexicans in the prosecution of commerce, by being able to transport the goods on that extraordinary animal the *Llama,* a kind of sheep, which, besides furnishing good flesh for food and wool for clothing, is of sufficient height and strength to carry burdens of a tolerable weight. The rearing of this useful animal, however, has, like all other advantages which the Spaniards found in the New World, been shamefully neglected by them, though it might with small attention and trouble have enabled them to establish considerable cloth manufactories in Peru, which would have been quite as remunerative as the working of their extensive gold mines.

Prescott tells us, also, that the Peruvians had an extraordinary mode of keeping their accounts, for a nation who knew nothing of writing. They tied a rope into the number of knots they required to express any particular figure. With regard to their early history, they had fewer annals than the Mexicans, and were obliged to transmit their records by tradition from father to son. With these scanty materials, however, it appears that the Spanish learned enough of Peruvian history to become acquainted with the fact of a most remarkable man appearing suddenly amongst them some three or four centuries previous to the Spanish mission, who had claimed the Sun as his father, and had taught them to consider that luminary as their principal deity, who had gathered the different tribes of the Peruvian race into one nation, had instructed them in the rudiments of agriculture, architecture, the making of roads and canals, and who had first brought amongst them the Llama, and taught them how to rear and feed it. He was followed on his throne by a long line of sovereigns, called Incas.

Greater cruelties were committed by the Spaniards under Pizarro in Peru, than under Cortes in Mexico; and his invasion was, perhaps, the most bloody and barbarous of all the contests by the Spaniards in the New World. The booty which fell into the hands of his followers was immense, and amply repaid them for all the dangers and hardships they had encountered in prosecuting this arduous expedition. Pizarro now returned to Spain, in order to be confirmed in his office of Governor of Peru by the Emperor Charles V, who rewarded him for his services by creating him a Marquess, and the title long remained in his family. He, as is well known, again returned to Peru, where he ended his career at Lima, the capital, being assassinated by his followers who had risen against him.

Prescott is considered by some to have displayed a greater elegance of style in his History of Peru than in any of his other writings. This may be the case; but in our opinion it does not equal the simple, plain, and clear style, so well adapted to historical writing, which has been displayed in the last work which occupied his attention before his death. Prescott added to his many honours degrees from the Universities of Oxford and Edinburgh; and his reputation as a writer had risen so high, that most of the libraries throughout Europe were open to him on the slightest demand. With such advantages, he was at length enabled to undertake a work embracing a much larger range of historical pursuit than either the reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella of Castile, or the Conquests of Mexico or Peru. He thus selected as his final subject *the Life of Philip II of Spain,* and he could not well have chosen a more interesting or a more important period on which to bestow the labour of his graphic pen.

It was no easy task to give an impartial account of the history of Philip, as it is that of Europe during its most exciting period—one as is well known, in which nearly every country of Europe was distracted by the bloody contests between Catholics and Protestants, when religious feuds were more sanguinary and more obstinate than the mere political struggles of states. Both monarchs and subjects were, in the days of Philip II, only beginning to awaken to their mutual responsibilities; and Prescott has well shown that Philip, by his power, position, and ability, was at the head of the Catholics in religion, and of the supporters of arbitrary power for political purposes; and that, in order to support these opinions, Philip not only carried on a long and desperate war with his own subjects in the Low Countries, but assisted the Catholics in France, England, and Germany.

In narrating the history of Philip's reign, Prescott found it necessary, more or less, to take a view of the former and contemporary state of all European countries; for Philip was engaged in struggles with the Pope in Italy, the Barbary states, and the Sultan of Turkey. And although Prescott has rather stept beyond his limits in giving an account of the establishment of the Turkish Empire, of the institution of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, and of the acquisition and defence of the island of Malta, he has, nevertheless, made his narrative more comprehensible and more interesting by these properly called digressions from the broad path of his subject.

As we have noticed the History of Philip II in another portion of this volume, we think it only necessary now to state that the whole work displays vast research and consummate learning; that it is written in a clear, simple style; and that it contains many lively pictures, which amply show the extraordinary powers of description at the command of the author. Two examples will sufficiently illustrate what these powers are. Let our readers turn to the narration of the parting speech made at the abdication of Charles V, to the Chambers assembled at Brussels, the first entrance of Philip into that capital, and his arrival and marriage with bloody Queen Mary at Winchester.

In narrating these occurrences, Prescott gives us a great insight into the manners and customs of those times, when the gaudy pageantry and processions of the middle ages had not yet faded away, but had just reached their greatest splendour.

Prescott has also rendered a great service to history, by confirming the assertions made by Mr. Stirling, in his work of *The Cloister Life of Charles V*, in which he proves that that monarch's retirement to Yuste was not, as most historians have represented, a complete seclusion from the business and pleasures of this world, but that it was rather a rest, furnished to an overworked and unsuccessful sovereign, whom disease had incapacitated, but who was, nevertheless, able to indulge in the pleasures and luxuries of the table, to take a passing interest in the affairs of his former dominions, and even to send from his quiet retreat that good advice to his son and successor which enabled Philip to pilot with some degree of safety the vessel of the state through the many breakers that surrounded it. The only matter which Mr. Prescott does not seem to explain with any greater degree of clearness than former historians, notwithstanding the many references he had access to, is the conduct of Philip II towards his unfortunate son Don Carlos. The three very excellent volumes which appeared on the reign of Philip II, though they contain much novel matter, yet do not extend further than through half the reign of that monarch.

Although Prescott suffered from a slight paralytic attack about a year ago, he so completely recovered his health, that his friends predicted many years of life, and a more brilliant literary career than he had yet enjoyed. These hopes were, however, suddenly put an end to by his unexpected death, which occurred, at his residence at Boston, at the beginning of the present year (1859). As an historian and critic, in his own country he held the first rank, and few in other lands have equalled him. He is a brilliant example of what may be effected by application and perseverance, even under so severe an affliction as blindness; and those blind people who may have studied his works will have derived great encouragement and consolation from the fact, that the attainment of the highest rank in intellect and information are yet within their reach. They may thus rest assured that if they cannot attain to an equal eminence with this great man, they may yet acquire a respectable mediocrity in the pursuit of any subject to which they turn their attention; whilst they may try to emulate him in his general amiability of character, and the patience and resignation with which he bore his severe affliction. Prescott's many talents and virtues have undoubtedly gained for him the esteem of his friends and relatives, and thrown a most enviable lustre around his name, which will help to transmit it with a double credit to an admiring posterity.

We may be allowed, before closing this short and imperfect sketch of Mr. Prescott's character and career, to glance across that mighty expanse of waters which divides us from the land which gave him birth, and take up the echoes which a grateful country poured forth at the loss of their illustrious son.

The Hon. Robert C. Winthrop thus feelingly addresses the Members of the Massachusetts Historical Society, who were hastily called together on the decease of their illustrious literary brother.

"You are already but too well aware of the event which has called us together. Our beautiful rooms are lighted this evening for the first time; but the shadow of an afflicting bereavement rests darkly and deeply upon our walls and upon our hearts. We are here to pay a farewell tribute to him whom we were ever most proud to welcome within our cherished circle of associates, but whose sunny smile is now left to us only as we see it yonder, in the cold though faithful outlines of art. We have come to deplore the loss of one who was endeared to us all by so many of the best gifts and graces which adorn our nature, and whose gentle and genial spirit was the charm of every company in which he mingled. We have come especially to manifest our solemn sense that one of the great historical lights of our country and of our age has been withdrawn from us for ever; and to lay upon the closing grave of our departed brother some feeble but grateful acknowledgment of the honour he had reflected upon American literature, and of the renown he had acquired for the name of an American historian."

Professor George Ticknor then takes up the refrain and declares, "I have no words of formal eulogy to offer. In this moment of sorrow, I cannot say what I would. But this I am able to say—and it becomes the occasion that it should be said—that to those of us who knew him from the days of his bright boyhood, down to his latest years, when he stood before the world crowned with its honours, the elements that constituted the peculiar charm of his character seemed always to be the same; that his life—his whole life—was to an extraordinary degree a happy one, governed by a prevalent sense of duty to God and love to man; and that he has been taken from us with unimpaired faculties, and with a heart whose affections grew warmer and more tender to the last.

"At the end of a life like this, although suddenly terminated, he naturally left few wishes for posthumous fulfilment; and the few that he did leave were of the simplest and most unpretending sort. But one was most characteristic and touching; and, as it has been accomplished, it may fitly be mentioned here. He desired that, after death, his remains might rest for a time in the cherished room where were gathered the intellectual treasures amidst which he had found so much of the happiness of his life. His wish was fulfilled. There he lay—it was only yesterday, sir—his manly form neither wasted nor shrunk by disease; the features, which had expressed and inspired so much love, still hardly touched by the effacing fingers of death: there he lay, and the great lettered dead of all ages and climes and countries seemed to look down upon him in their earthly and passionless immortality, and claim that his name should hereafter be imperishably united with theirs. And then, when this his wish had been fulfilled, and he was borne forth from those doors which he had never entered except to give happiness, but which he was never to enter again—then he was brought into the temple of God, where he had been used to worship, and into a company of the living such as the obsequies of no man of letters have ever before assembled in this land; and there a passionate tribute of tears and mourning was paid to the great benefits he had conferred on the world, and to his true and loving nature, which would have been dearer to his heart than all the intellectual triumphs of his life.

"And now that all this is past; now that we have laid him beside the father whom he so truly reverenced—whom we also reverenced, sir, and the mother whom he so tenderly loved, and who was loved of all, and especially of all in sorrow and suffering—now what remains for us to do? It is little, very little. We can express our respect, our admiration, and our love; we can mourn with those who are nearest and dearest to him. These, indeed, constitute our incumbent duty; and therefore, sir, I propose to you now, even in this season of our bitter sorrow, to fulfil it, and, as becomes such a moment, to fulfil it in the fewest and simplest words.

"Mr. Ticknor then read the following resolutions:—

"'Resolved, That, as members of the Massachusetts Historical Society, we look back with gratitude and pride upon the brilliant career of our late associate, William Hickling Prescott, who, not urged by his social position to a life of literary toil, and discouraged by an infirmity which seemed to forbid success, yet chose deliberately, in his youth, the difficult path of historical research, and, by the force of genius, of courage, and of a cheerful patience, achieved for himself, with the full assent of Christendom, an honoured place in the company of the great masters of history in all countries and in all ages.

"'Resolved, That, while we mourn the loss of one who has thus made our country and the world his debtors, we yet, in this moment of our sudden bereavement, grieve rather that we miss the associate and friend whom we loved, as he was loved of all who knew him, for the beauty, the purity, and the transparent sincerity of his nature; for his open and warm sympathies; and for the faithful affections, to which years and the changes of life only added freshness and strength.

"'Resolved, That we request the President of this Society to transmit these resolutions to the family of our lamented and honoured associate, expressing to them the deep sympathy we feel in their affliction, and commending them to the merciful God in whom he trusted, and to the influences of that religion in which he was wont to find consolation under trial and suffering.'"

Again, the voice of eulogy speaks through the celebrated *Jared Sparks, LL.D.*, the Biographer of Washington, who declares that "An intimate acquaintance with our departed associate for a long term of years, and a friendship and affectionate esteem growing stronger as those years advanced, have produced ties and sympathies which could not be severed without leaving a deep impression on my mind and feelings. The qualities of his heart, of his intellect and character, were such as to win the steady confidence and attachment of all who knew him, as many of us who are here present have known him."

"I will briefly touch upon those traits of his mind which qualified him for the remarkable success he attained as a historian. The highest requisites for a writer in this department of literature are a love of truth, impartiality, a discriminating judgment, and a resolute purpose to procure all the facts that can be found, enabling him to render full justice to his subject. These requisites Prescott possessed in an eminent degree. Read his works through, and you will find the evidence of them impressed upon every page. You will find no extravagant theories, no over-wrought descriptions to disguise the faults or foibles of a favourite hero, none of the resorts of the casuist to sustain or defend a doubtful policy; in short, none of those intricate and questionable by-paths of opinion or assertion into which historians are sometimes led by their personal antipathies or partialities. Truth was his first aim, as far as he could detect it in the conflicting records of events; and his next aim was to impress this truth, in its genuine colours, upon the reader. The characters and motives of men were weighed in the scales of justice, as they appeared to him after careful research and mature thought. In all these qualities of an accomplished historian, we may safely challenge for him a comparison with any other writer.

"In his unceasing efforts and extraordinary success in procuring the materials for his various historical compositions, he has certainly surpassed all other writers. Previous historians had, to some extent, made similar efforts; but I can say, with entire confidence, after my historical studies, such as they have been, that I know of no historian, in any age or language, whose researches into the materials with which he was to work have been so extensive, thorough, and profound, as those of Mr. Prescott. He was unwearied in his search after original documents, wherever they were to be found; never relying on secondary authorities, when it was possible to obtain those that were original or more to be depended upon. And it is wonderful with what success these efforts were attended, considering the sources he explored, particularly in Spain, where they had been for a long time, in a great measure, secluded from examination. But his perseverance, and, more than all, the peculiar and undisguised traits of his character, inspiring confidence in those who had this prejudice against allowing those materials to be exposed to the world, seemed to unlock every secret depository, especially after these traits had been so clearly unfolded in his first historical work. His obligations for these signal favours are freely and fully acknowledged in his prefaces; and, in the use he has made of the materials thus acquired, no one has had occasion to regret the implicit reliance that was placed on his discretion, judgment, and integrity. But, in all this, there was no ostentation or parade. He quietly pursued his course, devoting his time and thoughts to the pursuit he had chosen, and glad to gather from every quarter whatever would give more weight, character, and force to the work in which he was engaged, and thus contribute to enlighten the public, and produce the result he desired."

The Reverend N. L. Frothingham, D.D., remarks that "Prescott was more than his books. His character was loftier than all his reputation. So simple-minded and so great-minded; so keen in his perceptions, but so kind in his judgments; so resolute, but so unpretending; so considerate of every one, and so tasking of himself; so full of the truest and warmest affections; so merry in his temper, without overleaping a single due bound; such spirit, but such equanimity; so much thoughtfulness, without the least cast of sickliness; doing good as by the instinct of spontaneous activity, and doing labour without a wrinkle or a strain; unswerving in his integrity, and with the nicest sense of honour; whom no disadvantage could dishearten, no prosperity corrupt, no honours and plaudits elate or alter one whit; modest, as if he had never done anything; retaining through life all the artlessness of the highest wisdom; with a liberal heart and an open hand; the ingenuousness of youth flashing to the last from his frank face; walking in sympathy with his fellows, and humbly before God."

For want of space, we must here conclude our remarks on the character and career of the great blind American Historian, William Hickling Prescott; only transcribing a few of the opinions of those celebrated contemporary writers and historians, Professor C. C. Felton; the well-known literary statesman and diplomatist, the Hon. Edward Everett; and the historian of the United States, the Hon. George Bancroft.

Professor C. C. Felton assures us that "not only those (and there are thousands) who knew him personally, but those who knew him only in the printed page—those who knew him in those beautiful works—seemed to know the loveliness of his character, and to feel for their author all the tenderness of personal affection. It is a saying, that 'the style is the man;' and of no great author in the literature of the world is that saying more true than of him whose loss we mourn. For in the transparent simplicity and undimmed beauty and candour of his style were read the endearing qualities of his soul; so that his personal friends are found wherever literature is known, and the love for him is co-extensive with the world of letters, not limited to those who speak our Anglo-Saxon mother language, to the literature of which he has contributed such splendid works, but co-extensive with the civilized languages of the human race."

"Scholars everywhere will feel this bereavement; literary and scientific societies will notice it by commemorative rites. What a cloud will come over that fair and romantic land, whose history and literature he has done so much to adorn! In Germany, where his profound learning and his vast acquirements in the department of history were thoroughly appreciated, and where his name is one of the greatest—there, too, will his loss be deeply felt. In beautiful and unfortunate Italy, of whose literature he had early felt the charm, and over whose storied sites he had wandered in his youth, the name of Prescott has become a classic name. Aye, more than that. In the lovely land, where historical composition had its origin, in the land of Hellas, redeemed again to freedom, letters and art—even there the name of Prescott has become a classic name. It was only last July that I had the pleasure of looking upon the works of our distinguished countryman, and of his lifelong friend who introduced these resolutions, standing side by side, in the University of Athens, with those of the illustrious native masters.

"This sad news will speed over the earth and sea on the wings of the lightning. With the loveliness of returning spring, the announcement will be heard, even to the shores of Greece, that a great and pure light has been withdrawn from the Western World. It will come upon the festive rites of that most ancient Oriental church that has survived so many ages of woe; and, under the matchless glories of the sky of Attica, a sense of bereavement and a wail of sorrow will mingle with the festivities and Christian welcomes of that joyous season. Be assured that, before the summer comes, eloquent eulogies upon the character and works of our departed countryman will be pronounced before crowded audiences of Hellenic youth, in the language of Thucydides and Xenophon, in that same illustrious Athens where those great ancients lived whose renown has made her name immortal."

"Being about to leave home on Monday, the 24th of January, —says the *Hon. Edward Everett*—on a visit to Philadelphia, and taking my accustomed walk in the middle of the day on the Saturday preceding, I met out late lamented and beloved associate, Prescott. He seemed to me as well as at any time the past twelvemonth; but my son, who was with me, thought his countenance somewhat changed. On the following Friday, the telegraph transmitted the news of his death to Philadelphia; where, I think I can truly say, it was mourned as deeply and sincerely as anywhere in Boston, out of the circle of immediate relatives and friends. They felt his death as a loss, not of any one place, but of the whole country. And this feeling I found universally prevalent in a somewhat extensive circuit since made in New Jersey; in New York, where a most distinguished brother historian (Mr. Bancroft) gave utterance, in language the most appropriate and impressive, to the unaffected sorrow of the community; and in the neighbouring city of Brooklyn, which I have since visited. Everywhere those tributes of respect and affection which have been paid to our dear friend by his neighbours, associates, and immediate fellow-citizens, have found a ready response throughout the country, as they will throughout the civilized world.

"I can add nothing to what has been already said in the general contemplation of his eminence as an author, his worth as a man, his geniality as a companion, his fidelity as a friend; his severe trials, his heroic exertions, his glorious success. But I have thought it might be in my power to say a few words, not unacceptably, of the rapidity and the extent to which his reputation was established abroad, and the prompt and generous recognition of his ability in Europe. The "History of Ferdinand and Isabella" was published at the close of 1837, or the beginning of 1838; and, on my arrival in Europe, in the summer of 1840, I found it extensively known and duly appreciated. Mr. Prescott, following down the stream of Spanish history, had already conceived the project of writing, at some future period, the history of Philip II, after he should have narrated, in works to be prepared in the interval, the magnificent episodes of the "Conquests of Mexico and Peru." I remonstrated with him for passing over the reign of the Emperor Charles V; urging upon him, that the materials which had become accessible since Robertson's time, especially the archives of Simancas (the want of access to which was so much deplored by that author), would enable him to treat that period to as good advantage as that of Ferdinand and Isabella, or Philip. But he modestly persisted in thinking that the reign of Charles V was exhausted by Robertson. The supplementary chapter with which he has enriched the edition of Robertson's work, published under his supervision a few years since, is a sufficient proof that it would have been in his power to construct an original history of the reign of Charles V, which would have fully equalled in interest any that has been produced by him.

"He requested me to make some preliminary inquiries at Paris in reference to materials for Philip II, especially to obtain information as to the portion of the archives of Simancas which had been carried in the time of Napoleon to Paris, and were still detained there. No difficulty attended a thorough exploration of the rich materials in the royal library; but the papers from Simancas were guarded with greater care in the "Archives of the Kingdom." The whole of that celebrated national collection had been transported to Paris in the time of Napoleon; after his downfall, and in the general restoration, those portions of the archives which purported to relate to the history of France, were, in spite of the urgent and oft-repeated reclamations of the Spanish Government, retained in Paris. It was natural, under these circumstances, that they should be watched with some jealousy: but the name of Mr. Prescott was a key which unlocked the depository; and by the kindness of M. Mignet, who had himself examined them with diligence, they were fully thrown open to my inspection on his behalf.

"The same result followed a similar application at Florence the following year. Not only were the private collections of the Marquis Gino Caponi and the Count Guicciardini (the lineal descendant of the historian) thrown upen to the use of Mr. Prescott, but, after tedious hesitations and delays on the part of subordinate officials, a peremptory order was at length issued by Prince Corsini, with the consent of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, that I should be allowed to explore the Medicean archives (Archivo Mediceo), and mark for transcription whatever I thought would be useful for Mr. Prescott. When I add that this magnificent collection of eighty thousand volumes (since greatly augmented, as I learn from my friend Mr. Ticknor, by bringing together all the provincial archives of every part of the Grand Duchy), the examination of which was rendered easy by a copious index, contained the correspondence of the Tuscan minister at Madrid, during the entire reign of Philip II, it will be readily conceived how rich were the materials for the history of that period. Nothing that I marked for transcription was refused. It was sufficient that I thought it would be useful to Mr. Prescott; and among the portions of the correspondence which I was able in this way to procure for him, were the semi-weekly communications of the Tuscan minister on the arrest, imprisonment, and death of Don Carlos.

"That papers so delicate, guarded with such jealousy for three centuries, should have been fully thrown open by a Catholic sovereign to an American Protestant writer, bears witness at once to the liberality of the Grand Duke, and the European reputation of our lamented friend.

"Nor was his fame less promptly and substantially established in England. Calling one day on the venerable Mr. Thomas Grenville, whom I found in his library (the second in size and value of the private libraries of England), reading Xenophon's "Anabasis" in the original, I made some passing remark on the beauty of that work. 'Here,' said he, holding up a volume of 'Ferdinand and Isabella,' 'is one far superior.' With the exception of the Nestor of our literature (Mr. Irving), no American writer appeared to me so widely known or so highly esteemed in England as Mr. Prescott; and, when he visited that country a few years later, the honors paid to him by all the cultivated classes of society, from the throne downward, were such as are seldom offered to the most distinguished visitant."

So long as in ages far distant, and not only in countries now refined and polished, but in those not yet brought into the domain of civilization, the remarkable epoch which he has described shall attract the attention of men; so long as the consolidation of the

Spanish monarchy and the expulsion of the Moors, the mighty theme of the discovery of America, the sorrowful glories of Columbus, the mail-clad forms of Cortes and Pizarro and the other grim *conquistadores,* trampling new-found empires under the hoofs of their cavalry, shall be subjects of literary interest; so long as the blood shall curdle at the cruelties of Alva, and the fierce struggles of the Moslem in the east—so long will the writings of our friend be read."

"Finally, among the masters of historical writing, the few great names of ancient and modern renown in this department, our lamented friend and associate has passed to a place among the most honored and distinguished. Whenever this branch of polite literature shall be treated of by some future Bacon, and the names of those shall be repeated who have possessed in the highest degree that rare skill by which the traces of a great plan in the fortunes of mankind are explored, and the living body of a nation is dissected by the keen edge of truth, and guilty kings and guilty races summoned to the bar of justice, and the footsteps of God pointed out along the pathways of time, his name will be mentioned with the immortal trios of Greece and of Rome, and the few who in the modern languages stand out the rivals of their fame.

"No one can speak of our dear departed friend without recollecting the infirmity under which he laboured the greater part of his days, and with which Providence, in his case, applied the solemn law of compensation, by which the blessings of life are enjoyed, and endowments balanced by sorrows. To some it is given to ascend the heights of fame through the narrow and cheerless path of penury. Others toil patiently on beneath a load of domestic care and bereavement, the loss of the dutiful, the hopeful, and the beloved. For him that dares to intrude on public life (as our friend never did), ferocious detraction stands ready to fly at his throat, and petty malice to yelp at his heels. Our friend achieved the miracle of his unexampled success under the privation—at times the total privation—of the dearest of the senses—that through which the spirit of man is wedded to the lovely forms of the visible universe. At intervals, some years before he commenced his historical labours, for him, as for the kindred genius by whose example he tells us he took courage,

"Seasons returned; but not for him returned
Day, or the sweet approach of even or morn,
Or sight of vernal bloom, or summer's rose,
Or flocks, or herds, or human face divine."

"But he went from his darkened chamber and his couch of pain to his noble work, as a strong man rejoicing to run a race. A kind Providence at intervals raised the veil from his eyes, and his sweet resignation and heroic fortitude turned his trials into a blessing. His impaired sight gave him concentrated mental vision; and so he lived his great day, illustrious without an enemy, successful without an envier; wrought out his four historical epics to the admiration of the age; and passed away at the grand climacteric, not of years alone, but of love and fame."

The excellence of Mr. Prescott's productions is, in part, transparent to every reader. Compare what he has written with the most of what others have left on the same subjects, and Prescott's superiority beams upon you from the contrast. The easy flow of his language, and the faultless lucidity of his style, may make the reader forget the unremitting toil which the narrative has cost; but the critical inquirer sees everywhere the fruits of investigation rigidly and most perseveringly pursued, and an impartiality and soundness of judgment which give authority to every statement, and weight to every conclusion."

"In the writings of Prescott, his individual character is never thrust on the attention of his readers; but, as should ever be the case in a true work of art, it appears only in glimpses, or as an abstraction from the whole. Yet his personality is the source of the charm of his style, and all who knew him will say he was himself greater and better than his writings. While his histories prove him to have felt that he owed his time to the service of mankind, everything about him marked him out to be the most beloved of companions, and the life, and joy, and pride of society.

" His personal appearance itself was singularly pleasing, and won for him everywhere in advance a welcome and favor. His countenance had something that brought to mind " the beautiful disdain" that hovers on that of the Apollo. But, while he was high-spirited, he was tender, and gentle, and humane. His voice was like music, and one could never hear enough of it. His cheerfulness reached and animated all about him. He could indulge in playfulness, and could also speak earnestly and profoundly; but he knew not how to be ungracious or pedantic. In truth, the charms of his conversation were unequalled, he so united the rich stores of memory with the ease of one who is familiar with the world.

" In his friendships he was most faithful; true to them always, true to the last; never allowing his confidence to be so much as ruffled by the noisy clamours of calumny, or by rivalry, or by differences of opinion. In the management of his affairs he was prudent and considerate; in his expenditures, liberal to all about him, and to those in want, ever largely generous, having an open hand, but doing good without observation. His affections rested early and happily on the congenial object of his choice, and the rosy light of his youth, never dimmed by a cloud, went with him all his way through life.

"Brothers of the Historical Society, I see among you those who knew Prescott as a friend; we join the cultivated world in honouring his memory; we mingle our tears with those of his family. Standing as it were by his grave, we cannot recall anything in his manner, his character, his endowments, or his conduct, that we could wish changed. If he had faults, his associates loved him too well to find them out. We none of us know of his writing one line that he could wish to blot, or uttering a word of which the echo need be suppressed. Those of us who are growing old must bear in mind that he has gone but a little before us; his spirit speaks to you, young men, charging you to emulate him in the culture of intelligence and the practice of virtue."

PHILIP THE SECOND.

PHILIP THE SECOND*

FIRST NOTICE.

THE reign of Philip II is one of the most interesting in that very eventful period, the sixteenth century.

To the ordinary reader it will, doubtless, appear somewhat perplexing, on account of the vast extent of territory over which this monarch presided, and the important undertakings in which he was engaged; and still harder will it be to comprehend the difficulties which surrounded Philip, without first gaining some little insight into the previous history of the separate provinces over which he was destined to rule. Even the historian has no light task to perform in narrating the events of this remarkable reign, owing to the absence of documentary evidence, and to the conflicting statements of Catholics and Protestants, whose grave dissensions and persecutions disgraced this exciting period; for the character of every eminent man of that age was delineated by his peculiar historian according to the religious opinions which he entertained; and it has thus become a difficult matter to form a fair judgment on unprejudiced data.

Again, both the chronicler and reader of the present day will be forcibly struck with the amount of bigotry which existed three hundred years ago, and could make a man exclaim, with Philip, "*It is better not to reign at all, than govern heretics;*" and yet that the whole could have been blended with deep reflection, penetration, and wisdom in one and the same individual. Yet of such elements was the character of Philip II composed.

It must, however, be remembered that an intolerant spirit was, from the religious differences of the sixteenth century, the great and natural error into which men, though often possessed of great abilities and even great virtues, invariably fell. In Philip's case, this spirit was still further heightened by his early education, and by the gloomy and superstitious nature of his character. He was thus led by his bigotry and intolerance to undertake the long and unsuccessful Dutch war, which ended so disastrously for himself and his subjects.

---

* History of the Reign of Philip II, King of Spain, by William H. Prescott. Vol. I and II. London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street.

Surrounded by many difficulties,—hemmed in by conflicting opinions—all references to events of Philip's reign being alone accessible through the medium of old Spanish archives,—perplexed by the partiality of by-gone historians and the exaggerated homage of Philip's admirers,—Mr. Prescott has, nevertheless, contrived to furnish us with the best epitome of the life and times of Philip II that we are ever likely to possess. No historian could have been found better fitted than he to undertake so difficult a task, as his pen had already been occupied in describing the eventful reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella of Aragon and Castile, and the discoveries and conquests of Mexico and Peru by Cortes and Pizarro. The skill and care with which he has arranged his present work are equal, if not superior, to that displayed in his past writings. His vast research would have done credit to any historian, however learned, though it is rendered more remarkable by the fact that Mr. Prescott is almost blind. His style is clear, plain, and forcible, possessing the ease and fluency without the faults of an American: whilst his descriptions of the manners and customs of the sixteenth century are so well displayed in the different festivals he has to record, as to give to his work rather the character of an amusing novel than the sober narrative of grave historical fact.

He commences his work with an excellent recommendation, "that it will be necessary for the student, if he wishes to have a clue to this difficult reign, to bear in mind the fact that the chief feature of Philip's policy was to uphold the supremacy of the church, and, as a consequence, that of the Crown." "Peace and public order," as Philip declared, "are to be maintained in my dominions only by maintaining the authority of the Holy See."

Prescott then glances at the life of the Emperor Charles V, and tells us that the disasters which occurred at the latter part of that reign threw such a gloom over the spirits of the monarch and so disgusted him with the world, that he was obliged to relinquish the reins of government, and eventually to retire to the Monastery of Yuste, where he ended his days as a recluse.

The two or three chapters which are devoted to a consideration of the latter days of Charles V, coincide so fully with the able account so recently published by Mr. Sterling, that we cannot do better than recommend "The Cloister Life of Charles V" to our readers; and we shall now glean from Mr. Prescott's work some of the actualities of the life and times of Philip II, and give our readers a slight review of the peculiar and interesting events with which he was surrounded.

PHILIP II was born at Valladolid, on the 10th of May, in the year 1527, the same eventful year which witnessed the sacking of Rome by the Spaniards under the Constable de Bourbon, and the imprisonment of Pope Clement VII. His mother, a Portuguese princess of the name of Isabella, was the true and attached wife of the Emperor Charles V. She dying, however, whilst Philip was but twelve years old, the young prince was thereby early entrusted to the hands of strangers. The loss of a mother in early life is often more severely felt than that of a father; and in Philip's case it is likely that, had he not thus early been deprived of the tender cares of a mother, his character might have acquired much of that softness which the tender nature of a woman can alone give, and which would have gone far to have made Philip both a good as well as a great man; although we are not told what were the accomplishments of this princess, or whether she possessed any influence in the early formation of her son's mind.

Philip was distinguished even in childhood for his grave and reserved character, and showed none of the playfulness which is usually the accompaniment of early life. His education was conducted by a learned professor from the University of Salamanca, a man of considerable erudition, whose easy good-nature somewhat unfitted him for the difficult and onerous task he had to fulfil. However, he fairly instructed his young pupil in the Italian and Latin languages, and gave him a taste for the more abstruse and difficult study of mathematics; and the progress which Philip is said to have made in this latter study would tend to prove the thoughtful bias of his dawning mind, and no doubt fitted him, in after years, by reflection and calculation, to encounter graver difficulties.

In the year 1543, a great change took place in Philip's domestic relations. Charles V had for some time endeavoured to negotiate a marriage between his son and Margaret, the daughter of Francis I; but Philip's own inclination made him turn towards Portugal, and there to seek the hand of a Portuguese princess. After some little interval, we find him betrothed to Mary, daughter of John III, King of Portugal. Mary was escorted with great magnificence to Salamanca, where the marriage was celebrated. After which she took up her residence in Spain, in which country her husband had for some time administered the affairs of state during the absence of his father, Charles V. She did not, however, long survive the marriage, and left behind her one son, the ill-fated Don Carlos, who was afterwards imprisoned by order of his own father, and around whose death a mystery hangs which has never as yet been cleared away.

At the age of 21, Philip was presented by the Emperor to his subjects at Brussels. The young Prince accordingly set out by way of Genoa, attended by a splendid retinue of knights and nobles, at the head of which was the famous Duke of Alva, and reached Flanders, through Italy and Germany.

"After a journey of four months, the royal cavalcade drew near the city of Brussels. Their approach to a great town was intimated by the crowds who came out to welcome them, and Philip was greeted with a tumultuous enthusiasm, which made him feel that he was now indeed in the midst of his people."

The recognition between father and son is very touchingly described by Mr. Prescott, who expatiates on the affection and regard entertained by the royal father. Philip, at this period, must have been possessed of many personal charms, as we hear of his captivating the young and the fair, and calling forth the admiration of the knights and nobles, by his ready hand at tilt and tourney. He is described as of a fair and even delicate complexion; "his hair and beard were of a light yellow; his eyes were blue, with the eyebrows somewhat too closely knit together; his nose was thin and aquiline. The principal blemish in his countenance was his thick Austrian lip. His lower jaw protruded even more than that of his father. In stature he was somewhat below the middle height, with a slight symmetrical figure and well-made limbs. He was attentive to his dress, which was rich and elegant, but without any affectation of ornament. His demeanour was grave, without that ceremonious observance which marked the old Castilian, which may be thought the natural expression of Philip's slow and phlegmatic temperament."

Philip's reserved and haughty character made him unpopular with the Flemings, notwithstanding his good looks and his accomplishments; and their aversion lasted during his whole reign, and very much aggravated his arbitrary conduct towards them.

After a sojourn of some time in the northern provinces, he returned to Spain, and was every where well received, being by education and character a thorough Spaniard. The Emperor, his father, had committed a similar mistake in the education of Philip as had been made in that of Charles V—viz. surrounding the young prince with men of one nation, teaching him their language and institutions, and neglecting to inform him on those of the rest of his dominions.

Philip, soon after his return to Spain, again directed his thoughts to negotiations for another marriage, and sought a wife amongst the princesses of the royal house of Portugal. His father, the Emperor, however, had long been bent on obtaining for his darling son the hand of some more powerful princess, and therefore turned his views towards England, where Mary, daughter of his aunt, Catherine of Aragon, had just ascended the throne. This Queen is well known in history by the name of Bloody Queen Mary—a name she justly merited. We cannot, therefore, agree with our author in thinking that the epithet of bloody was not fully deserved, or that her faults were exaggerated by Protestant authors. Her religious zeal could have been no excuse for her cruel persecution of the Reformers; although she had sprung from a race of despots who had been alike cruel and capricious, yet they were far from being so terrible in their cruelties and religious persecutions as their kinswoman.

Mary, notwithstanding her ferocity of disposition, had possessed, in youth, personal charms and accomplishments, and had been carefully educated by her mother after the Spanish fashion. These accomplishments were greatly enhanced, in the eyes of Philip, by the fact of her holding the extreme and rigid feelings of a Catholic. The Emperor Charles V, the father of Philip, had himself been betrothed to her at an early age; and he only relinquished the idea of obtaining her hand when his negotiations with the Portuguese Infanta, Isabella, were likely to prove successful. Having always looked with the greatest interest on Queen Mary, and having many times assisted her with his advice and counsel, he naturally desired a closer connexion with her person and her country. All hope being now destroyed of obtaining her hand for himself, he commenced a negotiation on behalf of his son; and Renard, the Spanish Ambassador at the English court, was instructed to "sound the Queen's inclinations on the subject; but so as not to alarm her. He was to dwell particularly on the advantages she would derive from a connexion with some powerful foreign prince, and to offer his master's counsel in this or any other matter in which she might desire it."

It proved, however, no easy task to negotiate so important a match, as Mary had never seen Philip, and was already somewhat attracted by the handsome person and winning manners of her kinsman, the Earl of Devon. Renard's skill in all these difficulties ultimately succeeded, although the marriage of Philip and Mary was any thing but a popular measure in England; for when a rumour of it reached the ears of the Commons, they petitioned the Queen that she should not marry a foreigner, as that would bring great evils on the commonwealth; and suggested that she might find many amongst her own subjects worthy of the honour of her hand. The Queen replied in person, and told them "that from God she held her crown, and that to Him alone would she turn for counsel in a matter so important. She had not yet made up her mind to marry; but since the Commons considered it so necessary for the weal of the kingdom, she would take it into consideration;—it was a matter in which no one was so much interested as herself."

Egmont, one of the most distinguished of the Flemish nobles, was forthwith despatched to England, bearing a formal proposal from Philip for the hand of Mary, which was at once accepted, and the preliminaries of a marriage drawn up. It will be unnecessary for us to enter into this period of the life of Philip, further than to state that he visited England and espoused Mary, that the nuptials were solemnised at Winchester with great magnificence, and that his liberality and affability considerably increased his popularity, and dispelled the gloomy apprehensions of the English people. This popularity, however, lasted but a short period, as the characters of the Spaniard and the English were so different that jealousy soon sprang up between them; while the King augmented this dislike by his own personal reserve, and the difficulty which was invariably offered to all who desired access to his person.

Mary now began the work of violently restoring the Roman Catholic religion in England; and Cardinal Pole was sent as legate from the Holy See to assist her in her pious work. The Parliament being assembled, the Queen found little difficulty in persuading them to adopt vigorous measures; and the nation was thus cajoled back into the bosom of that Church which it had previously resisted and abandoned. This conduct on the part of many of the people caused great dissatisfaction, and occasioned riots and confusion throughout the country; and strong measures were resorted to by the Crown to restore tranquillity and obedience.

It has never been clearly ascertained what part Philip took in the dreadful persecutions that followed, though many writers have affirmed that he even urged the establishment of the Inquisition in England. Mr. Prescott, however, remarks that Philip wisely abstained from meddling in the affairs of the country at this period, and was appointed, in reward for his prudence, Regent, during the supposed pregnancy of the Queen. But, much as an heir to the throne of England was desired, both the expectations and hopes of the people were doomed to disappointment, notwithstanding the prayers and supplications offered up by the Church and by Mary's warmest admirers. Disappointed of a son, and enjoying little real authority, Philip appears to have been so disgusted with England that he determined to quit the country, and to take up his residence in the Netherlands, where he could exercise greater power and obtain a larger field for the display of his administrative talent, untiring energy, and crafty diplomacy.

The most amiable feature of Philip's character, during his residence in England, was the kindness which he evinced as intercessor between Mary and her sister Elizabeth, whose close confinement, on account of her Protestant opinions, gave rise to much general sympathy. It will appear strange that so Catholic a king as Philip should have commenced his warlike policy with a campaign against that Church for which he had so often expressed an unbounded devotion. It is, however, but just to add, that it was a war "not of Philip's seeking." The cause is well explained by Mr. Prescott, who, in describing the life of Paul IV, the then Pope, states that Paul needed no prompter to quarrel with Spain; for that, immediately on his elevation to the Papal chair, he "soon showed that, instead of ecclesiastical reform, he was bent on a project much nearer his heart—*The subversion of the Spanish power in Naples.* He seemed to think that the thunders of the Vatican were more than a match for all the strength of the Emperor and of Spain; but he was not weak enough to rely wholly on his spiritual artillery in such a contest. Through the French Ambassador, at his court, he opened negotiations with France, and entered into a secret treaty with that power, by which each of the parties agreed to furnish a certain contingent of men and money to carry on the war for the recovery of Naples."

The expedition was entrusted to the famous Duke of Alva, then Viceroy of Naples, and the most competent general which Spain possessed. As he plays a great part in the life and times of Philip II, Mr. Prescott has given us a thorough insight into his life and character. Descended from a rich Castilian family, we find that he entered the world in the year 1508. Early in life he was deprived of the counsel of his father, who died in Africa, and left him to the care of his grandfather, under whom he witnessed his first military campaign. By the death of his uncle, in 1532, he became possessed of large family estates, and from that time fully displayed the heroic courage of the Castilian cavalier, combined with a degree of caution which often made his comrades wonder *"how so old a head could be placed on such young shoulders."* His haughty temper made him disdain the usual means of advancement at court; though the Emperor Charles V, who thoroughly understood his character, rapidly promoted him to high command.

It was proved, at the siege of Metz, that the confidence of the Emperor had been well placed ; for Alva ably distinguished himself in that action.

Alva's iron nature, however, fitted him far better to rule over a country in which absolute power existed, and in which vigorous measures were required to carry on the government, than to administer a state which had long been under the sway of liberal institutions, especially at a period of ordinary tranquillity; for it was his uncompromising disposition which afterwards made him so unpopular in the Netherlands.

Having collected a large body of troops, the greater portion of which consisted of raw Neapolitan levies, and which were as much to be relied upon, and as remarkable for their bravery, as their countrymen of the present day, together with a small body of his Spanish veterans (a host in themselves), he marched with this force into the Papal territory, took town after town, until he nearly reached the gates of Rome—menacing the haughty but trembling Pontiff within his own capital.

The French Ambassador offered to mediate between his Holiness and the Spaniards; but Paul would hear of nothing like mediation, threatening to cut off the head of any one who should talk to him of such a measure. The Pope did not, however, confine himself to angry words; but busied his people in active preparations for the coming struggle, fortified the city, and made considerable levies of Roman troops. These Papal forces, though of good appearance on parade, were found to be a poor match for the Spanish veterans; and Paul was consequently obliged to have recourse to the German mercenaries at that period in his pay, most of whom, being Protestants, did not greatly respect either his Holiness or his religion, though it would not have done for Paul to have been over scrupulous as to his means of defence in such dangerous times.

Several well-fought and bloody actions took place between the Papal and Spanish troops. The Pope did not entirely rely upon his own army; but pressed Henry of France to hasten the departure of the French army for Italy, at the head of which the Duke of Guise had been appointed. Guise was one of the ablest of French commanders, and had successfully contended with Alva at the seige of Metz. He marched over the Alps into Italy; but did not win many laurels in that country, as an accommodation was soon after brought about between Paul and Philip II, much to the gratification of the latter, who had all along suffered qualms of conscience in thus being opposed to the Holy See.

The presence of the Duke of Guise being required in his own country, he was forthwith recalled; as the Duke of Savoy, Philip's general, and one of the ablest leaders of that age, had, after making a feint on Champaigne, invaded Picardy, and met the rash but brave Constable, Montmorency, at St. Quentin, on the 11th of August, 1557. The action was commenced by a charge of light cavalry under Egmont, whose dashing courage fitted him rather to execute the orders of a chief than to undertake the responsibilities of a separate command. The Schwarzreiters, or German mercenaries, soon yielded; but the French infantry most gallantly held their ground. The Duke of Savoy, however, coming up with the whole of the Spanish army, the French were at length overcome by superior numbers, after a hard-fought battle of ten hours, and Montmorency, together with several officers of note, taken prisoners.

Philip, in order to commemorate this battle, which was gained by the Spaniards on the fête of St. Lawrence, built the famous Palace of the Escorial, which he constructed in the shape of the Gridiron on which St. Lawrence had suffered martyrdom. Philip, according to Mr. Prescott, is stated to have shown a taste for architecture in the construction of this dull and heavy pile; and our author likewise remarks, in an earlier part of his work, that Philip possessed "enough of architectural knowledge for a king." We think that, when Mr. Prescott ventured on this observation, he did not sufficiently reflect how much the character and even the tastes of the princes and courts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries influenced those of the people. A great or an elegant prince often imparted his lustre or his refinement to his subjects; and although we do not mean to assert that a thorough knowledge of architecture was indispensably necessary to a monarch of that period, yet the encouragement of it would have tended to the advancement and refinement of his subjects. No more princely taste could have been indulged in by Philip, as it would have surrounded the throne with that magnificence and splendour which give it respect in the eyes of the vulgar, and his name could not have been better immortalized than by erecting some elegant monument of architectural taste and perfection. This end is certainly not attained in the Escorial.

Philip now endeavoured to drag England into the continental war, and his efforts for a time proved successful; as Mary whose best quality was the warm attachment which she entertained towards her husband, and the great anxiety for the success of all his undertakings, sent as many as eight thousand men, under the Earl of Pembroke, to join Philip's army. This proved an important accession, though the English troops soon became so discontented at fighting, as they said, the battles of the Spaniards instead of their own, that it was soon found necessary to allow them to return home again.

Another brilliant victory soon after gained over the French by the Count Egmont, at a place called Gravelines, so enraged the Duke of Guise, that he swore, at the risk of his life, to wipe away these stains from the French arms, and to attempt the capture of Calais, the only remaining possession held at that time by the English on the soil of France, and which had been retained by them ever since the reign of Edward III. The long tenure of Calais by the English had made them neglectful of the proper defences of the fortress; they, notwithstanding the constant and urgent representations of Philip, considered its position impregnable. The Duke of Guise, in consequence, easily made himself master of the place, and thus terminated the campaign by a brilliant achievement.

Philip and Henry of France, whose finances were in any thing but a flourishing condition, were mutually anxious for peace, being aware that neither had any great end to gain by a continuation of the war. The hot-headed Constable de Montmorency, who was by this time tired of his long imprisonment, opened negotiations on the part of his master, which were afterwards continued by more able agents, at *Cateau Cambresis*, where the Duke of Alva, the Prince of Orange, and Cardinal Granvelle, on the part of Philip, ably distinguished themselves. The whole of the dominions of the Duke of Savoy which had been conquered during the war were restored, and Philip's allies regained what they had lost in the contest.

Fortune was somewhat a harder goddess to Henry, who did not come off better in negotiation than he had done in war, the claims of his allies being neglected, and he himself only compensated for the expense and defeats of war by the cession of Calais.

Philip, we are told, found great difficulty in persuading the English envoy to relinquish Calais; and, in the midst of negotiations on this point, Mary, Queen of England, died. It was at length settled that Calais should be yielded up to the French, be retained by them for the period of five years, and that it should then either be restored to the English, or else that the conquerors should pay the sum of five thousand crowns in gold as a compensation.

Although the Emperor Charles V had abdicated the imperial throne of Germany soon after that of Spain and the Low Countries, he was still considered Emperor, as Philip little desired that a new Emperor should be crowned during the disturbed state in which Europe then existed. Charles V had in vain endeavoured to induce the electors to appoint his son Philip, King of the Romans; and, with as little success, attempted to persuade his brother Ferdinand to relinquish that dignity in favour of his nephew. Philip's character was still less suited to the Germans than to the Flemings, as it is probable that, had he been crowned Emperor of Germany, he would have annulled the concessions to the Protestants made by his father at the treaty of Passau, in 1550, and have endeavoured to reduce the princes of the Empire to the same condition as the nobles in the other countries of Europe, and have thus hastened the disasters of the thirty years' war a century earlier than they actually occurred. However, since the advantageous peace of Cateau Cambresis had been signed, there was nothing to hinder the coronation of the Emperor from taking place; and Ferdinand, the uncle of Philip, duly received the insignia of the Empire, and was crowned with great splendour.

An entirely new set of actors now took possession of the stage. The haughty Pontiff, Paul IV, no longer lived, having passed away without the regret of his subjects; though history looks somewhat lightly on his faults, and admires the courage he displayed in attempting to carry out the policy of Julius II, by driving the barbarians from Italy. His ally, Henry II of France, whose brilliant qualities rather gave him popularity amongst his subjects than fame amongst his contemporaries, had been killed at a tournament, in the yeary 1559; and, in England, the Bloody Queen Mary had been succeeded by her sister Elizabeth, one of the wisest princesses whom that or any other age had produced.

Philip, as is well known, no sooner heard of Elizabeth's accession, than he at once made proposals of marriage to his deceased wife's sister; and was not at first rejected, though his advances were but coldly received. It was not, however, until he made it a *sine qua non* that the Queen should adopt the Roman Catholic religion in the event of becoming his wife, that she decidedly refused his advances; from which period, Elizabeth became the staunch upholder of the Protestant religion, and consequently the bitterest enemy of the Catholic Philip. Philip remained in the Netherlands for some time after the peace was proclaimed, and occupied himself in the affairs of that country, where the Protestant religion was making great progress.

Mr. Prescott has thought proper to give us some account of the early history and government of the Low Countries, in which he has shown great research; for, although the general reader might have been perfectly aware that the towns of Liege, Ghent, Bruges, Antwerp, and Amsterdam, were the great marts for the exchange of goods from the Hanse towns and the North, for those of the Republics of Venice and Genoa, India and the Levant; yet, until his history appeared, there was no book which gave a clear account of their early government and languages.

Mr. Hume had cursorily informed us, in his History of England, that our Edward III joined the courts of Heinault and Brabant, and aided the people of Flanders in their revolt against their Count and liege lord, Philip VI; and also states, in the earlier portion of his work, that two of the Flemish counts were celebrated in the wars of the Crusades. It was not, however, the object of Mr. Hume to enter very fully into an account of the Flemish government; though the readers of his History may gain from his brief notice of their doings that the Flemings were early distinguished for their free and independent spirit.

Sir W. Scott has also, in his amusing novel of Quentin Durward, ably described the courts and policy of Louis XI of France, and Charles the Bold of Burgundy, and has furnished us with many interesting particulars of Flemish manners and customs. He enters into a very full description of the contests which took place between the good Burghers of Liege and their Bishop; but as his work is a novel and not a history, he could not well afford to give any previous account of the country.

Bentivoglio, a contemporary historian, who lived about the time of the Dutch war, and wrote his famous history of that very celebrated contest, although he enters very fully into the motives which led to its commencement, and gives almost word for word the speeches of the Prince of Eboli and the Duke of Alva, at the council board, when their opinions were demanded upon the measures about to be taken against the Protestants in Holland, yet does not give us any very clear idea of what either the previous Flemish government had been, or what it was at the time when this famous struggle began. It was reserved, therefore, for Mr. Prescott, with his clear judgment, untiring industry, and amusing style, to give us an early sketch of these important provinces of the Spanish monarchy. It would appear, from his account, that they were not originally united together, but that each followed its own mode of constitution; though all seem to have had a legislative body, some more liberally formed than others. They also differed in language, as the inhabitants of those states which bordered on France spoke French as their native language; whilst those who were in the vicinity of Germany used a kind of bad German, which is now known by the name of Dutch. The affairs of the whole community were administered by the States General, which were composed of the nobles, the clergy, and deputies from different states or towns. Their powers seem to have been much the same as the Parliament in

England; as they could pass laws, levy taxes, and petition the sovereign against abuses. The sovereign nevertheless held in his hands the appointment of officers and the conferring of all dignities; and was thus enabled, towards the sixteenth century, to acquire a very large share of power. The towne were, however, very much left to their own government; and, as Mr. Prescott well remarks, "they greatly remind us of the early Italian republics."

The Flemings do not seem to have been much engaged in war with their neighbours, as they were more profitably employed in commerce; and the common people were remarkable for a freedom of spirit and a degree of information rarely to be met with in the same class amongst the other nations of Europe at that period. The vast territories of the Emperor Charles V, coupled with the fact that he himself was a Fleming, gave great extension to their trade in all parts of the world. This sagacious prince could not but be aware that his own power would increase in the same ratio as the prosperity of his subjects, and he therefore gave all due encouragement to their commerce and enterprise; and under his sway the Flemish increased both in wealth and prosperity. It was not to be wondered at that, with their foreign trade, their independent spirit, and their proximity to Germany, where the Reformation first took its rise, that the Lutheran doctrines should have made great progress; and it was still less to be expected that a prince like Charles V, who connected the idea of Protestantism with civil liberty, and who had used his most strenuous efforts to put down the Lutheran princes in Germany, would sit calmly by and see the reformed faith taking deep root without making an attempt to stem its torrent. We, accordingly, find that he promulgated several edicts against those who held the new doctrines, and even attempted to establish the Inquisition in the Netherlands, although such a proceeding was in direct violation of the constitution. As many as fifty thousand persons are said to have suffered in the Netherlands for their religious opinions; but we quite agree with Mr. Prescott in thinking it unlikely that such a number could have been sacrificed for their creed, as it would have occasioned a similar resistance to Charles's authority as was afterwards encountered by his son. Notwithstanding this religious oppression, and the numerous efforts Charles was obliged to make to curb the turbulent spirit of his Flemish subjects, he nevertheless was proud of them, and governed them with comparative leniency; whilst they, in return, loved, admired, and respected their great monarch, being willing to bear the burdens of the wars in which they took but little part, and from which they could derive but scanty advantage. Many of their leaders, however, in the subsequent struggle with Spain, had learned their first lessons in war and politics under Charles V; while, with his son, the case was far otherwise. Philip was a foreigner, and having been brought up a Spaniard, he, no doubt, looked with contempt on the Flemings, and would have attempted to reduce them to greater subjection, even in their civil governments, had they been all staunch Catholics; but he was still a more uncompromising supporter of the Catholic Church than his father had been; and never allowed reasons of policy to stand between him and his darling object of rendering the Roman Catholic faith the one universal religion of his dominions.

SECOND NOTICE.

When such high authorities as the *Times*, the *Edinburgh*, and the *Saturday Review*, have admitted that Prescott's Philip II displays deep research, great clearness in arrangement, and perspicuity of style, we fear that there is little left for us to say. As we cannot, however, agree in all the views propounded by these journals, though we must fully concur in considering Mr. Prescott's History one of the most important productions of the age, as well as a valuable addition to the annals of the most interesting periods of bygone time, which, until very recently, was shrouded in mystery and uncertainty, we are bound to express *our* own opinions on the subject.

The retaining the services of a large body of Spanish troops in the Low Countries during a period of profound peace, on the pretext that the treaty of Cateau Cambresis had not been fully ratified; their oppression and tyranny towards the unfortunate inhabitants, in order to indemnify themselves for their arrears of pay; and the adoption of several beneficial, but unpopular, ecclesiastical reforms, which were rather looked upon as a veil to hide Philip's evil intentions of restoring the Inquisition in its full rigour; made the Flemish people most discontented and loud in their call for the assembling of the States General. This deliberative assembly was at length convoked, though the turbulent and refractory spirit of its members obliged the King to re-dissolve it almost as soon as it had assembled; and this unfortunate circumstance probably had the effect of driving him from the Low Countries, which he soon abandoned, never to return.

Margaret, Duchess of Parma, his natural sister, was forthwith appointed Regent in Flanders, and Philip withdrew from his important northern possessions, and with great pomp embarked at Ostend for his beloved Spain, in the presence of the Prince of Orange and several other Flemish nobles, who afterwards played so important a part in the contest for the independence of their country. Philip, encountering the most tempestuous weather in his passage across the Bay, only succeeded in saving his own life, and that of his crew, by landing at Laredo, on the coast of Spain, where the vessel, with its valuable freight of furniture, was all but stranded. Nine of his fleet foundered, and all the furniture, gems, pieces of sculpture, and paintings, "the rich productions of Flemish and Italian art, which his father the Emperor had been employed many years of his life in collecting," went to the bottom; and Philip had thus, as Mr. Prescott remarks, "sacked the land only to feed the ocean."

On arriving in Spain, Philip despatched a messenger to his sister Joanna, who had been left as Regent at Valladolid during the King's absence in Flanders, and at once repaired to the capital, where he was gladly received by the Infanta, and joyfully grasped the reins of his favourite government.

The royal return was celebrated by one of those cruel religious festivals, an "*auto de fé*," the terrors of which have been most painfully and graphically described by Mr. Prescott with all the glowing powers of his able pen. The reformed faith, in spite of severe Catholic persecution, had made considerable progress in Spain, owing, in some measure, to the fact of the troops, who had been employed in the German wars, and who had fought side by side with Protestant Flemings, having imbibed and brought back into Spain the religious doctrines of their Protestant comrades; and partly to the close intercourse and reciprocal trade which was continually being carried on between the northern provinces of Spain and the south of France, and which enabled the reformers easily to dispatch missionaries, make converts, and smuggle over the frontier books and religious tracts for the dissemination of the reformed faith. The Protestants carried on their plans with so much secrecy and caution that the first intimation which the Spanish inquisitors received of the spread of the new heresy was from their brethren abroad; and it was not until some of the prohibited books had been seized, that the Holy Office or the government were aware even of the existence of Protestantism in Spain. It was then discovered that the new doctrine had made advances little short of miraculous; aad the government, and particularly Philip, set to work most resolutely to crush the power of the reformed sect, and to devise most vigorous measures against all classes of dissenters from the Church of Rome. The Protestants, among whom were many persons of rank and eminence, both among the clergy and laity, were seized and imprisoned in considerable numbers; and, amidst the joyous shouts of the Catholic multitudes of the Spanish towns, the roar of artillery, and the denunciations of bishops and priests, were committed by that unjust and relentless tribunal, the Inquisition, to the tortures and the sad and cruel death of the fiery stake. Philip himself is said to have been so determined to put down Protestantism, that he exclaimed, to one of the most eminent and unfortunate of the victims: "If it were my own son, I would bring the wood to burn him, if he were such a wretch as thou art." As Mr. Prescott well remarks, these severe measures had the effect of thoroughly curbing the independent spirit of the brave and chivalrous Spanish people, both in civil and religious matters, and of fixing their minds so strongly upon the traditions and manners of the past, as not only to prevent their making any advance in constitutioual or religious liberty, but to cause the decline of their literature and civilization. It is singular that a people who, as Mr. Hallum informs us, were one of the first nations in Europe to obtain a charter of civil rights, should also be the first to lose their freedom. We may here observe that even France, not unfrequently quoted as a land of liberty and freedom, has been deprived of her real liberty chiefly from having fallen into the opposite extreme of abolishing all her ancient institutions, and replacing them by modern innovations. England and America, on the other hand, owe their present constitution, their superiority over the rest of the world in literature, science, trade, and manufactures, to having blended the traditions of the past with their schemes of modern reform and improvement. We cannot do better, in concluding this portion of our subject, than give our readers an extract from the pages of Mr. Prescott's work, in which he most painfully describes the horrors of the inquisition and the sufferings of its victims.

"The *auto de fé*—'act of faith'—was the most imposing, as it was the most awful, of the solemnities authorized by the Roman Catholic Church. It was intended, somewhat profanely, as has been intimated, to combine the pomp of the Roman triumph with the terrors of the day of judgment. It may remind one quite as much of those bloody festivals prepared for the entertainment of the Cæsars in the Collisæum. The religious import of the *auto de fé* was intimated by the circumstance of its being celebrated on a Sunday, or some other holiday of the Church. An indulgence for forty days was granted by his holiness to all who should be present at the spectacle; as if the appetite for witnessing the scenes of human suffering required to be stimulated by a bounty; that too in Spain, where the amusements were, and still are, of the most sanguinary character.

"The scene for this second *auto de fé* at Valladolid was the great square in front of the church of St. Francis. At one end a platform was raised, covered with rich carpeting, on which were ranged the seats of the inquisitors, emblazoned with the arms of the Holy Office. Near to this was the royal gallery, a private entrance to which secured the inmates from molestation by the crowd. Opposite to this gallery a large gallery was erected, so as to be visible from all parts of the arena, and was appropriated to the unhappy martyrs who were to suffer in the *auto*.

"At six in the morning all the bells in the capital began to toll, and a solemn procession was seen to move from the dismal fortress of the Inquisition. In the van marched a body of troops, to secure a free passage for the procession. Then came the condemned, each attended by two familiars of the Holy Office, and those who were to suffer at the stake by two friars, in addition, exhorting the heretic to abjure his errors. Those admitted to penitence wore a sable dress; while the unfortunate martyr was enveloped in a loose sack of yellow cloth,—the *san benito*,—with his head surmounted by a cap of pasteboard of a conical form, which, together with the cloak, was embroidered with figures of flames and of devils fanning and feeding them; all emblematical of the destiny of the heretic's soul in the world to come, as well as of his body in the present. Then came the magistrates of the city, the judges of the courts, the ecclesiastical orders, and the nobles of the land, on horseback. These were followed by the members of the dread tribunal, and the fiscal, bearing a standard of crimson damask, on one side of which were displayed the arms of the Inquisition, and on the other the insignia of its founders, Sixtus the Fifth and Ferdinand the Catholic. Next came a numerous train of familiars, well mounted, among whom were many of the gentry of the province, proud to act as the body-guard of the Holy Office. The rear was brought up by an immense concourse of the common people, stimulated on the present occasion, no doubt, by the loyal desire to see their new sovereign, as well as by the ambition to share in the triumphs of the *auto de fé*. The numbers thus drawn together from the capital and the country, far exceeding what was usual on such occasions, is estimated by one present at full two hundred thousand.

"As the multitude defiled into the square, the inquisitors took their place on the seats prepared for their reception. The condemned were conducted to the scaffold, and the royal station was occupied by Philip, with the different members of his household. At his side sat his sister, the late regent, his son Don Carlos, his nephew Alexander Farnese, several foreign ambassadors, and the principal grandees and higher ecclesiastics in attendance on the court. It was an august assembly of the greatest and the proudest in the land. But the most indifferent spectator, who had a spark of humanity in his bosom, might have turned with feelings of admiration from this array of worldly power, to the poor martyr, who, with no support but what he drew from within, was prepared to defy this power, and to lay down his life in vindication of the rights of conscience. Some there may have been, in that large concourse, who shared in these sentiments. But their number was small indeed in comparison with those who looked on the wretched victim as the enemy of God, and his approaching sacrifice as the most glorious triumph of the Cross.

"The ceremonies began with a sermon,—'the sermon of the faith,' by the Bishop of Zamora. The subject of it may well be guessed, from the occasion. It was no doubt plentifully larded with texts of Scripture, and, unless the preacher departed from the fashion of the time, with passages from the heathen writers, however much out of place they may seem in an orthodox discourse.

"When the bishop had concluded, the grand-inquisitor administered an oath t the assembled multitude, who on their knees solemnly swore to defend the Inquisition, to maintain the purity of the faith, and to inform against any one who should swerve from it. As Philip repeated an oath of similar import, he suited the action to the word, and, rising from his seat, drew his sword from its scabbard, as if to announce himself the determined champion of the Holy Office. In the earlier *autos* of the Moorish and Jewish infidels, so humiliating an oath had never been exacted from the sovereign.

"After this, the secretary of the tribunal read aloud an instrument reciting the grounds for the conviction of the prisoners, and the respective sentences pronounced against them. Those who were to be admitted to penitence, each, as his sentence was proclaimed, knelt down, and, with his hands on the missal, solemnly abjured his errors, and was absolved by the grand-inquisitor. The absolution, however, was not so entire as to relieve the offender from the penalty of his transgressions in this world. Some were doomed to perpetual imprisonment in the cells of the

Inquisition, others to lighter penances. All were doomed to the confiscation of their property—a point of too great moment to the welfare of the tribunal ever to be omitted. Besides this, in many cases the offender, and, by a glaring perversion of justice, his immediate descendants, were rendered for ever ineligible to public office of any kind, and their names branded with perpetual infamy. Thus blighted in fortune and in character, they were said, in the soft language of the Inquisition, to be *reconciled*.

"As these unfortunate persons were remanded, under a strong guard, to their prisons, all eyes were turned on the little company of martyrs, who, clothed in the ignominious garb of the *san benito*, stood waiting the sentence of their judges—with cords round their necks, and in their hands a cross, or sometimes an inverted torch, typical of their own speedy dissolution. The interest of the spectators was still further excited, in the present instance, by the fact that several of these victims were not only illustrious for their rank, but yet more so for their talents and virtues. In their haggard looks, their emaciated forms, and too often, alas! their distorted limbs, it was easy to read the story of their sufferings in their long imprisonment, for some of them had been confined in the dark cells of the Inquisition much more than a year. Yet their countenances, though haggard, far from showing any sign of weakness or fear, were lighted up with the glow of holy enthusiasm, as of men prepared to seal their testimony with their blood.

When that part of the process showing the grounds of their conviction had been read, the grand inquisitor consigned them to the hands of the corregidor of the city, beseeching him to deal with the prisoners *in all kindness and mercy;* a honeyed, but most hypocritical phrase, since no choice was left to the civil magistrate but to execute the terrible sentence of the law against heretics, the preparations for which had been made by him a week before.

"The whole number of convicts amounted to thirty, of whom sixteen were *reconciled*, and the remainder *relaxed* to the secular arm—in other words, turned over to the civil magistrate for execution. There were few of those thus condemned who, when brought to the stake, did not so far shrink from the dreadful doom that awaited them as to consent to purchase a commutation of it by confession before they died; in which case, they were strangled by the *garrote* before their bodies were thrown into the flames.

"Of the present number there were only two whose constancy triumphed to the last over the dread of suffering, and who refused to purchase any mitigation of it by a compromise with conscience. The names of these martyrs should be engraven on the record of history.

"One of them was Don Carlos de Sesso, a noble Florentine, who had stood high in the favour of Charles the Fifth. Being united with a lady of rank in Castile, he removed to that country, and took up his residence in Valladolid. He had become a convert to the Lutheran doctrines, which he first communicated to his own family, and afterwards showed equal zeal in propagating among the people of Valladolid and its neighbourhood. In short, there was no man to whose untiring and intrepid labours the cause of the Reformed religion in Spain was more indebted. He was, of course, a conspicuous mark for the Inquisition.

"During the fifteen months in which he lay in its gloomy cells, cut off from human sympathy and support, his constancy remained unshaken. The night preceding his execution, when his sentence had been announced to him, De Sesso called for writing materials. It was thought he designed to propitiate his judges by a full confession of his errors. But the confession he made was of another kind. He insisted on the errors of the Romish Church, and avowed his unshaken trust in the great truths of the Reformation. The document, covering two sheets of paper, is pronounced by the secretary of the Inquisition to be a composition equally remarkable for its energy and precision When led before the royal gallery, on his way to the place of execution, De Sesso pathetically exclaimed to Philip, "Is it thus that you allow your innocent subjects to be persecuted?" To which the king made the memorable reply: "If it were my own son, I would fetch the wood to burn him, were he such a wretch as thou art!" It was certainly a characteristic answer.

"At the stake De Sesso showed the same unshaken constancy, bearing his testimony to the truth of the great cause for which he gave up his life. As the flames crept slowly around him, he called on the soldiers to heap up the fagots, that his agonies might be sooner ended; and his executioners, indignant at the obstinacy—the heroism—of the martyr, were not slow in obeying his commands.

