

P9

3075

1901a

v. 21

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



THIS BOOK IS ONE OF A
COLLECTION MADE BY
BENNO LOEWY

1854-1919

AND BEQUEATHED TO
CORNELL UNIVERSITY



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924024798179>

FERNEY EDITION of the WORKS OF

VOLTAIRE

Limited to one hundred and ninety copies

No. 18



Murcell. sc.

L. Fournier. sc.

FERNEY EDITION

THE WORKS OF

VOLTAIRE

A CONTEMPORARY VERSION

WITH NOTES, BY TOBIAS SMOLLETT, REVISED AND MODERNIZED
NEW TRANSLATIONS BY WILLIAM F. FLEMING, AND AN
INTRODUCTION BY OLIVER H. G. LEIGH

A CRITIQUE AND BIOGRAPHY

BY

THE RT. HON. JOHN MORLEY

FORTY-TWO VOLUMES

TWO HUNDRED DESIGNS, COMPRISING REPRODUCTIONS OF RARE OLD
ENGRAVINGS, STEEL PLATES, PHOTOGRAVURES,
AND CURIOUS FAC-SIMILES

VOLUME XXI

E. R. DUMONT

PARIS : LONDON : NEW YORK : CHICAGO

PQ
2075
1901a
v. 21

A7 21174

COPYRIGHT 1901
By E. R. DuMONT

VOLTAIRE

HISTORY OF CHARLES XII.

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
VIII. DEATH OF CHARLES XII. . . .	5
ADDENDA:	
LETTER TO MARSHAL SCHULENBURG . . .	53
LETTER TO CHAPLAIN NORBERG . . .	59
RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL MOVEMENTS:	
THE COUNCIL OF TRENT	67
ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS IN FRANCE . . .	90
CALVINISM	107
JANSENISM	141
QUIETISM	179
THE JEWS	193
REMARKS ON PASCAL'S THOUGHTS . . .	212
ON PRINTED LIES	265

ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
“WHAT! MARRIED? WELL, THEN, LET US BE GONE.” See Vol. XVIII, <i>Nanine</i> , iii <i>Frontispiece</i>	
CHARLES XII. OF SWEDEN	46
EMPEROR CHARLES V.	68
FRANCIS I. OF FRANCE	80
JOHN CALVIN	106
PASCAL	212

HISTORY
OF
CHARLES THE TWELFTH.

A DISCOURSE ON THE HISTORY OF CHARLES XII.
(*Prefixed to the First Edition.*)

VOLUME II.

CHAPTER VIII.

Charles gives his sister in marriage to the Prince of Hesse: is besieged in Stralsund, and escapes to Sweden. Schemes of Baron de Gortz, his prime minister. Plan of a reconciliation with the czar, and of a descent upon England. Charles besieges Frederikshall, in Norway; is killed; his character. Gortz is beheaded.

IN THE midst of these preparations, the king gave his only surviving sister, Ulrica Eleonora, in marriage to Frederick, Prince of Hesse-Cassel. The queen dowager, grandmother of Charles XII. and of the princess, then in the eightieth year of her age, did the honors of the table at this solemnity, which was celebrated on the 4th of April, 1715, in the palace of Stockholm, where she died soon after.

The marriage was not honored with the presence of the king, who was then employed in finishing

the fortifications of Stralsund, a place of great importance, and threatened with a siege by the Kings of Prussia and Denmark. Nevertheless he made his brother-in-law generalissimo of all his forces in Sweden. This prince had served the States-General in their wars with the French, and was esteemed a good general; a qualification which contributed not a little to procure him the sister of Charles XII. in marriage.

Charles's misfortunes now came as thick upon him as his victories had formerly done. In the month of June, 1715, the German troops of the King of England, with those of Denmark, invested the strong town of Wismar, while the combined army of the Danes and Saxons, amounting to thirty-six thousand men, marched towards Stralsund, to form the siege of that place. The Kings of Prussia and Denmark sunk five Swedish ships a little off Stralsund. The czar was then in the Baltic, with twenty large ships of war, and a hundred and fifty transports, on board of which were thirty thousand men. He threatened a descent upon Sweden, at one time approaching the coast of Helsingborg, and at another appearing before Stockholm. All Sweden was in arms upon the coasts, and every moment expected an invasion. At the same time the czar's land forces drove the Swedes from post to post, until they had dispossessed them of all the places they held in Finland, towards the Gulf of Bothnia. But Peter pushed his conquests no farther.

At the mouth of the Oder, a river that divides Pomerania in two, and after washing the walls of

Stettin falls into the Baltic, lies the little isle of Usedom, a place of great importance on account of its situation, commanding the Oder both on the right and left; so that whoever is master of the island is likewise master of the navigation of the river. The King of Prussia had dislodged the Swedes from this place, and taken possession of it as well as of Stettin, which he kept sequestered, and all, as he pretended, "For the sake of peace." The Swedes had retaken Usedom in May, 1715. They had two forts in the island; one of which was the fort of Suine, upon a branch of the Oder, that bore the same name; the other, a place of greater consequence, was called Pennamonder, and situated upon another branch of that river. To defend these two forts, and indeed the whole island, there were only two hundred and fifty Pomeranians, under the command of an old Swedish officer, called Kuze-Slerp, a man whose name deserves to be immortalized.

On the 4th of August, the King of Prussia sent fifteen hundred foot and eight hundred dragoons to make a descent upon the island. They came and landed without opposition near the fort of Suine, which, being the less important of the two, the Swedish commander abandoned to the enemy; and as he could not safely divide his men, he retired with his little company to the castle of Pennamonder, determined to hold out to the last extremity.

There was, therefore, a necessity of besieging it in form; for which purpose a train of artillery was embarked at Stettin, and the Prussian troops were

reinforced with a thousand foot and four hundred horse. On the eighteenth the trenches were opened in two places, and the fort was briskly battered with cannon and mortars. During the siege, a Swedish soldier, who was sent privately with a letter from Charles XII. found means to land on the island, and to slip into the fort. The letter he delivered to the commander. The purport was as follows: "Do not fire till the enemy come to the brink of the fosse. Defend the place to the last extremity. I commend you to your good fortune. Charles."

Slerp having read the note, resolved to obey, and to lay down his life, as he was ordered, in the service of his master. On the twenty-second at day-break the assault was made. The besieged having withheld their fire till they saw the enemy on the brink of the fosse, killed an immense number of them. But the ditch was full, the breach large, and the assailants too numerous; so that they entered the castle at two different places at once. The commander now thought of nothing but of selling his life dear, and obeying his master's orders. He abandoned the breaches through which the enemy entered; intrenched his little company, who had all the courage and fidelity to follow him, behind a bastion, and posted them in such a manner that they could not be surrounded. The enemy came up to him, and were greatly surprised that he did not ask for quarter. He fought for a complete hour; and after having lost the half of his men, was at last killed himself, together with his lieutenant and major. Upon this, the surviving few, amounting to a hundred soldiers and one officer, begged their

lives, and were made prisoners of war. Charles's letter was found in the commander's pocket, and carried to the King of Prussia.

At the time that Charles lost Usedom, and the neighboring isles, which were quickly taken, while Wismar was ready to surrender, and Sweden destitute of a fleet, was daily threatened with an invasion, he himself was in Stralsund, besieged by an army of thirty-six thousand men.

Stralsund, a town famous over all Europe for the siege which the King of Sweden sustained there, is the strongest place in Pomerania; and is situated between the Baltic and the lake of Franken, near the straits of Gella. It is inaccessible by land, except by a narrow causeway, defended by a citadel, and by fortifications which were thought to be impregnable. There was in it a garrison of about nine thousand men, and, what was more than all, the King of Sweden himself. The Kings of Prussia and Denmark undertook the siege of this place, with an army of six and thirty thousand men, composed of Prussians, Danes, and Saxons.

The honor of besieging Charles XII. was so powerful a motive, that they soon surmounted every obstacle, and opened the trenches in the night between the nineteenth and twentieth of October, 1715. The King of Sweden declared, at the beginning of the siege, that for his own part, he could not comprehend how a place well fortified, and provided with a sufficient garrison could possibly be taken. Not but that in the course of his past victories he had taken several places himself, but hardly ever by a regular siege. The terror of

his arms carried all before it. Besides, he never judged of other people by himself; but always entertained too low an opinion of his enemies. The besiegers carried on their works with surprising vigor and resolution, and were greatly assisted by a very singular accident.

It is well known that the Baltic Sea neither ebbs nor flows. The fortifications which covered the town, and which were defended on the west by an impassable morass, and by the sea on the east, seemed to be secure from any assault. It had hitherto escaped the observation of every one, that when the west wind blows strong, the waves of the Baltic are driven back in such a manner as to leave but three feet depth of water under the fortifications, which had always been supposed to be washed by a branch of the sea, so deep as to be utterly impassable. A soldier having fallen from the top of the fortifications into the sea, was surprised to find a bottom; and thinking that this discovery might make his fortune, he deserted, and went to the quarters of Count Wackerbarth, the Saxon general, to inform him that the sea was fordable, and that he might easily penetrate to the Swedish fortifications. It was not long before the King of Prussia availed himself of this piece of intelligence.

Next night about twelve o'clock, the west wind still continuing to blow, Lieutenant-Colonel Kopen entered the water, with eighteen hundred men. At the same time two thousand advanced upon the causeway that led to the fort; all the Prussian artil-

lery fired, and the Danes and Prussians gave an alarm on the other side.

The Swedes thought they could easily repulse the two thousand men whom they saw advancing with so much apparent rashness upon the causeway; but all of a sudden, Koppen, with his eighteen hundred men entered the fort on the side towards the sea. The Swedes, surrounded and surprised, could make no resistance; and the post was carried after a terrible slaughter. Some of the Swedes fled to the town; the besiegers pursued them thither, and entered pell-mell along with the fugitives. Two officers and four Saxon soldiers were already on the drawbridge, which the Swedes had just time to raise; so that the men were taken, and the town saved for that time.

There were found in the fort twenty-four pieces of cannon, which were immediately turned against Stralsund. The siege was pushed with such vigor and resolution as this success could not fail to inspire. The town was cannonaded and bombarded without intermission.

Opposite to Stralsund, in the Baltic Sea, lies the isle of Rügen, which serves as a bulwark to that place, and into which the garrison and citizens might have retired, could they have found boats to transport them thither. This island was of the greatest importance to Charles. He plainly perceived, that should it fall into the hands of the enemy, he would be immediately besieged both by sea and land, and perhaps reduced to such great extremities, that he must either bury himself in the ruins of Stralsund, or else become a prisoner to those very enemies

whom he had so long despised, and upon whom he had imposed the most severe and rigorous terms. But notwithstanding these gloomy prospects, such was the wretched situation of his affairs, that he had not been able to place a sufficient garrison in Rügen, where, in fact, there were no more than two thousand men.

His enemies had been employed for three months past in making all the necessary preparations for a descent upon this island; and having at last finished a great number of boats, the Prince of Anhalt, favored by the goodness of the weather, landed twelve thousand men upon Rügen, on the fifteenth of November. The king, who seemed to be everywhere present, was then in the island, having lately joined his two thousand men, who were intrenched near a small harbor, three leagues from the place where the enemy had landed. He put himself at the head of this little troop, and observing the most profound silence, advanced at midnight towards the foe. The Prince of Anhalt had already intrenched his forces, a precaution which seemed altogether unnecessary. The inferior officers never dreamed of being attacked the very first night, as they imagined Charles to be at Stralsund; but the Prince of Anhalt, who well knew what incredible things Charles was capable of attempting, had caused a deep fosse to be sunk, fenced with chevaux-de-frise; and indeed took all his measures with as much circumspection, as if he had had a superior army to contend with.

At two in the morning, Charles reached the enemy's camp, without making the least noise. His

soldiers said to each other, "Come let us pull up the chevaux-de-frise." These words being overheard by the sentinels, the alarm was instantly given in the camp, and the enemy stood to their arms. The king, taking up the chevaux-de-frise, perceived a deep ditch before him. "Ah!" says he, "is it possible? this is more than I expected." However this unexpected event did not disconcert him. He was alike ignorant of the number of the enemy, and they of his. The darkness of the night seemed to favor the boldness of the attempt. He formed his resolution in a moment, and jumped into the ditch, accompanied by the bravest of his men, and instantly followed by all the rest. The chevaux-de-frise, which were presently plucked up, the levelled earth, the trunks and branches of such trees as they could find, and the bodies of the soldiers that were killed by random shots, served for fascines. The king, the generals, and the bravest of the officers and soldiers, mounted upon the shoulders of others, as in an assault. The fight began in the enemy's camp. The irresistible impetuosity of the Swedes soon threw the Danes and Prussians into confusion; but the numbers were too unequally matched. After a sharp contest for a quarter of an hour, the Swedes were repulsed, and obliged to re-pass the fosse. The Prince of Anhalt pursued them into the plain, little thinking it was Charles XII. that fled before him. The unhappy monarch rallied his troops in the open field, and the battle was renewed with equal fury on both sides. Grothusen, the king's favorite, and General Dardoff, fell dead at his feet. In the heat of the fight Charles passed

over the body of the latter, who was still breathing; and Düring, who had accompanied him on his journey from Turkey to Stralsund, was killed before his eyes.

In the midst of the fray, a Danish lieutenant, whose name I have not been able to learn, recognized the king; and seizing his sword with one hand, and with the other dragging him by the hair, "Surrender yourself," says he, "or you are a dead man." The king drew a pistol from his belt, and, with his left hand, fired it at the officer who died of the wound the next morning. The name of King Charles, which the Dane had pronounced, immediately drew a crowd of the enemy together. The king was surrounded, and received a musket-ball below his left breast. The wound, which he called a contusion, was two fingers deep. Charles was on foot, and in the most imminent danger of either being killed or taken prisoner. At that critical moment Count Poniatowski fought near his majesty's person. He had saved his life at Poltava, and had now the good fortune to save it once more in the battle of Rügen, by putting him on his horse.

The Swedes retired to a part of the island called Altefähr, where there was a fort, of which they were still masters. From thence the king passed over to Stralsund, obliged to abandon his brave troops, who had so courageously assisted him in this daring enterprise, and who, two days after, were all made prisoners of war.

Among the prisoners was that unhappy French regiment, composed of the shattered remains of the battle of Höchstädt, which had entered into the

service of Augustus, and afterwards into that of the King of Sweden. Most of the soldiers were now incorporated into a new regiment, commanded by the Prince of Anhalt's son, who was their fourth master.

The commander of this wandering regiment in the isle of Rügen was that same Count de Villelongue, who had so nobly exposed his life at Adrianople to serve King Charles XII. He was taken prisoner, with his men, and but poorly rewarded in the sequel for all his services, labors, and sufferings.

After all these prodigies of valor, which tended only to weaken his forces, the king shut up in Stralsund which was every moment in danger of being stormed, behaved in much the same manner as he had done at Bender. Unappalled by so many surrounding dangers, he employed the day in making ditches and intrenchments behind the walls, and by night he sallied out upon the enemy. Meanwhile Stralsund's walls were breached: the bombs fell thick as hail upon the houses, and half the town was reduced to ashes. The citizens were so far from complaining, that filled with the highest veneration for their royal master, whose vigilance, temperance, and courage, they could not sufficiently admire, they had all become soldiers under him. They accompanied him in all his sallies, and served him in place of a second garrison.

One day as the king was dictating some letters to his secretary, that were to be sent to Sweden, a bomb fell on the house, pierced the roof, and burst near the royal apartment. One half of the floor

was shattered to pieces; but the closet in which the king was, being partly surrounded by a thick wall, received no damage; and what was remarkably fortunate, none of the splinters that flew about in the air, came in at the closet door, which happened to be open. The report of the bomb, and the crashing noise it occasioned in the house, which seemed ready to tumble in on them, made the secretary drop his pen. "What is the reason," says the king, with great composure, "that you do not write?" The poor secretary could only bring out with a faltering voice: "The bomb, sir." "Well," replies the king, "and what has the bomb to do with the letter I am dictating? Go on."

There was, at that time, an ambassador of France shut up with Charles in Stralsund. This was one Colbert, Count de Croissy, a lieutenant-general in the French army, brother to the Marquis de Torcy, the famous minister of state, and a relation of the celebrated Colbert, whose name ought never to be forgotten in France. To send a man on an embassy to Charles XII. or into trenches was much the same. The king would talk with Croissy for hours together in places of the greatest danger, while the soldiers were falling on every side of them by the fire of the bombs and cannon; Charles, in all appearance, insensible of the risk he ran, and the ambassador not choosing to give his majesty so much as a hint that there were more proper places to talk of business. The minister exerted his utmost efforts, before the siege commenced, to effect an accommodation between the Kings of Sweden and Prussia; but the demands of the latter were too

high, and the former would make no concessions. So that the Count de Croissy derived no other advantage from his embassy to Charles XII. than the pleasure of being intimately acquainted with that extraordinary man. He frequently lay by his majesty upon the same cloak; and by sharing with him in all his dangers and fatigues, had acquired a right of talking to him with greater freedom. Charles encouraged this boldness in those he loved; and would sometimes say to the Count de Croissy, "*Veni, maledicamus de rege*": "Come now let us make a little free with the character of Charles XII." This account I had from the ambassador himself.

Croissy continued in the town till the thirteenth of November, when having obtained from the enemy a passport for himself and his baggage, he took his leave of the king, who still remained amidst the ruins of Stralsund, with a garrison diminished by one-half, but firmly resolved to stand an assault.

And two days after, an assault was actually made upon the hornwork. Twice did the enemy take it, and twice were they repulsed. In this rencounter the king fought amidst his grenadiers; but at last superior numbers prevailed, and the enemy remained master of the place. Charles continued in the town two days after this, expecting every moment a general assault. On the twenty-first he stayed till midnight upon a little ravelin that was entirely demolished by the bombs and cannon-balls. Next day the principal officers conjured him to quit a place which he could no longer defend. But to retreat had now become as dangerous as to stay. The Baltic was

covered with Russian and Danish ships. There were no vessels in the harbor of Stralsund, but one small bark with sails and oars. The great danger which rendered this retreat so glorious, was the very thing that prompted Charles to attempt it. He embarked at midnight on the twentieth of December, 1715, accompanied by ten persons only. They were obliged to break the ice with which the water of the harbor was covered; a hard and laborious task, which they were forced to continue for several hours before the bark could sail freely. The enemy's admirals had strict orders not to allow Charles to escape from Stralsund; but to take him, dead or alive. Happily for him, they were under the wind and could not come near him. He ran a still greater risk in passing by a place called la Babette, in the isle of Rügen, where the Danes had erected a battery of twelve cannon, from which they fired upon him. The mariners spread every sail and plied every oar in order to get clear of the enemy. But two men were killed at the king's side by one cannon-ball, and the ship's mast was shattered by another. Through all these dangers, however, did the king escape unhurt, and at last came up with two of his own ships that were cruising in the Baltic. Next day Stralsund was surrendered, and the garrison made prisoners of war. Charles landed at Isted in Scania, and forthwith repaired to Karlskrona, in a condition very different from what he was in when about fifteen years before he set sail from that harbor in a ship of a hundred and twenty guns, to give laws to the North.

As he was so near his capital, it was expected

that after such a long absence, he would pay it a visit; but he was determined not to enter it again till he had obtained some signal victory. Besides, he could not bear the thought of revisiting a people by whom he was beloved, and whom nevertheless he was obliged to oppress, in order to enable him to make head against his enemies. He wanted only to see his sister, with whom he appointed an interview on the banks of the lake Wetteren, in Ostrogothia. Thither he rode post attended only by one servant, and after having spent a day with her returned to Karlskrona.

From this place, where he passed the winter, he issued orders for raising recruits through the whole kingdom. He thought that his subjects were born for no other purpose than to follow him to the field of battle, and he had actually accustomed them to entertain the same opinion. Some were enlisted who were not above fifteen years of age. In several villages there were none left but old men, women, and children; and in many places the women were obliged to plow the land alone.

It was still more difficult to procure a fleet. In order to supply that defect as well as possible, commissions were granted to the owners of privateers, who, upon obtaining certain privileges unreasonable in themselves, and destructive to the community, equipped a few ships; and these poor efforts were the last that the declining state of Sweden was now capable of making. To defray the expenses of all these preparations, there was a necessity for encroaching upon the property of the subject; and every kind of extortion was practised under the

specious name of taxes and duties. Strict search was made into every house, and one-half of the provisions that were found in them was conveyed to the king's magazines. All the iron in the kingdom was bought up for his use. This the government paid for in paper, and sold it out for ready money. A tax was laid on all such as had any mixture of silk in their clothes, or wore periwigs or gilded swords; and the duty of hearth-money was immoderately high. The people, oppressed with such a load of taxes, would have revolted under any other king; but the poorest peasant in Sweden knew that his master led a life still more hard and frugal than himself; so that every one submitted cheerfully to those hardships which the king was the first to suffer.

All sense of private misfortunes was swallowed up in the apprehension of public danger. The Swedes expected every moment to see their country invaded by the Russians, the Danes, the Prussians, the Saxons, and even by the English; and their fear of this hostile visit was so strong and prevalent, that those who had money or valuable effects took care to bury them in the earth.

An English fleet had already appeared in the Baltic, though its particular destination was not known; and the czar had given his word to the King of Denmark, that in the spring of 1716, the Russians would join the Danes, in order to make a descent upon Sweden.

But how great was the astonishment of all Europe, ever attentive to the fortune of Charles XII. when, instead of defending his own country, which

was threatened with an invasion by so many princes, they saw him in the month of March, 1716, passing over into Norway, with twenty thousand men.

From the time of Hannibal to that of Charles XII. the world had never seen any general, who, unable to make head against his enemies at home, had boldly carried the war into the heart of their own dominions. The Prince of Hesse, his brother-in-law, attended him in this expedition.

There is no travelling from Sweden to Norway but through the most dangerous by-ways; and when these are passed, one meets with so many flashes of water formed by the sea amongst the rocks, that there is a necessity for making bridges every day. A handful of Danes might have stopped the progress of the whole Swedish army; but this sudden invasion had not been foreseen. Europe was still more astonished to see the czar, amidst all these mighty events, remaining inactive, and not making a descent upon Sweden, as had formerly been stipulated between him and his allies.

This inactivity was owing to one of the greatest and most difficult schemes that ever was formed by the mind of man.

Henry de Gortz, a native of Franconia, and baron of the empire, having done several good offices to the King of Sweden, during that monarch's abode at Bender, had now become his favorite and first minister.

Never was man at once so bold and so artful; so full of expedients amidst misfortunes; so unbounded in his designs, or so active in the prosecu-

tion of them. No project too great for his daring genius to attempt; no means too difficult for his sagacity and penetration to discover; in pursuing his favorite schemes he was equally prodigal of presents and promises, of oaths, of truth, and of falsehood.

From Sweden he went to France, England and Holland, to examine those secret springs which he afterwards meant to put in motion. He was capable of throwing all Europe into combustion; and his inclination was equal to his power. What his master was at the head of an army, that was de Gortz in the cabinet; by which means he had acquired a greater ascendancy over Charles XII. than any minister before him had ever possessed.

Charles, who at twenty years of age had prescribed orders to Count Piper, was now content to receive instructions from Baron de Gortz, resigning himself to the direction of that minister with so much the less reserve, as his misfortunes obliged him to listen to the advice of others, and as Gortz never gave him any but such as was suitable to his undaunted courage. He observed, that of all the sovereigns united against Sweden, George, Elector of Hanover, and King of England, was the prince against whom Charles was most highly incensed; because he was the only one to whom Charles had never done any injury; and because George had engaged in the quarrel under the pretext of compromising matters, but in reality with a view of preserving Bremen and Verden, to which he seemed to have no other right than that of having bought

them for a trifle from the King of Denmark, to whom, after all, they did not belong.

Nor was it long ere de Gortz discovered that the czar was secretly dissatisfied with his allies, who had all conspired to hinder him from acquiring any possessions in Germany, where that monarch, already become too formidable, wanted only to obtain a footing. Wismar, the only town that still remained to the Swedes on the frontiers of Germany, was, on the fourteenth of February, 1716, surrendered to the Danes and Prussians, who would not so much as allow the Russian troops that were in Mecklenburg, to be present at the siege. Such repeated marks of jealousy for two years together, had alienated the czar's mind from the common cause, and perhaps prevented the ruin of Sweden. There are many instances of several states in alliance being conquered by a single power; but hardly any of a great empire subdued by several allies. If it should happen to be humbled by their joint efforts, their intestine divisions soon allow it to retrieve its former grandeur.

Ever since the year 1714, the czar had had it in his power to make a descent upon Sweden; but whether it was that he could not perfectly agree with the Kings of Poland, England, Denmark, and Prussia, allies justly jealous of his growing power, or that he did not as yet think his troops sufficiently disciplined to attack in their own territories a people whose very peasants had beaten the flower of the Danish forces, he still put off the execution of the enterprize.

But what had chiefly interrupted the progress of

his arms was the want of money. The czar, though one of the most powerful monarchs in the universe, was far from being one of the richest; his revenues, at that time, not exceeding twenty-four millions of livres. He had discovered indeed some mines of gold, silver, copper, and iron; but the profit arising from these was still uncertain, and the expense of working them was inconceivably great. He had likewise established an extensive commerce; but that in its infancy rather filled him with the agreeable hopes of what it might one day prove, than was really productive of any present advantage: nor did the provinces which he had lately conquered increase his revenues, in the same proportion as they augmented his power and glory. It required a long time to heal the wounds of Livonia, a country extremely fertile, but desolated by fire, sword, and distemper, and by a war of fifteen years' continuance, destitute of inhabitants, and as yet chargeable to the conqueror. His finances were further drained by the large fleets he maintained, and by the new enterprises which he was daily undertaking. He had even been reduced to the wretched expedient of raising the value of money, a remedy that can never cure the evils of state, and is in a particular manner prejudicial to a country, whose exports fall short of its imports.

Such was the foundation upon which de Gortz had built his scheme of a revolution. He ventured to advise the King of Sweden to purchase a peace from the Russian emperor at any price, intimating to him, at the same time, that the czar was highly incensed at the Kings of Poland and England, and

assuring him that he and Peter Alexiowitz, when joined together, would be able to strike terror into the rest of Europe.

There was no possibility of making a peace with the czar, without giving up a great many of those provinces which lie to the east and north of the Baltic Sea. But Gortz entreated the king to consider that by yielding up these provinces, which the czar already possessed, and which Charles at present was unable to recover, he might have the honor of restoring Stanislaus to the throne of Poland, of replacing the son of James II. on that of England, and of re-establishing the Duke of Holstein in the peaceable possession of his dominions.

Charles, pleased with these mighty projects, upon which, however, he laid no great stress, gave *carte blanche* to his minister. Gortz set out from Sweden, furnished with full powers to act without control, and to treat as his master's plenipotentiary with all those princes with whom he should think proper to negotiate. The first step was to sound the court of Moscow, which he did by means of a Scotchman, called Erskine, first physician to the czar, and strongly attached to the pretender's interest, as indeed most of the Scots were, except such as subsisted upon favors from the court of London.

This physician represented to Prince Menzikoff the greatness and importance of the scheme, with all the warmth of a man who was so much interested in its success. Prince Menzikoff relished the proposal, and the czar approved of it. Instead of making a descent upon Sweden, as had been stipulated between him and his allies, he sent his troops

to winter in Mecklenburg, whither he soon after repaired himself. This he did under the specious pretext of terminating some disputes that had lately arisen between the duke and his nobility; but in reality with a view to prosecute his favorite scheme of obtaining a principality in Germany, and hoping he should be able to persuade the Duke of Mecklenburg to sell him his sovereignty.

The allies were highly provoked at these proceedings; and the more so, as they did not choose to have such a formidable neighbor as Peter Alexiowitz, who, could he once obtain any footing in Germany, might one day be able to have himself elected emperor, to the great oppression of all the princes of the empire. But the more they were provoked, the more was the grand scheme of de Gortz forwarded. This minister, the better to conceal his secret intrigues, affected to negotiate with the confederate princes, who were likewise amused with vain hopes from the czar.

Charles XII. and his brother-in-law, the Prince of Hesse, were all this while in Norway, at the head of twenty thousand men. The country was defended by no more than eleven thousand Danes, divided into several detached parties, who were all put to the sword by the king and the Prince of Hesse.

Charles advanced towards Christiania, the capital of the kingdom; and fortune began once more to smile upon him in this part of the globe. But he never took sufficient care to provide for the subsistence of his troops. A Danish fleet and army were coming to the relief of Norway; and Charles being in want of provisions, was obliged to return

to Sweden, there to await the issue of his minister's mighty projects.

The execution of the scheme required at once inviolable secrecy, and vast preparations, two things almost incompatible. Gortz even ransacked the Asiatic seas for an assistance, which, however odious in appearance, would nevertheless have been extremely proper for making a descent upon Scotland, and for furnishing Sweden with ships, men, and money.

The pirates of all nations, and especially those of England, having entered into a mutual association, had long infested the seas of Europe and America. Driven at last from all their wonted haunts, and having no hopes of obtaining any quarter, they had lately retired to the coasts of Madagascar, a large island to the east of Africa. These men were all of them desperadoes, and most of them famous for actions which wanted nothing but justice to render them truly heroic. They were endeavoring to find out a prince that would receive them under his protection; but the laws of nations shut all the harbors in the world against them.

No sooner were they informed that Charles XII. had returned to Sweden, than they began to flatter themselves with the agreeable hopes that that prince passionately fond of war, obliged at present to be engaged in it, and in great want as well of ships as soldiers, would be glad to make an agreement with them upon reasonable terms. With this view they sent a deputy to Europe on board of a Dutch vessel, to make a proposal to Baron de Gortz, that if they were sure of meeting with a

favorable reception in the port of Gottenburg, they would instantly repair there with sixty ships loaded with riches.

The baron prevailed upon the king to agree to the proposal; and next year Cromstrom and Mendal, two Swedish gentlemen, were sent to finish the treaty with the corsairs of Madagascar.

But a more honorable and a more powerful support was soon after found in Cardinal Alberoni, a man of extraordinary genius, who governed Spain long enough for his own glory; but too short a time for the grandeur and happiness of the kingdom.

He readily embraced the proposal of placing the son of James II. on the throne of England. Nevertheless, as he had but just entered into the ministry, and had the affairs of Spain to regulate, before he could think of throwing other kingdoms into confusion, it was not likely that he would be able for a considerable time to put this grand machine in motion. But in less than two years he changed the face of affairs in Spain, restored that kingdom to her former degree of credit, among the other powers of Europe, prevailed upon the Turks, as is commonly supposed, to attack the Emperor of Germany, and attempted, at one and the same time, to deprive the Duke of Orleans of the regency of France, and King George of the crown of England. So dangerous may one single man prove, when he is vested with absolute authority in a powerful state, and is endowed with courage and greatness of soul.

Gortz having thus scattered in the courts of Muscovy and Spain the first sparks of that flame which

he intended to kindle, went privately to France, and from thence to Holland, where he had an interview with some of the pretender's adherents.

He informed himself more particularly of the strength, the number, and disposition of the malcontents in England, of the money they could furnish, and the troops they could raise. The malcontents required only a reinforcement of ten thousand men, with whose assistance, they said, they should be fully able to effectuate a revolution.

Count Gyllenborg, the Swedish ambassador in England, being furnished with proper instructions by Baron de Gortz, had several conferences at London, with the chiefs of the disaffected party. He encouraged them with the most flattering hopes of success, and readily promised them whatever they could wish to obtain; and they, on their part, were so forward as to furnish considerable sums of money, which Gortz received in Holland. He treated about the purchase of some ships, and bought six in Britain, with all kinds of arms.

He then sent several officers privately into France, and among others the Chevalier de Folard, who having made thirty campaigns in the French armies, without any considerable addition to his fortune, had lately offered his service to the King of Sweden, not so much from any interested views, as from a desire of serving under a king of such a glorious reputation. Folard likewise hoped to recommend to that prince the improvements he had made in the art of war which he had always studied as a philosopher; and he has since published his discoveries in his "Commentary on Polybius."

Charles XII. who had made war himself in a manner entirely new, and was never guided by custom in anything, was pleased with his notions; and resolved to employ him in his projected invasion of Scotland. The secret orders of Baron de Gortz were faithfully executed in France by the Chevalier de Folard. A great number of French, and a still greater number of Irish officers engaged in this uncommon conspiracy, which was hatching at one and the same time in England, France and Muscovy, and the branches of which were secretly extended from one end of Europe to the other.

These preparations, however great, were only a sample of what de Gortz intended to do; though it was a matter of no small consequence to have thus set the scheme going. But the point of the greatest importance, and without which nothing could succeed, was to bring about a peace between the czar and Charles; to accomplish which many difficulties were to be removed. Baron Osterman, minister of state in Muscovy, refused at first to come into de Gortz's measures. The former was as cautious and circumspect as the latter was bold and enterprising. The one, slow and regular in his politics, was for allowing everything time to ripen; the other of a daring genius, and impatient spirit, had no sooner sown the seed than he was expecting to reap the harvest. Osterman fearing that the emperor, his master, dazzled with the splendor of this enterprise, would grant the Swedes a too advantageous peace, delayed the conclusion of it by a variety of obstacles and procrastinations.

Happily for Baron de Gortz, the czar himself

came to Holland in the beginning of the year 1717. His intention was to go from thence into France. He was desirous of seeing that famous nation, which, for more than a hundred years past, had been censured, envied and imitated by all its neighbors. He wanted to gratify his insatiable curiosity of seeing and learning everything, and, at the same time, to exercise his politics.

Gortz had two interviews with him at The Hague; and in these he made greater progress than he could have done in six months with the plenipotentiaries. Everything wore a favorable aspect. His mighty projects seemed to be covered under the veil of impenetrable secrecy; and he flattered himself that Europe would know them only by their being carried into execution. Meanwhile he talked of nothing but peace at The Hague, he openly declared that he would always consider the King of England as the pacifier of the North; and he even pressed (in appearance at least) the holding of a congress at Brunswick, in which the jarring interests of Sweden and her enemies might be amicably adjusted.

These intrigues were first discovered by the Duke of Orleans, regent of France, who had spies in every part of Europe. Men of this character, who make a trade of selling the secrets of their friends, and get their livelihood by being informers, and frequently by inventing and propagating the grossest lies and calumnies, were so much increased in France under his government, that one-half of the nation had become spies upon the other. The Duke of Orleans, who was connected with the King of

England by personal ties, acquainted him with the secret plot that was hatching against him.

At the same time the Dutch, who began to take umbrage at the behavior of de Gortz, communicated their suspicions to the English minister. Gortz and Gyllenborg were prosecuting their schemes with great vigor, when they were both arrested, the one at Deventer, in Guelderland, and the other at London.

As Gyllenborg, the Swedish ambassador, had violated the law of nations by conspiring against the prince to whom he was sent in a public character, the English made no scruple to violate the same law, by arresting his person. But all the world was surprised to see the States-General imprison the Baron de Gortz, in order to gratify the King of England, an instance of complaisance hardly to be paralleled in history. They even appointed the Count de Welderen to examine him. This formality was only an aggravation of their former insult, which being rendered entirely abortive, produced no other effect than to cover them with confusion. "Do you know me?" says Gortz to the Count de Welderen. "Yes, sir," replies the Dutchman. "Well, then," says de Gortz, "if you do know, you must be sensible that I will not speak one word more than I please." The examination was carried no further. All the foreign ministers, and especially the Marquis de Monteleon, the Spanish ambassador in England, protested against the violence offered to the persons of Gortz and Gyllenborg. The Dutch were inexcusable. They had not only violated a most sacred law, by seizing the prime minister of

the King of Sweden, who had formed no plots against them; but they acted in direct opposition to the spirit of that inestimable liberty which has drawn so many foreigners into their country, and is the foundation of all their greatness.

With regard to the King of England, he had acted consistently with the strictest principles of justice, in imprisoning his enemy. He published in his own vindication, the letters of Gortz and Gyllenborg, which were found among the papers of the latter. The King of Sweden was in Scania, when he received these printed letters, together with the news of the two ministers being imprisoned. He asked with a smile, if they had not likewise printed his letters; and gave immediate orders for arresting the English resident at Stockholm, with all his family and domestics. The Dutch resident was forbidden the court, and strictly watched in all his motions. Charles, meanwhile, neither avowed nor disclaimed the proceedings of de Gortz. Too proud to deny a scheme which he had once approved, and too wise to acknowledge a plot which had thus been stifled in its birth, he maintained a disdainful silence towards England and Holland.

The czar took a very different course. As his name was not expressly mentioned, but only obscurely hinted at in the papers of Gortz and Gyllenborg, he wrote a long letter to the King of England, complimenting him upon the discovery of the plot, and assuring him of the most inviolable friendship; and King George received his protestations without believing them, though he thought it most prudent in the present case to pretend that he did. A plot

contrived by private men is annihilated the moment it is discovered; but a conspiracy formed by kings, the more it is known the stronger it grows.

The czar arrived at Paris in the month of May, 1717, to view the beauties of art and nature; and to visit the academies, public libraries, the cabinets of the curiosi and the royal palaces, were not the only ends of his journey. He made a proposal to the Duke of Orleans for concluding a treaty, which, had it taken place, would have completed the greatness of Muscovy. His design was to compromise matters with the King of Sweden, who would yield to him some large provinces, to deprive the Danes of the empire of the Baltic Sea, to weaken the English by a civil war, and to make all the trade of the North centre in Russia. He had even some thoughts of setting up Stanislaus afresh against Augustus, so that the fire being everywhere kindled, he might have it in his power either to quench or blow it up, as should be most conducive to his interest. With this view he proposed to the Regent of France to act as mediator between Sweden and Muscovy, and to make a league offensive and defensive with these two crowns, and that of Spain. This treaty, seemingly so natural and so advantageous to the several nations concerned, and which would have put the balance of power in Europe into their hands, was nevertheless rejected by the Duke of Orleans. Nay, at that very time, he entered into engagements of a quite opposite nature. He made a league with the Emperor of Germany, and with George, king of England. The reasons of state had so much altered the views and inclinations of all

the princes of Europe, that the czar was ready to declare against his old ally, Augustus, and to espouse the cause of Charles, his mortal enemy; while France, in order to oblige the Germans and the English, was going to make war upon the grandson of Louis XIV. after having so long supported him against these very enemies, at a prodigious expense of blood and treasure. All that the czar could obtain by these indirect measures was to prevail upon the regent to interpose his good offices to procure the release of Gortz and Gyllenborg. He returned to his own dominions about the end of June, after having shown the French a sight they had never seen before, an emperor travelling for instruction. But the generality of that people were only struck with his rude unpolished manners, the result of his bad education; while the legislator, the great man, and the creator of a new nation, entirely escaped the notice of these superficial observers.

What the czar sought for in the Duke of Orleans, he soon found in Cardinal Alberoni, who now governed the Spanish councils with unlimited sway. Alberoni desired nothing so much as the restoration of the pretender. This he did both as he was minister of Spain which had been so ill treated by the English; as he was a personal enemy to the Duke of Orleans, who was leagued with England against Spain; and, in fine, as he was a priest of that church, for the sake of which the pretender's father had so foolishly lost his crown.

The Duke of Ormond, as much beloved in England as the Duke of Marlborough was admired,

had left his country at the accession of King George, and retired to Madrid. This nobleman was now vested with full powers by the King of Spain and the pretender; and, accompanied by one Irnegan, another native of England, a man of fine address, and an enterprising spirit, he went to meet the czar in his way to Mitau in Courland. He demanded the Princess Anna Petrowna, the czar's daughter, in marriage for the son of James II., hoping that this alliance would the more strongly attach the czar to the interests of that unhappy prince. But this proposal, instead of forwarding, retarded, at least for some time, the progress of the negotiations. Baron de Gortz, among his other projects, had long set apart this princess for the Duke of Holstein, to whom, in effect, she was soon after married. The moment he was informed of the Duke of Ormond's proposal, he became jealous of its success, and employed every art to render it abortive. He, as well as Count Gyllenborg, was set at liberty in the month of August, the King of Sweden not even deigning to offer the least apology to the King of England, nor to express the slightest disapprobation of his minister's conduct.

At the same time, the English resident and all his family were released at Stockholm, where they had been treated with much more severity than Gyllenborg had been at London.

Gortz, being now at liberty, behaved like an implacable enemy, prompted not only by the powerful motives by which he had been formerly actuated, but instigated by a spirit of revenge, on account of his late imprisonment. He instantly posted away

to the czar, and, by his artful insinuations, obtained a greater ascendancy over that prince than ever. He assured him, that in less than three months, he would, in conjunction with a single plenipotentiary from Russia, remove every obstacle that retarded the conclusion of a peace with Sweden. Taking a map in his hand, which had been drawn by the czar himself, and making a line from Viborg, all the way to the frozen sea, running along the lake Ladoga, he undertook to persuade his master to give up all the country lying to the eastward of that line, as well as Carelia, Ingria, and Livonia. He then hinted at a proposal of marriage between his czarish majesty's daughter and the Duke of Holstein, flattering the czar with the agreeable hopes that the duke might possibly be prevailed upon to yield him his dominions for an equivalent, by which acquisition he would become a member of the empire, and that either himself or some of his descendants might one day obtain the imperial crown. By these means he gratified the ambitious views of the Russian monarch, and deprived the pretender of all hopes of marrying the czarinian princess, at the same time that he opened to him a more tempting project in England, and thus accomplished all his own projects at once.

The czar named the isle of Aland for holding the conference between Osterman, his minister of state, and Baron de Gortz. He desired the Duke of Ormond to return to Spain, that he might not give too great cause of offence to the English, with whom he had no intention of coming to an open rupture, till he should be ready to make the projected in-

vasion. But Irnegan, the duke's confidant, was allowed to stay at St. Petersburg, where he lived with so much privacy and caution, that he never came abroad in the daytime, nor ever conversed with any of the czar's ministers except in the disguise of a peasant or Tartar.

Immediately after the Duke of Ormond's departure, the czar acquainted the King of England with the high compliment he had paid him in dismissing the greatest man in the pretender's faction; and Baron de Gortz returned to Sweden, flushed with hopes of success.

Gortz found his master at the head of thirty-five thousand regular troops, and all the coasts guarded by the militia. The king wanted nothing but money. But the public credit, as well at home as abroad, was entirely exhausted. France, which had furnished him with some supplies, during the last years of Louis XIV. refused to contribute any more under the regency of the Duke of Orleans, who entertained views very different from those of Louis. Spain promised him some remittances; but was not yet in a condition to afford anything considerable.