"The companion and fellow-sufferer of De Sesso was Domingo de Roxas, son of the Marquis de Poza, an unhappy noble, who had seen five of his family, including his eldest son, condemned to various humiliating penances by the inquisition for their heretical opinions. This one was now to suffer death. De Roxas was a Dominican monk. It is singular that this order, from which the ministers of the Holy Office were particularly taken, furnished many proselytes to the Reformed religion. De Roxas, as was the usage with ecclesiastics, was allowed to retain his sacerdotal habit until his sentence had been read, when he was degraded from his ecclesiastical rank, his vestments were stripped off one after another, and the hideous dress of the *san benito* thrown over him, amid the shouts and derision of the populace. Thus apparelled, he made an attempt to address the spectators around the scaffold; but no sooner did he begin to raise his voice against the errors and cruelties of Rome, than Philip indignantly commanded him to be gagged. The gag was a piece of cleft wood, which, forcibly compressing the tongue, had the additional advantage of causing great pain, while it silenced the offender. Even when he was bound to the stake, the gag, though contrary to custom, was suffered to remain in the mouth of De Roxas, as if his enemies dreaded the effects of an eloquence that triumphed over the anguish of death.

"The place of execution—the *quemadero*, the burning-place, as it was called—was a spot selected for the purpose without the walls of the city. Those who attended an *auta de fé* were not therefore necessarily, as is commonly imagined, spectators of the tragic scene that concluded it. The great body of the people, and many of higher rank, no doubt followed to the place of execution. On this occasion, there is reason to think, from the language—somewhat equivocal, it is true—of Philip's biographer, that the monarch chose to testify his devotion to the Inquisition by witnessing in person the appalling close of the drama; while his guards mingled with the menials of the Holy Office, and heaped up the fagots round their victims.

"Such was the cruel exhibition which, under the garb of a religious festival, was thought the most fitting ceremonial for welcoming the Catholic monarch to his dominions! During the whole time of its duration in the public square, from six in the morning till two in the afternoon, no symptom of impatience was exhibited by the spectators, and, as may well be believed, no sign of sympathy for the sufferers. It would be difficult to devise a better school for perverting the moral sense, and deadening the sensibilities of a nation.

From the gloomy picture of Spanish decay, and the annals of religious cruelty and civil oppression, Mr. Prescott turns to the bright and more attractive details of the marriage of Philip with Elizabeth de Valois, daughter of the King of France, or, as she is better known in Spanish history, as Isabella. Originally betrothed to Don Carlos, she had been transferred to Philip as a compensation for his ill-success with Elizabeth of England, and formed one of the stipulations included in the treaty of Cateau Cambresis. The nuptials were celebrated with great pomp at Paris, the illustrious Alva officiating as proxy for his royal master. On the entrance of the queen into Spain, she was received, at Toledo, by the Duke of Medina Sidonia, who, by his wealth, was able to display in private life the gorgeous magnificence of the old feudal barons of the middle ages. Arrived at the Spanish Court, Isabella was received by Philip with all the warmth and kindness which his morose and gloomy nature would admit of; being perhaps the only one of his four wives for whom he experienced a true attachment. Being only seventeen at the period of her marriage, she was indeed young to enter a court so filled with intrigues and so completely under the rule of priests and fanatics. Moreover, she is described as gay and lively, possessing pleasing manners and a somewhat handsome countenance. These qualities gained for her popularity with strangers and sympathy amongst her subjects, in whose prejudices and mode of living she easily and gracefully participated, although they were vastly different from the gay associations of her youth.

On hearing the news of this marriage, the Queen of England is said to have put on a well-feigned surprise and indignation, and, turning to the Spanish Ambassador, who announced to Her Majesty the news of Philip's engagement, remarked, with anger, "*So your master was so impatient that he has been unable to wait longer than four months ere he proposed to another woman.*"

The alliance with Isabella greatly strengthened the Catholic influence in France, which Philip was often called upon to aid with men and money,—his ablest generals being frequently interrupted in the midst of their most important operations in the Low Countries, to march to the assistance of the unsuccessful French Catholics.

Some time after the marriage of Isabella, Philip desired that she should visit her mother, the famous Catherine de Medicis, at Bayonne, and took the opportunity which that occasion afforded of negotiating with Catherine, through the Duke of Alva, the preliminaries of that terrible and vindictive blow at the Protestant faith, the massacre of the Huguenots on the feast of St. Bartholomew. The King of Spain found a most willing minister in the unscrupulous Alva, who carried on these dark and sinister intrigues with all the keen relish of a bigoted and infuriated Catholic, and at the same time kept a firm and undying watch on the movements of his Queen and mistress.

We must now turn our attention from the Court of Philip II to the affairs of the Low Countries.

It will be remembered that, on the departure of the King, the reins of government had been placed in the hands of the Princess Margaret—a most judicious election, as she possessed much of the spirit of her father, combined with love of intrigue, ambition, and knowledge of the world. Her natural prudence inclined her to pursue a somewhat less vigorous policy than Philip had devised, as she foresaw that it would require the utmost caution, as well as firmness, to execute those orders of the King which were so repugnant to the free and independent spirit of the Flemish people. She therefore merely urged on Philip the expediency of conciliation, and the fulfilment of his solemn promise and engagement, by a speedy return to his northern possessions, by the convocation of the States General, and by a ready acquiescence in the just demands of his faithful Flemings. She constantly advised the King to listen to her councils; but Philip preferred remaining at home, and leaving the Regent to grapple with her difficulties as best she could; thus hoping that the morrow might develop more favourable circumstances, and choosing rather to learn how affairs were going on in the Netherlands from the report of his ministers, than by personal inspection, or boldly facing his enemies at the head of his own brave Spanish troops, as his father would have done. This procrastination was the cause of Philip's ruin in the Netherlands, as well as in his more general policy at home, though it seems almost irreconcileable with the other great qualities of his character.

Amongst those whose opposition the Regent had most to contend with in the Low Countries, was William, Prince of Orange; and as his great abilities and high position fitted him more than any other man to lead his country in its struggle for liberty, and as he played a most distinguished part in that contest, it will be as well to notice the account which Mr. Prescott has drawn of his early career. He was descended from the illustrious house of Nassau, which had already furnished successors to the imperial throne of Germany, and which, besides possessing a duchy, held large territories in the Low Countries, together with the title of the Princes of Orange. William, surnamed the Silent, was born in the year 1533; and although his parents were both Lutherans, the Emperor Charles V was unwilling that so powerful a subject should be brought up in the teaching of the Protestant faith. William was therefore, at the early age of eleven, attached to the household of Mary, Queen of Hungary, sister to the Emperor Charles V, where he was brought up in the tenets of the church of Rome; and it is rather remarkable that the care of his education should have been entrusted to a younger brother of Cardinal Granvelle, to whom he was destined, in after life, to be so violently opposed. At the age of fifteen, he was removed to the service of the Emperor, in the capacity of page. The sagacious monarch soon discovered many eminent qualities in his young protégé, and so highly appreciated them, as to entrust him, at the early age of twenty-two, with the command of the troops engaged at the siege of Marienburg; which enterprise did not, however, call forth the display of any great military talents; as but little actual fighting took place. The army, however, was in great want of food and clothing, and it required the greatest prudence to bring this siege to any thing like an honourable termination. This quality, however, was shown in a high degree by the young Prince of Orange; and he there so pleased his master as to be afterwards entrusted with several important missions, and recommended to Philip as a commissioner to negotiate the treaty of Cateau Cambresis. The similar reserve in William and Philip's character at last rendered them mutually disagreeable to each other, without the assistance of any extraneous circumstance.

William early married Ann of Egmont, to whom he was apparently much attached. As Mr. Prescott remarks, their union was happy, though short, being soon dissolved by the death of the lady. William then turned his eyes towards Lorraine, where he again sought a wife; but, as Philip was any thing but desirous that the influence of so powerful a subject as the Prince of Orange should be increased by an alliance with the family of a great French feudatory, William's addresses were not destined to meet with success; and he at length married Ann, daughter of the celebrated Maurice, who had been the chief of the German Protestant League, and the great opponent of Charles V. He it was who obliged the Emperor to sign the celebrated treaty of Passau in 1550, which secured the religious liberties of Germany for nearly a century afterwards.

William was, however, soon tired of his wife's dissolute conduct, and was at length obliged to send her home to her friends. His discretion and caution enabled him, notwithstanding his love of pleasure, to conceal his movements and intentions even from those with whom he was most intimately connected, and thus obtained for him amongst his countrymen the surname of *The Silent.* He seems to have had a thorough knowledge of the character of all those with whom he had to deal; to have kept up a fair foreign correspondence with numerous agents, who furnished him with information concerning the foreign potentates, both friendly and adverse to his cause.

Mr. Prescott seems to think that there is some reason to doubt of William's religious sincerity; "for he appeared a Lutheran to the Lutherans, and a Catholic to the Catholics, and attempted to mix the least opposing tenets of both faiths into one, in a spirit of toleration far beyond the ideas of that age." Great political characters, however, such as the Prince of Orange, are not unlikely to waver in their religious belief in the midst of political schemes, and often shape their faith according to the circumstances that surround them.

There is, however, no doubt of the devotion, prudence, and courage which the Prince of Orange displayed in the cause of his country's independence, as he preferred its freedom to the promotion of his own interest, and was ready to serve under any leaders whom it might please the united provinces to place over his head, in order to assist the common object of freedom. Both Cardinal Bentivoglio, his own contemporary, and Mr. Prescott, seem to agree in thinking that his eloquence was of the most persuasive kind; and the former has given, in the History of the Dutch Revolution, several specimens of the speeches made by the Prince of Orange to his followers, which are certainly of the highest order.

Such is the character of the chief opponent whom Princess Margaret, the Regent, had to face in executing the King's measures. Let us now enquire whom she had to assist her in carrying out this difficult policy. In the councils of state, which administered the affairs of the Netherlands, when the States General were not sitting, three persons had contrived to engross the chief power—viz. the Viscount de Barlaimont, a noble of ancient descent and large possessions, of respectable though ordinary abilities, one who rather owed his seat at the Board to his rank and station than to his talents; the Chancellor Vigilus, a man whose great legal learning, unblemished integrity, and close application to the business of his office, rather fitted him for being a distinguished lawyer than an eminent politician; and the Cardinal Granvelle, whose skill and address at the treaty of Cateau Cambresis we have already had occasion to notice. A strong friendship soon sprung up between him and the Chancellor, owing to his great learning and close attention to the affairs of the state; and having completely won over the Viscount by his engaging manners, he contrived to obtain for himself the whole power of the state. Upon him, therefore, fell the odium of the King's measures, and the difficult and dangerous task of executing them. The nobles, of course, became jealous of the influence which Granvelle had acquired at the Council, and loudly complained to the King. Philip did not at once dismiss the Cardinal, but demanded from him an explanation, which was made in extremely indignant terms. The Regent, who had for some time supported the Minister, became jealous of the confidence which the King reposed in him, and recommended his dismissal; while Granvelle, who now became aware that his situation was an extremely difficult one, offered to resign and to retire to any place which Philip should deem fitting. This offer was accepted by his master, and Besanson, his native place, was appointed as his residence, where he employed himself in an extensive correspondence with the eminent statesmen and men of letters of that day, which correspondence has been carefully collected and published by Mons. Guizot, and has thrown considerable light upon the history of that period. It is to be hoped that this example will be followed by English Statesmen, in collecting the papers of the eminent personages of the times of Charles I and II, or other important periods of our history, and thus afford ampler materials than we now possess for the researches of such future students as may imitate Mr. Prescott's unwearied and valuable labours.

We indeed have the letters of that celebrated diplomatist, Lord Malmsbury, transmitted to us by his grandson, the late Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; and we also possess the important correspondence of the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Grenville, published by his descendant, the present Duke; but, with the exception of Sir Robert Peel's papers, which have been left in the hands of Lord Stanhope, scarcely a literary man of any eminence, or a statesman, has thought it worth his while to occupy his pen in furnishing us with the records of the doings of bygone politicians of celebrity, not in some way or other connected with his own family.

The Cardinal's retirement from office was received with the greatest rejoicings throughout the Low Countries, and many supposed that the difficulties of the Government were satisfactorily terminated by his retirement; but, as Mr. Prescott well remarks, the struggle, instead of ending, had only commenced, for Philip was as firmly resolved as ever to support the authority of the Inquisition, and to continue those ecclesiastical changes which had been introduced by his minister, and which, though contemplated by the Emperor Charles V, and sanctioned by the Pope, were unpopular both with Catholics and Calvinists; the former looked upon them as unnecessary innovations, whilst the latter only considered them as a cloak to conceal the King's real intention of re-establishing Popery in the Low Countries. Philip, like his father, put himself forward, in his letters to the Regent, as the prominent supporter of Romanism. Charles's zeal, however, was tempered by discretion; whilst Philip was an uncompromising supporter of Catholicism, without caring for the risks he might encounter in enforcing his policy; and Charles, although he might be harsh in suppressing that which he considered as error, was nevertheless a Fleming, and had always had the welfare and prosperity of his Flemish subjects really at heart; and his severity was on that account often overlooked. Philip, on the other hand, had not only the ideas and haughty demeanour of a Spaniard, but had also committed the unpardonable mistake of entrusting the government of the Low Countries to foreigners; and the concessions which he had made in the dismissal of his obnoxious minister and the withdrawal of his foreign troops, only served to calm men's minds for a time, without redressing real grievances.

The Princess now threw herself into the hands of the nobles with as much confidence as she had formerly reposed in the Cardinal, and it is somewhat amusing to see how her continual praise of the minister of last year was now turned to blame, and how readily she received the proffered services of the rebellious nobles, who now returned to their places at the council board with loud protestations of loyalty to their Sovereign, and assurance of repentance for their late want of confidence. The Regent even feared her late minister so much, that, notwithstanding his quiet retirement to his patrimonial estates, she was continually urging his removal to a greater distance from the Flemish frontiers.

But the Government of the Low Countries were not destined to go on smoothly for any great length of time. Although the Regent was supported by Egmont and William of Orange, there still remained some of the friends of the Cardinal, who formed themselves into a faction under the Viscount de Barlemont and the President Vigilus, who kept their former colleague, the banished Prelate, well informed on the state of parties, and of the measures adopted in the Netherlands. The Regent soon showed her hostility by accusing the President Vigilus of embezzling to a great extent the plate and money of the Church, and he vehemently retorted against her in his letters to Granvelle. The able and intriguing Prelate now offered to remove to any place where his presence was most needed for the King's service, "even were it to the end of the earth." This sincerity was soon after put to the test by Philip, who ordered him to repair to Rome; and thither the Cardinal accordingly went, and disappeared for some time from the political stage; nor do we again meet with him until a much later period than that to which Mr. Prescott's work at present extends. It was not long before Philip again urged his sister to proceed with rigour against the Flemish Protestants; and it appears that, in the year 1565, as many as 17 persons suffered at Antwerp for their religious opinions. So small a number of victims was rather calculated to irritate than to inspire the reformers with terror; whilst the courage and firmness displayed by the martyrs went far towards strengthening the faith in the eyes of the people, and gaining over new converts to their creed. All men became painfully disquieted by the severity of the King's measures, though the Regent did her best to reassure the Flemings.

In this state of alarm, the Flemings judged it advisable to send some one to Madrid who might be able to lay before the haughty Spanish Monarch a true statement of the grievances of his Flemish subjects; and who could be more fitted to execute this delicate task, with credit both to himself and his country, than Egmont, whose shining qualities and brilliant achievements at St. Quentin and Gravelines had made him a general favourite with the people, and whose rank also rendered him a proper representative at the Court of Philip? The steady and unflinching loyalty which he had always displayed towards the Crown seemed likely to insure for him a patient hearing, if not a favourable answer to such just complaints. Philip received him with the greatest cordiality, and having completely blinded him by flattery and attention, sent the unsuspecting Egmont home again to Flanders. The dispatches which were, however, sent back with Egmont, threw great ridicule upon the conduct and character of the mission which had been entrusted to him, and completely damped the hopes of the Flemings, if they had ever entertained any, of receiving mercy at the hands of Philip. The dispatches commenced by paying a high compliment to Egmont; and then went on to enforce the former orders of the King, and to request the provincial governors to carry out still stronger measures against the Protestants, who were now to be tortured in secret. Three bishops were also nominated as additions to the council, to whose hands the superintendence of ecclesiastical offices was to be entrusted. The Prince of Orange retired from the council, and from Breda wrote a letter to the Regent, in which he strongly blamed the policy of the King, and remonstrated with her upon pursuing it during a season of unwonted rigor, and when the people were still more irritated by famine. Egmont, however, remained at Brussels; having always been a staunch Catholic and a devoted and loyal servant of the Crown.

In the midst of these troubles, the young nobility of Flanders, men who had been educated abroad or brought up in the profession of arms, and who had distinguished themselves in the wars of Charles V, assembled at the house of one of their party, under pretext of hearing the discourses of a celebrated preacher of the name of Julius, and drew up that famous document known by the name of the Compromise. In it the measures adopted by the King's Government were very severely handled; its great power being chiefly directed against the establishment of the Inquisition, which it was contended was in direct violation of all the institutions of the Flemish Government. This celebrated document was signed by Prince Lewis of Nassau and several nobles of distinction; but the Prince of Orange and Count Egmont refrained from affixing their names to it, as they were Ministers of the Crown, and such an act would be considered equal to high treason. They, however, secretly gave it their encouragement and support.

William showed great prudence throughout the whole of this trying time; and, as Mr. Prescott well remarks, "he said little and wrote less," fearing that he would be the more compromised if he put his thoughts on paper. He wanted neither courage nor resolution, however, when the time for action arrived, but wisely reserved himself for that period.

Mr. Prescott terminates, at this point, the best and clearest account on record of the early part of Philip the Second's reign, and gives us an interesting introduction to the Dutch war.

At some future period we shall again revert to this subject, and, with the aid of Mr. Motley, and the other more recent historians, give our readers a further insight into the latter portion of Philip the Second's reign.

May, 1857.

CATHERINE THE SECOND

OF

RUSSIA.

CATHERINE II

AND THE

COURTS OF RUSSIA.

RUSSIA has been the last of all the European states to enter into the family of civilized nations. For many centuries it rather belonged to Asia than to Europe, and almost as much was known of its history by the general reader, as by those who made its study their particular occupation. The Russian or Muscovite scarcely appears in history until the 9th century, when he is found as a trader at Constantinople. The nation, however, soon after, assumed a more powerful position, mustered in great force, attacked the northern provinces of the Greek empire, and even threatened to make itself master of the Greek capital. Defeated, however, by the Greek Emperor, and its Grand Duke taken prisoner, Christianity was in course of time introduced, and the conversion of the Russian leader took place about the end of the 10th century. Olga, the mother of the reigning prince, appears to have ruled the country conjointly with her son, and afterwards with her grandson. She at first exerted all her influence in support of the old idolatry, until her resistance was at length overcome and she was induced to visit Constantinople, where she adopted the new religion, was baptized, and promised to use her best efforts to introduce its doctrines into Muscovy, where the tenets of the Greek Church soon became pretty generally adopted. We are further informed that this strong-minded old lady persuaded her grandson Vladimer to assist in the building of churches, the establishment of schools, the construction of roads, and the promotion of commerce with the neighbouring states of Germany and the Greek empire, and became in fact the Catherine of the 10th century. Treaties were afterwards made with foreign countries, and thus it happened that the successor of the grandson of Olga was married to a daughter of Otho, the great Emperor of Germany, and his relative became the wife of Henry I of France. After this, for a very long period, the Muscovites had but few foreign relations. They were invaded and conquered by Timour the Tartar at the end of the 14th century, and were obliged for nearly two hundred years to pay tribute to the Golden Horde or tribe to which Timour belonged. At length they threw off all foreign yoke at the end of the 16th century, and increased their own dominions with the state of White Russia, and the territory of Siberia, which they have ever since retained. We should not omit to mention that while the Grand Duke of Muscovy was still tributary to the Tartar tribes, he afforded a refuge at Moscow to one of the Palæologi, who, after having long endeavoured to maintain himself against the Turks in the Peloponnesus, was obliged to submit to overpowering numbers and to fly for safety to Moscow, where he not only found an asylum, but was even respected as a dethroned prince. A Russian Grand Duke ultimately married the daughter of this prince, and thus arose the claim of the Russian Czar to Constantinople, although it was long before the Russians had sufficient power to attempt to wrest the ancient possessions of the Greeks from the Turks.

At the end of the 16th century; that most remarkable and cruel tyrant, Ivan IV, ruled over the Muscovites, and put to death nearly all his family and relatives. He had, indeed, destroyed the royal family of Russia, so that no heirs could be found to succeed to the throne. Many competitors arose for the crown, and the country was for some time devastated by their struggles for power. It was, however, at length agreed that the Boyars, or nobles, and the clergy should be called together, and that they should, after due deliberation and casting of lots, agree upon electing one of these competitors as their sovereign, and that the rest of the nation should abide by the decision. They were accordingly assembled at Moscow; and after three days spent in fasting, and close deliberation, the lot was cast, and fell upon the son of the Patriarch, whose family name was Romanoff. Of course the choice of such a person as the son of the Patriarch was considered by the superstitious nobles as a peculiar interposition of Providence; and all of one accord exclaimed, "He who has been chosen by the Holy Spirit as our Czar, must be received and obeyed!!" Romanoff was at once acknowledged by the whole people, and his family have ever since occupied the Russian throne.

In the latter part of the 16th century, the Muscovites (though by accident) first opened a commercial communication with some of the other states of Europe. The captain of an English merchant vessel, who traded with the north, was carried by wind and tide into the White Sea, and was thus obliged by stress of weather to put into Archangel. He was kindly treated by the authorities of the port, was recommended to take an inland journey to Moscow, and to visit the Czar himself. Listening to these suggestions, he visited

Moscow, was treated with great condescension and affability by the Czar, and opened negotiations of a commercial nature, which were afterwards approved of and confirmed by our own Queen Mary.

If we glance at what is related of the Muscovite religion and government by Voltaire, in his lives of Peter the Great and Charles XII, we shall have a pretty good idea of early Russian history up to the time when Peter the Great ascended the throne in 1696. After God and St. Nicholas, the Patriarch and the Czar were looked upon as the chief rulers and protectors of Russia; the former having more real power than any other Patriarch of the Greek church, and having contrived, like the Pope, even to supersede the authority of his sovereign. On the festivals and holidays of the church, it is said the Czar used to lead the ass of the Patriarch, walking bare-headed by his side to the cathedral: whilst the Czar's authority was also much curtailed by the military force, called the Strelitz, which in its power and organization resembled the Mamelukes of Egypt and the Janissaries of Turkey. This military body could elect and depose the sovereign at pleasure; and it had, after the death of Alexis, father of Peter the Great, placed the infant son Peter on the throne of Russia, appointed his sister Sophia as regent, and associated in the government with Peter his imbecile brother Paul. This state of things lasted until Peter reached the age of 17, when he overthrew the government of his sister Sophia, confined her in a convent, and successfully accomplished the dangerous task of destroying the influence of the Strelitz.

The Empire of Russia now becomes both important and interesting, and commences from this period to take a considerable part in the wars and treaties of the other powers of Europe. It starts on that career of conquest and aggrandisement which has stretched its frontiers from the Frozen Ocean on the north, to the Black and Caspian Seas on the south; from the Baltic to the Vistula on the west; to the Pacific Ocean and north-west shores of America on the east. Although Peter, like Alfred of England, and Charlemagne of France, civilized his subjects by commerce with the nations of Europe, by building a new capital, and thus making his country more accessible to the shipping of foreigners, he did more, by inviting to his court men of learning, and encouraging foreign naval and military officers to enter his service. Still he did not extend the frontiers of his empire to that degree which Catherine the Second afterwards was enabled to do, as he was prevented from giving it a position as terrible to Europe as that which France occupied in the days of Louis XIV and Napoleon. It is true that, in the early part of his reign, Peter took from the Turks, with the aid of his general, Alexander Gordon, the town of Azoff, and made a good naval arsenal in the Black Sea; that he also followed his formidable rival, Charles XII, into Turkey in 1717; and that he was there surrounded by the troops of the Vizier, and obliged to negotiate for his personal safety, giving as a ransom the jewels of his wife, and restoring the town of Azoff to the Turks.

As is well known, Peter died in 1725, was succeeded by his wife Catherine I, his son Peter II, and his daughters Ann and Elizabeth. The last princess seems to have been raised to the throne by the assistance of the army and the nobles, who disliked the rule of the Empress Ann, on account of her supporting the English and Austrian alliance. They seem to have been moved to this attempt by French intrigue, and by the desire of curtailing the authority of the sovereign. Having no child, Elizabeth chose, as her heir, her nephew Peter. Thus it happened that Peter married the celebrated Sophia Augusta Frederica of Anhalt Bernburg, afterwards Catherine II.*

The history of this remarkable woman, whom Lord Brougham has well compared to Elizabeth of England, merits the closest attention of modern diplomatists and statesmen; as, during her reign, the Crimea was rescued from the Turks, the partition of Poland was planned and executed, with the aid of Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa; a great part of Finland was wrested from the Swedish monarchy; and the disadvantageous treaty of Kainardgiac was concluded with the Turks, the articles of which formed the basis of the protection which has been so long claimed by Russia over the Christian subjects of the Port; a right which was lately enforced by Prince Menchikoff, and thus led to war in the principalities and the siege of Sebastopol.

On these accounts, it is interesting to find that the memoirs of Catherine II, a sovereign who played so important a part in her day, are at length released from the secrecy which has so long enveloped them, and given to the world under the able editorship of Mr. Herzen. Although they contain many revelations dangerous to the present sovereign of Russia, if perused and believed by his subjects, yet Catherine has not veiled her licentious character, but openly tells us that her son and successor Paul was not the offspring of Peter III her husband, but of Sergius Soltikoff, one of her paramours. Thus it becomes a question whether the present possessor of the Rusaian crown is really descended from the Romanoff family, and whether he has really a right to be Emperor.

Mr. Herzen, in the preface to the work, tells us how he has obtained documents which have been so long concealed. It appears that the MSS. were sealed up by the Emperor Paul, and given by that sovereign to some of his favourite ministers. They then passed into the hands of Count Worontzoff, by whom they were restored to the Czar Nicholas, and again placed in the royal archives with the greatest secrecy. In 1840, the preceptor of the present Czar was permitted to use several manuscripts, containing interesting details of the modern history of Russia, in order to instruct his imperial pupil in the history of his future dominions. Amongst these documents were discovered the memoirs which we shall now briefly notice.*

---

* Peter was the grandson of Peter the Great, and son of the Duke of Holstein by the sister of Charles XII of Sweden.

The preceptor, being an intimate acquaintance of Mr. Herzen, informed him of the permission he had received, and the discoveries he had made. Herzen purloined the MSS. of Catherine's own memoirs, and now vouches for their authenticity. Our editor endeavours to excuse the dissimulation and heartlessness of Catherine, by affirming that her position was one of great difficulty; that she was placed in it when yet very young, and when her mind was hardly sufficiently formed to meet with and overcome the obstacles which she had to encounter; that she was betrothed to a husband who had no real affection for her, and who was every way her inferior in mind and manner, but yet liked to tyrannise over her whenever he had opportunity; that she was still further exposed to the whims of a capricious aunt, and to the irritability of temper of her own mother, much increased by the jealousy which subsisted between her and the Empress. These circumstances furnish, no doubt, great excuses for dissimulation and want of feeling; but they afford no apology for that grasping ambition and want of principle which made Catherine, in all her early acts, look to the acquisition of the Russian crown as the great end and aim of life, made her so unscrupulous as to the means she used to obtain her darling object, and led her to connive at her husband's murder; a stain which, in spite of all her able administration, and her endeavours to civilize and increase the powers of her subjects, will ever remain attached to her name.

One must receive with great caution the accounts which Catherine gives of her husband, her mother, and her aunt; for though she has not been ashamed, in her memoirs, to give us the full details of her own faults, she has been equally unscrupulous in apologising for them, by narrating the vices and the ill treatment which she received from those with whom she was brought into contact; whilst she has, no doubt in order to suit her own purposes, considerably exaggerated the misconduct of her husband and her aunt.

---

* Memoirs of the Empress Catherine II, written by herself, with Preface by A. Herzen.—Trübner and Co. 69, Paternoster Row. 1859.

Although the style of this remarkable work is none of the most elegant, being written in obsolete French, it nevertheless bears the impress of that energetic and strong mind, the abilities of which were acknowledged by all Europe, from Voltaire and Frederick the Great, to the Khan of Crim Tartary, and the Turkish general whom Catherine subdued. It acquires additional interest from the writer having ruled over vast dominions during the eventful period in Europe which elapsed between the seven years' war and the commencement of the famous French revolution; an epoch, the events of which have gone far towards making the separation between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that of several ages, instead of two successive centuries.

Catherine commences her narrative by sketching the picture of her husband, who was of the Holstein family. He left both father and mother at a very early age; the government of the Duchy of Holstein, as well as the care of his own education, being consigned to his uncle, the Bishop of Lubeck, with whom he chiefly resided. He had been brought up with the view of filling the Swedish throne, and the care of his education was in consequence committed to Marshal Brummer, who had served in the camp and the court of Charles XII of Sweden, and who, of course, indoctrinated Peter in the Lutheran faith, with somewhat of a turn for arms, which in a man of a stronger mind might have helped to make a great military emperor. Peter seems, however, to have possessed the heaviness of a German, without his deep thought; the drunkenness of a Russian, without his quick perception of character, thorough knowledge of the world, and readiness to adopt as his own the improvements and the excellencies which he sees in others. Peter, it would seem, indulged in intoxicating liquors as early as the age of ten years; and at the same time showed neither love nor power for the pursuit of his studies. When he reached the age of eleven, he was informed by his aunt, the Empress Elizabeth of Russia, of her intention of nominating him heir to her extensive empire. To fit him for this inheritance, she conferred upon him the rank of a Russian Grand Duke, and then required that he should change his religion from the Lutheran to the Greek faith, and become acquainted with the Russian language. Being so young, he did not understand the responsibilities which might be thrown upon him by accepting the Russian crown, and the difficulties he would have to encounter as the absolute master of so vast an empire. He readily, however, consented to his aunt's wishes; journeyed to St. Petersburg, where he was duly installed as a Russian Grand Duke and heir to her Imperial Majesty; and, although he was allowed to retain

Brummer as his tutor, a certain priest of the name of Theodosky was set to teach him the Russian language, and the doctrines of the Greek Church; for which, although he was obliged to adopt it, in order to fit himself for the dignity of a Russian Sovereign, he always felt the greatest contempt, and most probably remained a Lutheran to the end of his days; though he practised enough dissimulation to conform to its doctrines, and to make his aunt and his subjects believe that he was really in earnest in his professions.

He made but little real progress in his studies, and as he grew up, displayed a weak and childish mind. He was unfortunately as adverse to his tutors as to his studies; his chief amusement being playing at soldiery and fortification with his attendants.

The empress, having now settled her heir, became anxious to procure for Peter a suitable partner, who might share with him the cares of his crown, and continue the succession of the house of Romanoff. Her selection unfortunately fell upon Augusta Frederica Sophia, daughter of the Duke Anhalt Bernburg, a princess who, though she had only attained the age of fifteen, already displayed in her character the dissimulation, intrigue, and ambition of a full-grown woman. She was accompanied to the Russian court by her mother, a haughty, hot-tempered, foolish, and zealous woman; who was, of course, well satisfied with the match which had been negotiated for her daughter, as her husband's duchy was by no means either important or extensive, while she herself was extremely poor and ill provided for. It even appears that Catherine's mother was too poor to furnish her daughter with suitable clothing to appear at such a court as that of Russia, where people were expected to change their dress more than five or six times a day, and where clothes and ceremonial were looked upon with as scrutinous an eye as in the ceremonious court of Louis XIV.

On her arrival in Russia, Catherine was also placed under Simon Theodosky, the ecclesiastic, who seems to have found in her a readier pupil and more willing convert to the Greek faith than he had had in Peter. She applied herself zealously to learning the Russian language, and to an acquaintance with the tenets of the Greek church.

At this point of her memoirs, she enters into an account of the factions which divided the Russian court and councils on her arrival. It appears that the minister of Foreign Affairs headed a party opposed to French interests, whilst the Count de Lestocq, a favourite of the Empress Elizabeth, who was all powerful at court, fully sustained the French in Russia.

In order to understand the foreign policy of Russia at this period, it should be remembered that the great powers of Europe were engaged in the war known in history as that of the Austrian succession, a war which was to decide whether Maria Theresa, daughter of Charles VI, Emperor of Germany, should succeed her father in his dominions and as Empress of Germany.

Up to this time a female had never occupied the throne of the Emperors of Germany, or possessed the territories of the house of Austria. A number of competitors therefore arose, both for her dignities and possessions, although her rights had been previously acknowledged by nearly every power of Europe. Her most formidable adversaries were Frederick, King of Prussia, Louis XV of France, and Charles, Elector of Bavaria, who, as is well known, was chosen by the German electors to succeed the late Emperor, under the title of Charles VII. The Empress Queen was, however, supported in her rights by the King of England and her own brave and gallant subjects, while the Empress of Russia, although she took no active part in the war at the period, yet sympathised with the King of Prussia and the French. As we shall see in the sequel, however, she found reason to change her policy, and to support Maria Theresa by sending an army into Bohemia.

Soon after Catherine's arrival at the Russian court, she received direct proposals of marriage from her cousin Peter, who made them with the curious announcement that he had been much smitten with the charms of a certain lady in waiting at his aunt's court, who, being despatched in disgrace to Siberia, had left him disconsolate. Under these circumstances, he declared himself willing to marry her as a substitute for his lost one. This confidence was of course any thing but flattering to the young German Princess. She, however, accepted his proposals, not because she liked Peter, but because she wished to possess the Russian crown. She nearly lost her bright prospects, even after accepting this disagreeable offer, as jealousies continually arose between her mother and the Empress, and as she herself was one day informed by the Count de Lestocq, whilst conversing with the Grand Duke, that "she would most likely soon have to pack up and prepare for her return to Germany." Catherine remarks, on this intelligence, that she was very indifferent as to the marriage, but not at all so with regard to losing her chance to the succession of the Russian empire. These family differences soon blew over; and they were again reconciled. The Empress appointed the Countess Roumianzoff, together with several other Russian ladies of family, to attend upon the young Princess in the place of her German ladies; and with their assistance Catherine quickly acquired a knowledge of the Russian language, and of Russian manners and customs. Catherine, however, found that these attendants only acted as spies, and informed the Empress of all her movements.

Accordingly she soon perceived that her only chance of success was to keep in favour with Elizabeth, and to acquire a thorough knowledge of the Russian language. About this time she became dangerously ill, and was obliged to absent herself from Court. She had become very thin and had lost her good looks; but, nevertheless, still wrote pages in her diary on all the passing incidents of the Court and times. Thus she continues her narrative, and informs us that soon after her recovery, Count Gyllenburg, the Swedish minister, appeared at the Russian Court. He seems to have been a man of considerable ability and learning, and had become acquainted with Catherine and her mother some years previously, during her residence at Hamburgh. He had then taken much interest in the young Princess, and remarked to her mother, that were she properly educated, the child promised some day to fill an important place in history. He found no reason, when he renewed her acquaintance, to alter his previous opinions of her talents; and expressed himself so pleased with the progress she had made, that he gave her grave advice as to the future. It has been justly remarked that the qualities of the greatest minds may be judged by their actions even in the smallest matters; and Catherine now relates a circumstance which, though insignificant in itself, strongly shows her artfulness of character, and her desire to keep it with all persons with whom she was brought in contact, however different their views and opinions might be. Soon after her recovery, the Grand Duke paid her and her mother one of his usual visits, which were to Catherine usually insipid enough. On this occasion, he tried to amuse her by jumping about the room and performing several childish antics; and, whilst thus employed, managed to destroy some valuable works of art on which the Empress had set great store. Catherine advised the Grand Duke to brave all his aunt's displeasure, whilst behind his back she blamed and ridiculed his childish doings, never ceasing to condole with the Empress over her loss. Thus she early played the part of a thorough hypocrite, and artfully endeavoured to ingratiate herself with all parties.

Soon after this occurrence, she undertook a journey into South Russia by order of the Empress, and was accompanied by her mother, the Grand Duke, the Countess Roumianzoff, and a large suite. Finding that the order of march threw her into the company of the older and more stately personages of the party, which was any thing but amusing, she contrived to change the arrangements in such a manner that all the juveniles were placed in the same conveyance as herself, whilst those of a more advanced age were forced to continue their journey together. This gave great offence to the old Countess of Roumianzoff, who resolved to avenge herself on her young mistress;

and, with the aid of the Count Lestocq, afterwards occasioned much embarrassment to Catherine, by representing to the Empress the levity of her conduct. Catherine, however, in spite of these representations, by constant duplicity, regained her lost favour. Soon after her return home from her southern trip, she was deprived of the society of her mother, who reseived orders from the Empress to leave St. Petersburg. The parting between Catherine and her mother furnished her with a convenient opportunity for the display of a little more hypocrisy, by way of affection. She accompanied her parent on a part of the road, and wept bitterly, as though she really felt sorrow.

Catherine's nuptial day was at length fixed by the Empress, and she here declares that she had only anticipated this event with supreme indifference, " experiencing in her heart the sole satisfaction that thereby she should, sooner or later, become Empress, Sovereign of Russia." The marriage, under such circumstances, was unlikely to produce happiness; and we accordingly find that the narrative of her married life is one continual connubial quarrel. She blames Peter's childishness, his coldness and his cruelty towards her. Thus the history of her married and unmarried life differs little in the main, and strikes the reader as a long series of intrigues from beginning to end. It is a pity that, with vast materials at her disposal, Catherine has given so little of the real history of her times; she could easily have sketched the internal state of Russian society, the politics, intrigues, and public doings of the court and parties. As it is, however, her narrative becomes meagre at times, being just such a one as might be expected to proceed from the pen of an artful woman; still it is interesting and instructive, as showing every step of the ladder by which she rose to power, and the working of that unscrupulous will which made her, after she had attained to the full height of greatness, so formidable an enemy to the haughty Turks, the brave Swedes, the chivalrous Poles, and the fierce and barbarous Tartars of the Crimea; and which enabled her to rule over her large territories, powerful armies, and able and determined generals; and at the same time to be courted as an ally by Frederick the Great of Prussia, Maria Theresa of Austria, and Joseph II. We have, however, a sad history of court morality, and from it we gain a pretty good idea of that of the Russian people in the 18th century. Reasoning by analogy, we find how the licentious and immoral conduct of the courtiers of the time of Charles II, and the general want of principle of that monarch, exerted a great influence on the society of his day, as may be seen in the literature and public amusements of 1660 to 1685. Again, the morals of the court of Louis VI may be said in a great measure to have produced the French revolution, by the contempt which they brought on the higher classes of society. If courts like England and France could, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, have so vast an influence over the social and political condition of their subjects, how much more control must the Russian court have exercised over a barbarous and rude people, only just entering into civilization, and living under the absolute sway of their sovereign and nobles. We may therefore learn from the intrigues of the Russian court, headed by Catherine, the qualities which have made Russian diplomacy as terrible as it is insincere; which has enabled it to rise fresh from every struggle, however disastrous, and even to turn its defeats to advantage; as shown after the battle of Narva and the taking of Moscow by the French. This kind of "unprincipled luck" it is, which has made "Russia a formidable power, that has never yet receded in her schemes of territorial aggrandisement."

The progress of Russia during the last century and a half has been mainly owing to the energetic and vigorous character of her sovereigns, who, being unchecked in their authority by a popular constitution, have been enabled to introduce what improvements they pleased, and have, with the assistance of personal courage, time, and the native sagacity of their character, overcome all the prejudices of their subjects. Peter III, however, if we are to believe the account given of his character by his wife, was neither a good man in private life, nor an able monarch; whilst he was childish, and heartless to a degree scarcely to be conceived. On the marriage day, Catherine discovered his total want of attachment; though, had his dislike been kept within bounds of decorum, she might have submitted with resignation. It was, however, unlikely she would tamely submit to neglect, or lend her ear to the praise of his mistress who had just been exiled to Siberia by the Empress. In fact, Catherine states that she perceived from the first that Peter had made up his mind to dislike her, and that it would be waste of time and efforts to attempt to gain the favour or love of such a man.

She yet declares herself a good wife, always ready to discharge her duty, whatever it might be; whilst her charming husband was indifferent and brutish. Could it therefore be expected that she should long endeavour to please him? For reputation sake, however, she *played* the affectionate wife during the illness which seized him soon after their marriage. She watched him closely during his temporary insensibility, and endeavoured to acquire favour with the Empress by praying for his speedy recovery.

It was during the Grand Duke's convalescence that he performed one of those childish practical jokes which so often brought him into trouble, both with his aunt and his wife. By piercing the door of his chamber which adjoined that of the Empress's secret apartments, he overheard a conversation between his aunt and her favourite, and actually saw Count Razoumowsky, dressed in a robe de chambre, dining with her majesty. Peter was so amused with this discovery, that he sent for a number of the courtiers to participate in his indiscretion. Catherine, amongst others, was summoned to the peep-hole; but refused the invitation, rated him roundly for his imprudemce, and warned him that such a secret could by no possibility be kept.

Peter divided his time between puppet shows and amours with the various court ladies, the details of which he always confided to his wife; whilst Catherine was employed in the study of the best publications of the day, in horse exercise, for which she was famed, in the chase, and in court intrigue. As she was unlikely to gain the love of her husband, she soon formed an attachment to a certain Czernicheff, a handsome youth belonging to her household. Her intrigues with him were at length discovered, and he was sent to Moscow and there imprisoned.

It is hard to believe the account which Catherine gives of her husband's conduct during the early period of their married life, as it is so much in favour of herself and so damaging to Peter. She boldly asserts that she connived at his amours, and advised him in all his unprincipled doings. She dwells on her own sufferings and her frequent illnesses, which it is hard to believe were other than feigned means of gaining sympathy and affection. She, nevertheless, contrived to carry on pretty constant intrigues both with her mother and her lover. She corresponded with the former through Sacromoso, a knight of St. John of Jerusalem, who about this time visited the Russian court; and with the latter, by a musician named D'Ologlio, who used to play at the Court concerts. She only once, throughout the whole of this early period, gives us any information on the foreign relations of Russia, and just mentions that a treaty had been concluded between Austria and Russia, by which the Empress Elizabeth bound herself to support the claims of Maria Theresa, and sent troops into Bohemia.

Lestocq and his party, who had supported French interest, thus lost much of their influence at court. The former had become suddenly suspected, on account of his intrigue, and was even accused of having attempted to poison Frederick the Great of Prussia. Although there seems to have been but slight foundation for such charges, they were quite sufficient, in Russia, to cause immediate incarceration and subsequent banishment to Siberia. These intrigues at court were almost of daily occurrence; and it is, therefore, no matter of surprise that Catherine should act as she did, that her conduct to her husband should afterwards have been so treacherous, and her treatment of her paramours so cruel; and that so many princes of the house of Romanoff should have ended their career in assassination. It was a convenient thing for Catherine that treachery was the acknowledged practice of the Russian Court; as it in some measure seemed to palliate her crimes; whilst it enabled her to put out of the way many a dangerous and powerful favourite, whom she might otherwise have found it a difficult matter to deal with. A few convenient murders were rendered the more necessary, as, according to the accounts of historians, she had as many as six paramours at a time, whose jealousies it must have been no easy task to reconcile.

Catherine gives us an interesting account of the visit of the ministers of Austria, Demark, and Saxony, to the Court of Russia; and their negotiations with the Grand Duke for the surrender of the duchy of Holstein to the kingdom of Denmark. According to Holstein law, he was enabled to enter into such negotiation, although he was very reluctant to part with the sovereignty of his native duchy, to which he had always been much attached; whilst his subjects, on their side, were extremely unwilling to exchange the rule of their own Prince for that of the crown of Denmark. Catherine, as usual, takes all the credit of the negotiation, and persuades herself that she alone solved the difficulty. The families of Holstein and Denmark had never been friends since their separation at the end of the 15th century, on the expulsion of Christian II of Denmark: and they had always been ready to help the Swedes in their attacks upon that country, and had severely harassed the Danes during the days of Charles II. Thus the Holstein dislike to the Danish government was of old standing, and it was not at all surprising that discontent should be expressed at the likelihood of annexation. Peter's attachment to his duchy is a very creditable quality in his character, and shows that, notwithstanding all the childishness, artlessness, and cruelty of his disposition, of which his wife accuses him, he possessed some good feelings, which, had they been properly fostered, would have made him a better man. As Catherine's narrative proceeds, it differs little in its character of intrigue, though it becomes more than ever interesting. She describes, in amusing strains, the details of her daily occupations. As the Empress was afraid of seeing Catherine on horseback "à l'homme," our heroine contrived a saddle that, when in the presence of the Empress, she could easily convert into a lady's side-saddle, but when alone could turn it to the original shape, as she preferred the masculine mode of riding. She also gives us an account of the court balls and masquerades, at which the guests were to appear in various costumes, the women *à l'hommes,* and the men *en costume de dames;* an arrangement which suited neither party, as the men looked ridiculous in petticoats, and the women like so many small boys.

At one of these balls, Catherine encountered her old friend Count Czernicheff, with whom she had kept up a long and clandestine correspondence; and also gained two new lovers; the one, Leon Narichkine, whose conversational talents and personal appearance she highly praises; the other, Soltikoff, a chamberlain of the Empress, whom she describes as the haudsomest man she ever beheld. These lovers soon contrived to win the confidence of the Tchoglokoffs, Catherine's principal attendants, who constantly arranged love meetings for the Duchess at their house, where shameful debauchery was perpetrated. In Catherine's subsequent narrative, she consoles herself for the loss of the affections of one of these lovers by renewed intrigues with the other. Thus it was the constant change of admirers, whilst yet a Grand Duchess and without power, that made her so dangerous and tyrannical a mistress to her favourites when she became Empress. She contrived to have two miscarriages, the result of her intrigues, without the knowledge of her husband; and during her illness saw but little of the Grand Duke, who, nothing loath, amused himself with hard drinking, and drilling his puppets.

During the year 1754, Catherine spent much of her time in the country, taking long walks and drives, accompanied by her friend and lover Soltikoff; and about the end of the autumn was delivered of a son (in reality the child of Soltikoff), but who was, nevertheless, looked upon as the real heir to the Russian crown. Great care was bestowed upon the child by the Empress, who carried it off and attended it night and day; whilst the only notice the Empress Elizabeth seems to have taken of the unfortunate and forsaken mother, was an occasional enquiry, and the forwarding of 100,000 roubles and some valuable jewels to her needy niece. Catherine was kept in ignorance during this period of all that went on at court, but was fearfully jealous of the attention shewn to her child. She consoled herself, however, in study, and by planning schemes of power and ambition. As for the Grand Duke, he seldom, if ever, visited her, as he was enraged that the Empress should have bestowed on the Grand Duchess such presents, whilst he had received nothing, although as a father he needed help as much as Catherine. The new-born infant was in due course named Paul, and his baptism was solemnized soon after his birth with great pomp and rejoicings. After six weeks had elapsed, the Grand Duchess was allowed to receive the courtiers and attend prayers on her recovery; receiving, after the religious ceremony was over, the compliments of the whole court. Her recovery was, however, damped by the news that Soltikoff had been sent to Sweden on a mission; and that her friend and companion, the Princess Gargarine, was about to be married. Thus the two persons to whom she was most attached were unceremoniously removed from her.

About Whitsuntide, 1755, Sir Charles Williams paid a visit to the court of St. Petersburgh as English Representative. Catherine finds him an agreeable man, who had travelled much, seen many courts, and who made many desirable and witty observations; she soon became friendly with him. In the suite of Williams, came a young man of handsome person and agreeable manners, of the name of Count Poniatowsky, who at once caught the eye of the Grand Duchess. He was the son of the celebrated Count of that name, whose claim to the throne of Poland Charles XII had so stoutly supported against Peter the Great and Augustus II, Elector of Saxony. The Grand Duchess asked many questions concerning him, in the hope that she might repair some of the injury that Peter the Great had done to his family, and make his stay in Russia not only bearable, but even agreeable. Thus a great friendship sprung up between the Grand Duchess and himself, the result of which was by no means creditable to her virtue.

In the summer of 1755, she retired to her old country place, Oranienbaum, where she amused herself by planting a garden and rearing a collection of curious plants, being attended by an old gardener, who predicted her future greatness, and that she would one day become Empress sovereign of Russia. His manner was very peculiar, and his prophecies were uttered in a very commanding tone which inspired his hearers with confidence. These details are perhaps of little moment, either to the historian or general reader. They are, however, interesting and important, as showing the character of the princess who relates them, the court by whom she was surrounded, and the ministers and envoys who were sent thither by the different states of Europe.

In Catherine's day, Sweden was a great power in the north; and Poland, notwithstanding the evils of its constitution, and the constant disputes of its nobles and monarch, was enabled to make itself feared by both Turk and Muscovite; and indeed most of the territory which lies in the steppe of Russia, between Moscow and Odessa, and particularly that part of it which is occupied by the military colonies, had been ceded by the Turks to the Poles a little time before Peter the Great's accession to the throne. It was, perhaps, to their struggle with the Swedes that the Czar owed the safety of his dominions, after the decisive battle of Narva, and was enabled to prepare his subjects, by small skirmishes with the Swedish troops, to defend himself against the inroad of Charles XII, and finally to overthrow that power on the field of Poltowa.

After the victory of Poltowa, however, his power was raised to such a pitch that he was enabled to push on his success into Turkey. Although, as we have seen, he received a temporary defeat in that country, he was enabled successfully to place his own candidate upon the throne of Poland, to make himself dreaded by the Tartars, to be called in as an ally against them by the Shah of Persia; to make the King of England tremble for his German dominions; to negotiate at the same time an advantageous treaty with China; and to make an alliance with his daughters Ann and Elizabeth courted by the Empress Queen of Austria.

At the very period at which we have now arrived, 1755, the Empress Elizabeth was about to enter into one of the most memorable wars which Europe had ever witnessed, in concert with France, Sweden, and Austria, against Prussia and England; this has been called the 'seven years' war. France lost most of her possessions; England gained large territorial acquisitions in North America, and began, under Clive, that career of conquest in India which has enabled her to raise a most powerful and flourishing empire in the East, whilst her ally, the stout King of Prussia, after defending his dominions, single-handed, against the most influential states of Europe, was not only enabled to retain the provinces which he had conquered from Austria during the preceding war, but even elevated his country to a pitch of power and importance which it had never before enjoyed. Sweden neither lost nor gained; whilst Russia did not continue the contest sufficiently long to acquire territory. She, however, gained in her position as an European state.

Peter III. did not live long after the death of his aunt, or his admiration of Frederick the Great would have made him continue the war in his favour; but Catherine did not see what was to be gained by taking the side of either party in the war; and she, moreover, believed that Frederick had a great share in irritating her husband against her. She was not undeceived in this opinion until she read some of the correspondence which passed between Frederick and Peter, in which she ascertained that the former had done all in his power to soften her husband towards her. This afterwards led to an alliance with Frederick and Maria Theresa of Austria, which eventually proved most advantageous to Russia, as Catherine, induced those sovereigns to enter into negotiation with her to partition Poland amongst them.

Catherine's own narrative of her intrigues, and her description of the different characters of her lovers, show that she had a good appreciation of the qualities of those with whom she came in contact, that must have gone far towards enabling her to make that admirable selection of generals and statesmen, and afterwards assisted in carrying out her ambitious designs.

Catherine brings her account of the year 1755 to a close, with an amusing anecdote of her intrigue with Narickine, who, it appears, had recourse to the curious resource of mewing like a cat when he wished for admittance into her chamber. One of the nights on which he thus gained admittance, he told her that his sister-in-law, for whom the Grand Duchess had shown some esteem, was ill, and requested to see her.

"I would go to her—but how?" said Catherine.

"Oh, I will take you there," said Leon.

"Are you mad?" answered Catherine. "How can I go with you?"

"Why, in this way. I will come and fetch you in an hour or two's time. The Grand Duke will be at supper; he will get very tipsy and go to bed. Dress in men's clothes, for greater security, and we will go together to Anna Nikitchna Narickine's."

"As soon, therefore," writes Catherine, "as Madame Vladislava had undressed me and retired, I got up, dressed myself from head to foot as a man; Leon came through the apartment of the Grand Duke, mewed at my door, I opened it, we passed through a small ante-room into the hall, entered his carriage, and drove to the place of rendezvous, where a night of revelry was indulged in."

These nocturnal revels were often resumed, without exciting the suspicion of any of the courtiers; and they were rendered the more agreeable by the intimate acquaintance which she formed with the fascinating Count Poniatowsky, who was intriguing to get appointed Polish minister in Russia.

During 1756, diplomatic intrigues of a wider and more interesting nature were being carried on at Moscow. The seven years' war had now commenced, and the Count Esterhazy, the Austrian Envoy in Russia, used all his skill to persuade the Empress to support the cause of his mistress in Germany. The Chancellor Bestoujeff was, however, opposed to him, and favoured the interest of the King of Prussia and the King of England. The Chancellor was anxious that she should only send a small force, about 30,000 men, into Bohemia, and that she should by no means act as an important power in the war. The Austrian Ambassador, however, inserted, according to his instructions from Maria Theresa, that if she supported the Empress Queen of Hungary, she should do so with all her forces. He ultimately gained his point. Williams in the mean time had made most strenuous efforts to gain the Russian alliance for England and Prussia; and the Chancellor had even gone so far as to sign a treaty in Williams's favour. He was obliged, however, the day after, to undo his work, as his opponents were too strong; and, with great grief, was obliged to return to his own country. The Grand Duchess much regretted this termination of affairs, and the departure of the English Ambassador from the Russian Court.

Count Poniatowsky now returned from his Polish trip and visited Catherine, accompanied by Count Horne, a Swedish noble, who had belonged to the Russian party in that country, and who had been obliged to quit it on account of French influence gaining the upper hand; Catherine stating that many of the chiefs of his party had been executed on account of their political principles, and that he and Count Horne would have shared the same fate had he not taken refuge in Russia. It may here be observed that Sweden had been divided into two parties ever since the death of Charles XII, according to Voltaire; and, although party feeling ran high between them, we somewhat doubt whether it was pushed to such extremities as Catherine would have us believe.

On the return of Poniatowsky, a circumstance occurred, which, although slight in itself, throws great light on his character. The Grand Duchess had a small dog which barked most furiously at Horne, whilst he welcomed Poniatowsky with great delight; on which Horne remarked, "My friend, there is nothing so terrible as a little Italian greyhound: the first thing I always do with the ladies I am in love with is to give them one of these little dogs, and by this means I can always discover whether there is any more favoured than myself. The rule is infallible. You see it. The dog growled as if he would have eaten me, because I am a stranger, whilst he was mad with joy when he saw you again; for most assuredly this is not the first time he has seen you here."

The Grand Duchess, having given an account of her own intrigues, now proceeds to those of her husband. The detail of his amours is too long to be noticed here; suffice it to say that he formed an attachment to several of his wife's own maids of honour, and they were encouraged to deceive her. She seems also to have met with great opposition from the intrigues of Robert Brockdorf, the Holstein courtier, who advised the Grand Duke to introduce a guard of his own countrymen into Russia. He had acquired a great influence over his master, and had surrounded him.

according to Catherine's account, with many low and needy followers, who encouraged him in his drunkenness and debauchery, whilst they robbed him of his money and filled his head with all sorts of violent notions against his wife. The prince, being too idle and tco undecided to manage his own affairs, made his wife read the despatches from Holstein, and sign those she thought proper; countersigning them afterwards himself. The Grand Duchess, as may be supposed, acquired by these means a thorough knowledge of the Grand Duke's private business, and was by no means induced to submit to the supervision of Brockdorf. Amonst other things in which Catherine and her minister differed, was the long imprisonment of many men who seemed to have discharged the duties of their office with ability and honour, and who were apparently only confined on account of their attempts to overthrow Brockdorf's influence in the affairs of the Grand Duchy of Holstein.

After eight months' delay, Catherine obtained an interview with the Empress, who listened to her complaints against Brockdorf. She seems, however, not to have received Catherine very graciously, to have questioned her much on the state of affairs in Holstein, to have been extremely surprised that she was so well acquainted with them, and to have been very indignant that she should have informed herself upon them by the express order of the Grand Duke. The chief topic of this conversation was afterwards used by her enemies against Catherine, when the Empress's health became indifferent, and when it was impossible to hide the fact from the knowledge of the public. An accident had occurred to the Empress in church, by which her foot slipped, and she had so severe a fall as to be carried home on a litter, where she lay for some time in a state of insensibility. The dangerous state of the Empress made many of her servants fear the responsibility they might have to bear for political acts when her successor came to the throne, as there is no security for any official functionary when the reins of government fall into new hands, in a country like Russia, where the crown is not only despotic, but even as irresponsible for its acts as Divinity itself. Amongst these was Marshal Apraxine. He was well aware that the war had only been undertaken to please the Empress, and that it would not be carried on a single year after her death. He therefore retreated in a most precipitate manner to the Russian frontier; and, although this might have been necessary, his mode of conducting his retreat too much resembled a flight, to display either military talent or political prudence. Many ef his friends attributed his conduct to his real motives; but most of his enemies accused him of either treachery or cowardice. The Chancellor, who was desirous of saving him, and who well knew the attachment of the Grand Duchess to him, requested her to join in remonstrating with the Marshal on his conduct; and several letters were accordingly written by Catherine to her friend, which, however, were never answered, but, unfortunately for herself, were afterwards distorted by her enemies into an accusation against her, when the Chancellor lost his power. The Marshal was eventually recalled, tried by court martial, but expired previous to receiving sentence.

Catherine finally gives a long account of her intrigues with Poniatowsky, which we have not space to notice in detail; suffice it to say, she had another child, a daughter, of whom the Empress took as much care as she did of Catherine's eldest child, whilst the mother was left in a still more forlorn condition than on a previous occasion. Peter had hesitated whether he should consider this child as his own. The suspicions, however, were easily quieted by the 60,000 roubles which he received at its birth. His wife and he, however, were not long on good terms; and after a number of intrigues on both sides, matters were at length brought to a crisis by a violent dispute touching a visit to the theatre. She flatly declared that to live any longer with him was impossible, and that she intended to complain to the Empress, and request to be sent back to her own family. Soon after, the Empress saw her and listened to her complaints; though Catherine found that her enemies had been before hand with her, and accused her of interfering in the affairs of Holstein, of secretly corresponding with the Chancellor, who had now lost all his influence at court, and of sending letters to Apraxine which had somewhat induced his hasty retreat. She, however, contrived to clear herself of all the charges, although she does not seem to have obtained the permission of the Empress to return home.

With this conversation this remarkable book abruptly terminates. It clearly shows that not only the character of Catherine was full of deceit and hypocrisy, but that Russian morals were at a very low ebb in the eighteenth century, when no one, however exalted, feared to descend to intrigue or falsehood, as long as it brought interest and position. The Russian character has not improved since that day; though their present duplicity is carried on with more decency, and some pretence to civilization. We said, in the beginning of our article, that there was little doubt of Mr. Herzen's authenticity. It appears that several narratives of Catherine's life have been published anterior to the present time, none of which differ materially from his own. It is, therefore, likely that he has taken much from other works; and it is difficult to say which of the many works that pretend to be Memoirs of Catherine II is the original. It is thus no easy matter for the reviewer to determine between the true and the false. The only point which tells against Herzen, is, that he does not very clearly account, after all, for the manner in which he obtained his information. One lesson, however, to be learned from all the narratives of Catherine's life—is, that certain characters in history seem to be adapted to peculiar periods. There is no doubt, if Peter had long enjoyed the throne of Russia, that the country would have returned either to its state of barbarism, or else lost considerably in rank as an European power. It may be said, to the credit of Catherine, as of Elizabeth of England, that, in spite of her many vices, she placed her country in the van of advancement, and helped to make it one of the greatest powers in the world.

RUSSIA AS IT IS.

RUSSIA AS IT IS.

It is strange that a country like Russia, which commenced with such small beginnings, and was scarcely known to the ancients, should have terrified all her neighbours by her power and ambition. Insignificantly mentioned in ancient times as having been the scene of the Argonautic expedition, and as forming part of the kingdom from which Mithridates issued to contend for the dominion of Asia Minor, it subsequently became renowned as the scene of the overthrow of his son, so well described by Julius Cæsar; and as the locality to which the famous poet Ovid was exiled, and in which he wrote his famous verses.

Three hundred years ago, Russia was still considered rather as an Asiatic than an European state. It was not until the end of the 17th century that any attempts were made to raise it to a substantial rank amongst the western powers. Then it was that that extraordinary man, Peter the Great, introduced the civilization, customs and manners of the rest of Europe; and brought about such changes as hereafter placed Russia high amongst European nations. Wise and judicious measures have appeared through subsequent reigns, though progress has been retarded by a large retrograde party, which, assisted by the clergy and the landowners, has striven to keep Russia eastern in its Courts, its internal administration, and usages.

It is a wonder, to those who have read Russian history, how a people, so long strangers to civilization, who have passed through so many vicissitudes of fortune, should have made such rapid strides, gained such influence both in Europe and Asia, and, having acquired large territorial possessions in both continents, become the terror of their powerful and warlike neighbours.

Many causes, since the days of Peter the Great, have contributed to this sudden and unexpected rise; and chief among them, the vigour, celerity and secrecy, with which despotic monarchs execute their plans, a power which all jurists and politicians agree in considering the sole advantage of absolute government. The character of the sovereigns who have succeeded Peter the Great has generally been able and energetic, even to the present day; and modern Czars have followed up his measures and policy.

If modern rulers have done so much towards making Russia a first-rate power, the qualities of the people have equally contributed to this success. They are as courageous and determined in obtaining their ends as their sovereigns; they have an extraordinary quickness for adopting the inventions of other nations, and making improvements in their army and navy.

The two best works which have as yet appeared on the internal affairs of Russia are the Memoirs of Count Ségur,* the Erench Envoy to the Court of Catherine II, and the Travels of Mr. Kohl.† The former tells us "that when he accompanied the Empress on her journey to the Crimea, everything was done by the authorities to deceive her into the belief that her provinces were well administered, and her roads well kept." Although this clever princess did not swallow with credulity all she heard, yet she was nevertheless unable to arrive at any just idea of the true state of her dominions. There is too much reason to believe that the same deceptions are daily being practised upon the reigning Czar; for Kohl positively asserts "that everything is still done in Russia in an underhand and unstatesmanlike manner." Such facts suggest volumes. Russians, however, should be encouraged to write about their own country and government; for they would naturally be able to explain many customs which foreigners look upon with prejudiced eyes.

We are apt to wonder at the paucity of reliable works on this country; though we little know the sad truth, that the Russian writer is so surrounded by difficulties that he dare not express his real opinions on paper. He also labours under the misfortune of writing in a language which will never be read or understood out of his own country. If, therefore, he ventures to express his opinions to the world, he must do so in French. Whether he publishes his experiences at home or abroad, either against the Government, or in its favour, he must, as a Russian, expect to meet with insurmountable obstacles. At home, he has no chance of success, as he falls under the eye of the secret police and its spies; whilst abroad, he is likewise closely watched by diplomatic agents, who report correctly to their Government at St. Petersburg every word he utters.

It is, therefore, somewhat astonishing to meet with a book on Russia, written by one apparently well fitted for the task. Prince Dolgoroukow, the latest Russian Essayist, is distantly connected with the Imperial house, and has held at various times important posts in the Government, though generally supporting liberal principles. On this account, his treatise must be taken with some degree of caution; though it must be said, to his credit, that his descriptions and those of recent travellers thoroughly coincide. Well acquainted with Russian history, and connected with most of the celebrated characters who have taken a part in Russian policy for the last quarter of a century, Prince Dolgoroukow's* statements are as interesting as they are astonishing.

---

* Mémoires, ou Souvenirs et Anecdotes de Comte de Ségur; 3 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1857.

† Russia, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkoff, Riga, Odessa, and the German Provinces on the Baltic; the Steppes, the Crimea, and the Interior of the Empire. By J. G. Kohl. Chapman and Hall, London.

He commences by assuring us that "it is a mistake to suppose that the lives and properties of the subjects of the Russian Empire are entirely dependent on the absolute will of the Emperor, without laws to protect them."

"There is," he remarks, "a well-arranged code of fifteen volumes of one thousand pages each, which most accurately defines the duties of the different authorities of the State, and the rights of the people, both in civil and criminal cases. This has been arranged at various times by different Emperors, beginning with John IV; the subsequent additions by Alexis I, father of Peter the Great, in 1640; and lastly, by the Emperor Theodore III." These laws are, however, a mockery, as the first of them places the will and authority of the Emperor over that of all other powers in the State. He may annul or alter the statutes according to his pleasure; thus holding the lives and properties of his subjects positively, though not legally, in his hands. Again, any Emperor, however well intentioned, cannot bring about reforms, without the consent of the powerful Camarilla by which he is surrounded, or the connivance of the strong retrograde party now so triumphant in Russia. It is the interest of the Ministers to deceive the Czar as to the real state of affairs, and to thwart each other as much as possible. Thus we are told that for nearly half a century each Minister ruled over his department more like an oriental Pasha than an European; and that it is only since the summer of 1857, that they have assembled together like other Cabinets to deliberate on affairs of State. It is no less remarkable that at this conference it became difficult to define the respective functions of the different Ministers; as each, having acted so long in his own department, was naturally jealous of the interference of his colleagues. Thus for a long time it was almost impossible to administer the affairs of the State in concert.

---

* La Vérité sur la Russie, par la Prince Pierre Dolgoroukow. Paris: à Franck Libraire Editeur, 67, Rue Richelieu, 1860.

Our author bitterly complains of the necessity for propitiating those who are powerful at Court, even to obtain employment, or the appointment of an inferior office. In other European countries, a man of distinguished political or literary merit is sure to find in this a sufficient passport, if they do not obtain for him an important place in the state. In Russia it requires the protection of some great noble even to approach the person of the Sovereign; and, according to Prince Dolgoroukow, the administration is an *official lie* throughout the whole Empire. Justice is so complicated, that it is more calculated to occasion expense and delay than to fulfil its end. Thus there are a number of local tribunals in each province from which an appeal may be made to the Senate, then to the Minister of Justice, and lastly to the Emperor; each of which process requires bribery and interest to a fearful degree. A curious anecdote is told of a merchant who asked the advice of his Minister, how he should obtain justice in a cause which had been pending for several years. "Why," replied the official, "if you have resided long in Russia, you must be fully aware that justice cannot be had except it be bought." The merchant urged, "I have appealed from court to court, and I have paid large sums, until I am tired." On this anecdote Dolgoroukow quietly remarks, "it is not only necessary to bribe in order to gain a cause, but the money must be spent *judiciously*." If the civil jurisprudence is so corrupt, the criminal trials remind one of what used to occur during the middle ages, or in the early part of modern history, Even the Inquisition could hardly treat its victims with much more cruelty, Thus the political victims in 1825 were punished with extraordinary barbarity, and nothing was neglected to terrify them into confession and betrayal. "Closely confined in dark dungeons, and led through long corridors with veils over their faces, these poor men were brought before their stern judges; a glare of light was cast upon them to which their eyes had been long unaccustomed, and they were cruelly examined and tortured." All these political culprits were condemned to death, though the sentence was commuted for a life exile to Siberia. The parents of one of these unfortunates petitioned to see their son, as he passed through their village on his way to a living tomb. The authorities answered, "that a State criminal had neither parents nor relations, and refused the request." Most of these criminals are now toiling in the mines of Siberia.