De Gortz therefore carried a scheme into execution which he had tried before his journey to France and Holland. This was to give to copper the value of silver; so that a piece of the former metal, whose intrinsic value was only a halfpenny, should, when stamped with the king's mark, pass for forty pence; as the governors of besieged towns frequently pay the soldiers and citizens in leathern money, in expectation of being able one day to reimburse them in real coin. This fictitious kind of

money, which owes its birth to necessity, and can only be rendered current by its being punctually paid in real specie, is like bills of exchange, the imaginary value of which may easily exceed the solid funds that are in a nation.

These expedients are of great use in a free country. They have often saved a republic, but seldom, or never, fail to ruin a monarchy; for, as the people soon begin to grow suspicious, the minister is obliged to break his word: the ideal money multiplies apace: private men bury their money in the earth; and the whole machine of government falls into a confusion which is often productive of the most pernicious consequences, as was but too plainly exemplified in the fate of Sweden.

At first the Baron de Gortz issued his new coin with equal discretion and reserve; but, by the rapidity of a motion which he could not restrain, he was soon hurried beyond the limits which he had originally prescribed to himself. All kinds of goods and provisions having risen to an immoderate price, he was obliged to increase the quantity of his copper coin. But the more it was increased, the less was its value; and Sweden, deluged, as it were, by this false money, set up a general cry against Baron de Gortz. The people, who always regarded their sovereign with a kind of veneration, could not find in their hearts to hate him, and therefore made the weight of their resentment fall on a minister, who, both as a foreigner and chief director of the finances, was doubly exposed to the public odium.

But what entirely completed his ruin was a tax he attempted to impose on the clergy. The

clergy, who are too apt to join their own cause to that of the Supreme Being, called him an atheist, because he demanded their money. Some of the new copper coin being stamped with the figures of the heathen gods, they thence took occasion to call those pieces the gods of Baron de Gortz.

To this public odium under which he labored, was added the jealousy of the ministers; the more implacable in their resentment as their power was the less. The king's sister, and the prince her husband, dreaded him, as a man attached from his birth to the Duke of Holstein, and might one day be able to place the crown of Sweden on his head. In a word, he had incurred the hatred of the whole nation, Charles alone excepted; but this general aversion served only to insure him the friendship of the king, whose maxim it always was to be the more inflexible the more he was contradicted. Accordingly, he now relied upon the baron with an almost implicit confidence; gave him absolute power in the interior government of the kingdom; and committed to his care whatever related to the negotiations with the czar, pressing him above all things to hasten the conference that was to be held in the isle of Aland.

And, indeed, Gortz had no sooner regulated the finances (a work which had hitherto detained him at Stockholm) than he set out on his journey for the place appointed, in order to finish with the czar's minister the grand scheme he had projected.

The preliminary articles of that alliance which was wholly to have changed the face of affairs in

Europe, were found among de Gortz's papers after his death, and were as follows:

The czar was to keep the whole of Livonia, and part of Ingria and Carelia to himself, and to restore the rest to Sweden. He was to join his efforts with those of Charles XII. in order to restore Stanislaus to the throne of Poland, and to enter that country with eighty thousand Russians, to dethrone the very king in whose defence he had waged a war of ten years' continuance. He was to furnish the King of Sweden with a number of ships sufficient to transport ten thousand Swedes to England, and thirty thousand to Germany. The united forces of Peter and Charles were to attack the King of England in his German dominions, especially in Bremen and Verden; and were likewise to be employed in re-establishing the Duke of Holstein, and compelling the King of Prussia to agree to a treaty, by which he would have been deprived of part of those territories which he had seized. From the time that this alliance was made, Charles assumed such lofty airs, as if his victorious troops, reinforced by those of the czar, had already carried all his schemes into execution. He required the Emperor of Germany, in a peremptory manner, to fulfil the treaty of Altranstädt. But the court of Vienna would hardly deign to give an answer to the proposal of a prince from whom she had nothing to fear.

The King of Poland did not enjoy the same tranquillity; but saw the clouds gathering all around him. The Polish nobility had formed a confederacy against him; and, ever since his restoration, he had been engaged perpetually either in wars or treaties

with his subjects. The czar, who had now become a dangerous mediator, had a hundred galleys near Dantzic, and forty thousand men on the frontiers of Poland. All the North was filled with jealousy and apprehension. Flemming, of all men in the world the most apt to distrust, and himself the most to be distrusted, was the first who suspected the designs of the czar and the King of Sweden in favor of Stanislaus. He therefore resolved to have this prince seized in the duchy of Deux-Ponts, as James Sobieski had formerly been in Silesia. Saissan, a Frenchman, one of those restless and enterprising spirits, who wander into foreign parts to try their fortunes, had lately brought a small number of his countrymen, bold and daring like himself, into the service of the King of Poland. He imparted a project to Flemming, by which he undertook, with the assistance of thirty French officers, to seize Stanislaus in his own palace, and carry him a prisoner to Dresden. The project was approved. Enterprises of that nature were not then uncommon. Some of those desperate fellows who are called bravos in Italy, had performed similar achievements in the Milanese, during the last war between France and Germany: and, even since that time, several French refugees in Holland had ventured to penetrate to Versailles, in order to carry off the dauphin, and actually had seized the person of the first equerry, almost under the windows of the castle where Louis XIV. resided.

Accordingly, Saissan disposed his men and post-horses in the best manner he could contrive, in order to seize and carry off Stanislaus. But the

enterprise was discovered the night before it was to have been carried into execution. Several of the desperadoes saved themselves by flight, and the rest were taken prisoners. They had no right to expect to be treated as prisoners of war, but rather as common robbers. Stanislaus, instead of punishing them as their crime deserved, contented himself with reproaching them with their baseness, and even that he did with the greatest politeness and humanity. Nay, what is more, he gave them money to defray the expenses of their return to Poland, and, by that act of generosity, plainly showed that his rival Augustus had but too much reason to fear him.

Meanwhile Charles set out on a second expedition to Norway, in the month of October, 1718. He had taken all his measures with so much prudence and precaution, that he hoped he should be able, in the space of six months, to make himself master of that kingdom. He rather chose to go and conquer rocks amidst ice and snow, in the depth of winter which kills the animals even in Sweden where the cold is less severe, than to recover his beautiful provinces in Germany. These he expected he should soon be able to retake in consequence of his alliance with the czar; and, in any event, it was a much more tempting object of ambition to wrest a kingdom from his victorious foe.

At the mouth of the river Tistendall, near the bay of Denmark, and between the towns of Bahus and Anslo, stands Frederikshall, a place of great strength and importance, and considered as the key

of the kingdom. To this town Charles laid siege, in the month of December. The soldiers, benumbed with cold, were hardly able to break the ground which was so much hardened by the frost that it was almost as difficult to pierce it, as if they had been opening trenches in a rock. But nothing could resist the resolution and perseverance of the Swedes, while they saw their king at their head, and sharing in all their labors. Never, indeed, did Charles undergo greater fatigues. His constitution, strengthened by eighteen years of severe labor, was hardened to such a degree, that he slept in the open field in Norway in the midst of winter, covered only with a cloak, and without the least detriment to his health. Several of the soldiers on duty dropped dead with cold; and though the rest were almost frozen to death, yet as they saw their king partaking in all their hardships, they durst not utter a single word of complaint. Having heard, a little before this expedition, of a certain woman in Scania, called Joan Dotter, who had lived for several months, without any other nourishment than water, he, who had all his life studied to inure himself to the worst extremes that human nature can support, resolved to try how long he could fast without fainting. Accordingly he fasted five whole days, without either eating or drinking; and, on the morning of the sixth, rode two leagues, and then alighted at the tent of the Prince of Hesse, his brother-in-law, where he ate heartily, without feeling the least disorder, either from his long fast of five days or from the plentiful meal which now succeeded.

With such a body of iron, inspired by a soul alike

enterprising and inflexible in every condition, he could not fail to be formidable to all his neighbors.

The eleventh of December, being St. Andrew's day, he went at nine in the evening to view the trenches; and not finding the parallel so far advanced as he expected, he could not help expressing his surprise and displeasure. M. Megret, a French engineer, who conducted the siege, assured him that the place would be taken in eight days. "Well! we shall see," says the king, and went on with the engineer to survey the works. He stopped at a place where a branch of the trenches formed an angle with the parallel. He kneeled on the inner talus, and resting his elbow on the parapet, continued for some time to view the men who were carrying on the trenches by starlight.

Circumstances, in their own nature trivial, become important when they relate to the death of such a man as Charles XII. I must, therefore, take upon me to say, that the whole of the conversation, reported by so many writers to have passed between the king and Megret the engineer, is absolutely false. The following account I can affirm, upon the best authority, to be the real truth of the matter.

The king stood with almost the half of his body exposed to a battery of cannon pointed directly against the angle where he was. He was attended by two Frenchmen only; one of whom was M. Siquier, his aide-de-camp, a man of courage and conduct, who had entered into his service in Turkey, and was particularly attached to the Prince of Hesse; the other was this engineer. The cannon fired upon them with grape-shot, to which the king,

as he stood behind them, was most exposed. A little behind them was Count Schwerin, who commanded the trenches. While Schwerin was giving orders to Count Posse, a captain of the guards, and to one Culbert, his aide-de-camp, Siquier and Megret saw the king fall upon the parapet, with a deep sigh. They ran to him; but he was already dead. A ball of half a pound had struck him on the right temple, and made a hole sufficient to receive three fingers at once. His head reclined upon the parapet; his left eye beaten in, and the right one entirely out of its socket. Though he expired the moment he received the wound, yet, by a kind of instinctive motion, he had grasped the hilt of his sword in his hand, and still lay in that posture. At sight of this shocking spectacle, Megret, a man of singular turn of mind, and of great indifference of temper, said, "Come, gentlemen, the farce is ended, let us now go to supper." Siquier ran immediately and informed Count Schwerin of what had happened. They all agreed to conceal the news of his death from the soldiers, till such time as the Prince of Hesse should be acquainted with it. The body was wrapped up in a gray cloak. Siquier put his hat and wig on the king's head; and in this condition Charles was carried, under the name of one Captain Carlsberg, through the midst of his troops, who thus saw their dead king pass them without ever dreaming that it was his majesty.

The prince gave instant orders that no one should stir out of the camp, and that all the passes to Sweden should be strictly guarded, that so he might have time to take the necessary measures for



placing the crown on his wife's head, and to exclude the Duke of Holstein, who might lay claim to it.

Thus fell Charles XII. King of Sweden, at the age of thirty-six years and a half, after having experienced all the grandeur of prosperity, and all the hardships of adversity, without being either softened by the one, or the least disturbed by the other. Almost all his actions, even those of his private life, border on the marvellous. Perhaps he was the only man, most certainly he was the only king, that ever lived without failings. He carried all the virtues of the hero to such an excess as renders them no less dangerous than the opposite vices. His resolution, hardened into obstinacy, occasioned his misfortunes in the Ukraine, and detained him five years in Turkey. His liberality, degenerating into profusion, ruined Sweden. His courage, pushed the length of temerity, was the cause of his death. And, during the last years of his reign, the means he employed to support his authority, differed little from tyranny. His great qualities, any one of which would have been sufficient to immortalize another prince, proved pernicious to his country. He never was the aggressor; but, in taking vengeance on those who had injured him, his resentment got the better of his prudence. He was the first man who ever aspired to the title of conqueror, without the least desire of enlarging his dominions. His only end in subduing kingdoms was to have the pleasure of giving them away. His passion for glory, for war, and revenge, prevented him from being a good politician; a quality, without which the world had never before seen anyone a conqueror. Before a

battle, and after a victory, he was modest and humble; and after a defeat, firm and undaunted. Severe to himself as well as to others, he too little regarded either his own life and labors, or those of his subjects: an extraordinary rather than a great man, and more worthy to be admired than imitated. From the history of his life however, succeeding kings may learn that a quiet and happy government is infinitely preferable to so much glory.

Charles XII. was of tall stature and portly figure; he had a fine forehead, large blue eyes full of sweetness, and a handsome nose. But the lower part of his face was disagreeable, and too often disfigured by a frequent laugh, which scarcely opened his lips; and as to hair and beard, he had hardly any at all. A profound silence reigned at his table. Notwithstanding the inflexible obstinacy of his temper, he always retained that bashfulness which goes by the name of false modesty. He was but little qualified to make a figure in conversation, because, having addicted himself entirely to war and action, he was utterly unacquainted with the pleasures of society. Till the time of his residence among the Turks, which furnished him with a good deal of leisure, he had read nothing but "Cæsar's Commentaries" and the "History of Alexander." It is true he had written some remarks on the art of war, and particularly on his own campaigns from 1700 to 1709. This he owned to the Chevalier de Folard, but said that the manuscript had been lost in the unfortunate battle of Poltava. Some people would make us believe that Charles was a good

mathematician. That he was possessed of great depth and penetration of thought, cannot be denied; but the arguments they produce to prove his knowledge of mathematics are by no means conclusive. He wanted to alter the method of counting by tens, and to substitute in its place the number sixty-four, because that number contains both a square and a cube, and being divided by two is reducible to a unit. This, if it proves anything, only shows that he always delighted in what was difficult and extraordinary.

With regard to his religion, though the sentiments of a prince ought to have no influence on other men, and though the opinion of a monarch so illiterate as Charles, is of little consequence in these matters, yet in this, as well as in other particulars, we must gratify the curiosity of mankind, who are anxious to know whatever relates to a prince of his character. I am informed, by the gentleman who has furnished me with the greatest part of the materials which compose this history, that Charles XII. was a serious Lutheran till the year 1707. Happening then to be at Leipsic, he there met with the famous philosopher Leibnitz, a man who thought and spoke with equal freedom, and had already instilled his notions into more princes than one. I cannot believe, what is commonly reported, that Charles XII. conceived an indifference for Lutheranism from the conversation of this philosopher, who never had the honor to talk with him above a quarter of an hour; but I have been told by M. Fabricius, who lived with him in great familiarity for seven years successively, that having seen,

during his abode among the Turks, such an infinite variety of religions, he became more lax in his principles. This fact is likewise confirmed by Motraye in his voyages. The same too is the opinion of the Count de Croissy, who has often told me, that of all his old principles, Charles retained none but that of absolute predestination, a doctrine that favored his courage, and justified his temerity. The czar was of much the same way of thinking, with regard to fate and religion; but talked of these subjects more frequently, as indeed he did of everything else, with his favorites, in a very familiar manner; for he had this advantage over Charles, that he was a good philosopher and an eloquent speaker.

Here I cannot help taking notice of a most uncharitable suspicion, too readily embraced by the weak and credulous, and too industriously propagated by the malicious and ill-natured, to wit, that the death of princes is always owing to poison or assassination. It was then the current report in Germany, that M. Siquier was the man who killed the King of Sweden. That brave officer was long grieved at this injurious aspersion: and, as he was one day talking to me on the subject: "I might have killed the King of Sweden," said he, "but, had I been capable of forming such a barbarous resolution, so great was my veneration for that illustrious hero, that I could not have had the courage to carry it into execution."

I know, indeed, that Siquier himself gave occasion to this heavy charge, which, even to this day, many of the Swedes believe to be well founded. He told me, that being seized with a violent fever

at Stockholm, he cried out that he had killed the King of Sweden; and that, in the height of his frenzy, he even opened the window, and publicly begged pardon for the regicide. When he was informed, in the course of his recovery, of what he had said in his illness, he was almost ready to die with grief. This anecdote I did not choose to publish during his lifetime. I saw him a little before he expired, and think I can safely affirm, that, far from killing Charles XII. he would have suffered a thousand deaths to save the life of that hero. Had he actually committed such a horrid crime, it must have been to serve some prince, who, no doubt, would have liberally rewarded him for such a piece of treachery; but he died in France so extremely poor that he even stood in need of my assistance. If these reasons are not thought sufficient to vindicate his memory, let it be considered that the ball by which Charles fell could not have come from a pistol, and yet Siquier had no other way to give the fatal blow than by a pistol concealed under his garments.

The king was no sooner dead, than the siege of Frederikshall was raised, and a total change took place in the government. The Swedes, who considered the glory of their sovereign rather as a burden than an advantage, applied their whole attention towards concluding a peace with their enemies, and suppressing that absolute power which Baron de Gortz had so much abused to their ruin. The states, by a free and voluntary choice, elected the sister of Charles XII. for their queen, and obliged her, by a solemn act, to renounce all

hereditary right to the crown, that so she might hold it by the suffrages of the people. She bound herself by the most sacred oaths never to attempt the re-establishment of arbitrary power; and at last, sacrificing the love of royalty to conjugal affection, yielded the crown to her husband, who was chosen king by the states, and mounted the throne on the same conditions, with his royal consort.

The Baron de Gortz was taken into custody immediately after the death of Charles, and condemned by the senate of Stockholm to lose his head, at the foot of the common gallows; an act of revenge, perhaps, rather than of justice, and a cruel insult to the memory of a king whom Sweden still admires.

ADDENDA.

LETTER TO MARSHAL SCHULENBURG, GENERAL OF THE VENETIANS.*

Sir:

I received, by a courier of the French ambassador, the journal of your campaign in 1703 and 1704, with which your excellency has been pleased to honor me. Allow me, sir, to apply to you what an ancient writer said of Cæsar; "*Eodem animo scripsit quo bellavit.*" You must expect, sir, that so great a favor will make me extremely selfish, and will expose you to fresh requests. I beg you would communicate to me whatever can give me any light into the particulars of the war of Charles XII. I have the honor to send you a journal of that king's campaigns; a king worthy of having fought with you. This journal reaches to the battle of Poltava inclusive. It is the work of a Swedish officer, called M. Adlerfeld, who appears to be extremely well informed, and as accurate as it is possible to be on a subject of this nature. It is not a history; far from it; but it contains excellent materials for the composition of a history; and I flatter myself I shall be able to correct mine in many particulars by the memoirs of this officer.

Besides, sir, I must own to you, it was with particular pleasure I found in these memoirs a variety of circumstances that tally exactly with the infor-

* Dated at The Hague, Sept. 15, 1740.

mation from which I compiled my history. I, who doubt of everything, and especially of anecdotes, began to condemn myself touching a number of facts which I had advanced. For instance, I could no longer believe that M. de Guiscard, the French ambassador, was on board the ship of Charles XII. in the expedition to Copenhagen. I began to repent of having said that the cardinal-primate, who had so great a hand in dethroning King Augustus, secretly opposed the election of King Stanislaus. I was almost ashamed of having affirmed that the Duke of Marlborough, when he went to have a conference with Charles XII. addressed himself to Baron de Gortz before he saw Count Piper. M. de la Motraye had censured me for all these facts, with a confidence which, I imagined, could proceed from nothing but better information; notwithstanding which, they are all confirmed by the memoirs of M. Adlerfeld.

In these memoirs I find that the King of Sweden, agreeably to what I had said, sometimes ate with King Augustus, whom he had dethroned, and that he always gave him the right hand. In them I find, that the Kings Augustus and Stanislaus met at the court of the latter, and saluted each other without exchanging a word: there, likewise, mention is made of the extraordinary visit which Charles paid to Augustus at Dresden, upon leaving his dominions. There, even, the witticism of Baron Stralheim is quoted word for word, in the same manner as I have related it.

In the preface to M. Adlerfeld's book, the editor talks in the following strain:

“With regard to M. de la Motraye, who has officiously taken upon himself to criticise M. de Voltaire, the perusal of these memoirs will only serve to confound him, and make him sensible of his own errors which are much more numerous than those he imputes to his adversary.”

True it is, sir, and I plainly perceive it by this journal, I have been mistaken with regard to the minute circumstances of several military transactions. I have, indeed, ascertained the exact number of the Swedish and Muscovite troops at the famous battle of Narva; but on many other occasions I have fallen into mistakes. Time, you know, is the parent of truth; which I am afraid we have little reason to hope we shall ever be able to discover fully. You will see, sir, that M. Adlerfeld does not agree with you concerning some points relating to your admirable passage over the Oder; but I will believe the German general, who must necessarily have known all the particulars of this passage, much rather than the Swedish officer who could not possibly know any more than a few of them.

By the memoirs of your excellency, and by those of this officer, I intend to correct my history. I likewise expect an extract from a “History of Charles XII.”, written in Swedish by M. Norberg, chaplain to that monarch.

Indeed, I am much afraid that the chaplain has sometimes viewed matters with other eyes than the ministers who have furnished me with materials. I shall esteem him, to be sure, for his zeal in defending the honor of his master; but I, who

never was chaplain to the king, nor to the czar; I, whose sole ambition is to speak the truth, will always acknowledge, that the inflexible obstinacy of Charles XII. at Bender, his resolution of lying ten months in bed, and many of his measures after the unhappy battle of Poltava, appear to me more extraordinary than heroic.

If there is any possibility of rendering history useful, it is only, in my opinion, by pointing out the good and ill which kings have done to mankind. I think, for instance, that if Charles XII. after having subdued Denmark, beat the Russians, deposed his enemy Augustus, and established the new king on the throne of Poland, had granted peace to the czar, who begged it of him; had he returned home the conqueror and peacemaker of the North, and employed his attention in encouraging the arts and commerce in his country, he would then indeed have been a truly great man, instead of being but a great warrior, vanquished at last by a prince whom he despised. It is to be wished, for the happiness of the world, that Peter the Great had been sometimes less cruel, and Charles XII. less wedded to his own opinion.

I greatly prefer to both these sovereigns, a prince who regards humanity as the chief virtue, who never has recourse to war but through absolute necessity, who loves peace because he loves mankind, who encourages all the arts, and who, in one word, though a king, endeavors to act like a philosopher. Such, sir, is my hero; nor think that it is only a creature of the imagination. This hero actually exists in the person of a young king, whose

fame will soon reach even to your parts; you will then see whether or not I am deceived: he deserves such generals as you. To write the history of such kings is a pleasing task; for then we write the history of human happiness.

But if you carefully examine this journal of M. Adlerfeld, you will find in it little else, but that, on Monday the third of April, there were so many thousand men butchered in such a field: that, on Tuesday, whole villages were reduced to ashes, and the women, clasping their little babes in their arms, were consumed with them in the same flames: that, on Thursday, a thousand bombs levelled with the ground the houses of a free and innocent city for not having paid immediately a hundred thousand crowns to a foreign conqueror who happened to pass by its walls: and that, on Friday, fifteen or sixteen hundred prisoners perished of cold and hunger. These, or such as these, are the materials which compose the subject of his four volumes.

Have you not frequently thought, M. Marshal, that your illustrious trade is more shocking than necessary? I see M. Adlerfeld sometimes disguises cruelties, which ought, in effect, to be forgotten, in order to prevent their ever becoming the object of imitation. For example, I have been credibly informed, that at the battle of Fraustadt Marshal Renschild caused twelve or fifteen hundred Muscovites to be put to death in cold blood, six hours after the action, though they begged their lives on their knees. He alleges there were only six hundred, and that they were put to death immediately after the battle. This is a circumstance, sir, of which

you cannot be ignorant: you made the admirable disposition of the Swedish troops even in this unhappy engagement; be so good, then, as to tell me the truth, for which I have as great a regard as I have for your glory.

I expect, with extreme impatience, the other instructions with which you shall be pleased to honor me. Allow me to ask your opinion of the march of Charles XII. into the Ukraine, of his retreat into Turkey, and of the death of Patkul: you can easily dictate many things to a secretary, which will serve to throw light upon several truths; a favor for which the public will acknowledge themselves greatly obliged to you. You are bound in duty, sir, to communicate knowledge to mankind, in return for the admiration which they so justly entertain for your merit. I am, with the greatest respect and esteem, and with the most sincere wishes for the preservation of a life, of which you have frequently been so prodigal,

Sir, your excellency's most humble
and most obedient servant, V.

P. S. Just as I had finished my letter, I was informed, that a French translation of the "History of Charles XII.," written in Swedish by M. Norberg, has been printed at The Hague. This will be a new palette,* in which I shall dip the pencils with which I must retouch my picture.

* This palette could not answer the purpose. It is well known that the History of Charles XII. by M. Norberg, is no more, to the year 1709, than a confused collection of facts ill related; and from 1709, than a copy of the history composed by M. de Voltaire.

LETTER TO M. NORBERG, CHAPLAIN TO CHARLES XII. KING OF SWEDEN, AND AUTHOR OF A HISTORY OF THAT MONARCH.

Permit me, sir, after having taken the trouble to read that part of your "History of Charles XII." which is already published, to address to you some just complaints, both with regard to your manner of treating that history, and the freedom which, in your preface, you presume to use with those who have treated it before you.

I love the truth; but the old proverb, "All truths ought not to be told," relates chiefly to insignificant truths. Be pleased to recollect that passage in the preface to the "History of M. de Voltaire." "The history of a prince," says he, "is not all that he ever did, but only what he did worthy of being transmitted to posterity."

There are some readers, perhaps, who will be glad to see the catechism which Charles XII. was taught, and will take great pleasure* in being informed, that in 1693, Doctor Peter Rudbekius conferred the degree of doctor upon the masters of arts Aquinas, Samuel Virenius, Ennegius, Herlandus, Stukius, and upon other personages, extremely respectable, no doubt, but who had very little concern in the battles, the triumphs, and defeats of your hero.

Perhaps it is a matter of great importance to Europe to know that the chapel of the castle of Stockholm, which was burnt about fifty years ago, stood in the new aisle, on the north side, and that

* "History of Charles XII." by Norberg.

there were in it two pictures of the intendant Kloker, which are now in the church of St. Nicholas; that the seats were covered with blue on days of public service; that some of them were of oak, and others of walnut; and that, instead of large lustres, there were small flat candlesticks, which did not fail to produce a very happy effect; that there were there to be seen four figures of plaster of Paris, and that the pavement was black and white.

We will further believe, that it is a thing of great consequence to be well informed that there was no base gold in the canopy which served at the coronation of Charles XII.; to know what were the dimensions of it; whether the church was hung with red or blue cloth; and what was the height of the benches. All this may have its weight with those who want to acquire a thorough knowledge of the most minute concerns of princes.

After the tedious detail of these mighty matters, you tell us at what hour Charles XII. was crowned; but you do not tell us why he was crowned before the age prescribed by law; why the queen-mother was deprived of the regency; how the famous Piper gained the confidence of the king; what was the strength of Sweden at that time, what the number of its people, who were its allies, and what its government, its wants, and resources.

You have given us a part of the military journal of M. Adlerfeld; but a journal, sir, is no more a history than materials are a house. Allow me to tell you, a history does not consist in particularizing petty facts, in producing manifestoes, replies,

and rejoinders. This is not the manner in which Quintus Curtius composed the "History of Alexander," or in which Livy and Tacitus wrote the Roman history. There are a thousand journalists; but we have hardly two or three modern historians. We could wish that those who prepare the colors would give them to some painter in order to form a picture.

You cannot be ignorant, sir, that M. de Voltaire had published this declaration which your translator repeats.

"I love the truth and have no other aim nor interest than to know it. Those passages in my "History of Charles XII." in which I shall find myself to have been mistaken, shall be altered. It is natural to think that M. Norberg, a Swede, and an eye-witness, should be better informed than I, who am a stranger. I shall correct my history by his memoirs, and will do it with pleasure."

You see, sir, with what politeness M. de Voltaire mentioned your name, and with what deference he expected your work, though he had received memoirs for the compilation of his own from the hands of several ambassadors, with whom it would appear you had little connection, and even from the hands of more than one sovereign.

To this French politeness, sir, you reply in a manner that savors something of a Gothic taste.

You say, in your preface, that the history published by M. de Voltaire is not worth the pains of translating, though, in fact, it has been translated into almost all the European languages, and has undergone eight editions at London, in an English

dress. You there add very politely, that a Puffendorf would have treated him as he did Varillas, as an arch-liar.

In order to prove this charitable supposition, you take care to mark on the margin of your book all the capital errors into which he has fallen.

You particularly observe that Major-General Stuart did not receive a slight wound in the shoulder, as the French author, after a German writer, rashly affirms, but only a pretty severe contusion. You cannot deny that M. de Voltaire has faithfully related the battle of Narva, which in his book at least forms an interesting description. You must certainly know that he is the only writer who has dared to affirm that Charles XII. fought the battle of Narva with no more than eight thousand men. All the other historians give him twenty thousand: they say what is probable; but M. de Voltaire is the first that has told the truth in this important article. Nevertheless, you call him an arch-liar because he said that a suit of red-laced clothes was brought to General Lieven, at the siege of Thorn; and you magnify this enormous error, by positively asserting that the lace was not upon a red ground.

But what name will suit you, sir, you who so lavishly bestow, about matters of such mighty consequence, the genteel appellation of arch-liar, not only upon a man who is extremely fond of the truth, but likewise upon all the other historians who have written the "History of Charles XII.;" what name, sir, will suit you, after the copy you give of the Grand Seignior's letter to that monarch? Here follows the beginning of the letter:

“We Sultan Pasha, to King Charles XII. by the grace of God King of Sweden and of the Goths, health, etc.”

How could you, sir, who have been among the Turks, and who seem to have learned from them not to be very nice in the choice of your words, how could you be ignorant of their style? What Turkish emperor ever designated himself “Sultan Pasha”? What letter of the divan ever began in this manner? What prince ever wrote that he would send plenipotentiaries, the first opportunity, in order to learn the particulars of a battle? what letter of the Grand Seignior ever concluded with this expression: “To the protection of God”? In fine, when did you ever see an express from Constantinople dated in the year of the creation, and not in that of the Hegira? The iman of the august sultan, who shall write the history of that great emperor and his sublime viziers, may well give you many opprobrious appellations, if the Turkish politeness admits of such rusticity.

Does it then become you, sir, after the production of such a piece as this, which would offend that same Baron Puffendorf, to exclaim against a lie about a red coat?

Besides, are you a zealous advocate of the truth, when you conceal the cruelties exercised by the chamber of liquidations under Charles XI. when, in speaking of Patkul, you pretend to forget that he defended the rights of the Livonians, who had committed them to his charge; of those same Livonians who now live happily under the mild government of the illustrious Semiramis of the

North? This, sir, is not barely to betray the truth; it is to betray the cause of mankind; it is to fail in your duty to your illustrious country, which is an enemy to oppression.

Cease then in your compilation, to bestow your Vandalic and Gothic epithets upon those who write history: cease to arrogate to yourself the right to employ that same barbarous pedantry which you impute to Puffendorf.

Do you know, sir, that Puffendorf is an author sometimes as incorrect as he is fashionable? Do you know that he is read, because he is only one of the kind that was tolerable in his time? Do you know that those whom you call arch-liars would blush if they did not understand the history of the world better than your Puffendorf? Do you know that M. de la Martinière corrected more than a thousand errors in the last edition of that book?

Let us open at a venture this book, which is so universally known. I light upon the article of the pope's. He says, in speaking of Julius II., that he left behind him, as well as Alexander VI., a bad name. Nevertheless the Italians revere the memory of Julius II. They consider him a great man, who, after having presided in four conclaves, and commanded armies, pursued, even to his grave, the glorious scheme he had formed of chasing the barbarians from Italy. He was a lover of the arts; he laid the foundation of that church which is the wonder of the universe; he encouraged painting, sculpture, and architecture, and, at the same time, he rekindled the extinguished valor of the Romans. The Italians despise, and with good reason too,

the ridiculous manner in which the greatest part of foreigners write the history of the popes. We ought to be capable of distinguishing the pontiff from the sovereign; we ought to be capable, though born at Stockholm, of entertaining a high opinion of the popes: we ought to remember the saying of the great Count de Medici, viz.: "That kingdoms are not governed with paternosters." In a word, a historian should be a man of no country, and of no party.

If we again open Baron Puffendorf's book, we shall find it asserted, in the article on Mary, Queen of England, daughter of Henry VIII., that she could not be recognized as his legitimate daughter without the authority of the pope. What a crowd of errors in these few words! She had been recognized by the parliament: and besides, what need had she of the assistance of Rome, in order to confirm her legitimation, since it never had been either the interest or the intention of the Romish church to annul the marriage of her mother?

In reading the article of Charles V. I find that, before the year 1516, Charles had always in his eye his famous maxim, "*ne plus ultra*": but he was then but fifteen years of age; and that motto was not composed till a long time after.

Shall we, on account of these errors, pronounce Puffendorf to be an arch-liar? No: we will rather acknowledge that, in such an extensive work, a few mistakes are excusable; and we would entreat you, sir, to be more accurate than he is; more thoroughly acquainted with the style of the Turks than you yet seem to be, more polite with the French; in

a word, to be more just and judicious in the choice of the facts you relate.

Among the many advantages with which the art of printing has been attended, this is one inconvenience—that crowds of scandalous pamphlets are published, to the disgrace of genius and of good manners. Wherever there are many writers there are many libels: these wretched performances, frequently produced in France, pass current in the North, in the same manner as our bad wines are sold there for Burgundy and champagne. The former are read, and the latter are drunk, often with the same want of taste; but men of real knowledge will always despise what France rejects.

You quote, sir, some pieces which are altogether unworthy the notice of the chaplain of Charles XII. Your translator, M. Walmoth, has honestly informed us, in his notes, that some of these are such wretched and obscure satires, that any gentleman would be ashamed to cite them.

The duties of a historian are many and various. Allow me to remind you of two of them, which are of some consequence; these are, never to rail, and never to be tedious. For the first I can easily excuse you, because your book will be the less read; but for the last I cannot possibly forgive you, because I have been obliged to read it. In other respects, sir, I am with all possible regard, your most humble, and most obedient servant.

HISTORICAL NOTES
ON RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL
MOVEMENTS.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

IN the midst of so many religious wars, and scenes of disasters, the Council of Trent was assembled. This Council was the longest that had ever been held, and yet the most peaceable. It formed no schism like that of Basel, it lighted no fires like that of Constance, it did not pretend to depose crowned heads like that of Lyons, nor did it follow the example of the Lateran Council (and far less that of Rome, which stripped the Count of Toulouse of his patrimony, in which Pope Gregory VII. kindled the flames of discord throughout Europe, by presuming to depose the Emperor Henry IV. The third and fourth Council of Constantinople, and the first and second of Nice, had been theatres of divisions and enmity; but this Council of Trent was peaceable, or at least its disputes were neither public nor attended with consequences.

If there is any historical certainty, it is in what was written concerning this Council by cotemporary authors. The famous Sarpi, the defender of the Venetian liberties, better known by the name of Francis Paolo, and the Jesuit Pallavicini, his antagonist, both agree in essential matters of fact. It is true that Pallavicini reckons three hundred and

sixty errors committed by Francis Paolo; but what are these errors? He accuses him of having mistaken dates and names. Pallavicini has been detected in as many faults as his adversary; and when he is in the right against him, it is hardly worth being in the right. Of what consequence is it, whether a trifling letter of Leo X., was written in 1516 or 1517? Whether the nuncio Arcimboldi, who made such a traffic of indulgences in the North, was the son of a tradesman of Milan or of Genoa? Or, indeed, what signifies it whether he did or did not sell indulgences? What matters it whether Cardinal Martinusius was a monk of the order of St. Basel, or a hermit of St. Paul? But we should be glad to know whether this defender of Transylvania, against the Turks, was assassinated by the order of Ferdinand I., brother of Charles V. In fine, Sarpi and Pallavicini have both told the truth, but in a different manner; one as a freeman, and the defender of a free senate; the other as a Jesuit, who wanted to be a cardinal.

Charles V. proposed to Pope Clement VII., to call this Council as early as the year 1533, but that pontiff, who still trembled at the remembrance of the sacking of Rome and his own captivity, and dreading lest the story of his spurious birth should embolden the council to depose him, eluded the emperor's request, to whom he did not dare to give an absolute denial. Francis I., of France, proposed Geneva as the place of session, at the very time that the reformed religion began to be preached in that city. It is more than probable that if the coun-



cil had been held in Geneva the reformed party would have been considerable sufferers.

During these procrastinations, the Protestants of Germany demanded a national Council to be held; and, in their answer to the pope's legate, Contarini, founded their request upon these words of our Saviour: "When two or three are gathered together in my name, I will be in the midst of them." Their quotation was allowed to be just; but it was said at the same time, that if two or three persons were gathered together in the name of Christ, in a hundred thousand different places of the earth, this might produce a hundred wars and councils, which might produce as many different confessions of faith, in which case there never would have been any union, though it might be allowed at the same time, that there never would have been any civil wars.

Pope Paul III., of the family of Farnese, proposes Vicenza; but the Venetians reply, that the Turkish Divan might take umbrage at an assembly of Christians being held in the Venetian territories. He next proposes Mantua; but the chief of that city is apprehensive of admitting a foreign garrison. At length the city of Trent is pitched upon, the pope being willing to pay a compliment to the emperor, of whose assistance he stood much in need at that time, having hopes to obtain the investiture of the Milanese for his natural son, Peter Farnese, to whom he afterwards gave Parma and Placentia.

The Council is at length convoked by a bull, "by the authority of the Father, the Son, and the Holy

Ghost, and of the apostles Peter and Paul, whose authority the pope exercises on earth"; in which the emperor, the King of France, and the other crowned heads, are invited to be present thereat. Charles V. expresses his indignation that they should have dared to put a king on a footing with him, and especially a king who was in alliance with infidels, after all that he had done for the service of the church. But here his imperial majesty seems to have forgotten the sacking of Rome.

Pope Paul, who wanted to bestow the investiture of Parma and Placentia on his bastard, and thought that Francis I. might be more serviceable to him in that affair than the emperor, in order to intimidate the latter who was pressed hard by the Turks and Protestants, threatens him with the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in case he opposed the bestowal of the investiture of Parma; adding: "The Jews have been dispersed for crucifying their master; and the Greeks have lost their empire and their liberty for having insulted his vicar."

After a great deal of caballing, the emperor and the pope are reconciled. Charles permits his bastard to reign quietly in Parma; and Paul sends three legates to open the Council at Trent, which he proposes to direct from his Vatican. His legates correspond with him in ciphers, an invention little known in those days, and which was first made use of by the Italians.

The legates and the Archbishop of Trent begin by granting three years and three hundred and sixty days' deliverance from purgatory, to every one who shall actually be in the city at the opening of the Council.

The pope issues a bull, forbidding any prelate to appear by proxy, and immediately the proxies of the Archbishop of Mentz arrive, and are well received, this law not being made for the ecclesiastical princes of Germany, whom it was the pope's interest to humor.

And now Paul bestows on his son, Peter Louis Farnese, the investiture of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, with the connivance of Charles V., and publishes a jubilee.

The Council is opened by a sermon from the Bishop of Bitonto, in which this prelate proves that a council is necessary, "First, because several councils had deposed kings and emperors. Secondly, because we read in Virgil's 'Æneid,' that Jupiter assembled a council of the gods." He goes on with observing: "That God called a council before he created man, and destroyed the Tower of Babel; that all the prelates of the church should repair to Trent, as the Greeks did into the Trojan horse. That the gate of the council-chamber, and that of Paradise, are one and the same; that the spring of the fountain of life flows from it, with which the fathers are to sprinkle their hearts, as parched lands; or else that the Holy Ghost will open their mouths as it did those of Balaam and Caiaphas."

A discourse of this kind seems to contradict what we have said of the revival of learning in Italy. But this Bishop of Bitonto was a Milanese monk; a native of Florence or of Rome, or a disciple of Bembo or Gaza, would not have talked in this manner. It must be considered that though

good taste was established in several of the capital cities, it never spread over all the provinces.

The first thing ordered by the Council, was, that the prelates should always appear in the habit of their calling. The custom at that time was for the clergy to dress like laymen, except when in the exercise of their function.

There were very few prelates then present at the Council; most of the bishops of great sees brought theologians, or professors of divinity, along with them, who spoke for them. There were some also employed by the pope.

Almost all these theologians were monks of the order of St. Francis, or of that of St. Dominic, and were continually disputing about original sin, notwithstanding the emperor's ambassadors objected to such disputes, which they looked upon as idle and of no utility. These monks began on the grand question, whether the Virgin Mother of Christ was born subject to the sin of Adam. The Dominicans, adversaries of the Franciscans, obstinately maintained, with their patron St. Thomas, that she was conceived in original sin. The dispute was long and vehement; and the Council was at length obliged to put an end to it, by determining that the Virgin was not comprehended in the original sin common to all mankind; but at the same time she was not altogether exempt from it.

Duprat, Bishop of Clermont, after this was over, requires that his master, the King of France, may be prayed for by name, as well as the emperor, as he had received the same invitation as the emperor, to the Council; but his demand was refused, it

being alleged that in this case they must also pray for the other kings by name, which might occasion some difference with those who should find themselves last named: the rank of crowned heads remained as unsettled then as in former times.

Peter Danès arrives with the character of ambassador from the King of France. It was at one of the meetings of this Council that he made his famous repartee to an Italian bishop, who, after having heard him speak a long time, said, when he had ended: "How this cock crows!" To this insipid pun Danès replied with great coolness: "Would to God Peter may repent at the crowing of this cock."

And this is a proper place for taking notice of the bon mot of Don Bartholomew de los Martiros, primate of Portugal, who, speaking of the necessity of a reformation in the church, said that the most illustrious cardinals stood in need of being most illustriously reformed.

The bishops could with difficulty be brought to yield the precedency to the cardinals, whom they did not reckon as belonging to the church hierarchy; and the cardinals had not, at that time, the title of eminency, which they did not assume till under the pontificate of Pope Urban VIII. Here it is to be observed, that although all the fathers and theologians of the Council spoke in Latin at their meetings, yet they had some difficulty in understanding one another because a Pole, an Englishman, a German, a Frenchman and an Italian, have each a very different manner of pronouncing that language.

One of the most important questions discussed in this Council, was that of the residence of bishops, and their institution by divine right. Almost all the prelates, excepting those of Italy, who were particularly in the pope's interest, insisted that their institution should be declared one *jure divino*; alleging, that if it were not so, they would have no reason to condemn the Protestants. But how could they pretend their institution to be wholly divine, when they were obliged to receive their bulls of prelacy from the pope? If the Council controverted this point, the pope would then be no more than a simple bishop like themselves. His see was indeed the first of the Latin church, but not first of all sees; and therefore must lose its authority: and this question, which seemed at first wholly theological, became, in fact, a very political and delicate point. It continued to be debated a long time with great elocution; and none of the popes under whom this long Council was held would ever suffer it to be determined.

The subjects of predestination and saving grace were also a long time under consideration, and at length decrees were drawn up; Domingo Soto, one of the divines of this Council, explained these decrees in favor of the opinion of the Dominicans, in three large volumes in folio: but father Andrew Vega answered him in fifteen volumes of the same size; in which he explained them to the advantage of the Franciscans.

The doctrine of the seven sacraments was next examined with great attention, and passed without any disputes.

After having settled this tenet as it is now received by the whole Latin church, they proceeded to the plurality of church benefices. This was a ticklish point: several of the members spoke largely against the abuse, which had been long introduced, of suffering a number of benefices and dignities to be held by one person, and revived the old complaints which were made in the pontificate of Pope Clement VII., who in the year 1534 granted his nephew, Cardinal Hippolito, the usufruction of all the vacant benefices in the world, for six months.

Pope Paul wants to reserve to himself the decision of this point; but the fathers make a decree that no one shall hold two bishoprics at the same time, but with this modification: that it may be done by virtue of a dispensation from the pope. This has never been refused to the German prelates; so that now a poor country curate shall be incapable of enjoying two livings of one hundred crowns a year apiece, when a prelate shall be in possession of bishoprics to the amount of several millions. It was the interest of all the bishops, princes, and nations in the world to root out this abuse, and yet we find it authorized.

This point having somewhat ruffled the minds of the several parties, Pope Paul transfers the Council from Trent to Bologna, on pretence of a contagious disorder prevailing in the former city.

During the two first sessions of the council at Bologna, the pope's bastard, Peter Louis Farnese, Duke of Parma, becoming insupportable through his insolence, debauchery, and extortion, is murdered in Placentia, as Cosmo de Medici had been

before him in Ferrara, his brother Julian before him, Duke Galeazzo Sforza in Milan, and several other new-made princes. There are no proofs of the emperor Charles V., being accessory to this murder; but it is certain he enjoyed the fruits of it, for the very next day the governor of Milan seized upon Placentia in the emperor's name.

It may easily be supposed that this murder and the sudden depriving the pope of the city of Placentia, occasioned a rupture between the pope and the emperor. These dissensions affected the Council; and the few bishops of the empire who remained behind in Trent, refused to acknowledge the fathers of the Council of Bologna.

It was during these disputes that Charles V., triumphant over the Protestant princes by the famous battle of Mühlberg, in the year 1547, crowned with success on success, and displeased with the pope, aspires to the glory of doing what the latter could not, namely, to bring about a union, at least for a time, between the Catholics and Protestants of Germany. With this view he sets the theologians to work on all sides, and publishes his "inhalt," "interim," or temporary profession of faith, till a better can be drawn up. This was not declaring himself head of the church, as Henry VIII. had done; but it would have been the same thing in fact, if the Germans had been as tractable as the people of England.

This formula of the Interim has its foundation in the doctrine of the Church of Rome, but modified and explained in terms less offensive to those of the reformed party. The laity were allowed to par-

take of the cup at the eucharist, and priests to marry. There was wherewithal to have pleased every one if the spirit of party could ever be pleased; but neither the Catholics nor the Protestants were satisfied. Pope Paul, who might have been expected to oppose this proceeding, remained quiet. He foresaw that it would fall to the ground of itself; and even if he had been disposed to make use of the same arms against the emperor, as had his predecessors, Gregory VII. and Innocent IV., the example of England and the power of Charles made him humble.

Other concerns more pressing, because of a private nature, disturb the quiet of this pontiff's days. Affairs in Parma and Placentia were in an odd and ticklish situation. Charles V., as master of Lombardy, had lately annexed Placentia to that territory, and might do the same by Parma.

The pope, on his part, wants to annex Parma to the ecclesiastical state, and to give his grandson, Octavio Farnese, an equivalent. This prince is married to a natural daughter of the emperor, who has taken Placentia from him, and is grandson to the pope who wants to deprive him of Parma. Thus persecuted at once by two such near relatives, he resolves to ask assistance from France, and oppose the designs of his grandfather, the pope. Thus the incontinence of the pope and the emperor excites a furious quarrel in the Council of Trent, and their bastards stir up the most violent intrigues, while the monkish divines are busied in arguments. The pope, struck with grief, dies, like almost all other sovereign princes in the midst of the troubles they

themselves have raised, and which they do not live to see ended. His memory is severely censured, sometimes perhaps unjustly.

Juan del Monte is elected pope in his place, by the name of Julius III., and agrees to remove the Council again to Trent; but the quarrel about Parma overturns this Council. Octavio Farnese persists in refusing to give up Parma to the holy see; Charles V., is as resolute to keep Placentia, in spite of the tears and entreaties of his daughter Margaret, Octavio's wife. Another bastard steps in between and brings the war into Italy. This was the wife of one of Octavio's brothers, a daughter of Henry II., king of France and the Duchess of Valentinois, who engages her father, Henry, to espouse her quarrel and to declare himself the protector of the house of Farnese, against the emperor and the pope: and this very prince, while he is burning all the Protestants in France, opposes the holding of a Council against the Protestants.

While the most Christian king is declaring against the Council, some Protestant princes send their ambassadors thither; namely, Maurice, the new Duke of Saxony, the new Duke of Würtemberg, and last of all the Elector of Brandenburg; but these ambassadors soon return discontented. The French king also sends an ambassador there; this was James Amiot, better known for his translation of Plutarch than by his embassy: he however appears at the Council only to protest against its proceedings.

In the meantime the two electors of Mentz and Trier take their seats at the Council below the

pope's legates: the presence of two cardinal legates, two nuncios, two ambassadors from the emperor, one from the king of the Romans, together with some Italian, Spanish, and German bishops, restore life and business in the Council.

The Franciscans and the Jacobins now divide the opinions of the fathers in relation to the eucharist, as they before did touching the article of predestination. The Franciscans maintain that the body of Christ in the elements changes place, and the Jacobins insist that it does not change place, but is instantaneously formed in the consecrated bread.

The fathers come to a determination that the body of Christ is under the appearance of the bread, and his blood under that of the wine; that the body and blood are together in each of the elements by concomitance whole and entire, and that they are instantaneously produced anew in every morsel of the bread, and in every drop of the wine, and that accordingly there is the same worship due to them as to God.

During these debates, Prince Philip, son of the emperor, Charles V., and afterwards King of Spain, and the hereditary prince of Savoy, pass through Trent. It is said in some of the books concerning the polite arts, that "the fathers gave a ball to these princes, which was opened by the Cardinal of Mantua, and that the fathers danced with a great deal of becoming gravity and decency." Cardinal Pallavicini is quoted in this account, to show that dancing was not considered among the profane diversions; and great stress is laid on the silence of

Francis Paolo, who nowhere condemns this ball given by the cardinals.

It is certain that among the Greeks and Hebrews dancing frequently made a part of their religious ceremonies; but it is not true that Pallavicini, as is said, speaks of the fathers' dancing: and the claim to Francis Paolo's indulgence is as falsely grounded; for if he does not condemn this ball, it is in reality because the fathers did not dance in it. Pallavicini, in his fifteenth chapter of his eleventh book, says only, that after a magnificent repast, given by the Cardinal of Mantua, president of the Council, in a large hall built on purpose, about a quarter of a mile out of the city, there were diversions, jousts, and dancing; but he does not say a word about the president of the Council dancing at them.

In the midst of these diversions, and the more serious occupations of the Council, Ferdinand I., King of Hungary, brother to Charles V., causes Cardinal Martinusius to be murdered in Hungary. This news fills the Council with trouble and indignation. The fathers refer the cognizance of this villainous affair to the pope, who cannot take cognizance of it. The times of Thomas Becket and Henry II., of England, were long since past. Julius III. excommunicates the murderers, who were Italians, and some time after declares King Ferdinand, brother to the potent prince Charles V., absolved from all censure on that occasion. So that the death of the famous Martinusius still remains among the great number of assassinations which have passed unpunished, to the disgrace of human nature.



But now matters of a greater moment disturb this Council. The Protestant party, defeated at Mühlberg, recovers strength and appears in arms. The new Elector of Saxony, Maurice, lays siege to Augsburg; the emperor is surprised in the passes of Tyrol, and is obliged to save himself by flight, with his brother, Ferdinand; and, by this one reverse of fortune, loses the fruit of all his victories. The Turks threaten to invade Hungary. Henry II. of France, in alliance at the same time with the Turks and Protestants, even while he is burning the latter at home as heretics, sends troops into Germany and Italy. The fathers of the Council fly in all haste from the city of Trent, and the Council continues forgotten for the space of ten years.

At length in 1560, Pope Pius IV.—by name Medequeno—who pretended to be a descendant from those great merchants and greater princes, the Medici, revives the Council of Trent; to which he invites all the princes of Christendom, and even sends nuncios to the Protestant princes assembled at Naumburg in Saxony, whom he styles his “Dear Sons”; but these princes refuse to acknowledge him for their father, and return his letters.

The Council recommences its session by a solemn procession of one hundred and twelve bishops between two files of musketeers; the Bishop of Reggio preaches a more eloquent sermon than the Bishop of Bitonto, in which he raises the power of the church to the utmost possible height, by equalling it to that of God; for he says: “The church has abolished circumcision and the Sabbath, which were instituted by God himself.” In the

two years, 1562 and 1563, during which time this Council held its second sessions, there were almost continual disputes between the several ambassadors about precedence. Those of Bavaria wanted to rank before those of Venice; but, after a long contest, they gave up the point.

The ambassadors of the Catholic Swiss cantons claim precedence of those of the Duke of Florence, and obtain it. One of the Swiss deputies, named Melchior Laci, offers to defend the Council with his sword and to serve the enemies of the church as his countrymen served the curate Zuinglius and his adherents whom they murdered and burnt for the good old cause.

But the greatest dispute was between the French and Spanish ambassadors. The Count de Luna, ambassador from Philip II. of Spain, insists on being incensed when at mass, and to kiss the wine cup, before Ferrier, the French ambassador. Not being able to obtain this distinction, he agrees to admit that two incense pots and two cups be used at the same time; but Ferrier continues inflexible. The two ambassadors threaten each other, the service is interrupted, and the church is filled with tumult and uproar. At length this difference is compromised, by omitting the ceremonies of incensing and kissing the cup.

New difficulties arise to retard the theological debates. The ambassadors of the emperor Ferdinand, successor to Charles V., will have this assembly to be a new Council, and not a continuation of the former. The legates adopt the mean between

the two parties, and say: "We continue the Council by calling it, and we call it by continuing it."

The grand question concerning the residence of bishops and their institution by divine right, is renewed with more warmth than before. The Spanish bishops, strengthened by the arrival of a number of prelates from France, maintain their pretensions. It was on this occasion that some of them complained that the Holy Ghost was always sent from Rome in the courier's mail; a famous witticism, of which the Protestants have not failed to make the most advantage.

Pius IV., enraged at the obstinacy of the bishops, declares these barbarians to be enemies of the holy see, and that he must have recourse to a million of gold crowns. The Spanish bishops complain bitterly that their Italian brethren have betrayed the interests of the prelacy, and that they receive sixty gold crowns a month each from the pope. The greatest part of the Italian bishops were poor, and the see of Rome being richer than all the bishops of the Council put together, might assist them without any breach of decency; but then those who receive favors are very apt to be of the same opinion of the person from whom they receive them.

This same pope, Pius IV., offers Catherine de Medici, queen regent of France, a hundred thousand gold crowns, and to lend her a hundred thousand more, and a body of Swiss and German troops of the Catholic religion, if she will drive all the Huguenots out of France, confine Monluc, bishop of Valence, who is suspected of favoring them, a prisoner in the Bastille, together with the

Marshal de L'Hôpital, who lay under the same suspicion, and who was the greatest man in France, if that title is due to one in whom genius, learning, and probity were united. His holiness moreover demands the abolition of all the laws made by the French parliaments relative to the church; and in these hopes advances twenty-five thousand crowns. The abject acceptance of this charity of twenty-five thousand crowns shows into what an abyss of wretchedness the French government was at that time sunk.

But it was still more infamous that the Cardinal of Lorraine, who at length came to the Council, accompanied by some French bishops, should begin by complaining that the pope had given the king his master no greater sum than twenty-five thousand crowns. It was at this time that Ferrier, the French ambassador, in his speech to the Council, compared Charles IX., then an infant, to the Emperor Constantine: a comparison which every ambassador did not fail to apply to his own sovereign. In the first place, this comparison suited none of them. In the next, Constantine never received a subsidy of twenty-five thousand crowns from any pope: and lastly, there was some little difference between an infant king of a small part of Gaul, whose mother held the reins of government, and an emperor who was sovereign of both empires of the East and West.

Ferdinand's ambassadors complained with great warmth against the pope for having promised money to France, and moved that the Council might make a reformation in the pope and his

court; and that there should not be more than twenty-four cardinals at most, agreeably to the decree of the Council of Basel, never considering that by retrenching their numbers they increased their power. Ferdinand I. likewise demanded, that all nations might be allowed to pray in their mother-tongue; that the laity might partake of the cup; and that the German princes might remain in possession of the church revenues which they had gotten into their hands.

Proposals of this kind were generally started when there was any difference with the see of Rome, and as generally dropped again when matters were compromised.

The dispute about the cup continued a long time. Several of the divines asserted that the cup was not necessary to communion; that the manna in the desert, which was a type of the eucharist, was eaten without drinking; that Jonathan did not drink when he ate his honey; that Christ, when he gave the bread to the apostles, gave it them as laymen, and that he made them priests by giving them the wine. This question was decided before the arrival of the Cardinal of Lorraine, but afterwards it was left to the pope to grant or refuse the cup to laymen as he should judge proper.

The subject of the divine right was again renewed, and divided the Council. It was on this occasion that the Jesuit Lainez, who succeeded Ignatius Loyola as general of the order, and who was one of the pope's theologians at the Council, said, that "no other church could reform that of Rome, inasmuch as the servant could not be above his master."

The Italian bishops joined in his opinion, and admitted of no divine right but in the pope. The French bishops, who came with the Cardinal of Lorraine, joined the Spaniards against the court of Rome; which made the Italians say that the Council was fallen from the Spanish itch into the French disease, "*Della rognna Spagnuola nel mal Francese.*"

Recourse was now had to negotiating, caballing, and bribing. The legates gained over as many of the foreign theologians as they could. There was in particular one Hugonis, a doctor of the Sorbonne, who served them as a spy, and who is positively said to have received fifty gold crowns from the Bishop of Ventimiglia for betraying to him the secrets of the Cardinal of Lorraine.

The French court was at that time so exhausted by her religious and political disputes, that she had not money enough to pay the theologians she had sent to the Council, who therefore, all of them, returned home, excepting only this Hugonis, who was in the pay of the legates. Nine French bishops had already quitted the Council, so that now there remained only eight.

And now the religious disputes in France stained that kingdom with blood, in the same manner as they had done Germany in the reign of Charles V. The pope, incensed at a temporary peace which had been made with the Protestants, in the month of March of this year 1563, caused the Cardinal de Chatillon, Bishop of Beauvais, an avowed Huguenot, to be condemned by the Inquisition at Rome; including in the same sentence ten other bishops of France, none of whom we find to have appealed

to the Council. Some of them contented themselves with appealing to the parliament. On the whole, we do not find that any one session of this Council opposed this act of authority in the pope.

The fathers take this opportunity to draw up a decree against all those princes who wanted to exercise a civil power over ecclesiastics, and compel them to pay subsidies. All the ambassadors, in general, opposed this decree, and it did not pass. The dispute grew warm on all sides. In the midst of the tumult, the French ambassador, Ferrier, cries out: "Let us not in this place cry out with the devils at the approach of Jesus Christ, 'Lord send us into the herd of swine.'" It is not very clear what affinity there could be between the herd of swine and this dispute.

After such a variety of altercations, which though warm in their beginnings were always quieted by the prudence of the legates, it was now moved to put an end to the Council.

In the 24th session, the Council declared the marriage tie to be perpetual from Adam, and that it has become a sacrament from the time of Christ; that it cannot be dissolved even by adultery, and that nothing can make it void, but consanguinity within the fourth degree, or a dispensation from the pope. The Protestants, on the other hand, were of opinion that a man may marry his cousin, and may put away his wife, if found guilty of adultery, and marry another.

In this session also, the Council declares that, in criminal cases, bishops can be tried only by the pope; and that it is his province alone, in cases

of necessity, to commission other bishops to try them. This law, however, is admitted in very few courts of justice, especially those of France.

In the last session they pronounce an anathema against all those who reject the invocation of saints, pretending that we are to pray to God alone; that is, who do not think God like those weak and frail princes of the earth, who are not to be approached but through their courtiers or ministers.

Anathema is likewise pronounced against those who do not worship relics; that is, who think that the bones of a dead carcass have no sort of relation to the spirit which animated the living body, and that these bones have no virtue of their own. Such are also anathematized who deny the doctrine of purgatory, an ancient dogma of the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, which has been adopted and sanctified by the church, and thought by some to be more suitable to the justice and clemency of a God who remembers mercy in the midst of his judgments, than the belief of an eternal state of torment, which seems to make him a God of implacable vengeance.

In these anathemas no mention is made either of those of the confession of Augsburg, nor of those of the communion of Zuinglius and Calvin, nor those of the church of England.

This same session allows monks to make vows at sixteen years of age, and nuns at twelve; a permission which is justly considered as highly prejudicial to the well-being of states, but without which the monastic orders would have very soon become extinct.

They assert the validity of indulgences, which was the first source of those quarrels which occasioned the calling of this Council; but they prohibit the sale of them. Nevertheless, they continue still to be sold at Rome; but it must be confessed they are sold very cheap, and you may have them at second hand in some of the petty Roman Catholic Swiss cantons, for four sols a piece. The chief market for them is in the Spanish West Indies, where the people are richer and more ignorant than in these petty cantons.

At length they finished by recommending to the bishops never to yield precedency to the ministers of crowned heads, nor to lords.

The Council is subscribed by four legates, eleven cardinals, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, seven abbots, thirty-nine proxies of absent bishops, and seven generals of religious orders.

They did not make use of the form: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," but "it hath seemed good to us in presence of the Holy Ghost."

The Cardinal of Lorraine revived the ancient acclamations of the first Greek councils, crying out: "Long live the pope, the emperor, and all kings," which was repeated by the fathers. The cardinal was greatly blamed in France for not mentioning the king his master, by name; and from that time it plainly appeared how much the cardinal was in fear of offending Philip II., of Spain, who was the great support of the leaguers.

This finished this Council, which—including its

interruptions—had sat twenty-one years. The theologians who had no voices in the deliberations, explained the several dogmas; the prelates pronounced the decrees or conclusions, and the pope's legates directed them, appeased all murmurs, softened all animosities, eluded whatever could hurt the court of Rome, and, in fine, directed and controlled all the proceedings.

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS IN FRANCE.

It has always been necessary for the sovereign to act with more delicacy and caution towards the church, the most numerous of the three orders composing the state, than any other. To preserve at the same time a union with the see of Rome, and support the liberties of the Gallican church, which are the rights of the ancient church; that is, to make the bishops obey as subjects, without infringing their episcopal immunities, to oblige them to submit in many things to the secular jurisdiction, and to leave them judges in others, to make them contribute to the exigencies of the state, without injuring their privileges; all this required a compound of dexterity and resolution of which Louis XIV. was always master. The clergy of France were by degrees reduced to a state of order and decency, from which the civil wars and the licentiousness of the times had caused them to deviate. The king would no longer permit laymen to possess benefices in commendam; nor any to be bishops unless they were priests, as the Cardinal Mazarin,

who had held the bishopric of Metz, when not even a sub-deacon, and the Duke de Verneuille, who enjoyed the profits thereof, though a layman.

The money paid one year with another to the king, by the clergy of France and the conquered towns, amounted to about two millions five hundred thousand livres; and, since the numerical increase of the value of money, they have assisted the state yearly with about four millions, under the name of tenths, extraordinary subsidies, and free gifts. The name and privilege of free gift is still preserved as one of the remains of ancient custom, whereby the lords of fiefs were wont to contribute to the necessities of the state, by way of free gift to the king. In the time of feudal anarchy, bishops and abbots, being lords of fiefs, were only obliged to furnish soldiers. Kings then, like other lords, lived on the revenue of their own domains: afterwards, when every other order changed, the clergy remained on their old footing, and maintained the custom of assisting the state by way of free gift.

To this ancient custom, which a body that assembles often, easily preserves, and which must be necessarily lost by one that never assembles, we may join that immunity and maxim, always claimed by the church: that its revenues are those of the poor. Not that it pretends to owe nothing to the state, of which it holds everything, because, when the public is necessitated, it is to be considered in the first class of poor: and Louis XIV. exacted these supplies in such a manner, that he was sure of never being refused.

It is amazing to all Europe as well as to France,

that the clergy, who are supposed to be possessed of one-third of the revenue of the kingdom, should contribute so little to relieve its wants. If they are masters of one-third of the whole, it is indisputable that they should pay one-third of the expenses, which, upon an average, amounts, demonstrably, to thirty millions yearly, besides the duties on perishable commodities, which they pay in common with other subjects; but vague and partial judgments are passed on everything. The people talk of the clergy possessing one-third of the kingdom's revenues at random, just as they say Paris contains a million inhabitants.

Were we but to take the pains of computing the revenues of the bishoprics, by the leases granted about fifty years ago, it would appear that the whole annual revenue did not then exceed four millions; and the commendatory abbeys amounted to about four millions five hundred thousand pounds. It is true the leases were estimated at one-third of their real value, and if to this estimation we add the increase of the landed revenue since, the sum total of the consistorial benefices will amount to sixteen millions; and it should not be forgotten that out of this there goes annually a considerable sum to Rome, which, as it never comes back, is absolutely lost to us. The king is herein extremely liberal to the holy see; by which the state is plundered, in the space of a century, of more than 400,000 marks of silver, which could not in time fail to impoverish the kingdom, were not the loss abundantly repaired by the returns of commerce. To these benefices that pay annats to

Rome, must be added curés, convents, collegiate livings, and all other ecclesiastical establishments; and, if we compute the value of all together at fifty millions yearly, we shall not fall far short of the truth.

Those who have inquired into this matter with the utmost accuracy and attention cannot carry the sum total of the yearly revenues of the Gallican church, secular and regular, farther than eighty millions. This is no exorbitant sum when appropriated to the maintenance of ninety thousand regulars, and about one hundred and sixty thousand other ecclesiastics, which was the case in 1700: and moreover, out of the above ninety thousand, more than one-third live on alms and masses. Many conventual monks do not stand their community in two hundred livres yearly: there are regular abbots, whose income each, annually amounts to two hundred thousand livres. From this enormous and striking inequality, murmurs must necessarily arise. It is really lamentable, that a country curate shall, from his laborious duties, be only entitled to a scanty income of three hundred livres—and perhaps he shall receive from Christian liberality not more than four or five hundred livres besides—while a lazy monk, become an abbot, but not on that account the less lazy, is master of an immense fortune, receiving at the same time from his inferiors the most flattering and pompous titles. These abuses are carried much higher in Flanders, Spain, and above all, in the Catholic states in Germany, where we often find princes among the regularly religious.

Abuses almost everywhere pass by degrees into laws; and if the wisest men were to assemble to compose laws, where is that kind of state whose constitution would always remain unalterably the same?

The clergy of France always observe a custom that is very burdensome to them when they assist the king with a free-gift of several millions for a certain term of years. They borrow the money, and reimburse their creditors with the capital, after having paid the interest; thus paying it twice over. It would be more to the advantage of the state, as well as of the clergy in general, and more conformable to reason, if this reverend body were to assist the wants of their country by contributions proportioned to the value of their respective benefices: but we are always too much attached to old customs. It is owing to this disposition that the clergy, though they assemble every five years, have never yet had a hall, nor any one thing they could call their own. It is clear, that with less expense to themselves, they might have more effectually served the king, and have erected a palace in Paris, which might have been a new ornament to that capital.

In the minority of Louis XIV. the maxims of the clergy of France were not entirely cleared from the impurities they had imbibed from the League. It is well known, that in the younger days of Louis XIII. and in the last assembly of the states, held in 1614, the most numerous part of the nation, distinguished by the appellation of the third state, and which is, as it were, the foundation of the state, in

vain demanded of the parliament that it should be registered as a fundamental law: "That no spiritual power can deprive kings of their sacred rights, which they hold only from God; and that it is high treason of the blackest kind to teach the doctrine of deposing and killing kings." This was the substance of the nation's demand, in nearly the same words. It was made when the blood of Henry the Great still smoked. Yet a bishop of France, born in that kingdom, the Cardinal Duperron, opposed violently the proposition, under pretence that it was not the business of the third state to dictate laws that any way concern the church. Why did he not then, in conjunction with them, agree to this point? but he was so far from this as to say that: "The power of the pope was plenary without control, direct as to spiritual matters, indirect as to temporals; and he was also commissioned by the clergy to add, they could excommunicate all such persons as might pretend to maintain that the pope could not depose kings."

The nobility was gained over, and the third state obliged to desist. The parliament renewed their ancient decrees, declaring the crown independent, and the king's person sacred. The ecclesiastical chamber, in acknowledging the king's person to be sacred, persisted in maintaining that the crown was dependent. The very same temper had before deposed Louis the Débonnaire. It now prevailed so far, that the court was obliged to acquiesce, and imprison the printer that had published the decree of parliament, under the title of, "The Fundamental Law." This proceeding was said to be necessary for

the public peace; but it was really meant to punish those who furnished the crown with defensive arms. The case was quite different at Vienna, because France stood in awe of the court of Rome, and the pope was afraid of the house of Austria.

The cause here given up was so much the cause of kings, that James I., King of England, wrote against Cardinal Duperron; and this piece is the best of his works. It was also the cause of the people, whose safety required that their sovereign should by no means depend on a foreign power. Reason at length prevailed, and Louis XIV. with the weight of his authority, found no great trouble in procuring it to be heard.

Antonio Perez had recommended to Henry IV. three things,—Rome, Consejo, Pielago. Louis XIV. had attained to such a superiority in the two last, he had no need of the first. He was particularly careful to preserve the custom of appealing to parliament, from the decrees of ecclesiastical courts, in all cases respecting the regal jurisdiction. The clergy sometimes complained of this proceeding, and sometimes applauded it: for if on the one hand these appeals support the rights of the state against episcopal authority, they yet confirm that authority itself, in maintaining the rights of the episcopal church against the pretensions of the court of Rome: insomuch that the bishops have looked on the parliament as their adversaries and defenders; and the government has been careful that in spite of the quarrels of religion, the boundaries which are easily broken down should on neither side be infringed. It is the same in regard

to the different bodies and companies of the state as with the interest of trading towns; to balance them is in the hand of the legislator.

The most important and delicate affair of this sort, was that of the *régale*. The kings of France have a right to present to all simple benefices of a diocese during the vacancy of the see, and also for that time to appropriate the revenues to their own use. This prerogative is peculiar to the kings of France; but every state has its privileges. The kings of Portugal enjoy one-third of the revenues of every bishop in their dominions. The emperor claims the first fruits, and disposes of all livings when they become first vacant after his accession. The rights of the kings of Naples and Sicily are still greater. Those of the court of Rome are founded rather on custom than primitive title. The kings of the Merovingian race gave away livings and bishoprics on their own sole authority. It appears just that they should preserve the privilege of disposing of the revenue, and nominating to simple benefices during the short space that happens between the death of one bishop and the registering his successor's oath of fidelity.

The bishops of several towns, reunited to the crown under the third race, refused to acknowledge this right, which their former lords had been too weak to maintain. The popes sided with the bishops, and their claims always remained enveloped in obscurity. The parliament under Henry IV. in 1608 declared, that the *régale* should take place throughout the whole kingdom. The clergy murmured; and that prince, who temporized with

the bishops and court of Rome, brought the affair before his council, but took care it should not be decided.

The cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin caused several orders of council to be issued, whereby those bishops who held themselves exempt from that authority were required to produce their titles. The affair remained undecided even in the year 1673; and the king at that time did not dare to dispose of a single benefice in almost any diocese beyond the Loire, during the vacancy of a see. At length, in 1673, the chancellor Michael Letellier published an edict, whereby all the bishoprics in the kingdom were declared subject to the régale. Two bishops, who were unhappily the most virtuous men in the kingdom, obstinately refused to submit. These were Pavillon, bishop of Alet, and de Caulet, bishop of Pamiers. They defended their cause at first with plausible reasons, and were as strongly opposed. When men of understanding dispute long, it is very likely that the question is far from being clear. This was indeed obscure: but it was evident that neither religion nor good order were interested in preventing the king from doing in two dioceses what he did in every other. Nevertheless, the two bishops remained inflexible. Neither one nor the other of them had caused his oath of fidelity to be registered; and the king thought he had a right to dispose of the livings vacated in their respective sees.

The two prelates excommunicated all who were thus provided for. Both had been suspected of Jansenism. Innocent X. was their enemy; but when they disputed against the king's prerogative,

he became their friend. This pope, Odescalchi, as virtuous and obstinate as themselves, warmly espoused their cause.

The king at first contented himself to exile the principal officers of these bishops. He showed more moderation than the two men who piqued themselves on their sanctity. Out of respect to his old age, the Bishop of Alet was left to die in peace. The Bishop of Pamiers still resisted, nor could any remonstrances move him. He repeated his excommunications, and persisted in not registering his oath of fidelity, persuaded that by such an oath the church was acknowledged as subservient to monarchy. His temporalities were seized by the king. The pope and the Jansenists indemnified him. He gained by the privation of his annuity, and died in 1680, satisfied, that in opposing the king, he had maintained the cause of heaven. His death did not extinguish the quarrel: the canons named by the king came to take possession; the monks, who pretended to be canons and grand vicars, obliged them to quit the church, and excommunicated them. The metropolitan, Montpesat, Archbishop of Toulouse, whose province it was to take cognizance of this matter, gave sentence, but to no purpose, against these pretended grand vicars. They appealed to Rome, according to the custom of referring to that court such ecclesiastical causes as were determined by the archbishops of France, a custom directly contrary to the liberties of the Gallican church: but there are contradictions in every form of human government. The parliament issued decrees. A monk named Carle, who was

one of these grand vicars, broke through the sentence of the archbishop as well as the decrees of the parliament. This last tribunal condemned him to be drawn on a sledge to the place of execution, and to lose his head. He was executed in effigy. From his asylum he insulted the archbishop and the king; and was supported by the pope. Nay, this sovereign pontiff went farther. Persuaded, like Pamiers, that the right of *régale* was an abuse on the church, and that the king had nothing to do with the livings of that vacant bishopric, he repealed the ordinances of the archbishops of Toulouse, and excommunicated the grand vicars named by that prelate, with all the ecclesiastics that held under the *régale*, and their abettors.

The king convened an assembly of the clergy, consisting of thirty-five bishops, and a like number of deputies of the second order. The Jansenists for the first time took part with the pope; and this pope, an enemy to the king, favored, without loving them; he piqued himself on opposing this monarch on every occasion: and, in 1689, joined with the allies against James II. because he was protected by Louis XIV. so that it was now a common saying that James should become a Huguenot, and the pope a Catholic, to terminate the troubles of Europe and of the Church.

In the meantime the clergy in 1681, unanimously declared for the king. Another trifling quarrel, now become important, engaged the public attention. The election to a priory in the suburbs of Paris inflamed the difference between the pope and the king. The Roman pontiff repealed the ordi-

nance of the Archbishop of Paris, and annulled his nomination to that priory. The parliament adjudged this proceeding of the court of Rome to be an abuse. The pope, by a bull, ordered the Inquisition to burn the parliament's decree. These disputes have been for a long time the common and inevitable consequences of that ancient mixture of the natural liberty that every country claims of governing within itself, and of its subserviency to a foreign power.

The assembly of the clergy took a course which shows that men of wisdom can yield with dignity to their sovereign, without any other power interposing. They consented that the right of *régale* should extend over the whole kingdom; but it was done in such a manner as to seem rather a concession on the part of the clergy, relinquishing their pretensions out of regard to their protector, than a formal acknowledgment of the absolute right of the crown.

The assembly justified themselves to the pope by a letter, wherein we find this one passage which alone ought to serve as a constant rule in all disputes, namely: "It is better to cede something of one's rights, than to disturb the public tranquillity." The king, the Gallican church, and the parliament, were contented. The Jansenists wrote some libels: the pope continued inflexible. He reversed by brief all the resolutions of the assembly, and commanded the bishops to retract their concessions. Here was some foundation for dividing forever the church of France from that of Rome.

There had been some talk of making a patriarch in the times of Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin.

It was the wish of every magistrate that the tribute of annats should be no longer paid to Rome; that the holy see should nominate to the benefices of Brittany for only six months in the year; and that the bishops of France should no longer be styled bishops by permission of the holy see. Had it been the king's inclination, he needed only to have said the word; he was master of the assembly of the clergy, and the nation was for him. Rome would have lost all by the inflexibility of a virtuous pope, who knew not how to temporize. But there are certain ancient boundaries that cannot be removed without the most violent shocks. It required stronger ties of interest, more inflamed passions, and greater perturbations in the minds of men, to break at once with the court of Rome; and this rupture would have been the more difficult while the ministry persisted in extirpating Calvinism. It was even looked on as a bold step to publish the four famous decisions of the same assembly in 1682, of which here follows the substance.

1. God gave no power, either directly or indirectly, in temporal matters, either to Peter or his successors.

2. The Gallican church approved of the Council of Constance, which declares general councils superior to the pope in spiritual matters.

3. The rules, customs, and established practices of the kingdom and the Gallican church, ought to remain unchangeable.

4. The pope's decisions in matters of faith are not binding, until approved by the church.

All the tribunals and faculties of theology registered these four propositions in their fullest sense, and forbade by edict any one to maintain the contrary. This firmness was regarded at Rome as an effort of rebellion; and by the protestants of Europe as a weak essay of a church naturally free, which had broken only four links of her chains. These four maxims were at first espoused with enthusiasm by the whole nation; but they afterwards cooled.

About the end of Louis the Great's reign, they began to be considered as problematical; and Cardinal Fleury caused them to be in part disavowed by an assembly of the clergy, without the least consequential murmur, because the minds of men were not then so much heated, and because during the administration of Cardinal Fleury, nothing very remarkable was done.

Pope Innocent was nevertheless more than ever exasperated: he refused bulls to all the bishops and commendatory abbots that had been nominated by the king; so that when he died, which was in 1689, there were twenty-nine sees in France without bishops. These prelates indeed were not without their revenues; but they dared not either to be consecrated, or enjoy any of the episcopal functions. The notion of creating a patriarch was revived. The quarrel about the rights of ambassadors at Rome, which completed the widening of these breaches, gave one reason to think that the time had come for establishing in France a Catholic

apostolic church that was not Roman. The attorney-general, de Harlay, and the advocate-general, Talon, made themselves sufficiently understood, by appealing, in 1687, from the bull against the franchises, as an abuse, and exclaiming against the obstinacy of the pope, who left so many churches without pastors. This was a step to which the king never could agree, though it might have been easily done, notwithstanding it appeared so very difficult.

The cause of Innocent XI. became now the cause of the holy see. The four propositions of the clergy of France attacked the phantom of infallibility—which though not believed in at Rome, yet was there supported—and the real power annexed to that phantom. Alexander VIII. and Innocent XII. followed the steps of the obdurate Odescalchi, not indeed with such violence. They confirmed the judgment pronounced against the assembly of the clergy: they refused bulls to the bishops; and in fine did too much, because Louis XIV. had not done enough. The bishops, weary of enjoying no more than a regal nomination, without the exercise of their episcopal functions, entreated the court of France to permit them to appease that of Rome.

The king, whose resolution was worn out, allowed their request. Each of them wrote separately to the court of Rome, expressing themselves grievously afflicted with the proceedings of the assembly; and each of them in his letter declared he did not look on that matter as decided, which they had before absolutely decided; nor upon that to be established which they had really established. Pignatelli (Innocent XII.) more mild than

Odescalchi, was satisfied with this proceeding. The four propositions were yet from time to time not less taught in France. The cause subsided when disputes ceased; yet it only lay dormant without being determined, as is always the case in a state which has not in such matters, invariable and acknowledged principles. Thus we sometimes oppose, sometimes give way to Rome, according to the characters of those who govern, or the particular interests of those who are at the head of the administration.

Louis XIV. had no other kind of ecclesiastical quarrel with the court of Rome; nor had he any opposition from the clergy in temporal matters.

Under him the clergy became respectable by a decency of behavior unknown to the barbarous times of the two first races of our kings, to the still more barbarous times of feudal government; absolutely unknown during the civil wars, and above all during The Fronde. There are indeed some few exceptions, which will always be the case according to the prevailing virtues or vices. It was now only that the eyes of the people began to be opened on the superstitions that always mingle with their religion. It was no longer accounted criminal to assert that Lazarus and Mary Magdalen never were in Provence, whatever might be the opinion of the Parliament of Aix, or of the Carmelites. The Benedictines could no longer persuade the people that Dionysius the Areopagite governed the church of Paris. Pretended saints, false miracles, and supposed relics began to be decried. That sound reasoning which had thrown such light upon phil-

osophy, made its way everywhere but slowly and with difficulty.

Gaston Louis de Noailles, brother of the cardinal and Bishop of Châlons, in 1702 had sufficient sensible piety, to cause to be thrown away, a relic which had been many ages carefully preserved in the church of Notre Dame, worshipped under the name of Jesus Christ's navel. All Châlons murmured against the bishop. Presidents, counsellors, king's officers, treasurers of France, merchants, citizens, canons, curates, unanimously and formally protested against this bold action of the bishop; affirming that the garment of Christ, preserved at Argenteuil, the handkerchief at Turin and Laon, the nail of the cross at St. Denis, and the prepuce at Rome, were identically his. But the bishop's wise resolution triumphed at length over the credulity of the people.

Some other superstitions, because united with respectable customs, still subsisted. The Protestants have therefore exulted; but they are obliged to acknowledge that there is no Catholic church in which abuse is less common or more despised than in France.

The true philosophical spirit, which had not taken root till about the middle of this century, could not extinguish the ancient and modern disputes in theology, of which it did not take cognizance. We shall now proceed to speak of those dissensions which are a disgrace to human reason.



Engraved by T.W. Inooh

CALVINISM.

It is undoubtedly a melancholy consideration that the church has always been torn by intestine divisions, and that so much blood should have been for so many ages shed by those who proclaimed the God of peace. This rage was unknown to paganism. It covered the earth with darkness, but scarcely spilt any other blood than that of animals; and if human victims were sometimes offered among the Jews and Pagans, such offerings, horrible as they are, never occasioned civil wars. The religion of the Pagans was composed of morality and festivals. Morality, which is common to all men and all seasons; and festivals, which are only acts of rejoicing, could never disturb mankind.

The spirit of dogmatism inspired men with the rage of civil war. I have often inquired how and by what means that dogmatic spirit which divided the schools of Pagan antiquity, without occasioning any disturbance, should among us produce such horrible disorders. It cannot be caused solely by fanaticism; for the Gymnosophists and Brahmins, the most fanatic of mankind, never hurt any but themselves. Cannot then the origin of this new plague, which has ravaged the earth, be found in that republican spirit which animated the primitive churches? Those secret assemblies, which from caves and grottoes defied the authority of the Roman emperors, by degrees formed a state within a state. It was a republic concealed in the bosom of the empire. Constantine drew it from under ground, and set it by the side of the throne.

The authority annexed to great sees was soon found to run counter to the spirit of popularity, which had till then inspired all the Christian assemblies. It often happened that when a metropolitan uttered one opinion, a suffragan bishop, a priest, or a deacon, maintained the direct contrary. All authority secretly hurts mankind, inasmuch as that authority is always on the increase. When people can find a pretext that may be deemed sacred, they soon make a duty of opposition.* Thus one party becomes persecutors, the other rebels, while on both sides they pretend to maintain the cause of God. We have seen by the disputes supported by Arius against a bishop, how the rage of governing souls has disturbed the peace of the earth. To deliver an opinion as agreeable to the will of heaven, to command it to be believed under pain of death, temporal and eternal, was in some men deemed the utmost period of spiritual despotism;

* All the mischiefs of religious zeal are, we apprehend, deducible from the single doctrine of faith, implying that our eternal happiness or misery depends upon our believing or disbelieving certain tenets, concerning which the faculty of reason cannot be exercised. This it was which opened a way to every species of fanaticism and spiritual rancor: for those who adopted this tenet considered every person that differed from them in opinion as reprobated and accursed; and mutual hatred, animosity, and persecution ensued. As the concerns of the soul were much more interesting than anything that related to temporal establishments, the spiritual guides acquired such influence over the minds of the neophytes, as often superseded the authority of the civil magistrates; a circumstance that could not fail to arouse the jealousy of the government under which they lived; and this jealousy was attended with severity, which served only to inflame the spirit of enthusiasm, and engender rebellion and despair.

and to resist these two menaces was in others thought the last effort of independence.

In the general history we have run through, we have seen a continual struggle between the secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, ever since the time of Theodosius and since that of Charlemagne, the grand fiefs continually struggling against their sovereigns; bishops often rising against kings, and popes taking part sometimes with bishops, sometimes with kings. In the first ages they disputed less in the Latin church. The continual invasions of barbarians scarcely gave them time to think; and few of their dogmatical opinions were sufficiently clear to secure them universal credit. The worship of images was almost everywhere rejected in the West, in the age of Charlemagne. A bishop of Turin, named Claudius, inveighed against them with great acrimony, and maintained several opinions that at this time give foundation to the Protestant credit. These opinions spread themselves in the valleys of Piedmont, Dauphiny, Provence, and Languedoc. They flourished in the twelfth century; soon afterwards produced the wars of the Albigenses; and having passed thence to the University of Prague, excited the wars of the Hussites.

The interval between the troubles that arose from the ashes of John Huss and Jerome of Prague and the disturbances renewed by Luther, was not more than one hundred years. The ancient opinions embraced by the Vaudois, the Albigenses, and the Hussites, revived and differently explained by Luther and Zuinglius, were eagerly adopted in

Germany, as they furnished pretence for seizing the many lands possessed by the bishops and abbots, and for resisting the power of the emperor: they triumphed in Sweden and Denmark, countries wherein people were free under their kings.

The English, who inherit from nature a spirit of independence, adopted, moulded them, and thence composed a religion for themselves. These opinions made their way in Poland; and their progress was considerable only in places where the people were not slaves. They found little difficulty in being received among the Swiss, because the government was republican. For the same reason they were near being established at Venice; and might have perhaps taken actual root there, had not Rome been so near; and if the government had not dreaded a democracy, to which the people in every republic naturally aspire, and which was the chief view of most of the reformers. The Hollanders shook off the yoke of Spain* before they embraced this religion. Geneva became a popular state by receiving Calvinism. The house of Austria took all possible pains to prevent these religions from getting a footing in their dominions. They scarcely made any progress in Spain. They were extirpated with fire and sword in the dukedom of Savoy, which was their cradle. In 1655 the inhabitants of the valleys of Piedmont underwent the same cruel

* The Dutch did not first throw off the Spanish yoke, and then embrace the Protestant religion; they were first converted to this doctrine, and finding themselves oppressed in the point of liberty of conscience, shook off the yoke of Spain.

trials that those of Merindol and Cabrière had undergone under Francis I. in France.