Prince Dolgoroukow next discourses on the powers of the Russian Senate, which is of but recent creation, and forms a court of judicial appeal. It seems to hold its principal sittings at Moscow, its members being men of experience and information. All, however, are appointed by interest. An instance is cited in which the President was jealous of the power of one of the Senators, a man of great information in legal matters, and of general common sense. The President was at a loss how to displace him, until the unfortunate Senator requested, on the plea of ill health, to be allowed to travel for two years abroad, stipulating, however, that he should resume his office and duties on his return. This the President very readily agreed to, expecting never to see his opponent again. The necessary permission was obtained from the Government for foreign travel; but no sooner had the obnoxious Senator departed from Moscow, than his perfidious enemy intrigued to deprive him of his honours, and at once succeeded. The Senate, according to Dolgoroukow, appears to be divided into various complicated departments. It is thoroughly corrupt in its administration, and the laws, owing to their extreme voluminousness, are often obscure and even contradictory, having been made at a period when, in most countries of Europe, the noble as well as the serf was ignorant both of reading and writing, and it was thought beneath men to be occupied with any other business than that of war. In other countries, the laws have been gradually remedied by use, by correction of judges, by the pleadings and explanations of able lawyers; but in Russia, no one is considered to have the right of altering and revising the laws except the Emperor. Thus many things remain in a state inapplicable to the wants of the present age, and many important rights, such as that of succession to the throne, have been undefined until a very late period.

Dolgoroukow has taken the pains of making a long extract from Monsieur Herzen's Catherine II,* in order to prove that, in the middle of the last century, not even the highest man in the State could tell, "when he closed his eyes at night, whom he would find on the throne in the morning." This confusion in Russian law is, without doubt, owing to the want of free discussion; an assembly to revise it; and lawyers to plead the causes of clients in open Court. In fact, all legal cases appear to be carried on in writing and in secret.

The gloomy picture which Dolgoroukow has thus drawn, though perhaps exaggerated, is used as a means for venting the ill humour of an exiled and disappointed man. It must not be lost sight of that if the Russians have sometimes filled great offices with bad men by intrigue and cabal, they have as often appointed well-qualified foreigners, when they lacked talent amongst their own people. Thus

---

* Memoirs of the Empress Catherine II, written by herself, with Preface by A. Herzen. Trübner and Co. 60, Paternoster Row, 1859.

Pozzo di Borgo* guided their diplomatic policy throughout the last war, and, by his able management in the cabinet, contributed not a little towards repelling Napoleon's terrible attack in 1812, and thus gained for Russia an influence in European politiss, after the struggle was over, which it had never previously enjoyed. Again, Barclay de Tolly, a general of Scotch extraction, saved St. Petersburg from the fate of Moscow, and the empire from being conquered by the French; whilst Mackenzie, the noted Scotch engineer, made Sebastopol a Gibraltar of the Crimea, and enabled it successfully to resist the combined efforts of the armies of England and France. Our author should therefore pause before he blames his Government for its "bad selections to great offices."

Dolgoroukow turns with considerable feeling to the consideration of the *serf population.* The lower orders of Europe, as is well known, were all in a state of servitude during the middle ages, though they subsequently gained their freedom through the kindness of their masters, and by their gradual increase in wealth and influence. In England, serfdom was not totally abolished until the reign of Charles II; and in France, not until that of Louis XVI; whilst in other countries it gradually vanished, as feudalism disappeared. Strange enough, it has lasted up to our own time both in Poland and Russia, two countries in which it had never been established. The condition of the ordinary Russian serf, where the master is kind and knows his own interest, is anything but miserable, he being spared by his servitude from many of the cares which embarrass the poorer classes in other countries of Europe. The serfs on the crown domains, however, are handed over to the care of government officials, who make as much profit as they can out of their labour. If we are to believe our author, very heavy imposts are laid upon them, and they groan under severe restrictions; they are unable to appeal against the treatment of their superiors, and cannot obtain redress for their grievances, as their lot is cast in a country where every thing yields to money and influence.

Our author complains much of the hindrance placed in the way of emancipation by what he calls the Bureaucracy; a set of persons who possess considerable power, from their noble birth and family connections. The bureaucracy does not appear to have assumed an organized form until 1682, when the Emperor Theodore instituted the *Tchine,* an order composed of a number of nobles, and from which all officers and counsellors of state were selected. When Peter the Great began his schemes of civilization and aggrandisement, and invited eminent foreigners from all parts of Europe to assist him in his laudable undertaking, it was then found to be a necessary, though difficult, task to reward valuable foreign servants of the empire. Of course, the *Tchine* opposed these innovations, though Peter's vigour, perseverance, and firmness enabled him to overcome all obstacles and to subdue their resistance. Succeeding monarchs, down to the time of Paul I, though they followed in Peter's footsteps, were nevertheless continually hampered by the power of this highly conservative body. When Paul came to the throne, his absurd notions of imperial prerogative induced him to place all offices in the hands of court favourites and the great chamberlains. On his death, it appears that Alexander I abolished many posts about the court, and apparently augmented his own power. In spite, however, of all his endeavours, he fell more than ever into the hands of the bureaucracy. Dolgoroukow well remarks "that in no country are there more counsellors than in Russia, and in none is advice so little followed." Thus, real merit has no chance of advancement, owing to the intrigues of this hierarchy of placeholders. The career of young men in Russia cannot be compared with that in other countries of Europe. In free states, men have a greater choice of occupation, and more chance of advancement by their own merit. Most of the youths of Russia, who are not employed in military service, are obliged to engage in that of the state, either in public offices, or as diplomatists. In both cases, they for a long time copy the letters of their superiors, and go through years of tedious routine, not at all suited to men of ability. They are liable to be dismissed at any moment, without the slightest assigned reason, at the caprice of their superiors; whilst merit, honesty and talent, are entirely overlooked, if not combined with influential interest. Those who advance, are practised intriguers and adepts in fraud of every kind. Be the promotion ever so rapid, no man can hope to attain a high post in his department until he has reached a considerable age, and then he is too firmly rooted in his bad habits to desire reform. Even against his better judgment, he usually exclaims, with the old French noble, "après moi le deluge."

---

* Notice sur la Vie du Comte C. A. Pozzo di Borgo, par B. H. R. Capefigue. Paris, 1844. Biographie Universelle de Michaud—Article, Pozzo di Borgo.

With this introduction, our author takes up the important theme of *slavery*, and suggests a parallel between Russia and the United States. In both countries the difficulty of emancipation consists in "otherwise obtaining a supply of hands to perform the necessary labour." Both have equally to dread the revolution and anarchy which would follow from an imprudent and too rapid change. Our author gives a long and terrible account of the tyranny and maltreatment of the serfs under the paternal government of the Emperor Nicholas. It seems that, although their condition resembles in some measure the serfs of Europe during the middle ages, yet there are no means by which they can be easily emancipated. The original people of the Roman provinces were reduced to servitude by the various barbarous tribes who conquered them; and, like the Russian serfs, were afterwards attached to lands which they were allowed to till. Thus they were permitted to enjoy a third of the produce, and were gradually freed by the indulgence of masters, who permitted them to acquire land and to gain wealth. In Russia, however, the serf owns nothing; whilst there are no laws to create for him a landed tenure by which he may gradually obtain liberty. On the other hand, he never possesses even the most scanty means for purchasing his emancipation, no fixed price being settled by law. Thus he is little better off than the kidnapped negro from the African shore. Attached to land he cannot buy, he has neither prospect of freedom by law or by the indulgence of his master. It appears that this kind of servitude did not exist in Russia until three centuries ago, though it has been much increased since 1808. It was probably brought about by conquest, when the Russians drove out their Tartar masters and extended their own frontiers. It was not until 1855, that the nobles of Vilna, Grodno, and other provinces near Prussia, petitioned the Czar to emancipate their serfs. Alexander II, who seems to be an enlightened and benevolent Prince, at once set about solving this great question. He ordered committees to assemble in St. Petersburg and Moscow, as well as in the various provinces of the empire, " to inquire into the condition of the serfs, and the best method of giving them their freedom." The Bureaucracy as well as the nobles were at once terrified by such bold and determined measures, and accordingly endeavoured to postpone the consideration of the question by the pretended discovery of a conspiracy among the serfs. This expedient had often been used with success during the reign of Nicholas, whose administration was much disturbed at its commencement by numerous plots, the object of which was to replace Constantine on the throne which he had abdicated. Finding that the preseat Czar and his Government were not to be deterred from attempting reforms, the Bureaucracy proposed to emancipate the serfs *without land;* a measure which would put *slaves* entirely under the authority of their masters. It then endeavoured artfully to turn the subject which the different committees were to consider, by changing the words, in the royal manifesto, of "emancipation of the serfs," into that of "ameliorating the condition of the peasants." This gave quite a new power to the Bureaucracy, and enabled them to appoint many of its most powerful partisans as members of the commission. The committee continued its labours, but the Bureaucracy still further impeded its progress, and, bit by bit, gained a large majority of votes in favour of the old state of matters. There were still, however, a few enlightened spirits, five of whom drew up a report, in which they recommended *the emancipation of the serfs with land, the reform of abuses in the local police and administration, the freedom of the press,* and *many general privileges.* These bold measures were calculated to injure the power of the Crown; so that when they were presented to the Minister of the Interior and the Supervising Commission, they were dismissed with contempt. It now became a question whether the Czar should rule alone or with the assistance of the Bureaucracy. In fact, he was placed in much the same position towards his nobles, as the old feudal sovereigns of the middle ages—with this difference, that the latter could more easily use force in coercing their Barons, whilst the Czar failed to reduce his Boyards. The Bureaucracy are now anxious that the serfs should be emancipated, but clogged with what our author calls "*obligatory labour.*" Such a liberation would be merely nominal; it would involve the serf and his employer in never-ending law-suits, the chief wealth of a Russian noble being derived from the labour of his slaves, and the tribute which is levied on them. To this is to be traced the extreme unwillingness of all Russian nobles to free their slaves.

Our author next discusses the best method of indemnifying the proprietors for the loss they would sustain by the liberation of their serfs. He thinks "that an indemnity might be paid to them by the state; that the debt thus incurred might be ultimately liquidated by the produce and sale of the crown lands, by the public revenues of the state, which, hitherto collected by a system of the most shameful fraud and corruption, could be carefully administered; and by a small payment out of the earnings of the emancipated serfs from their lands." Thus, emancipation might be real and effectual; the territories of each province could be divided into lots and distributed to the serfs at the time of their freedom. We fully concur in all these suggestions; but cannot go the length of believing that emancipation is essential to the preservation of the Russian empire. The Czar must proceed with great caution in so vast a question, and determine whether the serf shall be emancipated with or without land,—by what tenure he shall hold such land, and whether liberation shall be purchased at fixed price,—or the state burdened with the indemnity payable to the master. Dolgoroukow is strongly in favour of liberation *with land;* and quotes the example of Russian and Prussian Poland. In the former, it is merely nominal, as the serfs have no possessions; whilst, in the latter, it is working well in a contrary direction. When all these points shall have been maturely discussed by the Russian Government, and have been legally and well defined, the Emperor can then commence, *and not till then,* a gradual and lasting emancipation.

There is also another consideration which our author has overlooked; viz. the want of education amongst ths serfs, and their unfitness for the enjoyment of liberty. At present, the serf possesses neither money nor land; his wants are chiefly supplied by his owner. Under a new state of things, he would be obliged to labour and provide for himself—a task not easily accomplished.

From the consideration of the serfs, our author turns to that of the *Russian States General and the Russian Constitution* of the earliest periods down to the present time. Russian history, owing to the difficulty of obtaining references, and to the long exclusion of Europeans from the Russian Empire, must at all times be an obscure study, if not a sealed book; but we were not prepared to hear, until we perused the volume before us, that the Muscovites thus early had so perfect a States General. He commences with the assertion that the different towns of Russia were, in early times, chiefly huts of wood and mud; and, owing to their unfortified condition, much exposed to the attacks of the wandering Asiatic tribes. At length, the conqueror Ruric, appearing in the northern districts about the end of the ninth century, overthrew, with the aid of his northmen, all the Russian tribes, and established the capital on the lake Ladoga; on this he built a strong tower, the remains of which are known to this day as the "Fortress of Ruric." He, like the other northmen sovereigns, divided the lands of the conquered race amongst his followers; and these estates were called "appanages;" and those who held them, "the Princes of the Appanage." This nobility does not seem, however, to have been hereditary; the inheritance, both of the estates and of the crown, went from eldest brother to eldest brother in succession, instead of from father to son in direct line. Such a succession, as might have been expected, caused great dissension, and threatened the state of Russia with annihilation. In other respects, however, the rule of Ruric seems to have been mild and equitable. The serf's condition had not yet become intolerable, and corporal punishment was little known. This state of things lasted until the 13th century, when the country was invaded and subdued by the Tartars, and the house of Ruric overthrown; though the various chiefs to whom "appanages" had been granted were allowed to remain.

The Princes of Moscow now became powerful, owing to their purchasing and conquering some of the petty states. They were considered to be the ruling family of the country, and as such had to levy the tribute imposed on the Russians by the Tartar Khan and his tribe of the Golden Horde. According to our author, all Russian princes had to pay an annual visit to this haughty chief, to offer an annual tribute, and render the most degrading homage. Under these Tartar rulers, all classes of the Russian people were oppressed and reduced to a state of servitude, though corporal punishments were not introduced. Slavery was, however, increased by the Grand Duke John III, who, marrying a Greek princess, introduced the extravagant ideas of prerogative which were entertained by the Byzantine emperors. It was not until the 16th century that the Muscovites successfully threw off the degrading Tartar yoke, under John IV*, who seems to have been a prince of great vigour, but became, towards the end of his reign, extremely tyrannical. He first assumed the title of Czar, the other Russian sovereigns having been known up to that period as Great Princes or Grand Dukes.

During this reign, we first hear of the sovereign having called to his councils *the States General*, composed of the bishops, the abbots, the higher clergy, the Boyards, of both classes (those with and those without titles), and deputies from towns. The powers of this assembly, however, were limited. It was chiefly called together to consider the code of laws collected by John IV. In the reign of Theodore I, who was a weak prince, it advanced in power. He, however, was followed by an impostor, known as the Pseudo Demetrius; many competitors also arising to contend with him for the crown.

About this period the Poles and Swedes invaded Russia; the roads were everywhere infested with brigands, and commerce with other countries was entirely arrested. Of course this was just such a crisis as would prove advantageous for putting forward popular rights and principles, and for the nobles to acquire power at the expense of the crown. Such a period had been made use of by the nobles in England, Scotland, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, during the turbulent days of the middle ages; and in our own country especially, we principally owe our excellent constitution to the good use made by the barons of such disturbed periods as the minorities of Henry III and Richard II. In Russia, the nobles were fully alive to the advantages which such a time gave them; and the States General was accordingly assembled, to consult as to the best methods of putting an end to the disturbances. It made a treaty with the Poles and Swedes, by which they were obliged to cede large portions of territory; in return for which, the Poles obtained a necessary tranquillity. The States General then resolved, after long deliberation, to elect Michel Romanow, the son of the Patriarch, Sovereign of Russia.* Being a youth of only twelve years of age, they invested him with the sovereignty on their own terms. He was unable to put any one to death, could confiscate no estates, could engage in no wars, nor contract treaties, without the deliberation and consent of his States General. Further, all criminals were confronted with their accusers. This was a most extensive charter of liberties, and was duly conceded during Michel's minority. The States General governed from 1613 to 1619, vigorously and prosperously. Dolgoroukow remarks that it made the great mistake of attempting to establish a free government for the higher classes, whilst the great mass of the people remained in hopeless servitude. As for the condition of the serfs, there were but two classes: prisoners made in war, and the voluntary serfs who had taken to that condition to escape the miseries of poverty. At a later period, they were divided into domestic serfs, who might be sold like negroes; and the serfs who cultivated lands, and who were permanently attached to the soil. Michel soon ended the charter, by exiling those who had drawn it up; and he, as well as his successors, Alexis and Theodore II, diminished the power of the States General, by adopting the same policy as the Tudors did with the English Parliament, by calling it together only at distant periods of time and on great occasions. It met for the last time in the 17th century, under Theodore III, eldest brother of Peter the Great, in 1682.

---

* Le Grand Duc Jean IV (1534—1584).

Peter the Great, although he was a reformer, was, nevertheless, a tyrant. He came to the throne in one of those crises when it is more necessary to have a firm and able ruler than a good sovereign. It was a question, in his day, whether Russia should remain an Asiatic and semi-barbarous empire, or become a civilized and European state. While Peter did much to enlighten and improve his people, he, nevertheless, took care that his authority should not be in the slightest degree diminished; and while he obliged his nobles to adopt European customs and manners, he still kept servitude and corporal punishment in full force. Even the Imperial family were often subjected to the latter. Peter did not hesitate even to inflict the bastinado on his sisters, and to torture and put to death his own son for resenting his uncontrollable temper.

Dolgoroukow tells us that Peter II, who died in 1730, was the last of the Romanow family. The nobles considered this event as a happy period for again attempting to curb the arbitrary power of the crown. As all Peter's heirs were females, and as nothing could be ascertained from him as to his successor, the nobles assembled at Moscow, and deliberated whether they should offer the crown to Ann, Duchess of Courland, or to the Princess Elizabeth, and as to what conditions should be imposed on these persons in the event of their acceptance of the crown. The Princes, Dolgoroukow and Galitzin—who were the most powerful chiefs amongst the nobles—united, and their partizans readily agreed upon limiting the prerogative of the crown, although they disagreed as to the mode in which it was to be effected. Some desired that the sovereign should reign with the assistance of a council, in whose hands the real government of the country should be placed; others desired that the nobles should be called together in a senate of two chambers; whilst a third and very small party were for preserving the authority of the crown in *statu quo*. None thought of giving a share in the legislature either to the serfs or to the clergy. A charter was at length drawn up by which nobles were to be formed into a senate, and the Czar was to rule with the assistance of a council. The sovereign agreed to these concessions; but, as the nobles were neither supported by the clergy nor the serfs, and were often at enmity with the former, they failed to establish a really strong government. The Empress Ann, on arriving at Moscow, at once released herself from her engagements, and abolished the charter as soon as she found herself firmly seated on the Russian throne. She and her successor, the Empress Elizabeth (1762), governed all classes of the Russian people with the most absolule sway.

---

* Michael Romanow (1605—1618).

Peter III (a foreigner), on his accession, finding it expedient to ingratiate himself with the nobles, abolished all the restrictions which they complained of, as well as the secret Chancellerie then so powerful at St. Petersburgh. On his dethronement and murder by his wife, the celebrated Catherine II, the prerogative of the crown was restored to its full force; and, though she called together the States General, in 1767, for the last time, she, like the rest, soon found the necessity of proroguing it, as she affirmed "that it unnecessarily lost time in talk." She would doubtless have retained all her power, had it not been for the rising of the serfs on the Volga, when she learned that it was requisite to obtain a large party amongst the nobles, if she desired to establish her authority. She therefore granted new concessions, the right of assembling in the provinces every three years to discuss the laws, and to elect judges and the great Marshals of Noblesse. These were in reality but trifling concessions, as the judges were completely under the control of the governors; and, even in criminal cases, they could only decide as commanded by the higher authorities; no appeals could be made in any case without bribery and corruption. These so-called privileges were, thus, insignificant, though by their means Catherine obtained her object. The brilliancy of her achievements abroad so glossed over tyranny at home, that it was imperceptible to foreigners.

Catherine, on her death, in 1796, was succeeded by her son, Paul, concerning whose character there seems to be a great diversity of opinion. All readers of Russian history have been led to look on Paul as the most arbitrary and absurd of tyrants, and his measures as emanating from the fears and depressions of a diseased mind. Dolgoroukow would have us, however, believe that in early life Paul was a prince of great ability and enlightened views. His education had been committed to the charge of a celebrated Russian politician who had long resided in Sweden, where he imbibed liberal opinions, and great admiration for the laws and institutions of a constitutional monarchy, which he had instilled into the mind of his pupil. Paul was still further urged to adopt a liberal policy by his wife, a German princess, a clever woman of great amiability of character. It is stated that with her help and that of his tutor, who filled the post of minister of foreign affairs, Paul drew up a constitution, by which legislative powers were placed in the hands of the Senate. He did not, however, venture on the bold scheme of emancipating the serfs. Had his constitution been established, it would only have merged into a strong oligarchy as tyrannical as the despotism exercised by the crown. It was never destined to see the light, as it was contrary to the views of Catherine II. The unfortunate princess who induced Paul to draw it up died early, hated and persecuted by the Empress, to whom, according to many, was owing her premature death. There is, however, according to our author, no foundation for this accusation. Paul, who was much attached to his wife, was thrown into great grief by the event; he did not, however, remain long unmarried, but espoused a Russian princess. The old Russian party again regained its full sway, and again filled the monarch's head with those absurd ideas of prerogative which led to his untimely end. Paul, however, rendered a great service to the Russian people by settling the succession to the crown; a fact which Prince Dolgoroukow has passed over in silence. By his edict, all males were to succeed according to seniority, before any female was allowed to occupy the throne. Many leaders conspired to put him to death, in the hope of establishing a liberal government; and for that purpose they offered the crown to his son, Alexander, who was favourable to the establishment of a popular constitution.

According to our author, the Emperor Alexander was a man of weak character, with a good heart; he possessed manyprincely accomplishments, which made him generally popular, though he was truly described by Napoleon when he accused him of duplicity. The early part of his reign was passed in drawing up liberal schemes which never became law; and Sir Archibald Alison, who has given a most favourable view of his character, states that he was afraid to carry out the idea of emancipating the serfs, for fear of dangers that might follow. Every one who has read the history of the early part of the 19th century is aware of the great part which he took in arresting the march of French ambition. He largely increased the power of Russia, by supporting, in the early part of his reign, the Emperor Napoleon, and by concluding the treaty of Tilsit, which gave him time to conquer Finland and Bessarabia. He saved his country, in 1812, by his measures at Moscow; and gained for it power amongst the German states, by joining the allies and by his campaigns in 1813 and 1814. This influenced the mind of Louis XVIII; whose intrigues, and those of his minister at Paris, in 1814 and 1815, have been well described by Mons. Guizot. The last years of his reign were passed in revising his early policy, and he died in the year 1825, in the Crimea. His last days have been rendered familiar to English readers by the excellent narrative of that eminent man of science, Dr. Robert Lee. No foreigner is, perhaps, so well acquainted with Russian manners, customs, and politics, as that physician; and certainly no one could have given a clearer history of that most difficult crisis in Russian history.*

The Grand Duke Constantine, as the next heir, was placed on the Russian throne. He abdicated almost as soon as he had ascended it, though the motives which induced him to adopt this policy have never been clearly explained. If one may judge from his conduct during the Polish war, it was not occasioned by feelings of moderation. He displayed, during that period, as much desire for power as any of his race, and his actions showed that he lacked neither courage nor ability, notwithstanding the many eccentricities of his character. As it was extremely difficult in those days, when neither railroads nor the electric wire were known, to convey news in a short time over so vast a territory as that between the northern and southern ends of the Russian Empire, few were aware of the abdication of Constantine, or what was going on in the capital of St. Petersburgh. Many nobles rose to support him, whilst others, at St. Petersburgh, thought this a favourable moment for carrying out their liberal views, and for establishing a constitutional government, if not a republic. A provisional government was elected, and a council of thirty-one was appointed; the national guard was organised, and the chambers were called together. Nicholas, however, fortunately for himself, arrived in time to crush the movement before it had gained strength, and to raise upon it a still more arbitrary government than had yet been known. Dolgoroukow praises the enlightenment, the public spirit, and the boldness, displayed by the members of the Chamber at this critical period, and bitterly laments their misfortunes. Their estates were confiscated, and they were all packed off to Siberia.

---

* The last Days of Alexander, and the first Days of Nicholas, by Robert Lee, M.D. F.R.S. 2nd ed. London, 1854.

The height to which Nicholas's power had attained, and the tyranny which he displayed in exercising it, is well illustrated by what occurred to Dolgoroukow himself, if his narrative be true. It appears that, in 1843, having published, whilst at Paris, a pamphlet against the Russian Government, and having been overheard by a spy using strong expressions against the Emperor, which were reported to the authorities at head quarters, he was ordered home, and at once obeyed the imperial command. On his papers being examined and no treasonable correspondence discovered, the Emperor determined to have his revenge, and tried to prove him insane. Failing in this attempt, he offered him an insignificant post in the government of Tafna, in order that he might remain under the surveillance of the secret police. Dolgoroukow, who well understood the Czar's object, at once refused this offer, quoting an article in the Russian constitution, which allows a noble to decline the acceptance of civil, military, and diplomatic appointments. He was then banished to the same province of Tafna; and, although not publicly flogged, as many have asserted, he was nevertheless treated with great cruelty.

We consider, on reviewing this chapter, that the Russians have failed in establishing a liberal constitution from three causes:

I. They had no definite laws, as in England, to be confirmed by a Magna Charta, whereon to erect a free constitution.

II. They desired to have a liberal constitution, without abolishing the servitude under which the lower orders of the people groaned; an anomaly which could neither exist in theory nor practice.

III. The supporters of a liberal government were at variance with each other as to the constitution which ought to be established.

We cannot say if a liberal constitution would be a real advantage to the Russian Empire, as there are so many considerations to be taken into account before such a question could be well decided; but, if it be necessary, it must be *gradual* to be *permanent*.

Prince Dolgoroukow now turns to the consideration of the privileges of those nobles whose cowardice, feebleness, and selfishness, according to his own account, have disabled them from acquiring power for themselves or freedom for their fellow subjects. He tells us that they are, together with the Bourgeoisie, merchants, and the rest of the middle classes, exempt from corporal punishment, an immunity conceded to them by the States General in 1767. They seem to be the only class which the law acknowledges to have a right of possessing serfs; they may accept posts in the civil, military, and diplomatic services of the country, if the government choose to appoint them, and retire if the same government will permit them. They may also demand permission to travel, and obtain passports, if the authorities do not refuse to grant them; they may assemble to administer the affairs of the provinces, appoint the judges of the provincial courts, and elect their own marshals. All these privileges, however, amount to nothing, as they do not possess power independent of the crown. Had they asserted their rights to give council to their sovereign on his internal and external policy, to assemble and deliberate on the measures to be passed for the benefit of their country, that would have been a step towards influence, and would have opened the door for further improvements and concessions. Had this been the case, Russia might at this time be in the full enjoyment of a liberal and popular constitution, instead of all classes being reduced to servitude to the crown.

From the nobles, our author turns to the consideration of the middle classes, and to the mayors and municipalities of the towns and provinces. They seem to have been long established, but to possess little power beyond that of receiving the Emperor and presenting petitions to him when he visits their towns. They are treated with great haughtiness by the governors of provinces, and with utter contempt by the district generals. In fact, Dolgoroukow gives an anecdote which fully illustrates the harshness and indifference shown to them by the representatives of Imperial authority. When the municipality went to congratulate a governor on his arrival at his new government, he replied, "Gentlemen, you are a set of rogues, which fact you know as well as I do. I would advise you to take care how you discharge the duties of your office, as I shall visit with the greatest severity all those officers of my province who neglect the performance of their functions." If the magistrates of the people are treated with such disdain by the higher authorities, they will hardly retain the respect of those whose rights they are appointed to protect; and they are thus unfitted to hold any great extent of power, were it granted to them. The fact is, that the

Russians are prepared, neither by education nor by wealth, as our countrymen in England in the days of the Stuarts, to obtain their own freedom for themselves, by vigorously resisting the assumption of the crown, and by firmly requiring that those laws which have granted them any degree of liberty should be put into full force, and not remain a dead letter.

From the consideration of the Bourgeoisie, our author gives us an insight into the *military organization* of Russia, of which he says the Emperor Nicholas was the founder. He accuses this sovereign of having filled a number of civil offices with military men, who were not fitted by their previous profession to administer the duties of such departments; and that these ill-placed generals were men of very ordinary capacity in a military point of view, who had acquired their position by interest, court intrigue, and corruption. Even the minister of war was a feeble old man, who, though he possessed experience and some military talent, was yet too old, weak, and *passé* to prevent the mal-administration which every day took place in his department. Dolgoroukow blames, in very strong terms, the conduct of the government with regard to the army employed in the Crimean war, assuring us that the money that was intended for the purchase of hay, corn, horses, and provisions, invariably found its way into the pockets of employés, instead of being spent in necessaries for the campaign. The oxen which were furnished to the troops were augmented in nominal value by the preparation they underwent before reaching their destination; and those soldiers who had the misfortune to be wounded during the war, were carried to their hospitals in rough wooden carts, and taken no more care of than if they were so many dogs. When dead, their corpses were kept in cellars for weeks without burial, in order that their allowances might be claimed by the officials; whilst fictitious sums were charged for the medicines and necessaries of dead men, which sums were divided amongst the lying officers of the commissariat. The officers of regiments were treated, in many cases, most tyrannically by their colonels; and although they were always asked whether they were satisfied with the treatment they received, this was no test of their truth. The men, likewise, had no opportunity of complaint, as they well knew that were they to lodge a grievance with their commanding officer, they would only receive severe punishment for daring to murmur. It is hard to believe *all* this sad account of the military administration of Russia. This is not the army which struck terror into the hearts of the fierce Turks, the chivalrous Poles, and the gallant Caucasian mountaineers; or that contended against the civilized nations of Europe, in 1814 and 1815. This cannot be the army which worsted such generals as Suvaroff, Barclay de Tolly, Begration, and many others, whose courage and military capacity would have done honour to the armies of Frederic the Great of Prussia, or even those of Napoleon himself.

The description given by Dolgoroukow of the Russian *finances* is doubtless true. In Russia, the sovereign has an unlimited command of money, and his expenses are not enquired into. Thus economy is not the rule, even in the most peaceable and ordinary times; and, after such a contest as the Crimean war, the resources of the empire were taxed to the utmost. It is not at all surprising that Russia should have brought upon herself more than ordinary financial difficulties, that she should have contracted loans, which she had no possible means of paying; that she should have issued a debased currency and a large paper circulation, and thus be near bankruptcy itself.

She is not, however, in a worse condition than France at the beginning of every reign of the Bourbons, from the days of Henry IV, to those of Louis XVI; though it is to be hoped that Russia, like France, will overcome her financial difficulties and eventually regain her credit by peace and commerce. Dolgoroukow does not give us much hope concerning the future, as he avows that the Russian merchants are cramped at home by the restrictions and monopolies of their government. Still they possess application and perseverance, though they lack the enterprise so eminently displayed by the Anglo-Saxon race in all their commercial undertakings. He complains in bitter terms of the extravagance of the members of the royal family in their home expenditure and foreign journeys; considering that, as long as such expenses are incurred, it will be useless to talk of economy, or of limiting the outlay of the crown. It is an undoubted fact that Russia has more to gain by developing her resources, by cultivating the arts of peace, and by rivalling the rest of the world in commerce and civilization, than in acquiring territorial possessions. Dolgoroukow goes on to tell us of one of the most fruitful sources of revenue, viz. *the consumption of ardent spirits.* The farmers of brandy furnish most ample means for filling the exchequer, and are a most extortionate set of tax-gatherers. It appears that they pay the presidents of the provincial assemblies, whose duty it is to look after the sale of spirits, large sums of money for their licenses. They also have to supply the police of the province and other officials. When these expenses have been met, they still have to pay a very heavy duty on the importation of brandy, which duty amounted to as much as

120 million roubles during the past year. The tax on spirits has occasioned such general discontent, that the Czar and his counsellors may find it expedient to abolish it, notwithstanding the great loss of revenue. Yet this brandy tax is, in our opinion, by no means an oppressive one, if moderately levied. It presses on what may be called a luxury; no one need feel it unless he choose. That it is injurious to health and morals, we are willing to admit; but it has been thought, in our own free country, a splendid means of replenishing an empty exchequer; and even Gladstone, with all his highflown notions of morality, does not scruple to make use of it.

Our author now turns to the subject which is more exclusively domestic; viz. the *secret police* and its *spies*. He contends that it is an erroneous impression to suppose that the government gains anything by the employment of spies, as they deceive their employers as well as those whom they are employed to detect. "Money and power is their object, and their profession is to tell lies to attain these ends." Every one who has visited Russia must have felt the inconvenience caused by his words and actions being so closely watched. If foreigners, who can only be punished by being sent out of the country, feel this so keenly, what must those feel who can be subjected, for an imprudent word, to imprisonment, or exile for life? This secret police has only existed in its present state since the beginning of the reign of the Emperor Nicholas. Formerly its duties were discharged by the secret chancellerie at St. Petersburg. This was, however, abolished by Alexander I; and Nicholas, who continually feared that the government would be overthrown by insurrections, formed a stronger and more secret police, at the head of which he placed an aid-de-camp of his own, a general in the army, on whose services he could fully rely, and who would be ready to act decisively. The secret police adopted a most iniquitous and arbitrary course in order to secure both victims and money. As soon as they suspected any unfortunate individual of machinations against the government, they at once seized and threw him into prison, where, after examination, they informed him that there were many prisoners like himself whose trial would have priority to his own, and thus extorted money, and tampered with the official list. When the prisoner was at length examined, nothing was neglected to make him confess his supposed guilt. As for the strict regulations to which every traveller has been subjected, on entering Russia, by this secret police, they are too well known to need comment here. We would only observe, that they make Russia one of the most isolated countries in Europe, and render the Russians suspicious even of their best friends, their nearest and dearest relatives, and their most tried and faithful servants.

Dolgoroukow's remarks on the *liberty of the press* are somewhat amusing. All books that were freely admitted during the reign of Alexander I were strictly prohibited in that of his successor, Nicholas; and no journal is allowed even to use the word tyrant. When describing the events of Roman history, Tiberius and Caligula rank as saints amongst the schools of the Russian empire. It appears that every journal is submitted, before publication, to severe censorship by the minister; the office of censor and minister of instruction being one and the same. It was held, in the early part of Nicholas's reign, by a man of enlightened views, who endeavoured to give to the students in the schools and universities the most extensive education which could be obtained under the close restrictions of the Russian government. When, however, the panic occasioned by the revolutions of 1848 occurred, he was succeeded by a narrow-minded man, whose chief object was to enforce the authority of the Czar, and who cared not what education the students received, so long as his object was attained. Under his anthority, severe measures were adopted against the press, and very limited instruction given to the Russian youth. Many great writers were exiled to Siberia, on account of their over-liberal opinions, and many died of ill-treatment there. Our author's statements have been unfortunately verified, by an anecdote which was told to us by one of Her Majesty's consuls at Riga. It appears that the students of that city petitioned the Czar to grant them a larger staff of professors. The sovereign, however, took no notice of their request; but, instead of augmenting their number, despatched three regiments of infantry, and a battery of artillery, to increase the garrison, and thus overawed "students who had imbibed such liberal opinions." Although we agree in thinking that the liberty of the press should be restricted in governments like France and Russia, we still think, with Dolgoroukow, that the course pursued by the ministers of Nicholas was utterly wrong. It can tend to no good purpose, whilst it discourages the efforts of men of learning, and deprives the state of the services of cultivated intellects.

The rights and privileges of one of the most important classes of the community, viz. *the clergy,* is but touched on in the volumes before us. It is an error to suppose that the Czar is the supreme head of the church; he is so *de jure,* though not *de facto*. No one but the unfortunate Paul has dared openly to claim such a power. The church has always claimed and exercised a certain degree of independence in its legislature, ever since the Russians were converted to Christianity, about the year 984. Their church was administered by synods, called together by the archbishops and bishops; though the Patriarch did not obtain his office until nearly the end of the 16th century, when the Patriarch of Constantinople conferred that dignity on the Archbishop of Moscow, about the year 1590. He was independent of the Czar, and governed the church without synods. He, however, as well as all the authorities of the church, was elected by the clergy; and when a patriarch died, the bishops and abbots assembled at Moscow, performed the service at the great cathedral, and then placed on the altar three bulletins, on which the names of three candidates were inscribed. That bulletin which was first drawn contained the name of the successful candidate, and his election was then confirmed by the Czar. Peter the Great, however, who found the clergy to be his greatest opponents, refused to fill up the place of Patriarch which was left vacant for nearly twenty-two years; and when he had at length installed one in the dignity, he curbed his authority by forbidding him to call the synods of the church together, as heretofore. Not content, however, with having thus broken the authority of the Patriarch, he placed limits to the influence of the clergy, by obliging the synod to send their decisions for confirmation to a supervising commission, which consisted of two ecclesiastical and three lay members. The consequence has been, that the clergy, since that period, have possessed little real power in the state, and the bishops and archbishops are entirely at the mercy of the Emperor and his ministers. An instance is cited, in which the Archbishop of Irkowtsk was deprived of his see, and confined in a monastery for life, for having dared to oppose the governor-general of Eastern Siberia. The bishops, however, indemnify themselves for this condition of servitude by oppressing the parochial clergy, who in their turn have no means of obtaining redress for their grievances, and are often deprived of their benifices by the mere caprice of their episcopal chief. The country clergy are likewise subjected to much harsh treatment from the great proprietors on whose lands they reside. The most serious cause of dispute, however, between the bishops and the parochial clergy, seems to result from the fact, that the former are usually chosen from the monkish orders, and are therefore unable to marry, whilst the parochial clergy are not only permitted, but *forced* to enter into matrimonial life, on receiving orders. The sale of benefices is also allowed in Russia, and indeed all appointments are to be obtained by bribery and corruption. It is greatly to be regretted that they are not more considered by the state, and that they have not larger privileges, as their condition tends much to lower the status of religion and morals throughout the vast Russian empire.

The government have, nevertheless, endeavoured to do much for the Orthodox Russian Church, by persecuting, with greater or less severity, all other creeds. It is, however, but fair to state, that the authorities do not so much molest the professors of the Jewish, Mahomedan, Protestant, and even Pagan creeds, as they do that of the Roman Catholic church. A most amusing account is given of the attempts made, during the reign of Alexander, to bring back some converts from Papacy to the orthodox Russian creed. The perverts inhabited the government of Koursk, to which a senator together with a colonel of Russian infantry were sent to strengthen the hands of the Greek clergy. These people, who steadfastly renounced the idea of giving up their Roman Catholic belief, were driven to the Greek church at the point of the bayonet, and forced to take the sacrament. On their quitting the sacred edifice, the colonel called upon them to make a public confession of their errors, as it was the command of their lord and master, the Czar. The trembling peasants urged that they were willing to obey all the mandates of their sovereign, but that they were still "unconverted." "What!" indignantly cried the colonel; "have you not been to church? have you not performed the rite, and taken the sacrament according to the doctrines of the Greek church?" "We have," replied the peasants; "but your bayonets drove us to the altar, and your priests forced down our throats the sacred mass, without our consent." The colonel, who saw that he should gain nothing by argument, only ordered the so-called *converted* to kneel, and kiss the hand of the representative of the Czar, the senator who had been sent to arrange these matters, and at once to acknowledge the adoption of that faith which the Czar had commanded them to embrace. These persons were duly returned as *converted,* "per order."

The last chapter of this remarkable book is merely a review of the reforms which Dolgoroukow has discussed in detail, together with a further protest against the evil doings of the bureaucracy. His dream for Russian prosperity is a constitutional government, with two chambers, as in England. The lower chamber to be re-elected every four years; all persons of twenty-five years of age being eligible to vote. All members to be not less than twenty-five years of age in the lower, and forty in the upper chamber; and that after eight years of experience these chambers might deliberate on the laws with some degree of efficiency and success. He desires that the serf should be liberated *with land,* should pay five roubles per annum, in order to defray the interest of the debt made by the government in purchasing their freedom, and that the clergy should be allowed to have their synods as heretofore, to legislate on the affairs of the church, and not be controlled by the imperial commission. That priests should be allowed to remain in a state of celibacy, if it suits their convenience. He further requires that the financial committees in the provinces should be abolished, that all the finances should be placed under the direction of a central board at St. Petersburg, appointed for the purpose; that there should be liberty of the press, with slight and reasonable restrictions; and that the power of the bureaucracy and the camarilla should be neutralized; for, as long as they exist, the Emperor has no means of learning either the abuses under which his subjects labour, or of carrying out the necessary reforms, and establishing a constitutional government. Should these impediments be removed, Dolgoroukow foresees a just and moderate constitutional government established in Russia. Although we join with him in these hopes, we much doubt whether the Russian nation has yet reached that condition of civilization and intelligence which would fit it for self-government; whilst we also fear that the Czar does not possess the requisite firmness and prudence for accomplishing so vast and so necessary a change.

Although this account of the Russian government may be a correct one in many of its details, it is, nevertheless, overdrawn. Of this we are certain, that neither Macchiavelli, Gibbon, Hallam, or Sismondi, or any other great political or historical writer, would be able to comprehend how such vast power and such corrupt administration as our author describes, could be found to exist side by side; and they would consider that such an empire was nearer its decay than Russia now seems to be, even after the disasters of the Crimean war. She undoubtedly possesses all the requisites for regaining the influence she has lost during that struggle. Dolgoroukow's account is exaggerated; though he has, nevertheless, shown research in collecting his facts; his statements are generally clear and conclusive, his suggestions often good, and worthy the pen of a politician of a more enlightened country. His style is clear and plain, and he has handled his subject with greater dexterity than we could have expected under his disadvantages. His work is therefore worth studying by all politicians who desire to consider the two great questions of the age; viz. how the governments of despotic monarchies are gradually to be raised to freedom more compatible with the idea of the age, without running the risk of anarchy and revolution; and how servitude is to be abolished, where a nation has so long depended upon it for the performance of necessary labour.

LA CHINE DEVANT L'EUROPE.

LA CHINE DEVANT L'EUROPE.

Few countries are more prosperous, more independent of other states, more fertile, or possessing a vaster area of territory unexplored by foreigners than China; not one so excites curiosity, or furnishes so rich a field for conjecture. It has been the wonder of all nations that the Chinese should have made early progress in civilization, arts, and sciences, and yet have stopped short at a certain point; for it is stated, on good authority, that the Chinese were acquainted even with the inventions of printing and gunpowder long before their introduction into Europe. The compass was likewise first used by them, though their ideas of navigation are still confused and illogical; for it is well-known that the Chinese sailors, who lately visited England with the junk, steered their course to New York, as the nearest road to the British Isles.

It is the natural enquiry of all travellers who have visited China, why such an early advance should have been made in the arts and sciences only to end in a gradual décadence? Little can be learned of the present condition or past history of the Chinese; partly owing to the limited access of foreigners to the interior of the country, and partly to the paucity of published works. Indeed, it is supposed that very few materials exist from which a correct history can be compiled, most of the Chinese archives having been destroyed in a Tartar inroad, three centuries before the Christian era. Moreover, the symbols in which Chinese writings are composed are so difficult to decipher as to baffle the patience of the most studious oriental scholars; and few even of the learned Chinese have mastered them. All that is certainly known of Chinese history is that the country was peopled at a very early date by the Mongolian race; that it advanced rapidly in civilization; was continually subject to the attacks of the neighbouring Tartar tribes, whose inroads were ineffectually prevented by the construction of that wonderful wall, the extent of which still continues to astonish the most intelligent of modern travellers, by its height, its durability, and the obstacles over which it has been carried—neither wide rivers nor lofty mountains having checked its progress.

The great Chinese philosopher, Confucius, who gave them their morals, and the foundation of what little religion they possess, is said to have lived five hundred and fifty-five years before the Christian era, about the same time as the Persian empire reached its highest pitch of importance in the East, and Athens, under Pisistratus, was commencing that career of glory, letters, and civilization, which has made her famous throughout the world long after her decline. It appears, however, that China was only known by name both to the Greeks and the Romans; though its trade with India made the Latins acquainted with silk, which was first imported into Rome from India—the rarity being so great, that it was only considered worthy of forming the material from which the togas of the most luxurious Emperors were made.

Accôrding to Gibbon, the manufacture of silk fabric was not known until the sixth century, when some monks of Constantinople are said to have visited China, where they first saw a collection of silk worms, the method in which they were reared, and the mode of working the cocoon.

We hear little more of China until the days of Marco Polo, the celebrated Venetian traveller, who, starting from his own country at the latter end of the thirteenth century, explored the whole of Asia, including Tartary, Thibet, China, and India. On his return, he related marvels of the great riches of all these countries, and seems to have considered the Chinese and Hindoos the wealthiest and the most civilized of Asiatic nations—as the former carried on a large trade with the adjacent south-sea islands, at that time inhabited by fierce cannibals.

Soon after, a Catholic Mission was sent from Naples to China, consisting of Franciscan and Dominican Monks. They seem to have made converts with greater ease than their more learned and worldly-minded successors, the Jesuits. This was, no doubt, owing to their attending only to religious affairs, without attempting to gain political influence. Doubtless, a speculative people like the Chinese liked the novelty of the Christian religion, the doctrines of which furnished them with matter for argument.

The Portuguese, who had solved their problem of a new way to India by the Cape, next arrived in China, where they founded the settlement of Macao; which, as they some centuries later informed Lord Anson, they only retained by sufferance, being entirely dependent on the good will of the natives, even for the most ordinary necessaries of life. Such a dependence did not suit the Portuguese, who were constantly endeavouring to acquire larger and more unfettered possessions; and as they were the first Europeans that ever visited China, their intrigues and ambition gave the Chinese but an unfavourable opinion of western nations, whom they were more resolved than ever to exclude from their country.

The Dutch, who, in their wars with Philip II, conquered most of the Portuguese possessions in India and elsewhere, also endeavoured to open communications with China. Their efforts being of a commercial nature, they were permitted to send an Embassy to Pekin, and allowed to trade with and visit the Chinese ports.

The English did not open negotiations with that great empire until the year 1783, when Lord Mc Cartney visited Pekin. He does not appear to have obtained any advantages by his mission. In 1816, diplomatic intercourse with the Emperor of China was again attempted, and Lord Amherst went to Pekin for that purpose. Every obstacle, however, was thrown in the way of his negotiations; and the British Government has ever since been unable to send an ambassador to Pekin, although several negotiations have been opened and three wars have been engaged in to protect British commerce.

It is these complicated relations with China, and the few authentic works that have appeared on the subject, that make any treatise on Chinese affairs at once received with interest by the public. But, although Dr. Tytler has given, in his Universal History, a fair account of China, and particularly of the mode in which the present Royal Family ascended the throne, and Professor Schlegel, in his Philosophy of History, has discoursed learnedly on their language and literature, and has placed the former amongst the earliest class of dialects, ranking it as co-existent with the language of many of the North American tribes, or the negroes of Africa,—yet it is pretty clear that early Chinese history and literature are both obscure and difficult.

Captain Basil Hall has told us, in an amusing manner, how the Chinese express their ideas on paper; whilst Stewart Mc Kenzie, and, at a later period, Sir John Bowring, and Mr. Wingrove Cooke, in letters to the *Times*, have given many curious details as to their mode of warfare, their population, and their social habits. Still these writers give but slight information for so vast an empire as China. We therefore expected great things, when the newspapers of a neighbouring country informed us that Le Marquis D'Hervey St. Denys was preparing to speak to the world on so interesting a theme. We were told that, as a counsellor of the French Asiatic Society, he was in possession of information concerning the Celestial Empire at once new and important; and it was with no small satisfaction that we received his pamphlet—"La Chine devant l'Europe."* But, in one hundred and sixty-four pages of loosely written and badly compiled matter, he treats of the origin, language, wars, and future destiny of China, as though he were a mandarin of the first order, keeper of the conscience of the Celestial Emperor, and dictator to the world as to the policy of European intervention.

---

* La Chine devant L'Europe, par Le Marquis D'Hervey Saint Denys, du Conseil de la Société Asiatique.—Paris: Amyot—8, Rue de la Paix.

He begins by asking—What is China, and what do Europeans know about it? This question he answers by telling us that, by long study of the Chinese language and literature, he, the learned Frenchman, can remove many prejudices and erroneous impressions from the minds of Europeans. After this piece of pedantry, he goes off to some interesting details as to the history, laws, government, and population of China; and although he assures us he has had the advantage of the companionship of an intelligent Chinese, who had long resided in Paris, many of his facts are nevertheless very questionable. His account of the government and population of China are no doubt pretty correct; but we have never heard it stated before that the Chinese seas were visited by Phœnician vessels, or that Chinese trade was opened by those enterprising navigators. No writer has previously ventured to assert that they had any other dealing with Europeans than that by trade through India. Monsieur St. Denys, however, would have us to believe that the Chinese were engaged in war with the Romans. The Parthians, however, who were of Tartar origin, and who contested with the Romans the possession of the countries bordering on the Caspian, may have been a portion of those Tartar tribes which subdued China; and as the Chinese soldiers have, since the Tartar invasion, chiefly belonged to that nation, it is possible that our author has confounded them with the actual Chinese. Again, on describing the ceremony of Prostration before the Emperor, he affirms that this custom was protested against by the Ambassadors of the Abasside Caliphs who were sent to China at the end of the 9th century. Now, although it is well known that the possessions of the Arabs extended as far as the north of India, it is yet very doubtful whether the Saracen Princes ever sent ambassadors to the Empire of China.

Having touched on the subject of the ceremony of prostration, Monsieur St. Denys excuses it by affirming that the Chinese and Europeans have different modes of showing respect, and that it has been the custom from time immemorial for Eastern princes to exact it. He then quotes the usages of the court of the Babylonian empire, under Nebuchadnezzar; that of Persia, under Xerxes; and that of Macedon, under Alexander the Great, when it became an Asiatic Court by the conquest of the Persian Empire; that it has been required by the Caliphs of Bagdad, as well as by the Tartar conquerors from Genghis Khan to Tamerlane; and is looked upon by the Chinese as a mark of respect to their Emperor, which is even paid to him by his own heir and by the princes of his own family;—that, in fact, it is no more a sign of inferiority than the uncovering of our head in the presence of our friends or neighbours. It has, however, always been looked upon by European governments as a humiliating and degrading ceremony. If we are to believe the contradictory statements of our author, even the Saracenic Embassies, with all their Oriental obsequiousness, not unfrequently protested against its adoption; and the Russian Envoy, who was sent by Peter the Great to negotiate the commercial treaty with China, most boldly and successfully resisted this ignominious ceremony. Whatever, therefore, Monsieur St. Denys may say with regard to the *ko-teow*, we must avow it as incompatible with the dignity of an Envoy; and that, whatever may be adduced in its favour, it is calculated to degrade the foreigner in the eyes of the Chinese, and to lead them to the belief that they really are the great celestial people they have always considered themselves. An ambassador, whether he be the representative of a despotic sovereign or of a republic, cannot perform the duties of his mission unless he be treated with more than ordinary respect. Thus the several ambassadors who have been sent to China have done wisely in protesting against this ridiculous and ignominious ceremony of prostration; and in doing so have shown the Emperor of China that he is not to be acknowledged by other nations as the chief ruler of all the earth, and a very deity; but that he is to be considered and treated, like other mortal sovereigns, with respect, but not with humiliating veneration.

Le Marquis St. Denys has introduced a long tirade against the want of courtesy in Europeans towards the Emperor of China, with the sole object of reading a corrective lesson to England. His whole work is very anti-English; as he declares, unhesitatingly, that the English wars in China have been undertaken for the sole purpose of territorial aggrandisement, ambition, and cruelty. It is true that his blame is somewhat merited when he declares that we had no right to carry on a contraband trade in opium, in the face of express Chinese laws—that the punishment of our smugglers was hardly a sufficient excuse for rushing into war with a state that had hitherto been on terms of peaceable relation; but he forgets that the Chinese used this pretext indiscriminately to seize on our shipping, to destroy our goods, and to murder our defenceless countrymen. Had we been able to obtain the same redress for our grievances in China, as in any other country, we might have restricted ourselves to firm and dignified threats and diplomatic remonstrance; but in China, where no communication is held with the rest of the world, and all other nations are looked upon as inferior barbarians, the only course left for us was that of supporting our demands by armed force. Canton was therefore bombarded, and several engagements took place, which ended in the ratification of the treaty which opened to us the five ports. Thus the Chinese acknowledged our right to establish Consuls, engaged to pay the expenses of the war, and lastly ceded to us the territory of Hong Kong, where we might anchor our shipping and garrison our troops. After this war, it was generally believed that peaceful relations were fully established between the English and the Chinese. The latter, however, found means of evading for many years the full performance of the stipulations of this treaty; and the inhabitants at Canton could never be persuaded to admit either of unrestricted foreign commerce or of foreigners sojourning beyond their allotted quarters. Things were in this state when the *Lorcha*, sailing under British colours, was seized by the authorities, on the pretext of contraband and piracy. Sir John Bowring thereupon broke off all diplomatic communication with the Chinese authorities, and Sir Michael Seymour, the British Admiral, was ordered to commence those operations which Mons. St. Denys stygmatises as "unnecessary and cruel." This struggle at length terminated with the arrival of Lord Elgin, who set to work to negotiate a fresh treaty—taking the former one as a basis, and demanding that an English minister should be received at Pekin, and a Chinese sent to the Court of St. James's; that tariffs and duties should be readjusted by commissioners appointed by both Governments; while he further offered to co-operate with the Chinese in putting down pirates and smugglers. The conditions of this treaty show clearly enough what the desire and intention of the British Government towards China have always been, and still are; that their wars were never undertaken with the view of territorial agrandisement, but rather with the object of opening an advantageous commerce to all the world, of restraining and civilizing a people already remarkable for some considerable progress in arts and sciences, and effectually protecting British lives and property. What, on the other hand, has been the conduct of the Chinese? Crafty prevarication and treachery have distinguished all their dealings with Europeans. Thus English toleration and justice have exercised but little influence over a people whose subtle powers of cunning have so often tempted them to evade their most sacred promises, however clear and binding they may have appeared to honest minds; for it is certain that the Chinese never really intended the British Minister to enter the capital of Pekin, although they promised it by treaty. They therefore detained him and his former colleagues as long as they were able at Shanghai; and when the diplomatists at length resolved on pushing their way to Pekin, the Chinese opposed their passage, blocked up the mouth of the river Peiho, and placed every obstacle in the way of fair diplomatic intercourse. What followed is too well known and too fresh in the memory of our readers to need any mention in these pages. St.

Denys, however, with his usual *anglophobia*, affirms that the British Minister ought never to have been accompanied by so large a squadron, as it clearly evinced an intention to support his unjust demands by armed force. He also blames Admiral Hope and his officers, both for their attack on the fortifications and the excesses which, he says, they committed during the expedition. The learned Frenchman seems to think that it would have been a better course had Mr. Bruce followed the example of the American Minister, and asked leave of the authorities to go to Pekin, and *there* to have negotiated a treaty, for which, if afterwards annulled, he might then have demanded satisfaction by *force majeure*. Our author, however, forgets that the Americans were in a very different position to the English; that it was the first treaty they had ever made with the Chinese Emperor; that they did not seek for any redress of grievances, and only desired to gain a few commercial advantages. It was therefore only necessary for them to study the prejudices and character of the curious people with whom they had to deal; though, after humouring all these eccentricities, they really gained neither advantages nor concessions over other Europeans; and, as brother Jonathan would himself express it, his diplomatic agents had to eat a considerable amount of Chinese dirt, and were placed in a very awkward fix. St. Denys should also remember that it is not the first time in history that the demands of a Minister have been enforced by the accompaniment of a naval or military expedition. The English have frequently done so, and the French are not over scrupulous as to the means they employ in making good their demands. Look to their conduct in the Algerian business. They gave the Dey but little time to decide whether or no he would agree to their demands, and at once attacked Algiers; deceiving all Europe with the idea that it was only a temporary occupation they desired, whilst they contemplated a permanent subjugation. St. Denys tells us that our wars in China have only been carried on to enrich our commerce and to extend our possessions. To this we might give a "tu quoque." France cannot afford to throw stones at her neighbour. Mons. St. Denys forgets that, with the single exception of the island of Hong Kong, we have no possessions in China. We might, however, have chosen some more healthy and convenient harbour, and some larger territory, had we been bent on acquiring territorial possessions. We would just ask this pure-minded Frenchman, when he accuses us of ambitious views, whether his countrymen ever desired to obtain political influence in China; whether, under the garb of protector to the Roman Catholic missionaries, France remained indifferent to Eastern politics? We differ again from his opinion that France has no interest in China, and that England had undertaken its late expedition solely to wipe out the stain of her ill success in the Crimea. It requires no conjuror to discover the motives of French vindictiveness and envy. France is destitute of colonies in the China seas; but she hopes, by allying herself with the English, to acquire some influence in a country in close proximity to our Indian empire, and to be thus able at some future period to gain for herself a participation in our extensive eastern dominions.

Our author's apology for China is a bad one: She is to be *left alone, because her prejudices, customs, and ideas, are different from those of the other nations of the world.* Can St. Denys prevent her shores from being visited by the ships of other people? and would he exclude the entire trade of the world from this portion of the universe? If so, he is no Frenchman, and belies his nation and her teaching. There is but one common-sense view of the whole matter; the Chinese ought to be induced, by fair or foul means, to give more ample protection to the lives and properties of foreigners resident on their soil; both the French and English, therefore, are fully justified in demanding such concessions, and punishing treachery by armed force. M. St. Denys has likewise overlooked the significant fact that Russia may acquire supreme commercial influence in China; if England and France are excluded, such a policy would give Russia immense importance in Asia, and would enable her to carry out the schemes of universal empire, at least in that continent. This consummation ought not therefore to be lost sight of by English and French politicians. British statesmen must keep a sharp eye on the doings of the Russians in the east, particularly since they have obliged the Chinese to cede a portion of territory on the Amoor, have built a fort on the Pacific, and have visited Japan with a larger fleet than any other nation. Such acts clearly show their intention of disputing the empire of the Pacific with the English, French, and American navies, at some future period.

In concluding these remarks on the very pretentious pamphlet of Le Marquis St. Denys, we should be sorry to withhold our praise from that portion of the work which displays learning and literary taste. The Marquis, however, has allowed his French prejudices to gain the mastery over his better judgment, and his irritated feelings to influence his pen as an historian. Thus he ends his pamphlet with the spiteful and uncalled-for observations: "Les Anglais ont d'immenses intérêts en Chine et nous n'en avons pas. Ils n'ont point de soldats et compteront comme en Crimée, sur les nôtres. Les sacrifices seront pour La France en raison inverse des résultats. Peut-être y-reflechira-t-elle, avant d'epouser irrévocablement une cause qui n'est pas la sienne, qui ne repond ni à ses instincts, ni à ses idées, et qui ne lui promet, en definitive, que des désastres sans gloire ou des victoires sans profit."

THE ROME OF THIS ERA.

THE ROME OF THIS ERA.*

MUCH has been said respecting the true balance of power in Europe, and the necessity for preserving it. Had a perfect indifference on this point been the policy of Europe, some one State would ere now have become more powerful and more ambitious than the rest, would have gradually expanded to colossal proportions, and have reduced the continent to that condition under which it laboured in the days of the Roman Empire, or of Charlemagne in the middle ages; which Charles V of Germany, Louis XIV of France, and the Emperor Napoleon in more modern times, have attempted to reimpose upon it.

It is a curious fact, that Italy should have been the country, in all ages, in which the battle for universal empire has been carried on. In ancient times, the Romans made themselves masters of the known world by their courage and discipline, by their superiority in arms, and by their prudent and progressive policy; and were enabled not only to establish one of the most extensive empires that ever existed, but even to transmit their laws, language, and literature, to a period many centuries after their power was annihilated, and to lay the foundation of that spiritual sway which has ever since been assumed by Roman Ecclesiastics over the greater part of the European continent.

Various circumstances enabled the elder Roman Pontiffs to obtain territorial possessions, as well as spiritual dominion; as they well understood the character of the age in which their spiritual power was founded, the use to apply it to, and the acquisition of real sovereignty over the people of Rome; though they were nominally governed by the Emperors of Constantinople. Again, at a later period, the Popes acquired territories in Italy by placing themselves under the protection of the French monarchs, Pepin and Charlemagne; and by inducing these sovereigns to grant church lands, in payment for which they confirmed their authority by priestly ceremonial. Though it was long before the Popes were able to make themselves independent of the Carlovingian Princes, or of their subsequent representatives, the Emperors of Germany; yet they at length contrived to do so; partly by taking advantage of the disturbances which occurred both in Italy and Germany during the tenth and eleventh centuries; partly by making good use of the little legal knowledge which was then possessed by European states; and, lastly, by forging the famous decretals of Isidore, which enabled them to impose upon the world the absurd doctrines of the infallibility of the Pope, as the actual successor of St. Peter.

---

* The Roman Question. By E. About. W. Jeffs, 15, Burlington Arcade.

Thus the Popes assisted the clergy in every country of Europe to rise against their lay masters; and often, when it suited their purpose, sided with inferior ecclesiastics even against prelates; thus, working on the gross superstition of sovereigns, priests and people. By such means influential monarchs were brought into submission to the most absurd assumptions of papal power, and even the courageous lay vassals of foreign states were often induced to defend the Pope against the attacks of enemies, such as the Emperors of Germany, and the discontented and turbulent subjects at Rome. Gregory VII made good use of the religious terrors of the Germans and their Emperor, Henry IV, to obtain his right of investiture to ecclesiastical benefices; and even prevailed upon the sons of that unfortunate prince to rise against their father in support of the claims of the church; whilst he skilfully turned to advantage the Norman vassalage in Naples, to fight against the anti-pope, who had been raised up by the Emperor of Germany, and who was supported by many of Gregory's enemies in Rome itself. This able pontiff also acquired the provinces of Ancona, Bologna, and Ferrara, through the will of his friend, the Countess Matilda; though her right, according to the feudal system of ceding these fiefs to the Pope, was illegal. Another great advantage was soon after acquired by the head of the Catholic church, viz. the independence of the papacy; and no pontiff, after the days of Gregory VII, dreamed of asking the Emperor for a confirmation of his nomination to the papacy.

The pontifical power made greater strides than it had ever previously done during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. The Crusades, which had been projected by the successors of St.

Peter, not only augmented the influence of the church, but brought commerce, wealth, and power to those Italian cities which supported the cause of the Pope against the Emperor, and thus enabled the papacy to acquire fresh strength until its pretensions reached their greatest height, in the days of the ambitious and vigorous Innocent III. He it was who quelled his nobles at home, successfully awed John of England into a most humiliating submission, and curbed the ambition of Philip Augustus of France, a monarch whose abilities and power extended far beyond what was usually possessed by the sovereigns of those days. Thus the Pope contrived to have his own candidate elected Emperor of Germany, whilst he numbered amongst his vassals Peter the Second of Aragon, and put an end to many bloody wars by his anathemas of interdict and excommunication. After his time, the papal power gradually declined, partly owing to its absurd assumptions, and the heavy exactions which it imposed on its votaries, and partly to the greater civilization and knowledge which both subjects and princes were every where acquiring throughout Europe; until it at length lost a great portion of its influence and importance in the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Many advantages, as well as disadvantages, have resulted from this great ecclesiastical power. Where the interest of the Pope was not involved, his spiritual influence was often exerted with advantage in the maintenance of peace, justice, and good order, which, without his anathemas, it was often impossible to obtain in the sanguinary and turbulent epoch of the middle ages. When any increase of power or territory was to be acquired by the church, the Pope did not scruple to stir up strife, both amongst the Italian states and other European powers; whilst his own authority was, in many instances, based upon the quarrels which occurred between subjects and sovereigns, and between monarchs and their heirs. The decay of the papal power was partly owing to the schism which existed for nearly seventy years in the Catholic church, and to the contentions of various candidates for the chair of St. Peter, whose claims were supported by the different Catholic sovereigns of Europe. This led to great disturbances and scandal in the church, lessened the general veneration of European nations for the papacy, and consequently diminished its authority; but, when the Reformation occurred, it was felt necessary by both leaders of the Catholic and Protestant parties that they should combine political with religious motives, in order to obtain followers to their various standards. The Catholics felt it requisite to support the absolute authority of monarchs, which was just then being established in Europe on the fall of the feudal system, together with the full prerogative of the Pope, both as the spiritual head of the church and as a temporal prince; whilst the Protestants combined the reform of the errors of Romanism with the support of liberal institutions amongst the people. The Catholics felt that, if the powers of the papacy were divided, its strength would be lost; and therefore Charles V, as well as Philip II, who were at the head of the Catholic princes of Europe, looked upon the Pope as a temporal prince, and treated with him as such. Both these princes, however, in turn, made war upon the Pope, and both invaded his territories, the former leading him into captivity, though neither of them ultimately lessened the temporal dominions of the church; and, even at a later period, after the long thirty years' war, the temporal rule of the Pope was fully acknowledged in Westphalia. Thus admitted by every subsequent European treaty, the Pope's temporal powers have been guaranteed, though his spiritual influence has not been acknowledged by all the contracting parties. Things remained in this condition until Rome, taken by the French, under Napoleon, was annexed to the kingdom of Naples, and conferred on Joseph.

The Pope, reinstated in his full rights in 1815, has since ruled over the states of the church with varied success. Many able and good Catholics have, in consequence, cavilled at this union of the spiritual and temporal power of the Pope, declaring it to be attended with much mal-administration in temporal things, and with grave danger to the Catholic religion. Amongst the ablest writers who have discussed this subject, Mons. About holds, perhaps, the highest place. His work was composed under great difficulty, and first published in the columns of a newspaper, since which it has been carefully re-written, with labour and forethought. M. About has combined a host of amusing matter with deep research, appealing to the most casual reader, whilst he furnishes grave matter for the most reflecting minds to ponder over. He paints a sad picture of the mal-administration of the present Papal government, giving us to understand that there is nothing right in the Papal states, that its finances are in disorder, its public works neglected, its soil unhealthy and barren, its people living in ignorance and superstition, ground down by the most arbitrary and absolute of despotisms; that the only institution which flourishes is the church; and that the attention of the government is chiefly directed to the support and enrichment of the priesthood, and to the adorning of ecclesiastical edifices. Although we have always been led to suppose that the Italian people have degenerated from their ancient courage, energy, and capacity, and are no longer competent to undertake self-government, M.

About stoutly contends that their ability, their foresight and their valour in arms, have in no way diminished; and that the opportunity is alone wanting to make them shine before the world. In support of this opinion he mentions the vigorous defence of Garibaldi and the Romans in 1849, against the efforts of French arms, and the courage and capacity which have been displayed by the other Italians in their wars against the Austrians, and the gradual formation of a liberal constitution in Sardinia.