This sect having appeared dangerous to the Duke of Savoy, he absolutely exterminated it; so that there remained only some few, scarcely known, in the most rocky and desert places. It does not appear that the Lutherans and Calvinists caused any great troubles in France, under the dominions of Francis I. and Henry II. But when the government was weak and divided, the quarrels of religion became violent. Condé and Coligny became Calvinists, because the Guises were Catholics, and overwhelmed the state with confusion. The levity and impetuosity of the nation, their passion for novelty and enthusiasm, changed us for upwards of forty years from a most polished to a most barbarous people. Henry IV., born of this sect, which he really loved, without being bigoted to any, could not, though seconded by his victories and virtues, obtain the crown, without abandoning Calvinism. After he became a Catholic, he had not the ingratitude to consent to the destruction of a people, to whom, though they were at variance with monarchical government, he owed his crown; and even had he been inclined to it, he could not now have dispersed this faction; he therefore cherished, protected, and restrained it.

The Huguenots of France did not at this time amount to a twelfth part of the nation. But among them were many powerful lords; whole cities were Protestants. They had made war on their sovereigns, who had been obliged to put some strong places into their hands for security. Henry III.

had given up to them in Dauphiny alone, fourteen; Montauban and Nimes in Languedoc; Saumur, and above all La Rochelle, which made a republic of itself, and had become powerful by the commerce and protection of the English. At length Henry IV. seemed to act according to his inclination as well as his duty, and even politically, by granting them in 1598, the celebrated Edict of Nantes. This edict was in reality no more than a confirmation of privileges that the Protestants had obtained sword in hand from preceding kings, and which Henry the Great confirmed to them voluntarily from the throne. By this Edict of Nantes, which the name of Henry the Great renders more celebrated than any other, every lord of a fief vested with power of capital jurisdiction, was permitted the full exercise, within his own castle, of the pretended reformed religion. Every lord, not possessed of such power, was allowed thirty persons to be present at divine service. The full exercise of this religion was tolerated in every place under the immediate jurisdiction of a parliament.

The Calvinists were free to print books in every place where their religion was permitted, without applying to their superiors. They were declared capable of holding all the great offices and dignities of state; and everything on their side appeared favorable, the king having created the lords of Trimouille and Roni dukes and peers of France.

A new chamber was purposely formed in the Parliament of Paris, consisting of a president and sixteen counsellors. This court, which was called the Chamber of the Edict, took cognizance of, and

determined all causes that concerned the reformed, not only in the immense district of Paris, but likewise of that of Normandy and Brittany. Indeed there never was but one Calvinist admitted by right among the counsellors of this jurisdiction; but as the principal design of it was to prevent those vexatious actions of which the party complained and as men always value themselves on discharging a trust by which they are distinguished, this chamber, though composed of Catholics, always rendered the most impartial justice to the Huguenots, as they themselves acknowledged.

They had a kind of lesser parliament at Castres, independent of that of Toulouse. They had likewise courts of justice at Grenoble and Bordeaux, composed of one-half Roman Catholics and the other half Calvinists. Their churches assembled in synods in the same manner as the Gallican church. These privileges, together with many others, incorporated the Calvinists with the rest of the nation. It was in effect suffering enemies to league together; but the authority, the goodness, and the address of this great monarch, kept them within bounds during his life.

After the tragical and much lamented death of Henry IV. during the weakness of a minority, and under a divided court, it was hardly possible for the republican spirit of the reformed not to abuse their privileges, or for the court, feeble as it was, not to attempt to restrain them. The Huguenots had already established circles in France, in imitation of those in Germany. The deputies of these circles were frequently men of a seditious turn, and there

were in the party itself several noblemen of unbounded ambition. The Duke de Bouillon, and above all the Duke de Rohan, the chief that was in the greatest credit among the Huguenots, soon hurried the restless spirit of the preachers and the blind zeal of the people, into an open revolt. The general assembly of the party in 1616 had the boldness to present a remonstrance to the court, in which, among other insolent articles, they demanded a change in the king's council. In the same year, 1616, they took up arms in several places, and through the audacious behavior of the party, joined to the divisions in the court, the public hatred against the favorites, and the unsettled state of the nation, everything was for some time in the utmost disorder and confusion. Nothing prevailed but seditions, intrigues, menaces, insurrections, treaties made in haste and broken as speedily, which made the famous Cardinal Bentivoglio, at that time nuncio in France, say, that he had been witness of nothing but storms.

In the year 1621, the Calvinist churches of France offered de Lesdiguières, that soldier of fortune, who was afterwards made constable, the command of their armies, with a salary of a hundred thousand crowns a month. But de Lesdiguières, who was more clear-sighted in his ambition than they in their factions, and who knew them well, having commanded them before, chose rather at that time to fight against them than at their head, and instead of accepting their offers, turned Catholic. The party afterwards applied to the Marshal Duke de Bouillon, who returned for answer that he was

too old. To conclude, they conferred that unhappy employment on the Duke de Rohan, who jointly with his brother de Soubise had the insolence to make war on the King of France.

The same year the Constable de Luines carried Louis XIII. from province to province. He reduced to obedience upwards of fifty cities, almost without resistance, but failed before Montauban, whence the king had the mortification of being obliged to decamp. La Rochelle was besieged in vain; that city continued to defend itself by its own strength and the succors it received from England: and the Duke de Rohan, a traitor to his country, concluded a peace with his sovereign like one crowned head treating with another.

After this peace, and the death of the Constable de Luines, there was a necessity of renewing the war, and La Rochelle was again besieged; that city, which was always in league against its sovereign with the English, and the Calvinists of the kingdom. A woman—the mother of the Duke de Rohan—defended this city a whole year against the king's army, against the active diligence of Cardinal Richelieu, and the intrepid valor of Louis XII. who braved death more than once at this siege. The city suffered all the extremities of famine, and would not have been reduced at last, had it not been for the mole of five hundred feet long, which Cardinal Richelieu ordered to be made across the mouth of the harbor, in imitation of that which Alexander the Great formerly raised before the city of Tyre. This stupendous work at once subdued the sea and the Rochellers. Guiton, the mayor

of La Rochelle, who had formed the design to bury himself under the ruins of the place, had the boldness, after having surrendered at discretion, to appear before Cardinal Richelieu, attended by his guards, the mayors of the principal Huguenot cities being allowed this mark of honor. Guiton's guards however were taken from him, and the city was divested of its privileges. The Duke de Rohan, chief of the rebellious heretics, still continued the war against his prince; and finding himself abandoned by the English, though Protestants, he entered into an alliance with the Spaniards, though Catholics. But the firm behavior of Cardinal Richelieu forced the Huguenots at last, after being defeated on all sides, to submit.

All the edicts granted them before this time, having been so many treaties made with their kings, Richelieu resolved that the one he granted them on this occasion should be called the Edict of Grace. The king in it speaks in the style of a prince that pardons. The exercise of the new religion was forbidden in La Rochelle, the Isle of Rhé, Oléron, Privas, and Pamiers; in other respects the Edict of Nantes was suffered to remain; which, by the Calvinists, was always looked upon as their fundamental law.

It seemed somewhat strange that Cardinal de Richelieu, who was so absolute and daring, did not totally abolish this famous edict; but at that time he had something else in view, more difficult perhaps in the execution, but not less conformable to the extent of his ambition and the loftiness of his designs. He aimed at the glory of subduing the

minds of men, which he thought himself capable of effecting by the greatness of his understanding, his power, and his politics. His project was to gain the ministers, to bring them first to acknowledge that the Roman Catholic worship was not criminal in the sight of God; to lead them afterwards by degrees, to give up some points of little importance, and to appear in the eyes of the court of Rome as if he had yielded nothing at all. He made sure of dazzling one party of the reformers, of seducing the other by presents and pensions, and of appearing at length to have united them to the church; leaving time to accomplish the rest, and indulging himself in the glorious prospect of having effected, or prepared the way for this great work, and passing for the author of it. The famous Father Joseph on one side, and two ministers he had gained, on the other, set about this negotiation. But it appeared that the cardinal had made too sure; and that it is more difficult to adjust the differences of divines, than to raise moles in the ocean.

Richelieu, thus disappointed, resolved to crush the Calvinists entirely; but cares of another nature hindered him from carrying his design into execution. He found himself obliged to combat, at the same time, all the grandees of the kingdom, the royal family, the whole house of Austria, and frequently Louis XIII. himself. At length, amidst all these storms, he ended his days by a premature death, before he was able to complete his vast designs, leaving behind him a name more dazzling than dear and venerable.

In the meantime, after the taking of La Rochelle,

and the publication of the Edict of Grace, the civil wars ceased, and there remained only a trifling controversy. Large volumes were published on both sides, which nobody reads at present. The clergy, and especially the Jesuits, aimed at converting the Huguenots. The Huguenot preachers endeavored to bring over some Catholics to their opinion. The king's council was busied in issuing arrets about a burying-ground which the two parties were disputing in a village; about a chapel built on some ground formerly belonging to the church; about schools, the jurisdiction of castles, interments, bells, and the like; in which the reformers seldom gained their cause. These trifling disputes were all now left of the former devastations and ravages. The Huguenots were without a leader, since they had lost the Duke de Rohan, and that Sedan had been taken from the house of Bouillon. They even made a merit of remaining quiet during the factions of The Fronde, and the civil wars excited by the princes of the blood, the parliaments, and the bishops, when they pretended to make the king an offer of their service against Cardinal Mazarin.

There were scarcely any disputes about religion during the life of this minister. He made no scruple to bestow the place of comptroller-general of the finances on a Huguenot of foreign extraction, named Hervard. The reformers were all of them admitted into the offices of the revenue without exception.

Colbert, who revived the industry of the nation, and whom France may look upon as the founder of

her commerce, employed a great number of Huguenots in arts, manufactures, and the navy. These useful engagements, which fully occupied them, softened by degrees the epidemic fury of controversy; and the glory that, for fifty years together, surrounded the throne of Louis XIV. added to his power, and the firmness and vigor of his administration, extinguished in the Calvinist party, as well as in all orders of the state, the least idea of resistance. The magnificent feasts of a gay and gallant court threw an air of ridicule on the pedantry and reserve of the Huguenots. In proportion as good taste improved, the psalms of Marot and Beza began to inspire disgust. These psalms, which had charmed the court of Francis II., seemed only calculated for the populace in the reign of Louis XIV. Sound philosophy, which began to make its way in the world towards the middle of this age, helped still more to put men out of conceit with religious disputes.

But while reason was gradually extending her influence over men, the spirit of controversy itself became instrumental in preserving the peace of the state: for the Jansenists beginning about this time to obtain some reputation, they acquired a considerable share in the esteem of those who are fond of such subtleties. They wrote at the same time against the Jesuits and Huguenots; these latter answered the Jesuits and the Jansenists. The Lutherans in the province of Alsace attacked all the three. A paper-war among so many different sects, at a time when the state was engaged in great designs and the government was powerful, could

not fail of becoming, in a few years, only an amusement for the idle part of the nation, which, sooner or later, always sinks into indifference.

Louis XIV. was exasperated against the sectaries in religion, by the continual remonstrances of his clergy, by the court of Rome, and especially by the Chancellor Letellier and his son Louvois, both enemies to Colbert, and who had resolved to root out the reformers as rebels, because Colbert protected them as useful subjects. Louis, wholly a stranger to the fundamental points of their doctrine, looked on them, not without reason, as old revolters not entirely quelled. He applied himself at first to undermining by degrees, and on all sides, the fabric of their religion: churches were taken from them on the most slender pretexts, and they were forbidden to marry the daughters of Catholics; but in this they seemed to want policy, or at least to be ignorant of the power of a sex with which the court was otherwise so well acquainted. The intendants and the bishops endeavored, by the most plausible contrivances, to get Huguenot children away from their parents. Colbert had orders, in 1681, not to admit any person of this religion into places in the revenue. They were excluded as much as possible from the corporations of arts and trades. The king, however, though he kept them under the yoke, did not always make them feel the whole weight of it. Edicts appeared, forbidding all violence against them; insinuations were mingled with severities, and the oppressions they labored under were at least covered with a show of justice.

One efficacious instrument of conversion was

particularly used on this occasion, which was money; but they did not make a sufficient use of the expedient. Pellisson had the charge of this secret service; the same Pellisson, who was so long a Calvinist, and who is so well known by his writings, his copious eloquence, and his attachment to the superintendent, Fouquet, whose secretary, favorite, and victim, he was. He had the good fortune to be convinced of his errors, and to change his religion, at a time when that change opened a way to fortune and preferment; he took the ecclesiastical habit, and obtained several benefices, and the place of master of requests. About the year 1677, the king intrusted him with the revenues of the abbeys of St.-Germain-des-Prés and Cluny, together with the revenues arising from the third part of all savings, the whole to be distributed amongst those who would become converts. Cardinal le Camus, bishop of Grenoble, had already tried this method. Pellisson, charged with this negotiation, sent money into the provinces, recommending at the same time to those who had the care of distributing the sums, to make as many converts as possible with a little expense. Small sums distributed to a few indigent wretches swelled the list which Pellisson presented every three months to the king, persuading him at the same time, that everything on earth would at length give way to his generosity and power.

The council, encouraged by these small successes, which time would have rendered more considerable, ventured in 1681 to issue a declaration, permitting children to renounce their religion at

the age of seven years: under the shadow of this decree, great numbers of children were seized in the provinces, in order to make them abjure; and troops were quartered in the houses of their parents.

This precipitate step of Chancellor Letellier and his son Louvois was the occasion that, in 1681, a great many families of Poitou, Saintonge, and the neighboring provinces, abandoned the kingdom.

Strangers with eagerness took advantage of this circumstance; the Kings of England and Denmark, and the city of Amsterdam in particular, invited the Calvinists to take refuge in their territories, promising them ample subsistence. Amsterdam alone undertook to build a thousand houses for such as should fly thither for an asylum.

The council soon perceived the dangerous consequences of a too speedy use of authority, and thought to find a remedy in that very authority. They were sensible how necessary artisans were in a country where commerce flourished, and seamen at a time when they were establishing a naval force. The punishment of the galleys was therefore denounced against all of these professions that should attempt to quit the kingdom.

It being observed that a great number of Calvinist families sold their estates, a proclamation immediately appeared, confiscating all those estates, in case the sellers should leave the kingdom within a year. The persecution against the ministers was now resumed with double severity. Their churches were shut up on the most frivolous pre-

tences, and all the rents left by will to their consistories, were applied to the hospitals of the kingdom.

The masters of Calvinist schools were forbidden to receive boarders. The ministers were taxed, and Protestant mayors were deprived of their right of noblesse. The officers of the king's household, and the king's secretaries, who were Protestants, had orders to resign their places. None of this religion were any longer admitted, either among the notaries, attorneys, or advocates.

The clergy were strictly enjoined to use their utmost endeavors to make proselytes, while perpetual banishment was denounced against those Protestant ministers who should make any. All these ordinances were publicly solicited by the clergy of France, who, like children of a household, were resolved not to share their inheritance with aliens introduced by force.

Pellisson went on buying converts; but Mme. Hervard, widow of the comptroller-general of the finances, animated with that zeal for religion which has been observed in all ages to belong to the women, sent as much money to prevent conversions as Pellisson had done to procure them.

At length—1682—the Huguenots took courage, and rose in some places. They assembled in the Vivarais and in Dauphiny, near the places where their churches had been demolished. They were attacked, and they defended themselves. This was a small spark of the fire of our ancient civil wars. Two or three hundred miserable wretches, without a leader, without towns, and even without any reg-

ular plan of design, were dispersed in a quarter of an hour. Their punishment straightway followed their defeat. The intendant of Dauphiny caused the grandson of the minister, Chamier, who had drawn up the Edict of Nantes, to be broken on the wheel. He is ranked among the most famous martyrs of the sect; and the name of Chamier has long been held in veneration by the Protestants.

The intendant of Languedoc caused—1683—the minister Chomel to be broken on the wheel. Three more were condemned to the same punishment, and ten to be hanged; but they saved themselves by flight, and were only executed in effigy.

All these rigorous proceedings inspired terror, and at the same time increased the spirit of obstinacy. It is but too well known, that people become more attached to a religion in proportion as they suffer for its sake.

And now it was that those about the king insinuated to him, that, after having sent missionaries into all the provinces, it behooves him likewise to send dragoons. These violences seemed very ill-timed, and were the consequences of the spirit that then prevailed at court: that everything should submit to the will of Louis XIV. These counsellors never considered that the Huguenots were no longer the same as at Jarnac, Moncontour, and Coutras; that the rage of civil war was now extinguished; that this malady, of long continuance, was now on the decline; that everything has its limited time of duration with mankind; that if the fathers had been rebels under Louis XIII. their children were become good subjects under Louis

XIV. It was seen in England, Holland, and Germany, that many sects, who had torn one another to pieces during the last age, now lived peaceably together within the walls of the same city. Everything proved, that an absolute prince might be equally well served by Catholics and by Protestants. The Lutherans of Alsace were unanswerable proofs of this maxim. In the end, it appeared, that Queen Christina was not mistaken in what she says in one of her letters on the subject of these oppressions and desertions: "I look upon France as a patient, whose physicians order his legs and arms to be cut off to cure him of a disorder that patience and mild treatment would have entirely got the better of."

Louis XIV. who, in seizing Strasburg in 1681, engaged to protect Lutheranism, might have acted in the same manner with Calvinism, which time would have insensibly abolished, as it every day diminishes the number of Lutherans in Alsace. Could it be imagined that in putting this force on a great number of his subjects, he would not lose many more, who, in spite of all his edicts and guards, would by flight avoid a violence that they looked on as a horrible persecution? and, in fact, why should a million of people be compelled to hate a name so dear and precious, and to which Protestants and Catholics, Frenchmen and strangers, had agreed to join the epithet of Great? Policy itself seemed to require a toleration of the Calvinists, in order to oppose them to the continual pretensions of the court of Rome. It was about this very time, too, that the king had openly broke

with Pope Innocent XI., the declared enemy of France. But Louis reconciling the interests of his religion with those of his grandeur, was resolved to humble the pope with one hand, and crush the Calvinists with the other.

He considered these two enterprises as productive of that lustre of glory, of which he was in all things fond even to a degree of idolatry. The bishops, several of the intendants, and the whole council, made him believe that his troops would, by their bare appearance, finish what his liberalities and missions had already begun.

He thought that in this he did no more than make use of his authority; but those to whom that authority was committed, exerted it with extreme rigor.

Towards the end of the year 1684, and in the beginning of 1685 when Louis XIV., always strongly armed, had nothing to fear from any of his neighbors, troops were sent into all the cities and castles where the Protestants were most numerous; and as the dragoons, who at that time were very ill-disciplined, committed the greatest excesses, this execution was called the *dragonnade*.

All possible care was taken to guard the frontiers, in order to prevent the flight of those who were designed to be reunited to the church. It was a kind of chase carried on within a large enclosure.

A bishop, an intendant, a subdelegate, a curate, or some other person in authority, marched at the head of the soldiers. The principal Calvinist families were assembled, especially those that were deemed most tractable. They renounced their re-

ligion in the name of the rest, and those that continued obstinate were given up to the soldiery, who had every licence but that of killing; nevertheless, many persons were so cruelly treated, that they died soon after. The posterity of the refugees in foreign countries still cry out against this persecution of their fathers, comparing it to the most violent the church ever sustained in the first ages of Christianity.

It seemed a strange contrast that such cruel and merciless orders should proceed from the bosom of a voluptuous court, distinguished for softness of manners, the graces, and all the charms of social life. The inflexible character of the Marquis de Louvois appeared too plainly in this affair; and we see in it the same genius that had proposed to bury Holland under the waves, and afterwards laid waste the palatinate with fire and sword. There are still extant, letters written with his own hand in the year 1685, and conceived in these terms: "It is the king's pleasure, that such as refuse to conform to his religion should be punished with the utmost rigor, and particularly those who affect the foolish glory of being the last to comply."

Paris was not exposed to these vexations; the cries of the sufferers would have made themselves heard too near the throne.

While the churches of the reformers were thus everywhere demolished, and abjurations were demanded in the provinces with an armed force, the Edict of Nantes was at last revoked, in the month of October, 1685: this completed the ruin of that fabric that was already undermined on all sides.

The Chamber of the Edict had been suppressed some time before, and the Calvinist counsellors in parliament were ordered to resign their places. Arrets of council followed one on another, like thunderbolts, to extirpate the remains of the proscribed religion. That which appeared to be the most fatal was the order for seizing the children of the pretended reformers, and putting them into the hands of their nearest Catholic relatives, an order against which the voice of nature cried so loudly that it was never carried into execution.

But in this celebrated edict, 1685, which revoked that of Nantes, they seem to have paved the way for an event directly contrary to the end proposed. The intent was to procure a re-union of the Calvinists to the national church throughout the kingdom. De Gourville, a man of consummate judgment, whom Louvois consulted in this affair, advised that minister, as is well known, to imprison all the preachers and release such only, as being gained by private pensions, would abjure in public, and might by this means contribute more to the desired union than the missionaries and soldiers. Instead of following this politic advice, an edict was issued ordering all the ministers who refused to renounce their religion to quit the kingdom in fifteen days. It was surely the utmost blindness to imagine that in driving away the pastors, a great part of the flock would not follow. It was presuming extravagantly on power, and betraying a very slender knowledge of mankind, to suppose that so many ulcerated hearts, so many imaginations heated with the idea of martyrdom,

especially in the southern parts of France, would not run all risks to go and publish their constancy, and the glory of their exile, in foreign countries, when so many nations, envious of Louis XIV. were ready to receive them with open arms.

The old Chancellor Letellier, when he signed the edict, cried out in an ecstasy of joy: "*Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine, quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum.*"—"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for my eyes have seen thy salvation." He did not imagine that he was then setting his hand to an act which would be productive of the greatest mischief to his country.

His son, Louvois, was no less deceived, when he thought that a bare order of his would be sufficient to shut the frontier-passes and seaports against those who thought their duty obliged them to fly. Industry, when employed to elude the law, is always too strong for authority. The gaining over some few of the guards was sufficient to favor the flight of a number of refugees. No less than fifty thousand families quitted the kingdom in the space of three years; and were afterwards followed by others, who carried with them into other countries their arts, manufactories, and riches. Almost all the north of Germany, a country till then rude and void of industry, received a new face from the multitudes transplanted thither, who peopled whole cities. Stuffs, gold and silver lace, hats, stockings, formerly bought of France, were now manufactured in those countries by them. A part of the suburbs of London was peopled entirely with French manufacturers of silk; others carried thither the art of

making crystal in perfection, which was about this time lost in France. The gold that the refugees brought with them, is still frequently to be met with in Germany.

Thus France lost about five hundred thousand inhabitants, an immense quantity of specie, and what is still more, the arts with which her enemies enriched themselves. Holland gained excellent officers and soldiers. The Prince of Orange, and the Duke of Savoy, had entire regiments of refugees. Some went even as far as the Cape of Good Hope to settle. The nephew of the famous Duquesne, lieutenant-general of the marine, founded a small colony at that extremity of the globe; but it did not prosper, as the most of those who went on board perished by the way.

In vain the prisons and galleys were filled with those who were stopped in their flight; what could be done with such a multitude of unfortunates that sufferings made more bold? how could persons bred to the law, and infirm old men, be left to perish in the galleys? Some hundreds were sent over to America: at length the council began to think that if they no longer prohibited leaving the kingdom, the minds of the people being no longer instigated by the secret pleasure of disobeying, desertions would become less frequent. But here they were again mistaken, and after leaving the passages open, guards were a second time planted to no purpose.

After all the churches of the reformers were demolished and their pastors banished, nothing more remained but to retain in the Roman communion

such as through fear or persuasion had quitted their religion. There were nearly four hundred thousand of these in the kingdom.* These were obliged to go to mass, and to communicate; some who refused the host after having once received it, were burnt alive. The bodies of such as refused to receive the sacrament at their death were drawn on a hurdle, and left unburied.

Persecution always makes proselytes, especially when it happens to encounter a heat of enthusiasm. The Calvinists assembled everywhere to sing their psalms, though the penalty of death was denounced against all such as should hold these assemblies. Ministers returning into the kingdom were likewise to suffer death, and a reward of fifty-five thousand livres was promised to whosoever should inform against them. Several returned, and were either hanged or broken upon the wheel.

The sect, however, still subsisted, though in appearance crushed. It vainly hoped in the war of 1689, that King William, who had dethroned his father-in-law, who was a Roman Catholic, would support Calvinism in France; but in the war of 1701, fanaticism and rebellion again broke out in Languedoc.

It was now some considerable time since, in the mountains of Cévennes and Vivarais, certain per-

* It has been several times asserted in print, that there still remained three millions of the reformers in France. This is an exaggeration; M. Baviile reckoned but one hundred thousand in Languedoc, and his account is exact. There are not above fifteen thousand in Paris, and there are several cities, and even whole provinces, in which there is not one.

sons had appeared, pretending to the gifts of inspiration and prophecy. An old Huguenot named de Serres had there kept a school of prophets. He directed children to these words of Scripture: "When two or three are met together in my name, my spirit shall be in the midst of them;" and "If you have faith like a grain of mustard seed, you will be able to move mountains." He afterwards received the spirit, was beside himself, fell into convulsions, his voice changed, he became immovable, with his hair standing on end, according to the ancient usage of all nations and the rules of prophetic madness, handed down from generation to generation. The children under his care thus received the gift of prophecy; and if they were not able to remove mountains, it was because they had faith enough to receive the spirit, but not to work miracles; accordingly they redoubled their zeal and fervor to obtain this last gift.

Whilst the Cévennes was thus the school of enthusiasm, some of the ministers, called apostles, returned secretly to preach among the people.

Claude Brousson, of a considerable family in Nimes, a man of eloquence, of great zeal, and in the highest esteem among strangers, returned to preach in his own country in 1698. He was convicted not only of preaching contrary to the edicts, but of having about ten years before held private correspondence with the enemies of the state. The intendant Baille condemned him to be broken upon the wheel. He died in 1688, after the manner of the first martyrs. All those of his own sect, and even all foreigners, far from considering

him as a criminal of state, saw in him only a saint, who had sealed the faith with his blood.

After this, prophets began to start up everywhere, and the spirit of frenzy redoubled. Unhappily, in 1703, an abbé of the family of Chaila, an inspector of the missions, obtained an order from the court, to shut up in a convent two daughters of a gentleman lately converted. Instead of conveying them to the convent, however, he carried them to his own castle. The Calvinists took the alarm, flocked together in crowds, broke open the doors, and set the two young ladies at liberty, with other persons, they found confined there. They afterwards seized the abbé, to whom they made an offer of his life, on condition he would change his religion; upon his refusing, one of their prophets cried out, "Die then! the spirit condemns thee, thy sin be upon thine own head!" and instantly he was shot. Immediately after this exploit, they seized the receivers of the capitation tax, and hanged them with their rolls about their necks; after that they fell on all the priests they met, and massacred them without mercy. Finding themselves pursued, they retired amidst the woods and rocks. Their number daily increased. Their prophets and prophetesses declared to them, as from God, that the establishment of Jerusalem and the fall of Babylon was now at hand. The Abbé de la Bourlie appeared unexpectedly among them, in the midst of their wild lurking places, and brought them money and arms.

This man was a son of the Marquis de Guiscard, the king's sub-governor, who was one of the wisest

men in the kingdom. The son was unworthy of such a father. Having taken refuge in Holland on account of some crime, he now came to excite a revolt in the Cévennes. Some time after, he went to London, where he was arrested in 1711, for betraying the English ministry, as he had before betrayed his own country. Being brought before the council in order to be examined, he snatched up a long penknife, which lay upon the table, and which seemed proper for perpetrating his purpose, and with it wounded the lord treasurer, Harley. Upon this, he was sent to prison loaded with irons. He prevented the punishment prepared for him by a voluntary death. This was the man then, who, in the names of the English, the Dutch, and the Duke of Savoy, came to encourage the fanatics, and promise them powerful succors.

In 1703 a great part of the country favored them secretly. Their war-cry—if I may so term it—was “Liberty of conscience and no taxes.” This cry seduced the populace everywhere, and these mad fanatics justified Louis XIV. in his design of extirpating Calvinism. But had not the Edict of Nantes been revoked, there would have been no such frenzies and insurrections to quell.

The king, at first, sent Marshal de Montrevel with some troops, who made war on these wretches as they deserved. Those who were taken prisoners were broken upon the wheel or burnt at the stake. But then the soldiers, who fell into their hands, were made to expire by the most cruel tortures. The king, who was engaged in war on all sides, could spare only a few troops to send against them. It

was a matter of no small difficulty to surprise them amidst rocks almost inaccessible, in caverns, in woods, whither they retired by unfrequented paths, and whence they sallied again, like wild beasts from a forest. They even defeated a body of marine troops in a pitched battle. Three marshals of France were employed against them successively.

Marshal de Montrevel was, in 1704, succeeded by Marshal de Villars, who, finding it more difficult to get at them than to defeat them, after he had infused terror into them, he proposed a general amnesty. Some amongst them gladly accepted it, finding themselves disappointed of the succors they expected from Savoy.

The most considerable of their chiefs, and indeed the only one that deserves to be mentioned, was Cavalier. I have seen him since in Holland and England. He was a little, fair man, of an agreeable and engaging countenance. His party gave him the name of David: from a baker's boy, he, at the age of twenty-three, became the chief over a great multitude of people, through his own courage, and the assistance of a prophetess who got him acknowledged chief, by an express order of the Holy Ghost. He was found at the head of eight hundred men, whom he had formed into a regiment, at the time that the amnesty was proposed. He demanded hostages of Marshal de Villars, which were sent him. He then came to Nimes, accompanied by one of the chiefs, while he concluded the treaty with the marshal.

He promised, in 1704, to form four regiments of

the revolted, who were to serve the king under four colonels, of which he was to be the first himself, and to have the naming of the other three. These regiments were to be allowed the free exercise of their religion like the foreign troops in the pay of France: but this freedom was to be permitted nowhere else.

These conditions were accepted, when emissaries from Holland arrived with presents and promises to prevent their being carried into execution. They succeeded so well, as to draw off the principal fanatics from Cavalier: but he, having given his word to Marshal de Villars, was resolved to keep it. He accepted a colonel's commission, and began to form his regiment, with a hundred and thirty men who still continued faithful to him.

I have frequently heard, from Marshal de Villars' own mouth, that he asked this young man how, at his years, he could have acquired such great authority over men so savage and undisciplined. His answer was that, whenever they disobeyed him, his prophetic, whom they termed the Great Mary, became immediately inspired, and condemned to death the refractory who were immediately executed without any further ceremony.* Having myself, since that time, put the same question to Cavalier, he returned me the same answer.

This extraordinary negotiation happened after the battle of Höchstädt. Louis XIV., who had so

* This circumstance should be met with in the true memoirs of Marshal de Villars. The first volume I know to be of his writing, because it agrees with a manuscript that I have seen; the two other volumes are by another hand, and differ widely in many respects.

haughtily proscribed Calvinism, concluded a peace, under the name of an amnesty, with a baker's lad, and Marshal de Villars presented him with his colonel's commission, and a brevet or grant of one thousand two hundred livres a year.

The new colonel went to Versailles, to receive orders from the secretary of war. The king when he saw him shrugged his shoulders. Cavalier, finding himself closely observed by the ministry, was apprehensive of some foul play, and withdrew into Piedmont, from whence he afterwards passed to Holland and England. He served in Spain, and commanded a regiment of French refugees at the famous battle of Almanza. A circumstance that happened to this regiment shows to what a pitch the rage of civil war may be carried, especially when heightened by religion. The regiment commanded by Cavalier happened to be opposed to one of the French. As soon as the men knew each other, they began a bloody fight with their bayonets, without firing a single musket. I have already observed that the bayonet is of very little use in a battle. The behavior of the front line of three deep, after having thrown in their fire, usually decides the fate of the day: but here rage and fury exceeded the brightest deeds of valor; there were not above three hundred men left alive out of these two regiments. Marshal Berwick was wont to relate this adventure with astonishment.

Cavalier died a general officer, and governor of the island of Jersey, with a great reputation for valor, retaining nothing of his former transports but courage, and having by degrees substituted

prudence in the place of a fanatic fury, which was no longer supported by any example.*

Marshal de Villars, being recalled from Languedoc, was succeeded in command by Marshal Berwick. The ill success of the king's arms had emboldened the fanatics of Languedoc, who expected succors from heaven, and received them from the allies. Money was sent to them by the way of Geneva. They waited for officers to be sent them from Holland and England, and they had intelligence in all the towns of the province.

We may rank in the number of the greatest conspiracies that which they formed to seize the Duke of Berwick and the intendant Baviile at Nimes, to make Languedoc and Dauphiny revolt, and to introduce the enemy into these provinces. The secret was kept by upwards of a thousand conspirators. The indiscretion of a single person discovered the whole. Upwards of two hundred died by the hands of the executioner. Marshal Berwick destroyed without mercy all these unhappy wretches that came in his way. Some died with their weapons in their hands; others upon the wheel, or amidst the flames; some, more addicted to prophecy than the use of arms, found means to escape into Holland. The French refugees there received them as messengers from heaven. They went forth to meet them singing psalms and strewing their way with boughs of trees. These prophets

* Matters are here a little too much exaggerated. Cavalier was always reckoned an honest man in England; but, his understanding was ever held in contempt. He was only lieutenant-governor of Jersey, a place of no great consequence.

went afterwards to England; but finding that the Episcopal Church there had too much resemblance to that of Rome, they strove to set up their own; and so strong was their confidence that, not doubting but with a great share of faith they should be able to perform miracles, they offered to raise a person from the dead, and even any one that should be chosen. The populace are everywhere the same, and the Presbyterians might have joined those fanatics against the established church. The English ministry therefore took that course which should be always taken with workers of miracles. They were allowed to take up a dead body in the church-yard of the cathedral. The place was surrounded with guards; everything passed in a juridical manner, and the scene ended with sentencing the prophets to stand on the pillory.

These excesses of fanaticism could meet with but little encouragement in England, where philosophy began to establish its reign. They had ceased to disturb Germany since the Treaty of Westphalia, by which equal protection was given to the three religions—the Catholic, the Evangelical, and the Reformed. The republic of the United Provinces, by a politic toleration, admitted into its bosom all religions whatever. In short, towards the end of this century, France was the only state that experienced any violent ecclesiastical disputes, notwithstanding the progress of reason.

This reason, which is so slow in introducing itself among the learned, could as yet hardly make its way to the doctors, and still less among the common people. It requires to be first established

among those of superior rank and capacity, whence it descends lower by degrees, till at length it comes to govern the people, even though they are unacquainted with it; but seeing their superiors behave with prudence and moderation, they learn to do the same themselves. This however ~~is~~ is one of the great works of time, and that time has not yet come.

JANSENISM.

Calvinism from its very nature necessarily produced civil wars and shook the foundations of states. Jansenism could only raise theological disputes and paper wars; for the reformers of the sixteenth century having destroyed all the ties by which the Romish church held mankind, having treated what she held most sacred as idolatry, having set open the doors of her cloisters, and given her treasures into the hands of the laity, it necessarily followed that one of the two parties must be subdued by the other; and indeed the religion of Luther and Calvin never appeared in any country without being the cause of bloodshed and persecution.

But the Jansenists did not attack the church, nor did they strike at her fundamental tenets, or her wealth; but by writing upon abstracted questions, sometimes against the Calvinists, sometimes against the Catholics and the Popes' decrees, they at length fell into general contempt and their sect is now despised by almost all Europe, notwithstanding that it has been supported by several persons of distinguished characters and abilities.

While the Huguenot party was an object of the most serious attention, Jansenism rather perplexed than disturbed the state. This controversy, like many others, had its rise from abroad. It was begun in 1552, by a certain doctor of Louvain,

named Michael De Bay, or Baius, according to the pedantry of those times. This man took upon himself to maintain certain propositions concerning grace and predestination. This question, like almost all others in metaphysics, had its foundation in the labyrinth of fatality and free-will, in which all ages have been bewildered, and where man has no clue to direct his steps.

The spirit of inquiry, which has been implanted in us by the Creator, and is a necessary incitement to guide us to instruction, too often carries us beyond the proper bounds, in the same manner as many other movements of the soul, which if not strong enough to carry us to extravagant lengths, would perhaps want sufficient power to excite us properly.

Thus mankind have run into disputes on what is understood and what is not understood: but the ancient philosophers always carried on their controversies peaceably; whereas those of our divines are frequently bloody, and always turbulent.

The Franciscans, who understood as little of these points as Michael Baius himself, looked on the doctrine of free-will as overthrown, and the tenets of Duns Scotus in danger. They had before been irritated against Baius, on account of a dispute of much the same nature; so that they referred seventy-six of his propositions before Pius V. And Sixtus Quintus, then general of the Franciscan order, was the person that drew up the bull of condemnation in the year 1567.

Whether through the fear of exposing themselves, a dislike to entering into a disquisition on

such subtleties, or an indifference and contempt for the theses of Baius, they condemned his seventy-six propositions in general as savoring of heresy, ill-founded, rash, and suspicious, without specifying anything in particular, or entering into a detail. This method of proceeding borders very near upon absolute power, and leaves little room for disputation. The doctors of Louvain were greatly confounded when they received the bull. There was one particular sentence in which by the position of a comma, certain opinions of Michael Baius were either condemned or admitted. The university sent a deputation to Rome, to know of his holiness where the comma was to be placed. The court of Rome, which had other business on its hands, sent the deputies back with no other answer than a fresh copy of the bull, in which there was no comma at all. This was deposited in the archives. The grand vicar, whose name was Morillon, insisted that the bull should be received, "even though it should be erroneous." Morillon was certainly right in a political sense; for undoubtedly it is much better to receive a hundred erroneous bulls than to reduce as many towns to ashes, as the Huguenots and their adversaries have done. Baius took Morillon's advice, and quietly retracted his opinion.

Some years afterwards, Spain, which was as fruitful in scholastic writers as it was barren in philosophers, produced the Jesuit, Molina, who thought he had clearly discovered the manner in which God acts upon the creature, and how the latter resists his operations. He distinguished between natural and supernatural orders; predestination to grace,

and predestination to glory; preventing and co-operating grace. He was the first that invented the doctrine of concomitant concurrence, of intermediate knowledge, and congruism. The two latter in particular were new ideas. God, by his intermediate knowledge, skilfully consults the will of man to know what man would do if he was assisted with his grace, and then according to the use that he foresees a free agent would make thereof, he takes his measures for disposing man; and these measures make what is called congruism.

The Spanish Dominicans, who understood no more of this explanation than the Jesuits, but were jealous of them, declared in their writings that "Molina's book was the forerunner of Antichrist."

The court of Rome took cognizance of this dispute, which was then under the consideration of the grand inquisitor, and with great prudence imposed silence on both parties, which however was observed by neither.

At length the affair came to be seriously pleaded before Clement VIII. and to the disgrace of human understanding, all Rome took part in the cause. A Jesuit, by name Achilles Gaillard, assured the pope that he had certain means to restore the peace of the church; and very gravely proposed to allow the free predestination, provided the Dominicans would admit the mediate science, and reconcile the two systems as well as they could. The Dominicans refused to accept Gaillard's expedient. Their famous brother Lemos maintained preventive concurrence as the completion of active virtue. Numberless congregations started up on this occasion,

without knowing anything of what one another meant.

Clement VIII. died before he was able to reduce the arguments on each side to a clear sense. Paul V. renewed the trial: but as he was engaged in a contest of greater importance with the Venetian state, he put a stop to all those meetings, then known by the name *de auxiliis*. This name, by which they are still known, and which is equally obscure with the disputes in question, was given them because it signifies assistance, and that this controversy related to the assistance which God gives to the weak will of mankind. Paul V. terminated the affair, by enjoining the two parties to live in peace.

While the Jesuits were thus establishing their doctrine of mediate knowledge and congruism, Cornelius Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, revived some of Baius' notions in a large volume that he wrote on St. Augustine, and which was not printed till after his death; so that he became the head of a sect without once dreaming of it. This book was scarcely read by any one, notwithstanding the disturbance it has occasioned. But Duvergier de Hauranne, abbot of St. Cyran, a great friend to Jansenius, a man as violent in his temper as he was prolix and obscure in his writings, came to Paris, where he found means to gain over some young doctors and old women. The Jesuits applied to the court of Rome to have Jansenius's book condemned, as a supplement to that of Baius; this they obtained in the year 1641. But at Paris the faculty of divines, and all those who dealt in argu-

mentation, were divided in their opinions. There did not seem much to be gained by adopting the sentiment of Jansenius, that God commands impossibilities. This doctrine is neither philosophical nor consolatory. But the secret pleasure of being of a party, the general odium that the Jesuits had incurred, the desire of being singular, and a restlessness of mind formed a sect.

The faculty condemned five propositions of Jansenius, by a plurality of voices; these five propositions were extracted from his book with great fidelity, as to the sense, but not in his own words. Sixty doctors appealed to parliament for an abuse, and the parties were summoned to appear before the Chamber of Vacations.

The parties themselves, however, did not make their appearance. But on the one hand a doctor named Habert stirred up the minds of the people against Jansenius, while on the other side, the famous Arnauld, the disciple of St. Cyran, defended Jansenism with all the force of an impetuous eloquence. He hated the Jesuits even more than he loved efficacious grace, and was held in still greater hatred by them, as being born of a father who having applied himself to the bar, had pleaded with great vehemence for the university against their establishment. His family had acquired great credit, in the army and long robe. His genius and the circumstances in which he then was, determined him to engage in a paper-war, and to set up for the head of a party; a kind of ambition that makes all others give way to it. He continued to wage war against the Jesuits till he was eighty years of

age. There are a hundred and four volumes of his writings, of which hardly one is at present to be found among the classical books that are the ornaments of the age of Louis XIV. and are justly esteemed the library of all nations. His works were all of them in great vogue at the time he lived, on account of the reputation of the author, and the then warmth of disputation. But that warmth is now allayed, and the books themselves in a manner forgotten. None of them are now regarded except those that simply relate to reasoning, his geometry, his rational grammar, and his logic, in which he was deeply read. No one was ever born with a more philosophical turn of mind; but his philosophy was corrupted by a spirit of faction, which hurried him away; and for above sixty years involved a genius formed to enlighten mankind in wretched school disputations, and in those evils incident to obstinacy of opinion.

The university was divided with relation to the five propositions, as were likewise the bishops. Eighty-eight of the French bishops wrote in a body to Pope Innocent X. requesting him to give his decision, and eleven others besought him not to do anything in the affair. Innocent proceeded to sentence and condemned each proposition apart, but without once quoting the pages whence they were extracted, or those that preceded or followed.

This omission, which would not have been made in civil matters in the meanest court of judicature, was made by the Sorbonne, the Jansenists, the Jesuits, and the supreme pontiff. The basis of the five condemned propositions is evidently to be

found in Jansenius; you have nothing more to do than that there are certain commands impossible, printed in 1641, where, on page 138, you will find these very words: "All this plainly and evidently demonstrates that there is nothing more certain and fundamental in the doctrine of St. Augustine, than that there are certain commands impossible, not only to the unbelieving, the blind, and the hardened, but even to the faithful and righteous, notwithstanding their will and efforts, according to the strength they are endued with; and that they fail of grace, which can alone render those commands possible." We also read on page 165, "That, according to St. Augustine, Jesus Christ did not die for all men."

Cardinal Mazarin obliged the assembly of the clergy to receive the pope's bull unanimously. He was at that time on good terms with his holiness; he did not love the Jansenists, and with good reason hated all factions.

The French church seemed now restored to peace; but the Jansenists wrote so many letters, quoted St. Augustine so often, and got so many women converts to engage in their interests, that Jansenism prevailed more than ever after the bull was received.

A priest of St.-Sulpice thought proper to refuse absolution to M. de Liancourt, because it had been said he did not believe the five propositions to be in Jansenius's book, and that he harbored heretics in his house. This was a fresh subject of scandal, and occasioned a new paper-war, in which Dr. Arnauld distinguished himself, and, in a letter that

he wrote to a real or imaginary duke or peer, he maintained that the propositions that had been condemned were not in Jansenius, but were actually to be found in the writings of St. Augustine, and several other fathers. He moreover added that "St. Peter was a righteous man, in whom grace, without which we can do nothing, was wanting."

It is true that St. Augustine and St. John Chrysostom had asserted the same thing; but time and circumstances, which change all things, made Arnauld culpable. As the most serious object to one party is the subject of pleasantry to the other, it was said on this occasion, that the holy fathers should have their wine mixed with water. The faculty met, and Chancellor Séguier appeared at the assembly on the part of the king. Arnauld was condemned, and excluded the Sorbonne in 1654. The appearance of the chancellor among the divines wore an air of despotic power, which displeased the public; and the care taken to fill the hall with a crowd of mendicant monks, who were not wont to be seen there in such numbers, gave occasion to Pascal to say in his "Provincial Letters" that it was easier to find monks than arguments.

The greatest part of these monks did not admit of congruism, intermediate knowledge, nor the necessitating grace of Molina; but they maintained a sufficient grace to which the human will may consent, but never does; an efficacious grace that it may resist and does not; and this they explained clearly, by saying that this grace might be resisted in the divided, but not in the compound sense.

If these sublime matters are not agreeable to

human reason, the opinion of Arnauld and the Jansenists seems too much to agree with pure Calvinism. This was exactly the ground of the quarrel between the Gomerists and Arminians, which divided Holland as Jansenism had divided France; but in Holland it became a political faction rather than a dispute between persons at leisure. It stained the scaffold with the blood of Barneveldt, a deed of atrocious violence, which is now held in detestation by the Dutch, after having had their eyes opened to the absurdity of these disputes, the horror of persecution, and the happy necessity of toleration, the resource of wise governors against the short-lived enthusiasm of those who delight in controversy. In France this dispute produced only a few edicts, bulls, lettres de cachet, and pamphlets, because the state was at that time employed in quarrels of more importance.

Arnauld then was only excluded the faculty. This small persecution gained him a great number of friends; but himself and the Jansenists had still the church and the pope against them. One of the first steps taken by Alexander VII. on his succeeding Innocent X. in the papal chair, was to renew the censures against the five propositions. The French bishops, who had already drawn up one formulary, now framed a new one, which concluded in this manner; "I condemn, with heart and voice, the doctrine of the five propositions contained in the book of Cornelius Jansenius, that doctrine not being of St. Augustine, whom Jansenius has badly explained."

This formulary was afterwards to be subscribed,

and the bishops presented it to all those in their dioceses who were suspected by them. They required the nuns of Port Royal of Paris and Port Royal des Champs to sign it. These two houses were the sanctuaries of Jansenism, as being governed by Arnauld and St. Cyran.

There was a house set apart near the monastery of Port Royal des Champs, whither several learned and pious men had retired, but headstrong and linked together by conformity of opinion: here they amused themselves with instructing a select set of young persons. From this school came the celebrated Racine, a poet best acquainted with the human heart of any of the world. Pascal, the chief of French satirists, for Desprèaux was but the second, was intimately connected with these illustrious and dangerous recluses. The formulary was presented to the sisters of Port Royal of Paris, and Port Royal des Champs, for them to sign; but they made answer, that their conscience would not permit them to acknowledge, with the pope and bishops, that the five propositions were in Jansenius's book, which they had never read; that his meaning had certainly been mistaken, and, though the five propositions might perhaps be erroneous, yet that Jansenius himself was not to blame.

This obstinacy of theirs incensed the court. D'Aubray, the lieutenant-civil—for at that time there was no lieutenant of police—went to Port Royal des Champs, and obliged the religious recluses to quit the place of their retirement, together with the young people that they educated; at the same time they threatened to destroy the

two monasteries; but they were saved by a miracle.

Mademoiselle de Perrier, a boarder in the monastery of the Port Royal of Paris, and niece to the celebrated Pascal, was afflicted with a disorder in one of her eyes; at Port Royal they had a ceremony of kissing one of the thorns of the crown that had been put on the head of our Saviour. This thorn had been a long time preserved at Port Royal. It would not be very easy to prove how it was preserved and transported from Jerusalem to the suburbs of St. James. However, this young lady kissed the thorn, and happened to be cured of her disorder a short time afterwards. Upon this occasion, they did not fail to declare and affirm that she had been cured in an instant of a dangerous fistula lachrymalis. This young woman lived till the year 1728. Several persons that had lived a considerable time with her, assured me that her cure had been very long, which is indeed the most probable. But it is very unlikely that God, who has not wrought any miracles to bring over to our holy religion three-fourths of the earth, who are either strangers to it, or hold it in abhorrence, should have interrupted the order of nature, in favor of a young girl, in order to justify a dozen nuns, who pretended that Cornelius Jansenius did not write ten or twelve lines that were ascribed to him, or that he wrote them with a different intention from that imputed to him.

The miracle, however, made so great a noise, that the Jesuits durst not deny the reality of it. They therefore fell upon the scheme of working miracles on their side, but they did not succeed

equally well: the miracles of the Jansenists were the only ones in fashion at that time. A few years afterwards these latter performed another miracle. One sister, Gertrude of Port Royal, was cured of a swelling in her leg. This prodigy however met with no success: the time for those things was past, and Sister Gertrude had not a Pascal for her uncle.

The Jesuits, though they had popes and kings on their side, were entirely sunk in the opinion of the people. They revived against them the old stories of Henry the Great, whose assassination was plotted by Barrière, and executed by Châtel, who had been educated in their schools; the punishment of Father Guignard, and the banishment of their society from France and Venice. Every method was practised to render them odious. Pascal went still further, he made them ridiculous. His "Provincial Letters," which made their appearance at that time, were models of eloquence and raillery. The best comedies of Molière have not more wit in them than the first part of those letters, nor the writings of Bossuet more sublimity than the latter.

It is true that the whole of this book is founded on false principles. He has artfully charged the whole society with the extravagant opinions of some few Spanish and Flemish Jesuits which he might with equal ease have detected among the casuists of the Dominican and Franciscan orders; but the Jesuits alone were the persons he wanted to attack. In these letters, he endeavored to prove that they had a settled design to corrupt the morals of mankind: a design that no sect or society ever

had or ever could have. But his business was not to be right, but to divert the public.

The Jesuits, who at that time had not one good writer amongst them, could not wipe off the scandal cast on them by this book, which was one of the best written that had yet appeared in France. But nearly the same thing happened with regard to them in their disputes, as did formerly to Cardinal Mazarin. The Blots, de Marignys, and Barbancons, had diverted all France at his expense, but the cardinal still continued master of the kingdom: in like manner, these fathers had sufficient interest to procure an arret of the Parliament of Provence, ordering the "Provincial Letters" to be burnt, by which they made themselves still more ridiculous and odious to the nation.

The principal nuns were carried away from the abbey of Port Royal by a guard of two hundred men, and dispersed into other convents, none being allowed to remain but such as would sign the formulary. This affair interested all Paris. Sister Perdreau and Sister Passart, who subscribed this formulary, and prevailed on some others to do the same, became the subjects of lampoons and humorous songs with which the town was overrun by a parcel of idle persons, who see nothing but the ridiculous side of things and make themselves merry with every occurrence; while those of a sincere faith are afflicted, adversaries find fault, and the government takes its own measures.

The Jansenists became stronger by persecution. Four prelates, Arnauld, bishop of Angers, brother to the doctor, de Buzanval of Beauvais, Pavillon of

Alet, and de Caulet of Pamiers, the same who afterwards opposed Louis XIV. on the subject of the régale, declared themselves openly against the formulary. This was a new formulary, framed by Pope Alexander VII. alike in everything essential to the former, received in France by the bishops, and even by the parliament. Alexander, incensed at this opposition, named nine French bishops to begin a process against their four refractory brethren. Upon this the spirit of animosity grew more outrageous than ever.

But just at the time that the flame of disputation was at the highest to know whether five propositions were or were not in Jansenius, Rospigliosi became pope, under the name of Clement IX. and made everything quiet for some time. He prevailed on the dissenting bishops to sign the formulary sincerely, instead of purely and simply. Thus it seemed permitted to believe, that though the five propositions were condemned, they might not be extracted from Jansenius. The four bishops gave some small explanations of their own, and Italian complaisance thus allayed French vivacity. One word substituted in place of another, brought about this peace, which is called "The Peace of Clement IX." and even "The Peace of the Church," though the whole affair had been only about a dispute, either unknown to, or despised by the rest of the world. It had been evident ever since the time of Baius, that the popes had always had in view to suppress these unintelligible controversies, and to bring the two parties to teach that morality which every one understands. Nothing could be more reasonable

than such an intention in the pontiffs; but they had to deal with men.

The government set at liberty the Jansenists that had been confined in the Bastille, and, amongst the rest, Sacy, author of a version of the Testament. Several nuns were recalled from their exile, who all signed the formulary sincerely, and thought they triumphed by this expression. Arnauld now came forth from his retreat, and was presented to the king, kindly received by the pope's nuncio, and looked on by the public as a father of the church. From that time he promised to enter the lists only against the Calvinists, for he must necessarily be engaged in some kind of dispute. In this time of tranquillity he sent into the world his book on the perpetuity of faith, in which he was assisted by Nicole, and this gave birth to the great controversy betwixt them and Claude the minister—a controversy in which each party, according to custom, claimed the victory.

The peace of Clement IX. having been given to restless minds that were perpetually in movement, proved but of short duration. Secret cabals, intrigues, and insults, continued on both sides.

The Duchess of Longueville, sister of the great Condé, so well known in the civil wars, and so noted for her amours, now grown old, and without any employment, became a votary to religion; and, as she hated the court and loved intrigue, she turned Jansenist. She added a wing to the abbey of Port Royal des Champs, whither she retired sometimes with the recluses. They were then in their most flourishing state. Arnauld, Nicole, Lemaistre de

Saci, Herman, and several other persons, who, though less famous, had nevertheless considerable merit, assembled at her house. In the room of that sprightly wit to which the duchess had been accustomed at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, they substituted conversations of a more solid kind, and that nervous and animated sense that so remarkably distinguished their compositions and discourses. They contributed not a little to diffuse true taste and eloquence throughout France; but unhappily they were still more anxious to spread their opinions. They seemed to be themselves a proof of that doctrine of fatality with which they were reproached. It might be said that they were carried away by an irresistible determination to draw down on themselves persecutions for mere chimerical notions, when they might have acquired the most solid reputation, and have enjoyed their lives in a happy tranquillity, by only renouncing these frivolous disputes.

The Jesuitical faction, who still smarted from the satire of the "Provincial Letters," stirred heaven and earth against their adversaries. Madame de Longueville, being no longer able to form cabals in favor of the malcontents, went to work in support of Jansenism. There were frequent meetings in Paris, sometimes in her house, and sometimes in Arnauld's. The king, who had already resolved to extirpate Calvinism, would not suffer a new sect. He threatened them; and at last—1679—Arnauld, dreading to encounter enemies armed with sovereign authority, and being deprived of the support of the Duchess of Longueville, of which death had

lately robbed him, determined to quit France forever, and go to live in the Netherlands, unknown, without fortune, and even without domestics; he whose nephew had been minister of state, and who might himself have been a cardinal; but the pleasure of writing with freedom outweighed every other consideration with him. He lived till the year 1694 in obscure retirement from the world, and known only to his friends, continually employed in writing, always the philosopher, superior to ill-fortune, and to his last moments giving an example of a pure, resolute, and unshaken soul.

His party was always persecuted in the Catholic Netherlands, called the Country of Obedience, where the pope's bulls are sovereign laws; they were still more harassed in France.

One thing extraordinary is, that the question, "Whether the five propositions were really in Jansenius?" was always the sole pretext for these little intestine broils. The distinction of *de facto* and *de jure* now occupied the minds of many. At length, in 1701, they proposed a theological question that was called *Le Cas de Conscience par Excellence*, "Whether the sacraments could be given to a person, who, though he subscribed to the formulary, believed in his heart that the pope, and even the church, might be mistaken in facts?" Forty doctors gave it under their hands that absolution might be given to such a man.

Immediately the controversy was renewed the pope and bishops insisted on being believed upon facts. Noailles, archbishop of Paris, decreed that belief was to be given to divine faith *de jure*, and

to human faith *de facto*. Others again, amongst whom was Fénelon, archbishop of Cambray, who was not well pleased with Noailles, demanded divine faith for the fact. It would have been better perhaps to have cited the passages in the book itself; but this was never done.

Pope Clement XI. published a bull in 1705, called *Vineam Domini*, by which he enjoined a belief *de facto*, without explaining whether it was of divine or human faith.

It was a new custom introduced into the church to make women sign these bulls. This respect was again shown to the sisters of Port Royal des Champs, and Cardinal de Noailles was obliged to cause it to be carried to them by way of trial. They signed it, without detracting anything from the peace of Clement IX. and confining themselves to a respectful silence with regard to the case *de facto*.

It can hardly be said which is the most extraordinary, whether the confession insisted on from women, that five propositions were contained in a Latin book, or the obstinate refusal of these nuns.

The king applied to the pope for a bull for the suppression of their monastery. Cardinal de Noailles deprived them of the sacraments, and their advocate was confined in the Bastille. All the nuns that were more obedient were removed into separate convents. The lieutenant of police in 1709 ordered their house to be razed from the foundation; and lastly, in 1711, all the bodies that were buried in the church, and in the churchyard, were removed, and carried elsewhere.

The troubles, however, were not suppressed with

this monastery. The Jansenists were still for caballing, and the Jesuits for making themselves appear necessary. Father Quesnel, a priest of the oratory, a friend of the celebrated Arnauld, and who accompanied him in his retreat, to his last moments, had, in 1671, composed a book of pious reflections on the text of the New Testament. This book contains some maxims that seem to favor Jansenism; but these are blended with such a number of pious sentiments and are so replete with that soft persuasion which wins the heart that the work was received with universal approbation. The good tendency of this book manifests itself in almost every line, and it requires the minutest search to discover the faults. Several bishops bestowed the highest encomiums on this book, even when imperfect, which they confirmed when the author had put the finishing touch to it. I myself know that Abbé Renaudot, one of the most learned men in France, being at Rome the first year of Clement XI.'s pontificate, and going one day to wait upon this pope, who loved men of letters and was himself a man of learning, found him reading father Quesnel's book: "This is," said the pope, "a truly excellent work; we have no one at Rome capable of writing in such a manner. I should be glad to bring the author to my court." This very pope afterwards condemned the book.

We must not, however, consider these encomiums of Clement XI. and his subsequent censure as a contradiction. A person may be touched with the shining beauties of a work at the first reading, and afterwards condemn faults that then escaped his

notice. Of all the French prelates, Cardinal de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, gave the most sincere commendations to this book. He declared himself its patron when bishop of Châlons, and the work was dedicated to him. This cardinal was a person equally eminent for virtue and learning, of the most mild and amiable disposition, and a sincere friend to peace. He protected some of the Jansenist party, though not of their persuasion; and, without having any great affection for the Jesuits, he neither injured nor feared them.

This order began to acquire great influence when Father La Chaise had the government of Louis XIV.'s conscience, and in consequence was the head of the Gallican church. Father Quesnel, dreading their power, had retired to Brussels with the learned Benedictine, Gerberon, a priest named Brigode, and several others of the same party, of which he became the chief after the death of the famous Arnauld, and, like him, enjoyed the flattering glory of establishing to himself a sovereignty independent of princes, of reigning over consciences, and of being the soul of a party composed of the brightest geniuses. The Jesuits soon found out Quesnel in his retirement, and accused him to Philip V., who was still master of the Netherlands, persecuting him as they had done his master, Arnauld, with Louis XIV. They obtained an order—1763—from the Spanish king to seize the person of these religious recluses. Quesnel was thrown into prison in the archbishopric of Mechlin. A gentleman, who thought the Jansenist party would make his fortune if he could compass the deliverance of their chief,

broke through the walls, and helped Quesnel to make his escape and to return to Amsterdam, where he died in 1719, in an extreme old age, after having contributed to establish some Jansenist churches in Holland: but this weak flock soon dwindled away.

When Quesnel was taken into custody, they at the same time seized on his papers, in which were found evident proofs of a formed party. There was a copy of an ancient contract made by the Jansenists with Antoinette Bourignon, the celebrated fanatic, a woman of great fortune, who, in the name of her spiritual director, had purchased the island of Nordstrand, near Holstein, as an asylum for those that she pretended to associate into a mystical sect, which she proposed to establish.

This Bourignon had printed, at her own expense, nineteen large volumes of pious meditations, and had spent the half of her fortune in making proselytes. However, she succeeded only in making herself ridiculous; and had even suffered all the persecutions that are the consequences of innovations. At length, despairing of settling in her island, she sold it again to the Jansenists, who, like herself, were incapable of making any establishment there.

Amongst the manuscripts of Quesnel, there was also found a project of a more criminal nature, had it not been so very foolish. Louis XIV. having sent the Count d'Avaux, in 1684, with full powers to grant a truce of twenty years to all the powers that were willing to accept of it, the Jansenists, under the title of "The Disciples of St. Augustine," had formed the idle scheme of getting themselves

included in this truce, as if they had been really a formidable party as the Calvinists had so long been. This ridiculous project, however, was not executed; but the propositions of a peace between the King of France and the Jansenists had been actually drawn up in writing. They had certainly a view in this scheme to make themselves too considerable. This alone was sufficient to make them culpable; and Louis XIV. was easily persuaded to look on them as a dangerous sect.

He wanted discernment, or he would have known that empty and speculative notions will fall of themselves, if left to their own insignificancy. It was giving them a degree of consequence that did not belong to them. It was no difficult matter to make Quesnel's book appear culpable, after the author had been treated as a seditious person. The Jesuits prevailed on the king to petition himself for a condemnation of this book at Rome. This was in fact condemning Cardinal de Noailles, who had been one of its most zealous patrons. They flattered themselves, and not without reason, that Clement XI. would be glad of an opportunity to mortify the Archbishop of Paris. It will be necessary to observe that when Clement XI. was only Cardinal Albani, he published a book written entirely on Molinist principles, by his friend Cardinal de Sfrondati, and that Noailles had censured it. It was natural, then, to think that now Albani had become pope, he would at least oppose the encomiums given to Quesnel's book, as those bestowed on his friend's book had been before censured.

This expectation proved to be well grounded.

Pope Clement XI. in 1708, issued a decree against Quesnel's book. But the situation of temporal affairs at that time hindered this spiritual business, which had been warmly solicited, from being carried on. The court was piqued at Clement XI. for having acknowledged the Archduke Charles for king of Spain, after having before acknowledged Philip V. The decree was found in some places not valid, and was rejected in France, and the controversy lay dormant until the death of Father La Chaise, the king's confessor, a man of mild disposition, who was always ready to adopt pacific measures, and who always kept up a good understanding with Cardinal de Noailles, as the relative of Madame de Maintenon.

The Jesuits had a right to appoint a confessor for the King of France, as well as almost all the other Catholic princes in Europe. They enjoy this privilege in virtue of their institution, by which they renounce all ecclesiastical dignities; so that what their founder established through humility has become the means of grandeur. In proportion as Louis XIV. advanced in years, the office of confessor became more important. This place was given to Father Letellier, son of an attorney of Vire in Lower Normandy; a gloomy, hot-headed, and inflexible man, who concealed the violence of his temper under the appearance of cool indifference: he did all the hurt that could be done by one in his office, where there are but too many opportunities of inspiring such sentiments as one pleases, and of destroying an adversary; and he had many private injuries to revenge. The Jansenists had

gotten one of his books on the Chinese ceremonies condemned at Rome. He had likewise a personal dislike to Cardinal de Noailles and he was not of a disposition to restrain his passions. He soon raised disturbances in the whole church of France. In 1711, he drew up letters and mandates to be signed by the bishops, and sent them several articles of accusation against Cardinal de Noailles, to which they had only to sign their names. Such practices meet with proper punishment in secular affairs; but here, though they were discovered, they still succeeded*.

The king's conscience suffered as much from the mean arts of his confessor as his authority did from a rebellious faction. Cardinal de Noailles, in vain, demanded justice of his majesty, for these mysteries of iniquity. The confessor persuaded him that he made use of human means to bring about divine matters; and indeed, as he defended the pope's authority, and the unity of the church, he seemed,

* It is said in the life of the Duke of Orleans, that the Cardinal de Noailles having accused Father Letellier of selling church-livings, that Jesuit expressed himself thus to the king: "I freely consent to be burned alive if this accusation can be proved, on condition that the cardinal shall suffer the same punishment if he does not prove it."

This story is taken from some of the pieces that were handed about on the affair of the constitution, and these pieces are as full of absurdities as the life of the Duke of Orleans. Most of them were written by a set of wretches, merely for the sake of getting money; this sort of people do not know that a person who has his credit to maintain with a prince whose confessor he is, would hardly propose to that prince to condemn his archbishop to the flames for his vindication.

All the idle stories of this nature may be found collected in the "Memoirs of Maintenon." We should be careful to distinguish between facts and hearsays.

in the main, to have right on his side. The cardinal applied to the dauphin, Duke of Burgundy, but found him prepossessed by the letters and friends of the Archbishop of Cambray. Human frailty finds an entrance into every breast; Fénelon was not yet philosopher sufficient to forget that Cardinal de Noailles had been instrumental in getting him censured, and Quesnel now suffered for Madame Guyon.

The cardinal found no greater support from the interest of Madame de Maintenon. This affair is alone sufficient to show the character of that lady, who had no sentiments of her own, and placed her whole study in conforming to those of the king. The few following lines of hers to the Cardinal de Noailles will enable us to form a true judgment of her, of Father Letellier's intrigues, and of the king's sentiments on this occasion; and give great light into the affair itself: "You are sufficiently acquainted with me," she says in her letter, "to know what my thoughts are on the late discovery, but I have many reasons to be cautious how I say anything. It is not my business to judge or condemn; I have only to be silent, and to pray for the church, for the king, and for you. I have delivered your letter to his majesty, who has read it: this is all I can say to you about it, being oppressed with sorrow."

The cardinal archbishop, being thus insulted by a Jesuit, took away the power of preaching and confessing from all the Jesuits in France, excepting only a few of the most moderate and discreet. By his place he had likewise the dangerous right of

hindering Letellier from confessing the king; but he did not dare to irritate his sovereign to such a degree; and therefore left him respectfully in the hands of his enemy*. "I am apprehensive," said he, writing to Madame de Maintenon, "that I show too mean a submission to the king, in thus leaving power in the hands of one so unworthy of it. I pray God that he will open his eyes to the danger he is in by intrusting his soul to a man of such character."†

We read in several of the memoirs of those times that Letellier declared either he must lose his place, or the cardinal his. It is not improbable that he might think so, but very unlikely that he should declare it.

When two parties are exasperated against each other, both frequently take steps that prove fatal to them. The partisans of Father Letellier, and those bishops that aspired to cardinalship, made use of the royal authority to blow up those sparks

* Consult "Madame de Maintenon's Letters." It may easily be perceived that the author of this work was well acquainted with those letters before they were published, and that he has taken nothing upon trust.

† When we are provided with letters of such good authority, we may boldly venture to quote them, as being the most valuable materials in history; but what trust can be put in a letter that is supposed to have been written by Cardinal de Noailles to the king, in which he is made to express himself thus: "I was the first that labored to ruin the clergy, in order to save your state and support your throne. It is not allowable for you to demand an account of my conduct." Is it probable that a wise and discreet subject should write so insulting and daring a letter to his sovereign? This is no other than a mean and false imputation; it is to be found in page 141, Vol. V. of the "Memoirs of Maintenon," and, as it is destitute of all authority and probability, should not meet with the least regard.

that might have been extinguished. Instead of imitating the conduct of Rome, which had several times imposed silence on both parties; instead of curbing the insolence of the Jesuit and soothing the cardinal; instead of prohibiting these controversies in the same manner as duels and making the clergy, as well as the nobility, useful without being dangerous; in a word, instead of crushing the two parties by the weight of the supreme power supported by reason and by all the magistrates; Louis XIV. thought he acted right in soliciting Rome himself for a declaration of war, and procuring that famous Constitution which embittered the remainder of his life.

Father Letellier and his party sent a hundred and three propositions to Rome, to be there censured, of which the holy office condemned one hundred and one. This bull, which was published in the month of September, 1713, raised a flame throughout the whole kingdom, as soon as it made its appearance in France. The king had applied for it, as a means to prevent a schism, and it was likely to produce one. The clamor against it was general, because, among those hundred and one propositions, there were several that appeared to every one to carry the most innocent meaning, and the purest morality. A numerous assembly of bishops was held at Paris; forty accepted the bull for the sake of peace, but at the same time, they added certain explanations, to quiet the scruples of the people. The direct and unreserved acceptation was sent to the pope, and the modifications were reserved for the people. By this means, they

thought at once to satisfy the pope, the king, and the people; but Cardinal de Noailles, and seven other bishops of this assembly, who joined with him, refused both the bull and its modifications: they wrote to the pope, requesting to have these modifications from his holiness himself. This was affronting him with the appearance of respect.

Accordingly the king would not permit it to be done, and hindered the letter being sent, remanded the bishops back to their dioceses, and forbade the cardinal to appear at court. This persecution procured the archbishop an additional share of credit with the public. The seven other bishops again joined him: there was now a real division in the episcopacy, among all ranks of the clergy, and all religious orders. Every one admitted that the fundamental points of religion were not concerned in this dispute, and yet a civil dissension was raised in the minds of people, as if Christianity itself was in danger of being subverted, and as many political resources were put in action as in the most profane affairs.

These resources were chiefly employed to get the constitution received by the Sorbonne. And it was registered—1714—notwithstanding the majority of votes was against it. The ministry could hardly find a sufficient number of lettres de cachet to confine or banish those that opposed it.

This bull had been registered in parliament, with a proper reservation of the ordinary rights of the crown, the liberties of the Gallican church, and the power and jurisdiction of the bishops; but the public clamor got the better of obedience. Cardinal de

Biffi, one of the most zealous defenders of the bull, acknowledged that it could not have been received with greater indignity in Geneva than it was in Paris.

The people were particularly incensed against Father Letellier. Nothing is more apt to excite indignation than a priest exalted to power; it seems a violation of his vows; but if he abuses this power, he is held in execration. Letellier presumed so much on his influence that he even proposed—1715—the deposing of Cardinal de Noailles in a national council. Thus did this priest make his prince, his penitent, and his religion, subservient to his revenge; and yet, with all this, I have strong reasons to believe that he was a well-meaning man: so apt are men to be blinded by their zeal and prejudices.

In order to prepare this council, which was to depose a man become the idol of Paris and of the whole kingdom, for the purity of his manners, the amiableness of his character, and still more by the persecution he suffered, they prevailed on Louis XIV. to order a declaration to be registered in parliament, by which every bishop, who had not received the bull purely and simply, should be obliged to subscribe it, or be prosecuted as a rebel by the advocate-general. Chancellor Voisin, secretary at war, a rigid and arbitrary man, was the person who drew up this edict. D'Aguesseau, who understood the laws of the realm much better than Voisin, and had all that courage which youth naturally inspires, peremptorily refused to be concerned in such an affair. D'Avaux, president of the council, demonstrated to the king the consequences likely to ensue.

Thus the affair was protracted. The king was at this time in a dying condition, and these unhappy disputes greatly disquieted him, and contributed not a little to hasten his end. His merciless confessor was continually teasing him, though in this weak condition, by repeated exhortations to consummate a work that would have been far from endearing his memory. The king's domestics, filled with indignation at the confessor's behavior, twice refused him entrance into his majesty's chamber, and at last earnestly conjured him not to speak to their royal master about the Constitution. Soon after the king died, and then a total change of affairs ensued.

The Duke of Orleans, regent of the kingdom, having, immediately on his assuming the reins of power, changed the whole form of Louis XIV.'s government, and having substituted councils in the room of the offices of the secretaries of state, erected a council of conscience, of which Cardinal de Noailles was made president. They banished Father Letellier, loaded with the hatred of the public, and very little beloved by his own fraternity.

The bishops who opposed the bull appealed to a future council *sine die*. The Sorbonne, the clergy of the diocese of Paris, and whole bodies of religious orders appealed likewise; and at length Cardinal de Noailles made his appeal, in 1717, but he would not publish it at first; however, it was printed, contrary to his inclination. The church of France remained divided into two factions, the acceptants and the recusants. The acceptants consisted of a hundred bishops, who had adhered under Louis

XIV. to the Jesuits and Capuchins. The other consisted of fifteen bishops and the whole nation. The acceptants had the court of Rome for their defender; the recusants were supported by the universities, the parliament, and the people. Volume upon volume, and letter upon letter, was printed; and each party treated the other as schismatics and heretics.

An archbishop of Rheims, named Mailli, a great and successful partisan of Rome, had subscribed his name to two papers, which the parliament ordered to be burnt by the hangman. The archbishop, when he heard of this, ordered *Te Deum* to be sung, and returned God thanks for having been thus ignominiously treated by schismatics. God rewarded him, and he was made a cardinal. The Bishop of Soissons having been dealt with in the same manner by the parliament, signified to that assembly that "it did not belong to them to judge, even in cases of high treason." For this he was mulcted in the sum of ten thousand livres; but the regent remitted the fine, lest, as he said, "Soissons should be made a cardinal also."

The court of Rome broke out in loud reproaches; much time was spent in negotiations, in appealing and re-appealing, and all this about a few passages, now forgotten, of a book written by an old priest of fourscore, who lived on charity in Amsterdam.

The extravagant project of the funds contributed more than one would imagine to restore peace to the church. The madness of the nation for stock-jobbing, and the greediness of every one to snap

at the bait hung out for his avarice, was so great, that those who talked about Jansenism or the bull could find no one to listen to them. The people of Paris paid as little regard to these matters as to the war that was being carried on upon the frontiers of Spain. The sudden and immense fortunes made at that time, the excess to which luxury and voluptuousness of every kind was carried, put a stop to all ecclesiastical disputes. Thus pleasure and dissipation brought about that which all the power and politics of Louis XIV. could not effect.

The Duke of Orleans laid hold of this occasion to unite the church of France. In this his policy was interested; for he dreaded to see the time when Rome, Spain, and a hundred bishops, should be all united against him.

And here he had to prevail on Cardinal de Noailles, not only to receive the Constitution, which that prelate looked on as scandalous, but also to withdraw his appeal, which he considered as lawful. He was to obtain more from him than his benefactor Louis XIV. had in vain demanded. The Duke of Orleans with reason expected great opposition from the parliament, which he had banished to Pontoise. Nevertheless he gained all his points. A body of doctrine was composed, which partly satisfied both parties; and the cardinal was prevailed on to give his promise, that he would at last accept it. The regent went himself to the grand council, with the princes of the blood and the peers, to get an edict registered, enjoining the acceptance of the bull, the suppression of all appeals, and the restoration of peace and unanimity. The parliament, which had

been mortified by seeing edicts carried to the grand council that it was their right to receive, and being likewise threatened to be removed from Pontoise to Blois, registered what had been entered by the council; but always with the customary reservations, namely: the preservation of the rights and liberties of the Gallican church, and the lords of the realm.

The cardinal archbishop, who had given his word to withdraw his appeal whenever the parliament should obey, now saw himself necessitated to keep his promise; and the instrument of his recantation was published the 20th of August, 1720.

Dubois, the new archbishop of Cambray, son to an apothecary of Brives-la-Gaillarde, afterwards cardinal and prime minister, was the person that had the greatest share in bringing about this business, in which the power of Louis XIV. had failed. No one is a stranger to the conduct, sentiments, and morals, of this minister. The licentious Dubois got the better of the pious Noailles. It is still remembered with what contempt the Duke of Orleans and his minister spoke of the disputes that they opposed, and what ridicule they threw on the controversial war. This contempt and ridicule contributed not a little to bring about a peace. People grew at length weary of such contests that afforded a subject of laughter to the rest of the world.

From this time all that was known in France by the name of Jansenism, Quietism, bulls, and theological disputes, sensibly declined; but some

bishops who had appealed, still continued obstinately attached to their opinions.

Under the administration of Cardinal de Fleury, an attempt was made to extirpate the remains of the party, by deposing one of the most stubborn prelates. To this end, old Soanen, bishop of the little town of Senez, was fixed on for an example; a man equally pious and inflexible, but of no family nor influence.

He was condemned by the provincial synod of Ambrun, in 1728, suspended from his episcopal and clerical functions, and banished by the court to Auvergne, when above eighty years old. This treatment occasioned a few murmurings, which proved of no consequence. There is not at present any nation that murmurs more, obeys better, and forgets sooner than the French.

Some remains of fanaticism still continued among a small number of the people of Paris. Certain enthusiasts imagined that a deacon named Paris, brother to a counsellor of parliament, one that had appealed and reappealed, who lay buried in the churchyard of St. Médard, was to perform miracles; some of the party, who went to pray at his tomb, had their imaginations so heated, that their disordered organs produced slight convulsions. Upon this the tomb was surrounded by swarms of people, who continued to flock thither day and night: some got on the tomb, and took the motion they gave their bodies in mounting, for miraculous convulsions. The secret abettors of the party encouraged this frenzy. They prayed at the tomb in the vulgar language; nothing was now talked of

but the deaf hearing certain words, the blind partly restored to sight, and the lame walking upright for some moments; these pretended miracles were even attested on oath by a crowd of witnesses, who thought they had beheld them, because they came thither fully prepossessed that they should behold them.

The government left this epidemical madness to itself for a month, but the concourse of people became so great, and the miracles so frequent, that they were at last obliged to shut up the church-yard, and place a guard round it. These enthusiasts then went to work their miracles in houses. This tomb of Deacon Paris, in the opinion of all sensible people, proved in effect the grave of Jansenism. Such farces might have had serious consequences in more ignorant times; but those who encouraged them seemed to have mistaken the age they lived in.

The superstition, however, was carried so far that a counsellor of parliament had the madness to present the king, in 1736, with a collection of these miracles, supported by a considerable number of attestations. This madman, the instrument and victim of others as mad as himself, says in the memorial presented to the king that "Credit ought to be given to witnesses that suffered death in support of their evidence." If all other books were to be lost, and this only was to remain, posterity would imagine our age to be the era of ignorance and barbarism.

These extravagances were in France the expiring sighs of a sect, which, being no longer supported by an Arnauld, a Pascal, nor a Nicole, and

confined only to a few convulsionaries, has fallen into utter contempt; and we should hear no more mention of those disputes that disgrace reason, and do injury to religion, were it not for some busy minds, who are continually raking in these extinguished ashes, for a remaining spark of fire, which they endeavor to blow into a new flame; but even should they succeed, the dispute concerning Molinism and Jansenism, will never again be the object of dissension. What has once become ridiculous, can never more be dangerous. The dispute will change its nature; for mankind never want a pretext to injure one another, though they may be without a cause.

The Jesuits seemed involved in the fall of Jansenism; their arms remained useless for want of adversaries to employ them on; they lost that credit at court which Letellier had so grossly abused; their journal of Trévoux gained them neither the esteem nor friendship of the learned world. The bishops, over whom they had formerly domineered, confounded them with the other religious orders; and these, who had been kept under by them, now humbled them in their turn. The parliament made them sensible, more than once, of the opinion they entertained of them, by condemning some of their books, which would otherwise have been forgotten. The university, which now began to make a shining figure in literature, and had an excellent method of educating youth, robbed them of most of their pupils; and they were obliged to wait with patience till time should furnish them with men of genius,

and a favorable opportunity to regain their former ascendancy.

It would be very useful for those who are infatuated with these kinds of disputes, to look into the general history of the world; for in observing the multitude of different nations, manners, and religions, they will see how insignificant a figure a Molinist and a Jansenist makes on the theatre of the world. They will then blush at their mad fondness for a party that is lost in the common crowd, and swallowed up in the immensity of things.

QUIETISM.

Amidst the factions of Calvinism and the disputes of Jansenism, there happened yet another division in France about Quietism. It was an unhappy consequence of the progress of human understanding in the age of Louis XIV. that it excited efforts to go beyond the limits prescribed to our knowledge; or rather, it was a proof that this progress might be still further extended.

The controversy about Quietism is one of those extravagant sallies of the imagination and theological subtleties, which would never have left any impression on the memory of mankind, had it not been for the names of two illustrious rivals in dispute. A woman without any credit, or even real understanding, who had only an overheated imagination, set at variance two of the greatest men in the church. Her name was Bouvier de la Motte. Her family was originally of Montargis. She had been married to the son of Guyon, the contractor for the canal of Briare: being left a widow when very young, with a considerable fortune, a tolerable share of beauty, and a disposition formed for distinguishing herself in public, she became possessed with what is called spirituality. She had for her confessor a Barnabite monk, of the country of Geneva, named La Combe. This man, noted for what is common enough, a medley of passions and religion, and who died mad, plunged the mind of

his penitent in mystical contemplations, to which she was already but too much inclined. The desire of being a sister Theresa, in France, prevented her from discerning the great difference between the genius of the French and Spaniards, and carried her even to greater lengths than sister Theresa. The ambition of having disciples, the strongest perhaps of every other species of ambition, took entire possession of her heart.

She and her confessor went into that small territory where the titular bishop of Geneva holds his residence. There she acquired great authority by her extensive charities, and held several conferences. She preached an entire self-renunciation, the tranquil state of the soul, and the annihilation of all its faculties, inward worship, and pure and disinterested love, such as is neither debased by fear, nor exalted by the hope of reward.

Tender and flexible imaginations, especially those of women, and some young ecclesiastics who loved the word of God as proceeding from the mouth of a fine woman, rather more than they believed it, were easily led away with an eloquence of delivery, the only thing calculated to persuade minds already favorably disposed. She made proselytes; but was soon driven thence by the bishop, with her confessor. They went next to Grenoble; there she published a little piece entitled, "The Short Way," and another called "The Torrents," both written in the same style as she preached; but in a short time she was likewise obliged to leave Grenoble.

Full already of the pleasing thoughts of being ranked among the number of confessors, she had

a vision, and prophesied. This prophecy she sent to Father La Combe: "All hell," said she, "shall rise up to stop the progress of the inward spirit and the formation of Christ Jesus in souls. And so great shall be the storm, and not one stone shall remain on another; and I foresee that throughout the whole earth, there shall be troubles, wars, and great overthrows. The woman shall be pregnant with the inward spirit, and the dragon shall stand up before her."

The prediction was in part verified: hell indeed did not rise up against her; but on her return to Paris with her confessor, where both endeavored to spread their doctrine in 1687, Archbishop Harlay de Chanvalon, obtained an order from the king to confine La Combe as a seducer, and to shut up in a convent Madame Guyon as a person disordered in her senses, and who stood in need of a cure. But before this blow, Madame Guyon had gained such a protection as now proved of service to her. In the palace of St. Cyr, then only in its infancy, she had a cousin named Madame de la Maison-Fort, a favorite with Madame de Maintenon. She had likewise insinuated herself into the good graces of the Duchesses of Chevreuse and Beauvilliers. These, her good friends, exclaimed one and all loudly against Archbishop Harlay, that he who was so well known to have a fondness for the fair sex, should persecute a woman only for discoursing on the love of God.

Madame de Maintenon, by her powerful influence, procured Madame Guyon her liberty, and got the Archbishop of Paris silenced. After she was re-

leased she went to Versailles, and introduced herself into the palace of St. Cyr, where, after having dined with Madame de Maintenon and another person, she assisted at the devout conferences held by the Abbé de Fénelon. The Princess of Harcourt, and the Duchesses of Chevreuse, Beauvilliers, and Charôt, were of this mystical society.

The Abbé Fénelon, then preceptor to the children of France, was the most engaging man about the court. He had naturally a tender heart and a mild and lively imagination. He had embellished his mind with all that was most excellent in the belles-lettres. He possessed a fine taste, with many other amiable qualifications, and preferred the affecting and sublime in divinity, to the gloomy and abstruse. With all these endowments he had a certain romantic turn which inspired him, not with the reveries of Madame Guyon, but with a taste for the doctrine of spirituality, which was not very unlike the notions of that lady.

His imagination was heated with candor and virtue, as others are inflamed by their passions. His passion was to love God purely for himself. He saw in Madame Guyon a spotless soul, fraught with the same inclinations as his own, and therefore made no difficulty to associate with her.

It was strange that such a man should be led away by a weak woman, who pretended to revelations, to prophecies, and such idle stuff; who was ready to be choked with inward grace, and made her attendants unlace her that she might empty herself—according to her own expression—of a superabundance of grace, in order to communicate

it to the body of the chosen person that sat next her. But Fénelon, in his friendship and mystical notions, was as a person in love: he excused the errors, and attached himself only to that conformity of opinion with which he had been first taken.

Madame Guyon, elevated and emboldened by the acquisition of such a disciple, whom she called her son, and depending on Madame de Maintenon's favor, propagated her notions in St. Cyr. Godet, bishop of Chartres, in whose diocese St. Cyr is, was alarmed, and made complaints. The Archbishop of Paris likewise threatened to renew his former prosecution.