Though we might be disposed to agree in some of these opinions, yet we think that, as a good Catholic, which M. About professes himself to be, he has strangely mistaken his argument. It is not so much a question whether the states of the church are ill or well administered, as whether the Pope's spiritual power, as head of the church, can exist without his being also considered as a temporal prince. M. About's objection, that the temporality often forces the Pope to act irreconcilably with his spiritual power, and with the character of infallibility which he is bound to assume through the general acquisition and belief of all Catholics, is an extremely true and just one; but, at the same time, it should be remembered by our author, that if the Pope's temporal influence is taken away, he will have but little hold on the minds of men as the spiritual head of an antiquated church, the superstitions and traditions of which may be and are reasoned against by men of ordinary education. If the spiritual power of the Pope only remained, is it likely that the Pontiff would be considered as the spiritual head of foreign ecclesiastics in countries where he had neither land nor money? and would princes be ready to acknowledge him as a spiritual head, and to treat with him on ecclesiastical matters, if he possessed no other influence than that grounded on superstition, ancient traditions, and long usage? Were he only a simple ecclesiastic, he would probably sink to the level of prelates and clergy in other countries, and become a mere subject, only important in his own state as holding a high clerical dignity; and concordats would not be made with him by such potentates as the Kings of Spain and France, or the Emperor of Austria.

We must say that we do not clearly perceive how M. About's scheme of dividing the ecclesiastical and temporal powers of the Pope could be effectually and permanently carried out, without the total abolition of papacy as an ecclesiastical institution. In fact, the scheme of secularization has been put forward by him and by others in order to support French ambition and aggrandizement, which would be satisfied with nothing less than either the annexing of the Papal states to the French crown itself, or as a dependent principality upon it. Should the French Emperor, however, attempt such an annexation, and divide the spiritual from the temporal power of the church, he will raise such a ferment both between the ecclesiastics of his own empire and the other Catholic states of Europe, as he will find difficult, if not impossible, to put down; and if M. About wishes that the papacy should retain the nominal, though generally acquiesced in, spiritual influence over 139,000,000 of souls, which, as a good Catholic, we suppose he does, he must allow the 3,670,168 people whom the Pope really governs to be sacrificed to misrule and oppression, in order that the papacy may remain unimpaired, even should it *"give the people a very horror of Heaven itself."*

In considering M. About's work in detail, it will appear not a little curious, to those who have never visited the Roman states, and are consequently unable to judge of the varied facts crowded together in the book, that there should exist so vast a difference between the condition of the inhabitants and soil of the capital and its immediate vicinity, and of those cities on the frontier of the Papal states lying beyond the Appenines. Such differences are declared to be the result of the negligence and mismanagement of the Cardinal rulers, and no sort of notice is taken of the climate and malaria of Rome, which, during the summer, is sufficient, not only to neutralize many efforts of the most vigorous government and to deter agriculturists, but even to depopulate the capital itself.

What M. About tells us as to the disorder in the finances, he strengthens by the assertion that the early Popes were not obliged to keep up the same state and dignity which has been forced upon their successors, and that the exigencies of the more recent Pontiffs may mainly be attributed to their inability to call so largely on the same sources as their predecessors did at the full height of their power; or, in other words, that the three millions are made to bear taxes which might, in the middle ages, have been imposed upon the 139 millions of superstitious people who acknowledged spiritual supremacy. M. About does not consider this as a good apology for the oppression practised by the Popes and the ecclesiastical rulers of the Roman states, nor for their gross extravagance and improvidence in ecclesiastical matters, to the neglect of all their temporal concerns; to which cause he attributes the insufficiency of the police, and the numerous robberies and murders which are continually occurring in the states of the church.

M. About seems to believe that the Italians possess not only the requirements for self-government, but the desire of burying their common differences by uniting to drive out the foreigner from their native land. We somewhat differ from these opinions, as we believe that the first qualification of self-government is only to be acquired by long habit and great experience, as in England and America. If nations, like the French and the Germans, who possess both ability and resolution, have not succeeded in their attempts at self-government, how can it be expected that the Italians, who have ceased for many centuries to take a share in the government of their different states, should now be able to do so without preparation or training? We do not deny that they have shown a greater capability for bearing suffering, and of contending bravely for the freedom of their country, than we should have expected from the levity of their character; although they still lack the sagacity and foresight necessary to form real politicians.

M. About next puts forward his theory for secularizing the government of the states of the church, and the admission of laymen as heads of departments and responsible ministers. This is by the way of opening the door to French influence and intrigues. From time immemorial it has been the desire of the French to acquire a footing in the Papacy. Thus, as far back as the fourteenth century, did Philip IV agitate for the election of his nominee, the Bishop of Bordeaux, to the Papacy, that he might gain his sanction to the seizure of the lands of the Knights Templars, and remove the Papal throne from Rome to Avignon. Since that period the French have made frequent efforts to acquire influence, even to the very time of the capture of Rome and its Pontiff by Napoleon I. The Pope, again restored to his full rights by the Allies in 1815, was not disturbed in his temporal power by the ambitious designs of the French until the accession of Louis Philippe, who most unwarrantably interfered in the administration of the Papal States by demanding that certain reforms should be introduced, by which ecclesiastics and laymen should have equal rights in governing the state, and by enforcing those demands by sending troops to Ancona; whilst the French attack in 1848 was made for the avowed purpose of reducing his rebellious subjects to obedience, but in reality to force French principles upon the Pontiff. The French no sooner acquired possession of the Eternal city, and replaced its ruler, than they established a garrison in the town, and thus gained much real power in the papacy, which they are now endeavouring to increase by advising his Holiness to make secular reforms, and by offering to him the honorary presidency of an Italian confederation.

The account given of the acquirements and abilities of the Roman nobles is not at all calculated to support M. About's argument as to the benefits likely to arise from the severance of the ecclesiastical and the secular authority of the Holy See. Now, if any Roman should be called to fill a ministerial post, who is not an ecclesiastic, he would in all probability be selected from the ranks of the nobles of the educated laymen. Our author describes these classes as mere respectable nonentities, who are contented to amuse themselves with church festivals, society, and the lazy life of the club and the casino, and who leave the government in the hands of the cardinals and other ecclesiastical officials, as being alone, in their opinion, capable of governing. Even in private life, such nonentities allow themselves to be chiefly influenced by their father confessors and family priests. The character of the Roman nobles and those of the provinces beyond the Appenines is, according to M. About, much in favour of the latter; though they could not, from their remoteness, be so easily called upon to engage in public affairs; and our author, like Guizot, seems to consider the intellectual strength of all nations, and more especially that of Rome, to exist in the middle class. In this he is somewhat mistaken, as the middle class, in Rome, unaided, cannot gain sufficient influence to restrain their poorer brethren, or to break those chains of ecclesiastical power which have been so long imposed upon them by usage, education, and superstition.

Were the Romans able to follow the example of the English, they might obtain some redress for their grievances, and, possibly, some abatement of the arbitrary power exercised by the Pope, although such a proceeding would be next to impossible in the present state of affairs. Some compromise, however, might be entered into by which the Pope should retain his throne, and yet give the Roman people a larger share of liberty, and opportunity of acquiring the knowledge of self-government.

M. About now launches into a most uncalled-for tirade against the "Opinions of Foreign Residents in Rome," most of whom, he would have us believe, sympathize but little with the sufferings of the Romans, and treat their complaints with indifference, bidding them be consoled by the magnificence of the church ceremonies, the perfection of Roman art, and their vast store of antiquities. But, in spite of all this, the Romans still sigh for change; and hence arises the question, who will bring it about? Certainly not the Austrians, nor even the Italians, with all their enthusiasm and desire for liberty. It must be, according to About, the French, who have, for the last four centuries, desired to possess dominions in Italy; and who do not care whether the excuse furnished for the invasion of that country be a claim to the kingdom of Naples, through the rights of the fallen house of Anjou, by supporting the oppressed nationalities of the Lombards and Sardinians against their old Austrian enemies; or the still more legitimate object of strengthening an injured Pope, effecting necessary and beneficial reforms in the states of the church, and freeing the Roman people from the oppressive yoke of the cardinals and minor ecclesiastics. In fact, all this cry, on the part of Mons. About and his countrymen, against the arbitrary temporal power of the Pope, has only been made in order to further the ambitious designs of the French Emperor in Italy; and his remark, that a man of genius, with honesty, when invested with arbitrary power, would be a god upon earth, is only a good excuse given for Louis Napoleon's occupation of Italy, for his unnecessary interference in the affairs of the church, affairs which he knows as well as any other Catholic sovereign he cannot alter as long as the Roman Catholic church continues to be what it is, and which he is well aware would raise against him all Catholic Europe, including the clergy of the church of France itself, together with the influential and able party which it commands amongst his own subjects. Thus Napoleon III has clearly put forward his desire that reforms should be introduced into the Papal government, only to give himself a good pretext for quarrelling with Austria for interfering in the affairs of Italy, and for acquiring that glory for his arms which have been heaped upon the eldest son of the church. M. About is for total reform at all risks, and substantiates his opinion by fulminating most severe remarks on the Pope's arbitrary power. This, he affirms, is oppressive, owing to the spiritual infallibility which is carried with it even into temporal affairs; though he holds the Cardinal Secretary, Antonelli, responsible for the unusually severe execution of the Papal orders.

The character of the present Pope, and of his minister, Cardinal Antonelli, and the influence which they exercise over the government of Rome, claims About's most envenomed pen. The chapters describing these two prelates are written in a most sarcastic, witty, and amusing style. They prove little, however, in favour of the writer's arguments, excepting that they convey his hatred and contempt of the ecclesiastical order in general, and his personal antipathy to its chief head. Granting all he says as well founded, he would have shown better taste and judgment, had he omitted his abuse of the Pope, a feeble old man of seventy, who has had an unexpected position thrust upon him. He, however, spares not Pius IX, as he tells us that "*the character of this respectable old man is made up of devotion, simplicity, vanity, weakness, and obstinacy, with an occasional touch of rancour; he blesses with unction and pardons with difficulty, he is a good priest and an insufficient king; his intellect, which has raised such great hopes and caused such cruel disappointment, is of a very ordinary capacity.*"

Our author dips his pen in the bitterest of gall when he describes the life and character of Antonelli. The censure of the Cardinal is well merited, as his career has been one long pursuit of selfish power, wealth, and position, without a redeeming quality to lighten up the dark side of his character. Giacomo Antonelli (according to About) "was born in a den of thieves," in the year 1806, "of a sensual, brutal, impious, superstitious, ignorant, and cunning race." His native village, Sonnino, belonging to the kingdom of Naples, is situated in a remote mountain district, amid "depôts of pillage and magazines of rapine." His parents, relations, and neighbours lived on brigandage, which noble occupation would have been followed by young Giacomo, but, "when hardly four years old, the discharge of a high moral lesson shook his ears; it was the French troops, who were shooting brigands in the outskirts, of Sonnino." This severely taught lesson was not lost on the parents of the future Cardinal. The son was therefore sent, at an early age, to a seminary at Rome, where he so distinguished himself "*that he escaped the sacrament of ordination*, became the friend of Gregory XVI, a prelate, magistrate, a prefect, secretary general of interior, and minister of finance, in which latter place he could lay by more money in six months than all the brigands of Sonnino in twenty years." At the death of Gregory, he became Secretary of Foreign Affairs and Premier. He shared the exile of Pius IX, acquired undisputed sway over the mind of his master, and became actual ruler of the Papal states on the return of the Pope. Thus he is hated and feared; and no one, with the exception of a poor maniac who attempted his life, has ever dared to dispute his authority; "all classes of Italian society hate him equally, and he is the only living man concerning whom an entire people is agreed."

Mons. About closes this interesting and piquant chapter by describing Antonelli as he now appears in the year of grace 1859. "He is well preserved, his frame is slight and robust, and his constitution is that of a mountaineer; the breadth of his forehead, the brilliancy of his eyes, his beak-like nose, and all the upper part of his face, inspire a certain awe. His countenance, of almost Moorish hue, is at times lit up by flashes of intellect; but his heavy jaw, his long fang-like teeth, and his thick lips, express the grossest appetites. He gives you the idea of a monster grafted ou a savage."

We must not omit to mention About's curious and interesting comparison to the characters of Antonelli and Mazarin, as it is quite of a piece with his other racy descriptions. "Antonelli and Mazarin have in common the fear of death, inordinate love of money, a strong family feeling, utter indifference to the people's welfare, contempt for mankind, and some other accidental points of resemblance. They were born in the same mountains, or nearly so; one obtained the influence over a woman's heart, which the other possesses over the mind of an old man; both governed unscrupulously, and both have merited and obtained the hatred of their contemporaries. They both talked French comically, without being sensible to any of the delicate niceties of the language.

"The selfish Mazarin dictated to Europe the treaties of Westphalia, and the peace of the Pyrenees; he founded by diplomacy the greatness of Louis XIV, and managed the affairs of the French monarchy, without in any way neglecting his own.

"Antonelli has made his fortune at the expense of the nation, the Pope, and the church. Mazarin may be compared to a skilful but rascally tailor, who dresses his customers well, while he contrives to cabbage sundry yards of their cloth. Antonelli, to those Jews of the middle ages who demolished the Colisseum for the sake of the old iron in its walls."

Antonelli, like Mazarin, has taken care that his friends and family should be well provided for. His brothers and his nephews have been raised to the second rank of nobility; one is Governor of the Bank, another Conservator of Rome, and a cousin reigns over the Police. In spite of all this success, the Roman Cardinal lacks the talent and abilities of that great French statesman, whose consummate skill laid the foundation of European politics up to the Revolution of 1789.

M. About now dashes off a chapter on the "Ecclesiastical Government of the Pope," which, although full of sarcasm, only tends to prove, that, so long as the Pope is a temporal prince, the ecclesiastical and lay administrations of his country must be united. It is full of unpalatable truths respecting the Roman clergy, as it plainly unmasks their bribery and corruption in the administration of justice, corruption which cannot be denied by the warmest supporters of the Papacy. Crime is also represented as most lamentably prevalent, a state of things which cannot well be otherwise, under a government which gives so many loopholes for the escape of criminals, and whose police is both indolent and feeble. Even those who might be willing to improve the condition of the ecclesiastical states, by their talents, their ingenuity, by the better construction of roads, canals, or any other public work, are not only discouraged by the government, but are even looked upon as dangerous innovators, and not unfrequently persuaded by those in office to leave the country, not actually as exiles, but as troublesome people, better out of Rome than in it. Every traveller who has visited the Roman states is too well aware, not only of the difficulties which are placed in the way of the advancement of men of talent, but also of the obstacles that are raised even to the introduction of scientific books. Thus education becomes a crime in the eyes of the priests. How can Europe reason with such logicians as the Pope and his admirers, who deny the freedom of printed thought, and debar their subjects the privileges of literature? How can it place a limit on his temporal power, when for ages past, even until now, he has disregarded the councils of the ablest and most powerful sovereigns of Europe, who have proposed rational and beneficial reforms? If the Pope was unmoved by the menaces of the French in 1831, and now doubts the good faith of Napoleon in offering to him the honorary presidency of the Italian Confederation, and takes passive, but successful measures, through the clergy, to resist him, in case the new honorary dignity is to be conferred as a compensation for lost territory, there is no alternative but to leave the Pope alone. His obstinacy is said to be strengthened by assurances of support from the different Catholic powers of Europe, in case Rome is menaced with invasion by the French. Any curtailment of Papal power would therefore involve the rest of the peninsula in such another bloody struggle as it has just been engaged in; one which would probably terminate in as degrading a way to the different parties concerned, as that conflict which brought about the Peace of Villafranca.

The intolerance of the Papal government against those subjects who profess any other religion than Popery, is dwelt on with much pathos by our author, who tells us that the unfortunate Israelites are restricted to one quarter of the city, are there locked up like so many thieves at sunset, are debarred the enjoyment of the most ordinary rights, and are forbidden to hold property, or even to engage in the most harmless trades. Thus, a Jew is scarcely looked upon as a man by the Papal government; "the law does not absolutely sanction his murder, but the tribunals regard the murderer of a Christian in a different light from the murderer of a Jew; as the church considers the soul of a Jew, as already lost, and his loss of life only bringing him into the eternity of torture, which he had all his life deserved, a few years before his time. Should the life of a Catholic, however, be sacrificed, it is looked upon as a most atrocious crime; as a child of the church would thus have to answer for his sins, unprepared either by confession or absolution, and his soul would run the risk of being prematurely cast into purgatory, if not into hell." A murderer is therefore subjected to the most severe penalty which the law can inflict. It is true that Pio IX somewhat ameliorated the condition of the Israelites at the beginning of his reign; that he suffered them to dwell where they pleased, did not force them to return to their miserable Ghetto at nightfall, and conceded to them some slight privileges which had been withheld during the reign of Gregory XVI.

An anecdote is told of the Jews, which shows how low they must have fallen in the estimation of the Roman clergy and government, even in matters of ordinary justice. It appears that a Ferrara Jew, who was tolerably flourishing in his business as a merchant, married a handsome Jewess, with whom he lived for some time in great happiness. He had the misfortune of employing a Christian clerk, who became enamoured of his wife, and who at length prevailed upon her to fly with him to Bologna. The unfortunate Jew brought an action against his wife for adultery, when he was not only refused redress by an unjust Christian judge, but was further insulted, by being informed that his wife and children had become Christians; and that as such, infidelity to a Jew was no crime; the court further decreed that he should pay an annual income for their support, until his wife's marriage with her Christian paramour had taken place; and the nuptials between the two culprits were afterwards solemnized by the Archbishop of Bologna. Such intolerance is a crying shame to the Romish church, which has, nevertheless, unscrupulously practised it in all countries, up to a very recent period. Not only the Jews, but even the Protestants of other states in which the Roman Catholic religion is established, have not, until lately, been safe from persecution; and it even now requires the permission of the church before a Catholic can marry a Protestant; in fact, the church of Rome could not maintain her supremacy as the sole and dominant church of the world, were not its inviolability one of her principal doctrines.

M. About gives a correct, though deplorable account of education in the Roman states. The Pope and Cardinals fear lest the minds of their subjects should become enlightened; a course which would only lead to the overthrow of their authority, and give rise to many enquiries as to the management of temporal and spiritual affairs; questions which would be difficult, if not impossible, to answer, and which would glaringly expose the injustice, intolerance, and arbitrary power under which these people have been so long governed. It is much to be lamented that so quick a people should be so neglected; "but he that is taught to write," facetiously remarks M. About, "might some day learn to disseminate doctrines contrary to the church of Rome; whilst he who had learned the art of ciphering, might make awkward enquiries in the management of the state finances." These remarks are just, and to the purpose; they prove what is well known, and testified to by all travellers, viz. that the Italians of the southern part of the peninsula, more especially the Romans and Neapolitans (par excellence the most bigoted Catholics), are sunk in the grossest and most shameless ignorance. Our author does not tell us, however, how such a state of things could be remedied, but by sweeping away the whole of the Roman clergy and Catholic hierarchies, both in Italy and other countries. Were we to compare the most enlightened Roman Catholic countries with those in which Protestantism has been established, we should find the same bigotry, and the same fear of opening the popular mind to Papal errors, which have characterized that church in all ages, from the 10th to the 19th century, and we should see how superior Protestants are in intellectual culture, in internal administration, police, and general civilization, to those who look up to the Pope as their spiritual head and temporal leader. This is nowhere so strikingly marked as in the Protestant and Catholic cantons in Switzerland. Every traveller is struck with the contrast in the state of cleanliness, order, and prosperity which prevails among the Protestant cantons, as opposed to the Catholic. Need we, however, any further proof than in our own turbulent and Catholic sister island. Again, ask a Swiss whether Geneva is more prosperous than Lucerne, or whether the canton Vaud appears better governed, and inhabited by a happier and more cleanly people than Fribourg or Soleure; he will have no hesitation in replying to your question, that the first two cantons furnish an aspect of greater wealth and happiness than the latter three; the former being Protestant, and the latter rigidly Catholic. If, then, it be the plan of ecclesiastics in Roman Catholic countries to keep the people in ignorance, in order to extend the power of their order, how much more must the Pope himself dread the chance of enlightening his subjects, a people who live so much within the vicinity of clerical tricks and superstition; who every day are obliged to submit to the ceremonies and falsehoods passed off upon the Roman Catholic world as miracles; and who, if they possessed the least outlet for education, would be the first, with their penetration of character, to discover and publish to the rest of the world the errors and falsehoods of the Papal creed, and would, at the same time, lift up their hands against the priestly and temporal authority of the Pope.

We are now ironically told "*that the Pope will never have soldiers*, as the army is ruled by ignorant officers, and is made up of the dregs of the people, and administered by ecclesiastics." To all About's remonstrances with the heads of departments he was met with the assertion, "a people which is never destined to make war does not want an army. Instead of having generals in our army, we have them at the head of our religious orders." Thus is Rome, without a respectable force, trying to play the independent state, without the power to help herself, or support her dignity, otherwise than through the superstition of her foreign devotees. Still, we maintain that all this might be altered; for the Romans yet possess dormant virtues and courage. When their city was besieged by the French in 1848, the fault of the Roman army was rather to be attributed to the deficiency of good officers, than to any want of bravery in the men. Yet it must be admitted by all that the present condition of the Roman army, organized as it is by ecclesiastics, is totally unfitted to contend with an European foe, or to take the name of an organized force, unless recruited with some of the more warlike Italians of the Romagna, beyond the Appenines. To attempt such reforms in the present condition of Roman politics would be next to impossible, as the question is surrounded by such difficulties as would scarcely be overcome by the ablest and most popular rulers. If such Popes as Gregory VII, Alexander VI, and Julius II could hesitate to propound them, with all their ability, courage, and influence, is it to be expected that a good-natured old man like Pius IX, could attempt so colossal a reform as the formation of a Roman army? That there are stout hearts and strong arms in the states of the church, no one for a moment doubts. Look at the Contadini, the brigands, and the ill-paid agricultural labourers. These men might be moulded into good soldiers, were the Pope and his government disposed to follow the example of Joachim Murat, and offer to the banditti the choice of falling on the field of battle, or dying ignominiously on the scaffold.

The last two chapters of M. About's very able work are devoted to the consideration of the agriculture, manufactures, and finances of the Roman states.

Agriculture is totally neglected, and pasturage is preferred to arable land, as the proprietors are mostly priests of religious orders. The last farthing is thus squeezed out of the tenant; and no deduction or allowance for drainage, farm buildings, or improvement, is under any circumstances permitted. All the corn harvested in the Agro Romano pays a fixed duty of twenty-two per cent.; all agricultural produce pays a tax on export, twenty-three shillings being the market tax on every cow or bullock sold, whilst horses are taxed five per cent. on their value every time they change hands. The best land is deprived of the advantage of the plough, lest the growth of corn should exhaust its virtues. Thus corn is an import instead of an export. An intelligent proprietor once asked permission to dam up a stream and to irrigate a dry country. The monks declared that "the extraordinary fertility which would result from irrigation would be a violence done to nature," and refused permission." Six-tenths of the lands are held in mortmain by the clergy, three-tenths belong to princely families, and the remaining tenth to different individuals. Thus, as long as the land is in possession of men who will have no posterity to succeed to them, it must remain both neglected and barren, and be a reproach and a scandal to all intelligent observers.

The finances are even in a worse condition than either trade or agriculture. Overwhelmed with debt, beset with monopolies of every description, taxed at the rate of three millions, in an unequal and unjust proportion; the higher class escapes, whilst the middle class is ground down to the last extremity. A million is paid in interest of a yearly increasing debt, half a million to a useless army, a quarter of a million to prisons, a quarter to charity (?), and the rest is divided between the most crafty and unscrupulous of the ministers. Such is the recent picture of Roman finance, as drawn by About.

Can things be in a worse condition? and yet who is to propound a remedy?

According to M. About—Ferrara, Ravenna, Bologna, Rimini, and Ancona, should be lopped off from the Papal dominion. The Pope might retain the city of Rome, his palace, and temples, his cardinals and prelates, his priests and monks, his princes and footmen; and Europe would contribute to feed the little colony. Rome, surrounded by the respect of the universe, as by a Chinese wall, would be, so to speak, a foreign body, in the midst of a free and living Italy.

Montalembert is right in his assertion: "That Italian unity, with Rome as its capital, is the goal to which the partizans of the Piedmontese movement in Romagna invariably tend."—"*No Austria, no Pope,* is the present aim of all so-called Italian patriots."

Neither reforms nor radical institutions will really content the Italian people; as what they actually desire, is to destroy the temporality of the Papacy, and to reduce the Pope to the happy position of the Patriarch of the Greek church, or the Archbishop of Canterbury.

After a long residence in Rome, a careful study of its actual condition, and an attentive perusal of Mons. About's and Count Montalembert's* works, we are bound, as Englishmen, to admit the strong claims of the Roman people for secular and religious reforms—though our legislators must be equally puzzled with the unfortunate Rossi, the clever Walewski, or the crafty Antonelli, as to the best means of accomplishing so desirable an end.

The subject becomes far more difficult, now that the Emperor of the French has, on the one hand, taken up the cudgels in favour of the Pope; whilst, on the other, he has lighted up the fiercest fires of discontent and rebellion in unfortunate Italy!

---

* Pius IX and France. By the Count de Montalembert. W. Jeffs, 15, Burlington Arcade.

A DAY AT MAGENTA

AFTER THE BATTLE.

A DAY AT MAGENTA

AFTER THE BATTLE.

FUTURE historians will have much difficulty in accounting for the motives which induced the present ruler of France to assist the Italians in their struggle for liberty. Even politicians of the present century can scarcely comprehend how it happens that a people who have so often laid claim to a large share of Italian territory, and contested its possession with the Austrians for nearly four centuries, should at length have rushed into an Italian war without obtaining either wealth or territory for the French Empire. Many supporters of Napoleon III quote the example of his uncle as a precedent for his present Italian policy; though, as far as it has yet gone, there is little real similarity. It is true that the first Napoleon encouraged the liberal feelings of the Italians, and fought bloody battles to obtain for them what he called liberty, but which was in reality a dependence upon the great French republic.—He erected several Italian commonwealths, though he always took care that such governments should secure to the French, important fortresses, vast extensions of territory, together with money and works of art; whilst the present Emperor seems only to have undertaken his Italian expedition, and to have fought as hardly contested fields as those of Arcola, Rivoli, and Marengo, purely to gain for the Italians an independence which they could not have acquired unassisted, and to establish an influence for the King of Sardinia, by the cession to him of Lombardy. Such a mode of proceeding is so contrary to all antecedent French policy, that it may well excite the astonishment of the present age and of posterity.

It would, at first sight, appear that the French Emperor is satisfied with having aided Italian freedom, and having braved the chance of drawing upon himself the arms of all Europe. Thus he would have us believe that he carried on an Italian war for the love he felt towards Italy; and that he made a hasty treaty with crippled Austria just in time to save her honor, and yet to screen himself by the timely proposition of a congress.—The drama, however, has not as yet been fully played out, and we may yet live to fathom all this cunning.

Napoleon is desirous, as far as we can see, of raising such complications as will render his further interference in Italy absolutely necessary, and thus obtain for the French, political, if not territorial, power in the Peninsula. Whatever his schemes may be, they do not render the late struggle in Italy less important, or less interesting; the well-fought fields of Montebello, Magenta, and Solferino, have obtained for the French and the Italians almost equal military renown. The French veterans seem to have lost none of the ancient glory for which they were so distinguished in the old Italian campaigns of 1796 and 1800; and the youth of Italy, roused from their long sleep of inaction, have once more acquired laurels little inferior to those which adorned the brows of their ancestors. They have thus attracted European interest to their struggling country—that Italy which has already been so celebrated for its past history, its arts, its fine climate and natural productions.

All old Italian travellers have been deeply interested in the doings of the patriots; and many an Englishman has in consequence visited the localities of the late struggle. I, amongst the number, started off in the autumn of the past year for the battle-field of Magenta, availing myself of the assistance and eyes of my old friend, whose companionship has lightened so many a weary hour.—After having passed through France, and visited that district of Switzerland which is rendered as interesting, as it is picturesque, by being the scene of the oldest traditions of Swiss history; viz. the native Canton of William Tell, its liberator, and the ground upon which he first raised the standard of Swiss independence; we crossed over the St. Gothard Pass into Italy, after having travelled through the whole of the Canton Tessin. From Bellinzona we ascended the heights of Monte Cenere, and from thence to the lake of Lugano and Como. This, in olden days, was the first town on the Austrian frontier; but now, being in Sardinia, presents a vast contrast to its former state. No vexatious passport restrictions, no police to pry into your business and your intentions, now detain you. Your passport and luggage, if viséd and examined, are done so in the ordinary manner of other countries. Indeed all the people we met seemed mad with joy at their newly acquired freedom under the auspices of the King of Sardinia, and were brim full of that glory which they had obtained in fighting against the Austrians. The very air was filled with the prodigies of valour performed by the famous Garibaldi and his small patriotic and brave band, that, as is well known, were not afraid of attacking a body of 10,000 Austrians, who, posted in an admirable position on the top of a lofty eminence, and possessed of the advantages of cavalry and artillery, were struck with such panic at the desperate charge of Garibaldi and his 300 men, near Como, and with the general hostility of the surrounding population, that they scarcely made any resistance, but fled in great disorder, leaving to them, besides the mastery of the field of battle, a park of artillery, and a large number of prisoners.

We are desirous of ascertaining the true feeling of the people of Como as to the result of the late struggle, and their notions of liberty; and we did so, whilst taking a row on the lake with a very intelligent boatman. On asking what his countrymen had gained by their successful struggle against Austria, he replied, "that the taxes were quite as heavy, and that the people had not acquired any real privilege in the government of the country." "Then what have you obtained?" "Well, Signor," he replied, "we are free to stop out all night—we may sing, shout, drink, and amuse ourselves as much as we please on the Grand Place, without let or hindrance, though tobacco is quite as dear as ever, wine is dearer, and employment more difficult to obtain than before the war." Such an answer was a sufficient proof of the vague ideas which these people entertain as to the real blessings of liberty, although they could fight well and suffer much in its cause.

From Como we easily reached, by rail, the great Lombard city, Milan, which has seen such a strange succession of masters during the present century; and in which the ridiculous and impolitic farce of receiving the Bolognese deputation on its way to offer the government of the Legations to the King of Sardinia, was being enacted. The decision of the plenipotentiaries of the great powers was unfortunately received by the Sardinian Government on the very day on which the Roman deputation entered Milan. This decision being adverse to Italian unity, the King of Sardinia was thus placed in a very difficult position; as he had to steer between offending his allies, and lowering his position and character in the eyes of the Italians. He therefore took a middle course, as the Milanese were permitted by the Sardinian authorities to indulge in those gaudy ceremonies and noisy rejoicings, without which no Italian festa is perfect, whether it be a religious ceremony, a national revolution, or a private family holiday. The churches and public buildings of Milan were illuminated, bells were rung, and artillery fired, whilst the deputation went in procession to the Cathedral, where it was received with loud acclamations by the populace, who assembled in vast crowds in the sacred edifice and in the streets. A banquet was given in La Scala, at which Massimo D'Azellio presided, and made a long and eloquent oration to the deputies, recommending "Italian union as strength." During his harangue, which was received with much applause, banners were carried about the town with "Viva la Unita" emblazoned upon them. The various municipal offices were tastefully illuminated, and even the great spire of the cathedral was lighted with thousands of tapers, which produced a very fine effect.—The Corso was also very brilliant, being thronged with crowds of well-dressed people, all bent on the enjoyment of the hour. As I walked up and down the Grand Platza, listening to the exquisite music of the military bands, I could not overcome the feeling of disappointment at finding that my old Austrian friends had so mistaken the people over whom they had ruled, as to have roused the Lombards to a man against them.

From this city we went by a short railway journey to the battle field of Magenta, which, though a considerable period had elapsed since the battle, still showed signs of a hotly contested struggle. In order that the locality of the battle-field may be understood, it will be necessary to explain the exact situation of the town. It is on the Lombard side of a canal branch of the river Ticino, whose deep and swift stream is traversed by three bridges, two of which are placed near the town, and are known as the old and new bridge; a third crossing is at Buffolora, at a distance of some two miles to the N. W. The railroad, leading from Milan to Novara, crosses this Ticino canal by an iron bridge, which formed quite a new adjunct to the art of war; for to its judicious use may be attributed the decision of the battle in favour of the French, as much as, in the 14th century, the victories of Creçy and Poitiers were accounted for by the use of artillery. It was, of course, the object of the French to obtain possession of both the bridges over the river, and of that of the railroad. After defending the first bridge with distinguished bravery, the Austrians succeeded in effecting their retreat in good order, blowing it up after them. In the meantime the most severe conflict went on between both parties for the possession of the bridge at Buffalora and the railroad. The former was at length carried by the French, who had only just time to step upon the bridge, when their enemy, with unwonted quickness, lit the match and sent the bridge into the air, with dozens of Frenchmen upon it, some of whom were precipitated into the water and carried away by the current, whilst others swam over and with great vigour charged the retreating Austrians. The French, with the promptitude which has always distinguished them, immediately replaced this last bridge, and threw over the river a pontoon of boats (still standing when we visited the spot), which enabled them to cross in great numbers. The French were still further reinforced by divisions which the rapid communication of the railroad enabled them to bring up, and they so overpowed the Austrians that the latter were driven back at all points into the town, upon what then became their third position. Here a scene of as violent a contest as that of Eylau or Saragossa took place. The possession of every house was disputed by the contending parties, and many of the dwellings were reduced to heaps of ruins. At the corner of the churchyard, as at Eylau, a fearful contest raged. The position was several times taken and retaken during the day. The Austrians were, however, at length driven out, and the French left masters of the town, not, however, without having suffered considerable loss; the brave General Espinasse having been killed in the defence of the railroad bridge, and several other officers of distinction having lost their lives in the conflict. A flank movement was then made by Mac Mahon which completely turned the fortunes of the day in favour of the French and gave them a complete victory. It has been a matter of astonishment to all those who have visited the field that so advantageously posted, so courageous, and so well-disciplined an army as that of Austria, considered by all military authorities as among the best in Europe, should have been vanquished at every encounter by the French, from Montebello to Solferino. An old French General of our acquaintance endeavoured to account for this fact by declaring that the Austrians had lost the experience which they had gained in the years 1814 and 1815, from want of practice, as they had never since that period been engaged in any considerable war, whilst the French had for the last 28 years been carrying on a series of struggles with the Dutch in Belgium, the fierce Moors and Kybeles in Algiers and Morocco, the Russians in the Crimea, the determined Cochin Chinese in the East; that by such a diversity of warfare, and with enemies of so varied a degree of civilization, the French had retained that skill and courage for which their army had always been so distinguished. We could not, however, fully admit that the Austrians had seen no service during the last few years, as they were undoubtedly engaged both in 1848 and 1850 in Italy, Hungary, Bohemia and Poland; and whatever may be said of the Italians, the Hungarians were certainly no mean foes to be opposed to; yet the Austrians were generally successful in all the expeditions which they undertook during that period. This may, perhaps, be attributed to their veteran leaders, who had all been well tried in the old French and Turkish wars, and who knew what fighting was, both in practice and theory. In the present campaign, however, most of the commanding officers were young men, who had seen no such fields as Marengo or Austerlitz. The present defeat of the Austrians in Italy may therefore be attributed to three principal reasons: *First,* they committed the old mistake of 1796, of placing all their armies immediately under the control of the minister of war at Vienna, who made all the plans of the campaign, without being able to judge whether they could be carried into execution. It thus happened that the General actually in command, on the spot, differed with his Chief in his bureau at Vienna, the consequence being that operations were not carried into execution with the necessary vigour. The same case occurred in the campaigns of the first Napoleon as in the late war in Italy. Baron Hesse, Minister of War, ordered defensive operations, while his General in the field considered that the greatest advantage would be acquired by boldly advancing, and by attacking the enemy in their own country. Thus the schemes of both Generals were tried without success. *Secondly*, the French possessed the same advantage over the Austrians which the Spaniards had, in a greater degree, over the inhabitants of the new world; their artillery was more numerous and efficient. Even the Emperor Francis Joseph himself confessed to Napoleon at Villa Franca that it was impossible for his troops to stand against the fire of the improved rifle guns of the French; and that he computed, on good authority, he had lost the services of upwards of fifty thousand men by wounds as well as death on the field of battle from that cause. Further, the French had made good use of the advantages to be acquired from the modern inventions of railroads and balloons; the former enabling them to bring up a considerable number of troops at any given point with greater rapidity than formerly; whilst the latter enabled them to reconnoitre the enemy's position without laying bare their own. *Thirdly* and lastly, the whole surrounding population being inimical to the Austrians, they could not reckon upon supplies, or communications being kept open in case of retreat. This was enough to dishearten any army, however brave, and however ably it might be led. If the Austrians therefore are ever to regain their lost position in Italy, they must give greater discretionary powers to their generals in the field, improve their artillery, and ingratiate themselves more with the Italians. It will, however, be almost impossible for them to obtain this last requisite for success, as it is not so much the exaggerated tyranny of the Austrians which the Italians hate, as that their country should be governed by a foreign race, whether it bears the name of Austrian or French. It is quite as much now the desire of the Italians to drive out the *Tramontani* from the Peninsula as it was in the 15th century; and we cannot say that we hope they will succeed, as we do not think the Italians sufficiently strong, either morally or physically, to defend their freedom against the aggression of powerful neighbouring states.

ROUSSEAU ET LES GENEVOIS.

ROUSSEAU ET LES GENEVOIS.*

It is always interesting to consider the lives and acts of men who, by their literary eminence, their military achievements, or their administrative abilities, have exercised a durable influence for good or evil, upon their contemporaries, and on posterity. Literature never possessed so much power over men's minds as it did at the end of the last century, just before the great revolution of 1789; for although it is true that the classical labours of Petrarch, Boccaccio, Lorenzo de Medici, and other great Italian scholars, gave an impetus to the general intellect of the whole of Europe, opened up a new philosophy which helped the reformation, to great inventions, and progress in arts, science, and political liberty; in effect, to the civilization which is now enjoyed by both Europe and America—yet their effects were slight when compared with that of the literature of the last century. The influence of the early writers was more beneficial to mankind than the brilliant works of the 18th century; for they did not aim at the overthrow of religion and government, like the French productions of the latter period; although they may, perhaps, have stimulated that spirit of inquiry which eventually led to revolutionary results. Both the early and the later writers produced evil by pushing their principles to excess; though both were in a way advantageous to the wavering and fickle, by quickening the spirit of inquiry, and thus giving intellect a wider sphere of thought.

It is much to be regretted that the literature of the last century should have made every one dissatisfied with existing governments; should have bred a longing for change at any price, and set up reason as the guide and chief source of happiness, in opposition to morality and religion. It was to be expected, in the corruption which existed, both morally and politically, at the end of the last century, that men of enlightened minds would be driven to inquire into the causes of such degeneration, co-existent with high civilization, great encouragement of art and science, and refinement of taste and manners. As usual, they pushed their inquiries too far, and ended in the subversion of all religious belief and stable government in those states in which their doctrines were most widely spread. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that such men as Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Volney, Hume, and Gibbon, should have ridiculed and reasoned against Christianity, rising, as it had done, from such small beginnings, and which had degenerated into the superstition of Popery, or doctrines so contrary to its teaching, as those inculcated by many of the reformers. It was not less surprising that these men should raise their voices against corruption and immorality, such as were to be met with in nearly every court of Europe, as well as that oppression and tyranny so often practised by monarchs and nobles of countries where the rights of rank were not clearly defined by the established laws or constitutional government.

---

* Rousseau et les Genevois, par M. J. Gaberel, ancien pasteur. Geneva, 1859.

Although Voltaire's abuse of these evils produced worse consequences than those he deplored, we must not find too much fault with opinions of his school, as they were in a measure caused by the evils of the time. Rousseau bore a chief part in bringing about great changes, both in politics and religion, by the inquiries and doctrines which he put forth in his celebrated confessions. Their style is sufficiently engaging to lead away the most reflecting and right-minded man by sophistical eloquence; whilst his political opinions are so chimerical, that no one but a philosopher could have conceived them, and no man of common sense would have attempted to carry them into practice. Such a mixture of the sublime and ridiculous must, of course, be traced to the fact of Rousseau's having been born and brought up as a rigid republican. His religious belief, whatever may be thought of its improbabilities, demands our pity more than our censure. Though religion is never unreasonable, it is often incomprehensible, and cannot be dealt with as a mathematical problem, or a principle in natural science, to be proved by tangible evidence, or experiment. Some of its doctrines may, therefore, at first sight, appear paradoxical; as, for instance, that which teaches us that we can do nothing good of ourselves, and must reckon on the merits of a

Saviour to make us guiltless in the sight of the Deity, and which yet, nevertheless, requires that we should support such a faith by good conduct, and a well-regulated life, as far as lies in our power. A doctrine such as this must appear, to a keen and sceptical mind like Rousseau's, wholly untenable; yet it has been attempted to prove, in a work which has been lately published at Geneva, that notwithstanding the doctrines which Rousseau professed by his writings and his life, he nevertheless was *impressed during his later years with the religious views of his childhood.*

The arguments which are produced by Mons. Gaberel in his new life of Rousseau are plausible enough, but go far to disprove what they are intended to establish. It is a very difficult matter to say what a man's religious convictions are, when he is on his deathbed, and is terrified at his approaching end. We shall, however, leave the character of Rousseau to the decision of our readers, and simply state the leading features of his life, as told by his recent biographer.

It appears that he was the son of a dancing-master, a man of extreme levity of character. He was born in the year 1712, at Geneva. His father's frivolity, which often led him to jest on the most serious matters, was not calculated to impress his son, Jean Jacques, with any very high respect for religion or morality. His early education, however, seems to have been solid, and, as far as worldly knowledge was concerned, judicious. He studied Roman history, in some of the great writers, who taught him high esteem for heroic deeds. He once frightened his father by attempting to imitate the Roman pro-consul, who declared he would rather burn his hand than sign an ignominious treaty. Young Rousseau all but destroyed his own hand in trying to act the part of his admired hero. Much as we may laugh at this display of childish enthusiasm, such traits of character often mark the intellect and disposition of the man; and it was probably this esteem for the heroic virtues of the ancient rulers of Rome, that produced, in after life, in the mind of Rousseau that contempt for luxury, indolence, and self-indulgence, which spurred him on to the attainment, under great disadvantages, of literary and philosophical eminence.

He was early enticed, during his residence at Turin, to change his religion and to espouse the Roman Catholic faith. This sudden conviction in favour of the Church of Rome, and his subsequent change to Protestantism, must have given him, like the famous historian, Gibbon, no very high respect for the Christian religion in general, and have entirely unsettled his ideas as to the truth of any one sect in particular. Soon after this period he goes to Paris, where he publishes his first work—a play, which was represented on the French stage, but was most unpopular, and entirely failed on the first night of its representation. He does not appear to have been very sanguine of its success, and after having witnessed its reception, had the candour to express publicly that its doom was merited, and himself its author. He seems to have published several works after this first attempt, which were severely criticised by a celebrated writer of the day for their want of style and ignorance of grammar. Rousseau was, however, undaunted, and by close study attempted to remedy his many defects. He read constantly and carefully the best French authors of his own times, and of the periods immediately preceding, taking as his models the works of Voltaire and Montesquieu, an excellent school for style, if not for morality.

At the age of 38, Rousseau first began his literary career, by answering a question which was proposed by the University of Dijon, as to "what art, science, and civilization, had done for the happiness of mankind?" His essay was so masterly in style, and so powerful in reasoning, that it not only obtained for him the prize of the University, but the admiration and attention of the best writers in France; although he opposed the opinion of the University, and of men of sound sense, in declaring that real happiness was only to be met with in the savage state.

His biographer gives several anecdotes with the object of proving Rousseau's simplicity in morals, and what he is pleased to call "his over-republican sensitiveness," but which ought properly to be termed "his extreme irritability of temper." In support of the former, he cites the following anecdote: "Diderot, a famous French author and a luxurious nobleman, called upon our philosopher in order to enjoy his conversation. Rousseau wished to know whether he was to ascribe the honour of the visit to a desire on the part of the Frenchman to ridicule his mode of living. Diderot replied, "that he had called to learn philosophy from sage lips." Rousseau at once replied, "you shall see how simply and frugally a republican can live,"—and forthwith turning to his servant, ordered the usual repast to be prepared, with another plate for Diderot. The meal consisted of some very poor soup, a few slices of plain roasted meat, and a very little wine of the country; but the conversation was piquant, full of *esprit* and of learning. Jean Jacques' sobriety, however, under the circumstances, might be called an ostentatious display of temperance before such a guest, in order to establish a reputation for asceticism. Again he tells us that Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, and several other literary men, were gathered together one evening to listen to the reading of an essay "On the

Drama" by a poor priest. The author contended, with singular originality, that all comedy consisted in a marriage, and the difficulties attending thereon; whilst the subject of all tragedy was a murder, the motives which had led to its perpetration, and the events which preceded and followed the *denouement.* During the perusal of this strange essay, Rousseau became each moment more and more indignant, and at length rose from his chair, stepped up to the author. snatched the MSS. from his hands, and threw it into the fire. The poor priest retreated in dismay, whilst the philosopher's friends could not refrain from a hearty laugh at this ridiculous explosion.

As we have already observed, Mons. Gaberel attempts to excuse this irritability of temper, by stating that it was occasioned by the over-sensitive feeling of a man who lived in a small town where his actions were closely watched, and his motives often calumniated by malicious neighbours. The apology is, however, a poor one for such a display of temper on so trifling a provocation. The biographer also endeavours to make out that his hero was not destitute of religious feeling, because he was benevolent to the poor, and ready to relieve their wants. Now, although charity arises from a true religious feeling, it sometimes exists without it, as in the case of the famous historian, Hume, who, notwithstanding his scepticism, was remarked not only for his benevolence to the poor, but for amiability of character towards his relatives and friends.

Rousseau, after a long banishment, desired again to be restored to his country, and to the enjoyment of the rites of Genevese citizenship. He could not do this, however, without relinquishing his Roman Catholic errors, and becoming once more a Calvinist. He felt little scruple in again renouncing his faith, and in thus suddenly changing convictions which had to all appearance been firmly rooted in his mind by many years of adherence. Now that his interests demanded it, he made the required renunciation, and obtained those coveted privileges which were duly accorded to him. This rapid change in his religious sentiments does not speak well for the sincerity of the man, notwithstanding that his biographer and his admirers are pleased to assert the contrary. It was now expected that Rousseau, having been confirmed in all the rights of citizenship, would continue to reside in his native town, and adorn and render more efficient some of the officers of the republic. As an inducement to remain in Geneva, his friends proposed to obtain for him the post of Custos of the City Library, which offered a good salary, and a suitable occupation for a literary man, and which might lead to some more important office. Rousseau, however, declined the offer, giving, as a reason, that he knew little Latin, and was ignorant of Greek; that he had a bad memory, and was no man of business. Moreover, he does not seem to have really liked Geneva, which may account for his refusal of office. Having obtained the protection of Frederick the Great, who may be said to have formed a rallying point for philosophers and men of letters of Rousseau's school, he retired to the Canton of Neufchatel, where he was enabled to pursue his literary and philosophical labours unmolested. The governor of the canton who ruled for the King of Prussia, was the famous Earl Marshal of Scotland, brother to the gallant Marshal Keith, who lost his life in Frederick's service at the battle of Hochkirchen in 1758. His esteem for Rousseau was so great that he used to call him his son, whilst the respect of the latter for the Scottish statesman was such that he always considered Keith as his father. The Earl Marshal, one of Frederick's most intimate friends, had been obliged to quit Scotland on account of the share which he took in the rebellion of 1745, and entered the service of the King of Prussia, who at once appointed him governor of the Canton of Neufchatel; in the administration of which, as well as by his diplomatic sagacity at Madrid, he distinguished himself as the representative of Prussia. He was the first person who had any suspicion of the existence of the family compact between the courts of France and Spain, and he communicated this information to Mr. Pitt, afterwards Earl of Chatham, for which service he obtained a pardon from the British Crown, and resided for some time in Scotland, from which country he was at length recalled to his foreign post by the earnest solicitations of Frederick II. He died at the great age of 82, with all his faculties in full vigour.

Rousseau enjoyed the friendship of this able man during his quiet retreat at Neufchatel, where, it appears, Jean Jacques carried on a large correspondence with many of the crowned heads of Europe, their chief statesmen, and with the most eminent ecclesiastics and scholars of both Roman Catholic and Protestant creeds. The numerous letters which he there wrote are preserved in the library at Neufchatel, and have been carefully arranged by the different librarians to whom the charge of that institution has been committed. These documents have formed the basis upon which the book before us has been compiled. Although we cannot agree in all that has been put forward in Rousseau's behalf by his able biographer, we cannot but highly praise the research and care with which Mons. Gaberel has arranged his little volume, and selected the most striking correspondence in order to throw light on his subject.

During his retirement, Rousseau varied his occupations by visiting the French capital, by composing his two great works, "Le Contrat Social," and "l'Emile." The former contained his political opinions, and the latter his religious ideas; though some insight into his religious creed may be obtained from scattered passages in his first work. His general political principles seem to have been, that all kings ought to be amenable to the laws; that they should rule their subjects for the general advantage of the state, and not as though man was made only to increase the power and pander to the pride of king-craft, a notion which seems to have been generally entertained in those days by monarchs and statesmen; that the people themselves should have a share in the legislature, and in the levying of taxes; that equality of rights, as far as it could be obtained at home, and peace in the intercourse with foreign nations, ought, in Rousseau's opinions, to form the distinguishing features of government. His works, however, will better display in detail what his ideas actually were, though we are unable in our limited space to do more than sketch their contents. The "Contrat Social" may be divided into three parts: the first containing an extract from the writings of an Abbé whose political views concurred with those of Rousseau, although pushed to much greater extremes than the opinions of the Genevese philosopher. He contends for the social doctrine that both rulers and ruled ought to possess equal rights; in fact, that all classes of a nation should be allowed, and be able to perform, the task of government for themselves, and that both labour and responsibility should be equalized throughout all ranks of the country. If his ideas on internal constitution are difficult to be carried out—though few men in that day would have admitted the fact—his ideas of foreign intercourse are still more eccentric and impracticable. He desired that all the nations of the earth should form a compact with each other, similar to that of the German Confederation, and that whenever disputes arose, they should be settled by a meeting of the various representatives, instead of by an appeal to arms. Rousseau, in the second part of his book, regrets that so sensible a man as the Abbé should have put forward so Utopian a theory, without perceiving how impossible it was to carry it out, under the conditions, and with the characters of those nations of the earth who at that period of history held absolute sway. As mere views, however, he stamps them with his approval as both just and sensible; though he complains that those states of Europe which have adopted a legislative constitution, have, nevertheless, degenerated from their ideas of freedom, and allowed the king and the higher ranks to assume supreme power, although concealed under a more popular name of government. He considers that all empires which owe their origin to conquest, have acquired an unjust, and therefore not a permanent stability; and further, looks upon the commercial influence of such countries as Holland and England, although great, not to be permanent. Here he breaks out into a panegyric on the delights of uncivilized life:—"And you, savage tribes, with your shell-fish on the shore, your sports, your rude huts, and your simple manners, be happy, and remain contented in your barbarism. Do not emulate the refinement and the knowledge of civilized nations, which only bring misery in their train."

Rousseau shows his religious opinions in this book, by going out of his way to abuse and ridicule Christianity, by asserting that a thoroughly Christian state, governed by the doctrines of religion, would not be allowed to arm it to resist foreign aggression, and would, in consequence, sink into a mere nonentity. He must well have known, when he put forth this opinion, that such a state as he describes could not exist in the present condition of the world; and he therefore must have written these observations for the mere sake of casting ridicule on our religion.

The third part of the "Contrat Social," which is by far the most sensible portion of the book, contains a number of letters written to a member of council in the Corsican republic, in which much sage admonition, with regard to the qualifications of those who are to fill posts in the legislature or administer the affairs of the state, is volunteered. He proposes that no one should be made a member of the council, or the chamber, until he should have reached the mature age of fifty, and become capable of discharging its duties by a long service in inferior offices, in which his capabilities could be tested, and experience acquired. The advice which he gives in this part of his work is worthy of the attention of statesmen of any country and any government. It may be said that the principles of the first part of Rousseau's work are simply impracticable in the present state of human affairs; and that the nearest approach that has been made as yet towards carrying them into practice, occurs in an article in the late Treaty of Paris, in which it is agreed, that if any difference should occur between any two powers, they shall be requested, previous to appealing to arms, to call upon the great powers to mediate between them.

Of the doctrines of the second part, it may be observed, that they are only made attractive by the imagination, the eloquent style, and the reasoning powers of the author; for the evidence of the whole of history goes to prove, that a savage condition produces wars, murders, and internal disturbances of every kind, which can only be restrained with difficulty, by a very powerful, and superior-minded chief; and that even such a state of things is incompatible with that peace which Rousseau so desires and recommends. The third part of the book is the only one which is really solid, and which does not need beauty of style or elaborate arguments to recommend it.

As may be expected, such a political work as "Le Contrat Social" caused a great sensation throughout Europe. It was assailed by the parliament of Paris, as containing doctrines subversive of the king's government, and it condemned the work to be burnt by the common hangman; which sentence was actually carried into effect. The great council of Geneva, in order to please the Duc de Choiseul, who was then first minister in France, passed the same sentence upon Rousseau's writings. It was, however, opposed by a large number of citizens, as well as by Rousseau's private friends; the former considering the measure to be an encroachment upon the liberty of the citizen, whilst the latter argued that, however adverse Rousseau's political and religious notions might be to French ecclesiastical and civil government, there was nothing in them contrary to the free constitution of a Swiss republic like Geneva, where the most liberal ideas were entertained upon civil government, and where a large latitude was permitted to all religions, so long as they were not similar to the Roman Catholic, and did not differ much in their morals from the austerities taught by the Calvinistic creed. Rousseau's works, notwithstanding this opposition, were committed to the flames, and the council of Geneva thereby placed itself in a very awkward position with its citizens, who considered themselves outraged, and therefore resolved to support their injured philosopher and his principles by an appeal to arms. It required all Rousseau's influence and persuasions to induce his friends to abstain from means so contrary to all his own principles, and so injurious to the cause of freedom. He at length calmed their irritability, and obtained permission of the government of Geneva to re-publish his writings in that city; and he congratulated his friends from England, in which country he then resided, on this peaceable and honourable termination of their differences.

About this time his quarrel with his old friend Voltaire commenced, which Gaberel ascribes to the attempt of Voltaire to introduce a theatre into Geneva, together with the luxurious mode of French living, and the pleasures of French society; innovations so contrary to the rigid morality of the Calvinists. Rousseau, according to his biographer, strenuously opposed all these innovations of the French poet and historian. In our opinion, these disputes ought to be attributed rather to the jealousy and wounded vanity of the great writers, who felt that they divided the favour of all the courts and monarchs of Europe, by writings which were influential in forming the opinions of mankind, and who had frequently hurled brilliant sarcasm at each other. Voltaire calumniated Rousseau because he opposed him in his schemes for acquiring power and popularity in the town of Geneva, and Rousseau retorted upon Voltaire with equal keenness.

Gaberel speaks much of Rousseau's religious principles, as displayed in "L'Emile," and *labours hard to prove that Rousseau was not an infidel,* but that he had been taken for such, simply on entertaining views of the Christian religion somewhat at variance with the teachings of the clergy; an opinion likewise entertained by many German students of philosophy. The book before us, however, is conclusive that the Genevese philosopher held some infidel opinions; though Gaberel stoutly asserts that Rousseau's works refuted Voltaire's deistical arguments. Voltaire's being a materialist, does not, however, constitute Rousseau a Christian. Rousseau, beyond doubt, held many arguments in support of natural theology; he, however, sneers at the professors of our religion, at its teaching, and many of its tenets, and must, by the showing of our author, have been at heart a deist, if not somewhat of a materialist. His defence of what he calls natural religion obtained for him the favour of a large body of the clergy at Geneva, and thereby provoked the anger and sarcasm of Voltaire, who declared that Rousseau was a traitor to his friends, and to the cause of materialism.

Rousseau soon after published a work, known as "Les Lettres de La Montagne," in which he pushed his principles to even greater extremes. These may, without doubt, and in spite of all Mr. Gaberel can say to the contrary, be considered atheistical; and the pastors of Geneva became both indignant and sorrowful at their old friend and defender Rousseau adopting ideas in opposition to their creed; whilst Voltaire was, in his turn, quite as much elated at Rousseau's apostacy, rejoicing that so powerful an ally had been gained on the side of infidelity. The Genevese still continued their attachment to Rousseau, notwithstanding the opposition of their clergy, and much desired that the philosopher should again reside amongst them. Our author here endeavours to excuse those extremes to which Rousseau was carried in his last work, by stating that they were in part occasioned by political rancour and irritation, and that Rousseau was pushed into a corner by the violence of his political adversaries. He nevertheless showed, by his private conversation, that he never really intended to put forward extreme doctrines; that he often contended against those of his friends who urged upon him the arguments of his own writings; and also, that his first work had done much good to the Calvinistic clergy, by inducing them to reflect upon, and to alter some of, the austerities of their observances.

Political irritation is no apology for infidelity. Whatever Rousseau may have said in his conversations in contradiction to his writings only proves that he must have been a man of great insincerity, and that his avowed convictions on either side of the question were not to be relied on. He could never repair the harm he had done religion in his writings by privately contending against his own arguments in the daily discourse with his friends; whilst whatever assistance he rendered to the Genevese clergy by his proofs of *natural theology* he completely neutralized by the extreme doctrines which he advocated in his later works.

Mons. Gaberel gives an amusing account of our philosopher's disputes with Voltaire; and quotes a long extract from one of his works, to prove that Rousseau was not an infidel; and that, in later life, he had lost none of the vigour and eloquence of style which had distinguished his earlier productions. These anecdotes do not place the character of Rousseau in a very happy light; though they deserve to be noticed.

There was once at Geneva a friend of Rousseau of the name of Tronchin, who seems to have been a man of some scientific eminence, and who was also well acquainted with Voltaire. He endeavoured to soften the differences which existed between these two great writers; though he agreed with Rousseau in opposing the French innovations of Voltaire, and in preserving the original simplicity of manners and morals of the Genevese. Rousseau even desired that morals similar to those of the Spartan republic should be introduced into Geneva. Tronchin objected, remarking that "such manners were neither applicable to the age nor to the Swiss republic." Several angry letters passed between them on this subject—Rousseau seeming to think that Tronchin blamed him for his opinions; whilst the latter reminded him that he only differed with Rousseau as to the expediency of applying these remedies; though fully admitting, in theory, their excellence and wisdom. This simple difference in opinion so irritated Rousseau that it occasioned a coolness between the two friends which ultimately terminated in the total interruption of their intimacy; and notwithstanding the attempts of many of their mutual friends, a reconciliation was never brought about. Tronchin endeavoured to persuade the philosopher to return to his native city, assuring him that, whatever might be the ideas of the rest of the world, Rousseau's own fellow citizens felt the most unbounded admiration for his talent and his political and social virtues. Rousseau, however, preferred the French capital to Geneva, where he kept up an acquaintance with many of the most celebrated and opulent of his countrymen then settled at Paris. This circle of acquaintance seems to have been very exclusive, as few writers and men of eminence were admitted into it. The coterie was made up of Mons. Verner, a wealthy banker, who managed the small funds of Rousseau, and disposed of them to great advantage; the well-known Necker, who afterwards played so distinguished a part in the great French Revolution; together with Lenieps and Coindet. Mons. Gaberel relates an anecdote, which, although it displays some eccentricity of character, clearly proves that Rousseau did not on all occasions display that vanity which his constant quarrels with his best literary friends rendered so apparent in his character. In the month of April, 1775, Vernet, Necker, and some other eminent Swiss savans then resident in Paris, had invited the philosopher to a petit soupé. Jean Jacques did not, however, make his appearance at the stated time; and, after waiting with some impatience for nearly three hours, the whole party began to be somewhat anxious for their friend, who was usually most punctual in keeping appointments. Vernet, who was curious to know the fate of the missing party, went round to Rousseau's lodgings; on arriving at which, he was met by a strong odour of smoke, and at once believed the house to be on fire. On entering the apartment of Rousseau, all fear for the safety of his friend was removed. Rousseau was calmly standing before the fire, in one of his most abstracted moods. Vernet began by reproaching him with his want of punctuality and courtesy. Rousseau replied: "I have been employed in the useless task of composing a work, which, after all my pains and trouble, is only worthy to be cast into the fire." On turning to the grate, Vernet perceived a large mass of papers, just beginning to scorch. "If the manuscript is not in your opinion worth publication or preservation," cried Vernet, "at least allow me the pleasure of rescuing it from the flames, and keeping it as a remembrance of the author?" Rousseau granted the request; and the manuscript thus rescued proved to be one of Rousseau's ablest works.

From such characteristic traits, we can only conclude that Jean Jacques was a man of eccentric and irritable temper, who was easily provoked by his best friends, and who, when once irritated, seldom became reconciled. His private character goes against the supposition that he was a religious man; whilst his whole life throughout, as described in the book before us, seems to have been one great conflict within himself between Christianity and infidelity. Whatever his morals may have been, his character was certainly not one of the most amiable; whilst the speculative bent of his mind, as displayed in his writings, rather inclined him towards atheism in religion, and liberalism in politics.

In the concluding chapter, our author gives us a description of the beauties of scenery to be met with in Geneva and its neighbourhood; and contends that they were never thoroughly appreciated until described by the pen of Rousseau, and embellished by his elegance of style and vivid imagination. He seems to think that Rousseau's account of the picturesque mountains and the placid lake first led travellers to turn their attention to Swiss scenery, and to the icy regions of the Alps. He quotes many passages from Rousseau's works, in which the philosopher recommends travelling as a means of appreciating the beauties of nature, as conducive to bodily health and mental reflection, and as a contrast to the idle luxury of towns, and the solid enjoyment and healthy recreations of a country life. We are told that, notwithstanding the irritability of Jean Jacques Rousseau's character, he could, after a good country walk, become as cheerful and convivial as most men. In one of these walks, Rousseau stopped to rest at a fine chateau near Montreux, and, whilst reposing in the garden, the proprietor suddenly confronted him. Rousseau at once began to praise the manner in which the gardens and vineyards were kept, observing that excellent wine must be procured from the latter. The proprietor at once invited Jean Jacques to taste his wine. He repaired "à la cave," refreshed himself with a glass, and then enquired the name of his hospitable host. "Monsieur, je suis le Banneret de Gleyrolles. . . .Et vous, Monsieur, qui avez l'air si bon enfant, oserais—je vous demander votre nom?" "Mon nom! je m'appelle Rousseau." "Rousseau—Monsieur Jean Jacques—Eh! Monsieur, excusez de vous avoir reçu ainsi Monsieur Jean Jacques. . . . Et moi qui vous donnais du nouveau." The Banneret pressed on Rousseau some of his choicest wine, under the influence of which Jean Jacques became so exhilarated that he sang one of his favourite songs all the way home. This anecdote certainly proves that Rousseau, with all his grave and sober reflections, could sometimes be a jolly fellow, and descend to the level and enjoyments of ordinary mortals.

Clarence, near which the philosopher must have passed in his walk from Montreux, furnished him with materials for one of his most ideal works, which was however rendered defective by the picture of the immoral French society of that day which it contained.

Gaberel seems to insist on the attention which Rousseau gave to the subject of educational reform. His work, however, on that subject rather served to point out existing evils, than furnish a remedy. That he was horrified at the practice, common in those days, of parents, both in the higher and middle ranks, abandoning the care of their children to servants, whilst they themselves indulged in gaiety and frivolity, was a step in the right direction. He, however, gives but few principles by which such crying evils can be corrected. He once replied to a man that boasted of having brought up a son according to the Rousseau scheme of education: "So much the worse for him. I never intended to give you any *method* which you might carry into practice, but rather to point out existing evils in all education." Gaberel, the Rousseau praiser, calls this find-fault-tone of Rousseau's life the lamentable page in it; and, moreover, blames the philosopher for his adoption of the worst manners and morality of French society.

Rousseau seems to have died with singular calmness at Ermenonville, a place situated between Paris and the Belgium frontier, in full vigour of mind and use of all his faculties. He is said to have reproached his wife for weeping at his fate; and to have asked her if she wished to deprive him of the happiness which was in store for him in the next world, "*by the mercy of God.*" This last expression agreeably uttered by the expiring philosopher, would almost induce one to think that he had in his last moments relinquished the opinions of his life, and that he had died a religious man. It is by no means improbable that the terrors of death had impressed him with the certainty of a future. Such a belief is often produced by fear, and is not therefore always the firm and calm conviction of a reflecting mind.

It appears, from the statement of our author, that much respect was shown to the memory of Rousseau, long after his death, both by his countrymen and the French republic, and that the latter celebrated the anniversary of his birth with great rejoicings; whilst the former erected a suitable monument to the memory of their fellow citizen, by placing, in the year 1828, a fine bronze statue on l'Ile de Barques, in the Lake of Geneva. The principal leaders of the allied army, when passing through Ermenonville, in 1814, visited the tomb of Rousseau, and thus testified their respect for his memory. Gaberel winds up his many praises of Rousseau by endeavouring to prove that many of the speeches of the principal orators of the National Assembly were copied from the Contrat Social and other works of Rousseau; and that Rousseau, in publishing his republican opinions, was in no way answerable for the horrors of the French Revolution, any more than Martin Luther and the first Reformers could be held responsible for the excesses of the Anabaptists at Muntz. It should, however, be remembered, that, while on the one case good examples invariably brought about bad effects—in the other, the doctrines enunciated were certain to produce the evils which unfortunately followed. Rousseau well merited the admiration and applause of his fellow citizens for a certain largeness of mind; for his perseverance in raising himself from a low condition in society to be the first writer of the age; whilst the pains he took to improve his style, and his industry under great disadvantages, may claim for him a place beside his eminent American cotemporary, Benjamin Franklin. They both raised themselves from a low position by their own efforts; both were self-taught, and both exercised an immense influence upon the political and moral condition of their countrymen, and indeed of the continents which they inhabited; whilst their power has lasted and has produced great and permanent effects upon posterity. We must, however, remember, that, while Rousseau only exerted an influence on liberalism, philosophy, and politics, and that for evil—the American made discoveries in physical science, which have since greatly altered the condition of mankind, and which will be beneficial to the latest posterity. Again, the Swiss philosopher was a man of irritable temper, easily provoked, and difficult to appease. The American combined with those of the philosopher and statesman, the most amiable private qualities, which obtained for him many friends. The Swiss, again, had the better of Franklin in style, for the American's language was never more than simple, clear, and short; he could not clothe his subject with the same elegance of diction as that employed by Jean Jacques Rousseau. Of Rousseau, it may be said that he was indeed a great and brilliant man, but *not a religious one,* as our author would have us believe.