Madame de Maintenon, who intended St. Cyr wholly for a peaceable retreat; who knew how much the king was an enemy to all novelty, and who had no occasion to put herself at the head of a sect to acquire influence, and had besides, only her own credit and repose in view, broke off all correspondence with Madame Guyon, and forbade her to appear again at St. Cyr.

The Abbé de Fénelon saw the storm gathering, and was apprehensive of being disappointed of the great employments to which he aspired. He therefore advised his woman friend to put herself in the hands of the famous Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, who was regarded as a father of the church. She accordingly submitted herself to the decisions of this prelate, received the sacrament from him, and delivered all her writings to his examination.

The Bishop of Meaux, with the king's permission, chose for his assistants in this affair, the Bishop of Châlons, afterwards Cardinal de Noailles,

and the Abbé Tronson, superior of St. Sulpicius. They had a private meeting at the village of Issy, near Paris. Chanvallon, Archbishop of Paris, jealous that any other persons should set themselves up as judges in his diocese, immediately fixed up a public censure on the books they had under their examination. Madame Guyon retired to the city of Meaux, subscribed to all that Bishop Bossuet required of her, and promised to dogmatize no more for the future.

In the meantime Fénelon was promoted to the archbishopric of Cambrai in 1695, and consecrated by the Bishop of Meaux. It might have been presumed, that an affair now dormant, and which had been from the beginning only a subject of ridicule, would never have been revived. But Madame Guyon, being accused of continuing to preach her doctrines after she had promised silence, was seized by order of the king in the same year, 1695, and was held a prisoner at Vincennes, as if she had been a person dangerous to the state. She could not possibly be so; and her pious follies did not merit the attention of the sovereign. During her confinement at Vincennes she composed a large volume of mystic poetry, more wretched even than her prose. She wrote parodies on verses of operas, and would often sing the following lines:

Pure, perfect love surmounts yon starry skies!

We little know when first it takes its rise

What pangs the subject heart will prove;

Vincennes had never shocked, nor tears bedimmed these
eyes,

Had I ne'er felt this pure and perfect love.

The opinions of mankind are frequently influenced by time, place, and circumstances. While Madame Guyon was confined in prison, who in one of her frenzies had imagined herself married to Jesus Christ, and from that time would never invoke the saints, saying, that it was not for the mistress of the family to address herself to her servants; at this very time, I say, there was application made to Rome for the canonization of Mary de Agreda,* who had pretended to more visions and revelations than all the rest of the mystical tribe put together; and as an unanswerable instance of those contradictions with which the world abounds, at the Sorbonne they prosecuted as a heretic this very de Agreda, whom they wanted to make a saint in Spain. The university of Salamanca condemned the Sorbonne, and was in return condemned by it.

Bossuet, who had long looked on himself as the father and master of Fénelon, beheld with jealous eyes the rising reputation and credit of his disciple; and desirous of preserving that ascendant which he had over all the rest of his brethren, he required the new archbishop to join with him in the condemnation of Madame Guyon, and to subscribe to his pastoral instructions. Fénelon refused to sacrifice either his sentiments or his friend. A medium was proposed, and mutual promises made. The one accused the other of breach of faith. The

* This enthusiast, who was abbess of a convent at Agreda, pretended to have received divine orders to write the life of the Virgin Mary, which was accordingly published under the title of the "Mystic City of God" and appears to be a strange medley of madness and fanaticism.

Archbishop of Cambray, when he departed for his diocese, caused his book entitled, "The Maxims of the Saints," to be printed in Paris; a work in which he endeavored to palliate the charge brought against his friend, and to reveal the orthodox notions of devout contemplators, who raise themselves above the senses, and aim at a state of perfection to which ordinary souls seldom aspire. The Bishop of Meaux and his adherents vehemently opposed this book. They complained of it to the king, as if it had been as dangerous as it was unintelligible. His majesty spoke of it to Bossuet, of whose reputation and understanding he had a great opinion. This prelate, throwing himself on his knees before his prince, implored his pardon for not having before informed him of the fatal heresy of the Archbishop of Cambray. The king and Madame de Maintenon immediately consulted Father de Lachaise upon the affair, who made answer, that the archbishop's book was an excellent piece; that it had greatly edified all the Jesuits; and that the Jansenists only disapproved of it. The Bishop of Meaux was not a Jansenist, but he had studied some of their best writings. He did not like the Jesuits, nor they him.

The court and the city were divided; and the attention of everyone being engrossed with this affair, the Jansenists had a little respite.

Bossuet wrote against Fénelon, and both sent their works to Pope Innocent XII. submitting themselves to his decision. Circumstances were rather against Fénelon; for not long before, the court of Rome had strongly condemned, in the per-

son of Molinos, the Spaniard*, the Quietism of which the Archbishop of Cambray was now accused. Cardinal d'Estrées, the French ambassador at Rome, was the person that had prosecuted Molinos. This cardinal, whom we have seen in his old age more engaged in the pleasures of society than in theology, had proceeded against Molinos merely to please the enemies of that unfortunate priest, and had even prevailed on the king to solicit his condemnation in Rome, which he obtained but too easily; so that Louis XIV. proved, unknown to himself, the most formidable enemy of the pure love of the mystics.

In matters of this delicate nature, nothing is more easy than to discover passages in a book under consideration resembling those in one already condemned. The Archbishop of Cambray had on his side the Jesuits, and Cardinal de Bouillon, lately ambassador from France to Rome. The Bishop of Meaux had his own great name and the principal prelates of France for his adherents. He presented to the king the subscribed declarations of many

* Michael Molinos, a Spanish priest, and founder of the sect of Quietists. He published his book on spiritual conduct in Rome, and was much followed for a series of years; but his reputation having at length awakened the jealousy of the Jesuits, they employed all their art and influence for his destruction. A process was instituted against him in the general congregation of the inquisition of Rome, held in presence of the pope and the cardinal inquisitors. Sixty-eight of the propositions were condemned as false and pernicious, scandalous, blasphemous, and heretical. He was compelled to abjure them publicly in the habit of a penitent, and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, in which he died. His real character was that of an inoffensive enthusiast, who aspired to a sublime communication with God, by means of abstracted contemplation.

of the bishops, and a great number of doctors, who all condemned "The Maxims of the Saints."

So great was the authority of the Bishop of Meaux, that Father de Lachaise durst not vindicate the Archbishop of Cambray to his royal penitent, and Madame de Maintenon entirely abandoned her friend. The king wrote to Pope Innocent XII. that having had the archbishop's book laid before him as a dangerous work, he had put it into the hands of the nuncio, and earnestly requested his holiness to give judgment on it.

It was insinuated, and even publicly affirmed in Rome, nor are there wanting those that still believe the report, that the Archbishop of Cambray was thus persecuted for no other reason than his having opposed the private marriage of the king with Madame de Maintenon. The anecdote-makers pretend that this lady had engaged Father de Lachaise to press the king to acknowledge her for queen; that the Jesuit had artfully thrown this dangerous commission on the Abbé Fénelon; but that this preceptor of the children of the blood, preferred the honor of his country and that of his royal pupils to his own interest, and had thrown himself at the feet of Louis XIV. to prevent a marriage which, from its unaccountable strangeness, would have injured that monarch more with posterity than all the transitory gratifications of his life could have recompensed.

This tale is still to be found in the "History of Louis XIV." printed at Avignon. Those who have had access to that monarch, and to Madame de Maintenon, know how far this is from the truth. But it

is true that Fénelon, having continued his education of the Duke of Burgundy after his promotion to the archbishopric of Cambrai, and the king during this interval having heard some confused talk about Fénelon's connection with Madame Guyon, and Madame de la Maison-Fort, was apprehensive that Fénelon might inspire his pupil with maxims too rigid, and such principles of government and morality as would perhaps one day become an indirect censure on that air of greatness, that thirst for glory, those wars undertaken on the most frivolous occasion, and that taste for luxury and pleasures, which had characterized his reign.

The king was desirous of having some conversation with the new archbishop on his political principles. Fénelon, full of his ideas, discovered to the king some part of the principles that he afterwards unfolded in those passages of his "Telemachus" where he treats of government; principles that better suit with Plato's ideal republic, than the true manner in which mankind are to be governed. The king, after this conversation, said, that he had been discoursing with the finest and most chimerical genius in his kingdom. The Duke of Burgundy was made acquainted with what his majesty had said, and repeated it afterwards to M. de Malesieux, his master for geometry. I had this from M. de Malesieux himself, and it was afterwards confirmed to me by Cardinal Fleury.

It is certain that from this conversation the king readily believed Fénelon to be as romantic in his religious as in his political notions.

The congregation of the Holy Office named a

Dominican, a Jesuit, a Benedictine, two Cordeliers, a Feuillant,* and an Augustine, to take cognizance of the affair. These are what they call in Rome the consultors. The cardinals and prelates generally leave to these monks the study of theology, so as to be at leisure to follow politics, intrigues, or the pleasures of an indolent life.

The consultors, in thirty-seven sittings, examined as many propositions, and declared them erroneous, by a majority of voices; and the pope, at the head of a congregation of cardinals, condemned them by a brief published and fixed up at Rome the thirteenth day of March, 1699.

The Bishop of Meaux triumphed; but the Archbishop of Cambray gained a more glorious victory in his defeat. He submitted without restriction or reserve. He even mounted the pulpit himself at Cambray, to condemn his own book, and forbade his friends to defend it. This singular instance of condescension in a man of his learning, who might have raised a considerable party to himself, even from his persecution, added to his known candor and ingenuousness, gained him the good will of everyone, and made his antagonist almost hated for his victory. He ever afterwards continued to reside in his diocese, like the good archbishop and the man of letters. That sweetness of manners which showed itself in his conversation as well as in his writings, made all who had the happiness of being acquainted with him, his affectionate friends. The persecution he underwent, and his "Telemachus,"

* A set of begging friars of the order of St. Bernard.

gained him the veneration of all Europe. The English in particular, though they carried the war into his diocese, were the most eager to show him respect. The Duke of Marlborough took particular care that his lands should be spared. He was always held dear by the Duke of Burgundy, who was his pupil; and had that prince lived, he would have had a share in the administration.

In his philosophical and honorable retreat, we may see with what difficulty a man can disengage himself from court. He always spoke on this head in such a feeling manner as broke through all his appearance of resignation. Several pieces on philosophy, divinity, and polite literature, were the fruits of the leisure hours of his retirement. The Duke of Orleans, afterwards regent of the kingdom, consulted him on certain difficult points that concern all mankind, and yet are seldom thought of by them. He asked him whether the existence of a Deity could be demonstrated? Whether this Deity required worship of us? What worship he most approved? And whether a mistaken choice was offensive to him? He started many questions of a like nature, as a philosopher that sought instruction; and the archbishop answered him like an able philosopher and divine.

After having been worsted in scholastic disputes, it would have been more agreeable to his character, had he not intermeddled in the controversy of Jansenism; nevertheless, he engaged in it. Cardinal Noailles had formerly joined with the strongest side against him. The Archbishop of Cambrai did the same in his turn. He was in hopes of being

recalled to court and consulted; so hard is it for the mind of man to disengage itself from public affairs, after having been once embarked in them. His desires nevertheless were as moderate as his writings; and even towards the latter part of his life, he at last despised all disputation, resembling in this one particular Huet, Bishop of Avranches, one of the most learned men in Europe, who in his latter days acknowledged the vanity of almost all science, and of the human understanding itself.

The Archbishop of Cambray—who would believe it!—thus turned an air of Lulli:

When young, I was exceeding wise,
And piled up knowledge in a heap;
Now nothing I prize,
But trifles and toys,
And creep to the grave without noise;
Nor wish to look before I leap.

He composed these verses in presence of his nephew the Marquis of Fénelon, afterwards ambassador at The Hague, from whom I had them, and can warrant the truth of this fact. It is a circumstance of very little importance in itself, only as it is a proof that in the grave tranquillity of old age, we often view in a different light what appeared so great and interesting to us at a time of life when the active mind is the sport of its own desires and delusions*.

* The above verses are to be met with in the poetical works of Madame Guyon: but the archbishop's nephew having assured me more than once that they were his uncle's, and that he heard him repeat them the very day he made them, I thought I was in justice bound to restore them to their real author.

THE JEWS.

You desire me to give you a faithful picture of the spirit and history of the Jews; and, without entering into the ineffable ways of Providence, you want to discover, in the manners of that people, the true origin of those events which Providence hath brought about.

Certain it is, of all the nations in the world, that of the Jews is the most remarkable. However contemptible they may be in the eyes of a politician, they are nevertheless well worthy of the serious attention of a philosopher.

The Guebers, the Banians, and the Jews are the only people that preserve a being, notwithstanding their dispersion; and, without making an alliance with any other nation, perpetuate their race among strangers, from whom they keep themselves entirely distinct.

In former times the Guebers were infinitely more numerous than the Jews, as being the remains of the ancient Persians, who held the Jews in subjection: at present, however, they are to be found only in one corner of the East.

The Banians, sprung from those ancient people from whom Pythagoras derived his philosophy, are met with only in Persia and the Indies: but the Jews are scattered over the whole earth; and, were they now to be collected into one body, would compose a nation far more numerous than

they were during the short period in which they were masters of Palestine. Nearly all those who have committed to writing the history of their origin have endeavored to heighten it with prodigies; with them, everything is miraculous; their oracles foretell nothing but conquests; and such of them as have really become conquerors have made no difficulty to believe the truth of ancient oracles, so amply justified by the event. But what distinguishes the Jews from all other nations is that their oracles alone are true; of this we are not permitted to entertain the least doubt. These oracles, which they understand in the literal sense, have foretold, a hundred times, that they should one day become masters of the world; notwithstanding which, they were never in possession of more than one paltry spot for a few years; nor have they, at present, a single village they can call their own. They are, therefore, bound to believe, and in fact they do believe, that these predictions will be one day accomplished, and that they shall obtain the empire of the universe.

Among the Mussulmans and Christians they are considered as people of the meanest and most despicable character, and yet they believe themselves to be of the greatest importance. This pride, in the midst of their abasement, is justified by an unanswerable argument; to-wit, that they are really the fathers of both the Christians and the Mussulmans. The Christian and the Mahometan religions acknowledge that of the Jews for their mother whom, nevertheless, by a strange kind of contradiction, they at once respect and abhor.

It is not our intention here to recount that long train of prodigies which astonish the imagination and exercise our faith. We mean to examine only those events which are purely historical, stripped of the divine agency, and those miracles which God condescended, for so long a time, to work in favor of this people.

At first, we behold in Egypt a single family of seventy persons. This, in the space of two hundred and fifteen years, produced a nation capable of furnishing six hundred thousand fighting men, which, together with the old men, women, and children, may be supposed to amount to two millions of souls: a prodigious increase! to which the history of mankind cannot furnish a parallel instance. This multitude, having left Egypt, continued in the deserts of Arabia Petræa for forty years, during which their numbers were considerably diminished in that cold and barren country.

The remaining part of the nation advanced a little to the northward of these deserts.

It appears that their principles were the same as those which were afterwards adopted by the natives of Arabia Petræa and Deserta; for they put to death, in cold blood, the inhabitants of the small towns which they took, and reserved only the young women. The interest of population has always been the chief aim of both the one and the other. We find that when the Arabs conquered Spain, they imposed a tax of marriageable virgins on all the provinces; and, even at this day, the Arabs of the desert never make a treaty without stipulating for some presents and young women.

The Jews arrived in a sandy and mountainous country, in which there were some villages, inhabited by a small nation called the Midianites,* from whom they took, in the course of one campaign, six hundred and seventy-five thousand sheep, seventy-two thousand oxen, sixty-one thousand asses, and thirty-two thousand maids. All the men, all the married women, and all the male children were put to the sword. The young women and the booty were divided among the people and the priests.

They afterwards made themselves masters of the town of Jericho† in the same country; but, having previously condemned the inhabitants to destruction, they put them all to the sword, not even sparing the young women; and granted life to none but to a harlot named Rahab, who had assisted them in surprising the town.

It has long been a matter of dispute among the learned, whether the Jews offered human sacrifices to the Deity, like other nations; but this is merely a controversy about words. Those, it is true, whom they devoted to destruction were not butchered on the altar with all the parade of religious rites; but they were nevertheless sacrificed, without its being lawful to spare so much as a single person. In

* They derived their name from Midian, said to be the son of Abraham and Ketura; and inhabited the country of Arabia Petræa. But that the whole nation was thus extirpated seems a little improbable, inasmuch as we find the Israelites enslaved by the Midianites in the sequel; a state of slavery from which they were delivered by Gideon.

† Josephus tells us, that the plain of Jericho was planted with the tree which produces the real balm of Gilead, whence the city took the name of Jericho, which signifies sweet odor. But none of those trees are now to be seen on this spot.

Leviticus, xxix, 27, the Mosaic law expressly forbids them to ransom those whom they had devoted to destruction; the words are, "Let them die the death." It was in consequence of this law that Jephthah vowed, and butchered his daughter; that Saul endeavored to kill his son; and that Samuel, the prophet, hewed King Agag, Saul's prisoner, to pieces. Certain it is, God is the absolute master of the lives of his creatures; nor does it belong to us to examine his laws. It is our duty to believe these facts, and silently to reverence the designs of the Deity in permitting them.

It is likewise asked, what right could strangers, such as the Jews were, have to the land of Canaan? To this they answer that they had that right which God gave them.

Hardly had they taken Jericho and Laish, when a civil war broke out among them, in which the tribe of Benjamin, men, women, and children, was almost extirpated. Of the whole, there only remained six hundred males; and, in order to prevent the total ruin of one of their tribes, they thought proper to destroy a whole town of the tribe of Manasseh, with fire and sword, killing all the men, children, married women, and widows, and taking thence six hundred virgins, whom they gave to the six hundred surviving Benjaminites to repair their tribe, so that the number of their twelve tribes might be always complete.

Meanwhile the Phœnicians, a powerful people established in these quarters from time immemorial, being alarmed at the depredations and cruelties of these newcomers, chastised them frequently; and

the neighboring princes uniting against them, they were reduced to a state of servitude for upwards of two hundred years.

At last they made a king and chose him by lot. This king could not possibly be powerful, for in the first battle which the Jews under his command fought with the Philistines, their masters, they had neither sword nor spear, nor a single weapon of iron. But David, their second king, makes war with more advantage and success. He takes the town of Salem;* is famous afterwards under the name of Jerusalem; and then the Jews begin to make some figure in the confines of Syria.

From this time their religion and government assume a more august form. Hitherto they had had no temples; a convenience possessed by all the nations around them. Solomon built a superb one, and reigned over this people for about forty years.

The reign of Solomon is not only the most flourishing period of the Jews, but all the kings of the earth together could not produce a treasure nearly equal to that of Solomon's. His father, David, who was not even possessed of iron, left Solomon twenty-five thousand six hundred and forty-eight millions of French livres in ready money,† accord-

* It is supposed to have been founded by Melchisedec; to have been taken by the Jebusites, who possessed it till the time of Joshua, who reduced the city, and caused their king Adonisedec, with four princes, his allies, to be put to death. After the death of Joshua they recovered it, and built the citadel of Sion, of which they were dispossessed by David.

† The sum contributed by David and his princes towards the building of the temple, according to the value of the Mosaic talent, and the account given in the book of Chronicles, must have exceeded eight hundred millions sterling.

to the present computation. His fleets, which traded to Ophir, brought him annually sixty-eight millions in pure gold, not to mention silver and precious stones. He had forty thousand stables, as many coach-houses, twelve thousand stables for his cavalry, seven hundred wives, and three hundred concubines. And yet he had neither wood nor workmen to build his palace and the temple: these he borrowed from Hiram, King of Tyre, who also furnished him with gold, in return for which Solomon gave Hiram twenty cities. The commentators acknowledge that these facts are dubious, and suspect that some error in the calculation must have escaped the transcribers; the only persons, it seems, that could possibly be mistaken.

The twelve tribes, of which the nation consisted, were separated on Solomon's death. The kingdom was torn in pieces, and divided into two petty provinces, the one called Judæa, the other Israel; the latter containing nine tribes and a half, the former only two and a half. There reigned between these two nations a hatred, the more implacable as they were neighbors and relatives, and professed a different form of religion; for at Sichern and Samaria they worshipped Baal, a word of Sidonian extraction; whereas at Jerusalem, Adonai was the object of their worship. At Sichern two calves were consecrated, and at Jerusalem two cherubims; the latter of which were two-winged animals, with two heads apiece, and placed in the sanctuary. Thus each party, having its own king, its own God, its own worship, and its own prophets, was perpetually engaged in a cruel war with the other.

During the course of this war, the kings of Assyria, who conquered the greatest part of Asia, fell on the Jews, with the rapidity of an eagle darting down on two fighting lizards. The nine tribes and a half, settled at Samaria and Sichem, were carried off, and dispersed beyond all possibility of return, and without its ever being distinctly known whither they were led into captivity.

As the distance from Samaria to Jerusalem is but twenty leagues, and their territories lie contiguous, when one of these towns was razed by the powerful conquerors, the other could not hold out long. Thus we find that Jerusalem was often sacked: it was tributary to the kings Hazael and Rezin; reduced to slavery by Tiglath-Pileser; thrice taken by Nebuchadnezzar, or Nabuchodonosor; and at last destroyed. Zedekiah, whom the conqueror had appointed king or governor, was, together with all his people, carried captive into Babylon; so that no Jews were left remaining in Palestine, except a few families of country slaves to sow the land.

With regard to the little country of Samaria and Sichem, which was more fertile than that of Jerusalem, it was repopled by colonies of strangers, who were sent thither by the kings of Assyria, and took the name of Samaritans.

The two tribes and a half, continuing in a state of slavery for seventy years, in Babylon and the neighboring towns, had thereby an opportunity of learning the customs of their masters, and of enriching their language by a proper mixture of the Chaldæan tongue. From that time the Jews under-

stood no other alphabet; or characters, than those of the Chaldæans; and it is an indisputable fact that they even forgot the Hebrew dialect, substituting in its place thenceforward the Chaldæan tongue. Josephus, the historian, declares that he wrote at first in the Chaldæan tongue, which was the language of his country. It appears that the Jews imbibed a small tincture of the sciences of the magi. They soon became bankers, brokers, and chapmen; by which means they rendered themselves necessary, as they still are, and acquired immense fortunes.

Their great riches enabled them to procure from Cyrus permission to rebuild Jerusalem; but when the time came, at which they were to have set out on their return home, those who had grown rich at Babylon did not choose to quit such a beautiful country for the mountains of Cœlo-Syria, nor to abandon the fertile banks of the Tigris and Euphrates for the brook of Kedron. It was only the dregs and refuse of the nation that returned with Zorobabel. The Jews of Babylon contributed only by their charitable collections towards rebuilding the city and temple; and even these collections were inconsiderable. Esdras says that he could not make up in the whole above seventy thousand crowns for rebuilding that temple, which was to be the temple of the universe.

The Jews were still subject to the Persians, as they were likewise soon after to Alexander; and when that great man, the most excusable of all conquerors, began, in the first year of his victorious reign, to build Alexandria, and to make it the

centre of commerce of the whole world, the Jews flocked thither to follow their trade of brokerage; and then it was that their rabbins acquired some knowledge of the learning of the Greeks, the language of which people had then become absolutely necessary to all the trading Jews.

After the death of Alexander, they continued in subjection to the kings of Syria in Jerusalem, and to the kings of Egypt in Alexandria; and when a war broke out between these monarchs, the Jews always underwent the common fate of subjects, and fell to the conqueror's share.

From the time of their Babylonian captivity, the governors of Jerusalem never assumed the name of king. The administration of civil affairs was intrusted to the high priests, who were nominated by their masters. This dignity they sometimes purchased at a very high price, as is still done by the Greek patriarch of Constantinople.

Under Antiochus Epiphanes they raised a rebellion: the city was once more pillaged, and its walls laid level with the ground. At length, after a train of similar disasters, they obtained from Antiochus Sidetes, for the first time, about one hundred and fifty years before the vulgar era, the liberty of coining money. From this time their governors assumed the name of kings, and even wore a diadem. Antigonus was the first who was adorned with this insignia of royalty, which, after all, when stripped of power, can confer but little honor.

The Romans now began to be formidable to the kings of Syria, who held the Jews in subjection; but the latter gained the senate of Rome by their

presents and submissive behavior. The wars which the Romans were waging in Asia Minor seemed to promise a long respite to this unhappy people; but hardly had Jerusalem begun to enjoy the least degree of liberty, when it was rent by civil wars, and rendered much more miserable under its shadows of kings than ever it had been in all the various kinds of slavery to which it had been subjected.

The better to compose their intestine commotions, they chose the Romans for their umpires. Most of the kingdoms of Asia Minor, of the southern part of Africa, and of three-fourths of Europe, already acknowledged the Romans as their lords and sovereigns.

Pompey came into Syria to administer justice to the different nations, and to depose some petty tyrants. Being imposed upon by Aristobulus, who contended for the sovereignty of Jerusalem, he avenged himself both on him and his party. He took the city, hanged some of the most seditious, whether priests or Pharisees, and, long after that, condemned Aristobulus, the King of the Jews, to undergo capital punishment.

The Jews, always wretched, always slaves, and always rebellious, once more drew upon themselves the Roman arms. Crassus and Cassius were sent to chastise them; and Metellus Scipio caused one Alexander, a son of King Aristobulus, and the author of all these disturbances, to be crucified.

Under Julius Cæsar they were perfectly quiet and peaceable. Herod, who has since become famous among us as well as among them, and was for a long time a simple tetrarch, purchased the crown

of Judæa from Antony at a very high price. But Jerusalem refused to acknowledge this new king, because he was descended from Esau, and not from Jacob, and was besides an Idumæan; and yet this circumstance of his being a stranger was the very thing that induced the Romans to choose him, the better to curb this seditious people.

The Romans supported the king of their own nomination with an army; and Jerusalem was once more taken by assault, sacked and pillaged.

Herod, being afterwards supported by Augustus, became one of the most powerful princes among all the petty monarchs of Arabia. He repaired Jerusalem, and rebuilt the fortress that surrounded the temple, for which the Jews had so great a veneration. He even began to build the temple anew; but could not bring the work to perfection, for want of money and workmen. Hence it appears that, after all, Herod was far from being rich; and that the Jews, though fond of their temple, were still fonder of their money.

The name of king was merely a favor granted by the Romans, and by no means a title of succession; for, soon after Herod's death, Judæa was reduced to the form of a lesser Roman province, and governed by the proconsul of Syria; though the title of king was sold, from time to time, for a round sum of money, sometimes to a Jew, and sometimes to one of another country; as it was to Agrippa the Jew, under the Emperor Claudius.

Berenice, so famous for having engaged the affections of one of the best Roman emperors, was a daughter of Agrippa. This was the lady who, on

account of the bad treatment which she suffered from her countrymen, drew upon Jerusalem the vengeance of the Roman arms. She demanded justice; but the factions in the city prevented her from obtaining her request. The seditious spirit of the people carried them into new excesses. Cruelty has ever been their distinguishing characteristic, and severe and exemplary punishments their just lot.

This memorable siege, which ended in the destruction of the city, was conducted by Titus and Vespasian. It is alleged by Josephus, whose accounts are mostly exaggerated, that in the course of this short war, a million of Jews and upwards, were put to the sword; no wonder that an author who assigns fifteen thousand inhabitants to every little village should kill a million of men! Those of the people who remained were exposed in the public markets, and every Jew was sold for much the same price that is usually paid for the unclean animal which they dare not eat.

In this last dispersion, they still hoped for a deliverer, and under the reign of Adrian, whom they cursed in their prayers, there arose one Bar-Cocheba, who called himself a new Moses, a Shiloh, a Christ. A number of these unhappy wretches having crowded to his standard, which they believed to be sacred, were entirely destroyed, together with their leader; and this gave a finishing stroke to the fortunes of that nation, from which it was never afterwards able to recover. The only thing that has preserved them from utter destruction is their prevailing opinion that barrenness is a disgrace. There are two duties which the Jews consider as the most

indispensable of all others—the getting of money and children.

From this short sketch, it appears that the Jews have always been either fugitives, freebooters, slaves, or rebels. At this very day they are vagabonds on the earth, and detested by the rest of mankind; confident, as they are, that the heaven and the earth and all its inhabitants were created for them alone.

It is evident, as well from the situation of Judæa, as from the genius of the people, that they must always have been in a state of subjection. Surrounded, as they were, by strong and warlike nations, which they abhorred, they could neither enter into an alliance with them, nor receive any protection from them. They could not possibly defend themselves by a naval force, having soon lost the harbor, which in Solomon's time they had, in the Red Sea; and Solomon himself having always employed Tyrians to build and navigate his ships, as well as to raise the temple and his own palace. Hence, too, it appears that the Hebrews were strangers to industry, and could never compose a flourishing nation. They had no regular troops, as the Assyrians, the Medes, the Persians, the Syrians and the Romans had. Their artists and peasants took to arms on pressing emergencies, and of consequence could never form a body of brave and warlike troops. Their mountains, or, to speak more properly, their rocks, were neither sufficiently high nor sufficiently contiguous to defend the entry into their country. The greatest part of the nation being transported to Babylon, to Persia, or the

Indies, or settled in Alexandria, were too closely engaged in trade and brokerage to think of war. Their civil government, whether republican, pontifical, monarchical, or reduced, as it often was, to a state of anarchy, was as imperfect as their military discipline.

You ask me what was the philosophy of the Hebrews. My answer shall be short; they had no philosophy at all. Their legislator does not so much as mention the immortality of the soul, nor a future state of rewards and punishments. Josephus and Philo Judæus believe that souls are material. Their doctors admit of corporeal angels; and during their abode at Babylon, they gave these angels the same names that the Chaldæans gave them; such as Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel. The word "satan" is of Babylonian extraction, and is much the same as the "Ahrimans" of Zoroaster. The name "Asmodeus," too, is a Chaldæan word; and Tobias, who lived at Nineveh, is the first that used it. It was not till a long time after this that the Pharisees broached the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. The Sadducees always denied the spirituality and immortality of the soul, as also the existence of angels; and yet the Sadducees always communicated with the Pharisees: there were even some high priests of the former sect. This difference of opinions in these two great bodies was not productive of any disturbances. During the latter years of their abode at Jerusalem, the Jews were attached only to their ceremonial law. The man who had tasted of pudding or rabbit would have been stoned; but he who denied the immortality of

the soul might attain to the dignity of high priest.

It is commonly supposed that the hatred which the Jews bore to all other nations was owing to their detestation of idolatry; but it is more probable that it proceeded from the barbarous manner in which they extirpated some colonies of the Canaanites, and the indignation which the neighboring nations must, of course, have conceived against them. As they did not know of any other nations but such as bordered on their own country, they imagined that in hating these they hated the whole earth, and thus accustomed themselves to become the general enemies of mankind.

To be convinced that the idolatry of the neighboring nations was not the true cause of their hatred, we need only consult the "History of the Jews," where we shall see that they themselves were frequently idolaters. Solomon sacrificed to strange gods; and we can hardly find one king after him that did not permit the worship of their gods, and offer them incense. The province of Israel preserved its two calves and sacred groves, or adored other deities.

This idolatry, of which the heathens are commonly accused, is a subject but little understood. Perhaps it would be no difficult matter to clear the theology of the ancients from this aspersion. All civilized nations have ever had a knowledge of one supreme being, the sovereign lord of gods and men. The Egyptians themselves acknowledged a first principle, which they called "Knef," and to which everything besides was subordinate. The ancient Persians adored the good principle "Ormuzd,"

and were very far from sacrificing to the bad principle "Ahrimans," whom they considered in much the same light as we do the devil. The ancient Brahmins acknowledged one supreme being. The Chinese never joined any inferior being with the Deity, nor had they any idol till the worship of Fo-Hi, and the superstition of the bonzes corrupted the minds of the people. The Greeks and Romans, notwithstanding the great number of their gods, acknowledged Jupiter as the absolute sovereign of heaven and earth: nor does Homer himself, even in his most absurd poetical fictions, so much as once deviate from this truth. He always represents Jupiter as the only omnipotent being, who sends good and evil upon the earth, and who by a single motion of his eyebrows makes both gods and men tremble. It is true they raised altars and offered sacrifices to other gods; but then they always considered them as of an inferior order, and dependent on the supreme being. There is not a single instance, in all the records of antiquity, where the name of the sovereign of heaven and earth is given to an inferior deity, such as to Mercury, Apollo, or Mars. The thunder has always been an attribute of the supreme lord of all.

The notion of a supreme being, and of his providence and eternal decrees, is to be found in the works of all the poets and philosophers. In a word, it would perhaps be as unreasonable to suppose that the ancients compared their heroes, their genii and inferior deities to that being whom they called the father and sovereign of the gods, as it would

be to imagine that we considered saints and angels as equal to the deity.

You further ask me whether the ancient philosophers and legislators derived their knowledge from the Jews, or the Jews from them. For an answer to this question we must consult Philo Judæus, who owns that before the septuagint translation of the Bible, the books of the Jewish nation were entirely unknown to foreigners. Besides, it can hardly be supposed that great and mighty nations should borrow their laws and knowledge from a handful of obscure slaves. Add to this that the Jews had no books in the time of Uzziah. Under his reign the only remaining copy of the law was found by accident. From the time of the Babylonian captivity, they understood no alphabet but that of the Chaldæans. They were not famous for any art or manufacture; and even in the time of Solomon they were obliged to hire foreign workmen at a high price. To suppose that the Egyptians, the Greeks, and Persians derived their knowledge from the Jews is to suppose that the Romans learned their arts and sciences from the Low Bretons. The Jews were utterly unacquainted with natural philosophy, geometry, and astronomy. Far from having any public schools for the education of youth, they have not so much as a word to express that institution. The inhabitants of Mexico and Peru regulated their year with much greater exactness than the Jews. Their abode at Babylon and Alexandria, where some of them might have been supposed to have acquired a little learning, contributed only to improve them in the practice of usury. They

never understood the art of coining money; even when they had obtained permission so to do from Antiochus Sidetes, it was four or five years before they could avail themselves of it; and after all it is alleged that the money was coined at Samaria. Hence it is that Jewish medals are so rare, and that most of them are spurious. In a word, after the most exact scrutiny, you will find the Jews to be an ignorant and barbarous people, who have long joined the most sordid avarice to most abominable superstition, and to an implacable hatred of all other nations, among whom, however, they are allowed to reside, and to acquire immense fortunes. And yet we do not think they should be committed to the flames.

. . .

REMARKS ON M. PASCAL'S THOUGHTS.

YOU have here the remarks which I made some time since on M. Pascal's thoughts. Let me desire you, however, not to compare me on this occasion to Hezekiah, who was for having all the works of Solomon burnt. I have a profound respect for M. Pascal's genius and eloquence, but this respect serves to convince me that he himself would have corrected many of those thoughts that he occasionally committed to paper, with an intention of examining them afterwards, and at the same time that I combat his opinions, I admire his genius.

It appears to me that M. Pascal's design in general was to exhibit mankind in an odious light. He exacts the uttermost efforts of his pen to make us all appear a wicked and wretched set of beings. He writes against the human species, in much the same strain as he wrote against the Jesuits. He ascribes to the essence of our nature things that are peculiar to some men only, and with all imaginable eloquence abuses the whole race of mankind. I shall be so bold as to defend my fellow creatures against the invectives of this sublime misanthropist. I will venture to affirm that we are neither so wretched nor so wicked as he declares us to be. I am likewise fully persuaded, that had he, in the book he proposed to write, carried into execution the plan laid down by him in his thoughts, it would have been a work full of eloquent false reasonings and



untruths, reduced in a wonderful manner. I even think that the great number of books that have been written of late years to prove the truth of the Christian religion, so far from edifying the reader, will be found so many stumbling-blocks. Do these authors pretend to know more of this matter than Christ and his apostles? This is like propping up an oak with reeds to prevent it from falling, though the latter may very safely be rooted up without prejudicing the oak in any manner.

I have selected some of Pascal's thoughts at discretion, and annexed my remarks or answers to each of them.

And here it cannot be too often repeated, that it is the height of absurdity and malice, to make a party affair of this examination. I acknowledge no party but that of truth: I am of opinion that it is an undoubted truth, that it is not the business of metaphysics to prove the truth of the Christian religion, and that reason is as much inferior to faith as the finite is to the infinite. Here we are to consult only reason, and that is a thing of so little consequence that it is not worth the trouble of contending about.

I. THOUGHT.

“The greatness and misery of man are so visible that true religion must necessarily have taught us that these are inherently in him, so mighty a principle of greatness, and at the same time some mighty principle of misery, for true religion cannot but be perfectly acquainted with our nature, by which I mean that it must know the utmost extent of its

greatness and misery, and the reason of both ; from true religion likewise we must learn the reason of those astonishing contrarities which are found on that occasion."

This way of reasoning seems false and dangerous, for the fable of Prometheus and Pandora, the Androgyni of Plato, and the tenets of the ancient Egyptians and of Zoroaster would account as well for those apparent contrarities: the Christian religion would remain true, even though no person should draw those ingenious conclusions from it, which can serve only to show the brilliant imagination of those who favor them: to establish the truth of a religion, it is necessary it should be revealed, without explaining to us the reason of these supposed contrarities, and we are no more to expect metaphysical lights from it than astronomical ones.

II.

"Let us examine on this head, all the known religions in the world, and then we shall see if there is any other since that of Christianity capable of satisfying us herein. Will it be taught by the philosophers, who propose to us as the only good, the good inherent in ourselves? But is this true good? Will this be found a remedy for our evils?"

The philosophers never taught a religion, and their philosophy was not the subject to be combated. No philosopher ever pretended to be inspired by the Almighty, for had he done this he would no longer have acted in the character of a philosopher, but in that of a prophet. The question is not to inquire whether Jesus Christ ought to be

preferred to Aristotle, but to prove that the religion of the former is the true one, and that those of Mahomet, Zoroaster, Confucius, Hermes, and every other are false. It is not true that the philosophers have proposed to us as the only good, the good inherent within us. Read Plato, Marcus Aurelius, and Epictetus, you will find they endeavor to inspire us with a desire of meriting a reunion with the divine Essence, whence we originally sprung.

III.

“And yet without this mystery, which is of all others the most incomprehensible, we are incomprehensible to ourselves. The knot of our condition has all its turns, and plies in the abyss of original sins; insomuch that man is incomprehensible without this mystery, as this mystery is incomprehensible to man.”

What an unaccountable way of reasoning! Man is incomprehensible without this incomprehensible mystery? Certainly it is enough to be wholly ignorant of our origin, without going about to explain it by a thing we know nothing of: we are wholly in the dark as to the manner in which man comes into the world, how he grows, how he performs the various functions of life, and how his members are made to act subservient to his will. How should I be looked upon if I went about to explain these obscurities by an unintelligible system? Would it not be better to confess I know nothing of the matter? A mystery never was the explanation of anything; it is something divine and wholly inexplicable in itself.

What answer would M. Pascal have made to any who should have spoken to him in this manner? I know that the mystery of original sin is the object of faith, not of reason. I very well conceive without a mystery what man is; I perceive that he comes into the world like other animals; that women of the most delicate constitutions have the hardest labors; that women and the females among brutes sometimes lose their lives in bringing forth; that sometimes the organs of young children are so unhappily formed that they remain deprived of one or more of their senses, void of the enjoyment of the rational faculties; that those whose passions are most lively are found to have the least developed organs; that the principle of self-love is equally predominant in all men, and that they stand in no less need of them than of the free senses; that God inspired us with this principle of self-love for the preservation of our being, and gave his religion to govern this self-love; that our ideas are just or inconsistent, clear or dark, according to the strength or weakness of our organs, or in proportion to our prejudices; that we depend entirely on the air that surrounds us and the food we eat; and that there is nothing inconsistent nor contradictory in all this.

Man is not such a riddle as you may figure him to yourself to be, merely to have the pleasure of solving it. Man appears to hold his due place in the scale of beings, superior to brutes, whom he resembles with regard to the organs, but inferior to other beings, to whom he very possibly may bear a resemblance with respect to thought. Man is

like everything else we see around us; a composition in which good and evil, pleasures and pains are found. He has passions to excite him to action, and reason to direct those actions. If man was perfect he would be God; and those contrarieties which you call contradictions are so many necessary ingredients to the composition of man, who is like everything else in nature, just what he ought to be. Thus might reason argue: it is therefore not reason that teaches man the face of human nature, and it is to faith only we ought to have recourse.

IV.

“Let us follow our own impulses, turn our eyes inward, and see whether we do not therein find the living characteristics of those two natures.

“It is impossible for so great a number of contradictions to be found united in one and the same subject.

“The duplicity in man is so evident that some have thence been induced to think that we are endowed with two souls, imagining it impossible for a single subject to exhibit such strange and sudden varieties, and to change in an instant from the highest degree of presumption to the most abject state of dependency.”

This thought, as well as some others, is taken entirely from Montaigne, and is to be found in the chapter on the inconstancy of human actions. But the wise Montaigne argues like a man who has some doubt. This diversity in our wills is not so many contradictions in nature, and man is not a single

subject. He consists of an innumerable multitude of organs. If only one of these be ever so little out of order, it must necessarily change all the impressions made on the brain, and the animal must be endowed with new thoughts, and a new will. It is very certain that we are sometimes dejected with sorrow, and again elated with pride, and this must necessarily be the case when we are in opposite situations. An animal that is fed and fondled by his master, and another that is put to a lingering death, for anatomical purposes, feel very different sensations. It is the same with regard to us, and that difference which is found in man is so far from being contradictory that it would be contradictory were it not to be found. Those madmen who asserted we had two souls might with equal reason have given us thirty or forty; for that man whose spirits are strongly agitated has sometimes thirty or forty ideas of the same thing, and must necessarily have such ideas according to the different faces under which that object appears to him. This pretended duplicity in man is an idea equally absurd and metaphysical. And it might with as much justice be asserted, that the dog that fawns and bites is double; that the mirror that represents different objects is double; and that the tree which at one time is tufted with leaves and at another presents only naked branches to the view is also double. I own, indeed, that man is incomprehensible, but the whole of nature is likewise so; and we do not find a greater number of contradictions in man than in the rest of creation.

V.

“The not laying a wager that God exists, is laying that he does not exist: which side will you take? Let us weigh the loss and gain, in believing that God exists. If you win, you win all; if you lose, you lose nothing: lay therefore without the least hesitation that he exists. Yes, I must lay; but I possibly hazard too great a stake. Let us see, since there is an equal chance whether you win or lose, if you were to stake one life against two, you surely might venture the wager.”