Although we cannot agree with M. Gaberel in all he says concerning Rousseau, we must give him credit for research and clearness in arranging this little book, and the impartiality with which he delineates the character of the philosopher. He has brought to light many new facts, which are always useful to the historian in an enquiring age like the present. We may therefore be allowed to express a hope that the same energy and talent will be again employed on some other biography, to which may he give as much thought and care as he has done to the life of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

LOUIS THE FOURTEENTH,

DANS SES RAPPORTS AVEC LA RELIGION.

LOUIS THE FOURTEENTH,

DANS SES RAPPORTS AVEC LA RELIGION.*

NOTHING so completely marks the line between modern and ancient history as the effect of religion on politics in the two different periods. In ancient times religion and morals held a high place in the consideration of rulers, and often, if not always, contributed to the formation of the national character. Thus the Brahmin creed in India, and the ecclesiastical caste in Egypt, went far towards giving the people of both those countries a veneration for religion, a speculative and argumentative mind, and a peaceful and laborious character; whilst the Persian and Chaldean idolatry of the heavenly bodies created an astronomical taste, and enabled the people to make progress in science. The fables of Hellenic mythology excited the imagination and patriotism of the Greeks, and no doubt gave to their literature an extraordinary and early poetic character. The veneration of the God of War by the Romans, and their stern morals, tended to the formation of that character which made them conquerors of the ancient world, and the most practical and sensible of nations, whose durable laws and works formed models for their conquerors centuries after they had ceased to exist. In all these states, the sacerdotal order held a high position, and the ceremonies of religion, as well as the condition of morals of the people in each, occupied the serious attention of their rulers and lawgivers. In none, however, was a man persecuted for refusing to adopt the peculiar idolatry of the country, and few attempts were made to convince the sceptic that the religious opinions of the nation amongst whom he dwelt were more correct than his own. The consequence was, that religious wars amongst the ancients were rare. The Jewish struggles in Palestine were certainly of a religious character, and were often exterminating, bloody, and durable in their effects. They should not, however, be strictly quoted as historical exceptions, as they arose from a distinct chain of circumstances peculiarly ordered by the Almighty to advance his chosen people; and they do not give the same play to human passions and motives as the Huguenot wars of France; the rising against Philip II, in the Low Countries; the contentions between the German princes and Charles V; and the subsequent thirty years' war in Europe. In all these modern struggles the contending parties alike considered that they were acting conscientiously, that they were supported by Heaven, and were fighting to maintain their own religious opinions. Whereas the nations whom the Jews conquered, principally contended for territory in self-defence. As every one knows, the ferocity of the religion of the northern nations greatly contributed to that courage which vanquished the hitherto irresistible Roman legions, and to overthrow the Roman Empire. It was, however, reserved for more modern periods to witness the spectacle of a religion which in its principles taught peace and good-will towards men, but in its practice raised bitter contentions and disputes between ecclesiastics and laymen, and ultimately brought about persecutions and bloody wars.

---

* Du Gouvernement de Louis XIV dans ses Rapports avec la Religion. Par H. De Marne. Bar le Duc—Contant—Laguerre, Rue Rousseau, 1860.

Many causes contributed to the difference between precept and practice in the Christian faith, which it will be necessary to notice before we approach our subject. History tells us of two religions in which coercion has been used—the Christian and the Mahomedan. The one brought suffering on its followers from the first, but only throve by persecution; whilst the other started with the principle that its tenets must be propagated by the sword. The founders of both religions were surrounded at first by few followers, though their opinions made rapid progress in an incredibly short period. Here terminates the likeness between them. The Christians were persecuted by both Jew and Gentile from the very earliest periods; and there seemed, humanly speaking, to be little chance of their doctrine becoming universal. It, however, quickly extended itself throughout the whole of the Roman Empire. But, as the Church grew strong, heretical doctrines crept in amongst her followers, whose conduct was much influenced by the circumstances of nation and climate; the subtle minds of the Greek scholars soon led them to dispute on mere words, whilst the enthusiastic character of the African converts led them to support their various opinions by appeal to arms. At length, in the fourth century, the Christians obtained a decided advantage by the conversion of Constantine to the new faith; and some of the more far-sighted Christians were willing to admit some slight degree of pagan error into the church, in order to ingratiate their very numerous pagan brethren. The combination of Christianity with heathenism gradually became still greater as the western empire declined, and the Teutonic tribes of the north became masters of the Roman provinces; and as these nations were converted, it was found necessary to give them a higher veneration for the ecclesiastical body than had been entertained in the earlier and purer ages of the church. Thus, Rome, owing to her universal sway, became the chief civilizing and converting power. Although she was invaded and plundered by hordes of barbarians, and her temporal power destroyed, yet she early began to exercise that spiritual authority which has been so injurious to nations in general, and to the doctrines of Christianity in particular, and to endeavours to proselytize by persecution.

The Pope first assumed power in Rome during the sixth century, when he aided the people to assert their own rights against the oppressive tyranny of the Greek Emperors and their governors. Rome was then looked upon next to Jerusalem, as a most sacred *locale*, to which pilgrimages were made by men of all classes, and even by sovereigns. It was the chief city of one of the three great Italian sees, as well as, at one time, the universal capital. The Popes also derived power from their activity in sending missionaries to Germany, the Low Countries, and the British Isles; and they still further increased their strength by their well-known disputes with the Lombards, and the assistance which they obtained from Pepin and his son Charles, with that of their Frank subjects. The Pontiffs likewise obtained grants of land from both these princes, and the coronation of Charles, or Charlemagne, as he is better known, the Emperor of the west, in 800, was quite as advantageous to the Pope as to the monarch. The former derived from it his claim to crown the future Emperors of Germany, who were successors of the Carlovingian race. The Papal power was kept down during Charles's reign; but the weak and superstitious character of his son, Louis le Debonnaire, enabled the Popes to acquire influence during the ninth and tenth centuries, when the Carlovingian princes declined each day in influence, ability, and vigour of character. Abuses gradually crept into the Church, which damaged its power and its moral character, until benefices were shamefully bought and sold in every country throughout Europe, and the chair of St. Peter had been filled by boys, and even women. This state of things was, however, put an end to in the latter part of the tenth century, when the Papal power received a great accession by the establishment of the infallibility of the Pope, and by the publication of the famous, but false, decretals of Isidore.

Gregory VII, in the beginning of the eleventh century, took advantage of the abuses of the church, and the licentious character of Henry IV of Germany, to free the papacy from its subjection to the German Emperors. Previous to his time, it was necessary that a Pope's election should be confirmed by the Emperor of Germany; but he entirely shook off this yoke by his admirable arrangement of the Papal election; and thus no Pope after his day dreamed of asking the imperial consent to the assumption of the papal dignity.

Gregory VII may be said to have established the Papal authority at Rome. The much-vexed question of investiture to bishoprics was but slightly interfered with by Gregory; he was unable to settle the point, although he could have done so with greater advantage than his successors. The next Emperor of Germany being popular with his subjects, it was necessary to touch this difficult question with much caution; whilst, on the other hand, Urban II, who succeeded Gregory VII, was by no means so sagacious a statesman, or so vigorous and courageous a man, as his predecessor. It was contended, on the part of the Pontiffs, that, as temporal power was inferior to spiritual, a prince who was a temporal potentate had no right to invest a bishop with the insignia of his office, still less to seize on his temporalities as feudal lord, during a vacancy in the See. After a long contest with the Emperors of Germany, and the Kings of England and France, a compromise was arranged, by which all bishops were to appear at Rome, and be confirmed in their ecclesiastical office by the Pope who was *only* to confer on them the mitre and other insignia of their spiritual office; whilst their sovereign was to bestow upon them the temporalities as their feudal lord. This agreement was, however, often broken through when the Pope or the bishop found a convenient opportunity of doing so; or when the sovereign was weak and superstitious, and the bishop independent, or rich enough to apply to the Papal court against the supposed tyranny of his monarch. Thus large sums of money rolled into the Papal exchequer; and the Pope, by the judicious use of his power over the clergy, by interdicts and excommunication, and acting on the fears and superstitions of princes and people, increased his influence until it reached its height in the days of Innocent III, at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century. This Pontiff numbered amongst his vassals many of the most powerful sovereigns of Europe, and even terrified into tranquillity the able and ambitious prince, Philip Augustus of France. The Papal power remained for more than a century at its zenith; and would have continued all powerful, but for the rash attempt of Boniface VIII to make himself as powerful in temporal as in spiritual affairs, and for his still more impolitic dispute with Philip the Fair of France. As is well known, the quarrel with that monarch ended in the Pope's captivity and death, and the removal of the Papal chair from Rome to Avignon. During the long residence of the Popes in France, they fell more or less under the influence of the French monarch, whilst the schism in the church between the rival pontiffs of Rome and Avignon weakened their power throughout Europe, and brought about the councils of Constance and Basle in the fifteenth century; which, besides settling the difficult question of the rightful successor to the chair of St. Peter, declared that from henceforward the Pope's opinion on church matters was not to be considered infallible, but was to be regulated, in case of error, by decrees of general councils of the Church, to be called together from time to time by the Pope. The Pontiffs, as may be supposed, were not very anxious to assemble these councils; and we only hear of one more general council, that of Trent, which sat, with various interruptions, from 1545 to 1560, on whose decrees was based the present fundamental articles of belief of the Romish church. The Pope's temporal power was now chiefly confined to Italy; and, although his spiritual authority was acknowledged in most countries beyond the Alps, various sovereigns endeavoured to circumscribe it within proper limits by concordats and other ordinances. Thus we find that Frederick IV, Emperor of Germany, made one with the Pope in 1448, by which great concessions were obtained. In like manner, Charles VII of France passed, with the assistance of his clergy assembled at Bourges, his celebrated Pragmatic Sanction, an ordinance which defined the powers of the Pope over the Gallican church, and gave extensive authority to the King. This blow to the Papal supremacy was followed by the concordat made by Francis I.

Notwithstanding the troubles of the Reformation, and the power which the Roman Church lost thereby, many Pontiffs were still found rash enough to urge their claims to temporalities, as well as spiritualities, in various foreign churches. Such claims lasted in full vigour until the days of Louis XIV, between whom and the Pope arose a hot contest on the question of investiture to bishoprics and their temporalities. This dispute lasted throughout the greater part of Louis' reign; a good account of which is given in a work recently published in Paris, from the pen of Monsieur H. de Marne, under the title of "*Du Gouvernement de Louis XIV dans ses rapports avec la Religion.*" As might be expected, it takes a somewhat French view of the subject, avowing that "le grande monarque showed the greatest moderation as well as firmness in his negotiations with the Pontiff," an assertion which may be somewhat doubted. That Louis XIV is, however, entitled to great praise for the spirit he evinced in resisting the encroachments made on the Gallican church by Alexander VII, Clement IX, and Innocent XI, is beyond doubt; and it is likewise clear that no monarch, who desired either to preserve his own independence or obtain the respect of his subjects, could well have brooked the interference of a foreign potentate, even in ecclesiastical affairs. Thus it is admitted on all sides that Louis XIV did well, on the one hand, to contend against the claims of the Pope to the temporalities of French bishops; and on the other, to oppose all appeals by them to the court of Rome. It is curious enough that this same monarch, who so persecuted the Protestants, should have been engaged in a violent quarrel with the head of the Romish church. But little open opposition to the Papal authority was attempted in the days of Mazarin, as that minister believed that such a course would not only injure him as a cardinal, but help to embarrass his policy during the troublous days of the Fronde.

The first ambassador sent to Rome by Louis XIV, after taking upon himself the duties of his position, was ill received by Alexander VII, and seems to have been insulted by the Roman people. Then commenced a dispute between the King and the Pope, which was soon destined to become as violent as any previously heard of in the middle ages. Two bishops in Languedoc, of the name of Pavillon and Caulet, appealed against the King, on account of "his demanding the surrender of the temporalities of their bishoprics, that they might be legally conferred upon them by the King, when assuming their sacred offices according to the usual custom of the Gallican church." Clement IX, on succeeding Alexander VII, highly approved of this resistance to the temporal authority of the monarch over ecclesiastical temporalities, and wrote to these bishops letters of praise and approval. The King at first remonstrated with the Pontiff, and then, finding it of no avail, consulted the best legal authorities of his kingdom, in the assemblies of the parliaments of Paris and Toulouse. These assemblies both concurred in supporting Louis in the assertion of his prerogative over the temporalities of the church, and appointments of the bishops; and a law was passed in 1673, "forbidding bishops to appeal against the decrees of their sovereign to the Papal court." If they had any grievances to be complained of, they were to appear before the tribunals of France.

The dispute between the King and Innocent XI, who had now become Pontiff, rose to such a height that the Pope was rash enough to threaten Louis with excommunication. Had the King thought it advisable to separate himself from the Romish church, he would not only have had the support of the whole French nation, but the greater part of the French clergy. He, however, considered that such a step would be a great scandal to the church, and an unnecessary act, as long as matters could be arranged by negotiation. In Innocent XI, if we are to believe M. Marne, he had to deal with a Pope who was as obstinate as Gregory VII, or Boniface VIII, and who could understand neither the sovereign with whom he negotiated, nor the age in which he lived. The King's conduct certainly seems to have been moderate; as he might have brought the Pope to reason by force of arms, or have adopted the policy of Henry VIII of England. He properly considered that, as a Catholic sovereign, his most politic as well as his most dignified course lay in treating the Pope as the head of the church, whilst he obtained the sanction of his own clergy for the uncontrolled management of their ecclesiastical property. His parliament, as we have seen, supported him strenuously in his opposition to the Papal encroachments; and that of Toulouse even went so far as to declare that "prelates who should appeal against the monarch to the Pope, had not only forfeited their sees, but were even guilty of death." This proceeding was an over-violent one; and it required all the efforts of both people and monarch to maintain their rights against the unjust and overbearing assumption of power on the part of the Papacy. When Franche Comté was conquered, Innocent considered it a good opportunity for putting forth his right to the temporalities of the churches of this newly acquired and yet unsettled province. The King claimed the same right as he possessed in his original dominions through the concordat of Frederick IV; while the Pope still proved obstinate, and the King resolved to refer the question to his own clergy, a large assemblage of whom were called together at Paris.

The Assembly, with the archbishop as its head, thoroughly supported the measures of the sovereign, as being fully in accardance with the views which had been maintained from the earliest periods of the Gallican church; and the ablest supporter of the King in this ecclesiastical synod was the famous scholar and divine, Bossuet, who had just been appointed to the bishopric of Meaux, and who commenced his new duties with a very able discourse on the rights of the Gallican church over its own temporalities. He also wrote several able letters, strongly reasoning on the point; and the resolutions to which the ecclesiastical assembly at length came, were chiefly ascribed to his eloquence and persuasion. The famous declaration which they presented to the King, in 1682, was supposed by many to have emanated from his pen. Others say, however, that Colbert was the author of it. It was a most liberal declaration, affirming "that the Pope had no authority in temporal matters over the Gallican church; that no bishop or priest ought to appeal to his court; that the Pontiff, even in spiritual matters, was not infallible; and that when the clergy differed from him, such differences should be decided by a national synod, called together by the King." Innocent did not approve of these liberal measures, and threatened Louis with excommunication, a sentence which he did not, however, dare to put into force. He nevertheless, according to Monsieur Marne, "rejoiced at any blow that could be aimed, even by heretics, at the power of the French King and his clergy." We are also told, on the same authority, "that the Pope rejoiced at the downfall of James II of England, as an ally of Louis XIV, although the event occasioned the ruin of the Catholic cause in the British Isles."

Monsieur Marne now enters into a long and able argument concerning the temporal power of the Pope. He is honest enough to admit that he cannot trace it from the time of St. Peter, and is content to show that it was denied by the fathers of the church, and never assumed by the early Roman Popes. The whole of his arguments on this point are clear, and full of learning and research, though they are those of a thorough catholic, who venerates the Pope in his spiritual capacity, and would most strenuously support the Romish Church as it *now exists* in France. These opinions are somewhat at variance with his political convictions, as he professes to be a thorough legitimist by continually speaking of the honour and the moderation displayed by the Bourbons." M. Marne, nevertheless, attacks the infallibility of the Pope, and contends that it was never assumed by the early Pontiffs; that the fathers of the Church did not acknowledge it; and that the opinions of the Papacy during the fourth, fifth, sixth, and even seventh centuries, were corrected by general councils of African and Asiatic bishops; that in the 7th century the Emperor of Constantinople sided with the patriarch against the Pope, and first developed the schism between the Latin and the Greek Churches; that the bishops whom the Pope censured, in the days of Louis le Debonnaire, openly denied his infallibility; that several of the Popes abolished the bulls of their predecessors, and thus completely destroyed all the Papal claims to infallibility. He then quotes the case of Boniface the Eighth, whose famous bull of the Unam Sanctam, which declared "both the temporal and spiritual power of the Pope over Philip the Fair of France," was rescinded by his successor; and further brings forward the examples of the councils of Constance and Basle, in which, as we have already mentioned, it was decreed that the Pope's opinion, when erroneous, could be overruled by general councils. Thus, says Monsieur Marne, "it is clearly proved that the early Popes did not consider themselves infallible, that they were never acknowledged so by the Church, the chief dogma of which is that *the Church is infallible*, and *not the Pontiff*. This view was supported by the Four Articles put forward by the ecclesiastics of Louis XIV's time, in which all the free assertions of the Gallican Church which had been made since the 15th century were fully maintained.

Louis XIV, according to Monsieur Marne, did not persecute the opponents of the four articles. The truth of this assertion we must take leave to doubt. It is unlikely that a monarch of so arbitrary a character as Louis XIV should tolerate those who differed from him in his own religious views, when he so bitterly persecuted "heretics." Monsieur Marne is, however, a staunch supporter of Louis XIV, whose conduct, he tells us, "was marked by moderation, firmness, and dignity of character, throughout the whole of his dispute with Innocent XI;" whilst the truth is that the Pontiff for ever remained obstinate, and even secretly joined in the famous league which was formed in 1687 by William of Orange, the Emperor of Germany, the King of Spain, and the northern powers of Italy. Thus, when Louis blamed the Pontiff for his secret correspondence, the object of which was to dethrone William's Roman Catholic Father-in-law, the Pope replied that "his efforts were not made against the Roman Catholic Church, but against the ally of that monarch who had attempted to curtail the Papal authority by the four Heretical Articles of the Gallican Church."

If our author descends to subterfuge in order to assert his own views, we can no longer look upon him as an impartial historian. That Innocent was perfectly justified in protecting himself from the attacks of an ambitious and powerful neighbour, such as Louis XIV, has been long ago decided, though our author blames the Pope for his general conduct, declaring "that it occasioned the irreligious and philosophical opinions of the following century." How such an effect could be brought about by Innocent's conduct, we cannot understand; although many Catholic writers of well-known ability and learning agree with Monsieur Marne in considering that "any assistance rendered to Protestant sovereigns would produce sad results." Innnocent XI was succeeded by Alexander VIII, from whom and his successor, after long negotiations, Louis XIV obtained ample consent to his Articles. Our author, who is a rabid admirer of "le grand monarque," gives us a long dissertation on the firm and liberal basis on which Louis XIV had established the Gallican Church; and turns to the edict of Nantes, the abolition of which he justifies on what we think very lame arguments. Louis XIV, of course, like all the great characters in history, displays virtues and vices in his conduct throughout life. No one who is not a bigoted Catholic can place his revocation of the edict of Nantes either amongst his good or his politic acts, although they may excuse it on the very "tu quoque" argument that both Catholics and Protestants practised a very intolerant spirit towards each other during the 16th and 17th centuries. Of course, it is useless to argue with any man who considers, like Monsieur Marne, "that passive obedience ought to be the rule both in politics and religion; that the Inquisition and the

Pope were always indulgent towards those who differed from them, that heresy from the Roman faith was a crying sin, to be punished as soon as it appeared; that Louis was more tolerant than any Protestant sovereign of the day, and that the edict of Nantes had been gradually undermined before it was revoked." Added to these startling historical assertions, we are told that the "revocation" was perfectly justifiable, not only from the majority of the nation being Catholic, but from the many rebellions which had taken place amongst the Huguenots, during the days of Louis XIII and the minority of Louis XIV. We are willing to accede to much that Louis did under the trying circumstances. It is true he attempted to make converts to the Catholic faith, and that the well-known Dragonnades did not occur until after the Huguenots had revolted against him. The best and strongest argument in the King's favour is to be found in the fact that the Huguenots continually disturbed the peace of the kingdom. The question then arises, what was the state of the Protestants when Louis XIV deprived them of all their rights by the revocation of the edict of Nantes? They were, undoubtedly, not only peaceable and well-conducted citizens, who had brought wealth into the kingdom by their manufactures and industry, but many of their leaders had done good service to the state in the army and navy. Louis not only cruelly punished them by the revocation of this edict, but deprived France of many of her best citizens and servants, to augment the riches and the power of his enemies. The revocation of the edict was, without doubt, an unjust, intolerant, and impolitic measure, the excuse for which, according to Monsieur Marne, is to be found in the spirit of the age. Such an excuse is utterly insufficient, and does not at all lessen the harshness of the measure. Monsieur Marne vindicates the King's conduct by contrasting it with that of Elizabeth, Oliver Cromwell, and Charles II, of England, who were well known persecutors of the Catholics; whilst he boldly asserts that all classes ought to have been satisfied with the King's liberal promise of restoring the confiscated lands to those who would become Catholics; a condition which, of course, was not accepted. Our author seems to have been blinded by his prejudice in favour of Louis XIV, and to have curiously distorted history to serve his own peculiar views. Thus he has declared results to be produced by causes which, if they ever existed, could have had no influence on the events he records; whilst his far-fetched arguments, brought forward in answer to a periodical called "Le Correspondant," are the most partial and prejudiced of any historical or political writer that has come under our notice.

The brief history of the Jansenists, as given in the book before us, is however interesting; though we hear little about their founder, or their doctrines. It is well known, however, that Jansenius produced a work, full of doctrines which, when pushed to extremes, were contrary not only to the Papacy, but even in some points to Christianity itself. The book seems to have been compiled with great labour, through the long period of twenty-two years. Its chief doctrine partook of the predestination and Calvinistic theories, pushed to a much greater extent than at present admitted by Calvinists themselves; and it contended that the popular belief of the death of our Lord to save all men was incorrect, as many were predestined to eternal misery. It also appears to have suggested doubts as to the agency of the Holy Spirit in assisting men to overcome their temptations; and it condemned the doctrine of Grace. The only part of the Jansenian doctrine which seems to have been worth anything, was that which inculcated the close and diligent search of the Scriptures, in order to test the Christian creed. Innocent XI at once condemned these doctrines as heretical, although they were professed by many bishops. Both his predecessor and successor in the Papacy were of the same opinion; and many of the moderate Jansenists even came to the conclusion that the principles of their sect were carried too far. Cardinal de Richelieu imprisoned at Vincennes the Abbé de St. Cyr, one of Jansenius's warmest supporters and most intimate friend, and would listen to no petitions for his release, declaring that "had Luther or Calvin been confined in a similar place of safety, many misfortunes and much bloodshed would have been saved both to Germany and to France." This policy was also adopted during the administration of Mazarin, and through Louis XIV's reign.

Mr. Marne again improves the occasion by giving us a long sermon on the necessity of coercion in matters of religion; contending that "it is no reason against coercion that it has not always succeeded in putting down those who rebel against the established religion of the country, any more than it is a reason against the punishment of criminals that crime is not entirely put down by the terror of the law." This is another bad argument. The heretic may enjoy his opinions without injuring society, if he keeps them to himself; whereas the criminal cannot carry on his evil practices without disturbing the peace of society, and ought therefore to have the fear of some severe punishment before his eyes, to deter him from continuing in his evil courses. Our author, like a true partizan, affirms that "tolerance is nothing more than indifference to religion." We would have him look around on Europe, and see with how much more tranquillity Protestants and Catholics can live together now, than they could in the seventeenth century. He must confess how much more they add by their united efforts to the welfare, prosperity, and good government of the different states to which they belong, than when they were in continual hostility; and he must admit that this is more especially the case with the British Isles and France. By his own showing, coercion had a small effect in rooting out either the Protestant or Catholic religion in the countries where either faith was professed by the minority.

We have a good account of the disputes between the Jansenists, Jesuits, and other clergy, and between Bossuet and Fénelon —the former a supporter of the King's authority, and the latter, according to our author, a firm partizan of the Pope's infallibility. M. Marne gives Fénelon a character for ambition and intrigue contrary to what has been related of him by most other historians. He also considers that Bossuet was the better theologian, the clearer reasoner, and the greater scholar of the two; whilst the latter acted only with the view of obtaining a cardinal's hat. He likewise quotes a number of works which detail the disputes of the Jansenists; but, though full of learning, fill up too great a space, and are uninteresting to the general reader. He then endeavours to prove the sagacity of Louis XIV in his dealings with both sects, and only expresses a wish "that the King's measures towards them had been still more severe, as it was mainly to the heretical doctrines in the state that a laxity in morals and religion ultimately occurred, and revolution was produced." He again stoutly contends that "it was an able policy on the part of the King to revoke the edict of Nantes;" and reiterates his assertion, "*that the Protestants were neither unjustly nor cruelly treated thereby, nor by any other measure adopted against them by the King's government.*" Any one, however, who will turn to the correspondence of Louis XIV and his Ministers, which has been lately published by order of the French Government,* will be convinced how prejudiced and how erroneous these assertions are, as all the archives of the period clearly prove *that Louis XIV left no stone unturned to convert the Protestants to his own faith, by bribes, persuasion, menaces, confiscations, and even death itself, long before the revocation of the edict of Nantes was probably thought of.* We ourselves have found many letters written to the different bishops and agents of the King throughout the country by Colbert*—a statesman whom historians have agreed in considering the most tolerant to the Huguenots of all Louis XIV's ministers, and one whom many believe to have been opposed to the revocation of the edict of Nantes, to have done all in his power to avert this measure, and whose death in 1683 was looked upon "as a blessing to the Catholic cause." We can only notice the substance of these authentic and curious letters: one of which appears as early as the year 1662, in which the Bishop of Castres is informed by Colbert "that the sum of 3,000 francs will be duly remitted by the Government to a certain Protestant lawyer for losses incurred, *provided he will become a convert to the Catholic and Apostolic faith.*"† In another, of nearly the same date, Colbert calls upon the French Minister at the Court of Savoy to require "that the conditions respecting the district of Gex, made over to France by the treaty of 1602, by Henry IV, shall be duly carried out;" and goes on to say, "*that the King has destroyed twenty-five temples belonging to the pretended reformed faith, and has only left them three in which devotions can be performed.*"‡ We have again another letter, bearing date 1665, from Colbert's agent, informing him that "conversion was making great progress in the south of France, owing to the impression made on heretics by the action of the state."

---

* Correspondance administrative sous le Règne de Louis XIV entre le Cabinet du Roi, les Secrétaires d'Etat le Chancelier de France, etc. recueillie et mise en ordre par G. B. Depping. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855.

If we search further, we shall soon find that the sufferings which the Protestants had to endure were sufficient to make them rise against any government, however mild to the rest of the nation. The lieutenants of the Bastile addressed a number of letters to Monsieur Colbert concerning a certain *Marcilly*, a Protestant, and a native of Languedoc, who had for some years resided in England, and had been connected with the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Arlington, and other ministers of Charles II's Court, during the triple alliance against France formed by England, Holland, and Sweden. This man had projects against the King's life and Government, though we are not distinctly told what these schemes were. He was, however, on his arrival in France, arrested on the charge of treason, and confined in the Bastile. Here, notwithstanding his declaration of suffering from all kinds of disease, he was put to the torture, to make him confess his accomplices. His chief crime, however, seems to have been that he was an obstinate Protestant, who would not be frightened into conversion, either by entreaty or punishment. We find that he was promised a commutation of his sentence if he would *become a Catholic*. This inducement proving of no avail, the full force of his sentence was carried into effect, and he was broken on the wheel, *firmly maintaining his avowal of the Protestant faith*.* A letter is also extant from Louis XIV himself, demanding from a lady at Court "that her relative, Mademoiselle de Beaumond, who had lately been converted to the established religion, and who had on that account been concealed somewhere in Paris by the Huguenots, should at once be given up to the authorities;" at the same time forbidding "all exercise of the pretended reformed religion within the neighbourhood of Paris."

---

* Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, publiés par les soins du Ministre de l'Instruction Publique—Première Série Histoire Politique.

† D'Anglure, Evêque de Castres, à Colbert. Page 303. Correspondance administrative.

‡ Colbert à Carcavi. Page 307. Lettre No. 5.

There is a host of correspondence despatched by Colbert to the Bishop of Moutauband, the Presidents of the Parliaments of Toulouse and Dauphine, and other provincial and mercantile corporations of Bourdeaux, Blois, and Tours; the general purpose of which was to exclude the Protestants from all share in the magistracy, to oblige them to appoint Catholic judges within their own lands, to deprive them of the benefits belonging to trade associations, and, if possible, to stop all advantages which they might gain from commerce, also to regulate the education of their children, and forcibly to drive them into the church at an age when they might possess such feeble understanding as to render them easy of conversion—at the age of seven years. All Huguenot churches were to be destroyed, and the attendance of the congregation *compelled* at orthodox places of worship. Prisoners were refused religious consolation if they belonged to the reformed sect; and marriages were only to be solemnized by Catholic magistrates, appointed by the Government. These letters not only show that the privileges and power of the Protestants were systematically undermined from a very early period in Louis XIV's reign, but they contradict the assertion of M. Marne that the revocation of the edict of Nantes was "neither unjust nor injurious to the Huguenots." Protestants, as long as it remained in force, had, in the eye of the law, equal right with the Catholics to fill all posts and offices of the state, although they might be actually deprived of these privileges by the arbitrary power of the King. The revocation was therefore only the last great blow aimed at the Protestant faith; and what our author chooses to call coercion, is the most cruel religious persecution which history has recorded. Even Philip II, although he was not so attractive in his private character as Louis XIV, was nevertheless more merciful to his heretical subjects, wisely abstaining from meddling with their commercial pursuits any further than by taking their vessels as lawful prizes of war. The only parallel that can be found to the treatment of the French Huguenots, is that of Philip III of Spain, towards his Mahomedan and Jewish subjects. Both were equally impolitic, and both deprived their dominions of many useful and industrious inhabitants. This policy is not to be wondered at in the bigoted Philip III, who was originally intended for the priestly office; but it is surprising in the able and politic French monarch, whose cruelty towards the unfortunate Protestants we could scarcely believe, were it not proved by authentic state papers. It is, however, abundantly proved by a state correspondence of Colbert, the Chancellor, the Secretary of State, and the Marquis de Seignelay, &c. &c. during the years '81, '82, '83, and in the written order for the destruction of Protestant temples, the prevention of removal of Protestant children from certain neighbourhoods in order that they might be sent to Roman Catholic schools; the deprivation of Protestants of all share in judicature; and the prohibition to leave the country under any pretence. All efforts to assist the poor and sick amongst the Protestants were strictly forbidden; and societies for that purpose were to be put down by the strong hand of the police. All efforts to convert the Catholics to Protestantism were strongly opposed by the Government; and a certain surgeon, who repaired to some baths on the Swiss frontier, and who was supposed to combine conversion with the cure of the sick, received peremptory orders from the Government to confine himself to the duties of his profession. All books also were prohibited to be published which propagated the doctrines of the reformed religion; and a librarian at Paris was informed by Colbert that although his Majesty had no objection to his continuing the sale of his works, he desired to put a stop to the distribution of Protestant publications. The authorities in certain districts of the south of France were likewise informed that those farmers on the King's land, who obstinately refused to be converted to the Roman Catholic faith, were to be deprived of their lands, and replaced by the men of the orthodox religion. The same measures were also to be adopted with regard to Protestant communes, which were being depopulated of their present inhabitants, and were to be filled by Catholics. Orders were also issued that Catholic instead of Protestant workmen should be employed in repairing the various churches throughout the kingdom, a labour which had formerly been equally enjoyed by men of both religions. The only privilege which seems to have been accorded to the Protestants, was one of which they had been deprived in former years, and which had been regulated by the declaration of 1669. This was a permission to solemnize marriages in their own churches, provided the parties were within the degrees of relationship sanctioned by the Roman Catholic church. It is no wonder then that the Huguenots should sometimes have risen against the King's Government, and that they should have made the monarch distrustful of their conduct, though it is a poor excuse for the King's harshness and bad faith, or of the unheard-of severities committed in his name.

---

* Defita Lieut. Criminel à Colbert, 1669. Page 311.

Louis XIV may have acted from conscientious motives; but he ought not to be praised for his harsh persecutions. In our opinion, such conduct was the greatest blemish on his character and policy. It deprived him, whilst alive, of his best generals and admirals; for such men as Schomberg and Duquesne shrank from serving a monarch who treated their fellow religionists and countrymen with unrelenting rigour, and tarnished the records of his better deeds. Such a fatal course must be regarded with the eye of pity, as even the most impartial Protestants allow that Louis, in other relations of life, was an affectionate and able man, and a monarch anxious to promote the welfare and interest of his subjects.

There are abundant facts on record to refute Mons. Marne and his advocacy of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, whilst hosts of letters prove that the Dragonnade (which Marne calls an impudent lie) was a true historical fact. Notwithstanding Mons. Marne's many inaccuracies, his work is worthy of perusal—if for no other reason, for the learning evinced in its compilation, and as illustrating the amount of prejudice which an earnest man can bring to bear on a subject on which he bestows his full powers.

L'ACADÉMIE FRANCAISE.

L'ACADÉMIE FRANCAISE*.

In the present anomalous condition both of Europe and America, it becomes a curious study for the historian to ponder over the opinions recently propounded by the only French assembly which dares to utter its deliberate sentiments on the passing occurrences of the day. No better place than the French Academy, and no more fitting opportunity, could have been afforded than the Electoral Séance at which the Abbé Lacordaire was elected to fill the vacant seat of Monsieur de Tocqueville in that body.

The sentiments expressed on the occasion by the Abbé, and the answer of Monsieur Guizot, gave for a time an importance and a prominence to the proceedings of that association previously unknown. The character of the two men, and the difference of their lives and positions, were sufficient to create abundant expectation, independently of the interest belonging to the subjects of their discourse. The one a philosopher, accustomed from a very early period to occupy himself with the consideration of the origin of the constitutions of various nations, their effects on governments, their social condition, and their positions; an eloquent and successful statesman, who had brilliantly discharged a variety of offices, who had acquired vast political information, and considerable insight into the character of men; possessed of a mind alike accustomed to calm and sober reflection, without being swayed by imagination or strong passion. Such was

---

* Histoire do L'Académie Française, par Pellisson et D'Olivet, avec une introduction des eclaircissements, et notes; par M. Ch. C. Livet. Paris: Didier et Cie. Quai des Augustins, 1861.

Monsieur Guizot. In the other was found an eloquent preacher, of singular imagination and great rhetorical power, who had trained himself by austerity of life, and a devotion to the cause of the church—that church which had been so constantly threatened with ruin during the last three centuries, and whose head at the present moment is scarcely able to maintain its spiritual, much less its temporal power. Added to these great qualities, Monsieur Lacordaire had long maintained his reputation as a Frère Precheur, though no man's tongue or pen is absolutely free in France.

The pulpit and the Academy are even now too powerful to be restrained; and thus a license has been given to the speech of these two men, and the doings of the Academy itself have been brought prominently before the public. The speech of the Abbé* gave rise to much conjecture at the time of its delivery, from its eloquence and novelty. He commenced by thanking the Academy for having selected him as a successor to such a man as Monsieur de Tocqueville, whom he eulogised as "a useful citizen and ornament to the State, both in his private character, his inherent bravery, and his political wisdom." The Abbé then touched on dangerous ground, and drew a parallel between the democracy of the United States, and that professed by republican politicians in Europe, much to the advantage of the former, which he contends "has always, notwithstanding republican ideas, respected order, laws, social institutions, rights of the church and religion; whilst the latter are, and ever have been, for abolishing existing constitutions, to make way for novelties which are supposed to exceed in excellency all that has gone before." He enumerated the works of Monsieur de Tocqueville, and compared them to those of Montesquieu and of Rousseau, declaring that they owed their excellence to liberal principles. He then surveyed what civilization has done, during the last three centuries, for liberty, literature, and religion; and strangely closed with an exordium on the present government of France. Of the Abbé's speech we can only add that it was republican, learned, and eloquent, though not uniformly consistent; that he endeavoured to combine a support of the principles of the most absolute church in the world, with the most liberal ideas in politics—a task difficult of accomplishment, even for one of Monsieur Lacordaire's eloquence and ingenuity.

Mons. Guizot's reply† is much more in accordance with our own ideas. He asked what would have been the difference in the position of the two orators, had they lived 600 years ago—he an heretical Protestant, and Lacordaire a Romish priest? "Nous sommes ici, vous et moi, Monsieur, les preuves vivantes et les heureux témoins du sublime progrès qui s'est accompli parmi nous dans l'intelligence et le respect de la justice, de la conscience, du droit, des lois divines, si longtemps méconnues, qui règlent les devoirs mutuels des hommes quand il s'agit de Dieu et de la foi en Dieu. Personne aujourd'hui ne frappe plus et n'est plus frappé au nom de Dieu; personne ne prétend plus à usurper les droits et à devancer les arrêts du souverain juge. C'est maintenant l'Académie seule qui est appelée à reconnaître les siens." He then paid a well-merited compliment to the eloquence and ability of the new Academician, and declared that an oration like the one he had just heard would be sufficient to immortalize the most ordinary of men; and that De Tocqueville, great as he was, was rendered greater by his eulogiser. Guizot then reviewed the whole career of Lacordaire, in which he affirmed that the Abbé had not only well merited universal praise for his eloquence as a preacher, and his zeal and virtue as an ecclesiastic, but for moderation hardly to be expected in a public man at so very trying a period as 1831, when editor of a leading journal; and again, in 1848, when he was member of the National Assembly. He blessed the day when Mons. Berrier gave that valuable advice to the young Lacordaire:—"Je crains votre imagination riche et vagabone, l'ardente témérité de vos pensées, l'exuberance de votre langage; vous compromettrez dans l'independance et les luttes passionnées du barreau vos grands avantages naturels; vous avez besoin de subir un joug, de soumettre votre esprit et votre talent à une forte et sévère autorité. *Faites-vous prêtre;* vous deviendrez un éminent orateur de la chaire."

---

* Discours de M. Guizot, Directeur de L'Académie Française. en reponse au discours de M. Lacordaire, pour se reception à L'Académie. Paris: Didier, 1861.

† Discours de reception à L'Académie Française, par Le R. P. H. D. Lacordaire, des Frères Precheurs, January 24, 1861.

From this anecdote Guizot proceeded to consider the merits of Mons. De Tocqueville's compositions, declaring them to have been misunderstood, owing to their author having turned his attention more especially to democracy as it existed in the United States, and thereby given the impression that he was an admirer of democratic institutions, whilst in truth he was the representative of that old French society which existed before the revolution of 1789, and which "is replaced in the Academy by La Jeune France in the person of our new Associate." He then read a lesson to the Academy, on which we shall do well to ponder:

"La démocratie a, de nos jours, une passion pleine d'iniquité et de péril; elle se croit la société elle-même, la société tout entière; elle y veut dominer seule, et elle ne respecte, je pourrais dire, elle ne reconnaît nuls autres droits que les siens. Grande et fatale méprise sur les lois naturelles et nécessaires des sociétés humaines! Quelle que soit leur forme de gouvernement, et au sein mêmes des plus libres, des droits divers s'y développent et y coexistent, les uns pour maintenir l'ordre et le pouvoir social, les autre pour garantir les libertés publiques et les intérêts individuels, les uns déposés aux mains des princes ou des magistrats, les autres placés sous la garde des citoyens. Le respect mutuel et le maintien simultané de ces droits divers font la sûreté, la durée, l'honneur, la vie même de la société. Quand ce respect et cette harmonie manquent, quand l'un des grands droits sociaux se saisit seul de l'empire, méconnaît, viole ou même abolit les droits collatéraux; quand la démocratie, par exemple, se croit maîtresse de changer à son gré les gouvernements, les dynasties, les relations et les limites des États ce n'est pas la liberté, ce n'est pas le progrès, c'est anarchie, ou la tyrannie, et peut-être aussi l'ambition étrangère qui profitent de tels désordres."

Monsieur Guizot, extolling the monarchical constitution, concluded his powerful harangue by declaring that had the Academy existed some six hundred years ago, it could not have witnessed the spectacle of a Roman Catholic priest, and a heretic, meeting face to face, calmly to discuss matters of science and art. That so desirable an effort had only been produced by the civilization and knowledge fortunately acquired during those humanizing ages which had intervened between that remote period and the present time.

Great as was the contrast between the speeches of these two celebrities, they yet prominently showed the dearly-bought experience of a statesman who has passed through a variety of fortunes; the calm reflection of a sober and well-read historian, who, notwithstanding his liberal ideas, bases his hopes on the tradition of the past; and the energy and zeal of a well-trained and earnest supporter of the Gallican church.

Those who have been introduced to the French Academy for the first time, through the speeches of Guizot and Lacordaire, will be naturally curious to learn something of the foundation of an institution which has gained a world-wide reputation, and of the doings of so learned and so illustrious a body. Their curiosity will be amply satisfied by the perusal of a book which has lately appeared in France, and which, besides carrying the history of the Academy down to a late period, reprints the works of Mons. Pellisson and Mons. D'Olivet, well-known historians of the Academy. In it we have an account of the association from its commencement, its objects, the names of its early members, and their works, which ranges over a considerable period of the seventeenth century.

It is rather singular, when the whole of Europe was disturbed by those long and bloody civil wars between Catholics and Protestants, when Charles V and Philip II were striving to establish the power of the house of Austria in every part of the world, and when the obstinate struggles with France for the mastery of Italy took place, that literature should everywhere have flourished; that the best cotemporary authors should have been produced, at nearly the same time, in Italy, France, Spain, England, and Germany; and that such men as Ariosto, Guichardini, Bentivoglio, and Galileo, should have been contemporary with such authors as Cervantes, Shakespeare, Sydney, Spencer, and Lord Bacon; and that France should have possessed her Brantome, Montaigne, Sully, Granville, and Cardinal de Richelieu. There is but little doubt that the reign of Henry IV was well calculated to advance both the interests of literature and commerce, by putting an end to the troubles of the religious wars, and by restoring peace to the surrounding countries. His life being prematurely cut short, arrested for a time the brilliant prospects of letters. The troublous days of Louis XIII's minority were little calculated for the advancement of literature and commerce at home, or for territorial aggrandisement abroad, as they were disturbed by the intrigues of Marie de Medici, the rising of the Protestants, and the indignation of the nobles. A vigorous man, however saved his country from these dangers; who alike possessed the qualities of a subtle intriguer, a daring conspirator, and an able and enterprising statesman. His Eminence the Cardinal de Richelieu combined these qualifications; he supported all parties, alternately, until he had acquired permanent influence as the chief minister of the King. Every one knows with what success he suppressed the power of the nobles and the Protestants in his own country, and that of the House of Austria abroad. He also joined to these great abilities considerable literary talent. He was therefore desirous of encouraging both literature and art with all the power he had at command, and assisted the efforts of all writers who were struggling to succeed. It is thus but little surprising that he should have protected a body of *literati,* who were afterwards known as the *French Academy.*

This association, like many other great societies, rose from an insignificant origin; and few of its early members could have realized the importance it ultimately attained, or that it would become permanent. Its history is so curious that we cannot help glancing at its progress. It seems that in 1629 Mons. Boisrobert, Malleville, Desmarests, and other celebrated literary personages, were in the habit of meeting together to read each other's productions, to pass opinions on mutual compositions, and to discuss various matters bearing on literature and science. These meetings were long of a private nature, and their proceedings a matter of secrecy. At length they reached the ears of Cardinal Richelieu, who, being acquainted with Boisrobert, offered his protection to this small coterie of literary personages. Letters patent were soon after signed by the King, constituting it "a Royal Academy." Some little apprehension was shown on the part of the early promoters of the society at its rapid advance and its dignified title. Desmarest and Boisrobert, however, urged that it would be imprudent to reject the offer of the Cardinal's protection, as he was known to be unscrupulous when interfered with. This little knot of authors were not without their troubles. They early lost two of their members, one from death, the other from imprisonment in the Bastile. All things considered, they determined on commissioning Boisrobert to thank his Eminence for the honour which he had conferred on the society by his offer of protection, and accepted the letters patent from the King. It now became a matter of some difficulty to give an appropriate name to the Society. Some were for calling it the "*Most Eminent Academy*," from the Cardinal, its founder; whilst others contended for the term "*illustrious*" before that of Belles Lettres; others desired to give it a more ample nomenclature, and a more intelligible title. Thus it was at length called *L'Académie Française;* and three officers were appointed to draw up rules and regulations to be submitted to the Cardinal. Richelieu at once gave his full sanction to the objects of the Academy, which were publicly stated to be for "the improvement of the French language and composition." This occurred prior to the year 1634; and in June, 1635, the King duly signed Letters Patent, creating the Academy a Royal Association, with the power of electing members, to be duly qualified and limited to the number of forty; together with the privilege of appointing its own president and other officers, and making rules and regulations for its government. It was then placed under the especial supervision of the King's well-beloved cousin, the Cardinal de Richelieu; and the object of the society was set forth in these letters patent as "being for the improvement of the French language and literature." Before, however, these letters patent could become law, they had to be sent to the Parliament of Paris, as being the highest court of judicature in the kingdom. They met with great opposition in that assembly, notwithstanding the utility of the Society, and its object; the Parliament being divided into three parties, the first of which looked with suspicion upon any proposal made by the Cardinal as only hiding some intrigue for advancing his own designs; the second party considered the Academy too insignificant a body to require public support, and ridiculed its objects as unnecessary and impossible of fulfilment; whilst the third party were duly sensible of the importance of the Society and of the ends it had in view, and through their efforts the letters patent became law. But the society met with further opposition and ridicule from statesmen and men of letters, and was soon violently attacked by the Cardinal de St. Germain, the principal adviser of Marie de Medici, the Queen Mother and former Regent of France, with whom he was then residing at Brussels. This attack was at once replied to by the Academy, although it did not feel itself bound to encounter all assailants; its members wisely considering that truth, together with public opinion, could alone give the association its proper influence. A very amusing comedy* was published, ridiculing the Academy and its individual members; but the author of the play was never discovered, though it was attributed by many to the brother of Halle, the Archbishop of Paris.

Following out the history of Mons. Olivet, we are told of some of the early regulations of the Academy, and find that its laws were at first few in number, ands imple in character. As the society became more permanently established, it was found necessary to amplify these rules. A director, chancellor, and secretary, were elected by ballot; the two former officers holding their posts for two months, but eligible for re-election. Their duties were to preside over the meetings of the Academy, to see that its objects were properly carried out, and receive new members on election. Besides the secretary, whose duties were similar to those of any other association, a librarian took charge of the library, and superintended the publication of the works of the Academy. Mons. Boisrobert and Desmarest were the first director and chancellor, and Mons. Conrart the first secretary. As for the further details of the regulations of this famous association, we would direct our readers to the excellent account of Mons. D'Olivet, where they will find ample particulars on the subject.

It is interesting to know what the Academy effected in the way of improving and refining the literature and language of France. Several of the council were appointed, at particular periods, to deliver discourses on various subjects, such as history, philosophy, and Latin and Greek literature. Many of the members attempted to refine the language, by means of a dictionary and grammar, and set to work to correct idiomatic phrases and expressions referred to by several writers of known eminence, both in prose and in verse. They were much assisted by the judgment of the Cardinal himself, who, with refined taste, encouraged, by his liberality, many of the writers of the day to compose poems and plays, the representation of which took place in a large hall built adjoining his palace, which served both as a theatre and an assembly room. By such means the impurities and errors of the language were made apparent and corrected, and expressions, the propriety of which were often discussed at Court, were referred by the Cardinal to his savans of the Academy. Thus much was done, even in the early days of the Academy, to purify the French language and style, and progress was made in the advancement of literature.

---

* La Comédie des Académistes, pour la reformation de la langue François. Published from the old MSS. 1753.

The death of the first librarian, who was much esteemed and lamented by the Academicians, for whose family they petitioned his Eminence, was followed by that of the Cardinal himself who had for so long protected the association. It was determined that his merits should be publicly proclaimed, and that an oration should be delivered on his virtues by the principal members in full séance; that the Academy should attend his funeral in procession, and wear mourning as for a departed brother in science. After all these complimentary measures were fully carried out, the Academy had the difficult task of selecting a new Protector. Two candidates offered themselves; viz. the Cardinal de Mazarin, who had not as yet made himself unpopular by mixing with the factions which afterwards disturbed France, and who was most likely to obtain as great an influence in the state as his former colleague the Cardinal de Richelieu. The other candidate was the Duke D'Enghein, afterwards well known as the great Condé. Although very young, he had already become famous as a wit and a patron of literature, and had taken an interest in the affairs of the Academy from its very beginning in 1635, and had then been elected one of its members. The body had at first desired to place itself under his protection, as a Royal Prince, but it feared the all-powerful Cardinal. Neither were however appointed President; as the post was filled by M. Chancelier, a very old and deserving Academician.

We have a long list of the original members of the Academy, an epitome of their lives, and a catalogue of illustrious persons, down to Louis XIV, who encouraged literature and science; also of the foreign princes who patronised the Academy, amongst whom the celebrated Swedish Queen Christina was the earliest. She not only favoured it by presenting her portrait, but attended a séance in person. Her presence was so unexpected, that half of the members were absent, and the rest totally unprepared.

A poetical and rhetorical department was soon added by Balzac, in 1656, and was further encouraged by the King himself, who gave prizes in money, and a gold medal to the successful candidates. The Academy progressed favourably, and was greatly assisted by François de Harlay de Champvallons, Archbishop of Paris, who was appointed one of its members in 1671. He was preceptor to the Dauphin, and considered the best speaker of the period. His first essay was a complimentary address to the King on the marriage of that Prince, who in return did every thing to encourage the Academy by his patronage, and granted the members the free use of apartments in the Louvre, and a considerable contrbution of books from his own library. The King also took great interest in the elections of the Academy, to which he himself became protector. He however desired to attend its sittings in the quality more of an Academician than of sovereign protector, though he was often anxious that his own candidates should be elected in opposition to the wishes of the majority. Thus he expressed much displeasure at its support of M. de La Fontaine in lieu of his own nominee. It appears, however, the Academy was much divided; one party desiring to elect the Abbé, on account of his great genius, which no one even at that day doubted; whilst others, amongst whom were many prelates, opposed him on the plea of his licentious character. La Fontaine, however, so judiciously managed the members of the Academy, so wisely chose his friends at Court, made such agreeable speeches, and wrote such complimentary verses to Louis XIV, that he carried the election in spite of grave opposition in the assembly itself, and in spite of the abilities of his adversary. The King further honoured the members of the Academy by allotting to them a place at the theatrical representations which were given in the presence of the whole Court. Another post of extreme importance soon became vacant in the Academy, which was filled by Monsieur Darcier, in accordance with the King's desire. This appointment brought forth a letter from the Cardinal de Polignac, who had been ordered by the King to congratulate the Academy on their choice, and to express his royal opinion that so long as the Academy continued to nominate all men of ability to its vacant offices and to its membership, so long would it be looked up to by the nation at large. In the year 1700, we find that the King and the Academy fell into a dispute concerning an important election, which, according to the Cardinal de Rohan, was decided in favour of the monarch.

We must now turn to the labours of the Academy in the cause of letters and science. During the first part of this reign, the Academy did little, as it had lost its ablest friend in Cardinal de Richelieu, whilst the intrigues of the Fronde so occupied men's minds that there was little opportunity for attention to literature. Every one was either intriguing in politics, endeavouring to obtain power, or defending what had been already acquired. Thus military talents and political address were the chief things in request, and it was not until the majority of Louis XIV, that literary men could recommence their labours with any degree of success. The Academy now reared its head with renewed strength, under the protection of Louis XIV; though it still had difficulties to encounter in the compilation of its famous *Dictionary and Grammar;* for what might have been effected by one man could not be so easily performed by a society, the members of which not unfrequently disputed amongst themselves, and so retarded the completion of their labours.

Such men as La Fontaine, Corneille, Racine, and other celebrated writers, were however appointed to confer with the directors of the Academy for the time being, and to aid them in their labours. This mixed commission did not, however, agree; and the academicians resolved on following out the plan of Cardinal de Richelieu, in compiling a dictionary and grammar of the French language. Their labour proceeded slowly, owing to the difficulty of classifying words, and of defining the meaning of each expression. All provincial or *Patois* words were carefully excluded. Notwithstanding the learning of the Chancelier Seguier and the Abbé Regnier, to whom the completion of this difficult task was committed, the Dictionary was only finally concluded in 1694, having taken forty years in its composition. Nor did the Grammar appear before the year 1697. Thus, notwithstanding all the talent which had been employed on these two great works—the very basis of the French language—they cost nearly half a century of toil. Nothing gives a greater idea of the care and labour which must have been bestowed upon the French language by the Academy, than the length of the period occupied in the production of these two works.

We can obtain no good account of the doings of the Academy from 1700 to 1715—the last fifteen years of Louis XIV's reign; and Monsieur D'Olivet has not been able to follow the plan of M. Pellisson, of giving a biography of the Members of the Academy during that period. A list, however, is furnished of the names of the various members of the Academy down to the year 1789, with a sketch of their doings.

Our space prevents a more detailed account of this celebrated association, though enough has been said of its history to prove what that learned body has effected for the language and literature of France; and how much labour and skill have been bestowed upon objects which would not have been accomplished but for the eminent men belonging to it. We are glad to see that the Academy has not departed from the admonition given to it in its early days by Louis XIV—"*to select as its members the ablest men it can find, without care as to politics or religion.*"

Thus, as we have seen, it could not have made a better choice than the Abbé Lacordaire, the greatest French preacher of his age, and one of the most eloquent supporters of his own peculiar creed —even in spite of Imperial warnings; while it is pleasing to find that, notwithstanding the many changes which have taken place in France, the Academy still numbers amongst its most eminent members that ablest of statesmen, most erudite of historians, and highly-gifted French orator, Monsieur Guizot, the illustrious president of the association. In offering our tribute of praise to these two able men for eloquence and independence, we should not forget the impartiality of the French Emperor, who has permitted the expression of opinions in the Academy opposed to his own policy and government. Historical students, as well as politicians, may thus learn something from the orations of both these men, and from the vicissitudes of the Academy. No work will give them a better idea of the origin and the labours of the Academy, the objects which it had in view, and the difficulties with which it had to contend, than the book we have placed at the head of our article.

LES GIRONDINS DE MONS. J. GUADET.

LES GIRONDINS.*

Many striking historical phenomena fade into insignificance when compared with the great political and social change which is known as the French Revolution of 1789. As important as it was powerful over the subsequent politics of Europe, the Revolution exercised, and still continues to exercise, a perceptible influence on the destinies of nations, having so fostered and protected democratic and radical changes as to acclimatize republicanism in many a country of Europe. So many works have appeared on the causes, the parties, the occurrences, and the effects, of the French revolution, that we could scarcely have believed it possible for any writer, however able or studious, to have afforded new information on so old a subject. We are therefore not a little surprised, though much gratified, that a well-known historian and translator of many valuable French works has entered the lists as a champion for "Les Girondins." As nephew of one of the most active chiefs of the Gironde, Monsieur J. Gaudet has been enabled to obtain ample sources of information from public documents, private letters and papers, and the conversations and traditions of his family; which disclose much that is novel in the private life of the most illustrious men of that party.

He has divided his work on "Les Girondins" into three parts:—1, their private lives;—2, their public career;—3, their destruction during the reign of terror.

In a well-written preface, he tells us that as early as 1840 he had collected ample materials for a vindication of his ill-fated countrymen, and had even put into type some private papers, when Lamartine announced his History of the Girondists. Thus, for a time, Gaudet relinguished his labours, hoping for ample justice from so able and eminent a writer. When Lamartine's work appeared, Guadet found his expectations sadly disappointed, as Lamartine had only used "Les Girondins" as an attractive title, and said but little of their actual doings. Our author's pen could, therefore, no longer remain inactive; and he resumed his task, trusting thereby not only to put the conduct of his uncle in a clearer light before the world, and remove the unfavourable verdict which had so long been recorded against the Girondist party, but also to publish much novel and hitherto unauthenticated information. His close relationship to the famous Guadet is therefore the best introduction he can have to the public; though, while making allowance for his family predilections, we are surprised that he should adopt theories at variance with most other historians.

---

* Les Girondins, leur vie privée, leur vie publique, leur proscription et leur mort, par J. Guadet, Neveu du Representant. Two Vols. Paris: Didier & C^{ie}. 35, Quai des Augustins, 1861.

Thus he has described Louis XVI as a hypocrite, indifferent to all obligations, who only signed the constitution through fear, with the reservation to break it as soon as foreign allies and his own friends at home could assist him. It is quite possible that the actions of the sovereign might give a republican like Guadet an unfavourable impression; but any impartial narrator will at once perceive that it was the King's want of firmness, and not his duplicity, which made him adopt an apparently double conduct. With regard to the Girondist party, we can only judge of it from the host of Memoirs left by all shades of political writers. It was, doubtless, composed of brilliant men, whose chief qualities for legislation lay in their eloquence and opportunities; though it cannot be denied that they propounded the use made of impracticable theories, and endeavoured to unite a moderate democracy with a monarchical constitution—two forms of government impossible for France. Our author is not altogether incorrect when he states that it would have been impossible to raise a new hereditary order, to stand between the King and the people after the noblesse had been swept away by the Revolution; nevertheless he must admit that no firm constitutional monarchy ever existed without it, and that the aristocracy which he would have *temporally* established would not have possessed sufficient solidity or independence to oppose the encroachments of the crown or the excesses of the people.

The book opens with a long account of the difference between the northern and southern inhabitants of France. The former, we are told, are German in origin, having thence imbibed much of their language, laws, and even character; whilst the latter are Roman in origin, language, and government. Having given us a somewhat discursive account of the natural feelings of these races, he at once goes on to describe the town of Bordeaux, the chief seat of the Girondin party, and gives a good account of its early history. It seems that as long ago as the 12th century, while yet under the dominion of the English, it had already made great progress in wealth and commerce, and that it was more liberal than any other district of that period. Its municipality at an early date passed severe laws against the ill treatment of citizens of the middle and lower ranks by the Barons; whilst in other places they still continued to plunder the merchants and tyrannize over the labouring man. A heavy penalty and even imprisonment was often inflicted, at Bordeaux, upon a noble who had ill-treated an inferior. Thus the town increased in importance, in civilization, and in power, with each succeeding century, until Louis XIV's reign, when the greatest part of the American commerce with France was carried on through Bordeaux, and the town became second only in importance to Paris itself. It had, likewise, made rapid advances in letters and science, and possessed an university, academy, museum, and parliament; which latter was the chief legislative assembly of Guienne. Its bar was filled by men of great legal power, eloquence, and general information; and thus, in the popular excitement which spread through France in 1789, Bordeaux had more than its proper share. As the original seat of the Girondist party, it gave political birth to three young men of very remarkable talents and character—Verginaud, Gensonné, and Guadet. The two former were of respectable parents in Bordeaux, received a good education at the academy and university of that city, and afterwards went to the bar, at which they soon acquired a well-deserved eminence for eloquence and learning. Guadet (the uncle of our author) was born at St. Emilion, a town of the Bordelais, at some distance from Bordeaux and received the rudiments of his education at home. He was afterwards sent to complete his studies at the university of the city, where he much distinguished himself by his application and by the progress he made in all branches of knowledge. Here a friendship sprung up between him and the other two future leaders of the great Girondist party, and, like them, he endeavoured to acquire celebrity, by devoting himself to the legal profession, and thus became renowned for oratorical powers, although of a more moderate style than that of his associates.

Virginaud has been compared by our author to Demosthenes, whilst Gensonné is said to have resembled Cicero. Notwithstanding the brilliant talents which these three men possessed, they seem, even according to the admission of our author, to have lacked that common sense which is so necessary to the formation of a really good administrative statesman. They were, no doubt, great speakers and able to lead a legislative assembly; but they were men ever ready to run after speculative theories impossible of accomplishment. Of their integrity and sincerity, which are so loudly praised by our author, we have but little doubt, though we must admit that their chief fault lay in obstinate adherence to impracticable opinions. Having given us a long dissertation on their characters and abilities, our author briefly glances at the public events which were then occurring at Paris. He relates how the States-General had been hastily called together to deliberate on urgent affairs, and the finances of the nation; how the three orders could not agree together; how the Tiers États took upon itself the whole powers of the legislature; how it formed itself into a national assembly, and would not disperse even at the King's command; how the people became excited by the speeches of Mirabeau and other ministers; how they attacked and took the Bastile; how they provided themselves with arms; how the National Guard was formed under La Fayette, who, unfortunately for himself, displeased by his conduct both the sovereign and the people; and how the Parisians were pressed by a famine, which was attributed to the bad government of the King and his ministers, and only to be removed by his presence, together with that of his whole court, at Paris. We are then told that, in order to carry out these measures, the people tumultuously marched, on the 5th of October, 1789, to compel the King to return to his capital; that, after a severe struggle, they successfully accomplished their purpose. Louis, thus being at Paris instead of Versailles, was, together with the Assembly, thoroughly under the control of the mob, who found no difficulty in obtaining the King's consent to the favoured "Constitution of the Rights of Man," by which it was enacted that all citizens should be equal in the eye of the law; that the press should be free; that liberty of speech should be generally allowed to all men, even on political matters; that the King, although at the head of the army and navy, and of the judicial courts of the country, should be unable to enter on any war, or complete any treaty, without the consent of the National Assembly; and, lastly, that his signature, though now obligatory to each act of the legislature, was henceforth to be considered as unnecessary. All titles of nobility were likewise abolished, and the emigrants who had been formed into a small army under the Prince de Condé and the Comte d'Artois, on the banks of the Rhine, were declared exiles from the kingdom, their estates confiscated, and their lives forfeited. Before, however, this constitution could be entirely completed, the King made his escape towards the frontier, where, as is well known, he was unfortunately recognised and brought back to Paris. M. Guadet informs us that the King never intended to leave France, but simply to establish himself at some place on the frontier, where he could easily obtain assistance from his emigrant subjects and his allies, and with them be enabled to march to Paris in triumph. We much doubt this assertion. Assuming, however, that it was so, the conduct of the National Assembly was most imprudent, as it placed itself in a false position by thus restraining the person of the King, and *forcing* him to consent to a constitution which was contrary to his own wishes, and thus gave the allies an excellent pretext for their subsequent invasion of France. From Paris, our author returns to Bordeaux, and describes the sensation occasioned there by the passing of the new constitution, and the subsequent flight and recapture of the King. The former event was received with great rejoicings by the Bordelaise; bells were rung in all churches, salvos of artillery were fired, the civil and military authorities and the national guard marched in procession to the principal church, where the book of the constitution was placed on the altar of liberty, and an address to the King was drawn up and composed by Verginaud, Gensonné, and Guadet, now high in municipal office. In this address the King was congratulated and praised for having granted "so liberal a constitution to his subjects, for having more considered their welfare than his own, and for having fulfilled in action what his predecessors had only promised." Still the flight of the King and his subsequent arrest occasioned considerable anxiety. In Paris, the National Assembly continued its labours, where the constitution was at length completed, and signed by the King. Here, again, our author accuses Louis XVI of "*temporising;*" as he affirms that the King fully intended to break his oath as soon as he could obtain assistance, and that he was engaged in a long and secret correspondence with the Count d'Artois, the Prince de Condé, the Emperor of Germany, and the King of Prussia, whose assistance he sought to enable him to regain his lost authority. If this secret correspondence actually took place, it was both foolish and impolitic, as the letters were almost certain to fall into the hands of the republicans, and furnish them with a good excuse for their subsequent cruel and unjust treatment of the really good-hearted, though feeble monarch. We cannot agree with our author that Louis XVI perjured himself in order to obtain power. That it would have redounded more to his credit had he gallantly supported his authority by an appeal to arms, or given his full and undeviating assent to the constitution, there can be no doubt. Vacillation, not temporising, ultimately lost him his life. We have a lively description of the formation of the clubs, and of their influence on French politics—Petion being the chief of the Cordeliers; Robespièrre, Danton, and Marat, the municipal Jacobins. The revolutionary movements at this period might have been considerably moderated by Mirabeau, whose eloquence and influence carried much weight. He, however, was now struck down by death. After him, Brissot could have effected much, as the leader of the moderate republicans; for, as a statesman and editor of the *Moniteur* and several pamphlets of a republican character, he had long led the moderate party of reform, previous to 1789. He, however, was in exile in Britain, and only returned to France to be imprisoned in the Bastile for his old political opinions. On his release, he again devoted himself to letters, and to the advocacy of republican opinions. His influence waned, however, with his age. We have, lastly, La Fayette, whose character as a courageous, though rash soldier, had given him much influence in the country. These three men let slip the happy moment of their popularity, and anarchy ensued.

The Constituent Assembly, having been dissolved, was replaced by the National Assembly. This was an injurious step, as the country was thus deprived of many statesmen who had acquired experience in the business of legislation. During its sitting, great troubles arose in the provinces of Brittany and Normandy, owing to the dissensions of the clergy with respect to the oath to be taken to the new constitution. These disturbances rose to such a height in Brittany that General Dumouriez, the commander of the province, requested further military aid from Paris. Thus the new Assembly looked with alarm at these priestly differences; and, in consequence, the Girondist chiefs emerged, during this debate, from almost private into public life, displaying as much eloquence and ability in the Assembly as they had done in the courts and parliament of their native town. Their powerful speeches are quoted at great length by our author, though they appear to us to be more adapted for a debating society than a legislative chamber. The Assembly next occupied itself with the impeachment of the foreign minister, who was tried for the secret correspondence which he had carried on with the emigrants and German Princes. The impeachment was adopted by a large majority, and the King was obliged to change his whole ministry.

The next cabinet was chiefly formed of the leaders of the Girondist party; viz. Dumouriez, Roland, Claviere, Servan, and Brissot. Their policy was very contrary to the inclinations and opinions of the King, who became a mere puppet in their hands; and they were much disliked by the Court, Dumouriez being the only person whom the Queen could tolerate. Roland was a simple man of business, who cared neither for the haughty flippancy of the courtiers, nor the coldness of the King. He maintained a quiet, but determined attitude, and forced the sovereign to declare war against the Emigrants and the German Princes. The Jacobins may be said to have dated their success from this period, under Danton, Marat, and Robespierre. These men opposed the superior eloquence and modified republicanism of the government with noisy clamour. Danton was a man not altogether devoid of good qualities and generous feelings, though impulsive, firm, and courageous. Robespierre, on the contrary, was hypocritical, ambitious, calculating, and cold. Whilst Marat was a bloody tyrant, possessed of vast influence over the mob; thus becoming extremely useful to his two more able colleagues, in directing its movements.

We have a very amusing account of the person and character of Madame Roland, her opinions on the statesmen of the day, and on the characters of Brissot and Robespierre; the former of whom she considered as a man of much intellect and information, though wanting in resolution; whilst the latter, she avowed, "supported the most absurd theories with the greatest obstinacy;" and was unlikely to distinguish himself either as an orator or politician, or to attain that influence and importance which he afterwards acquired during the reign of terror. Madame Roland was the spirit and life which guided all the measures of this ministry, and thence, as some say, their name, *Sans-Culottes*. It did not, however, long remain in power, as the King very justly refused to give his consent to the decree which had been passed against the clergy, confiscating to the state all the lands of those who would not take their oaths to the government.

The King, though desirous of retaining the service of Dumouriez, now lost that general, who unfortunately resigned his post, on the plea, that having outlived his popularity, he could no longer secure his majesty from the attacks of the violent republicans.

We cannot agree with M. Guadet in his defence of the Girondins as the supporters of constitutional monarchy, however able as politicians and orators. We think that what he alleges in their behalf is erroneous, and that they were looked upon by the royalists as republicans, and by the Jacobins as counter-revolutionists. This was their error and their misfortune. By their obstinate support of impracticable principles they became in a great degree responsible for the evils which afterwards befel their unfortunate country. If they dreaded that royalty would reduce every thing to the same arbitrary condition as existed previous to the assembling of the States General in 1789, they should first have placed the state in security from the attacks of the ultra-republicans, who were far more dangerous than the supporters of the King; and they then might have with safety proceeded to the discussion and establishment of their principles of government, if practicable.

It was the endeavour to support monarchical government joined with democracy that lost the Girondists their influence, and at length consigned their chief leaders to the tender mercies of the Jacobins, and ended in the ruin of the whole party.

We must take leave also to differ from M. Guadet in his attempts *to excuse the declaration of war against the European powers.* France was not attacked at this period, though it was necessary both for the Girondists and their successors, the Jacobins, to acquire popularity by brilliant campaigns. It was a *sine quâ non* for them, if they intended to preserve their power at home, to surround themselves with a number of republican states, whose interest it would be to fight against absolute monarchs, and be, to a certain degree, dependent on the French republican party. M. Guadet defeats his own arguments by his statements, as he tells us that on all the frontier a war, sooner or later, was apprehended, and that the most active preparations were everywhere going on. Such efforts could not have been made, nor such apprehensions felt, unless the government of the country was absolutely bent on contending with foreign powers. We are further strengthened in this opinion by the fact, that Mons. de Narbonne, Minister of War, journeyed to the frontier, and held several consultations with La Fayette and other generals as to the best modes of recruiting the army and attacking the most exposed towns. He also entered into an arrangement for the supply of 22,000 horses, and raised the force of the army to 200,000 men. Mons. de Narbonne also strongly impressed the generals with the necessity of secrecy. "We will only tell the National Assembly what is absolutely necessary, and what it is impossible to keep secret from them and the rest of the public." These plans alone might be sufficient to prove what the war policy of the Girondist government really was, had not a further proof been furnished by the three large armies which were kept on foot on the frontier. It proves nothing to say that many of the powers of Europe refrained from immedialety entering into a gigantic contest with France. The English were unlikely to enter hastily into another war, after the defeat and expense of the American contest. The Russian Empire and the Northern States were too far removed from the scene of action, and too busy with their own concerns, to take an interest in so distant a war. The Swiss and the Italian powers were too weak to undertake such a contest unassisted, whilst the mountaineers were naturally unwilling to take up arms in opposition to those who held similar political principles to themselves. Spain, Sardinia, and the German powers, were more likely, from their importance and position, to commence a war; and who could more justly enter into it than the Emperor of Germany, the relative of Louis XVI and the unfortunate exile princes of the Rhine, and the Prussian King, who justly feared that his dominions would be the first to be invaded; but still they had not actually commenced hostilities. Thus the war was impolitic on the part of the Girondists, as it gave the Jacobins a good opportunity for creating disturbances at home, and attaining subsequent success. We shall soon see how Les Girondins, by abandoning the King in the midst of so terrible a war, a war that they had sanctioned and partly directed, and by endeavouring to force the King's consent to measures which were contrary to the royal inclinations, ruined the sovereign, lost their influence, and gave a good excuse to the mob for beginning those terrible outrages which terminated in the destruction of the King and royal family, and in the total insecurity of life and property.

The King was now obliged to call to his councils the most liberal amongst the royalists. These men were unfortunately little known, although they were sufficiently moderate in their principles to have governed any country, and advised any monarch but Louis XVI of France, during the year 1792. The Girondists, had they possessed any pity for the monarch in his unfortunate situation, might have coalesced with these men, or else have recommended some suitable advisers at so critical a period. They did neither, and thus seem to have rejoiced that their dismissal occasioned so much discontent and embarrassment. M. Guadet simply notices this ministry as "composé d'hommes a peu près inconnus." The people took the opportunity of the anniversary of the Tennis-court day to march to the Assembly, and tumultuously lay their complaints before its members. After some hesitation, they were admitted into the hall of the National Assembly, where a most ludicrous and violent scene occurred; most of the multitude were armed with pikes and other weapons, and indignantly demanded why the members of the National Assembly had permitted the Girondist ministry, the friends of the nation, to be dismissed. These demands were accompanied with terrible menaces and republican songs, brandishing of pikes and other arms. Petion endeavoured, but in vain, to quiet the mob; and when La Fayette, who was absent on the frontier, heard of the demonstration, he declared his intention of journeying to Paris to save the King and the Assembly. Petion, however, was loath to adopt the counsel of La Fayette, fearing his rashness at the head of the National Guard more than all the excesses of the revolutionary mob. Thus Les Girondins may be considered as the cause of the early disturbance of public order, notwithstanding their boasted support of the laws and constitution. Even the eloquent pen of M. Guadet cannot find a just excuse for their conduct.

The allies had by this time collected a great force on the eastern frontier of France, and the greatest alarm and excitement were occasioned by their warlike appearance and vigorous measures.

Many of the republican leaders set up the cry that the country was in danger, and strongly fostered the belief that the King carried on a secret correspondence, both with the emigrants and the German powers. This of course still further exasperated the republicans, and gave rise to much excitement amongst the people. Volunteers enrolled themselves in the service of their country, and were for a time gladly accepted; although they augmented the expenses of the French army by their numbers, and were almost useless against the well-organized and experienced Austrian and Prussian troops. Still the royalists everywhere began to hope that the fortunes of their sovereign would revive, and Guadet affirms that the Queen had even communicated to one of the King's greatest supporters and most trusted counsellors that her husband's authority would soon be restored with the assistance of foreign troops. Marie Antoinette's brave heart might have fostered such hopes, and her want of caution might have led her to express them; but this is no reason why the honesty of her husband should be calumniated, or misrepresented. It is a matter of fact that the King was *now* resolved to carry on the war with vigour, having once reluctantly declared it against the German powers. Unfortunately for him and his Queen, the allies lost their advantage by imprudence. The Duke of Brunswick, who led them, and who was admitted even by republican leaders to be a good general, was yet no politician, as he issued a most violent manifesto, threatening all those who should oppose the allied armies on their march through France to Paris with the treatment of rebels, and even menaced the inhabitants of the French capital with severe chastisement, should they resist his soldiers. This conduct did more harm than good to the royal cause; and drove the Jacobins to strike a decisive blow at the power of the King, on the memorable 10th of August, 1792. Various corps from the different sections of Paris advanced against the Tuileries—Petion, the Mayor, endeavouring in vain to appease so vast a mob. He then hurried to the Palace and apprised the King of the rising of the people, and, as he declared, "supported him in resisting their intrusion." The King's defenders were 900 Swiss guards, and 400 of the old nobility who rallied round their sovereign. These troops were, however, at variance with each other; whilst the commander of the old noblesse imprudently irritated the National Guard by exclaiming, in the presence of the sovereign, "Sire, your subjects of the aristocracy are ready to shed their best blood in the attempt to restore your authority." The mob were well organised and well armed, and the conspiracy had been so thoroughly planned, by a club of leading Jacobins formed for the purpose, that its dreadful success was beyond doubt. The first consideration with Petion was the safety of the King and his suite, in which the National Assembly shared; and it was decreed that the King, the Queen, the children, and the ladies of the court should be received within its walls. Thus both Petion and the Procureur-general advised the royal family to proceed thither; and, after some hesitation on the part of the Queen, who was a true and worthy descendant of the house of Austria, and who would have defended the royal prerogatives and dignity with the spirit of a Maria Theresa, had she been on the throne instead of Louis XVI, the advice was accepted, and the King and the royal family were escorted to the National Assembly by 200 Swiss guards. Great difficulty, however, was experienced *en route,* as the mob penetrated in great numbers into the Tuileries gardens. When the King reached the Assembly, its doors were closed against the unfortunate guards. A struggle between the populace and the Swiss guard commenced, the latter refusing to surrender so long as they had arms. Few, however, escaped the fury of the mob, who, after they had butchered the faithful Swiss, turned their steps towards the Assembly, and obliged the members, by fearful menaces, to pass a decree by which the executive authority of the King should be provisionally suspended, and the government intrusted to a provisional council, until a National Convention could be assembled. This was another fatal step; as, without the executive, everything fell into disorder and anarchy. Our author endeavours to exculpate Les Girondins, by affirming that neither Verginaud, Gensonné, Guadet, or Petion were in the secret of this conspiracy. This may be so; but they must be blamed for their want of resolution to resist the demands of the Jacobin leaders, in abolishing the power of the King, and in allowing all influence to verge into the hands of Danton and his friends of the Commune.

The Assembly now placed the government in the hands of Roland, Brissot, Danton, and some of his more moderate revolutionary friends; and, as our author observes, this was a "nouveau rôle des Girondins en face de la Commune." It clearly proves that their sympathies were with the ultra republicans rather than the royalists, that they preferred uniting with the tumultuous leaders of the mob, than to honestly joining the King and his friends, even though such a union might have secured the laws and the government which they themselves had established. By appointing Danton minister of justice, they enabled the Commune to carry out all their audacious and bloody designs, even in defiance of the National Assembly and the cabinet; for, as M. Guadet rather happily expresses it, "Danton had one foot in the Cabinet and the other in the Commune." He thus apparently stultified the measures of his friends in the Commune, though he actually did all in his power to promote their schemes in the Cabinet. It appears more than wonderful that he should ever have been selected as the colleague of Roland and Brissot. The Girondists, however, seem to have thought that Danton's ambition would have been quieted by such an appointment, and that the ministry would thereby be strengthened.

The Commune commenced its career of bold atrocity by forming an extraordinary tribunal, as it alleged, to try the Swiss prisoners, but really to condemn all opponents, a military court martial being too slow a proceeding for such bloodthirsty tyrants. It seized on the public press, terrified several writers and journalists, and thus gained vast influence over the minds of the people, by calumniating the ministry and the members of the National Assembly. All houses in the city were searched for concealed or suspected royalists; and although the members of the Assembly and the Girondist portion of the Cabinet protested against this audacious conduct, and passed several decrees condemning it, these ultra revolutionists were nevertheless enabled to overcome the moderates by threatening to sound the tocsin and call the sections to arms; which latter power they obtained by the secret connivance of Danton, minister of justice. As the Assembly was not sufficiently pliant, the next step was to terrify it, and to gain further influence with the mob. This was done by organizing the insurrection and massacre of the 4th of September, when the prisons of Paris were attacked, and the helpless prisoners butchered, in the hope that some aristocrats might be amongst them. The remonstrance of the moderate party in the Assembly was of no avail, and the thorough absence of military force and police, to counteract such excesses, must have clearly shown to the Girondists the sad evils which they had brought upon themselves and the country by their abolition of the executive power of the King. It is true that the royal power was considerably limited; but even to the last it had sufficient strength to exact some degree of obedience from the military and the police. This moral power could not easily be supplied by the Assembly, or by the Cabinet which it had appointed to rule over the country during the period which intervened between the King's dethronement and the calling together of the National Convention.

Our author endeavours again and again to vindicate the conduct of his friends, by affirming that they had not sufficient strength to cope with the Jacobins, that Roland was continually writing to Petion, the mayor, or other officers of the municipality, calling upon them to maintain order by adopting vigorous measures. But it appears to have been their own fault that they did not possess the power to put down the revolutionary leaders; as every public step they made to regain that influence led to their own ruin, and the power of their adversaries. Thus the Jacobins made good use of the time which intervened between the King's loss of power and the assembling of the Convention, whilst they obtained by intimidation the election of a larger number of their own members than had been previously represented in the National Assembly. Amongst these, Robespierre, Marat, Camille Desmoulins, Danton, and other ferocious leaders, were the most conspicuous. The Jacobins in this manner obtained more power in the Convention than they could have done in the Commune, that body having influence only in Paris, whilst the Convention legislated for the whole nation. The rest of the Convention was composed of men of good intentions and respectable position in the nation, together with a considerable number of Girondists; viz. the Rolands, Brissots, the Condorcets, the Petions, the Verginauds, Gensonné, and Guadet. These men displayed their usual eloquence and tenacity in supporting their own principles in the *new constitution,* which had now to be drawn up. France was at once declared a republic, and liberty and equality the principal aim of the government. This settled, the Jacobins set to work to accuse the Girondists of treachery, and of neglect of the defences of the country. According to Robespierre, the *émigrés* were daily obtaining fresh successes, and advancing quickly towards the frontier. The Jacobins made good use of this news to alarm the people and ŏccasion riots — thus overawing those members who were peaceably disposed, to support the Girondists in resisting the calumnious attacks of the Jacobin chiefs. Robespierre was, however, intent on mischief, and daily brought forward frivolous charges, which he endeavoured to prove by quotations from the celebrated memorial to Louis XVI. Robespierre affirmed that this document fully proved that the Girondists were *united with the King against the liberties of the people.* This was, however, indignantly refuted by Verginaud, who, in a very able speech, declared that the document was rather to be looked upon in the light of a private letter, written to the King, than as a state paper; and further, that the Girondists had shown, by the dethronement of the King and abolishment of his authority, that they were not united with him. Louvet, one of the Girondists, retorted on Robespierre with violent recrimination. He accused him of having tampered with the elections, and with having obtained influence for his party by intimidation and violence.

The Jacobins, having filled all the government offices with their creatures, now adopted a still more daring policy, and brought the King to trial, "for having abused his authority, and conspired with the enemies of the empire against the safety of the nation." It was maintained by the Girondists that no clause existed in the constitution by which the King could be tried *for his life;* that his person had already been declared inviolable; so that the Assembly could only inflict upon him perpetual imprisonment, or exile. All these reasons were, however, overruled by Robespierre and the other Jacobin leaders, who carried, by a large majority, the trial of the King at their bar.

This trial was a political blunder, and cannot be justified. We therefore do not agree with M. Guadet in considering that the King was guilty of conspiring against the safety of the empire. Had he been so disposed, he need never have called together the States General to deliberate on the affairs of the nation; for it was not an established necessity, as in England, to convoke any assembly to legislate on external or internal affairs, or to levy taxes. Again, the States General had not been acknowledged as a part of the French constitution for nearly two centuries. The calling together of the States therefore, and the King's request that they should assist him with their advice, was a pure act of grace on his part; and he might, when the Tiers État took upon itself the whole burthen of legislation, have dissolved the assembly, as his ancestor, Henry IV, had done, on the plea, that as the orders could not agree amongst themselves, their proceedings were useless, and only calculated to impede, instead of assisting, the King and his government in the business of legislation. Any other sovereign but Louis XVI would have attempted to disperse the deputies of the Tiers État at the point of the bayonet on the Jour de Paume. He might easily have rallied round his person the royalist nobles of the provinces, by any decided step. None of these measures, however, did he choose to adopt; and thus his want of firmness totally unfitted him for his station. The best defence ever made for Louis XVI was in the brief answer which Napoleon gave to Talleyrand, when that statesman applied the epithet of tyrant to the fallen sovereign,—"Tyrant he was not," said Napoleon; for had he been one, *you* would have remained an Abbé, and *I* a simple Captain of Engineers." There were great differences in the Convention as to whether the King should be put to death at once, or allowed to appeal to the people. The Girondists were mostly of the latter opinion; but the Jacobins, fearing that their victim would escape by delay, and that they would be deprived of the opportunity which his execution afforded of ruining their enemies, hastened the trial as much as possible, and obtained, by a very large majority, the immediate execution of the Sovereign. The Girondists in vain endeavoured to save the King, though they were not actuated by the conviction of his innocence, but were induced to do so by the feeling that so soon as the King was executed their own destruction would be planned.

At this period, Condorcet and his party suggested an elaborate form of representation with two chambers, and proceeded to pass stringent measures for the election of the provincial magistracy. Such a sensible mode of government was but little desired by the leaders to gain influence by clamour and the mob. They doubtless felt that if the Girondists were allowed to proceed quietly in forming a thorough republican constitution, they would irrevocably lose their hold upon the Assembly, and by it all opportunity of gaining influence in the republican faubourgs of Paris. They therefore strove to bring to trial all those who had defended the Sovereign and the Tuileries Palace on the memorable 10th of August, and all those who had opposed the massacres of the 4th of September. This sweeping measure was resisted by the Girondists with all the energy and eloquence which they could command; but their efforts proving ineffectual, Danton, Marat, and Robespierre obtained a complete ascendancy over the neutral members by means of intimidation and clamour. Our author goes out of his way to attack Lamartine for endeavouring to show that Dumouriez sought to bring about an alliance between Danton, Condorcet, and other chiefs, and more especially with his uncle. M. Guadet stoutly denies this assertion, and proves that Dumouriez never attempted such a combination, and never alluded to it in his Memoirs; that the meeting which Lamartine describes between Guadet and Danton is a pure invention, and that had the Girondists united with this celebrated Jacobin chief, they could have gained but little power, as Danton, although a great mob orator, was a speaker of but little note in the Convention. Whichever writer is correct, there is but little doubt that the refusal of Guadet and his colleagues to join with Danton, if they had the chance, did them infinite harm; as that statesman, once firmly united with Robespierre and Marat, gave his whole weight with the ultra revolutionary party, which from that time advanced to the greatest power and guilt. Several of the Girondists in vain attempted to rouse the Convention as to the condition of the manufactures and commerce of France, then at the lowest ebb, from the pillage and excitement which had everywhere existed at the defeat of Dumouriez and his army. Nothing, however, could be done to alleviate the commercial distress, until the army had been properly reinforced. Commissioners were therefore sent to watch the motions of the General, and, if possible, to supply him with the necessary provisions and ammunition of war. The want of success on the frontier was laid to the charge of the unfortunate Girondists, and led to the conspiracy of the 10th of March, when the sections everywhere arose, and, marching towards the Convention, demanded that more vigorous measures should be taken to supply the wants of the army, and that the Commune should sit in permanence, together with its committee, for the trial of suspected persons: and that 40,000 volunteers should be added to the army. As soon as these riots had subsided, the Girondists demanded that a strict investigation should be instituted, and the ringleaders brought to trial and punished. This occasioned very warm debates, in which Verginaud displayed his usual eloquence, and carried his point; and a committee was appointed, composed half of Girondists and half of Jacobin leaders. These men, however, did not agree; and from that period no reconciliation could be brought about between the two great parties in the state; whilst the Girondists lost every day in influence and importance. The disaffection of Dumouriez, as it became more patent, was attributed to the Girondists, who were accused of conniving at it. Their indignant retorts on the Jacobins were answered by Danton, who, in a very angry speech, declared "that he could prove that no truce had been formed between the friends of liberty and the people, and those traitors whose object it was to restore the King to power and to save his life." Thus it became apparent that the Convention could do but little to maintain peace, and that affairs were fast drifting into anarchy and confusion."

Considerable mystery hangs over the events of the 10th of March. Many writers partly attribute the insurrection to the Royalists, whom they accuse of the desire to create a counter revolution, and others affirm that the most exciting speeches did not proceed from the most democratic mouths. Be this as it may, it is rather too hard to lay the blame of most of the violent insurrections on the Royalists, though they were doubtless desirous of regaining their lost lands and wealth, and of restoring their beloved monarch to his former power. It was very natural that men who had been deprived of everything they had previously enjoyed, who were exiles from their country, and obliged to obtain a scanty subsistence, should not be over scrupulous as to the means they employed to regain their former position. It seems to us, however, much more reasonable to put the blame on the Jacobin leaders, as they were unscrupulous in a bad cause, and only desired personal power and position. Their only real impediment was the the little knot of Girondists, and it therefore became necessary that to clear the political horizon of these men, whom they accordingly attacked in the public journals and in the Convention. Robespierre began by accusing Verginaud, Gensonné, and Guadet of treason to their country; as having attempted to save the King, to restore the regal power; to induce the army to march on Paris, and to put down the people and their friends. That they had likewise endeavoured to establish a new and middle order of aristocracy, by the formation of two deliberative Chambers, and had endeavoured to extinguish the glorious revolution with English gold. These taunts were indignantly answered by Verginaud and Guadet, in two very able speeches.

Guadet on this occasion uttered the most violent invectives against Robespierre and Marat, accusing them, in turn, of grossly calumniating the characters of the real friends of the people, of having occasioned all the evils which *they* placed to the credit of the Girondists, of having formed the tribunal of the Commune, of having organised the most terrible riots only to advance their own ambition, of having introduced a number of their armed creatures as spectators of the doings of the Convention merely to intimidate its members by their clamour and menaces. The Girondists, in their turn, attempted to bring Marat to trial for his violent writings. This was another impolitic act, as it only exasperated the republicans, and did the Girondists an infinity of harm. "Search for your enemies," said Marat, "in Paris itself, amongst the members of the Convention who formed the government; there you will find the greatest traitors to your liberty." This was a direct attack on the Girondists' party, though Marat's trial was moved and carried, notwithstanding the violent opposition of the Jacobins. Nevertheless, it was an unhappy victory for the Girondists; for, as is usual with such martyrs, the more Marat had to suffer, the more his favour increased with the mob; and a tumultuous body of petitioners appeared at the bar of the Convention, and demanded that justice should be done to Marat. This packed mob, who invaded the chamber, made up of some two hundred infuriated women and *sans-culottes*, demanded that certain of the members on the *right* (Girondists) should be proscribed. This mob increased in phrenzy and in numbers, and ultimately obtained the assistance of the Cordeliers and Jacobin clubs. It marched to the Convention, which was thus forced to accede to its demands; and placed the greater number of the Girondin members on the list of the proscription. The Girondists declared their readiness to sacrifice property, and even life itself, to secure the freedom of their fellow citizens, whilst they stoutly denied the charges which had been brought against them. Notwithstanding their eloquent protestations, they were overruled by the clamour of the Mountain, who organised another insurrection, more formidable than any which had preceded it.

Thoroughly overawed, the Convention now consigned the Girondists leaders to the tender mercies of the Committee of Public Safety. In the mean time, Verginaud and Gensonné acquainted the inhabitants of Bordeaux with the events which had occurred at Paris, and which filled the whole Gironde with the greatest alarm and indignation. The Bordelais, together with the surrounding districts, organised a counter revolution, in support of their unfortunate deputies; and were joined by the towns of Marseilles and Lyons, who together raised a little army of 600 men, made themselves masters of Aix and Avignon, and broke down many of the bridges of the Rhone. In Lyons, though a feeling of hostility prevailed towards the Convention, the people were actuated by a very different motive. The manufacture of silk had flourished greatly under the ancient regime, and the workmen therefore looked with coldness on the efforts of the revolutionary party, and as the destroyers of their trade. They accordingly judged this a good opportunity for shaking off the yoke of the Convention, and restoring their old royalist friends to power. Thus they gladly joined the Bordelaise, the Marsellaise, and the inhabitants of other towns and departments, in their attempts to march upon Paris and reduce the Commune to its legitimate level.

It had now become a question whether Paris alone should rule over the departments. The Jacobins, supported by the inhabitants of Paris and the Clubs, were resolved to centralize all power in their own hands by bloodshed and clamour; and thus, by degrees, the Girondins lost all political power. If the account of Guadet is to be believed, these unfortunate men made a greater stand for their independence than other historians give them credit for. Had they lived at any other period, they might possibly have succeeded in establishing a firm republican government, on modern principles, together with security for life and property. But this was the age of extremes, when no man, however able, could expect to enjoy safety, much less success, unless he was either an ultra-royalist amongst the Vendean insurgents or the Rhenish emigrants, or a fierce Jacobin, ready to take part in all the riots of the sections of Paris, and to commit himself blindfold to the guidance of Robespierre, Danton, and Marat. In such days, brilliant and eloquent speculative politicians, who supported well-defined laws and a tolerably equitable constitution, could not expect to stem the torrent of violent revolutionary opinions: and thus the Girondist leaders, with their comparatively moderate aspirations and sentiments, were overcome by enemies, who, though lacking the ability and the debating talents of their victims, possessed the more valuable qualities of audacity, ambition, and unscrupulous indifference as to the means employed. Courage and a knowledge of mob government were more useful in 1793 than political sagacity and prudence, the most brilliant eloquence, profound reasoning in debate, or power of intellect. Such men, therefore, as Verginaud, Gensonné, Guadet, Barbaroux, Roland, Petion, and many others, were completely overcome by the violence of Robespierre and his colleagues, and were without difficulty incarcerated in the prisons of Paris, to undergo a long and severe confinement, and to be brought before the Committee of Public Safety and condemned to be guillotined. Startling as it may appear, these pure and eloquent leaders of the Girondists, *as our author calls* *them*, would not avail themselves of the frequent opportunities of escape; but refused to quit Paris; though to save themselves by flight would have been an easy matter, as their chief jailor was an old Swiss soldier of the guard, who had been taken prisoner on the memorable 10th of August, and whose life had been spared by Verginaud. This man urgently entreated him to escape, and twice undertook to cover his flight from Paris. Persuasion was, however, useless; with death before his eyes, Verginaud firmly refused to accept the offers of his Swiss friend, or escape his doom. Many of the Girondin leaders did likewise, until all hope was extinguished, and the alternative of flight or death alone remained. Early escape had been impossible, notwithstanding the rising of several provinces against the Convention; as all their letters to persons in the provinces were seized, and their movements thwarted, by the Jacobin government. Information was also gained by commissioners, who were sent into every part of the country to take cognizance of the military operations of the various armies of the republic; to supervise the magistrates, police, and officials of the different towns and departments; to collect the taxes, and to control the mercantile affairs of the provinces.

The Jacobins made themselves masters of the press, and kept the provinces in total ignorance of what was occurring in the capital. False reports were published in the *Moniteur* and other journals; and some curious letters of Robespierre to the editors of papers, on the events of the 2nd of June, have been quoted in full by our author. They likewise raised large revenues by means of assignats, and by imposing an income-tax on the inhabitants of the sections and communes who possessed any degree of fortune, and confiscated the lands, life, and property, of aristocratic victims whom they every day sentenced to be guillotined.

Guadet, and those of the Girondists readers who made their escape, fled to Normandy, where a counter-revolution had been formed, and an assembly called together, known by the name of the "*Central Assembly of Resistance against Oppression.*" To this assembly all those who had successfully accomplished their flight were admitted; and an address was drawn up, in which an immediate march on Paris was recommended, to free the capital and Convention from the yoke of its tyrants. Assistance was offered to those citizens of Paris who should feel desirous of aiding them, and a small force of Norman and Breton volunteers were collected. Unfortunately, the provincial forces were met by their adversary, and totally defeated near Vernon; and Guadet, Barbaroux, and their friends, were, in consequence, obliged to seek further safety in flight. They joined a Breton battalion of volunteers, and marched into that province, disguised in the dress of soldiers, after a time quiting their military friends and making the best of their way to Bordeaux. After a most adventurous journey, full of the strangest incidents, they reached the sea coast, where they divided into two parties, one starting for Brest, under Guadet, the other making for another port in Bretagne, and thence in safety to the Gironde. Here our friends found affairs much changed, though they were for a short time supported by the municipality and officials of the city of Bordeaux. Commissioners were, however, soon sent after them by the Convention, who cajoled and intimidated the mob, and stopped all the convoys of corn and other provisions from entering the town. Thus the municipality found it necessary to resign their places to men who were under the control of the Convention; and Guadet, Petion, Barbaroux, Salle, Buzot, and Louvet, found it necessary to fly to Guadet's paternal home, at St. Emilion. This locality our author describes as one of great beauty, situated on an eminence, and surrounded by an old wall and battlements, now a mass of crumbling ruins. Its old fosse, several feet in depth, was excavated out of the natural rock. Most of its inhabitants being quarrymen, they spent a considerable part of their time underground, in strange galleries, which, at the time we are describing, served as good hiding places for fugitives. The house of Guadet the elder possessed many of these secret passages or cells, in which a man might hide with impunity from the most vigilant pursuer. Our author tells us that his grandfather was a grave old man of seventy, who had acquired the respect of his neighbours by his able and exemplary discharge of the duties of mayor, and one who was implicitly obeyed by his sons and family. He, together with a younger son, who had served in the republican armies on the Rhine, and had resigned his commission as lieutenant, on hearing of the events of the 10th of August, received the five Girondin chiefs, and concealed them by day in a *souterrain,* behind the house; removing them at night to a secluded chamber. In this manner they existed, undiscovered, though not unsuspected by the revolutionary authorities around them, for a considerable period.

We are now called upon by M. Guadet to revisit Paris. His narrative at this point is more like a disjointed novel or drama, than a fair statement of historical events, as we have continually to journey backwards and forwards between Paris, Bordeaux, and St. Emilion; and to witness the most heart-rending pictures.

Verginaud, Gensonné, and those leaders of the party who had chosen to remain in Paris, were brought to trial before the Convention, to whom a report of their crimes, drawn up by the Committee of Public Safety, was read by the President, and various witnesses produced in support of the accusations. It may, however, be called a mock trial, as, although these unfortunate men were allowed to defend themselves against their accusers, their death had been long before determined on. They were tortured for three hours, during which the Convention went through the formality of discussing and voting on the sentence, and were then recalled, and condemned to death, their execution being carried into effect within a few hours of the verdict. Our author goes on to describe the suffering of Madame Roland, and her untimely end; passing a long eulogium on her character for firmness and courage, by reprinting some of her most touching compositions. Her husband did not long survive her cruel fate, and perished by his own hand.

Retribution now seemed to be falling on the heads of some of the Jacobins, as from this period they became victims to their own jealousy, cruelty, and ambition. Marat had been murdered, and Robespierre and Danton now governed the country with despotic rule, and subdued every part of France to their control. Bordeaux shared the fate of other cities, and numbers of victims were sent every day to the scaffold. Danton, however, at length became the victim of Robespierre, who then reigned supreme, Emissaries of the Convention were sent throughout the country; though Robespierre trusted none but his own confidential agents, one of whom he despatched to Bordeaux, who there obtained supreme power for his master. An active search was set on foot for the five deputies who had escaped, and who were supposed to be lurking in the house of Guadet senior, at St. Emilion. After a most rigid inspection of the houses and *souterrain*, Guadet and Louvet were captured. The other three had parted from their companions and sought safety in flight.

Guadet, Louvet, Guadet père, and the other members of the Guadet family, with the exception of the author's father, were, after most unheard-of sufferings and privations, brought to trial before the republican tribunal at Bordeaux, and condemned to death, their severe sentence being carried out with barbarous haste. Of the other members of this once powerful party, two were executed, and Barbaroux defeated the object of his assassins by committing suicide.

We are free to own that on the whole, however, Monsieur J. Guadet's History of "Les Girondins" is in many respects the clearest and most ample account we have yet seen of the political parties in France during the French Revolution. Differing as we do from the author in many respects, we yet consider his book as worthy of a place in every historical library of Europe.

It is true, we think that he has misunderstood the character of Louis XVI, from his too great partiality for the doings of his uncle's party. But, notwithstanding this error, his history of the early revolution, extending from 1789 to '94, displays that careful research and clear arrangement for which our author is remarkable. He has given us much that is new; he has been able to convey a full and touching picture of the different characters of the greatest actors of the time; he has described, by numerous and extensive quotations from the public speeches of these men, as well as from their memoirs and letters, their private and public acts; and he has been in many points impartial, considering his education, his connections, and his political bias. His facts are generally correct; and the excuses he is called upon to advance for his party are always plausible, having constantly before his eyes the laudable desire of shielding a dear and eminent relative from the blame of hostile writers, and the judgment of posterity.

In perusing this work, we should advise our readers to bear in mind that our author is entitled to indulgence for his partiality, while relating the actions, the difficulties, and the unjust and ignominious death of his illustrious, though unfortunate family. It would have been easy to give a more exaggerated account of the atrocities committed by the Jacobins, and to draw a more highly coloured picture of the King's conduct, and his royalist friends. To praise success is always easy; but to record the doings of an unsuccessful party, whose conduct has hitherto been overrated by its friends, and improperly condemned by its enemies, is a task requiring firmness and an honest judgment; and Monsieur J. Guadet, by the possession of these qualities, has added to a well-deserved historical reputation.

MADAME RECAMIER.

MADAME RECAMIER.*

Much of European history has been derived from two principal sources: monkish tradition, and such memoirs as great politicians, generals, or distinguished men of letters, have left behind them. Thus the history of the early Saxon princes of England has been written by Alcuin, St. Swithen, Asser, and others; whilst the letters of Pope Silvester II have contributed much towards the history of the latter end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century; for as a priest, he threw great light upon the life and tradition of those days; and, as a great statesman and prince, he held a correspondence with all the crowned heads of Europe.

After that time, the troubadours,† or wandering minstrels, became the chief chroniclers of heroic deeds, and exercised a vast influence over the literature of Europe, by giving birth to the bases of modern poetry.

By means of the monkish historians of the twelfth and two following centuries, the writings and letters of John Scotus, Thomas Aquinas, who died on his way to the Council of Lyons, 1274, and the rest of the schoolmen, together with the efforts of the chief literary, scientific, legal, and historical penmen of those days, we have a clear notion of the progress of historical events up to the beginning of the fourteenth century; at which period there dawns upon us a fresh era in historical research, through the letters of Petrarch and Boccachio, and the labours of the Sarbonne.

In the fifteenth century, we meet with an entirely new class of writers, both on history and general literature; who are tolerably accurate narrators of facts; and for the first time approach a set of men who treat history as a political school of precedents, in the which to learn the art of government. Thus there is, perhaps, no more philosophical writer in history and politics than the celebrated Florentine, Machiavelli, whose conclusions, though sometimes dangerous, are by no means so unprincipled as modern critics would have us believe.

In France, during this fifteenth century, we have the first example of a class of Historical Biographies, for which French literature has since become famous. The Memoirs of the celebrated Philippe de Commines,* who figured in the service of Charles the Bold of Burgundy, and afterwards in that of Louis XI of France, offer the best information concerning those times. Again, the Memoirs of the Lady of Beaujeu, daughter of Louis XI, and Regent during the minority of her brother, Charles VIII, furnishes much of the material for a history of her siècle. The events of the reigns of Louis XII and Francis I have not been portrayed by any of the friends or cotemporaries of those monarchs; and, indeed, there are few private memoirs of any note until the time of Henry IV of France, unless we choose to consider the letters of Granvelle, the celebrated minister of Philip II of Spain, as a French work. He could not well be called a Frenchman, being born at Besançon in Franche Comté, and being still further, by office, a foreigner. French was, however, the language in which his letters were written; and his native country, although possessed by the house of Austria through their connection with the house of Burgundy, was nevertheless considered more as a French than a Flemish or German province. There are several minor memoirs to be met with during this period; but the letters of Granvelle† to the chief statesmen and men of rank throughout Europe furnish the most considerable information on the history of those times, both in France and elsewhere. Their value having been acknowledged by such men as Guizot and Prescott, they necessarily pass as the best detailed account of the early doings of the reign of Philip II, and of the struggles between Catholics and Protestants during the reigns of Francis II and Charles IX. The Duc de Sully, in his Memoirs,‡ gives a narrative of the French civil wars during the three reigns of Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III; and further describes the court and policy of his celebrated master, Henry IV. There are many works which treat of the turbulent times of Louis XIII; but none so effectually portray the actual condition of France as the Memoirs of the famous Cardinal de Richelieu,§ in whose days France first became a great military power. The designs of this great minister were so vast, that they brought his country in connection with nearly every other state of Europe. It is a sad pity that his correspondence has never been published; and, as Mr. James well remarks, when speaking of the mystery of the iron mask, in his Life of Louis XIV, "a collection of the correspondence of the ministers during the reigns of Louis XIII, XIV, and XV, drawn up by some intelligent French statesman, would go far towards clearing up this and many other French enigmas." The history of the reign of Louis XIII is further unfolded by the Chamberlain of his much-persecuted Queen, Ann of Austria; and a good insight is afforded into the intrigues carried on against her by the Cardinal de Richelieu himself, which has again furnished Mr. James with the foundation for one of his best novels, "The Woodman," and with much of the frame-work for his life of Louis XIV.

---

* Souvenirs et Correspoudance tiré des papiers de Madame Récamier. 2 vols. Paris: Michael Levy, Frères, Rue Vivienne, 2 bis. Jeffs, Burlington Arcade.

† Histoire littéraire des Troubadours, contenant leurs vies, extraits de leurs pièces, et les mœurs, usages, et histoire du 12^e et 13^e Siècles:—3 vols. Paris, 1772.

---

* Memoires, enrichis de notes et de figures, de Philippe de Commines, par Nic Lenglet du Fresnoy. 4 vols. 1747.

† Mémoires de Granvelle, et Correspondance de Philip II. Papiers d'Etat d'après les Mss. de la biblothèque de Besançon, publiés sous la direction de M. C. Weiss, tome i à ix—dans l'Histoire de France, 1841-50.

‡ Memoires du Duc de Sully. Paris: Etienne Ledout, Rue Grénégaud, No. 9.

§ Memoires du Cardinal Duc de Richelieu, par Aubery. 2 vols. 1660.

In the Grand Monarch's reign, the longest in France, we have in the memoirs, letters, and other kinds of historical literature—an "embarras de richesses." During the minority of Louis XIV, and the troublous days of the Fronde, the sparkling and witty accounts of the Cardinal de Retz*, who was himself the chief leader of that popular movement, stand unparalleled; whilst the easily written and equally interesting Memoirs and Letters of Madame de Montespan, De Sevigny, and De Maintenon,† touch on the more domestic phases of the history of their time. Saint Simon‡ also gives an accurate resumé of the wars and court intrigues of the latter part of Louis XIV's reign, and well ridicules the pompous ceremonies which that monarch so often indulged in.

The early life and times of Louis XV have been well narrated by the famous Duc de Berwick, who, though a natural son of the unfortunate James II, and born in England, is, nevertheless, considered a Frenchman by historians.

Montesquieu§, the celebrated jurist, has also left ample information of this period, brimful of interesting details, relating both to its history, laws, and literature; whilst the letters and correspondence of the Duc de Choiseul,¶ both with men of letters and statesmen of his day, form a good historical record of the latter part of his reign. " Voltaire's " Siècle de Louis XV," although not, strictly speaking, a Memoir, might almost be called so, as the author was an eye witness of many of the circumstances which he relates, and well acquainted with all the chief political, military, and literary characters of that day. The contemporary period of Louis the Fifteenth's reign has perhaps been better described by Frederick II of Prussia, who wrote in French, and whose Memoirs take rank amongst the chief literature of Europe, than by any of Louis' own subjects. Frederick the Second not only raised his own monarchy from a second-rate state to be one of the first powers in Europe, but his wars brought him into such close connection with nearly every court of Europe, that his Memoirs thus became quite as much a history of the times in which he reigned, as a record of his own particular life.

---

* Published at Amsterdam. 4 vols. 1719.

† Memoires et Lettres de Madame de Maintenon. 15 vols. Haye, 1757.

‡ Mémoires complets et authentique du Duc de Saint Simon, sur le Siècle de Louis XIV et La Regence, par M. le Marquis de Saint Simon. Paris: A. Sautelet et Cie, Rue de Richelieu, No. 4. 1829.

§ The Complete Works of M. de Montesquieu, translated from the French. 1777. W. Davis, Piccadilly.

¶ Mémoires inédits de M. le Duc de Choiseul. Paris: Baudouin, Frères, Rue de Saugeraud.

About this same period, M. le Comte de Segur[*] gives us an insight into the policy of the French Court in Russia and various other countries in which he held diplomatic appointments, and collected valuable information as to the character and proceedings of that extraordinary woman, Catherine II of Russia.

The reign of Louis XVI has been fully described by Faucher, in his history of Cardinal de Polignac, and those of M. La Fayette[†]; though the Memoirs of the latter more properly belong to the Revolution. Several of the Court Ladies have also contributed their quota of historical information; whilst the imprisonment of the unfortunate King in the Temple has been vividly described by his intelligent valet, Cléry[‡], who has given us a clear and simple narrative of the sufferings endured by his master and the rest of the Royal Family during those terrible times.

The days of the Revolution and of the Empire have been recorded by a host of Memoirs. Madame Roland[§] has given an account of the Girondin party, and of the formation of the Sans-culotte administration, in which she actually directed many of the affairs of state. The Memoirs of General Dumourier[||] also furnish a good account of the early revolutionary wars, in which he himself took so prominent a part; whilst those of the Duke of Orleans, afterwards Louis Philippe, supply a link in the history of the Royal Family until their restoration in 1815. The Sayings and Doings of Mirabeau, edited by Etienne Dumont, one of the revolutionary committee, who was appointed to draw up the Declaration of the Rights of Man, furnish much information as to the character of those who played the principal parts in the revolutionary movements of 1789 to 1793; and although his work cannot, strictly speaking, be called a memoir, yet it partakes of that character, written as it was by an eye witness of many of the most startling events.

---

[*] Mémoires, ou Souvenirs et Anecdotes de Ph. Comte de Ségur. 3 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1857.

[†] Mémoires, Correspondance, et Manuscrits de Général La Fayette, publiés par sa Famille. 3 vols. 1837.

[‡] Journal de ce qui s'est passé à la Tour du Temple pendant la Captivité de Louis XVI, Roi de France; par Cléry. Paris: Femin Dederd, Frères.

[§] Œuvre de J. M. Ph. Roland, femme de l'ex-ministre de l'interieur, des mémoires et notices historique qu'elle a composer dans sa prison en 1793. Paris: Bidault, Rue Serpent, Anné viii.

[||] Coup d'Œil Politique sur l'Avenir de la France, par Dumourier.

We have again the Memoirs of Fouché, Duke d'Otranto*, who, during the early part of the Revolution was a staunch Jacobin, but was subsequently employed by Napoleon, and became his minister of Police, and even held the same office for a short time under Louis XVIII, with whom he had carried on considerable intrigues during the latter years of the Empire; also the Memoirs of Marmont and Soult, as well as the account of the Grande-Armée, by Count Ségur,† son of the French Envoy above mentioned. He has given a good sketch of the motives which induced Napoleon to undertake this difficult enterprise; and also of the preparations which were made previous to the Russian war. He also describes, in vivid colours, the sufferings and hardships which the French army underwent in their retreat from Moscow. But, no doubt, we shall soon have more recent revelations as to the whole epoch of the French Revolution, and subsequent periods of European history, from the pen of that arch diplomatist and intriguer, Talleyrand. In the mean time, we must console ourselves with the lively and touching records of Madame De Stael‡, M. Guizot§, M. Chateaubriand‖, and other writers, who have carried the history of the revolution of France down to our own times, and have cleared up many of the mysteries which surrounded the policy of that presiding genius of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century, Napoleon Bonaparte.

Perhaps, of all the host of French Memoirs of modern times, no one gives us a more thorough sketch of the state of general society in France, at the close of the last and the opening of the present century than Madame Recamier. Although her volumes abound in few stirring incidents, yet they paint the characters of great historical individuals as one would judge of them in private life; for she acquired much of her knowledge of the great public men by opening her brilliant salons to such politicians and writers as Guizot, Chateaubriand, and La Harpe. The work is full of letters from celebrated characters in all ranks of life, the editor having laboured hard to screen Madame Recamier from the accusation of vanity and the love of flattery, which her memoirs are likely to elicit from unfriendly critics.

---

* Mécmoirs de Joseph Fouché, Ministre de la Police général. Paris: chez le Rouge, Rue St. André des Arcs. 2 vols.

† Histoire de Nnpoleon et de la Grande Armée, pendant 1812, par M. le Général Comte de Ségur, Paris: Baudoin, Frères, 2 vols. 1825.

‡ Considerations sur les principaux Evènements de la Révolution Française. 3 vols. par Madame de Stael........Mémoires. Dix années d'exil, suivi d'autres ouvrages posthumes. (Paris 1843.) Par Madame de Stael—16°

§ Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de mon Temps, par M. Guizot.—Paris: Michel Levy, Frères, 2, Rue Vivienne.

‖ Essai historique sur les Révolutions, 2 vols. Paris, 1835. Par le Vicomte de Chateaubriand.

Madame Lenormant, however, fails signally in this respect; as every one, who reads the book must come to the conclusion that Madame Recamier was not only a vain woman, but that she hid her real faults under much affected modesty. It is true that she possessed sufficient attractions of mind and conversation, and sufficient personal charms, to render her society agreeable to all who became acquainted with her, though her panegyrists would make us believe that her attractions had equal weight over monarchs, the most distinguished generals, the most eminent statesmen and writers. Madame Recamier's origin had nothing to do with her brilliant career—her father, Monsieur Bernard, being only a lawyer of reputation, at Lyons, who, during the troubles of the Revolution, rose to the surface by his industry and intelligence. Madame Bernard, a woman of great beauty and some talent, gave birth to Juliette, the heroine of these Memoirs, in the year 1777. Of her early infancy nothing remarkable transpires and we only learn that, about the year 1784, her father was appointed to an office in the Treasury at Paris, to which city he removed his family, and in which Juliette made the acquaintance of, and married, Monsieur Recamier, a wealthy banker. The attachment of this man to his young wife rather resembled that of a father to a daughter than the warmer feelings which usually exist between the newly married. His wealth and importance made his réunions the resort of all the first political characters of that period, and the attractions and charms of his spouse went far towards rendering his house the most agreeable and the most sought after in all Paris. Both Monsienr and Madame Recamier, however, participated in the general gloom and fear which was gradually overshadowing French society immediately preceding and during the troubled days of the Revolution and the reign of terror. Monsieur was in hourly dread of his bank being plundered by the populace, whilst Madame felt her youth and her beauty to be no security against the arraignment of the revolutionary tribunal, imprisonment without a cause, and the guillotine. She, however, obtained the protection of Barras, one of the most influential Jacobins, and vividly describes the horrors which took place in Paris during the bloody period of the Revolution, having been an eye witness of the procession which accompanied the unfortunate Louis XVI to the scaffold. As a thorough royalist, she of course was inveterate against this unjust execution, though at the time she was forced to suppress her feelings. When Barras became director, she formed one of that circle of beautiful women who attended his Court at the Luxembourg, and was often in close conversation with Madame Beauharnais, afterwards the Empress Josephine. Although Madame Recamier tells us that she had much to undergo from the Emperor Napoleon I, she avows that she never saw him but twice in her life, at both times with pleasurable feelings. The first interview which she amusingly relates, took place after he had concluded his brilliant campaigns in Italy, and when the Directory, in approbation of his services, gave him a grand military reception in the Luxembourg. The second time that she saw him was after his return from Egypt, on the occasion of a banquet given to the First Consul, at which Madame Recamier was present, and where, according to her account, Napoleon desired to become better acquainted with her, and even expressed a wish that she should occupy a seat next to him at table. Owing, however, to some mistake in the arrangement, the First Consul found himself separated from the beautiful young Frenchwoman; and the only words which it seems ever passed between them were in the shape of a reproach—"Pourquoi ne vous êtes vous pas placèe auprès de moi? Je n'aurai pas ose, respondit elle—C'était votre place. Mais c'etait ce que je vous disais avant le dîner." Her simple but lady-like manner seems to have made a great impression on all present.

During this particular period, she was much harassed by the advances of Lucien Buonaparte, who, besides the rank of being brother to the First Consul, held the important post of President of the Senate. This worthy wrote many letters brimful of the most ardent and passionate expressions, which she answered with much indignation, first consulting with her husband, to whom she honourably confided her position and her course of conduct. Whatever the worldly banker might have thought of his wife's propriety, he was too prudent to recommend a breach with so influential an acquaintance as Lucien. He therefore gave his wife the rather questionable advice "to bear as long as possible with Lucien's importunities." The President of the Senate soon found that his addresses were only met with coldness, and at length desisted from his importunity.

Lovers, however, were, even at this early day, very plentiful. M. De La Harpe, whose learned works on French, German, Italian, and English Literature, well fitted him for the situation which he held as instructor to the Russian Prince, addressed Madame

Recamier in the same absurd style as Lucien had previously done. Most people would have considered him as too wise to be influenced by the charms. of a woman; but he does not seem, in this respect to have been exempt from the general failings of humanity — common to other philosophers and scholars. His friendship, however, was of great service to Madame Recamier in many circumstances of difficulty in which she was soon afterwards placed. Her father, who held an important situation in the Post-Office, had allowed an anonymous and suspicious correspondence to pass through it unexamined, which so compromised him with the Chouan leaders, that it ultimately led to his arrest on suspicion of conspiracy. Madame Recamier sought to liberate her father at an interview with the First Consul, which she endeavoured to arrange through Madame Bacciocchi, the friend of Monsieur De La Harpe. The Princess at once promised an introduction, if Madame Recamier would accompany her to the opera. After the performance, she met General Bernadotte, who also proffered his services, and finally, not only obtained for her an order to visit the prison in which her father was confined, but eventually procured his pardon.

The arrest of her father, together with that of George Cadoudal and her friend Moreau, the suspicious death of Pichegru in prison, and the fatal end of the unfortunate Duke D'Enghein, thoroughly alienated Madame Recamier from the Government of the First Consul; and the exile from Paris, in 1803, of her intimate and personal friend, Madame De Stael, still further embittered her. She now became a determined Royalist, her opinions being still further strengthened by the brothers Montmorency, the elder of whom afterwards occupied the important post of French Minister at the Roman Court under Louis XVIII. Napoleon, on the other hand, was greatly irritated that Madame Recamier should take an interest in the fate of the Royalists, and that she should have been present at the trial of her friend Moreau. He was still more exasperated that her salons should be attended by eminent politicians of his own nation and of foreign states of all parties. Indeed, he showed his irritation so strongly that Prince Metternich, who was then Austrian Ambassador at Paris, feared that by attending Madame Recamier's réunions he might injure the relations which then existed between his own sovereign and the French Emperor—relations which at that period stood on a very delicate footing.

Many sovereigns about this time are said to have courted the acquaintance of this celebrated French woman; amongst whom may be mentioned the King of Bavaria, the Crown Prince of Wurtemburg, and the Grand Duke of Mechlenbourg-Strelitz—brother of the unfortunate Queen of Prussia—who all seem, according to Madame Lenormant, to have been equally smitten with the charms of Madame Recamier, and, if we are to believe her own account, all worshipped at her shrine.

Napoleon, although he desired to get rid of this influential woman, nevertheless sought to propitiate her, and offered her, through the Duchesse de Chevreuse, the post of dame d'honneur to the Empress Josephine. He likewise employed his intriguing minister of police, Fouché, Duc d'Otranto, to induce her to accept the post, and to point out the influence it would give her at court. Fouché soon found that such an argument was of small avail. He then tried another tack—assured her that he required the assistance of a woman of a fine mind and commanding power like herself, to acquire moral influence over the Emperor. At first, she seems to have hesitated; flattered by such prospects, however, she soon made up her mind to refuse all such offers of service to a ruler who had treated her friends and relations with cruelty and injustice.

Napoleon was not, however, discouraged by this refusal, but again and again attempted to induce Madame Recamier to accept some post about the court, and finally offered her the place of dame d'honneur to Madame Murat. Madame Recamier, it seems, still refused, a course which farther enraged Napoleon against her. Many letters are published in this part of the narrative, from Moreau, Bernadotte, and Madame De Stael; the former gives a tedious account of his journey to Spain, the kind reception he met with there, and his embarkation for the United States of America; whilst Bernadotte's letters are full of admiration and love towards his fair countrywomen, written among the engrossing cares of war. Madame de Stael's letters contain expressions of equal warmth to those of Madame Recamier's male admirers. About this time Madame Recamier went to England, where she was received with the greatest cordiality, and is said to have formed a generally favourable opinion of the English character. The summer and autumn of 1807 were spent at Coppet, near Geneva, with her friend, Madame de Stael, where she met with another ardent admirer in the person of Prince Augustus of Prussia, who had been wounded and taken prisoner at the battle of Jena. Although she pitied his despair, she could not encourage his passion. Finding, however, that his love only became the more intense, and that he offered her marriage, she at length wrote to her husband to request his consent to a divorce, their marriage having been to all intents and purposes null and void, according to the laws of the Catholic church. Monsieur Recamier replied, if it were really her wish, it should be so, but he reminded her of his affection since her childhood, and the scandal it would give rise to in the polite world. On receiving this letter, she at once abandoned the idea, and returned to Paris without giving notice of her departure to Madame de Stael or to Prince Augustus of Prussia, and devoted herself assiduously to the society of her husband, notwithstanding the many earnest letters which her royal lover persisted in writing to her. The Prince again saw her in 1815, when he entered Paris with the allied armies, and for the last time in 1825.

In 1807, two great misfortumes befel Madame Recamier, the death of her mother, and the loss of her husband's fortune. The former was a severe trial, as she had always been warmly attached to her parent; whilst the latter was a blow which was more keenly felt because unexpected. About this time Napoleon became irritated at the consideration shown to Madame Recamier, and the avowed correspondence openly carried on between her and his old enemy Madame de Stael. He accordingly exiled Madame Recamier from Paris. She took refuge in the town of Chalons-sur-Marne, where she was consoled by the letters and the society of Mathieu de Montmorency, and others of her friends. From Chalons she went to Geneva and on to Lyons, where she joined her husband's sister, whose daughter, the editor of these memoirs, she adopted as her own child, and received from her great support and comfort through all her trials. At Lyons she encountered her old friend, the Duchess de Chevreuse, who had lost her place at Court, and, like herself, had been exiled from Paris. Travelling about the country for the sake of her health, the unfortunate Duchesse had contracted a severe disease, which ultimately terminated her life. It appears to have been one to which the French nation alone is subject—a mixture of melancholy and disappointed ambition. At Lyons, Madame Recamier found, in the person of Monsieur Ballanche, one of the most devoted of her admirers; in fact, his attachment could scarcely be called love, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, as it approached to idolatry. He was ready to sacrifice every consideration without even the hope of being loved in return. He was a man of considerable ability, and originally the son of a printer; he devoted himself in moments of leisure to the study of poetry, history, and philosophy, and published many works on these subjects, so full of learning and research that they acquired for him the rank of a Member of the French Academy. According to some authorities, he is the best prose writer of his day in France; but, like many other authors, has since been forgotten, and probably is now only known to the most erudite of French scholars. Strange are the likings of woman! as Ballanche's appearance was but little calculated to engage the affections of a pretty and fashionable woman, like Madame Recamier. He was much disfigured from the effects of an operation, though his ugliness was counterbalanced by the brightness of his eyes, his handsome forehead, and his intelligence. Madame Recamier seems to have overlooked all these defects in his personal appearance, and only beheld his devotion.

In the winter of 1812, Madame Recamier left Lyons for Italy, first visiting Nice, from whence she went to Turin and Florence. In the beginning of the year 1813, she arrived at Rome, and made acquaintance with that most celebrated of modern sculptors, Canova, who, together with his brother, the Abbé, received her with the greatest respect and cordiality, and offered a house near Albano as a summer residence. There the sculptor became so smitten with her charms, that he is said to have modelled a bust of Madame Recamier without her being aware of the fact; indeed, if we are to believe our editor, she was so indignant at such a liberty, that Canova was obliged to pacify her by declaring he had only used her as a friendly model for his celebrated statue of Beatrice. During her residence in the states of the church, she received daily information of the disasters attendant on the French arms; and although she bore no great love to the Emperor, she felt his reverses as a stain upon the national honor. From Rome, Madame Recamier went to Naples, at the beginning of the year 1814. Her journey was rapidly made, and Madame Lenormant here tells us that her aunt was rather surprised to find a number of horses ready for her use. She little dreamed for whom they were actually prepared. On her arrival, however, at the Neapolitan frontier, the mystery was solved. In the hotel where she took rest for the night, an indignant voice demanded who had dared to rob him of his horses; she at once recognised the voice of her old friend Fouché, Duc d'Otranto, whom she had not seen for several years, and to whom she at once acknowledged herself the culprit. To do the crafty Fouché justice, he was at once appeased, and seems to have taken the affair as a good joke. He promised to meet her in Naples, to which place he had been despatched by his master on urgent affairs. This year of 1814 was a most calamitous one to the interest of the Emperor. The allies were now endeavouring to persuade Murat to oppose his brother-in-law, who, after a considerable struggle, yielded to circumstances, and signed the convention by which he gave up the monarchy to the Bourbon king, provided his own life was guaranteed. King Ferdinand landed in Naples after some opposition, and became master of the town, though he did not carry out the conditions of this treaty. As is well known, Murat was seized, and tried by a military court martial, and put to death. During the occurrence of these events, the whole kingdom of Naples, as may be supposed, was much agitated, and Madame Murat, who was appointed Regent at Naples during the absence of her husband, seems to have displayed great administrative abilities and vigour of character in her difficult position. During Madame Recamier's residence at Naples, an incident is told of her intercession for a criminal, whose death warrant was about to be signed by the Regent; and she succeeded in obtaining the pardon after a long and earnest appeal. This fact would show, that however vain and trifling much of the conduct of Madame Recamier might sometimes appear, yet in truth she possessed many warm and noble feelings not common to her class.

In the early part of 1814, we find her at Rome, where, as a good Catholic, she rejoiced at the return of Pius VII. She saw the Pontiff re-enter his capital in triumph, after a long and severe imprisonment; and witnessed with religious enthusiasm his performance of the ceremonies and devotion at Easter.

Great changes had taken place in France during Madame Recamier's tour in Italy; the allied armies had entered Paris, the Emperor had abdicated, and gone to Elba, and Louis XVIII had been restored to full rights. Madame Recamier, as may be well conceived, did not long remain in Rome, but hastened to return to Paris, where her friend Madame de Stael had already arrived. With the restoration of the monarchy, a new era, both in society and in politics, commenced. In the former, we find Madame Recamier playing a brilliant and important part, and winning for herself the attachment and admiration of all the celebrated men of letters, politics, and arms, with whom she became acquainted. Her old friends, the Montmorencys held the first place in her affections. They belonged to the old aristocracy who had been so long exiled from France, and of which there were so few good specimens still existing. Their resolute loyalty to the monarch and his family throughout all the dangers of the revolution, made them, at the restoration, all powerful at Court, and most desirable and useful friends to Madame Recamier, who seems, with singular good fortune, to have exercised vast influence upon three generations of this handsome and accomplished race. Madame de Stael also renewed her friendship with her old acquaintance, and treated her with greater warmth than ever. She had come to Paris, after the fall of Buonaparte, with her son and daughter, together with the young officer to whom she had been privately married—a fact which was only known to a few of her dearest friends. It was Madame de Stael who first introduced the Duke of Wellington to Madame Recamier. The simplicity, frankness, and upright character of the great English general seems to have made but a slight impression on the mind of this petted woman of fashion. She doubtless expected to receive the same homage and flattery from him as she had obtained from other great men.

She was, however, jealous at the preference shown by him for one of his countrywomen, and like a true femme Française, shocked when the Duke said, "J'ai bien battue!" an expression which he made use of on his return from the battle of Waterloo. During this period she kept up a close correspondence with her old friend, Madame Murat, whose husband had deserted the cause of Napoleon, in 1814, only to return to it with greater devotion in 1815. Murat might, like Bernadotte, have been confirmed on his throne by the allied sovereigns, had his conduct been more prudent. As it was, however, he enraged all parties. The Emperor indignantly refused to see him on his return from Elba; and after Napoleon's final defeat at Waterloo, he was tried by court martial, and sentenced to be shot.

We now find Madame Recamier engaged in correspondence with Benjamin Constant, and commencing that friendship with Chateaubriand which was destined to become so warm and so endurable. She also sees much of Madame Moreau, wife of the famous General of that name, who had been so highly esteemed by Louis XVIII that he conferred upon her the extraordinary title of *maréchale de France.*

The Memoirs inform us that, in 1817, Madame de Stael went to Italy, with her son and daughter, and that during her sojourn in that country, she met with the famous minister of Louis Philippe, le Duc de Broglie, between whom and her daughter an attachment sprung up which ended in marriage. On Madame de Stael's return to Paris in 1818, she was seized with sudden illness and died. The sad intelligence of this event was communicated by Monsieur Montmorency to Madame Recamier in a letter which is still preserved. Madame Recamier, during this period, lived in a house agreeably situated in a fine garden, which M. Chateaubriand has accurately described in his Memoirs. It appears that she first knew this celebrated politician and orator in 1818. His visits soon became frequent, and his letters, which abound throughout the volumes before us, are full of the warmest and most enthusiastic expressions of admiration, as he seems to have made a confidant of his fair acquaintance, even in his most private and public affairs.

Monsieur Recamier about this time endeavoured to restore his shattered fortunes, and used the little money which his wife still possessed. He, however, failed; and his wife, who seems to have been indignant that her whole fortune should be thus lost in speculations, at once demanded a separation, and retired into a monastery near Paris, which was then under the direction of the Abbé Le Bois. Her seclusion from the world, however, appears to have been more in name than reality, something like that of the Emperor Charles V, at Yuste;

for she still continued to receive, and to correspond with, some of the most eminent men of the day, attended theatrical performances, patronized the then rising Rachel, and was idolized in her own immediate circle. Amongst her friends, Chateaubriand and Ballanche of course held the highest place; the conversation of the former abounding in wit of the most piquant kind, and being full of information on all the principal events of the day. The latter, on the other hand, abounded in interesting remarks on historical and philosophical subjects, which he explains with great clearness and facility.

After the death of the Duc de Berry, a strong ministry had been formed in order to put down the conspiracies which were everywhere forming against the government of the Bourbons, both in France as well as in Spain; during which, her friend Chateaubriand held the post of French Minister at Berlin, and from whence he held a long correspondence with her. It is not, however, so interesting as that which she received from him in his next post, as Ambassador at London. In these letters he freely gives his opinions on the climate and society of our capital. His desire to assist at the Congress at Verona is also fully established, and he urges Madame Recamier to tell Mathieu de Montmorency "that he would do much for the interests of France in sending him or some other influential diplomatist to the meeting of the representatives of the great powers."

At length, Montmorency so far gave in as to nominate Chateaubriand, conjointly with himself, French Minister at Verona. Madame Recamier's lover, with great joy, at once prepares for his return to Paris; where, after a short interview with her, he continues his route to Verona. Mathieu de Montmorency in the meantime goes to Vienna, in order to acquaint himself with the policy likely to be pursued by the Austrian and Russian Governments at the Congress, and also to make some further arrangements for the meeting of the representatives. During his journeying through the Tyrol to Verona, he writes a touching account to Madame Recamier of the death of their old acquaintance, Canova. At Verona, the two representatives of France employ the greater part of their time in intriguing against each other, and *both* write long letters to their fair countrywoman, who seems to have lost none of her influence by absence. At length negotiations are terminated, and both return to Paris. Montmorency, arriving the first, is favourably received by his sovereign, who offers him the title of Duke of Verona. This, however, Montmorency refuses, preferring to retain his family name. He is then created Duc Mathieu Montmorency. His triumph over his rival, however, is of short duration; as M. Vellelle and Chateaubriand combine against him in the Cabinet, and oblige him to resign; the latter receiving the portfolio of foreign affairs.

Madame Recamier was much grieved at the dissensions of her two private friends, though Madame Lenormant, our editor, endeavours to defend both rivals, by stating that their disputes were prompted rather by conscientious religious scruples, than by any feeling of ambition or ill-will to each other. Madame Recamier here appears as rather a vain, intriguing, and even dangerous woman; for it seems that she had more influence over the affairs and the advancement of great public men than could have been expected from a woman who was apparently so secluded from the world, and so ignorant of politics as she was at this period. The editor, of course, thinks that her grief at the disputes of her friends was real; but we are inclined to believe, from the published correspondence, that she had now become more than partial to Chateaubriand.

Montmorency and Chateaubriand both continued as warm as ever in their feelings towards Madame Recamier, notwithstanding their political disputes; and the letters of both are full of high-flown expressions of love and adoration. One always finds Montmorency, throughout the whole of his correspondence, addressing her as "Ma chere et aimable amie," whilst his rival, Chateaubriand, tells her again and again throughout his troubled period of office, that although he has much to think of, and still more to do, he dreams of her constantly, and is never more pleased than when an opportunity offers of writing to, or conversing with her.

An occurrence took place at the beginning of 1823, which was destined not only be a great trial to Madame Recamier herself, but also to cause great sorrow to Chateaubriand, as it removed her from his society for a lengthened period. Her niece and adopted child fell ill, and Madame Recamier decided to visit Italy for a second time. Both her lovers, of course, regret the necessity of her absence, though Montmorency consoles himself with the idea that he shall at least spend some days with her in the holy city, at Easter. Monsieur Ballanche also arranges to accompany Madame Recamier, who seems to have possessed a most arbitrary influence over the actions and destinies of all her admirers. She reached Rome, by way of Turin and Florence, and tells us how much changed she found all things since her visit, ten years previously. Pius VII was dead, and the new Pope, Leo XII, had just been elected, and installed in his sacred office.

If she finds Rome and its rulers changed, she is consoled by the presence of her old friend, the Duchess of Devonshire; whose handsome person, amiable and accomplished manners, and liberal encouragement of art, are now a matter of history; whilst the French ambassador, Duc Laval de Montmorency, receives her with his wonted hospitality, and amuses her with his agreeable conversation.

Madame Lenormant describes, in touching terms, the death-bed of the English Duchess, at which Madame Recamier and the Duc Laval were present, and rendered all the comfort and consolation so requisite at such a moment. Besides these great friends, Madame Recamier was surrounded by a host of the leading French artists then resident in Rome; among whom Guerin and Leopold Robert, men of two very opposite characters, seem to have engrossed her attention. The former was lively in conversation, a man of the world, as well as a great artist; whilst the latter had nothing attractive in his manner, and required a long acquaintance before he could be appreciated.