It is a false assertion, that the not laying a wager that God exists is laying that he does not exist: for certainly that man whose mind is in a state of doubt, and is desirous of being informed, assuredly does not lay on either side; moreover this article is really indecent and childish: the idea of gaming, of losing and winning, is quite unsuitable to the dignity of the subject: further, the interest I have to believe a thing is no proof that such a thing exists. If you should promise me the empire of the world, provided I would believe you were in the right, I should undoubtedly, upon that offer being made, very readily agree that you might be in the right, but I cannot believe this till you have proved it to me. The first step you should take—might one say to M. Pascal—would be to convince my reason; it is doubtless to my interest to believe that there is a God, but if, according to the system, God came but for so very few, if the number of the elect is so alarmingly small; and if I am unable, from my own impulse, to do anything, be so good

as to tell me what interest I can have in believing you? Is it not visibly to my interest to believe the direct contrary? With what face can you talk to me of infinite bliss, to which scarce one man among a million has the least claim? If you would really convince me, you must take a different course, and not at one time talk to me of gaming, staking heads or tails; and at another terrify me by scattering thorns up and down the path which I should, and am determined to, walk in; your reasoning serves only to make men atheists, did not all nature proclaim the existence of a God, in a manner as forcible as those subtilties are weak.

VI.

“When I reflect on the blindness and misery of man, and the astonishing contrarieties that discover themselves in his nature; and when I behold the whole universe dumb, and man left to himself destitute of lights, and wandering as it were in the work of the universe, without knowing who placed him there, what he is sent to do, or what will become of him after death, I start with horror, like a man, who having been carried in his sleep into a frightful desert island awakes and knows not where he is, nor how he can get out of this strange place to which he has been transported: on considering all this, I wonder that mankind are not seized with despair every time they reflect on the wretchedness of their condition.”

Whilst I was perusing this reflection I read a letter from a friend living in a far distant country, who writes me thus:

“I am at this time exactly the same as when you left me, neither gayer nor more dejected; neither richer nor poorer; I enjoy a perfect state of health, and am blest with everything that can make life agreeable; undisturbed by love, by avarice, by ambition, or envy; and I think so long as these things last, I may continue to pronounce myself a very happy man.”

Many men are as happy as the writer of this letter. It is with man as with the brute creature. One dog shall eat and lie with his mistress, another shall be destined to turn the spit and is equally happy, a third runs mad and is knocked on the head. For my part, when I take a view of London or Paris, I see no cause for the violent despair mentioned by M. Pascal. I see a city which bears not the least resemblance to a desert island, but on the contrary, a populous, rich, and well governed place, where mankind are as happy as it is consistent with their nature to be. What man in his senses would sink in despair because he does not know the nature of his own thoughts, because he is acquainted with only a few of the qualities of matter, or because God has not revealed to him all his secrets? He might as justly despond because he has not four feet and a pair of wings: why should any one go about to make us reflect on our being with horror? Our existence is not so wretched as some persons would make us believe it to be. To consider the universe as a dreary dungeon, and all mankind as so many condemned wretches being carried to execution, is the idea of a mad enthusiast: to suppose the world to be a scene of delight, wherein nothing

but pleasures are to be found, is the dream of a Sybarite: but to conclude that the world, mankind, and the brute creation, are just what they ought to be, is in my opinion, thinking like a wise man.

VII.

“The Jews imagine that God will not forever leave other nations involved in this darkness; that a deliverer for all mankind will come; that they are sent into the world to proclaim him; that they were created purposely to be the herald of that mighty event, and to call upon all nations to unite with them in expecting such a deliverer.”

The Jews have always been in expectation of a deliverer, but then he is a deliverer with regard to them, and not for us; they expected Messiah, who is to bring the Christians in subjection to the Jews; whereas, we expect a Messiah, who is one day to unite the Jews with the Christians. Their notions on this head are directly opposite to those entertained by us.

VIII.

“The law by which this people is governed is in all respects the most ancient and most perfect in the world, and the only one which has ever been observed in a society or state without interruption. This Philo Judæus shows in several places, as does Josephus admirably well in his writings against Appian, wherein he proves its antiquities to be so very remote that even the word ‘law’ was not known in the most ancient governments till above

a thousand years afterwards; so that Homer, who mentions so many nations, has never once mentioned the word. We may easily judge of the perfection of this law from the bare perusal of it; it appearing that all things are there attended to with such a depth of wisdom, equity, and judgment that the most ancient Greek and Roman lawgivers, having some knowledge of the system in question, borrowed their principal laws from it, as appears from the laws of the 12 tables, and from the other evidences exhibited by Josephus on that occasion."

Nothing can be more false than to assert that the Jewish law is the most ancient; since the Jews, before the time of Moses, their lawgiver, lived in Egypt, a country the most renowned of any in the universe for its laws; which were so wise that kings were said to be judged by them after death. It is no less false, that the word "law" was not known till after Homer's time, since this poet expressly mentions the laws of Minos in his "Odyssey;" and moreover the word "law" is found in Hesiod; but admitting this word not to have been specified in either of these authors, that would be nothing to the purpose. There were ancient kingdoms, there were kings and judges, and consequently there were laws. Those of the Chinese are far prior, in point of antiquity, to those of Moses.

It is equally untrue, that the Greeks and Romans formed some laws from the Jews. This could not be in the infancy of the Roman commonwealth, it not being possible for them to be then acquainted with the Jews, nor could it be during its flourishing state; for at that time they held these barbarians

in the utmost contempt, as was well known to the whole world. Observe how Cicero treats them in speaking of the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey. Philo himself acknowledges that before the translation of the "Septuagint" their writings were wholly unknown to other nations.

IX.

"The sincerity of these people is admirable; they preserve with the utmost care and affection, the book wherein Moses tells them that they have always behaved ungratefully towards God, and that he knows they will be still more ungrateful after his death; but that he appeals to heaven and earth whether he had not reproached them sufficiently for it. Finally, that God, incensed at their transgressions, will disperse and scatter them among all nations. That as they had provoked him to jealousy by serving Gods that are no Gods, he also will provoke them by calling a people who were not his people. Nevertheless the Jews preserve, at the hazard of their lives, this book, which reflects so much dishonor on them in every respect; an instance of sincerity that is not to be paralleled nor can its root be in nature."

Instances of this sincerity are to be met with everywhere, and it has its root wholly in nature. The pride of every Jewish individual prompts him to believe that he does not owe his destruction to his detestable politics, his ignorance of the polite arts, and his uncivilized disposition, but that it is the wrath of God that punishes him. He feels a pleasure in the reflection, that nothing less than

morality were necessary before he could be humbled, and that his nation, though punished by the Almighty, is still his darling people.

Should a preacher get into the pulpit, and address his French congregation in the following manner: "You are a parcel of cowardly, ignorant fellows, and were beat at Höchstädt and Ramillies, merely because you did not know how to make a proper defence," he would get his brains beat out. But if, instead of so ill advised a harangue, he was to speak thus: "You are Catholics, and as such beloved by heaven. The enormity of your sins had drawn down upon you the wrath of God, who therefore gave you up to the heretics at the battles of Höchstädt and Ramillies; but when you turned again to the Lord he blessed your courage at Denain," such a speech would win him the affections of his auditors.

X.

"If there is a God, he only is to be loved, and not the creatures."

It is the duty of man to love, and that with the utmost tenderness, the creatures: it is incumbent on him to love his country, his wife, and his children, and this love is so inherent that the Almighty forces a man in spite of himself to love them. To argue upon contrary principles would answer no other purpose than to make men brutal and inhuman: a clear evidence of the truths of this assertion we have in M. Pascal himself, who, by making a bad use of this principle, treated his sister with great harshness, and rejected her tender offers

of service, lest he should appear to love a creature: this anecdote is found in the history of his life. If such was the use to be made of this principle, what would become of human society?

XI.

“We are born unjust, every man thinking only how to gratify himself, a circumstance which clashes with order in general. Man should direct his views to the general good, and self-affection is the same of all the disorders which arise in war, polity, and economy.”

This is agreeable to order in general. It would be as impossible for a society to be founded and support itself without self-love, as for a person to attempt to get children without the desire of coition, or to nourish his body with food when he has no appetite. It is the love of ourselves that aids the love of others; it is by our mutual wants that we become useful to the rest of mankind. This is the foundation of all commerce, the bond which unites men eternally to one another, and without it not a single art would have been wanted, nor a society even of ten persons founded. This self-love, with which nature has inspired every animal, makes him pay a regard to that of others. The law directs this principle, and religion refines it. God might, indeed, if he had thought proper, have formed creatures whose only object should be the good of others. Had this been the case, merchants would have traded to the Indies merely from a charitable desire of supplying the wants of others, and the mason would have sawed stone with no other view

but to serve his neighbor. But God has seen fit to order things after a different manner: therefore let us not accuse the instinct which he has given us, but apply it to the several uses which he has directed.

The hidden sense of the prophecy could not lead men into error, and none but a people so entirely carnal-minded could have mistaken the sense of them.

For where an abundance of blessings were promised, what besides their own lusts could have determined them to apply these to the good things of this world, instead of those more durable ones hereafter?

Would it have been possible for the most sagacious people in the world to have understood them otherwise? They were slaves to the Romans; they expected a redeemer, by whose help they were to become victorious, and who was to make Jerusalem formidable throughout the world. How was it possible for them, with the eye of reason only, to see that conqueror and that monarch in Christ, whom they beheld with their bodily eyes poor and crucified? How could they understand by the name of their chief city, a heavenly Jerusalem, since the immortality of the soul is not once mentioned in the Decalogue? How could a people who adhered so scrupulously to their law discover, without the help of supernatural light, in the prophecies which were not their law, a God concealed beneath the form of a circumcised Jew, whose new religion destroyed and set in the most despicable light circumcision and the sabbath, the sacred foundations on

which the Jewish law is built? Had M. Pascal himself been born a Jew, he would, he must have, fallen into the same errors. Once again let me repeat it: It is our duty to worship God, without attempting to pierce through the veil which hides his mysteries from us.

XIII.

“The time of Christ’s first coming is foretold, but that of his second coming is not, and for this reason, because the first was to be private, but the second was ordained to be so open and conspicuous that even his enemies might be compelled to acknowledge him.”

This time of Christ’s second coming was foretold more clearly than even the first. I suppose M. Pascal forgot that Christ, in “St. Luke’s Gospel,” xxi, declares himself thus:

“And when ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the seas and the waves roaring. For the powers of heaven will be shaken and then they shall see the son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory.”

What clearer prophecy can we have with regard to Christ’s second coming? But if this be an event that is yet to come, it would argue great presumption in us to inquire of Providence concerning it.

XIV.

“The Messiah, in the opinion of the carnal Jews, is to be a powerful temporal prince, whereas the

carnal Christians think he is come to release us from our love to God, and to give us sacraments which, without our concurrence, shall operate all powerfully upon us; but neither of these is the Christian or Jewish religion."

This article is rather a satirical fling than a Christian reflection. It is plain, that the Jesuits are aimed at here: but what Jesuit was ever known to assert that Christ came into the world to release us from our love to God? The controversy concerning the love of God is a mere contest about words, like most of these quarrels, whence such strong animosities, such fatal calamities have sprung. There is also another defect in this article; I mean the author's supposing that the expectation of a Messiah was considered by the Jews as an article of their religion; whereas it was only a consolatory reflection, in which they indulge themselves. The Jews hoped for a deliverer to come, but then they were not obliged to believe this as an article of faith. Their whole religion was comprised in the book of the law, and the prophets were never considered by them as law-givers.

XV.

"To examine the prophets with effect we must understand them: for if we believe they have but one meaning, it is certain the Messiah is not yet come; but if they have two meanings, he certainly came in Christ Jesus."

The Christian religion, which is founded on truth itself, does not stand in need of doubtful proof or evidences; but if any circumstance is capable of

shaking the foundation of that holy, that rational religion, it is this opinion of M. Pascal. He asserts that every part of the Scripture bears a double meaning; but a person who should be so unhappy as to be an unbeliever might argue this with him. A person who delivers himself in terms that bear a double interpretation must have an intention to impose upon us, and such double dealing is punishable by the laws. How, therefore, can you, without blushing, admit in God, those very things for which mankind are adjudged infamous and are punished? Nay, in how contemptible a light do you consider, with what indignation do you treat, the oracles of the heathens, merely on account of their being always susceptible of a double interpretation? If a prophecy is accomplished in its literal sense, will you take upon you to assert that such prophecy is false, because it is verified only as to the letter, and will not answer in the mystical sense that may be affixed to it? Certainly you could not, without being guilty of great absurdity. How then can a prophecy, which never has been really accomplished, become true in a mystical sense? Or will you say, that you cannot make it false if it is true, but that if it is false you can make it true? This is certainly very enigmatical, and after all we shall find it best to abide by faith in these matters, as the surest way of ending the dispute.

XVI.

“The infinite distance between the body and spirit, points out the infinitely more infinite distance between spirit and love, this latter being supernatural.”

We may reasonably suppose M. Pascal would never have introduced such confused stuff into his work, had he taken the pains or leisure necessary to compose it.

XVII.

“Such particulars as are most apparently weak are found to have great strength by those who consider things in a proper light; for instance, the two genealogies given us by St. Matthew and St. Luke. It is evident this was not done by confederacy.”

The editors of Pascal's thoughts should undoubtedly have suppressed this reflection, the bare explanation of which will perhaps be prejudicial to religion. Of what use can it be to declare that those genealogies, which are fundamental points of the Christian religion, clash with each other, unless a method be at the same time pointed out to reconcile them? An antidote should have been administered with the poison. What should we think of a lawyer who should say: “My client contradicts himself, but these apparent weaknesses will be found of great strength by those who consider things in their proper light?” Or what opinion should we entertain of two witnesses, whose depositions contradict each other? Should we not be apt to say: “You do not agree in your evidence, but certainly one of you is mistaken?”

XVIII.

“Let no one, therefore, reproach us with want of light, since we make profession of it; but let them acknowledge the truth of religion, even in the ob-

scurity of it, in that indifference we show with regard to gaining insight into it."

What odd characteristics of truth are here brought us by M. Pascal? What then are the characteristics of falsehood? Can it be enough for a man desirous of being believed, to say: "I am obscure, I am unintelligible?" It would show much more judgment to offer only the light of faith to the eye, in the room of such abstruse strokes of erudition.

XIX.

"If there was but one religion, God would be too manifest."

How! do you say, that if there was but one religion, God would be too manifest? You surely forget that you tell us in every page, that the time will come, when there will be but one religion. According to your reasoning, God will then be too manifest.

XX.

"I affirm that the Jewish religion did not consist in any of these things, but only in the law of God, and that God rejected and condemned all other things."

What! did God reject and condemn all those things, the performance of which He Himself had so strictly and particularly enjoined the Jews? Would it not be rather more just to affect that the law of Moses consisted in love, and was life? The reducing of all things to the law of God argues not so much a love for God, as the hatred which every Jansenist bears to his Molinist neighbor.

XXI.

“The most important act in life is the choice of a trade, and yet chance generally determines on this occasion. Custom makes soldiers, bricklayers, and the like.”

How should soldiers, bricklayers, and mechanics in general be governed, but by the things we call chance or custom? It is only in the acts of genius that we find a self-impulse, but as to those trades or professions which all men are capable of exercising, it is not only just but it is natural that custom should determine on those occasions.

XXII.

“Let every man examine his own thoughts, and he will find that they are always busied on things past, and on those to come. We scarcely ever reflect on the present; and if we ever do reflect on it, it is only with a view to borrow light therefrom, in order for our disposal of futurity. The present is never our aim; past and present are our means, futurity only is our object.”

It is false to say that we do not think of the present; we think of it while we are engaged in the study of nature, and while we are performing all the functions of life; we also think greatly of the future. Let us, therefore, thank the author of nature for endowing us with that instinct which is forever directing us to futurity. The most valuable treasure possessed by man is that hope which softens our cares, and which, while we are enjoying present blessings, paints future ones in the imagin-

ation. Were mankind so unhappy as to employ their minds only on the time present, no person would sow, build, plant, or make the least provision in any respect, but would be in want of all things in the midst of this false enjoyment. How could so sublime a genius as M. Pascal insist on the truth of so false a proposition! Nature has so settled things that every man is to enjoy the present by supporting himself with food, by getting children, by listening to agreeable sounds, by employing his faculties of seeing and feeling; and that at the instant of his quelling these several conditions, and even in the midst of them, he reflects on the morrow, without which he would die for want to-day.

XXIII.

“But on examining this matter more attentively, I found that the total disregard which men show to procuring repose and tranquillity, and to the living inwardly, springs from a cause which is but too real; I mean from the natural infelicity of our weak, our mortal condition, which is so very wretched that nothing is able to comfort us at the time that we are not prevented by anything from reflecting on it, and that we behold nothing but ourselves.”

The expression, “we behold nothing but ourselves,” conveys nothing intelligible to the mind. What would a man be, who should remain in a state of inactivity, and be supposed to contemplate himself? I affirm such a person would not only be an idiot, a useless member of society, but I will also as boldly affirm, that no such man can ever exist;

for, what can he have to contemplate? His body, his feet, his hands, his five senses? He must be an idiot, or he would make a proper use of these. Would there still remain his faculty of thinking for him to contemplate? But he cannot contemplate that faculty without exercising it. He will either think on nothing or on those ideas that are already present to his imagination, or he will form new ones; now all his ideas must come from without. Thus is he necessarily employed, either about his senses, or about his ideas; consequently he, on this occasion, is either beside himself, or an idiot. Once again, it is impossible for human nature to continue in this supposed lethargy: it is absurd to imagine it, and foolish to pretend to it. Man is born for action as the fire tends upwards, and a stone downwards. Not to be employed, and not to exist, is one and the same thing with regard to man. The whole difference consists in his employments, as they are either calm or tumultuous, dangerous or useful.

XXIV.

“Mankind are informed with a secret instinct, which prompts them to seek after amusement and employment from without, arising from a sense of their perpetual misery; and they are informed with another instinct, arising from the greatness of their first nature, which teaches them that happiness is found nowhere but in repose.”

As this secret instinct is the first principle and the necessary foundation of society, it proceeds from the kindness of our Creator, and is an instru-

ment of our felicity rather than a sense of our misery. I know not how our first parents passed their time in paradise, but if each of them had made their own person the sole object of their respective thoughts, the propagation of mankind would have been extremely dubious. Can anything be more absurd than to suppose, they were endued with perfect senses, that is, with perfect instruments for action, only to pass their whole lives in contemplation? And how whimsical is it to suppose that thinking men should imagine that idleness ennobles, and that action degrades human nature!

XXV.

“When therefore Cineas told Pyrrhus, who proposed to repose himself and enjoy his friends, after he should have conquered a great part of the world, that he had better hasten his felicity, by enjoying that repose for the present, rather than undergo such a series of fatigues, in order to obtain it in future, it would (I say) have been very difficult for Pyrrhus to put this advice in execution; nor was it much more just and rational, than the design of this ambitious youth. They both imagined that it was possible for man to draw contentment solely from himself, and from present blessings, without filling the void of his heart with imaginary hopes, which is false, for Pyrrhus could not be happy, neither before nor after he had conquered the world.”

This example of Cineas does well enough in Boileau's satires, but not in a philosophical treatise. A wise king may be happy at home, and the in-

stance of Pyrrhus' madness or folly has nothing to do with the rest of mankind.

XXVI.

"We ought therefore to confess, that man is so very unhappy, that he would grow tired of himself, without any external cause to render him so, merely from the state of his condition."

On the contrary, man is so happy in this particular, and we are so much obliged to the author of nature, that he has made uneasiness inseparable from activity, in order to compel us by that means to be useful both to our neighbors and ourselves.

XXVII.

"See yonder man! how comes it to pass, that he who has lately lost his only son, who involved him in a vexatious law-suit, and was but this morning in a state of despair, seems now so perfectly easy and unembarrassed? There is nothing wonderful in all this. His eye is at this instant curiously examining which way it will be possible for that stag, which the hounds have been closely pursuing these six hours, to escape. Man, however oppressed with grief, if he can but be persuaded to engage in some diversion, is happy during that time."

This man acts wisely, diversions being a more infallible remedy against grief, than the Jesuit's bark in fevers. Let us not censure nature, for she is ever ready to indulge us with any assistance.

XXVIII.

“Let us suppose a number of men chained together, and all sentenced to die, some of them being daily executed in presence of the rest, the wretched survivors behold their own condition in that of their fellow prisoners, and gazing upon each other, overwhelmed with sorrow, and lost to all hope, expect their turn to be next; this is an exact image of mankind.”

This comparison is most certainly false. A number of miserable creatures bound in chains and successively called forth to execution, are unhappy not only because they suffer, but because they suffer what other men do not. The natural condition of man is not to be either chained or murdered; but all men, like animals and plants, are sent into the world to grow, and live a certain period, to beget their like and die. Satirists may, if they please, take all opportunities of exhibiting man in his worst light; but if we will make the smallest use of our reason, we shall find ourselves constrained to own, that of all animals man is the most perfect, the happiest, and—comparatively speaking—the longest lived.

Therefore, far from wondering at, or complaining of, the infelicity or shortness of life, we ought, on the contrary, to wonder that our happiness should be so great, and of so long duration, and felicitate ourselves on that prerogative. To reason only philosophically, I will venture to observe, that he who shall assert, that we ought, from our na-

ture, to be in a better condition than we actually are, shows a great share of pride, and no less temerity of judgment.

XXIX.

“For, in a word, if mankind had not been corrupted, he would enjoy the knowledge of truth and felicity in an assured manner, etc., so evident is it that we have once been in a state of perfection, whence we are fallen.”

It is certain, from faith and revelation, which are far superior to human comprehension, that we are fallen; but it is by no means manifest from reason. For I would desire to know, whether God could not, without derogating from his justice, have created man such as he now is, and even whether he did not create him to be what he now is? May not the present state in which man is, be considered as a blessing? What reason have we to expect anything more from God? Who told us that our being required greater knowledge or happiness? Who told us we could bear with more? Are you surprised that God made man so weak, so ignorant, and so wretched, and not astonished that he did not make us more so. You complain of a short life, full of misfortunes. Return thanks to the Creator who did not make it more circumscribed and miserable. By your reasoning it should seem that every man has reason to accept the duty the metaphysicians excepted, who reason on original sin.

XXX.

“Original sin is a ridiculous notion in the eyes of mankind, and it is accounted such.”

How contradictory! a little before you have said, that the reality of original sin is evident, because—to use your own words—everything declares it to us. But how can it at one and the same time be ridiculous, and yet demonstrable by reason?

XXXI.

“The sages amongst the heathens, who declared there was but one God, were persecuted; the Jews were hated, and the Christians held in detestation.”

They were sometimes persecuted just as a man would be who, in this age, should teach the worship of God independently from the established worship. Socrates was not condemned for saying there was but one God, but for censuring the exterior worship of his country, and for having raised against himself, very unseasonably, a set of powerful enemies. With regard to the Jews, they were hated, not because they believed only in one God, but because they bore a ridiculous hatred to other nations; because they were barbarians, who cruelly butchered their vanquished enemies; and because this swelling, this superstitious and ignorant people, who were utter strangers to the polite arts and trades, had a contempt for the most civilized and refined nations. As to the Christians, the heathens have an aversion to them, because they endeavored to destroy their religion and government; in which they succeeded at last in like

manner as the Protestants have got possession of these very countries, where they were for many years persecuted and butchered.

XXXII.

“What a number of stars have been discovered by telescopes, that were hid from the philosophers of antiquity! some have boldly impeached the Scriptures, on account of what is said in so many places of the vast number of stars; because, say they—very modestly—we know there are but one thousand and twenty-two.”

It is certain, that the sacred writers, in matters relating to physics always adapted themselves to the received notions. Thus they supposed the earth to be fixed, the sun to move, and so forth. It is not in any manner from astronomical knowledge, that they assert the stars to be numberless, but merely to suit themselves to vulgar capacities. And, indeed, though our sight discovers but one thousand and twenty-two stars, nevertheless, when we look attentively upon the sky, the dazzled eye imagines it beholds a numberless multitude. The sacred penmen, therefore, express themselves agreeably to this vulgar notion, their compositions not being transmitted to mankind with a view to make them naturalists. And it is more than probable, that God never revealed to Habakkuk, to Baruch, or to Micah, that an Englishman, named Flamstead, would one day insert in his catalogue upwards of seven thousand stars, discovered by the assistance of telescopes. Observe, I beseech you, what an inference might be drawn from Pas-

cal's thought. If the sacred writers have really spoken of such a great number of stars, from a knowledge of their cause, they must then have been physically inspired: But how then could such great naturalists say, that the moon shone at noon-day upon Ascalon, and the sun stood still upon Gibeon in Palestine? Could they have asserted that the grain must rot in the ground, before it produces corn, and an hundred other like absurdities? Hence then we are to conclude, that moralists, and not natural philosophers, ought to be the object of our Scriptural researches, and that the Bible is intended to make Christians, and not philosophers.

XXXIII.

“Can it be called courage in a dying man, to defy, in his last moments, an omnipotent and everlasting God?”

This never happened, and no man, but in the height of a delirium, could say, I believe in God, and I defy him.

XXXIV.

“I willingly credit those histories, the witnesses to which gave themselves up to death.”

The difficulty is not only to know whether we ought to give credit to witnesses, who should suffer death in defense of their sentiments,—as so many enthusiasts have done—but likewise whether such witnesses really laid down their lives on such account; whether the testimony for which they suffered, has been really transmitted to us; and whether they actually lived in the countries where they are said to have died. Whence comes it that

Josephus, who was born about the time of Christ's death; Josephus, who hated Herod; Josephus, who was but faintly attached to the Jewish principles, does not once mention any of these particulars? This is what M. Pascal would have unravelled with success.

XXXV.

“There are two extremes in the sciences that border close upon each other. The first is the natural ignorance in which all men are born. The other extreme is that to which great souls attain, who, after having acquired all that is possible for man to know, find they know nothing, and meet at the very point of ignorance whence they set out.”

This thought has all the air of sophistry, and its falsity consists in the word ignorance, which is taken in two different senses. One who can neither read nor write is ignorant; but a mathematician, though he be unacquainted with the occult principles of nature, is not so ignorant as when he first began to learn to read. Though Sir Isaac Newton could not tell why a man can move his arm at pleasure, this did not make him less knowing in other particulars. A person who is ignorant of the Hebrew language, but skilled in the Latin, is learned in comparison with one who understands no tongue but his own.

XXXVI.

“A man cannot be called happy because diversions give him pleasure; these coming from without, and consequently being dependent, and as such as are liable to be disturbed by a thousand acci-

dents which each form as many unavoidable afflictions."

He might with equal truth have said, that a man is not unhappy, because he is overwhelmed with grief, for grief comes from without. That man is actually happy who enjoys pleasure, and this pleasure can arise in no other way than from without. All our sensations and ideas can result only from external objects; in like manner as our bodies can receive nourishment in no other way than by taking in foreign substances, in order for their being changed into, or assimilated with, our own.

XXXVII.

"Extreme wit is said to border as near upon folly as extreme imperfection. Mediocrity only is accounted good."

It is not the extremes of wit or genius, but their extreme vivacity and volubility, which are said to border upon folly. The extremes of wit or genius, are extreme justness, extreme delicacy, extreme extent of conception, all which are diametrically opposite to folly. An extreme defect of genius is the want of conception; an absolute vacuity of ideas; it is not folly, but stupidity. Folly is a disorder in the organs, which makes us perceive several objects too quickly, fixes the imagination on one in particular with too great intensesness and violence. Neither is it mediocrity that is only accounted good, but the keeping clear of the two opposite vices is what we call the just mean, not mediocrity. I have made this remark, as well as some others of the same kind, only to convey clear

and precise ideas of things, and with a view rather to enlighten than cavil.

XXXVIII.

“If our condition was truly happy, it would not be proper to divert us from thinking on it.”

The state of our condition is directly this, to reflect on those outward objects to which we bear a necessary relation. It is false to say, that it is possible for a man to be diverted from thinking on the condition of human nature; for to what object soever he applies his thoughts, he applies them to something that is necessarily united to human nature. And once again, for a man to reflect, or think on himself abstractedly from natural surveys, is to think on nothing; I say, on nothing at all, and let this be well observed.

People, so far from preventing a man from thinking on his condition, are ever entertaining him with the pleasures of it. To a scholar we talk of learning and fame; to a prince, of matters relating to his grandeur; and with all men we make pleasure the subject of conversation.

XXXIX.

“The high and the low, the mighty and the mean, are all subject to the same uneasinesses and passions. But some are at the top of the wheel, and others near the centre; these are consequently less agitated by the same motions.”

It is false to assert that those in a low condition are less agitated than such as are in a higher sphere of life; on the contrary, their grief is the more poignant.

nant as they are less provided with remedies against it. Of a hundred persons who lay violent hands on themselves in the city of London, seventy will be found to be mean persons, and scarce one of high rank. The comparison of the wheel, though ingenious, is false.

XL.

“Mankind are not taught to be honest, though they are taught everything else; and yet there is nothing in which they pride themselves so much, as in a knowledge of that which they are not taught.”

Persons are taught to become honest men, otherwise few would be so. Should a father permit his child, during his infancy, to pocket everything that came in his way, at fifteen he would take to the road. Should he be proud of his dexterity in telling a lie, he would turn out a knight of the post; and were he to be indulged in the free exercise of his lustful appetites, he would certainly become an abandoned debauchee. Mankind are taught all things, even virtue and religion.

XLI.

“How stupid was it in Montaigne to draw his own picture; and this not occasionally, and in opposition to his own maxims—as every man may make a slip—but agreeable to his own maxims, and as his first and principal object; for to vent trifles merely by chance, and through frailty, is a common evil; but to vent them designedly, and such as those we are speaking of, is insufferable.”

Say rather how charming a thought it was in

Montaigne, in drawing so natural a picture of himself; for mankind was the original he copied. Had Nicole and Malebranche always made themselves their subject, they would not have succeeded. But the private gentleman, in the reign of Henry III., who is learned in an age of ignorance, and a philosopher amidst a herd of enthusiasts, and who presents to us our follies and weakness under his own character, will never continue to be beloved by us.

XLII.

“When I considered whence it should come to pass, that people give so much credit to such numbers of quacks, who boast their being possessed of infallible nostrums, so as frequently to trust their lives in their hands, I imagined the true cause of this to be, that there were such things as true medicines in the world; for it would be impossible that there should be so many spurious ones, or so much credit given to them, if there were none genuine. Had there never been any such, and had all diseases in general been incurable, it is impossible that mankind could have imagined there were any in nature; and still more that so many multitudes of people should have given credit to those that boasted their being possessed of such medicines. Were a person to pretend that he had got a secret that would preserve people from the grave, no one would believe him, because there have been no examples of this. But as a great number of medicines have been found genuine, from the experience of the greatest men, this circumstance was the belief of mankind. For as the thing could not be

denied in general, because some particular effects have been found true, the vulgar, who have not the capacity to discern among those which are the true ones, therefore give credit to them all indiscriminately. In like manner, the reason why so many false effects of the moon are believed is, because there are some true ones, such as the ebbing and flowing of the sea.

“Thus it seems evident to me, that the sole reason why there are so many false miracles, false revelations and witchcrafts, is, because there are true ones.”

The solution of this problem is very easy: some extraordinary effects in nature having appeared, they were by artful impostors made to pass for miracles: some maladies being observed to be worse while the moon was in the full, hence a parcel of silly people imagined that the moon being in the full was the cause of those disorders growing worse. A sick person, who is already in a fair way of recovery, eats some crawfish for supper, the next day he is better; therefore it was concluded, that crawfish were purifiers of the blood, and especially because they are red when boiled.

In my opinion mankind are not obliged necessarily, in order for their auditing what is fact, to be acquainted with what is true: a thousand false influences were ascribed to the moon, before we had the least conception of the true reason of the ebbing and flowing of the sea. The first man who found himself sick, easily gave credit to the first quack he met with. No one ever saw a hobgoblin or a wizard, and yet many believed there were such

beings: no man was ever an eye witness to the transmutation of metals, and yet thousands have been ruined by their believing in what is called the philosopher's stone. Did the Greeks, the Romans, or other heathen nations, give credit to the numberless false miracles that were exhibited to them, for no other reason but because they had been spectators of true ones?

XLIII.

"The land serves as a mark to the mariners, but where shall we find such a rule in morality."

In this single maxim, admitted by all nations, "Do as you would be done by."

XLIV.

"These prefer death to living in peace, others prefer death to war. Every opinion may be preferred to life, the love of which appears so strong and natural."

"*Ferox gens nullam esse vitam sine armis putant,*" says Tacitus, in speaking of the Catalans. This fierce people think their life thrown away if not spent in arms. But there is no people of whom it has been and may be said that they prefer death to war.

XLV.

"The more discernment any person has, the greater number of persons will be found that are originals in their way. The vulgar cannot perceive difference between man and man."

Very few men can justly boast an original character, as most people square their conduct, their think-

ing, and their feeling, according as they have been influenced by education: nothing is more rare than a genius who strikes out a new path for himself. But among a crowd of men that travel in company, each of them has some little difference in his gait, which is perceived by those only who have a piercing eye.

XLVI.

“Death is more easy to be supported without thinking of it, than the reflection on death when out of danger.”

We cannot say that man bears death very easily or uneasily when he does not reflect at all upon it. He who feels nothing bears nothing.

XLVII.

“All our reasoning terminates in yielding to sensation.”

Our reasoning must yield to sensation, in matters of taste, not in those of knowledge.

XLVIII.

“Those who judge of work by rule, are with respect to other men, like those who have a watch, in comparison with those that have none. The one shall say: ‘We have been here these two hours’; the other, ‘We have been here but a quarter of an hour.’ I look at my watch, and say to the former, ‘You are tired’; and to the latter, ‘You think the time very short.’”

In works of taste, in music, poetry, and painting, taste serves as a watch, and that man who judges of them only by rule, judges wrong.

XLIX.

“Cæsar, in my opinion, was too old to set about the conquest of the world. This was an amusement that suited well enough with Alexander, who was a young man, whose impetuosity it was difficult to check; but Julius Cæsar should have been more composed.”

It is vulgarly supposed, that Alexander and Julius Cæsar left their respective countries with a design to make the conquest of the world, but this was far from being the case. Alexander succeeded his father, Philip, as generalissimo of the united forces of Greece, and was appointed chief of the just enterprise which the Greeks had formed to avenge the injurious treatment they had met with from the Persian's monarch. He defeated the common enemy, and pushed his conquests as far as India, because Darius' kingdoms extended so far; in like manner the duke of Marlborough, had he not been stopped by Marshal Villars, would have marched to Lyons. With regard to Julius Cæsar, he was one of the chief personages of the Roman commonwealth. He quarrelled with Pompey as the Jansenists do with the Molinists; on which occasion they endeavored to cut one another's throats. But a single battle, in which less than ten thousand men fell, decided the contest at once. Besides, M. Pascal's reflection may possibly be false in many respects. It was necessary that Julius Cæsar should have lived to the age he did, in order for him to get the better of all the intrigues that were formed against him; and it is surprising that Alexander,

when so young, should have conceived pleasures for the sake of engaging in so laborious and painful a war.

L.

“Man is neither an angel nor a brute; and the misfortune is, that he who attempts to act the angel plays the brute.”

The man who endeavors to destroy the passions, instead of regulating them, attempts to act the angel.

LI.

“It is whimsical enough to consider, that there should be men in the world—thieves for instance—who having bid defiance to all the laws of God and man, form to themselves a set of laws, to which they pay the most implicit obedience.”

This reflection is more useful than whimsical, as it proves that no society of men can subsist a single day without rules or laws. It is with societies of men as with games, there is no one without its rules.

LII.

“A horse does not endeavor to make himself admired by his companion. We indeed perceive those beasts fired with some kind of emulation when running a race; but this is of no further consequence, for when they are got together in the stable, that horse which is less agreeably shaped than the other will not on that account yield his oats to him. But it is different with mankind; their virtue is not satisfied with itself, and they are not

contented unless they can reap such a benefit from it as may be disadvantageous to others."

The man who is less well shaped than another, will not give up his bread to him for that reason, but the stronger dispossesses the weaker of it. Among brutes and among men, the strong prey upon the feeble. M. Pascal is doubtless right in saying, that what particularly distinguishes men from brutes is, that he seeks the approbation of those of his own species, and that this talent is the source of every talent and virtue.

LIII.

"If man was to begin by studying himself, he would find how difficult it is for him to proceed farther. How can it be possible for a part to know the whole? He will perhaps aspire to acquaint himself at least with those parts, to whom he himself bears a proportion. But all the parts of the world bear such a relation one to the other, and are so connected that I am of opinion it is impossible to know one without the other, and without the whole."

It would not be proper to divert man from searching after those things that may be of advantage to him from this reflection, that it is impossible for him to know all things.

*Non possis oculo quantum contendere Lynceus
Non tamen idcirco contemnas lippus inungi.*

—Hor. Ep. i. Lib. i.

We are acquainted with a great number of truths, and have discovered a multitude of useful

inventions. Let us be easy, though we may not know the relation that may be between a spider and Saturn's ring; and let us confine our researches within the sphere of our comprehension.

LIV.

"If thunder always fell in valleys, poets, and those that are able to reason only on things of this nature, would be at a loss for proofs."

A simile is our proof, either in verse or prose: in poetry it serves as an embellishment, and in prose it illustrates things and renders them more forcibly striking. Those poets that have compared the misfortunes that befell heroes and great men to the thunder, that strikes and rends the mountains, would make quite opposite comparisons if the opposite happened in nature.

LV.

"It is owing to a particular cast of mind and composition of body, that philosophers have confounded the ideas of things, and ascribed to the body things that relate only to the mind; and to mind such as suit the body only."

Did we truly know what the mind is, we might then justly complain of philosophers, for ascribing such things to it as are quite foreign thereto; but we are not acquainted either with the mind or body; we have not the least idea of the one, and but very imperfect notions concerning the other; consequently we are not able to settle their respective limits.

LVI.

“As we say poetical beauty, we likewise should say geometrical and medicinal beauty, and yet we do not say so; the reason is, we know very well what is the object of geometry, and what is the object of physic; but we do not know what that is, in which the charm of beauty consists, which is the object of feeling. We do not know what this natural model is, which we ought to imitate, and for want of this knowledge, we have invented and adopted certain odd terms, such as golden age, miracle of our fine fatal laurel, beautiful stars, and so forth, and this jargon is called poetical beauty; but were any person to figure to himself a woman, dressed after this model, he would see a handsome young lady covered with looking-glasses, and bound in tinsel chains.”

This is very false. We should not say geometrical beauty, nor medicinal beauty, because a theorem and a purge do not affect the senses in an agreeable manner; because we give the name of beauty to those things only that charm the senses, as music, painting, eloquence, poetry, regular architecture, and so forth. The reason given by M. Pascal is equally false with his reflection. He well knows what it is that forms the object of poetry. It consists in painting with strength, clearness, delicacy and harmony. Poetry is harmonious eloquence. M. Pascal must have had little taste, to say that fatal laurel, beautiful star, and such like stuff, are practical beauties; and the editors of his “Thoughts” must have been little versed in polite literature,

otherwise they would not have printed a reflection so unworthy of its illustrious author.

LVII.

“No one is thought to understand poetry, who does not put on the badge of a poet; nor to be expert in the mathematics, who has not the stamp of a mathematician: but the real honest man wears no badge.”

By thus reasoning, it would be as bad to have a profession, or a distinguished talent, to excel in it. Virgil, Homer, Corneille, Newton, and the Marquis de L'Hôpital, wore badges of the studies they followed with such success. Happy is he who succeeds in any particular art, and at the same time is acquainted with others.

LVIII.

“The common people have in general a very just taste, an instance of which is in their preferring public sports, hunting, and so forth, before poetry, and the polite arts.”

It would seem as if it had been proposed to the people to choose a game at bowls, or to make verses. But this is not the case. Those whose organs are more grossly formed, seek after those pleasures in which sentiment has the least share; while, on the other hand, those of delicate sensations wish for the more refined pleasures, where we must live.

LIX.

“Though the universe should fall on man and crush him to death, yet would man be still more noble than that which destroyed him; because he is conscious of the advantage the universe has over him, and that he is about to die, whereas the universe knows nothing of this.”

What is here meant by the word noble? It is true indeed, that “Thought” is a different kind of thing from the sun; but can it be proved, that an animal, because he is endowed with a few thoughts, is more noble than the sun which animates all that we behold in nature? Is it for man to decide who is judge and culprit? We say that one performance is superior to another, when it cost the workman more pains, and is more evidently useful; but did it cost the Creator less pains to make the sun than to mould a little animal about five feet high, who reasons sometimes well and sometimes ill? Which of the two is more useful in the universe, this animal, or the planet that bestows light and heat, and so many surrounding worlds? Or again, how comes it that a few ideas received into the brain should be preferable to the material universe?

LX.

“Fix on what condition of life you please, and add to it all the conveniences, the blessings, and the pleasures of life, all that can seem most likely to satisfy a human being, yet, if the person who is placed in this state is without occupation or amuse-

ment, and left to reflection as to what he really is, this insipid felicity will soon grow irksome."

How can we place a man in the midst of all the conveniences, the blessings and pleasures of life, and at the same time leave him destitute of occupation and amusement? Is not this a palpable contradiction?

LXI.

"Let a king be left alone without anything to satisfy his senses, without any care in his mind, and retired from company, to think at leisure on himself, and you will find that king who entirely unto himself will appear a creature full of miseries, and who feels them like others."

Still the same sophistical way of reasoning. A king who retires to indulge in thoughts, is then fully occupied; but if he confined his thoughts wholly to himself, by saying, "I reign, I am a king," and nothing more, he would be an idiot.

LXII.

"Every religion that does not acknowledge Christ Jesus is notoriously false, and miracles can avail it nothing."

What is a miracle? Let us form what idea we please of it, it is a thing that the Almighty alone has the power of performing. Now here we have a supposition that God can work miracles in support of a false religion: this is deserving of a more serious consideration, each of these questions would furnish matter for a volume.

LXIII.

“We are told to believe in the church, but we are not told to believe in miracles, because the latter is natural, and the former is not: we stood in need of a precept for the one, and not for the other.”

Here I think is a contradiction. First we are told that miracles would avail nothing on certain occasions, and then, that we ought necessarily to believe in miracles, which is saying, that they were such convincing proofs that there was no reason of recommending such proofs. This assuredly is answer pro and con, and in a very dangerous manner.

LXIV.

“I do not see that there is a greater difficulty in believing in the resurrection of the body and the conception of the blessed virgin, than the story of creation. For is it more difficult to reproduce a man than to produce him at first?”