A very pretty episode took place during Madame Recamier's stay in Rome, in the way of Roman Catholic conversion. Her maid, who was a Swiss and a Protestant, and who had married a Frenchman, became seriously ill. Madame Recamier fearing that, in the event of her decease, she could neither expect religious consolation nor a Christian burial in Rome, became truly grieved at so sad a position of affairs, and looked around for a priest who might convince the stubborn maid of the errors of the Reformed church. There lived at Rome a certain Abbé, Duc de Rohan Chabot; a man of handsome person, and persuasive conversation, who had formerly been a soldier in the French army, and had filled important posts in the Emperor Napoleon's household. His wife having been burned to death by accident, his sorrow for her loss was so great that it induced him to sacrifice all his dignities and offices to enter the church, in which he had now attained the rank of Monsignore. He visited the sick woman, and not only converted her, but even restored her to health.

The Queen Hortense and Madame Recamier, after a separation of ten years, met again in Rome. Fearing, however, that the French ambassador would object to the acquaintance, she arranged a number of secret interviews between the Queen and herself, at picture galleries, or at the Coliseum. It was at one of these interviews that the Queen poured forth her sad tale of the harsh reception she had met with from the Emperor, on his return from Elba, for having accepted for herself and her children an asylum in France at the hands of the Bourbons. This touching account is not only well written, but merits the perusal of historians. The last meeting between Madame Recamier and this remarkable woman was as curious as it was romantic; it took place at a masked ball, where both ladies wore the same-coloured dominos. It was thus a matter of difficulty to distinguish one from the other. Madame Recamier amused herself by visiting the boxes of the various members of the Bonaparte family in Rome, whilst the Queen passed herself off as her friend amongst the members of the French Embassy and the rest of the diplomatic body; from whom she obtained such information as she could never otherwise have acquired.

Madame Recamier then returned to Paris, after another short visit to Naples.

We cannot here give further details of the life of this extraordinary woman, or a full account of the influences she seems to have exercised over the great literary men of the day. It will be a a wonder to those who read her second volume, how Chateaubriand and Laval de Montmorency could have found time to write so many letters; and to find that, in spite of many friends and her brilliant position in society, she was visited at this period by as great trials as she had ever laboured under in the days of the Revolution or the Empire. She lost what little fortune she had saved, and became totally blind. Previous to the last of these calamities falling upon her, she seems to have devoted herself to cheering the latter days of that brilliant ennuyè, Chateaubriand, whose vanity and selfishness were not atoned for by the refinement of his mind. Eminent as a statesman and man of letters, he possessed sufficient genius to command and attain any object of ambition, though he lacked that resolution and steadiness of purpose which, even amongst lively Frenchmen, is a requisite necessary for the head of a government. It was just this want of firmness which made him rather the brilliant leader of opposition, than the able chief of a powerful cabinet, and which rendered him negative in private life. It is difficult to conceive how so vain, so indifferent, and so selfish a character, could attract a woman of Madame Recamier's charms and tact; for her keen penetration must at once have detected the weak points in his character. She, however, like many other eminent persons, was dazzled with his brilliant talents and the charms of his witty conversation.

She seems to have borne with resignation the loss of sight, though it greatly added to her trials during her latter days. This was, however, somewhat alleviated by her love of music, the talent for which she still seems to have retained; nor does she appear even to have lost those personal charms which made her so attractive in her younger and best days. Throughout the evening of her life she sadly regretted the overthrow of that Royal Family to which she was so strongly attached. About 1836, Madame Recamier first began to suffer from a want of sight, her general health being still more injured by the successive deaths of her three friends, Laval de Montmorency, Chateaubriand, and Ballanche; the last of whom had been a tender and most devoted companion throughout all her trials. Madame Recamier was seized, in the year 1849, with cholera, a disease which she had much feared. Her relative, Dr. Recamier, and the other celebrated physicians, whose opinions were taken on her case, after using their best efforts, considered her state as hopeless, and she expired on the 12th of May, 1849.

Ten years have elapsed since her death, and few of those who remembered her in all her pristine glory now remain. It is this fact which has induced Madame Lenormant to collect and publish those Memoirs and Correspondence which will hand her name down to posterity. Whatever the faults of Madame Recamier's character might have been, the history of her life is peculiarly that of French society of the latter part of the eighteenth century; whilst her letters and memoirs make us acquainted with many of the leading characters of her epoch, nowhere else so well and truly described.

MADAME DE CAYLUS.

MADAME DE CAYLUS.*

THERE are some periods of history in which France has been formidable to her neighbours by successful inroads on their territories, and by outshining Europe in letters, arts, or sciences. These successes, although chiefly to be attributed to the characters of her rulers, may, nevertheless, be accounted for in other ways. Thus, in Charlemagne's reign, which forms the first of these periods, the vast empire as much depended on the general anarchy, barbarism, and want of strength of her enemies, as the vigour, energy, and determination of her own monarch; and, although all Charlemagne's adversaries were individually brave, none of them possessed the organization or the spirit sufficient to resist the invasions of so able a prince as the founder of the Carlovingian line, whose ambition was aided by the superstition of the age in which he lived, and by the fact of his supporting the spiritual head of the church against both his religious and his temporal enemies. This great prince was enabled to arrest for a while the barbarism and disorder of his age, and to lay a foundation for future rulers to build a firm government, and by means of which civilization could be firmly planted, schools established, and encouragement given to the few men of letters who lived in those troublous times.

The next epoch is one more definitively described by the historian, and in all respects more brilliant, for France never before obtained such influence as in the days of Louis XIV. If success attended her arms abroad, her internal administration was, if possible, more prosperous than in any other period of her history; whilst the country became renowned for the great writers it produced. This glory and prosperity were as much to be ascribed to the circumstances of the times, as to the character of the monarch who then ruled France; whose merits and defects have occupied the pens of the most celebrated writers. It had always been the aim of French monarchs, for more than a century previous to the time of Louis XIV, to lessen the preponderating influence of the house of Austria; and no state in Europe was either sufficiently strong, or had any interest, to oppose its schemes, though Francis I and Henry IV had fruitlessly endeavoured to diminish its power. It was, however, weakened partly by the division of its territories between the German and Spanish branches of the family, and partly by the long and bloody contest which had endured in Germany for thirty years, between Catholics and Protestants, and in which nearly every power in Europe had been engaged; whilst, at a later period, the house of Bourbon rose to power, and was feared by the rest of Europe. In France itself, the glories of Louis XIV had been ushered in by the able administration of the Duc de Sully and Henry IV, both of whom had striven to place the finances in order, and to give vigour to the struggles of the country, by inaugurating a long peace. Again, the power of the monarchy was still further strengthened, during the days of Louis XIII, by the determined manner in which Cardinal de Richelieu opposed all attempts on the part of the Protestants and the nobles to acquire power. Thus he thoroughly subdued their influence, and rendered them so subservient to the crown, that the sovereign was left with his hands unshackled, to undertake any enterprise, at home or abroad, which might suit his caprice. Louis XIV throughout his whole reign possessed absolute power, with the single exception of the troublous days of the Fronde. Though, fortunately for him, his minister had acquired an overwhelming influence over his mind, by a knowledge of the art of government, and the mode of conducting foreign affairs. Thus Mazarin was fully able to detect and cope with the undecided aims and efforts of the different fickle leaders who conducted the Fronde.

---

* Les Souvenirs de Madame de Caylus. Nouvelle Edition. Paris: J. Techncer.

It is well known that great varieties of opinion existed in France as to the character of the king. Some thought him idle, luxurious, and frivolous, only intent on pleasure and show; whilst others considered him a cruel and selfish tyrant, desirous of advancing his own ends, and caring little for the prosperity and welfare of his subjects. Another party, and by far the largest, looked upon him as a really great monarch, capable of originating and carrying out grand designs; a generous and warm-hearted friend, who was always ready to forward the interests of those who surrounded him and were devoted to his service. In all these opinions there is something of truth. Those who regard Louis XIV as influenced by his mistresses, and as one of the most ceremonious monarchs in Europe, have full reason for styling him "a trivial and insignificant prince." Those who judge of his conduct towards the Protestants, and in the matter of the Iron Mask, have good grounds for their epithet—"a dark and cruel tyrant;" whilst those who remember his treatment of the unfortunate house of Stuart, his general kindness towards his friends and followers, and the generous way in which he was always ready to assist them in their difficulties, either by money or promotion, his close application to business, his thorough knowledge of foreign affairs, his able manner in conducting negotiations, and, above all, his admirable selection of ministers and generals, cannot but conclude that he was an able prince, a generous man, and one who had fully earned the title, bestowed upon him by his subjects, of "le Grand."

We cannot but blame the faults of Louis XIV's character, though we must admit that most of them were tempered by great penetration and sagacity, and a thorough knowledge of the character of the nation over whom he was called to rule. The influence and power of his mistresses tended to weaken his character; though they were mostly women of great ability, and never acquired the injurious power of a Pompadour or a Du Barry. No monarch knew better than Louis XIV how to appreciate talent in his councillors, and how to tolerate them when their advice was distasteful. With regard to the pomp and ceremony of his court, it may be remarked that, although it appeared insignificant and trivial in its character, it was, nevertheless, well suited to the tastes of the French, who were fond of pleasure and change, and could appreciate splendour and love of show in their princes better than more sterling qualities. It is true that his ambitious wars exhausted the country, and that they closed in disaster; nevertheless they were politic in their way, as they blended the glory of the nation with the King's own interest, and strengthened the absolute power of the crown.

The great blot in the reign of Louis XIV, and the most difficult to excuse, is his sad persecution of the Protestants. It seems hardly consistent with his character as an able monarch, that he should illtreat and drive away thousands of innocent and unoffending subjects, who by their industry and ingenuity enriched the commerce and manufactures of the country; and that he should deprive the army of many a brave soldier and able general, only to root out a creed to which his own opinions were opposed, and establish uniformity in religion as well as in government. Foolish, however, as such a policy may appear, we ought not to be too hasty in our blame. Ever since the commencement of the Reformation, it should be remembered that religion and politics had gone hand in hand; that Protestants were usually the supporters of liberal opinions throughout Europe, whilst the Catholics everywhere naturally combined with the arbitrary power of the crown, in order to prevent the decay of their own influence—that Louis XIV, in persecuting the Protestants, only carried out that bigoted spirit of the age which often existed in Protestant and in Catholic countries. The Dutch authorities did not treat those who opposed their Calvinistic opinions with more leniency than the French monarch did those of his subjects who differed with him on religious matters; whilst readers of English history are well aware of the cruelties exercised by Charles II on the Scots, because they resisted the attempt to establish Episcopacy in that country. In all probability Louis XIV still feared the power of those Protestants who had proved dangerous in his father's reign, and had only been kept down by the strong hand of Richelieu, when he deprived them of all their fortresses, after the successful termination of the siege of Rochelle. Although the Protestants were by these means somewhat subdued, they were yet formidable; they held an equal right with the Catholics to all posts of trust and honour in the state; and long before Louis had ventured on so bold a measure as the revocation of the edict of Nantes, which conferred upon them these privileges, he always endeavoured, as far as lay in his power, to diminish the influence of the Protestants, by converting the ablest amongst them to the Catholic religion, and thereby lessening the influence of their leaders.

As we have already remarked, one striking feature of Louis' character showed itself in his able selection of generals and statesmen. Few monarchs ever had such ministers as Colbert and Louvois, in finance and war. Colbert was the man who made the French nearly as powerful as the Dutch in India, by the establishment of the French East Indian Company; whilst to the latter is owing the great success of the French wars at the early portion of Louis XVI's reign. No army, excepting in the days of the empire and the revolution, was ever commanded by such leaders as Condé, Turenne, Luxembourg, Catinat, Berwick, Vendôme, Bouffleurs, and Villeroy; and no court was ever surrounded by so brilliant an array of literary and scientific men. This epoch also seems to have been prolific of men great in arts, science, and literature; and Louis XIV, with his usual discernment, held out to them the most liberal encouragement. There were no names before this period to equal in science Descartes and Buffon; to compete in theology with Bossuet; in sarcasm and description of character with Rochefoucauld and La Bruyere; in poetry with Racine, Molière, Corneille, and Boileau; and no writers excelled Madame de Sévigne and Pascal in their letters; Fénélon, or Le Sage, in romance; La Fontaine in fables; Madame de Maintenon, Montespan, Saint Simon, and a host of others too numerous to mention, in the memoirs of their times.

One would have thought that every particular of Louis XIV's reign had been long ago exhausted. It appears, however, that there are still some memoirs which have only just merged into light, and which are interesting, from the extreme veracity with which they are written, and the amusing facts which they relate. Amongst works of this kind, "The Souvenirs of Madame de Caylus" holds a prominent place. She was niece to Madame de Maintenon, was thoroughly acquainted with all the intrigues and doings of Louis XIV's court, and had ample means of gaining correct information. In the volume before us we are treated with a long preface from the editor, in which it appears that the work was first published in 1777, under the editorship of Voltaire, that it was again reprinted in 1804, and 1822; but that it afterwards became a "rara avis," probably being bought up and withdrawn from circulation. Voltaire's preface, which is preserved in full, passes a high eulogium on the modesty and candour of Madame de Caylus; and further lavishes great praise on the character of the Grand Monarch, his military successes, and the brilliant writers who lived during his reign. We are then treated to an explanation of the motives which induced Madame de Caylus to collect these souvenirs, which are in fact "Memoirs of her own Times."

Her position at the palace, and her near relationship with Madame de Maintenon, led her to devote the early pages of her souvenirs to a history of the family of that great favourite. It appears that Mons. Theodore Agrippa D'Aubigne, the grandfather of Madame de Maintenon, was a Protestant, and a stout follower of Henry IV; that, after having supported him in all his battles, and seen him firmly seated on the French throne, he retired to his estates in the south of France, lived a secluded life, married, and had three children, two of whom were girls; whilst his only son became the father of Madame de Maintenon.

We are briefly told of Mademoiselle D'Aubigne's conversion to Catholicism, at the instigation of Madame de Neuillan, and of her subsequent marriage with the poor poet, Scarron, who had nothing but a literary reputation to offer. This brought Madame Scarron into a circle of illustrious savans, through whom she was introduced to the notice of Madame de Montespan, whose power was then at its height. The king at this period had five natural children by Madame de Montespan, and it was deemed desirable that they should be removed from the court, and brought up in the seclusion of a country house, where, hid from the notice of the world, they might be educated by persons of good sense and morals. Madame de Montespan soon discovered in Madame Scarron the person she was seeking, and offered a post which was gladly accepted. Of course Madame de Caylus does not hint at the possibility of the ulterior views of Madame Scarron, or of the probability of her gaining a footing at court, or an influence over the monarch. But if our reader turns to any good life of Louis XIV, he will there find many extracts from Madame Scarron's journal in 1660, in which she describes the monarch's triumphal entry into Paris, when he took the reins of government into his own hands, how she was not only struck with the regal pomp of the sovereign, but more particularly with the beauty of his person, and the grace and dignity of his manner. It is thus not at all improbable that her strong mind may have planned the scheme for future influence over the king, if *any* means should occur of approaching his person. There is no doubt, therefore, that she looked upon this favourable opportunity as the first step on the ladder of fame.

Madame de Caylus gives us many interesting details of the children of Madame de Montespan, derived from her aunt. The Duc de Maine, the eldest, already gave promise of those talents and that handsome person for which he was afterwards so distinguished, and which, with a little more energy and courage, would have made him a really eminent man. He was, however, a striking historical example, illustrating Dr. Arnold's remarks, "that success in life depends upon the use made of talent; ability being of small avail, unless combined with resolution of character." The other children were the Comte de Vexin, Mesdemoiselles de Nantes et de Tours, and an eldest son who died during youth. Madame de Montespan soon lost her influence over the king, and it was several years before she gave birth to any more royal children. This was a matter of such grief and annoyance, that it injured both her health and her appearance. Her power with the king, if we are to believe Madame de Caylus, was rather owing to her intellectual qualities, than to her personal charms, in which she was as much superior to her predecessor, Madame La Valliere, as Madame de Maintenon was to Madame Montespan. At length, to her inexpressible joy, she gave birth to two children—the Count de Toulouse, and Mademoiselle de Blois; and thus for a time regained her influence. These two children, we are told, were early remarkable for their beauty; the latter was afterwards Duchess of Orleans, and carried on those intrigues which our authoress improperly drags to light at a later period of her Memoirs. Here she strongly protests against the treatment which Madame La Valliere underwent at the hands of both Louis XIV and Madame de Montespan, when her influence was declining at court. Although Madame de Caylus declares that she does not feel bound to give a history of every one of the king's mistresses, she nevertheless considers that the sufferings inflicted on this unfortunate lady were most cruel and unjustifiable, that she could thoroughly understand the feelings which drove La Valliere to exclaim, "Quand j'aurai de la peine aux Carmélites, je me souviendrai de ce que ces gens-là m'ont fait souffrir" (meaning the king and Montespan). The farewell between the king and Valliere is as touching on her part, as it is indifferent on his. Whatever may have been the faults of this unfortunate woman, her influence was beneficial to France; as she was the great supporter of that able financial minister and friend of the Protestants, Colbert.

During all these intrigues of Louis XIV's mistresses, the Queen was living at court, devoted to her husband; and, what is more extraordinary still, she seems to have been indifferent to the power acquired over him by Madame La Valliere and Madame de Montespan. A daughter of Philip IV of Spain (and, like all the rest of the house of Austria, a bigoted Catholic), she seems to have had but two objects of adoration—her religion and her king. An anecdote is related by her confessor, which proves her attachment to Louis XIV. On enquiry whether she had ever felt an attachment towards the cavaliers who frequented her father's court, she answered: "There was nobody equal in person or mind to Louis XIV." It must have been very agreeable to possess such a wife, on whom the better qualities of his character and person had made so favourable an impression, and who was so indifferent to his love bestowed elsewhere.

Madame de Caylus has done well to style these writings of hers Souvenirs, instead of Memoirs, as they are written with little regard to order; for were they the only annals of Louis XIV's private doings, they would puzzle the most persevering and studious historian, in their mêlé of dates and facts. She ranges backwards and forwards in her periods, epochs, and narratives, in so marvellous a manner, that it is no easy matter to collect and group her information. Thus, after having informed us of the advanced age of the Duc de Maine, of his talents, which were, nevertheless, rendered of no avail, by his timidity, and want of energy; after telling us how that prince feared his father, the king, who, nevertheless, treated him with kindness and consideration; how Louis XIV was satisfied with the marriage that he made, afterwards to prove the source of so much grief both to monarch and prince; how the lady, being both hasty and extravagant, brought her husband, who was afraid to restrain her, into many an awkward scrape; Madame Caylus returns to the early childhood of the said Duc de Maine, his education under Madame de Maintenon, and a description of his personal appearance, and his health; telling us that he was recommended to travel, to try the baths of the south of France, and to be accompanied by his governess, Madame Scarron. She then affirms that her aunt experienced the greatest pleasure in being absent from the court. This is, however, hard to believe; as we cannot agree with most of Madame de Maintenon's friends, that she had but little ambition, or that it was her virtue which advanced her. She was as fond of intrigue as any woman, and it was only her good sense that saved her from committing the same mistakes as her predecessors, and gave an air of candour and modesty to all that she did. The Duc de Maine was everywhere received as a royal personage, and more attention was paid to him in the different towns through which he passed than would have been shown to the Dauphin himself. When he and his governess reached the province of Poitou, Madame de Maintenon found her relative, Mons. D'Aubigny, who held the post of governor of a province, and received the young Duke with great magnificence. Here again we have one of those digressions of which the book is so full. Madame de Caylus goes off into a wild description of the amours of Louis XIV, which, if true, shows that that monarch was quite as loose in character as any of his race; and that the indecencies of his court were barely veiled by his able administration, his application to business, and his success in war. The king was not content with the presiding beauty, Madame de Montespan, but carried on intrigues with several other ladies of the court, amongst whom Madame de Soubise held a prominent place. Madame de Caylus here draws a parallel between her character and that of Madame de Montespan, stating that the duchess was obliged to be more circumspect in *her* conduct towards the king than Madame de Montespan, as *her* husband was a man more difficult to manage than M. le Marquis de Montespan, and that she made the best use of those days in which Mons. Soubise was absent from court. She was, however, not so dangerous a rival to Madame de Montespan as might have been expected, if we credit the account of her as left by Madame de Caylus. It appears that, she was a woman of great beauty, but of a kind which did not prepossess the world in a favourable degree. Tall and commanding in figure, she was more like a fine marble statue than a human being; her intellect was vigorous, though she seems to have been a cold woman, of a masculine turn of mind, and great power in conversation.

The king, though for some time fascinated, is said never really to have liked her. Madame de Montespan, though not equal to her rival in personal appearance, was still more of a woman in her character; she knew how to fain affection where she did not really possess it, and act the part of rendering any topic agreeable on which she conversed. She seems to have been aware of her powers, and by no means to have feared the rivalry of Madame de Soubise.

She soon, however, had a more formidable opponent to contend with in the person of her own dependant, Madame de Maintenon; who, according to our authoress, was at first treated by the king with great hauteur and coldness, and there seemed little in their early intercourse which could occasion fear or enmity in the mind of Madame de Montespan. Madame de Maintenon, however, owing to her conversation, her wit, and her tact, gradually but surely acquired influence; and Madame de Montespan lost her power even before she perceived its decline. She then injured her cause by ill humour and jealousy, calling to her aid the influence and talents of Louvois and Rochefoucauld.

Madame de Caylus tells us that both these women managed their intercourse with each other so well, that it was long before either the court or the public were made aware of their differences; and it was only by degrees that the courtiers became acquainted with the fact that Madame de Montespan was losing her influence, and than Madame de Maintenon was her successful rival. Great impartiality has been displayed in the portrait of Madame de Montespan, as, whatever Madame de Caylus's interested pen might have led her to assert, she renders a just tribute to the qualities of her aunt's rival. The characters and society of the Dukes du Rochefoucauld and Richelieu are also well described. They seem to have attracted around them most of the celebrated wits of the day. As for the Duke de Rochefoucauld, every one who is acquainted with French literature is acquainted with his celebrated maxims, and knows that he served in early life in the French army. His eyesight having been early injured, he was obliged to relinquish the military profession, and to turn his attention to literature, in which, after he had recovered from his temporary loss of sight, he acquired a great reputation. It appears that Richelieu was also handsome, tall, and well made, possessed a large fortune, and was the nephew of the famous cardinal. He had, however, married a woman who was old enough to be his mother, and who, though neither handsome nor clever, yet contrived to become his wife. We learn from these memoirs that it was no difficult task to gain his favour by flattery, by admiration of his personal appearance, his fortune, or his family connnexions; and that the Duchess, after her marriage, obtained the post of dame d'honneur to the Dauphine, where she seems to have intrigued against Madame de Maintenon. It is strange to add that, after the death of the Duchess, Madame de Maintenon was offered her vacant post, which was declined; Madame de Maintenon, however, contrived to place Madame la Contesse de Neville, one of her best friends, in the office which she herself had refused. This woman, says our authoress, was of inferior capacity, cold in temperament, and virtuous—if abstinence from gallantries constitutes virtue. This sentence clearly shows what the license of Louis XIV's court really was.

The king, notwithstanding his close application to business, was, at this period, young, gay, and fond of pleasure. Thus, there was again a certain Madlle. de Laval, who possessed personal charms, great wit, was fond of dancing, and who was in the service of Madame la Dauphine; she also seems to have attracted Louis the Fourteenth's attention, as also that of Mons. de Roquelaure, who was an old admirer of Maintenon, and who, when he found that he could not obtain *her* hand, solicited that of Madame Daubury, afterwards Madame de Caylus; and ended by marrying Madlle. de Laval.

Although details of court intrigues and amours are insignificant in themselves and not always interesting to the general reader, still they give an insight, at this period of history, into the character both of the king and of his court, which we in vain seek for in the more sober letters and memoirs. We may learn much of the acts of the great men of the last and present century in the newspapers and periodicals of the day; but such publications did not exist in the earlier parts of Louis XIV's reign. If, therefore, subsequent generations wish to become acquainted with his policy and his court, they must either rely upon the grave and heavy quarto vols. of those days, which no one, at the present, cares to look into, or else they must have recourse to such light memoirs and letters as are more in accordance with the taste of modern readers. Thus it is that these *souvenirs,* though written without much order, yet give a good account of the principal events of the time.

Madame de Caylus's second part gives us a long account of the amours and intrigues of several persons chiefly belonging to the household of Madame la Dauphine. Their career is so similar, and their numbers so great, that a notice of them would fill more space than we can afford. Madame de Caylus, has, however, particularly described the career and character of Madlle. de Leweistein, though she never occupied any very important place at court.

According to Madame de Caylus, she was pretty, agreeable, and witty, descended from a very ancient family, which had lost cast by one of her ancestors having married into an inferior family. Nevertheless, it was still looked upon as holding a place of some distinction; and one would have supposed that Madlle. De Leweistein, with all her charms, her accomplishments, and her honourable descent, would have made a very advantageous match. She could, however, find no one to appreciate her, except a M. Dangeau, an old man who had for some time filled the place of gentleman in waiting to Madame la Dauphine. He was poor, had no prospect of rising to any better post, a widower, with a grown-up daughter by his first wife. Mademoiselle seems to have thought it preferable to have a husband, even with bad prospects, rather than remain single. With this introduction, Madame de Caylus now gives us a long account of the Dauphine, her character and her occupation, in terms mostly confirmed by other historians who have written on Louis XIV's reign. This princess, who was a Bavarian, was ugly in appearance, and not at all prepossessing either in manner or conversation. She never could be amused by the society of the Court, although the king did his best to make it agreeable to her. Her chief pleasure was to shut herself up with her German women, and to converse on very insignificant subjects, in her own language, which was understood neither by the king nor by her husband. The prince, notwithstanding her appearance and her solitary mood, still liked her, though it may be wondered that the king should have chosen a wife of such small attractions for his son. It is stated, in his justification, that he was so alive to the licentious character of the court, and of the scandals which would follow, were the Dauphin not early married, that he was satisfied with obtaining any wife for him. The Dauphine, however, made up for her want of charms by bearing three young princes, and thus furnishing heirs to the French throne. Madame de Caylus's account of the queen's death is interesting, her decease being occasioned by the breaking of a blood-vessel in a most unexpected manner. The king felt it much, as he was every day becoming more affectionate towards her. According to Madame de Caylus, she had always been treated with kindness by her husband, while the queen, although passionately fond of the king, did not possess sufficient attractions to retain his love. If we are to believe all other historians, Louis was attached to all other women but his wife. She feared him to a degree almost beyond belief, and often trembled in his presence. Madame de Maintenon, in describing the queen to her friend and confessor, the Abbé Goubelin, regrets that the queen had not so able a spiritual guide as the Abbé; for it appears that, after her husband, the person who possessed most influence over the queen was her confessor. She had few friends, poor thing, to whom she could confide in her unfortunate position. Louis seems, however, to have much regretted her loss; and if she was neither an attractive nor a wise woman, she was, throughout her whole life, a devoted and affectionate wife, while her marriage to Louis was most important in a political point of view. Through her, he derived claims to the Spanish possessions in the Netherlands, and to the Spanish crown itself, which occasioned long and bloody wars in Europe; a crown too, which, when possessed by the house of Bourbon, was formidable to all the other powers, until the revolution of 1789. Louis XIV, after the death of his wife, went first to St. Cloud, and afterwards to Fontainbleau. Madame de Maintenon, on the news of the queen's death, determined to leave the court, but was stopped by Mons. de Rochefoucauld, who abruptly informed her *that she was necessary to the king*. She, therefore, accompanied Louis XIV on his journeys, together with Madame la Dauphine.

In this portion of the volume we have some curious details as to the court ladies, amongst whom La Princesse de Conti, a natural daughter of the king by Madame de Valliere, seems to have held the chief place. Her husband, the nephew of the great Condé, was a man of talent and information, whilst she was a woman of ordinary ability, but great personal beauty. If we are to believe Madame de Caylus, the great Condé acquired most of his influence by the alliance of his family with the natural children of Louis XIV. Madame de Conti's beauty was so remarkable, that the Sultan of Morocco requested permission to have her portrait, and is said to have been quite overcome with her charms. We are told that Madame de Montespan also followed the example of Madame la Valliere in marrying her children to princes of the royal blood, and thus strengthened her power at court. Madame de Caylus seems to think that the king would have really loved his wife, after the scandalous days of Madame la Valliere, had the husband of Madame de Montespan possessed sufficient firmness; for Louis had not yet arrived at that state of licentiousness when he could lay siege to a woman in defiance of her husband's strong opposition. Mons. de Montespan, according to these souvenirs, did everything he could to bring the king and his wife together, and used her influence as a means to advance his own ambitious schemes.

Madame de Maintenon rose every day in power, and the time at length arrived when Montespan was to bid a last farewell to her royal lover. Madame de Caylus, however, judiciously omits all accounts of this parting. We soon find that Madame de Maintenon exerted her influence over the king, and established the famous institution of the Sisters of Saint Cyr, for the instruction and support of poor ladies of noble families. It appears that she spent much of her time in this admirable institution, one of her greatest amusements being the superintending of the performances of Racine's plays by "les Demoiselles de Saint Cyr." There is an amusing account given by Madame de Caylus of the indignation of the foundress at the representation of *Andromaque*. "Nos petites filles viennent de jouer *Andromaque* et l'ont si bien jouée qu'elles ne la joueront plus, ni aucune de vos pièces," writes Madame de Maintenon to the immortal Racine. Madame Brinon, however, the principal of the institution, toned down the moral of the plays, and ultimately got Racine to write more simple acting stories, in which the tender passion bore no part.

Madame de Caylus gives further details of the intrigues at court, all of which are insipid to the general reader, and not at all creditable, either to the great monarch, or to the brilliant personages who took so considerable a share in them. Thus we are informed that Madame la Princesse de Conti carried on intrigues with generals in the army, which were discovered by her father, and gave occasion to much anger and recrimination between her and Madame de Maintenon; though we find that the illegitimate children of the king obtained more consideration at the hands of Madame de Maintenon than they had done from Madame de Montespan. The children of the latter had not lost much by the advancement of their mother's rival, for the Comte de Toulouse filled the place of Grand Admiral of France; and his sister, Mademoiselle de Nantes, a woman of considerable attractions, was married to the Duc de Bourbon, grandson of the great Condé. This lady became greatly disfigured by the small-pox, with which malady she was seized soon after her marriage; and Louis XIV, with his usual fondness for his children, insisted on visiting her during the height of the malady. The great Condé, however, who had hastily returned from a campagne on the Rhine, on the news of his grand-daughter's illness, stood before the door of her chamber, and firmly opposed the admittance of the king, being fully aware of the risk which his sovereign was running. This interference led to a very angry altercation between Louis XIV and Condé, and the latter was dismissed to the camp in disgrace. About this time we find that Mons. de Conti requested permission of the king to engage in the Hungarian wars, and obtained the royal consent not only for his own departure to the scene of action, but that numerous volunteers should accompany him. This call to arms was, however, so favourable in the eyes of the young French nobles, that the whole of France would have followed the prince to the wars, had not the king and Mons. de Louvois withdrawn their permission. Mons. de Conti was not, however, deterred from the pursuit of his warlike objects; as, together with the Prince Eugene of Savoy and several young men of distinction, he secretly started at night for the French frontier, and was only stopped by a peremptory message from the king, who, through the emissaries of the minister of war, had discovered the plans, and successfully traced the volunteers thus far on their journey. On his return to Paris, Madame de Conti seems to have had great difficulty in pacifying the king, who at last pardoned her husband.

Madame de Caylus now reverts to some circumstances in her early life which first opened to her a career at court; viz. her marriage, in 1686, with the son of Mons. le Marquis de Caylus, *grand menin* to the Dauphin. She informs us that she was not at once received at court, being considered almost too young to hold any post, having only just attained the age of thirteen. She however lived at Paris, and during the following year was placed by Madame de Maintenon under the surveillance of Madame de Montchevreuil. She seems to have become much attached both to that lady and the Dauphine, though the attachment was little in accordance with the views of Madame de Maintenon, who endeavoured to dispel the favourable impressions which her young relation had awakened in that quarter.

Madame de Caylus, wonderful to relate, gives us an opinion on *one* important event in history, though the rest of the book is rather devoid of historical details. She tells us how the war with Holland had now recommenced by the siege of Philipsbourg, that the king and queen of England, together with their infant son, the Prince of Wales, had taken refuge in France after the abdication, and the landing of William III in England. She then describes the generous reception which James met with from Louis XIV; but seems to think that Louis never expected to be able to restore the house of Stuart to its lost possessions. If such was really the case, Louis XIV's conduct towards these unfortunate princes is to be admired, as it was little prompted by selfish or politic motives.

Our authoress soon starts off into the intrigues of Madame La Dauphine with Mons. de Conti and other lovers; her endeavour to marry one of the Condés to the Duc de Berry, which succeeded; together with the history of Mons. le Duc de Bourgogne and his wife. This prince, as is well known, was the son of the Dauphin and the pupil of the celebrated Archbishop Fénélon, for whose instruction the well-known Telemachus was written. He grew up remarkable for many amiable and great qualities; and although Madame de Caylus gives him rather a harsh and hypocritical character, he was, on the whole, one of the best of the Bourbon Princes; and his administration of Bourgogne and the adjacent provinces showed that he possessed real talent for government; and that, had he lived to succeed his grandfather, he would have equalled him in more than reputation. Although Madame de Caylus represents him as a man of severe temper, and extremely jealous of his wife, whom he affected not to care for in the least, she still allows that his death, which occurred in 1712, was a loss to France. With this she mixes up the character and intrigues of Mons de Conti, whom she considers a more agreeable person than the Duke of Burgundy, and in fact makes us believe that he was a general favourite with the ladies of the court, by his wit in conversation and pleasing manners. He was, however, called away from the French court to the distant region of Poland, to the great regret of the Dauphine, having been proposed by a large portion of the Polish nobility as a candidate for the crown. It was supposed that he would never again return to France. Ousted, however, in 1697, by the party of the Saxon Elector, Augustus, he did return to France, where, after amusing himself with other intrigues, he died. We should not omit to mention that Madame la Duchesse de Bourgogne, the wife of the prince above-mentioned, is described at length by Madame de Caylus as a daughter of the Prince of Savoy, and was recommended by her mother to the care of Madame de Maintenon on her first entry into the French court. Her marriage having taken place at a very young age, she was surrounded by some of Madame de Maintenon's most select and discreet adherents; which, of course, in the opinion of our narrator, preserved her in the path of virtue! Whether this was the fact or not, we are pretty certain that, guided by Madame de Maintenon's advice, she had sufficient cunning to hide her vices, if she had any, under an apparent modesty and devotion.

The marriage of Madame de Blois with the Duc de Chartres, who was early distinguished for those talents which afterwards made him so famous as the Regent Duke of Orleans, is related at full length in the third part of the volume before us. Debauched in early youth, the Duke seems to have considered that there were only two classes of men in the world; viz. fools, and men of ability; the former he believed to be honest, because they could not help it, and did not possess sufficient talent to enable them to plan any schemes of ambition; whilst he looked upon the other class as constantly plotting and scheming for their own interests and influence. All who have read the history of the period during which he was Regent are well aware of his injurious influence and levity of character; qualities which may be said to have contributed not a little to the overthrow of the French dynasty and aristocracy at the end of the eighteenth century. Lord Brougham remarks of him, that "he was not so bad as he is painted;" and Lord Mahon, whilst blaming him for his debauched character, applauds the energy he displayed, in conjunction with Lord Stanhope, in opposing the ambitious designs of Cardinal Alberoni, and in thus preserving the peace of Europe, which remained undisturbed, with slight interruption, from 1713 to 1740.

The interesting *souvenirs* of Madame de Caylus are brought to an abrupt termination by further accounts of the intrigues of

Madame de Conti. We have, however, added to the book an *Appendice*, in which are given a few interesting particulars as to the manner in which these souvenirs were published.

Mons. le Comte de Caylus, son of Madame de Caylus, seems to have been a man of considerable literary taste, and to have induced his mother, when she became old and ill, to dictate to him her experiences. She at first refused to do so, alleging that it was too difficult a task for her to collect all her papers and to write as she desired. He then suggested that her reminiscences might be arranged under the name of "Souvenirs," with but little order with respect to dates. This advice was accordingly followed. A man of some literary reputation, an acquaintance of Mons. de Caylus, desired to see these souvenirs, promising most faithfully to return them to their owner; which engagement he, however, never fulfilled, but clandestinely published them in Holland. This strange history was brought to light by Mons. Marin, of the Débats in 1804, long after Madame de Caylus's death. The rest of the *Appendice* has been compiled with care and labour, being full of explanatory matter of Louis XIV's time. Without it, many of the occurrences, anecdotes, and characters would be inexplicable to the general reader. As for the narrative, it is written in a natural, easy style, such as a woman like Madame de Caylus would be expected to converse in. It is interesting enough to be called a "romance of real life," and gives detail which it would be difficult to find in more erudite histories of the customs and morals of Louis XIV's court. Its descriptions are generally lively, accurate, and true. It well portrays that license which prevailed throughout French society in the days of Louis XIV and XV, and which, by bringing the court and nobles into general disrepute and contempt, contributed much towards hastening the terrible revolution of 1789, and the overthrow of all religion as well as all real government in France.

CARNOT,

ENGINEER AND REVOLUTIONIST.

CARNOT.*

Of all the revolutionists of 1793 there is perhaps not one who has made a more durable reputation or obtained greater respect from posterity than Carnot. Great as an engineer and as the associate of Robespierre in the Committee of Public Safety during the Reign of Terror, he evinced a sincerity rarely found amongst his fellows, whilst firmly professing thoroughly republican principles. Throughout his long career he relinquished his own inclinations and principles, to serve his country when in danger. Thus, in 1793, he is known as a bloody and ultra republican, and again, in 1813, as the coadjutor of Napoleon in his defence of France against the attacks of the allies. It was, therefore, during his maturer age that he erected a durable monument of his own talent, and associated his name with that of Antwerp, which he fortified and rendered one of the strongest positions in Europe. It was just this peculiarity in his political career, and his self-sacrifice of person and of principle, which exposed him to the attacks of enemies and the reproach of friends. His admirers cannot comprehend how so rigid a republican could condescend to serve an ambitious ruler like Napoleon, and accordingly look upon this phase in his existence as a weakness, instead of a noble virtue and a high generosity of mind. His enemies, on the other hand, consider him as a frantic republican, desirous of obtaining power by any means, whose love of notoriety at length forced him to tender his services to the Emperor when most needed, and therefore most likely to be appreciated and rewarded. It was therefore much to be desired that some impartial writer should have undertaken the biography of this truly eminent man, as his faults can never be fairly treated by the pen of a friend, or of a relative. For this reason, we regret to find that his son has undertaken this difficult task; for, as we glance at the work which we have placed at the head of our article, we are struck with the great amount of lavish praise which it bestows on the memory of Carnot, and the small amount of historical information which it affords. The introduction is so replete with fulsome praise, that we are led to believe that the son has set up the father as an idol, like some ancient hero of romance, to be worshipped as a family deity; for we are told that his rigid virtues resembled those of a Roman republican. His great deeds in science, as well as arms, are heralded to the world as marvels of skill and courage,

---

Mémoires sur Carnot, 1753—1823, par son fils. Tome premier, première partie. Paris: Pagnerre, rue de Seine, St. Germain, 18. 1861.

whilst for his parental indulgence and private qualities, according to his biographer, no parallel can be found. Thus he treats lightly of the daily companionship and intimate friendship which Carnot enjoyed with such tyrants and hypocrites as Danton, Marat, and Robespierre; and forgets that Carnot might have been a great mathematician, a good soldier, and an ardent patriot, and yet mistaken in his theoretical ideas of government, and in practical matters connected with his own profession, though possessed of sound common sense. Thus the fault of the work we are about to notice is a rigmarole introduction, and much unqualified praise of a man by no means perfect. A son may be dutiful, affectionate, and desirous of giving a good record of the actions and motives of a great father, but this should not be effected at the expense of truth, nor should it blind a writer to the demerits of his hero. It would be useless to record the filial outpourings of our author, or to follow him whilst he descants on the sincerity and the patriotism of Carnot in the Directory under Napoleon, and during the restoration under Louis XVIII; nor do we admit his grand maxim, that "the revolution was a political necessity which could not be avoided, and which, though it had strong opposition to contend with, was productive of lasting benefits."

Our author opens the Memoires with a long account of his family, the descent of which has been traced by his uncle further than he can vouch for. He facetiously remarks, "there exists among the family archives an old medal, on which is inscribed the words *Dux Carnot,* and from which it may be inferred that the family was descended from some old Roman who had entered Gaul with Julius Cæsar." Our author, however, confesses that he can only trace his family as far back as Louis XIII or XIV, that his maternal ancestor was originally of an old Breton family, which had subsequently removed into Normandy; and that the native place of his male ancestor was Epertulley, a village near Nolay, formerly in the duchy of Burgundy. He then gives a long account of the derivation of the name Nolay. It appears that the town or its vicinity was the site of one of the many camps established by Cæsar when he entered Gaul, and that it is rendered interesting by the ruins which abound in its neighbourhood. We next have a long list of the most eminent members of the Carnot family, amongst whom may be cited an Abbé, who wrote several learned works, of a theological and archæological nature, and a doctor who made several scientific discoveries as a professor in one of the universities of the province. The grandfather held the respectable position of lawyer and notary at Nolay, where he married Marguerite, daughter of a M. Pothier, a writer of the period, by whom he had fourteen sons and four daughters. The account of Claude and Marguerite Carnot is amusing, and is written with the naïveté so peculiar to French biographers. Carnot, being one of these eighteen children (of whom seven only survived), was destined to push his own fortunes in the world. His two elder sisters early entered a religious society at Nolay, and all his brothers seem to have held respectable positions in the various professions in which they were engaged. Our hero was born on the 13th of May, 1753, and was christened on the same day by the name of *Lazare Nicholas Marguerite*. He, as well as his other brothers and sisters, owed much early instruction to their father, who seems to have been a man of high principles and industrious and studious habits, though generally indulgent to his children. Lazare, and his elder brother, Claude, were at an early age sent to the college of Nolay, then superintended by a man of considerable learning, and in which their own uncle, Dr. Carnot, held a professorship. Lazare was assiduous in his studies, and soon became remarkable for his readiness in learning, and his thirst for general information. At ten years old, he showed a considerable taste for the army; and an anecdote is related of his having accompanied his mother to the fair at Dijon, where, at a dramatic spectacle in which some battle was represented, our young hero became alarmed at the awkward manner in which the soldiers on the stage were posted for a sham battle. The boy shouted to the actors and warned them of their false position, pointing out, amid the laughter of the audience, the proper military manœuvre which would alone secure success. The performance was thus brought to an end amidst the applause of a well-filled booth. From Nolay, he and his brother proceeded to the celebrated provincial college of Autun, where philosophy and the sciences were taught, and where young Lazare made great progress in mathematics, and gained a prize, without the usual assistance afforded to junior candidates. On quitting this seminary, the two brothers separated; Claude, the elder, being sent to the university of Dijon, to complete his studies and prepare himself for the duties of magistrate; whilst Lazare entered the military seminary of M. de Longpré, at Paris, where young men were prepared in those days for the navy, and for the engineer and artillery corps. Here young Carnot was remarkable for great progress, and was greatly assisted in his studies by the Principal of the College, who, besides being a man of no mean ability, was intimately acquainted with many of the most celebrated Parisian *savans* of that day. M. d'Alembert, the celebrated geometrician, seems not only to have been one of Longpré's greatest friends, but also to have taken lively interest in the inclinations of his pupils, and often to have assisted them with his own experience and advice. He soon noticed Lazare, and foresaw in him the future engineer and statesman. Thus, no school could have afforded better training for one who was hereafter to fill so high a destiny.

Our author now leaves the strict path of biography to glance at the manner in which this celebrated engineering school was founded. It appears that Louis Simon Longpré was born in 1737, of poor parents, and was left an orphan at the age of fourteen. He supported himself thus early by giving instruction in mathematics, and soon after became an author. He had little chance of rising in life, except by his own talents, perseverance, and the excellent education which his parents and guardians had commenced. By hard work he amassed a small sum of money, and, being well versed in mathematics, conceived the plan of erecting a school for the preparation of young men destined for the army. Thus he obtained the consent of the government, in 1767, for its formation. The seminary was well managed, and soon became celebrated. Many students of noble family were candidates for admission, and not a few of the greatest generals of France received their elementary education from Longpré. We are told that Marie Antoinette so far patronized this school as to be present herself at one of the examinations. Lazare Carnot had thus open to him a chance of the patronage and interest so essential to advancement in those days, had he chosen to make himself popular amongst his aristocratic fellow-students. He was, however, of too uncompromising a nature to bend to their will, or to cringe to birth and rank. Thus we find, in the early dawn of his career, that he blended learning with republican tendencies, and that he only bent to his superiors in mind and not in social position. During his residence in Paris, Lazare appears to have received much kindness from the Duchesse d'Aumont, whose husband had already been acquainted with the Carnot family in his capacity of Seigneur de Nolay. Carnot, notwithstanding his strong republican principles even in the most prosperous stage of his career, felt a great regard for this worthy lady, who had almost filled the place of a mother to him. She was one of the most conspicuous of his guests during the period of his directory; and, at a later period, he was enabled to render her real service, when Minister of the Interior to Napoleon, in 1815, as by his means she escaped condemnation for her treasonable correspondence with the exiled Bourbons.

During his residence at Longpré, Carnot had devoutly studied theology, as well as his profession. It appears that he devoted eighteen months to a theological course, during which he read all the best authors on both the Catholic and Protestant doctrines, and also the works of those who had been celebrated for their answers to the learned infidels of the day. After much application, he seems to have arrived at the conclusion that simple Deism was the only rational faith. Our young hero, like many other great men, respected and esteemed sincerity in opinions, even though contrary to his own. Thus we are told that he reverenced the purity and simplicity of Christian principles. Previous to his leaving Longpré, he, together with a fellow pupil, attempted to pay their respects to the great Genevan philosopher, J. J. Rousseau; and we find the two young aspirants at the very door of the philosopher's lodging, on the fourth story of a house in an obscure street in Paris, asking for admission. Rousseau was, however, in one of the many morose fits to which he was subject, and received the young people in so cold a manner that they were disinclined again to renew their attempt.

From Paris, Carnot went to the celebrated engineering school of Mezières, in 1771. Here he was looked upon with contempt by the aristocratic pupils, who refused to associate with him. His mathematical talents, however, so struck the professors of that department, that he was soon appointed Assistant Instructor over those who had refused to receive him as a comrade. After close study for two years in this school, he entered as a sub-lieutenant in the Royal Company of Engineers, in 1773, and joined his first garrison at Calais, which town, as well as the province of Picardy, was then governed by M. le Prince de Croy. This General, who possessed a character well expressed by the French term *Bizarre,* appears to have encouraged scientific men, and particularly those of the army. He had much improved, at his own expense, the fortifications of Calais, and added a celebrated tower, which was known by the name of Tour de Croy, and from which he could survey the opposite coast of England. He had also restored the fort and approaches of Dunkerque, and was now in search of some able engineer officer who might report on the voyages of the famous Captain Cook. The chief engineer at once recommended to the notice of the General our young friend Carnot, as the most efficient officer to undertake so difficult a task. Although Lazare had only just joined the corps, the Prince was so pleased with his conversation and talents, that he employed the young lieutenant in this service, and was highly satisfied with the manner in which he completed his work. This old Prince kept open house for the garrison, and was a regular *bon vivant,* as well as a skilful officer. It appears that he entered into an agreement with an hotel keeper to furnish his table with every luxury at so much per day; he used to fill his hospitable board to overflowing, and, after his guests were nearly surfeited with wine and good cheer, would exclaim, "Allons, messieurs, buvez, mangez, bourrez vous bien;" which advice the young officers never failed to adopt, amid shouts of laughter. Carnot, notwithstanding his early luck, was nevertheless slow in obtaining promotion. He spent some time in the garrison at Calais, where he applied himself to close study, and to the education of a younger brother. But whilst he devoted his chief time to mathematics and fortifications, he did not neglect his general reading, or his family ties. He closely studied Cæsar's Commentaries, from which, like our great English captain, the Duke of Wellington, he derived much knowledge which afterwards proved useful to him in his military career. He was moved from garrison to garrison, and did not obtain the rank of captain until the year 1783. He was, however, previous to this period well known in the scientific world by his two great works; one on mechanics, the other *l'Eloge de Vauban.* In the first, he discussed the new appliances in locomotion by land, water, and air, whilst *l'Eloge de Vauban* was written for a prize which the Academy of Dijon had offered on this subject. It treated of the Marshal as an engineer, praised him highly for the improvement he had suggested in fortification, and discussed at great length the utility of fortifying places as a means of defence, and of prolonging a war against a formidable and well-equipped enemy. He quoted a number of historical examples, as far back as the fourteenth century, to prove that well-fortified towns on the frontier were frequently not only of great value in defence, but had enabled an invaded and unprepared country to collect its forces, and to come out of a contest victorious. He also considered the merits of Vauban as an administrator and statesman, and proved that "he went far beyond his age in the liberality of his views, and in his desire that all his fellow countrymen should be made equal in the eye of the law." This memoir was considered by the University of Dijon as the ablest which had been written on the subject, and worthy of the prize. His success, however, raised him a host of enemies in his own profession, and gave rise to rather a warm discussion between himself and the Marquis de Montalambert, who had invented and written upon a new theory of fortification. Carnot, however, bowed to the superior knowledge of his adversary, admitted the correctness of his ideas, and wrote the Marquis a conciliatory letter on the subject. It was, however, couched in very bold terms for so young an officer; and, although the Marquis was flattered, yet the insubordination of Carnot raised him many an enemy in the army. Thus they made use of his first error, viz. a duel which he fought with a young infantry officer, respecting the hand of the daughter of the Chevalier de B——, to carry out their desires; and Carnot was, in consequence, confined in the Bastile for some considerable period. After writing several papers and memorials to the Minister of War, to the King, and to the National Assembly, on the neglected state of the army, and on the miserable condition in which the education of the engineer corps was conducted, he was at length released, though some of these papers afterwards occasioned his imprisonment, and retarded his promotion. Thus it was that he had only become a senior captain of engineers when he joined the National Convention of 1793. During this period he wrote several poetical effusions, which his biographer would have us believe were the models which Beranger adopted for his unrivalled ballads. He also became a member of a society of poets at Arras, of which his future associate in the Committee of Public Safety, Robespierre, was the President; though it is an error to suppose that these men, though republicans, met at that early period for political purposes. Historians have, therefore, committed an error in giving importance to such a club of young literati. It is quite true that at their meetings they ridiculed the ministers and government of the day in doggrel verse, but had no idea of overthrowing the power of the state. They were a set of *bon vivants* as well as poets, fond of meeting together to read each other's productions, and to enjoy a good dinner and a good bottle of burgundy. We are told that one of the members combined the power of verse with a knowledge of the cuisine, and that he thoroughly understood his art, if he has not left us the effusions of his muse. He is, however, remembered as companion and *chef de cuisine* to the greatest men of the revolution. It appears that, although a complimentary letter was addressed by the society to Carnot, through Robespierre, the future political colleagues were at that period unacquainted with each other, and that their introduction took place under the following curious circumstances. An old lady of tolerable affluence died at Arras without heirs; the brothers Carnot were struck with the similarity of the name to that of their old servant and housekeeper. They enquired if she was not in some way connected with the deceased. The old woman replied that as she could neither read nor write, she would trouble the brothers Carnot to look at her papers, on the perusal of which it became evident that her claim was worth contesting. The law suit, which was tried at the Court of Arras, was conducted by Robespierre. He, however, managed the case so badly, and spoke so indistinctly, that the younger Carnot feared the case would be lost. He thus several times interrupted the lawyer, and was often called to order by the Court. The case, however, terminated favourably for the old woman, who retired and lived in ease for the rest of her days. The elder Carnot was also present at the trial, though wise enough to remain silent. Thus, when he joined the Convention, he recognised Robespierre as the *avocat* of Arras, and was astonished at the position he had obtained. Many other celebrated characters of the revolution were brought together in quite as extraordinary a manner. Our readers may remember the meeting of young Beauharnais and Napoleon, when the latter was commanding his company on parade, and the influence which it had in raising the fortunes of the whole Beauharnais' family. Carnot and Robespierre's acquaintance was quite as eventful; it strengthened the influence of both parties, and probably saved Carnot his head during the reign of terror.

There are many interesting details in the volume before us as to the financial state of the country, and the many civil and military reforms which Carnot considered necessary, and in which he displayed his usual clearness and vigour of intellect. Even in this early period of his career, he showed himself an unflinching republican, whilst his sincerity as a politician does him much credit.

Once more we see Lazare in his domestic relations, when the family were assembled together for the last time, in 1788, and when a great family affliction befel him in the loss of his mother, who died suddenly at rather an advanced age. Soon after this event, Carnot married. His engagement was brought about after an accident which befel him, and which, for some time, made him a close prisoner in his chamber. Here he was tenderly nursed by Mademoiselle Dupont, daughter of a gentleman who had formerly held a military post during the seven-years' war, and who had since his retirement resided at Dijon. A friendship sprang up between the young people, which ended in marriage, his elder brother having previously married the sister of his intended. The occasion of the nuptials of our hero is made the text for a long dissertation on the French revolution, and we are told "that each step in the path of progress had become an accomplished fact, before the violence to which it gave rise had occurred." This is a plausible excuse, which is generally made by French republicans to support their theory of the benefits derived from these outrages. Our author, however, deserves to be praised for the tolerant impartiality with which he has reviewed Louis the Sixteenth's vacillating conduct, and traced his misfortunes. He endeavours to vindicate the revolutionists, by showing that none of its leaders were republicans until 1789, and that even men of such ultra views as Robespierre and Marat were at that period for retaining the royal authority, and for introducing such liberal reforms in the constitution as were practicable; and that they did not adopt their ultra-republican opinions until the popular excitement had become so great, and the clubs of the Jacobins so firmly established, that to hesitate was to perish. There may possibly be some truth in these assertions, but they do not excuse the excesses to which such men fell during the revolution itself, or during the subsequent reign of terror.

Although our author proves that his father and uncle, staunch republicans, never entered the Jacobin Club but once, and that they retired from thence when they discovered the fatal doctrines of the members,—although he declaims against the doctrine that "no patriot could be found so excellent as he who approved that society,—yet a detail is wanting of the private aspirations of our hero. It appears, however, that Carnot's love of study inclined him more to join the Girondins than the ultra republicans; that he was a great admirer of Condorcet and Rollins; that he was intimate with the former; but that he was a man of too independent a nature to ally himself entirely with any one party in the state. His principles, however, must be called ultra republican, as he looked upon the King as a traitor, for his declaration of war against the allied powers and the emigrants. In fact, Carnot, like all other republicans, seems to have considered the King's want of firmness to have been nothing less than duplicity and perfidiousness; and he therefore voted against the monarch, and heartily joined in supporting the friends of the new constitution. His speeches in the National Assembly were marked by clearness and fluency of style; but he could not strictly be called an orator. His younger brother seems, however, to have possessed greater powers of diction, and would, according to our author, have been a very Demosthenes, had his parliamentary career been prolonged.

Carnot may have been sincere in his principles; but he seems often to have varied them when circumstances changed, and to have adopted the pretext that the people must either be worked upon by fear, or guided by a deep and cunning policy; and thus, while he professed to maintain order, he, by his military code, gave strength to the revolutionary party. He was of opinion that military discipline should not be too rigorously enforced whilst the soldier was in garrison in the time of peace, where he could enjoy similar privileges to those of his fellow citizens. Of course, when before the enemy, his own judgment showed him the necessity of rigorously carrying out all the enactments of the military code. It was argued against him, that, whether in peace or in war, the military chiefs were answerable for the acts of those placed under their command. "If that be the case," he replied, "what would have become of the liberty of France when the army was commanded by Louis the Sixteenth's generals? It would have been annihilated." "La conclusion palpable du système de Carnot c'est que le soldat de profession ne doit pas être employé dans les troubles civiles, contre des manifestations plus ou moins serieuse de l'opinion publique." In another part, however, of his military opinions, no conservative alive could have shown sounder judgment. He strictly required that all posts on the frontier should be placed in a posture of defence, and blamed the royalists and republicans alike for their neglect in this important particular. He was likewise in favour of the declaration of war, and voted for it; though this declaration, our author endeavours to prove, was brought upon France by the attacks of her enemies, and by the anti-revolutionary spirit of the neighbouring states. He is especially bitter against Mr. Pitt, for having prevailed on England to enter into so long and so obstinate a war against France. He is, however, willing to admit, that so far as the interest of England was concerned, Pitt must be considered a great minister; and he is loud in his praise of those orators who defended the French Revolution in parliament, and who were for allowing France to continue her course of popular changes without foreign interruption. Much blame is cast upon the unfortunate King and his court; the former for his want of firmness, and the latter for their intrigues and duplicity. As we have already given our opinion on this portion of our subject, in the article "Les Girondins," we shall simply remark, that the biography of Carnot is as partial and one-sided in politics, as it is in the description of private character. The reader can see the ultra democrat, if not the terrorist, in every page and in every line of the book.

We have an excellent account of the tumults and treachery which took place in the French army before Tourney, together with the total route of the soldiers, notwithstanding the efforts made to rally them by their generals, and a résumé of the diseases which arose in the camps of the frontier, owing to the bad bread supplied to the troops, which many suppose to have been poisoned by court emissaries. Although our author does not substantiate this accusation, he blames the King and his ministers for their negligence in supplying the army, and declares that much excitement was created amongst the people by that event, and much alarm at the defeat of the troops and their insubordination at Tourney; Carnot, with a number of other officers, being appointed to enquire into this misfortune. Great difficulties soon arose, owing to the disputes between the National Guards, the Swiss, and other regiments, with which the King had surrounded himself; and the idea that he had despatched a private agent into Germany to thwart his own generals. Had such been the case, it was little likely that his advice could have been listened to, or that the allied generals would have abstained from issuing violent manifestoes until they had obtained some degree of success in France itself. Our author, however, tells us that the French King's recommendations, though actually given, were not listened to.

Carnot appears to have striven, as far as lay in his power, to quiet the apprehensions of his fellow-citizens and the army, and to have restored order in Paris, though France was pressed on every side. The Spaniards, who were ruled over by a branch of the house of Bourbon, now entered into coalition against her; and Francis, who had succeeded his more philosophical and peaceable brother as Emperor of Germany, entered with his whole heart into the views of the allies, and engaged with vigour in a war against France. Russia had concluded peace with Turkey, and only waited for a favourable opportunity to turn her arms against the revolutionary forces of France; whilst Prussia took an active part in the early struggles. The French, as we have seen, had only young and undisciplined soldiers, badly equipped and armed, to oppose such formidable forces; and the chief military men of the country were engaged, not only in reforming and reporting on its abuses, but also in considering the best mode of arming the troops. In all these debates we find Carnot taking a very prominent position. He made a motion in the Assembly for a large supply of pikes to be furnished to the army, contending that they were the best weapons which could be given to the infantry, and that their value and importance were by no means diminished since the invention of artillery and the introduction of gunpowder in the art of war. He quoted several famous military opinions, from the days of Louis XIV, to strengthen this assertion. Our author improves the occasion by stating that a similar distribution of pikes was ordered by the Emperor Napoleon, in 1814, and that the Emperor had affirmed, when at St. Helena, that Carnot had by no means overrated the importance of this weapon. It appears also that he was desirous that some method should be adopted by which the citizens of the whole country might be generally instructed in the use of guns and other arms.

We are now told of the different movements which took place in Paris, and terminated in the total overthrow of the royal authority. This narrative does not much differ from that which is given by most historians, only that, perhaps, a litte more odium is attached to the King's conduct. As might be expected, Carnot, at this period became a violent republican; was appointed as one of the commissioners to enquire into the state of the Tuileries after it had been vacated by the King, and reported as to the condition of the two contending parties. He found it, however, no easy matter to make his way from the Assembly to the Palace, and he narrowly escaped being cut down, even by the populace. Some of the spectators, however, of the memorable contest of the 10th of August, shouted his name, and a number of the most violent combatants on the part of the people came to his rescue, and escorted him to his hotel. The termination of this conflict is shortly passed over, and we are told, in true French style, that "La famille royale assistait à la destruction de la royauté, elle ne quitta l'Assemblé que pour la prison du Temple."

The biographer is impartial enough, however, to admire the heroism of many of the royalists, whose desire was that, if the King should fall, the monarchy should at least be preserved; whilst, on the other hand, he highly praises the Jacobins for their ultra republicanism.

Carnot duly accepted the office of Commissioner from the Assembly to the Army of the Rhine, and strengthened the power of the republic in that quarter by his vigour and sagacity; during which, intrigues were carried on by the court with La Fayette. Our author defends that general from the accusation of treachery to either party, and affirms that his attempts at mediation had placed him in a false position. La Fayette was much annoyed by the want of confidence which the government had shown towards him, by sending emissaries to supervise and report upon his conduct. As is well known, he seized the revolutionary commissioners, and himself went over to the allied camps. He was, nevertheless, long confined in a Prussian dungeon, and did not take any active part in French politics until the restoration in 1814. It appears that his flight, together with the advance of the allied troops, had terrified and excited the French people, whilst even the generals and the commissioners felt some degree of apprehension for the exposed situation of several ports on the Rhenish frontier, of which Strasbourg was the most important. This place was commanded by an old general, whose age made him incapable of carrying on military operations. It was, however, found difficult to displace him, though he was at length sent as a representative to the Assembly. But Carnot undertook the defence of the place, and discovered a conspiracy formed against the commissioners, called together the municipality, harangued them as to their fatal conduct, insisted on a search for the conspirators, and their delivery into the hands of the government, discharging the officials from the Hotel de Ville, in much the same manner as Napoleon afterwards expelled the representatives of the people when he made himself First Consul. This vigorous conduct laid him open to many unjust accusations, and forced him to return to Paris in self vindication. Anxiety and overwork soon produced their effects. He was attacked with severe illness, was prostrate for some considerable period at Paris, and only recovered after he had dispelled the cloud that hung over his reputation in the Assembly. He was at length again taken into public favour, appointed to command and organize the volunteer troops of the Rhenish frontier, and most ably fulfilled his task. For these troops were not only enabled, in the subsequent campaigns, to defend the country against the allies, but also to gain victories over the well-disciplined Austrian and Prussian armies.

Thus terminates the first volume of Carnot's Memoirs, which, though erroneous in many of its political views, and without much novel historical information, nevertheless gives many facts of the life and conduct of Carnot which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find in other works. The author must be praised for his industry in collecting rare genealogical and family traditions, and for his clear account of Carnot's writings and political career. We trust that, in continuing the Memoirs, he may be enabled to furnish more that is new touching the great convulsion in which his hero was so great an actor. This will be no easy task, as the events of the period have been so often, so amply, and so well described by greater writers than himself.

DIANE DE POITIERS.

DIANE DE POITIERS.*

THE epoch which saw Henry II on the throne of France may be considered as the link between the middle ages and modern times. Men were beginning to awake from a long sleep of barbarism and ignorance to the dawn of modern civilization—when well-organised and absolute monarchies were raised upon the chaos and tumult which had existed for nearly a thousand years—when art and science began to revive—when a new religion was propagated, when fierce contests between Protestants and Catholics prevailed, and when *absolute* or *liberal* ideas were the watch-word of contending parties. It was fortunate for Europe, at such a crisis, that the chivalry of the old feudal barons did not degenerate as the courage and vigour of ancient empires decayed. Had it been otherwise, Europe would have been overrun with fresh hordes of barbarians, as on the fall of the Roman empire; or would have been subdued by the vigorous Mahomed II, or by Suleiman the Magnificent.

In Germany, the Reformation had already commenced under Martin Luther and his followers; the Smalkalde league had been formed to support the Protestant religion, and to resist the ambitious designs of Charles V of Germany, who had schemed for universal conquest, by attempting to unite the whole German empire under one head and one religion. For some time his plans proved successful; he vanquished the two most important Princes of the League, viz. the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, whom he led in triumph through Germany; but was at length baffled by his general, Maurice, Duke of Saxony, who nearly succeeded in capturing the Emperor; forcing him to release the two captive princes, and sign, with the assistance of his brother Ferdinand, the disadvantageous treaty of Passau,* in 1552, which conferred many privileges on the Protestants, and finally regulated the powers of the German princes, until the commencement of the thirty years' war in 1618. Besides the hostility of these princes, Charles V, in his German dominions, had to contend against the inroads of the Turks, who, but for the opposition they met with in Hungary and Austria, would probably have subdued the greater part of Europe. They were not at that period an enemy to be despised by the Christian nations around them; as they had overrun the whole of Asia Minor, conquered the Greek islands, and, under their monarch Mahomet II, taken Constantinople, and overthrown the Greek empire. Besides this, they had made themselves masters of Syria, reduced the Mamelukes of Egypt to some degree of obedience to the Porte, and were now, under their accomplished sultan, Suleiman the Magnificent, the terror of the whole of Christendom. That Sultan, as is well known, twice during the reign of Charles V, overran Hungary and the greater part of Austria itself, even appearing before the walls of Vienna. Thus the Turks continually alarmed Christendom, by their successful capture of the island of Rhodes from the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, and their subsequent desperate invasion of the island of Malta, which had been given to them by the Emperor Charles V, after the loss of Rhodes.

---

* Très Haute et très Puissante Dame, Diane de Poitiers, Duchesse de Valentinois. Par M. Capefigue. Paris: Amyot, 8, Rue de la Paix. 1860.

In Italy, many republican towns had fallen during the two previous centuries, under the rule of some great family. At Milan, the Viscontis, and the Sforzas; and at Verona and Padua, the La Scalas and the Grimalcis, were the reigning families. Venice was ruled over by its Doge, and Genoa was governed in a similar manner. The heads of the Doria family supported Charles V, and usually contrived to be elected to the dignity of Doge. In Florence, the Medici family had long sustained their supremacy; and one of them was raised by the Emperor Charles V to be the first Grand Duke of Tuscany. Lorenzo de Medici, the liberal patron of art and letters, invited many illustrious scholars to visit Florence; and, during his period, a new philosophy was introduced, and such authors and artists as Machiavelli, Leonardo da Vinci, and Michael Angelo, flourished. Again, at a somewhat later age, Florence was distinguished by the presence of the celebrated Guicciardini, the historian of Italy at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

---

* History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V, by William Robertson, D.D. —London: Baldwyn and Co.

The Papacy was filled, at the end of the fifteenth century, by two very vigorous Popes. Alexander VI, of the famous house of Borgia (celebrated for its ambition, its immorality, and its gross crimes), was a man of great ability, having distinguished himself as a lawyer and a soldier, previous to his entering the church. He it was who settled the famous dispute between the Spaniards and Portuguese as to the possession of their discoveries. His scandalous doings, however, much diminished the respect in which the Papacy and clergy were generally held, and thus prepared the way for the coming reformation. Julius II, his successor, was a warlike Pontiff, who added somewhat to the territorial possessions of the church by his wars, but who commenced that extravagance which was ultimately to destroy the Papal power in many countries beyond the Alps. Leo X, whose munificence to sculptors, painters, poets, and men of letters, at length obliged him to publish those indulgences which brought about the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, was the next Pontiff. He and Clement VII both belonged to the Medici family, and vastly increased the influence of that house. Although the latter was taken prisoner by the Emperor Charles V, and his capital handed over to the pillage of the Spanish soldiery for a period of eight months, the pontifical power was not crushed. The celebrated Catherine de Medici was a natural daughter of this Pope, and, as is well known, played a most important part in French history during the reigns of Henry II, Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III of France. To the first of these sovereigns she was wife, to the latter three, mother. Paul III, a Farnese, succeeded Clement VII. Bent only on amassing wealth for his own house, he obtained for it the Duchy of Parma. Paul IV, who filled the chair of St. Peter during the earlier part of Henry II's reign in France, was a haughty pontiff, possessed of all the absurd notions of power befitting a pope of the thirteenth century.

The kingdom of the Two Sicilies had long been contested for by the houses of Anjou and Aragon. The claims of the former had been surrendered, by the last descendant of the house, to Louis XI; and hence the origin of the wars which were for so long a period waged between France and the house of Austria in Italy. The two Sicilies were, however, at this period actually in the possession of Charles V of Germany, to whom they had been left by his grandfather, Ferdinand of Aragon, whilst the territories of Piedmont and Savoy belonged to the Dukes of that name, who were scarcely looked upon as Italian sovereigns.

The Swiss obtained their independence in the year 1307, but were not acknowledged by their Austrian oppressors, or indeed by any other state, as a free people until 1498, when their liberties were recognised by the Emperor Maximilian I, grandfather of Charles V, at a diet of the Empire. They were at this time, like all other countries of Europe, engaged in the disputes between Catholics and Protestants. Zuinglius, a Franciscan monk, who was shocked at the indecency of the sale of indulgencies carried on by his order, first preached amongst them against the errors of Rome; and the Reformation was afterwards energetically carried on at Geneva by Calvin, a native of the south of France. Although Switzerland was a small state, and did not permit its people to make territorial conquests, yet they nevertheless repelled with success the invasion of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy; and their military skill and courage were held in such repute amongst neighbouring nations, that the Swiss were hired to fight, and thus early distinguished themselves both at Ravenna and Marignano in the service of Maximilian.

At the end of the fifteenth century, Spain had become a powerful state, by the marriage of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile. The Moors had been driven out from their last stronghold at Grenada, and various places were taken from them in the north of Africa. The contest, however, between them and the Spaniards was continued through the greater part of the sixteenth century, and all the coasts of the Mediterranean were reduced to desolation by their famous piratical commander, Barbarossa. The wealth and power of Spain were further increased, at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, by the discoveries of Columbus, Cortes, and Pizarro, in the new world; and by the marriage of Ferdinand's daughter with the Archduke Philip, son of the Emperor Maximilian by Mary of Burgundy, daughter and successor of Charles the Bold. Thus the Spanish crown became possessed of the rich inheritance of the Low Countries, Franche Comté, Artois, and French Flanders, as fiefs of the French crown.

The Low Countries were preparing for that struggle which was to give them their civil and religious rights. Charles V, owing to his disappointment in the non-election of his son Philip to the dignity of king of the Romans, which he hoped would have made him Emperor, and to his non-success in the scheme of uniting the whole of Germany under one head, and his ill-fortune in the wars with the Smalkalde league and Henry II of France, resolved to abdicate his German possessions in favour of his son Philip; retiring from the world, and enjoying some degree of rest and religious contemplation before his death.* He accordingly relinquished the Empire to Ferdinand, in 1555, and the rest of his dominions in the following year to his son Philip, who early engaged in war with Henry II of France, and Pope Paul IV.

---

* The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles V, by William Stirling.—London: J. Parker, West Strand.

The contemporaneous history of Europe at this period is, also, worth noticing.

The Portuguese, during the fifteenth century, had been engaged in those discoveries along the coast of Africa which eventually led to the doubling of the Cape of Good Hope, in 1497, by the adventurous navigator, Vasco di Gama, and thus opened a new route to India, where the descendants of Tamerlane had founded the vast empire known as that of the Great Mogul. These discoveries destroyed the commerce of Venice and Genoa, and the other republics of Italy, through the old channels of Constantinople and Alexandria, and it is reported that the Venetians attempted to regain their lost commerce by cutting the Isthmus of Suez, a task in which they completely failed.

England, during the fifteenth century, was engaged in quelling insurrections at home, and in wars with her French enemy abroad. The whole country was disturbed by the bloody contests between the rival families of York and Lancaster, in the Wars of the Roses, which were happily terminated by the battle of Bosworth in 1485, and by the marriage of Henry VII, the representative of the House of Lancaster, with Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Edward IV, of the House of York. Henry VII, a cold, sagacious, and arbitrary monarch, was chiefly bent on amassing treasure, and defending his own rights to the throne, which were, notwithstanding his Imperial descent, of a very insecure nature. His foreign policy showed his real sagacity. He negotiated an advantageous marriage between his eldest daughter Margaret, and James IV of Scotland, which ultimately led to the two countries being brought under one sovereign. Again, he united his son Arthur, and afterwards his son Henry, to Catharine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, then the most powerful sovereigns of Europe. The influence of the aristocracy had been greatly weakened by the many executions which took place during the Civil Wars; and Henry VII and his son found it an easy matter to augment the prerogatives of the Crown, and to levy heavy taxes on the people without the assistance of Parliament, as the Commons were too weak to contend single-handed against the sovereign. During Henry VIII's reign, the power of the Crown made rapid strides, and became as absolute as any Oriental despotism. The king was capricious and tyrannical; but he helped to establish the Reformation in England, and had power enough to arbitrate between the two powerful sovereigns, Francis I and Charles V. He was followed by his two children, Edward VI and Mary. The one a weak prince, who supported the policy of his father; and the other, the incarnation of Romish bigotry, and the wager of that unfortunate war with France which deprived us of Calais. Her reign in England brings us to a period contemporary with that of Henry II of France, and his mistress, Diane de Poitiers.

In Scotland, after several attempts had been made ineffectually to curb the power of the Barons, James IV attached them to his person by his courage and generosity; and had it not been for his ill-fated expedition into England, and his unfortunate defeat and death, his reign would have been a glorious one for Scotland. James V endeavoured to put down the authority of the nobility, by supporting the clergy; and, according to Dr. Robertson, this policy proved eminently successful, until his uncle, Henry VIII, called upon him to introduce the reformed religion, or to prepare for war. Unfortunately for himself, he preferred the latter alternative; and as most of his nobles, besides being dissatisfied with his policy, adopted the new faith, they rebelled against him. James, in consequence, was disgusted, and returned to Edinburgh, where he died, leaving his crown to his unfortunate daughter, Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. Mary of Guise became Regent in Scotland during the minority. The young princess had been betrothed to Henry's infant son, Edward; but it was broken off, and the young princess was sent over to be educated at the French Court, preparatory to her marriage with Francis II, son of Henry II, the devoted lover of Diane de Poitiers.

As for the Northern Courts, they had as yet taken so small a share in European politics, that their history is insignificant. The Lutheran religion, however, was established in Denmark and Sweden; the Poles obtained a constitution, and the Muscovites threw off the Tartar yoke. As for France, most of its fiefs had been united to the Crown, under Louis XI, and the strength which the country thus gained was made good use of by Charles VIII, in asserting his claims to Naples and Milan. His wars, however, and those of Louis XII and Francis the First, have been so well told by Monsieur Capefigue, in his work on the Renaissance, and in his Diane de Poitiers, as to render further remark unnecessary. Although Mons. Capefigue has chosen to call the work we are about to notice a "Life of Diane de Poitiers," it must not be supposed to contain her memoirs. Indeed, very little is said about her in the commencement of the book, though a fair history is given of the times in which she lived and exercised influence over the French Court. It is full of references to the chronicles, ballads, romances, and poems of those days; and although differing in some of the views and statements from other historians, it is nevertheless likely to be accurate, on account of the many documents from which it has been compiled. We wish that the author had given us a more detailed account of the early life of Diane de Poitiers, as we have scarcely any means of judging how her character was formed, or what influenced her in the adoption of her strong religious opinions. We are bound to be tolerant of her faults, as they occurred at a period when the chivalrous feeling of the middle ages was again attempted to be reviled, and gave rise to a strange state of mind even in our heroine. Although civilization and learning were beginning to revive, and the philosophy and letters of the Greeks and Romans were being taught at the universities, good literature was only attainable by a few. Most of the gallant knights who distinguished themselves at the period were incited to deeds of daring by the perusal of the old romances of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries; and they seem to have revelled as much in the study of these productions as the old Arabians did in the Tales of Haroun al Raschid. The "Handbook of Chivalry" was an old romance called "The Rose," a legend of extreme length, composed in verse by different authors, and brought to perfection in the thirteenth century. Filled with heroic sentiments, it stimulated the appetite for heroic deeds, and led to the surprising feats performed by Gaston de Foix, Lautrecht, Bayard, Montmorency, and a host of other distinguished Paladins whom that mirror of chivalry, Francis I, had drawn around him.

After describing the families of the most illustrious knights, and the wars of Charles VIII and Louis XII in Italy, Mons. Capefique informs us that Jean de Poitiers, Seigneur de Saint Vallier, in Dauphiné, a valiant knight, and inferior to none of the great men of those days in military prowess and chivalrous deeds, had a daughter born to him on the 3rd of September, 1499, whom he named "Diane." Remarkable in very early life for her love of chivalry and manly exercises, she is reported to have "rode a hunting at the age of six years," and to have been "handy with the hawk and falcon." At the age of ten, she was betrothed to Louis de Brezé, Comte de Maulevrier, a bastard descendant of Charles VII, whom she subsequently married.

Having thus far touched on the early life of Diane de Poitiers, our author abruptly turns to the doings of Francis I;* no doubt a necessary historical digression, but one likely to confuse the general reader. He tells us that Francis I, son of the Duc D'Angoulême and Louise of Savoy, was born on the 12th of September, 1494,* and early distinguished for his love of wrestling, boxing, and all those manly exercises and sports which afterwards made him so great a favorite with his cousin, Louis XII, who, after losing his two sons, adopted him. An attachment soon sprang up between Francis and a daughter of the king, named Claude, and they were united in marriage. This happy circumstance secured Francis in the position of heir to Louis XII, and not only strengthened the bonds which already subsisted between the two families, but gained for the young monarch the rich inheritance which Ann of Brittany had brought to the French crown. Francis I succeeded Louis XII in 1515, when he had only reached the age of twenty-one years. On his accession, he at once resolved to continue those conquests in Italy which had been made in support of the claims of Charles VIII and Louis XII, and declared war against the Emperor Maximilian, marched into Italy, and met his enemy on the famous field of Marignano. The contest was only decided in favour of the French after two days' hard fighting; and we are told that Francis entered Milan in triumph, in which capital he first met the celebrated Leonardo da Vinci,† a man of considerable age, who still possessed those accomplishments for which he had been distinguished during his youth. Leonardo was, perhaps, one of the foremost men of his time; for he united to his talents as a painter, consummate skill in the martial exercises of the day, and knowledge as a scholar and mathematician. His mechanical genius is associated with Francis the First's entrance into Milan, by his construction of a most wonderful automaton in the form of a lion, which met the monarch in the Grand Place, and did homage to him. If we are to believe M. Capefigue, great rejoicings took place on the entrance of the French into Milan. Bells were rung in all the churches, the theatres were opened, and the inhabitants amused by every sort of public festivity, whilst Francis made himself popular amongst the Milanese by his support of the claims of the house of Sforza. We are led to believe that Leonardo da Vinci was much about the person of the sovereign, and accompanied him back to France, where he painted the royal portrait, together with that of La Ferronnière, a favorite mistress of the king, though it does not appear that she ever acquired any political influence.

---

* Cronique du Roy Francoys. Premier de ce nom.—Par Georges Geoffrey; 3 vols. Paris, Jules Renouard.

The Field of the Cloth of Gold, and the meeting between Francis I and Henry VIII, are well described by M. Capefigue, though he falls into an error, in stating that the three competitors for the imperial crown of Germany were Charles V, Henry VIII, and Francis I. No doubt the German and French sovereigns endeavoured to obtain it; but it is the first time we have heard it asserted that Henry desired the crown for himself. The splendour displayed at the meeting of the two kings, the amusements, the manly sports, and the insult which Francis offered to Henry by his greater skill in these exercises, are too well known to require further mention, though we cannot refrain from noticing the parallel which our author draws between the characters of the two monarchs, a parallel most partial, and much to the advantage of Francis. It is undoubtedly true that Henry, in his youth, possessed many of those manly qualities which are calculated to ingratiate a sovereign with his people; though he was neither so frank nor so social as the French King. His passions were stronger, and his jealousy greater, and he was of a more arbitrary and violent temper than Francis. Charles V being the successful competitor for the imperial crown, Francis could not control the annoyance he felt at his rival's good fortune; and, as might have been expected, an open rupture soon followed. Charles endeavoured to persuade Henry of England to join him against Francis, by supporting the claims of that ambitious minister Cardinal Wolsey to the papacy, and by giving him a share in the proposed partition of France. During the short interval of peace between the campaign of Marignano, and the resumption of hostilities, the Countess of Chateaubriant, a relative of Gaston de Foix, had become the mistress of Francis I, disposing of all posts, both military and political. She had obtained the appointment of Marshal Lautrec to the command of the Italian army, who did his best to maintain French influence in Italy, and to cover the important possession of Milan, when the wars opened between Charles and Francis. France was, however, first menaced on its Mediterranean shore by the imperial forces, and Francis marched on Lyons and Marseilles, in order to repel the attacks of the enemy; but when he had reached Lyons, his further advance was checked by a very unexpected event at home, upon which our author expresses an opinion opposed to that of other historians. The Constable de Bourbon, by his youth, handsome person, courage and great military talents, having found favour in the eyes of the Duchess D'Angoulême, the mother to the king, this lady who had been left regent of the kingdom during the absence of Francis, made him an offer of marriage, and was indignantly refused by the Constable; our author adding that it was his large fiefs that the Queen desired to obtain, and not his person. Be that as it may, his refusal so enraged her, that she ultimately obtained the confiscation of all his possessions. The Constable fully avenged himself for this unjust treatment, and secretly plotted with the Emperor Charles V against France. Fortunately for the French king, however, the conspiracy was discovered in time, and the march of the French retarded, in order that Francis might take proper measures to secure his own authority. The Constable, immediately on finding that he was discovered, quitted the kingdom, went into the service of Charles V, who received him with open arms, being glad thus to possess the services of the ablest captain of the age. Most historians have considered, with very good reason, that the conduct of Bourbon was treacherous. Monsieur Capefigue, however, endeavours to excuse him, by alleging "that, according to the feudal customs, a vassal who had had all his fiefs confiscated was no longer bound by an oath of allegiance to his liege lord." This legal plea will not, however, excuse the conduct of the Constable. That he had no means of protecting himself from the injustice of the Duchess D'Angoulême, there is no doubt; nor that, had he remained in his own country, he would have been reduced to beggary. Nevertheless he might have retired to some other land, and not have taken part with France's bitterest enemies. He was soon employed in Italy, by his new master, against the French forces under the command of Marshal Lautrec and the Chevalier Bayard, who were defeated on their retreat towards Milan. In this action, the most remarkable military character of the age, Chevalier Bayard, was killed. He was generally known by his comrades as the Chevalier "sans peur et sans reproche." Many a knight at that day might have obtained the former appellation, but very few would have coupled with it the latter, for that was an age of broadest license and military outrage. Bayard was, however, but a poor general, and no match for such a chief as the Constable de Bourbon, with an army of Spanish troops. Arriving just as the Chevalier was expiring, Bourbon was, according to the chronicles of the day, severely blamed by the dying knight for his treachery. The French monarch soon entered Italy, and sat down before Pavia in the middle of winter, whilst Bourbon made every effort to collect an overpowering army of Germans and Spaniards, whom he encouraged by the promise of victory and the sacking of the eternal city. He soon completed his levees, and marched to attack the French camp before Pavia. Most of Francis's prudent officers advised a retreat; but, with the true spirit of knight errantry, the French monarch considered it a point of honour not to raise the siege, and to stand his ground before the greater number of Spaniards. Bourbon contrived to convey to the garrison of Pavia the information that he was marching to their relief, and advised them to make a sortie on the French troops, whilst he was attacking them from without. The two armies met at a short distance from the town, and a severe conflict took place, in which both wings of the French army were cut off from its centre and routed. The King, mounted on a splendid charger, encouraged and rallied his men, until his horse was killed under him, and his troops were everywhere overpowered. The few knights who surrounded his person, suggested as the wisest course a surrender to the Constable; but the King's indignation against that chief was so great that he preferred to trust to Lannoy, to whom he at length succumbed.

---

* François I, et la Renaissance, 1515—1547, par M. Capefigue. 4 vols. Paris: D'Amyot, 6, Rue de la Paix.

† Memorie Storiche su la Vita, gli studj de la opere di Leonardo da Vinci. Per Carlo Amoretti. Milano, 1784.

Francis was speedily removed to Madrid, and closely confined, though he was promised an immediate interview with the Emperor. This grace was, however, long delayed; but when accorded, such severe conditions were imposed upon the King, that Francis was unable to accept them. The victory of Pavia, and the capture of the King, had left France in much the same state as after the battle of Poitiers and the capture of John II. The peasantry everywhere rose against their lords and demanded their rights, which could not be conceded. The Queen-mother, who had been left Regent, manfully contended against these internal disturbances, and set to work to prevail on the King of England to form an alliance with herself and the Pope against Charles V. His Holiness rashly entered the field before his allies were ready for action, and thus gave Bourbon a still further reason for fulfilling his promise to the Spanish soldiery, of leading them to the sacking of Rome. As is well known, the Constable lost his life in the assault—an occurrence which so enraged his troops, that they committed unheard-of excesses, and kept possession of the town for nearly eight months. The Pope, shut up in the castle of St. Angelo, was at length obliged to surrender himself a prisoner into the hands of the Imperialists. The siege and sacking of Rome have been most vividly described by Guicciardini, from whose account our author takes leave to differ, as unfavourable to the French.

Charles V was well pleased with his success, and desired to transport the Holy Father to Madrid. He feared, however, to shock the feelings of his Spanish subjects, who were the most Catholic nation in Europe; he therefore hypocritically ordered prayers to be read in all the churches of his dominions for the speedy deliverance of the Pontiff. It was, no doubt, this conduct that made Mr. Prescott declare "that most of Charles the Fifth's ambitious schemes were executed under the cloak of religion." M. Capefigue, also, observes, "Il mêlait un respect affecté dans sa politique d'invasion et de conquêt—l'Empereur aimait les grands captifs."

What the Emperor's religious views really were, was seen at a later period of his life, when he enforced the Interim in Germany.

The death of the Constable somewhat facilitated negotiations between the two monarchs; though we are at a loss to know where Capefigue finds his references as to the correct details of the treaty. We never before heard of a separate kingdom having been demanded for the Emperor's general, though he is correct as to the other conditions of the truce.

The close confinement to which Francis was subjected, brought on severe illness, which tended to an early settlement of affairs. Charles V feared that by the death of his prisoner he might lose all the advantages that he had acquired by his captivity; he therefore willingly listened to the proposals of the Princess Margaret, who had left France to succour her imprisoned brother, attended by several court ladies. She watched over the political interest of France during her sojourn in Madrid; and at length induced Francis to give his consent to the hard terms imposed upon him by the Emperor Charles V. He was required to give up all claims to Naples and Milan; to return the Duchy of Burgundy to the house of Austria; to relinquish all feudal right to the province of Franche Compté, Artois, and French Flanders; to pay 20,000 marks for himself; and render up as hostages his two sons, the Dauphin and the Duke of Orleans (afterwards Henry II), as pledges for the performance of the treaty. These terms were too severe to be carried out; and it appears that even the Emperor entertained grave doubts as to the fulfilment of the conditions. Whilst accompanying the King to Fontarabia, where the exchange of prisoners was to take place, Charles remarked to Francis that he had acted throughout the treaty in the political spirit of a monarch, but that now he wished to obtain the word of Francis as a man of honour and a knight, that he would carry out the stipulated engagements. The King of France was rash enough to comply with this request, and thus injured his character as a man of honour. Historians have been somewhat justified in calling this conduct to the Emperor "base and treacherous." We think that the King had many faults, and should not be too harshly blamed. It is clear that he must have desired his freedom, that he must have felt the awkward position in which both he and his country were placed, and have been anxious to escape from it at any sacrifice, however galling to his pride or injurious to his private character. Thus he consented, after much hesitation, to terms literally thrust upon him, the severity of which rendered them impossible of accomplishment. Charles, with all his sagacity and penetration, must have perceived that he would lose all by asking too much. He, however, like many another crafty politician, overreached himself, by supposing that the King's confinement and the condition of the kingdom would induce his captive to purchase peace at any price.

When Francis returned to Paris, he at once summoned the states of the province of Burgundy, and placed before them the conditions of the treaty which related to that duchy. They replied with indignation that they did not deserve to be given up to the House of Austria; whilst the Parliament of Paris, the greatest legal authority in the kingdom, decided that the King had *no right* to make the treaty, and that he was *not bound* to carry it out, as, at the time of contracting it, he was a prisoner in the hands of one of the contracting parties. Charles, however, demanded, indignantly, that Francis should keep his word, as a man of honour, if he did not choose to adhere to his negotiations as a sovereign. He sent a herald to Paris to challenge the French king to single combat. Francis accepted the challenge, on condition that a place of meeting should be chosen where no interruption or unfair dealing could be possible. The Emperor chose Burgos; but the French king, fearing that he might be again entrapped, declined the encounter. Charles, in consequence, declared war against Francis and his ally, Henry VIII of England; and after some severe fighting on both sides, and another siege of Marseilles, the Duchess D'Angoulême, mother to Francis and Margaret of Austria, aunt of Charles V, who had long administered the affairs of the Low Countries with considerable vigour and ability, arranged the treaty of Cambrai, on much the same terms as had been offered to the King at Madrid. He gave up all claim to the two Sicilies, the Milanese, and every other part of Italy; he relinquished the feudal rights to Franche Comté, Artois, and French Flanders; he paid his ransom, and his sons were restored to their liberty. All the titles and lands held in France by the Constable de Bourbon were to be returned to his family. This treaty was fully assented to by both belligerents—both being unable to pay their armies. Francis required rest for himself and his dominions; and Charles required leisure for maturing his ambitious schemes in Germany, and for crushing the dawn of the Reformation. All were glad of peace on any terms.

After this long digression, Capefigue returns to his account of Court intrigue, and tells us that the Countess de Chateaubriant* had been disgraced even before the battle of Pavia, many supposing it to be the result of the machinations of Diane de Poitiers. Diane, however, was too young to have taken any active part at Court during that important period; as it appears that Mademoiselle de D'Heilly had succeeded Madame de Chateaubriant in

---

* Histoire Tragique de la Comtesse de Chateaubriant; par Pierre de Lexouvel. Amsterdam, 1714.—Francis I, et Madame de Chateaubriant; par Augustin Gottis. Paris, 1822. (Roman Historique.)

Francis' affections since his return from Madrid, and that she was created Duchess D'Etampes, and became the greatest supporter of the Calvinists in France. Clement Marot and Calvin—one the heroic poet of the day, and the other the great religious reformer—were commanded by the Duchess to translate the Psalms into French, and to dedicate the book to the King, who had them sung at his own chapel. Diane de Poitiers, on the other hand, who soon rose to power, as the mistress of the young Duke of Orleans, was a staunch friend of the followers of the old religion, and was strongly allied to the Duke of Guise and the House of Loraine. About this time, also, the Duchess D'Angoulême, mother of the King, died, and the Smalkalde League was formed in Germany, in 1532, to protect the reformed religion, and furnish the King of France with formidable allies against the Emperor of Germany.

Francis, during the leisure which was afforded to him by the treaty of Cambrai, encouraged artists and men of letters; he was fond of architecture, ornamented many churches and buildings, and called to his aid Rosso, the famous Italian painter, together with many celebrated artists of that country. The King likewise encouraged the study of Greek literature and philosophy, and did much to revive the rude sciences of those early days.

Our author gives us an interesting chapter on the general politics of the middle ages, during which, as he truly remarks, the chief aim of all European powers was to reconquer the Holy Land, and check Mahomedan ambition. It was therefore considered the height of temerity on the part of Francis I to ally himself with Suleiman the Magnificent. He was looked upon by the church as a great sinner, whilst combining with the heretic princes of the Smalkalde league, who, though they had seceded from Romanism, were still Christians. The Pope, however, might forgive Francis for joining with heretics of his own religion; but the union with the dreadful Musselman, the enemy of all Christian sects, was an unpardonable offence, which even Leo and Clement could not overlook. Although Francis had but small claims to territory in Italy, he yet desired to preserve influence in that country, and therefore negotiated a marriage with Pope Clement VII for his own son, the Duke of Orleans, and the young Catherine de Medici, the natural daughter of the Pontiff. This wealthy and powerful family, though of low origin, had furnished many occupants to the chair of St. Peter, and had acquired many dignities by industry and application. Ever eager to make noble and royal alliances, they were delighted at the opportunity thus afforded them of being connected with so old a house as that of Valois, and a sovereign of so powerful a country as France. The Princess being very young, it was agreed that she should spend some years at the French court previous to her nuptials. On arriving in France, she soon awoke to the fact that the young prince to whom she was affianced was under the absolute control of a mistress of nearly double his own age. But such a state of things scarcely affected the young Italian princess, who seems to have viewed the circumstance with indifference; as almost every great man, whether Lay or Ecclesiastic, at that period, had his mistress as well as his wife. Catherine, therefore, did not trouble about this, but rather endeavoured to learn the position of parties, and to gain the favour of Francis. Soon after her arrival, the King, who had suffered from a severe illness, received a request from Charles V for a safe conduct through his territory, as that monarch was on his way to the Low Countries, to quiet the turbulent risings in the towns of Ghent, Liege, and Bruges. This passport was at once granted, and the French King even went as far as the Chateau d'Ambroise, to meet the Emperor, all honours being paid by the authorities of the different towns and provinces through which he passed. During the royal interview there was much talk and intrigue, but no definite arrangement was come to, and Charles continued his journey to the Low Countries. Another war soon afterwards commenced between these two powerful and ambitious sovereigns. Charles put forth the whole might of his empire, and attacked France, together with his capricious ally, Henry VIII of England. Francis, on his side, put the country in a good state of defence, marched towards the frontier with a brilliant army of knights and great nobles, and renewed his alliance with Sultan Suleiman and Barbarossa. Great gloom was thrown over the camp of Francis by the sudden death of the Dauphin, who was popular both with the army and the nation. His death was by some attributed to poison, administered by the agents of the Emperor. This death, of course, conferred a higher position on the Duke of Orleans, and gave greater influence to Diane de Poitiers at Court. The war that followed was long and bloody, but neither belligerents acquired much by it; and the Pope, Paul III, fearing its consequences, endeavoured to bring about a compromise, which he at length accomplished. The terms were much the same as those agreed on at the treaty of Cambrai, with the exception that it was proposed that the Dauphin should now marry the Arch-duchess, daughter of Ferdinand, King of the Romans, and niece of the Emperor Charles V; and that several provinces were to be conceded to the King of France as her dowry. It was rather extraordinary that these matrimonial negotiations should have been proposed and that Catherine de Medici should have been abandoned; it is still more curious that a princess, who afterwards exercised such influence over French politics, should have been treated with so much indifference. Francis was, however, induced to put Catherine aside, for the brilliant prospects of territorial aggrandisement.

An irregular life and grave disease now began to make great inroads on the constitution of the French King, and although he had only reached the age of fifty-two, he was an old man in feeling and habits, His only amusement was that of the chase, in which he was accompanied by Catherine, who had, after all, married the Dauphin. He also took great delight in decorating his palaces, and beautifying Paris, adding much to Fontainbleau, his chief residence during the latter years of his reign. He likewise collected works of art, and encouraged native artists and sculptors.

Francis I expired in the month of March, 1547. His death made a great change both in the interior policy of the country and in the Court. Diane de Poitiers, now nearly forty years of age, became the absolute mistress of the sovereign, having lost none of the charms for which she had been so famous in her youth. She completely overcame the Duchesse d'Etampes, and was herself created Duchesse de Valentinois, with a large dowry from the royal domain. United as she was to the Guise and the Montmorency faction, she did everything to elevate the supporters of the old faith, and to persecute the Protestants. The strongest measures were therefore adopted against heretics; and those wars which took place during the subsequent reigns may be attributed to the policy which was pursued towards the unfortunate Huguenots. So great was the influence which Diane de Poitiers exerted over the chivalry of the period, that a deadly conflict was entered into between the valiant knights, La Chataignerie and Jarnac, as to who was most worthy of support, Diane, or the Duchess D'Etampes.

Contrary to all precedent, the King and his whole Court was present, and the ground was prepared as for a tournament; Jarnac being victorious, in spite of the wishes and sympathies of the Court, Henry II was thus obliged to accept the life of La Chataignerie, who died of wounds and vexation at the chateau of the Duke of Guise.

The Renaissance was much developed in the days of Henry II and Diane de Poitiers. Hunting, sporting, literature, the fine arts, and chivalry being everywhere supported and encouraged. Montaigne, Brantome, and Nostradamus, three of the most renowned scholars and writers of the day, basked in the sunshine of royal favour, whilst the palaces of Chambord, Chenonceaux, and Anet became little less than museums of arts and curiosities. The love and affection of the King for Diane de Poitiers seemed to increase as years rotled on. "Le roi portait publiquement ses couleurs, la devise de '*donec* *totum implicit orbem,'* sous un crossant placé sur les monnais s'appliquait à Diane de Poitiers, qui elle même avait pris pour devise le cheffre de Henri. Dans quelques medailles on voit Diane foulant au pied un amour avec cette légende: *'omnium victorem vinci.'* " He bestowed upon her the beautiful chateau d'Anet, the work of the architect, Delorme, and founded in Diane's name a hospice for fifteen poor widows.

The death of Henry II is thus related by Mons. Capefigue:—

" Les mariages d'Elisabeth de France et de Philippe II, roi d'Espagne, et de Marguerite, sœur de Henri II, avec le duc de Savoie, venaient de s'accomplir, Mai 1559. A l'occasion de ces mariages, un tournois avait été annoncé par des messagers, selon l'antique usage, dans toutes les cours d'Espagne, d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, d'Italie.

" Le lieu fixé pour la lice fut encore la rue Saint-Antoine, entre les Tournelles et la Bastille. Il y eut multitude de dames et de preux chevaliers. Après cent lances brisées, le roi voulut lui-même courir contre un capitaine de la garde écossaise du nom de Montgomery. Brantôme rapporte qu'avant le tournoi, Henri II s'était fait tirer son horoscope en présence du connétable Anne de Montmorency, et qu'on lui avait annoncé qu'il serait tué en duel; alors le roi se tournant vers le connétable, lui dit: 'Voyez, mon compère, quelle mort m'est présagée. Comment, sire, lui répondit le fier connétable, vous, vous pouvez croire à ces marauds qui sont menteurs et bavards; faites-moi jeter célà au feu. N'import, compère, je la garde, mais j'aime autant mourir de cette manière-là, pourvu que ce soit de la main d'un chevalier brave et noble." Paroles loyales dignes d'un Valois.

"L'horoscope n'avait donc point arrêté ce roi qui entra fièrement dans la lice; Henri mit donc la lance hautement en arrêt contre Montgomery, qui, fort colère de voir sa propre lance brisée dans le choc, atteignit durement le roi du tronçon à la visière au-dessous de l'œil, et lui fit une plaie profonde. On crut d'abord la blessure peu dangereuse; bientôt, elle s'empira et le roi fut en danger de mort. Ce fut un grand deuil autour de ce lit de douleur déjà les ambitions s'agitèrent. Avec la vie et le pouvoir de Henri II devait s'effacer et disparaître l'influence de Diane de Poitiers, et Catherine de Médicis, si longtemps reléguée dans les plaisirs et les arts, devenait reine et régente." (Henry II died 10th of July, 1559, after a reign of thirteen years.)

" Aussi fit-elle donner avis à la duchesse de Valentinois qu'elle eût à se retirer de la cour; Diane, avec beaucoup de dignité, demanda si le roi était mort: 'Non, madame, mais il ne passera pas la journée. Je n'ai donc point encor de maître; que mes ennemis sachent que je ne les crains point; quand le roi ne sera plus, je serai trop occupée de la douleur de sa perte pour que je puisse être sensible aux chagrins qu'on voudra me donner.' Diane avait toujours eu un langage plein de dignité et de fierté, même envers Henri II. Quand le roi voulut légitimer sa fille, Diane lui dit: 'J'étais née pour avoir des enfantes lêgitimes de vous; je vous ai appartenue parce que je vous aimais, je ne souffrirai pas qu'un arrêt du parlement me déclare votre concubine.'

"Après la mort de Henri II, Diane de Poitiers se retira au château d'Anet, où elle vécut dans le deuil et la solitude la plus absolue, conservant auprès d'elle ses amis les plus intimes, les Montmorency et les Guise, ces grandes races."

The influence of Diane de Poitiers was entirely destroyed by the death of Henry II, and she retired to the Chateau d'Anet, where she lived in the greatest seclusion, until her death in 1556. Brantôme is said to have seen her some ten years after this event, and to have left on record that he was much struck by her surpassing beauty, even at her advanced age. She only once emerged from her retirement, in order to assist Catherine in obtaining the support of the house of Loraine. Of course, the regency fell into the hands of Catherine de Medici, during the minority of her sons, who, according to Capefigue, possessed great moderation, and endeavoured to govern by well balancing parties against each other. We should rather say that Catherine must have had sufficient cunning to carry out the old adage that "to divide was to govern."

In concluding our lengthened remarks on this period of history, we may observe that M. Capefigue shows both learning and research in his little work. Its chief defect, however, lies in the paucity of detail as to the private actions and motives of Diane de Poitiers. It is too confused and too complicated in its arrangement; and embraces a period of history which requires as many volumes as Capefigue has pages. It is, however, a well-written, amusing summary of the times, the monarchs, the persons of distinction, and the favourites who for more than half a century held a prominent position in the history of Europe.

AGNES SOREL.

AGNES SOREL.*

If we are apt to look upon the sixteenth century as one of the most important and interesting periods of history, when literature, art, and science began to revive; when a new faith was propagated, new lands discovered, and solid forms of government established, after the ignorance and turmoil of the middle ages; we should also remember that such events were only brought about after the long struggles and trials of two previous centuries. Otherwise, we are scarcely able to understand how the papacy and the clergy generally throughout Europe, after attaining to vast power, gradually declined, and in many countries lost all influence—how the extensive monarchies of the sixteenth century took the place of the domains and fiefs possessed by the great feudal barons; and how it was that, instead of the precarious service of vassals and retainers, monarchs formed and disciplined large armies. In this intermediate period of history, we shall find that the sovereign power was much curtailed by the nobles, that the internal peace of various European dominions was continually disturbed by family broils, and that the powerful rulers were forced to employ such levies as captains of adventurers or condottieri could bring to their standard. The destitute condition of these condottieri made them dependent on their employers, as their whole fortune lay in their sword, their achievements on the field of battle, and the plunder they acquired from their enemies. Thus they became far more serviceable troops than feudal levies, and could be depended upon at all times. Another cause of the decay of the baronial power was the oppression of the people, who, on most occasions, sided with the sovereign against their lords. Although the people thus gained many privileges, they were not sufficiently strong to retain the liberties they had acquired; and it was owing to this state of things that the vast and absolute monarchies of the sixteenth century were formed.

---

* Agnes Sorel et la Chevalerie. Par M. Capefigue. Paris, 1846. Amyot, Rue de la Paix.

Eloge d'Agnes Sorel, surnommé la belle Agnes. Par T. H. Riboud. Lyons, 1785.

Notice sur Agnes Sorel, &c. &c. Par Quintin Craufurd. Paris, 1819.

Essai Critique sur l'Histoire de Charles VII, d'Agnes Sorel, et Jeanne D'Arc, Par Joseph Delort. Paris, 1824.

Histoire d'Agnes Sorel et de Madame de Chateauroux. Par J. N. Quatremère de Roissy.

The decrease of the Papal authority during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was partly owing to the abortive efforts of Boniface the Eighth to obtain temporal as well as spiritual control over the dominions of Philip IV of France, a policy which ended in his own captivity and death, and which occasioned the subsequent removal of the chair of St. Peter from Rome to Avignon. Here it remained for seventy years, during the greater part of which period the schism in the church, and the quarrels between the two Popes, greatly diminished the respect in which the papacy and the clergy had hitherto been held. Added to such a state of things, a spirit of enquiry was growing up consequent on the advance of literature and knowledge, and the road was thus being gradually prepared for the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

At the period when *Agnes Sorel* lived and flourished, England and France occupied the most prominent positions in Europe. Italy also was important, as the residence of the Pope, and as the country where liberal government was most developed; where the original idea of the European Balance of Power was first adopted in the wars of its various republics; where commerce was carried on with the Levant and the East, through Constantinople and Alexandria; and where the compass was first discovered, and navigation improved. Nevertheless, Italy took but little or no part in the politics of countries beyond the Alps. Germany was too much distracted by the disputes of its electors for the dignity of the Imperial Crown, too much engaged in the Hussite wars in Bohemia, and in the contests against Tartars and Turks, to admit of the German nation or its imperial chief meddling in foreign policy. The Spaniards were occupied in conflicts with the Moors, whom they had driven into their last stronghold of Granada; though they were not yet sufficiently united to form a powerful state, capable of taking a part in general European politics. The Portuguese were, during the whole of this period, partly engaged in asserting their independence, and partly in prosecuting their discoveries along the western coast of Africa. The Scotch could not be said to take much interest in the general policy of Europe, as their chief endeavour, under Robert Bruce, David II, Robert II and III, and James I and II, was to repel invasions, and to make inroads into the north of England. Their only connection with continental states was through France; and a long and close alliance was maintained between the two countries, until Scotland was united, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, to England.

The wars between England and France, from the days of Philip Augustus and Richard Cœur de Lion, down to those of Charles VII and Henry VI, are so well known that it will be unnecessary here to enter into further details. England was making steady progress during all this period, and acquiring those privileges which served as a foundation on which to establish a liberty, which was afterwards acquired in the seventeenth century. The preaching of John Wickliffe, and the opinions of the Lollards, prepared the way for the Reformation, just as the preaching of John Huss and Jerome of Prague cleared Germany and Bohemia of Papal error. It is beyond our subject to notice the doings of the northern powers, as they took scarcely any share in the general affairs of Europe. They were chiefly occupied in wars amongst themselves, in establishing a free constitution, and in prosecuting discoveries in the northern seas. Poland was allied with Germany by having chosen several of the Emperors of that country to be their sovereigns. Muscovy was hardly an European state; whilst the Turks were rapidly progressing in their conquests against the Byzantine Empire.

Mons. Capefigue has furnished us with an excellent résumé of the period, in the work now under consideration, a volume which we earnestly recommend to all lovers of history. After a preliminary notice of the early history of France and England, Mons. Capefigue turns to the consideration of the life and times of *Agnes Sorel*, a sketch which is in every way worthy of perusal, and which forms a valuable addition to his best of Essays on "Les Reines de la main Gauche." He commences his sketch by asserting that, "notwithstanding the arguments of many modern writers, the middle ages were wanting in interest, owing to their remoteness, their general barbarism, and the cruelty of their chief characters." "I was more pleased," says he, "with the study of these ages, when I saw in them a stirring period, in which much that was great and vigorous in the general character of European nations was formed." Thus he came to choose the times of *Agnes Sorel* as being the most interesting of those ages of chivalry, when Charles VII had to fight for the very existence of his kingdom against the English, who were then in actual possession of the whole of the north of France, and when Agnes Sorel was the pleasing figure round which was grouped many grand historical characters.

M Capefigue begins his narrative at the period when Charles VI became acquainted with his wife, Isabella de Baviere, who visited France on a pilgrimage. The King was so struck with her appearance, while performing her devotions at the altar, and so smitten with her charms, that he soon after made her an offer of marriage, and the ceremony was solemnized with great pomp at Amiens, on the 11th of July, 1385. A handsome and intriguing woman, Isabella soon made use of her husband's incapacity to establish her own influence. The manner in which Charles VI first became insane is then fully detailed, and does not differ from the general narrative given of it by other historians. It appears that while on an expedition in Brittany, "échauffé pas une longue route, et pas les rayons d'un soleil brûlant," a curiously dressed man suddenly appeared before the King, who, seizing the reins of his horse, cried out, "Roi, on te trahit!" Such was the impression produced on the monarch, that it threw him into a hopeless state of insanity, which continued throughout the whole of his reign. He now hated as much as he had previously loved his beautiful queen, and indulged in several indiscriminate amours; his chief mistress being the daughter of a horse-dealer, named Odetta. She it was who first thought of diverting the king's mind, by teaching him the new game of cards then just invented. Odetta was seventeen; the King, twenty-five. Isabella at once deserted her husband, and amused herself, at a private house in Paris, with balls, masquerades, and other entertainments, being surrounded by many lovers, the chief of whom was the Duke of Orleans, the king's cousin. The government during this period was in the hands of the Dukes of Burgundy and Berri, the King's uncles, in whom the regency had previously been centred during the minority, and who thus contrived to regain their influence after the insanity of the sovereign was established. The Duke of Burgundy, jealous of the power of the Duke of Orleans, caused that noble to be assassinated on leaving the King's residence. Thus the dispute commenced between the Burgundian and Armagnac, or Orleans party (so called from Marshal Count Armagnac, son-in-law of the Duke of Orleans, who succeeded that leader). This scene is well described by our author, who remarks:—

"Ce jeune prince sortait de l'hôtel de la reine Isabeau, rue Barbette; il etait huit heures du soir, le couvre-feu était sonné, les rues étaient désertes; Monseigneur, frère du Roi, nétait suive que de quelques pages ou varlets. Une troupe de gens armés le precipita sur le duc d'Orleans, qui fût tué à coups de hache et de poignard. Quelques jours après, le duc de Bourgogne vint declarer audaceusement que le coup avait été fait par ses ordres, afin de venger l'honneur du Roi et de soulager le peuples de Paris."

The queen, who should have supported the Armagnacs, changed her opinions for some unaccountable reason, and allied herself with the Duke of Burgundy; whilst her son Charles, who had, since the death of his two elder brothers, become the Dauphin, joined the Armagnac party. He had only reached the age of fourteen, and was, therefore, almost too young to be aware of the part he was playing in these unhappy disputes. The Armagnacs and Burgundians, however, alternately obtained power, and deluged Paris with blood, until a great blow was struck against the latter by the murder of the Duke of Burgundy, on the bridge of Montereau. This was an unfortunate step both for the Dauphin and for the kingdom of France, as it alienated from the young prince the successor of the Duke of Burgundy, and made him a ready ally of the enemies of the country, the English, whenever they should invade it.

One of the most formidable characters now appears on the stage, in the person of Henry V of England, who, landing in Normandy, in the year 1415, gains the celebrated victory of Agincourt, and kills the Duke Alençon, brother to the King, together with a large number of valiant French knights, a circumstance which, as our author remarks, "damaged the prestige of French chivalry." Capefigue now goes back to the fourteenth century, to read a lecture on the Salique law, and the motives which led to the wars of Edward III, whose claims to the French crown descended to Henry V. He tells us that Philippe le Bel had three sons and a daughter; Louis, who succeeded his father, left two daughters, who gave up their rights in favour of Philip V, their uncle, who also arranged that his daughters should relinquish their right in favour of Charles IV, who in his turn, leaving only a daughter, was succeeded by Philip, Count of Valois; the Parliament of Paris having declared that no female or her issue should hereafter occupy the throne of France. Edward III of England, notwithstanding, laid claim to the French crown through his mother, Isabella, daughter of Philip the Fair, and proceeded to assert his claims by force of arms. As is well known, he defeated Philip at Cressy, in 1346, and took Calais at the same period. His son, the Black Prince, afterwards gained a still more brilliant victory over the French at Poitiers, when John II, King of France, was made prisoner, and was forced to sign the ignominious treaty of Bretagny, by which nearly the whole of the south of France was given up to the English, and 400,000 crowns were to be paid as a ransom for the French king. This treaty was never carried into effect; and John, much to his honour, returned to England, where he died, in order that the difficulties concerning his ransom might be settled. Charles, afterwards Charles V of France, surnamed the Wise, was appointed Regent during his father's imprisonment in England. He had great difficulties to contend with, the country being everywhere infested with disbanded soldiers, who lived by plundering the inhabitants; whilst the peasantry everywhere rose against their lords; the King of Navarre caballed with the English, and even for some period acknowledged Edward III as his liege lord. The Regent, however, was soon released from the first of these troubles by Bertrand du Guesclin, who collected the soldiers into what were called *"the companies of adventurers,"* and joined the service of Henry of Aragon. That renowned knight and enemy of England was the theme of all writers of the period, and still holds a most conspicuous position in the annals of chivalry. His name is even now so revered in France, that the sonnets and poems dedicated to his memory, have all been preserved in the Imperial library, and published in two large volumes, in the collection of "Documents Inédits," under the title of *La Vie vaillant Bertran du Guesclin.* The poem by Cuvelier, "Trouvère," of the fourteenth century, published by M. Charrière, is by far the most interesting of these works, as it gives the life and doings of the Marshal, from his birth at the Château de la Motte de Bron, his first exploit at the siege of Rennes, Dinan, and Melun, his succour of Charles of Blois, the battle of D'Aurai, the negotiations with the "grandes compagnies," and the operations in Spain, to the period when he is named "Connétable," his doings at Rochelle, and his illness and death, after the siege of Château-Neuf de Randon.*

A lui n'était chevalier comparable.
De prouesse son vivant, ce dit-on
Ne qui tant fust ni bon ne convenable
Pour gouverner le bon peuple charton,
Or, il est mort Dieu l'y fasse pardon
Qu'il plust à Dieu qu'il vecust encore
Pour defendre du Leopard felon.
MSS. Biblioth Impériale.

A rising of the peasants, or Jacquerie, was put down as soon as Charles V's authority became more vigorous, and the King of Navarre joined the Regent after he had been proclaimed sovereign. Although Charles V wrested from the English many of their conquests, he was never able completely to drive them out of France; and the Duke of Gloucester, uncle to Richard II of England, made a successful inroad into France, from Calais. No permanent acquisitions were, however, obtained; and Richard II and Henry IV were too much occupied with the troubles of their own dominions. to pay attention to French affairs. It was therefore reserved for Henry V of England, after Agincourt, to complete the conquests that had been made by Edward III. A still more disadvantageous treaty than that of Bretagny was now effected, as Henry was supported by the influence of the wife of Charles VI (Isabella of Bavaria) and the Duke of Burgundy. By this peace Henry became King of France, after the death of the reigning sovereign, and was to marry the youngest daughter of the French monarch, Princess Catherine. The death of Henry, however, taking place a few weeks before that of Charles VI, the rights were conceded to Henry VI of England, who was proclaimed King of France with great solemnity at Paris. The Duke of Bedford was at once appointed Regent in France during the minority, and no better man could have been found to carry on the war in that country. He was the most accomplished Prince of his age, possessed great administrative abilities, and had learnt the art of war in the excellent school of his brother, Henry V. The whole of the north of France, with the exception of a few towns, was in the hands of the English. Charles VII held his court at Bourges, but, although supported by the south of France, could hardly be called a King; as he alone depended upon his sword and the small force he could gather around him to support his tottering position. M. Capefigue gives us a better account of the sources from which Charles VII's troops were drawn than any modern historian. They were composed of the French companies of adventurers, the descendants of those bands which Du Guesclin had led into Aragon; of Lombard levies, under Ludovico Sforza; of Bretons now allied to the French King, who had always most cordially hated the Anglo-Norman nobles, since the days of Philip Augustus, and the cruel murder of their young Duke Arthur by John of England; and by the brave Scotch Archers of the Guard, led by a member of the powerful house of Douglas. These troops, though gallant and formidable, were no match for the English barons, commanded by such generals as the Earls of Suffolk, Salisbury, Harwich, Talbot, and a host of other brave leaders. In this critical state of affairs, the indolent though able Charles VII was roused to fresh efforts by the chivalry and devotion of certain illustrious females, amongst whom *Agnes Sorel*, or *Soreau*, held the most prominent position.

---

* Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin, par Cuvelier, Trouvère du XIV Siècle, publié, pour la première fois, par E. Charrière, tome ii. Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France, publié par ordre du Roi, et par les soins du Ministre de l'Instruction Publique. Premier Serie, Histoire Politique.

Histoire de Bertrand du Guesclin, Connétable de France et de Castile; par N. de Freminville, Paris, 1841.

Anciens Mémoirs du XIV Siècle, depuis peu découverts, on l'on apprend des aventures les plus surprenantes et les circonstances les plus curieuses de la vie de B. du Guesclin; par Jacques Lefèbvre. Douai, 1692.

She was the daughter of Jean Soreau, Seigneur de Codun, Écuyer du Comte de Clermont, a Knight of Champagne, and of surpassing beauty and accomplishments. She was early appointed one of the Dames d'Honneur to the Queen, in that capacity became known to Charles VII, and quickly acquired a strong influence over him. At the period of her arrival at the French court, she was, according to Capefigue, only seventeen years of age. This must be an error, as he previously states that she was born in 1409 at Fromenteau in Touraine. Thus she must have appeared at Charles's court either in 1422 or 1423, which would only make her fourteen or fifteen years of age. Be that as it may, she appears to have played quite as important a part in the history of his reign as any man or woman of the period, and she exercised more power over Charles VII than even the Queen herself. "Les traits d'Agnes nous ont été aussi tres-imparfaitement conservés, on peut juger néanmoins qu'elle avait le front haut et pur (elle était alors appelle la demoiselle de Fromeneau) les yeux vifs et bleux surmontés de longs cils et de laugoureuses paupières ; le nez d'une grande perfection ; la bouche mignonne, le cou, les epaules le sein d'une forme et d'une blancheur incomparable,

'Agnès, la belle Agnès deviendra le surnom,
Tant que de la beauté, beauté sera le nom.'

Et avec cette beauté, le plus gentil esprit du monde, et sa parole était si au-dessus de celle des autres femmes qu'elle était regardée comme un prodige."

We have a touching picture of the poverty of Charles's court during his residence at Bourges. His repasts were of the simplest kind, he and his followers being often obliged to content themselves with a dish of ill-fed and ill-cooked mutton, or some other common food. Our author likewise gives us a dissertation on the bravery of Dunois, Lahire, Xaintrailles, Tannegui, and the other chiefs of the company of adventurers who assisted Charles VII.

It was during Charles the Seventh's reign that the French were rendered famous by the visitation of a supposed heavenly messenger, in the person of Jeanne d'Arc, who appeared at Chinon, on the 24th of February, 1429. "Tout-a-coup se repandit le bruit qu'une jeune fille venait d'arriver à Chinon, pour parler au roi Charles VII ; elle avait eu, disait-on, des revelations divines ; elle annonçait qu'elle etait destinée a faire lever par les Anglais le siège d'Orléans, puis conduire le gentil roi a l'église de Saint Rémi de Rheims."* She would never have been able to achieve great exploits but for the ignorance and superstition of the times; there being little doubt that the French mainly owed their subsequent successes to the credulous feeling of their troops, whilst the English, after one or two defeats, considered their cause as an unlucky one, in which no skill or bravery on the part of leaders or men could avail. The account given by Mons. Capefigue of this celebrated woman does not materially differ from that of other historians. He tells of her low origin—how she gained great skill in horsemanship at a roadside *cabaret*, at which her father worked, and how she early possessed a dreamy idea "that she was appointed by Heaven to deliver the King of France from his English enemies, to raise the siege of Orleans, and finally to conduct the monarch to Rheims, there to behold his coronation by the Archbishop." All these achievements were no sooner accomplished, than her good fortune failed her; and though she displayed her usual bravery, she was denied the enthusiasm of her countrymen, and, as is well known, was at length made prisoner by the English commanders, tried by court-martial, and condemned to be burnt as a witch. This our author seems to consider a sentence that would not have been passed by any but English judges, "that it was one particularly suited to the dark and superstitious views of an Anglo-Saxon mind."

---

* Histoire de la Pucelle de Vaucouleurs ; par Mons. de Laverdi. Paris.

Monsieur Capefigue now makes good his promise of giving us some new historical information. In fact, we have nowhere previously seen so detailed an account of the mode in which the English government in France was carried on during the regency of Henry V (in the lifetime of his father-in-law, Charles VI), and afterwards during that of the Duke of Bedford. Our own writers assert that the English made great conquests in France, until they reached Orleans, and most of them agree that the Duke of Bedford was an accomplished and popular leader; but here their narrative stops short. Neither Hume nor Hallam have informed us how Bedford governed the country he had subdued, and only tell us that his authority was undermined as soon as the Duke of Burgundy and Charles VII were reconciled. M. Capefigue has, however, through the medium of authentic documents, given a good idea of the government of the English at Paris. From him we learn that our countrymen were even popular amongst the citizens of that capital, who preferred them to their own overbearing barons—that both Henry and the Duke of Bedford introduced similar municipal privileges to those of England; and we are given proof that, had the Duke of Bedford lived longer, and extended his French conquests, he would have bestowed permanent liberties on France. These documents also furnish the details of the accession of Henry VI, which was carried out with due legal form, all honour being paid to the remains of his grandfather, Charles VI, whose ashes were buried in the church of the Abbey St.

Denis, together with those of his ancestors. How Henry VI made a journey to France by way of Havre—how he went to Rouen where he was met by a deputation of the Parliament of Paris, and accompanied by them to the capital—how he was crowned in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, and how this event was accompanied by all sorts of rejoicings, are fully detailed in the work before us. We thus for the first time learn from the pen of a Frenchman that the Parisian citizens would have been well satisfied with an English Prince, had not their pride been hurt by the preference shown to the Anglo-Norman barons, by the speedy return of the King to Rouen, and by his subsequent entry into his own dominions. If we are to believe Capefigue, the English Parliament seems to have been reluctant to grant the necessary supplies for this journey, doubtless fearing that the King might be induced to prolong his stay in France, and make Paris his capital.

But we must return to Agnes Sorel, whose vast influence over Charles VII became more firmly established each day of that monarch's reign. She early set to work, together with the Queen, to bring about a reconciliation between the monarch and his barons, and more particularly sought to attach the Duke of Burgundy to the royal cause; for as long as that Prince remained an ally of the English, he was one of the most formidable foes that Charles had to contend against. Many of the King's councillors considered a reconciliation as impossible; and most of the Armagnac party were strongly adverse to it. It was, however, at length effected by the talent and diplomatic skill of Agnes Sorel, and her friend the Duchess de Lorraine and de Bar, a princess of Sicily, who exercised considerable power over the vassals in Anjou, Bretagne, and Bourgogne.

The star of Charles VII was now in the ascendant: he was surrounded by a most brilliant court, and only lacked money to defray his increasing expenses. The Jews were then, as they still are in the East, the chief merchants and money-holders; and whenever a sovereign or great lord required bullion, he obtained it by persecuting and robbing this unfortunate race. These Israelites found it so difficult to carry their wealth about their persons, that they invented *notes*, as a more convenient means of exchange. During the thirteenth century, the Lombards participated with the Jews in carrying on European commerce and monetary exchanges, though it must be understood that the term Lombard implied an inhabitant of a much larger space than that recently known in Europe as Lombardy. Besides Venice and Genoa, and other towns of the north of Italy, it comprised Florence, Pisa, and some of the Italian republics. The Lombards, like the Jews, had obtained wealth during the Crusades, in supplying shipping and provisions to the soldiers of the cross who had embarked in those desperate enterprises, whilst the capture of Constantinople, at the end of the thirteenth century, by the Latins, and its submission for seventy years to their dominion, opened for Venice and the other towns of Italy a still more extended field of commerce with the East, and brought about the restoration of the Greek authority, through the Genoese.

There lived, in the days of Charles VII, an enterprising Jewish merchant, born of French parents, and named Jacques Cœur, who desired to open the trade of the East direct with Marseilles, and seems to have accomplished his difficult undertaking. He visited Constantinople; and on his return, introduced a coinage for the first time into France, and established a fixed price for gold currency. Some of his coins then manufactured are still preserved, and although poor specimens, they still give an excellent idea of what such early attempts were like. He also introduced into Europe the art of cutting and setting diamonds, and the manufacture of linen; and it appears that the first articles of jewellery, and the first spun cloth was worn by Agnes Sorel, who likewise induced Jacques Cœur to advance money to the King for the expenses of his court and army.

We have a host of letters from the pen of Agnes, from which our author attempts to show the extent of the influence she really exercised; and establishes, beyond doubt, that much of the wise policy of Charles was mainly owing to her.

The causes which occasioned the decay of the English power in France are treated by our author with an extraordinary degree of impartiality. He has calmly described the true reasons, without giving any of that high colouring so peculiar to French historians; whilst he highly praises the sagacity of the Duke of Bedford, whose authority was too much hampered by the interference of the English Parliament. Had the Duke been allowed to follow the bent of his own judgment, he would have known not only how to govern that part of the French nation which he had already subjected, but he would also have gradually extended the British dominion over the greater part, if not the whole, of France. The municipal privileges granted to the Parisians, and at first appreciated by them, were not quite in accordance with their ideas. If such changes had been more gradual, they would probably have been more acceptable. The commerce which had flourished during the earlier part of the Duke of Bedford's regency, had been destroyed, and the Parisians were suffering all the horrors of famine, whilst the behaviour of the Anglo-Norman barons was more haughty than the French could well submit to. The conduct of the English towards the vicious, but unfortunate Queen Isabella, who had at one time greatly assisted them, but now lived neglected and unnoticed in the Rue Barbotte, thoroughly impoverished by the expenditure she had made in their behalf, so aroused the French, that they seem to have felt this cruelty and want of attention more than their own sufferings. To all these misfortunes of the English, may be added the death of the Regent. His prudence and vigour had made him beloved by many of his French subjects, and even esteemed by those with whom he was unpopular. His loss was an irreparable one to the English King and government, as no other British noble could be found who possessed sufficient control over his national prejudices to rule the French people with any degree of success. The downfall of the English power was still further hastened by the coolness which at this time subsisted between the Duke of Burgundy and their chief leaders, and, facilitating the overtures made to that prince by Charles VII and his mistress Agnes Sorel, thus brought about a meeting at Arras, where severe conditions were demanded and accepted, and friendship thoroughly restored.

The Duke of Bedford is said by some historians to have died of grief, when he heard of the successful termination of these negotiations between Charles VII and his influential vassal. Our author seems to think, however, that this is a chronological error, and that the Duke of Bedford died a short time previous to this reconciliation. The young King of England, Henry VI, seems to have been deeply grieved at these events, and to have wept; exclaiming, "that the disaffection of the Duke of Burgundy would occasion the loss of all his French possessions." Such was the truth, as the English power from that time quickly decayed, although we retained for some considerable period the whole of Normandy, Paris, and parts of the territory which had been conceded to the Duke of Burgundy. The English courageously contended for these provinces, though they quickly lost all the popularity they had formerly possessed. The public buildings and markets in various towns still in their possession were allowed to fall into ruin; and though the Duke of York was appointed to succeed the Duke of Bedford in the regency, and, together with Lord Willoughby and Lord Talbot, manfully defended what little remained of the English possessions in France, Charles VII was enabled, in 1437, once more to re-enter his capital in triumph, accompanied by Agnes Sorel. Notwithstanding the great beauty of her person, her splendid attire, and her valuable and well-known services, she had raised up a host of enemies, amongst whom the Bishop of Saint Eustache was the most powerful. As he had given her the soubriquet of "La Nouvelle Herodias," she roused the jealousy of the people about the Court, and caused the Parisians to look upon her only as a mistress of the King. It is said that Agnes was so enraged at this that she exclaimed, "If Parisian citizens cannot be persuaded to show me more respect, I will not again put my foot within their capital." Charles VII, although he looked upon Paris as his chief city, preferred Bourges or Orleans as a residence; and it was at the latter of these places that he assembled the States General, in order to confirm his authority, and to deliberate upon the best measures to be taken against the English.

The King continued still to love and admire Agnes Sorel, and he endowed her with the Chateau of Beauté, in the Valley of the Marne, from which circumstance she was afterwards called "La Dame de Beauté." Here she resided, and gave balls, masquerades, and every sort of entertainment, and here she patronized all that was chivalrous and noble, and became, as it were, a very goddess of chivalry. She encouraged that order, which had for some time fallen into decay; she revived knight-errantry, made it useful, and brought about in France a love for valour and for deeds of daring.

After some well-timed remarks on the chivalrous feeling displayed by several knight-errants of the period, to the widow, orphan, and generally distressed, Mons. Capefigue closes a very interesting chapter on "La Chevalerie au quinzième Siècle," and turns to the consideration of the doings of the Dauphin, afterwards Louis XI. He assures us that his character has been grossly mistaken by all historians, when they affirm "that Louis was desirous of raising the lower orders on the ruin of the nobles," "that those who have a thorough knowledge of the early days of the Dauphin's life, must admit that, although he was a suspicious and rather crafty Prince, he yet distinguished himself in several encounters against the English." Affianced in early life to the Princess Margaret of Scotland, a woman of melancholy mind, and fond of the old poets and romancers, this lady is said to have aroused the jealousy of her husband by too great a familiarity with one of the minstrels, Alain Chartier, who was in frequent attendance at Charles's court. The Dauphin never overcame this jealousy and hatred, whilst Agnes Sorel sympathised with Margaret. Thus a violent quarrel arose between the King's mistress and the Dauphin, which terminated in a separation from his father, and the establishment of his own camp and court. He appears to have selected the well-known Tristram as his chief confidant, who, though a cruel man, was nevertheless a captain of some renown, a good executioner, and no mean head of police. After Louis became sovereign, Tristram shone as his aide-de-camp; together with his trusty comrade, Trois Echelles. According to our author, their cruelties were remembered throughout the country for nearly two centuries after their death.

Paris must have been a fine city at this period, if we are to judge of the works undertaken by Charles VII and Agnes Sorel. Charles inhabited the old palace of Tournelles. He resided there in order to comply with the prejudices of his subjects, rather than because his own taste induced him to do so. His leisure was, however, spent with Agnes Sorel at the Manoir de Beauté, the beloved retreat.

M. Capefigue next turns to the contemplation of the splendour and dignity of the Duke of Burgundy's court, which combined the pageantry and old usages of the great federal vassals of the middle ages with the magnificence of a more modern prince. Other authors, as well as M. Capefigue, consider this court to have been the most remarkable in Europe, at that period, for the wealth by which it was surrounded, and for the old customs which it still preserved. It retained amongst its attendants the old ballad singers, poets, and court fools, and held its tournaments and its martial exercises. The Duke of Burgundy possessed, besides the large concessions made to him at the treaty of Arras, the whole of the Low Countries, the richest and the most manufacturing and commercial state in the north of Europe.

The details of the famous singers and poets of the period are most interesting, and the manner in which Réné of Anjou, Count of Provence, figured in the front rank amongst them is well told. Like the Duke of Orleans, Réné was a prisoner during the greater part of his life, in the hands of the Duke of Burgundy. He possessed a melancholy, highly-wrought, poetical imagination, and indulged in romantic extravagances. Owing to his being titular King of Sicily, he was known as "le bon Roi Réné." He is said to have performed several times in presence of Charles VII and Agnes Sorel after he regained his freedom; though by others he is declared to be a poetic myth.

From this time Agnes Sorel delined in favour, and, through the machinations of the Dauphin, was exiled from the Court. Retiring to her chateau at Loches, she was seized with an illness which terminated her existence on the 11th of February, 1449. Some say that her death was accelerated by poison; but it is more probable that she died from grief and neglect. She was buried at the church of Loches; and a tomb erected at the expense of her faithful follower, Jàques Cœur. Thus ended the once great and mighty favorite, who had done more to liberate France than even Joan of Arc. She is, however, forgotten; whilst her more humble contemporary is remembered. That Agnes did more towards liberating France by the energy which she instilled into Charles VII, and that she assisted him by her talents and advice in repelling the English, is beyond doubt; that she accomplished more than Joan of Arc could have done by her valour and enterprise is a matter of history.

The excuses put forward for her liaison with her royal lover are unnecessary, her amours with the King being in some measure atoned for by the great services she rendered to her country.

Reluctantly, we now stop short at the death-bed of Henry VII, who seems to have experienced the same fate as the one he had so cruelly brought upon Agnes. He died alone and unregretted. No funeral pomp accompanied his remains, and Dunois was the only friend who followed him to the tomb.

With the reign of Louis XI we have nothing to do. All was fresh and bright whilst the old king and his mistress lay rotting in their graves. Still, as time wore on, the memory of La Dame de Beauté dawned on the minds of men who loved the muses and sorrowed at the decline of chivalry.

Froissart, Monstrelet, and Jean Chartier, wrote and sang of her goodness and chivalrous doings.

Gentille Agnès! plus d'honneur tu merite,
La cause étant de France recouvrer,
Que ce que peut dedans du cloitre ouvrer,
Close nonain ou bien-dévot hermite.

At a later period, Chatelain drew her portrait in verse; and even Voltaire rendered her immortal, in his poem "La Pucelle d'Orléans." Thus he paints our heroine:

Le bon roi Charle, au printemps de ses jours
En temps de Pâques en la cité de Tours
A certain bal (le prince amait la danse)
Avait trouvé (pour le bein de la France)
Une beautée nommée Agnes Sorel:
Jamais l'amour ne forma rien de tel.
Imaginez de Flore la jeunesse,
La taille et l'air de la nymphe des bois
Et de Vénus la grâce enchanteresse
Et de l'Amour le séduisant minois.
L'art d'Arachné, le doux chant des syrènes,
Elle avait tout; elle aurait dans ses chaines
Mis les héros, les sages et les rois.

Telle plutòt cette heureuse grisette
Que la nature ainsi que l'art forma,
Qu'une maman avisée et discrète
Au noble lit d'un fermier éleva.
Sa douce allure est un vrai port de reine,
Ses yeux fripons s'arment de majesté,
Sa voix a pris le ton de souveraine
Et sur son rang son esprit s'est monté.

Il faut partir, Agnès l'ordonne,
Adieu repos, plaisir, adieu;
J'aurai pour venger ma couronne
Mes lauriers, l'amour et mon Dieu.
Français, que le nom de ma belle,
Dans leurs rangs porte la terreur;
J'oubliais la gloire auprès d'elle,
Agnès me rend tout à l'honneur.

FINIS.

LONDON: PRINTED BY J. MALLETT, 59, WARDOUR STREET, SOHO.

70

Berkeley
LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

YC 29501