Simple reasoning will afford us proofs of the truth of the creation; for when we perceive that matter cannot exist, move, and so forth, of itself, we readily come to know that it must have been assisted; but we can never discover by the bare help of reason, how a body that we see continually subject to change, is to be restored again to the same state as it was in at the time it put on that change: neither will reasoning satisfy us how a man could be produced without the seed peculiar to his species. Hence it follows, that the creation is an object of reason, but the other two miracles an object of faith only.

May 10, 1742.

I have lately read some thoughts of M. Pascal, which had not before appeared in public. They were copied by Father Mollets from the hand-writing of that illustrious author, and have been lately printed. They seem to confirm what I have formerly said, that this great genius had scattered his ideas loosely on paper, with an intention of correcting some, making use of others.

Among these latter thoughts, which the editors of M. Pascal's works had denied a place in the collection, there are several that were worthy of being preserved. The following are some of those, which, in my opinion, this great man should have corrected.

I.

"Though a proposition may seem incomprehensible, yet we must not absolutely deny it on that account, but well examine its opposite; and if we find this manifestly false, then we may affirm the first, however inconceivable it may seem."

To me it seems evident, that two opposites may be equally false. An ox flies towards the south with wings. An ox flies towards the north without wings. Twenty thousand angels killed yesterday the same number of men. Twenty thousand men killed yesterday twenty thousand angels. Now these propositions are both of them evidently false.

II.

"How vain an art is that of painting, which attracts our admiration by the resemblance of things, whose originals we do not admire."

Certainly the merit of a portrait does not consist in the goodness of heart of the person it resembles, but in the likeness it bears to him. We admire Cæsar in one sense, and his statue, or his image on canvas, in another.

III.

“If physicians had not worn cassocks and ridden upon mules, and doctors of divinity appeared in square caps and flowing robes, they never would have acquired that consideration in the world that they now possess.”

And yet physicians never ceased to be the objects of ridicule, never acquired real consideration, till they had cast aside those liveries of pedantry: and the head of a university must leave behind him his square cap and his arguments, if he would be received among the genteel world. There are even some countries where the magistrates make themselves respected without pomp or parade. There are some kings in Christendom, who neglect the ceremonies of consecration and coronation. In proportion as mankind increased in knowledge, they set less value upon particular garbs. Dress is now only used to captivate the vulgar, for whom it is still sometimes necessary *ad populum phaleras*.

IV.

“According to the lights of nature, if there is a God, He is infinitely incomprehensible; because as He is without parts or limits, He can have no relation to us; therefore we are incapable of knowing either what He is, or if He exists.”

It is very strange that Pascal should have thought we could guess at original sin from reason, and that he should say we cannot know from reason that God exists. It was probably the reading of this thought that made Father Hardouin place Pascal in his ridiculous list of atheists. Pascal had most evidently renounced this notion, since he has combated it in several other places. In fact we are under the necessity of admitting several things, that we cannot conceive; "I exist, therefore something exists from all eternity." This is an evident proposition; and yet can we say, that we conceive what eternity is?

V.

"Do you think it impossible that God should be infinite and without parts? I do. Well then, I will show you what an infinite and indivisible thing is. It is a point which moves itself on every side with infinite quickness, for it is in all places, and entire in every place."

Here are four palpable falsities: 1. That a mathematical point can exist by itself. 2. That it can move from right to left at the same time. 3. That it can move with infinite quickness; whereas there is no quickness, however great, but what may be augmented. 4. That it can be whole and entire in all places at once.

VI.

"Homer wrote a romance, and has given it to us as such. No one ever believed the existence of Troy or Agamemnon, any more than that of the golden apple."

No writer has ever so much as hinted a doubt of the reality of the Trojan war. The fabulous part of the story of the golden apple does not destroy the foundation of the subject, any more than the fiction of the Ampulla brought by a dove, and the Oriflamme by an angel, impeach the truth of Clovis having reigned in France.

VII.

“I shall not pretend in this place to prove either the existence of God, the trinity, or the immortality of the soul, from natural reasons; because I should want abilities to find arguments in nature sufficient to convince an atheist.”

Is it possible M. Pascal should want abilities to prove the existence of God?

VIII.

“Mankind are, in general, so fond of free opinions, that it is surprising such should ever displease them.”

But does not every day's experience show us that there is not so effectual a method of gaining a power over the minds of the vulgar, as by proposing to them the most difficult, nay, even the most impossible things, to perform or believe? What gained the Stoics so much credit, but only that they reduced human nature to the lowest ebb? Propose only what is reasonable, and every one will cry out: “We knew this before.” It requires no inspiration to become popular. Only enjoin the performance of austerities or impracticabilities; paint the deity as perpetually armed with thunders, and delighting in

rivers of blood, the multitude will greedily hearken after you, and every one will say: "This man must certainly have reason on his side, otherwise he would never publish such extraordinary things with so much boldness."

I shall not send you the rest of my remarks on M. Pascal's thoughts, as this would lead me into too tedious inquiries. But as some have endeavored to set up as laws those thoughts, which M. Pascal probably scattered upon paper only as doubts, I thought it necessary to show that we should not look on those things as demonstrations, that he himself would probably have refuted.

ON PRINTED LIES.

We may at present divide the inhabitants of Europe into authors and readers, as they were for seven or eight ages divided into a set of barbarous tyrants with hawks on their fists, and slaves who were destitute of every necessary of life.

It is now about two hundred and fifty years since men, by degrees, began to conceive the idea that they had such a thing as a mind: now every person reads, either to cultivate or adorn his mind, or, at the least, that he may be able to boast of his reading. As soon as the Dutch perceived this new want of the species they became the factors of the commodity called "thought," as they had formerly been for our wines and salt: so that a bookseller of Amsterdam, that could not read, gained a fortune of a million by the labors of a few Frenchmen, who took it into their heads to become authors. These merchants informed themselves, by their correspondents, of the most marketable commodities; and according to the wants of the public, set their workmen at writing histories or romances; but chiefly the former, because, after all, we cannot help believing there may be some small matter of truth in everything that wears the title of a "New History," "Historical Memoirs," and "Anecdotes," more than could well be expected from what passes under the denomination of a "Romance." In this manner did the journeymen and laborers of those dealers in paper and ink compose

the "Memoirs" d'Artagnan, de Pontis, de Vordac, de Rochefort, with so many others, in which we find a circumstantial account of all the secret thoughts of kings and prime ministers, together with a hundred thousand public transactions that were never heard of before. Your young German barons, your Polish palatines, your dames of Stockholm and Copenhagen read these books, and believe they are thereby informed of the most hidden secrets of the court of France.

Varillas was infinitely superior to the noble authors of whom I am speaking, though he frequently takes unwarrantable liberties. He said, one day, to one who saw him somewhat puzzled: "I have three sovereigns whom I must engage in conversation together; now none of the three ever saw the other; and I cannot tell, for the soul of me, how to bring it to pass." "So then," says the other, "I suppose you must be writing some tragedy?"

Everyone has not been blessed with invention: therefore it is, that we find the fables of antiquity, which were formerly printed in folio, reprinted a second time in duodecimo. I fancy one might discover, in upwards of two hundred authors, the same prodigies and the same predictions that were made in the time when astrology passed for a science. We shall possibly be told again, how two Jews, whose only talents were the selling of old clothes and the clipping of old coins, promised the empire to Leo the Isaurian, and demanded of him, that he throw down the images of the Christians as soon as he should be seated on the imperial throne; as if Jews cared much whether we had any images or not.

I do not despair of seeing printed a second time how Mahomet II., surnamed the Great, the most enlightened prince of his time, and the most magnificent encourager of the arts, spread fire and sword through Constantinople—which, by the bye, he preserved from pillage—demolished all the churches—of which he actually preserved above one half—caused the patriarch to be empaled; he who paid more honor to the patriarch than had ever been shown him by the Greek emperors; had the bellies of four pages ripped up, that he might discover which of them it was that had eaten a melon; and, lastly, cut off his mistress's head to please the janissaries. These histories, worthy only of Jack the Giant-killer and of Bluebeard are sold every day with approbation and privilege.

Some wiser heads have bethought themselves of another art of lying. They have made themselves heirs to all the great ministers, and have got possession of all their testaments. We have seen the testaments of Colbert and of Louvois published as authentic pieces by refined politicians, who never once crossed the threshold of the offices of the secretary of war. or of the treasury. The testament of Cardinal Richelieu, written by a hand rather better than the rest of them, has had a better fate, and the imposture passed well enough for a considerable time. It is really pleasant to see, in collections of harangues, what eulogiums have been lavished on the admirable testament of that incomparable cardinal. In this piece we find his great depth of genius; and a simpleton who had read it with a great deal of care, and had made a number of ex-

tracts from it, thought himself fit to govern the universe. The public has been as much imposed upon by the "Testament of Charles V., Duke of Lorraine"; in this they discovered the vast penetration and the very spirit of that prince; though they who were in the secret plainly discovered the spirit of M. de Chevremont, who wrote it.

After these testament-writers came the authors of anecdotes. We have a small history, printed in 1700, written by one Mademoiselle Durand, a person well acquainted with the facts she related, under the title of "The History of the Amours of Gregory VII., Cardinal Richelieu, the Princess of Condé, and the Marchioness d'Ursé." I have read, some years since, the "Amours of the Rev. Father de Lachaise, confessor to Louis XIV."

A lady of great honor, a refugee at The Hague, composed, in the beginning of the present century, six large volumes of "Letters," between a lady of quality in the country, and a lady of quality in Paris, informing one another, very familiarly, of the news of the times. Now, in these news of the times, I will venture to say there is not one piece of true intelligence. All the pretended adventures of the Chevalier de Bouillon, since known under the name of the Prince of Auvergne, are here related with all their circumstances. One day I had the curiosity to ask the chevalier, whether there was any foundation for what Mme. Du Noyer had placed to his account. He assured me, on his honor, that the whole was nothing but a collection of falsehoods. This lady had gathered together all the silly stories

current among the populace, which, in foreign parts, passed for the history of the court.

Sometimes the authors of such histories do more mischief than they think for. A few years ago a person of my acquaintance, not knowing how to employ his time, printed a little book, in which he stated that a certain celebrated personage had lately perished by a most horrible assassination. I was an evidence of the contrary: I represented to the author how, by all laws divine and human, he was under an obligation to retract this falsehood, which he accordingly promised he would: yet the effect of his piece still remains, and I have seen this calumny repeated in some of the pretended histories of the age.

There has lately appeared a political work at London, the city of all cities in the universe where the falsest news is published, with the falsest reasonings upon those falsities. "Everybody knows," says the author, "that the Emperor Charles VI. died of poison given him in *aqua tuffana*: we know his favorite page was a Spaniard, to whom he left a legacy by his will, and who gave him the poison. The magistrates of Milan, who took the deposition of this page a little before his death, and sent it to Vienna, might tell us if they pleased, who his instigators and accomplices were; and I should be glad if the court of Vienna would, as soon as possible, inform the public of the circumstances of this horrible crime." I fancy the court of Vienna will cause them to wait a long while for the information they want, in regard to this chimera.

These calumnies, which are perpetually recurring, often remind me of the following verses :

*Les oisifs courtesans, que leurs chagrins dévorent,
S'efforcent d'obscurir les astres qu'ils adorent ;
Si l'on croit de leurs yeux le regard pénétrant,
Tout ministre est un traître, & tout prince un tyran ;
L'hymen n'est entouré que de feux adulteres ;
Le frere a ses rivaux est vendu par ses freres ;
Et sitot qu'un grand roi panche vers son déclin,
Ou son fils ou sa femme out haté son destin . . .
Qui croit toujours le crime en parait trop capable.*

The courtly fry, from disappointment sore,
With slander blacken what they should adore.
Trust their remarks, they'll prove it clear as day,
All kings oppress, all ministers betray.
Adulterous fires surround the marriage-bed ;
The brother's blood the brother's hand hath shed ;
Should some great monarch touch the goal of life,
His fate is hastened by his son or wife.
Of guilt that man too capable appears,
Who credits thus each horrid tale he hears.

In this manner have the pretended histories of the age generally been written.

The wars of 1702 and of 1741 have produced as many lies in books as they killed soldiers in their campaigns : they have told a hundred times over, and they tell it still, that the ministry of Versailles forged the testament of Charles II., King of Spain. Some anecdotes tell us that the last Marshal de la Feuillade failed in the attempt on Turin, and sacrificed his reputation, his fortune, and his army, purposely, and by a capital stroke of politics. Others of them assure us that a certain minister was the cause of the loss of a battle, by a like stroke of politics. They have lately reprinted in the "Transactions of Europe," that at the battle of Fontenoy we

loaded our cannon with pieces of glass and poisoned shot; that General Campbell was killed by one of those poisoned bullets; upon which the Duke of Cumberland sent the King of France a box, in which were contained the glass and metals extracted from his wound; that in this box was enclosed a letter, in which he tells the king that the most barbarous nations had never made use of such weapons, and that the king was highly displeased on reading this letter. There is not the least shadow of truth or probability in this account. To these absurd lies they add that we murdered the wounded English that remained on the field of battle in cold blood; though it stands proved, by the registers of our hospitals, that we took the same care of them as of our own soldiers.

How numerous are the secret memoirs, histories of campaigns, and journals of all kinds! the prefaces to which promise the utmost impartiality, and the most exact information. If you visit one of these great politicians, you will find a poor scribe in a banyan and night-cap, without fire or furniture, compiling or cobbling newspapers. Sometimes these gentlemen will take a power under their protection. The story of one of these writers is well known, who had a reward of the Emperor Leopold, at the close of the last war, for having kept him an army of fifty thousand men on the Lower Rhine for five years running. They will also sometimes declare war, and commit acts of hostility; though they run the risk of being treated as enemies. One of them, called Dubourg, who had an office in Frankfort, was unluckily arrested there by an officer of our

army in 1748, and conducted to Mount St. Michael in a cage: and yet this example is far from cooling the courage of his magnanimous brethren.

One of the most noble and most common tricks of this kind is that of those writers who transform themselves into ministers of state, and lords belonging to the court in the country they speak of. We have been favored with a voluminous history of Louis XIV. compiled from the memoirs of a minister of state. This minister was a Jesuit, who had been expelled from his order, and had taken refuge in Holland, under the name of de la Stode, and who afterwards thought proper to create himself secretary of state for France in Holland for bread.

As it is always fitting to imitate good models, and as Chancellor Clarendon and Cardinal de Retz have drawn portraits of the principal personages they treat of, we should not wonder that the writers of our own times should, on hiring themselves to a bookseller, begin with long and faithful portraits of the princes of Europe, and even the ministers and generals, though they have never so much as seen a lackey who wore their livery. An English author, in the "Annals of Europe," printed and reprinted, assures us that Louis XV. has nothing of that grandeur in his air and gait which speaks the king. This person must undoubtedly be difficult and nice with regard to physiognomies. But, to make amends, he tells us that Cardinal Fleury had an air of noble confidence. He is fully as exact in regard to characters and facts as he is to persons: he informs Europe, that Cardinal Fleury gave up his title of prime minister—which he never had—in

favor of Count de Toulouse. He tells us that the army of Marshal Maillebois was sent into Bohemia, only because a young lady of the court had left a letter on the table, which letter gave information of the situation of affairs: he says Count d'Argenson succeeded as minister of war, in the room of M. Amelot. I fancy, if one were willing to make a collection of all the books written in this manner, in order to become a little acquainted with the anecdotes of Europe, one might make an immense library, without ten pages of truth in the whole collection.

Another considerable branch in this trade of printed paper is in these books called "polemical," by way of excellence; that is to say, those in which one slanders his neighbors to get money. I do not speak of the functions of advocates, who enjoy the noble privilege of bespattering the adverse party at pleasure, and defaming families according to statute. I speak of those who in England, for example, excited by an ardent love of their country, write "Philippics" worthy of Demosthenes, against the minister, in their garrets. These pieces are sold for two pence a sheet: sometimes they will print you four thousand copies, which is enough to keep one of those eloquent citizens alive for a month or two. I have heard Sir Robert Walpole say that, one day one of these Demostheneses, who sell their works at two pence a sheet, having as yet declared himself of no party in the parliamentary dissensions, came to make him an offer of his pen to knock down all his enemies. The minister very civilly thanked him for his kind offer, and excused himself from accepting

his service. "You will not be offended, then," answered the writer, "if I make your antagonist, Mr. Pulteney, a tender of my assistance?" So away he hies to him, and he met with much such another reception. He declared openly against both; so that on Monday he wrote against Mr. Walpole, and on the Wednesday against Mr. Pulteney. But after getting a very honorable subsistence by it for some two months, he concluded by asking charity at their doors.

The celebrated Pope was in his time treated exactly like a minister: his reputation made many men of letters imagine something might be got by him. For the honor of learning, and in order to advance the progress of the human mind, they printed against him above a hundred libels, in which they proved him to be an atheist; and, what is yet worse in England, they reproached him with being a Catholic. They affirmed, on his publishing his translation of Homer, that he did not understand Greek, because he was crooked and had an ill smell. It is true he was crooked; but this was no reason why he might not be a very good Greek scholar, and his translation of Homer a very noble one. They impeached his morals, his education, his birth; they attacked his father and mother. These libels had no end. Pope had sometimes the weakness to answer them, which thickened the cloud of libels. At length he determined to print a small compendium of all those excellent pieces. This was a mortal blow to these writers, who till then had lived decently on the slanders they vented against him: they were now

no longer read, and were silenced by the abridgment. They never recovered from this stroke.

I was strongly tempted to grow vain, on finding that our great writers dealt with me in the same manner as those gentry had used Pope. I may safely say, I have been of some little service to more than one author. I had, I forget how, done some little service to the illustrious Abbé Desfontaines. But as this service was not sufficient to maintain him, the first thing he thought of, in order to get rid of his difficulties, on coming out of the jail from which I delivered him, was the publishing of a dozen libels against me, which, in truth, he composed wholly out of his regard for the honor of letters, and from the overflowing of his zeal for good taste. He printed an edition of the "Henriade," in which he inserted some verses of his own composing, and then criticised those very verses he had made himself. I have carefully preserved a letter written me by an author of this stamp: "Sir, I have printed a libel against you: there are four hundred copies in the impression; now, if you will send me four hundred livres, I will send you every copy of the work, upon my honor." I wrote him in answer, that I should be very far from abusing his goodness; that this would by no means be an advantageous bargain for him; and that the sale of his work must certainly be of much more service to him. I had no cause to repent of my generosity.

It is a good-natured action to encourage men of letters who are unknown, and who know not what subject to begin with. One of the greatest pieces of charity that can be done them is to give the public

a tragedy. The moment you do this, all of a sudden come out "Letters to Ladies of Quality, an impartial Criticism of the New Play; Letter From a Friend in Town to his Friend in the Country, a Serious and Mature Examination, the new Tragedy Taken to Pieces and Examined Scene by Scene"; every one of which is greedily bought up, which is the point aimed at.

But the most curious secret of all, for an honest bookseller, is to take care to print, at the end of the book he publishes, all the abuse and ribaldry that has been written against the author. Nothing is better calculated to whet the curiosity of the reader, and to quicken the sale. I remember, among the execrable editions that have been printed in Holland of my pretended works, an artful editor of Amsterdam, who, desirous of lessening the credit of an impression printed at The Hague, thought proper to add, by way of appendix, a collection of all the ribaldry he could scrape together that had been written against me. The first words of this collection called me a snarling cur. I found this book at Magdeburg, in the hands of the postmaster, who never ceased telling me what an eloquent piece it was. Lately two worthy booksellers of Amsterdam, after having disfigured, as much as in them lay, the "Henriade," and my other pieces, did me the honor to acquaint me by letter, that if I persisted in my intention of permitting a better edition of my works to be published at Dresden, than that on which they were then engaged, they should hold themselves bound in conscience to publish against me a volume of the most atrocious calumnies, on the finest writing

paper, with a large margin, and the most beautiful letter they could procure. They have been as good as their word with me. It is a pity such valuable collections should have been buried in oblivion. Formerly, when there were eight or nine hundred thousand volumes fewer in Europe than at present, those pieces of scandal had their effect. People read with extreme relish in "Scaliger," that Cardinal Bellarmin was an atheist, the reverend father Clavius a drunkard, and that the reverend father Cotton had sold himself to the devil. Those were happy days; but, alas! everything degenerates.

Very little has been said on printed lies, with which the world has been deluged; it would be no difficult matter to write a large volume on the subject; but we know we are not to do all that may be done. We shall here give only a few general rules, to caution mankind against that multitude of books, in which errors and falsities have been transmitted from age to age.

We are apt to start at the sight of a numerous library, and to exclaim, "What a dismal thing is it to be condemned to remain ignorant of almost all it contains!" Do not be cast down: there is very little reason for sorrow in the case. Observe those four or five thousand volumes of the ancient metaphysical writers: they contain not a word of truth till the time of Galileo. Look into the histories of a multitude of nations; their first ages are nothing but absurdities. After the fabulous times come those called heroic: the first are no better than the "Persian Tales," where everything is invention; the second are of the same kind with our romances of

knight errantry, where nothing is true, except a few names, and two or three dates.

Here then are already many thousand years and volumes, in which there is nothing to be learned; so that we rest perfectly satisfied as to that point. Next come the historic times, where the ground of the story is true, and most of the circumstances lies: but amongst all those lies, are there no truths? Yes, much such a proportion as of gold dust in the sands of some rivers. Perhaps I shall here be asked, how this gold is to be found. In this manner. Whatever is consistent with neither physical nor rational truths, nor the temperament of the human mind, is nothing but sand: the rest, provided it has the concurrent testimony of the wise men of the age, is the gold dust you seek for.

Herodotus relates, to the whole body of the Greeks assembled, the history of the neighboring nations: he is laughed at by all men of sense, when he talks of the predictions of Apollo, and the fables of Egypt and Assyria; nor did he believe them himself. All that he relates on the credit of the Egyptian priests is false; everything which he speaks of, as an eye-witness, has been confirmed since. We certainly should rely on what he says, when he tells his Grecian auditors: "There is among the treasures of the Corinthians a golden lion, weighing three hundred and sixty pounds, which is a present made them by Croesus: in the same place likewise we are shown two tuns, the one of silver, and the other of gold, which he presented to the temple at Delphi: that of gold weighs about five hundred pounds, and that of silver contains about two thous-

and four hundred pints." However extraordinary this magnificence may appear to us, and however superior it may seem to anything we are acquainted with, it cannot be called in question. Herodotus speaks to a matter of fact, of which there were upwards of a hundred thousand witnesses. This fact is important on another account, as it proves to us that in Lesser Asia, in the time of Cræsus, there was a greater magnificence than we see at present; and this magnificence, which can only be the fruit of a great number of ages, proves a very high antiquity, whereof there remain not at present the smallest traces. The prodigious monuments which Herodotus saw in Egypt and at Babylon are, moreover, incontestable facts.

The case is not the same with regard to solemnities, instituted to celebrate an event: most false reasoners tell us, here is a ceremony instituted from time immemorial, therefore the event so celebrated must certainly be true; but yet philosophers will often reverse the argument, and say, therefore that event never had existence.

The Greeks celebrated the Pythian games, in memory of the serpent Python, which Apollo assuredly never slew: the Egyptians celebrated the admission of Hercules into the number of the twelve great gods; yet there is no likelihood that this Hercules of Egypt existed seventeen thousand years before the reign of Amasis, as was asserted in the hymns sung to his honor. Greece assigned nine stars in the heavens to the dolphin which carried Arion on its back. The Romans celebrated this pretty adventure in February. The Salian priests

carried in procession, on the first of March, the sacred bucklers that fell from heaven, when Numa, having bound Faunus and Picus, learned from them the secret of turning aside the force of thunderbolts. In short, there never was a people who have not solemnized, by ceremonies, the most absurd imaginations.

As for the manners of the barbarous nations, whatever a sensible and ocular witness shall relate concerning them, be it ever so ridiculous, so infamous, so superstitious or abominable, I shall be inclined to believe it of human nature. Herodotus affirms, before all Greece, that the inhabitants of those immense countries lying beyond the Danube prided themselves in drinking the blood of their enemies out of human skulls, and in clothing themselves in their skins. The Greeks, who carried on a commerce with these barbarians, might have detected Herodotus, had he been guilty of exaggeration. It is certain, that upwards of three-fourths of the inhabitants of the globe have lived for a long time like wild beasts: they are born such. They are so many baboons that are taught to dance, and so many bears chained up by the mere force of education. That which the Czar Peter found necessary to do in part of his dominions is a proof of what I advance, and renders all that Herodotus relates extremely credible.

After Herodotus, the substance of history becomes much more true, and the facts more circumstantial; but very often we meet with as many lies as there are circumstances. Can I believe the historian Josephus, when he tells me that the smallest town

in Galilee contained fifteen thousand inhabitants? By no means. I cannot help declaring that he has exaggerated: he thought he should do his country honor by so bold an assertion, instead of which he has degraded it in the eyes of mankind. What a shame was it for the Jewish people, if they were really so numerous, to suffer themselves to be so easily subdued by a handful of Romans!

Most historians resemble Homer; they sing of battles: but, of all this dreadful number of combats, there are not any, if we except the retreat of the ten thousand in Xenophon, the battle fought between Scipio and Hannibal at Zama, described by Polybius, and that of Pharsalia, related by the conqueror, capable of affording the reader the smallest instruction: everywhere else I can see nothing but mankind cutting one another's throats, and nothing more.

We may believe all the horrors to which princes have been driven by their ambition, with every act of folly which mankind have committed through superstition. But how could historians descend so low as to admit for supernatural prodigies the tricks devised by conquerors, and adopted by the people?

The inhabitants of Algiers firmly believe their city to have been saved by a miracle, when Charles V. was coming to besiege it. They say that one of their saints struck the sea, and a storm arose which destroyed half of the emperor's fleet.

How many of our historians have written as if they had been Algerines! How lavish have they been of their miracles against the Turks, and against heretics! They have often treated history as Homer

has done the siege of Troy. They interest all the powers of heaven in the cause or defence of a city. But can men, who profess to tell truth, imagine that the Divine Being sides with one petty nation that is at war with another, equally as inconsiderable, in some insignificant and remote corner of our hemisphere?

No one has a greater veneration for St. Francis Xavier than I have: he was a Spaniard, animated with the most intrepid zeal; he was the Fernando Cortes of religion. But I cannot help thinking the writers of his life should not have asserted so roundly that this great man was in different places at the same time.

If any one has a right to pretend to the gift of working miracles, it is undoubtedly those who carry their charity and their doctrine to the extremities of the earth. I could have been glad, however, had their miracles been a little less frequent; that they had raised fewer of the dead; and that they had not so often baptized thousands of the Orientals in one day. It is glorious to preach the gospel in a foreign country the moment one sets foot in it. It is no small accomplishment instantly to speak with eloquence, and to move the passions, in a language that cannot be learned in many years, and which, after all, we are never able to pronounce, but in a ridiculous manner. These prodigies should certainly be husbanded, and the marvellous, when indiscreetly lavished, serves only to augment the number of unbelievers.

But it is in travellers, above all, that we meet with the greatest number of printed lies. I pass over

Paul Lucas, who saw the devil Asmodeus in Upper Egypt. Neither shall I take notice of those who deceive us, even while they tell us the truth: they may have seen a very extraordinary thing in a country, and take it for a common custom; they may have met with some abuse, and imagine it to have been a law of the land. These authors are much like the German who, happening to have a small difference with his landlady at Blois, whose hair was somewhat inclinable to the sandy, put down in his pocketbook: "*Nota bene*—All the women in Blois are red-haired and scolds."

What is still worse is, that most of those who write on the subject of government often draw false examples from mistaken travellers, with which they impose upon mankind. A Turkish emperor may perhaps have confiscated the treasure of certain pashas, who were born slaves in his seraglio, and given such share as he thinks proper to the family of the deceased; therefore it must be a fundamental law in Turkey, that the Grand Turk is heir to all his subjects: he is a monarch, therefore he must be despotic in the most horrible sense of the word, and in the manner most humiliating and disgraceful to humanity. The Turkish government, which does not allow the emperor to absent himself any length of time from his capital, to change the laws, to touch the public revenue, etc., shall be represented as an establishment in which the prince may lawfully kill and plunder from morn till night every one he pleases. The Koran says, it is lawful to be married to four wives at the same time; therefore every private tradesman at Constantinople has four wives,

as if it were so easy a matter either to have or maintain such a number. Some persons of rank have seraglios; hence it is taken for granted that every Mussulman is a Sardanapalus; and in this manner we generally judge of things. A Turk who should have chanced to be at a certain capital, during the celebration of an *auto da fé*, would surely be mistaken, should he assert, that there is a civilized country where they sometimes solemnly burn a score of men, women, and children for the amusement of their gracious majesties. Most narratives are written in the same taste. The case is still worse when they happen to be filled with prodigies. In short, we ought to be as much upon our guard against what books tell us as a judge is against the pleadings of the lawyers.

There is yet another great source of public errors amongst us, which is peculiar to our nation: this is the taste for lampoons and abusive songs. These are sometimes made on the most respectable personages; and we hear the living and the dead slandered every day on such noble foundations as these: "It is an undoubted fact," say they, "there is a song about it, which proves it beyond question."

Let us not forget to mention, among the number of printed lies, the rage of making allegories. On finding the fragments of "Petronius," to which Nodot has since boldly added his own, all the learned took the consul Petronius for the author of this book. They plainly discover Nero, and all his court, in a company of young roguish scholars, who are the heroes of that work. They were then, and still are, deceived by the name: and that obscure and

creeping debauchee who wrote this satire, which is more infamous than ingenious, must absolutely be the consul Petronius; that absurd old fellow Turkaret; that financier below Trimalcion himself, must be the young Nero! and that silly insignificant wife of his, the beautiful Acte; that clownish pedant Agamemnon, the philosopher Seneca. This is like seeking Louis XIV. and his whole court, in "Gil Blas." But, some one will tell me, what advantage do you reap by undeceiving mankind in regard to those trifles? That I shall gain nothing is past all doubt; but we ought to accustom ourselves to search for truth even in minute things; for want of which habit we are egregiously deceived in those of consequence.

My zeal for the discovery of truth; my function as historiographer of France, which requires my applying to historical researches; my sentiments, which are those of a citizen; the respect I bear for the memory of the founder of a body of which I am a member; my personal attachment to the heirs of his name and his merit; these, I say, are my motives for endeavoring to undeceive those persons who attribute to Cardinal Richelieu a work which I have good grounds to think neither is, nor can be his.

1. Even the title of it is suspicious; a person who addresses his master, would never have given to his respectful counsels the pompous title of a "Political Testament." Scarcely was Richelieu dead, when a hundred different manuscripts were published for and against his memory. I have two of them under the title of "*Testamentum Christianum*,"

and two more under that of "*Testamentum Politicum.*" These are probably what have given rise to all the Political Testaments that have been forged since.

2. Had a work, in which one of the greatest statesmen that Europe ever bred is supposed to give his master an account of his administration, and to offer him his advice with respect both to the present and the future, been actually written by this minister, he would certainly have taken all possible measures that such a monument should not perish; he would have given the most authentic proofs of its being genuine; he would have mentioned it in his real testament, in which his last requests were contained; he would have bequeathed it to the king as a present infinitely more valuable than the cardinal-palace; he would have given it in charge to his executors to transmit this important work to Louis XIII. The king must have mentioned it to some one; all the memoirs of those times would have taken notice of an anecdote of this importance: not a tittle of all this has happened. Such a general silence in an affair of so much weight cannot fail to raise the strongest suspicions in the mind of every sensible person. Why did neither the original manuscript nor any copy of it appear in the space of so many years? It was known at the death of Cæsar that he had written "*Commentaries.*" it was known that Cicero had written on eloquence; a manuscript of Raphael on painting could never have remained a profound secret.

3. Moreover, this work is no half-formed design, it has actually had the last hand put to it. It con-

cludes with a fine peroration full of morality: "I beseech your majesty to bethink yourself from this moment, of what Philip II. never thought, till he was ready to resign his breath; and to engage you to do so by example as well as precept, I promise that not a day of my life shall pass in which I will not endeavor to reflect on what ought to be my sentiments at the day of my death, with regard to public affairs." There is nothing wanting to render this work complete; even the epistle dedicatory has been found, which they had the effrontery to sign in Holland, "Armand du Plessis," although the cardinal never subscribed his name in that manner. Even the table of contents has been recovered, which the editor is so audacious as to ascribe to the cardinal. Lastly, in this epistle dedicatory they make the cardinal address the king in the following words: "This piece will one day appear under the title of Political Testament, that it may be of use after my death." As this piece was to see the light after the cardinal's death, it consequently should have been presented to the king in the most solemn manner; the original, in like manner, should have been signed and witnessed; and lastly, the very date of the presentation of this important legacy should have been recorded.

4. Had this manuscript fallen into the hands of some minister of state on the death of Louis XIII. and so passed into those of the persons who made it public, some circumstances of it should certainly have been known; the editor must have told by what means he obtained possession of such a manuscript, which he would have declared with more boldness,

as printing it in a free country, nearly forty years after the death of the cardinal, and when the remembrance of the hatred that had subsisted between the cardinal and certain great families, had entirely subsided. The editor, as I have already remarked in another place, was, above all, under the obligation to ascertain the authority of this manuscript, by neglecting which he must acknowledge himself unworthy of all credit. None of all these conditions, so indispensably necessary to establish the authenticity of a book of such a nature, have ever been fulfilled, and even for twenty-four years from the date of the pretended manuscript, neither the court, nor city, nor any book, nor any journal, makes the least mention of any such thing as the cardinal's having left the king a political testament.

5. How, indeed, was it possible, that Cardinal Richelieu, who as is well known, found greater difficulty in governing the king, his master, than in guiding the helm of state, should have ever had either leisure or inclination to compose such a work for the use of Louis XIII.? The author of the "New Chronological Abridgment of the History of France," who is so excellent at depicting times and persons, confesses in his useful performance, that Cardinal de Richelieu "has had much cause to be afraid of the king, for whom he risked his all, as he had to dread the resentment of those whom he compelled to obey him." Disappointments, suspicions, and reciprocal discontents were daily carried to such a length between king and minister, that Cinq-Mars, Louis' master of horse, proposed to his master to assassinate Cardinal de Richelieu as he

had done Marshal d'Ancre, for which he promised his personal service; this is asserted by Louis himself in a letter to Chancellor Séguier, after the conspiracy of Cinq-Mars. The king therefore had given his favorite reason to think he might venture to make this strange proposal. In such a situation as this, it is impossible one should take the trouble to compose for a king, who had already arrived at years of maturity, in the midst of mutual apprehensions, a collection of precepts which an unoccupied father might possibly have bequeathed to a son still in his infancy? I can hardly think such conduct consistent with human nature. This reason will have no effect with one of the learned, but I am sure it will not fail to persuade such as have a proper knowledge of mankind.

6. Let us suppose however, a man, such as Cardinal Richelieu, to have really intended to give the king proper rules for government after his death, as he had given him while he was living; what man is there, who, on opening this book, would not expect to see all the secrets of Cardinal de Richelieu laid open, and to find his "Testament" breathing the grandeur and boldness of his genius? Who would not flatter himself with having the pleasure of discovering measures at once artful and daring, suitable to the then state of Europe, and of France, of the court, and above all, of the monarch? In the first chapter it is evident that the author pretends to write in 1640; for he makes Cardinal Richelieu in a barbarous jargon, speaking of the war with Spain, say: "It is in this war, which has lasted five years only, that you have met with any accident," for this

was begun in 1635, and the dauphin was born in 1638. How then comes it that in a political work, which enters into all the detail of privileged cases, of appeals in matters of abuse, of rights of indultos, and of the venditions that prevail in the Mediterranean, the education of the presumptive heir of the crown should have been forgotten? This forger must surely be a very bungling fellow in his profession. The real cause of this omission is that the author, having in several other parts of his book forgotten that he had made as if he had written in 1639 and 1640, afterwards takes it into his head to write as if he were then in 1635. He makes the reign of Louis XIII. no more than twenty-five; whereas, he should have made it thirty years—a palpable contradiction and an evident demonstration of an imposition which no art can palliate.

7. Again, Louis XIII. is engaged in a ruinous war with the house of Austria; his enemies are on the frontiers of Champagne and Picardy; and yet his first minister, who has promised him his counsels, does not mention a single word to him of the manner in which this dangerous war was to be carried on, of the terms of peace to be agreed on, or of the generals or plenipotentiaries proper to be employed. Not one word is said of the conduct to be observed with respect to Counsellor Oxenstiern, with respect to the army of the Duke of Weimar, with respect to Savoy, Portugal and Catalonia! Nothing is to be met with in regard to the revolutions which the cardinal himself fomented in England; nothing of the Huguenot party, which still breathed a spirit of faction and vengeance. In all

this I think I see a physician who, when called to prescribe for a sick man, entertains his patient with talking about everything but what relates to his disorders.

8. The person who has vended these notions under the name of Cardinal de Richelieu first of all avails himself of the success of that great man in his ministry, in order to make him aver that he had promised the king, his master, this good fortune. The cardinal had humbled the *grande*es of the kingdom, whose power was dangerous, the Huguenots, who had the upper hand, and the house of Austria, which was still more to be dreaded: hence, he infers, that the cardinal had promised the king he would accomplish those revolutions the moment he set foot in the cabinet. These are the words he puts in the mouth of the cardinal: "When your majesty had formed the resolution not only to admit me to your councils, but even to a great share in your confidence, I promised you I would employ all the authority you should be pleased to invest me with, in order to destroy the Huguenot party, humble the *grande*es, reduce all your subjects to their duty, and raise your fame among foreign nations, to that high rank it ought to hold," etc. Now, it is universally known, that when Louis XIII. gave his consent to the admission of Cardinal de Richelieu into the council, he was far from being sensible of the good he had procured to France as well as to himself. It is an acknowledged truth, that the king, who then had a dislike to this great man, acted merely in compliance with the repeated intercessions of the queen-mother, who left no stone unturned to introduce

her favorite, for whom she had lately procured a cardinal's hat, and whom she looked upon as her creature, and by whom she hoped to govern. She at length prevailed, and he was admitted into the council: nevertheless it was even found necessary to gain over the Marquis de la Vieuville, superintendent of the finances, who reluctantly consented to the cardinal's admission into the council in 1624: and he neither held the first place there, nor was in any great degree of credit. This whole year passed in jealousies, cabals, and secret factions; and the cardinal got the ascendant only by degrees, and as it were, by stealth.

It will afford satisfaction to some readers to learn in this place, that Cardinal de Richelieu received his patent of first minister on Nov. 21, 1629, and not before. Louis XIII. signed it privately with his own hand. These letters-patent are addressed by the king to the cardinal himself; and what is very remarkable is that the appointments attached to that new dignity are left blank in this instrument; the king leaving to the magnificence and discretion of his minister, the care of taking out of the public treasury what was necessary to support the dignity of his station.

But to return, it is by no means probable that the cardinal should have expressed himself in 1624, in the manner they have made him do. It was certainly much for his honor to have achieved so many great things; but it would have been extremely rash to have promised them, and it would have been the most ridiculous and indecent thing in nature to have said to the king on his admission into his

councils, "I will raise your fame." They make him relate, contrary to his oath of secrecy, and against all decorum, what he had done; yet he says not a word of what should be done. Why? because the one was very easy, and the other extremely difficult.

9. By the little we have now said, it already appears that the pretended work in question is wholly inconsistent with the character of the minister to whom it is ascribed, of the king to whom it is addressed, and the time in which it is supposed to have been written; and, I will also add, with the style of the cardinal. We need only examine five or six of his letters, to be able to judge that it is impossible this work should have been done by the same hand; and this proof would be sufficient to convince any one who is possessed of the least degree of taste or discernment. Moreover, Cardinal de Richelieu, though he was sometimes under the necessity of doing violent things, never let any harsh or indecent expressions escape him. If he was daring in his actions, he was extremely circumspect in what he wrote: he would certainly never have called, in a political work, the Marchioness du Fargis, one of the queen's ladies of the bed-chamber, plain Fargis. This would have been the highest want of good-breeding and respect both to the king and posterity, to whom he was addressing himself. This indecent expression is taken from a wretched book, printed in 1649, entitled, "The History of the Ministry of Cardinal de Richelieu." The author of the "Testament" has copied this work of darkness, which has been more disgraced by the contempt of

the public than by the arret by which it stands condemned.

Can anyone be brought to believe, that a first minister, who supposes the peace with Spain already concluded, should speak of the Spaniards in such terms as these: "This covetous and insatiable nation, an enemy to the repose of Christendom?" He could not have spoken of Mahomet II. in worse terms. It is impossible to conceive that a priest, a cardinal, a first minister, and a man of sense, writing to a wise king, and in a testament which ought to be exempt from passion, should have been so little master of himself—at the time of this supposed peace—as to let fall expressions he would not have used in a declaration of war.

10. Is it possible that a statesman, proposing to write a work which required so much solidity, should say: "The King of Spain, by assisting the Huguenots, has laid the Indies under contribution to hell; courtiers measure the diadem by its form, which, as it is round, has no end; the elements have no weight, but when they are in their proper places; neither fire, air, nor water, is capable of supporting a terrestrial body, because such a body gravitates even when out of its place"; with a hundred other absurdities of the same sort, worthy of a country professor of rhetoric of the sixteenth century, or of an Irish pedagogue disputing upon a stool.

11. Is there again any great probability that the Cardinal de Richelieu, so well known for his gallantries, not to say for the over-warmth of his desires, should recommend the virtue of chastity to

Louis XIII., a prince chaste from constitution, by conscience, and by infirmity?

12. After such strong presumptions, what man of sense can resist that glaring proof of falsehood to be found in the first chapter? I mean the supposition that the peace was already concluded. "You are now come," says he, "to the conclusion of a peace: your majesty entered into the war wholly, . . . and have extricated yourself out of it only" An impostor, in the hurry of his forgery, forgetting the times of which he speaks, might well fall into so gross an absurdity; but a first minister, when he is actually at war, would certainly not have said the war is concluded. The war against the house of Austria was carried on more briskly than ever, although all the princes of Europe were then in negotiation, and perhaps for that very reason. It is true that, in 1641, there were some foundations laid for the treaties of Münster, which were not concluded till 1648; and the author of the "Testament" makes Cardinal de Richelieu speak sometimes in 1640, and sometimes in 1635. The cardinal could neither have supposed the peace made in the middle of the war, nor fly out into the most atrocious invectives against the Spaniards at a time when he was desirous to enter into a treaty with them.

13. Can there be any necessity to add to this evident proof of a palpable imposture, a mistake not quite so absurd indeed, but which, notwithstanding, serves equally well to detect an ignorant liar? He makes a prime minister, as the cardinal was, say, in the same chapter, that the king refused the assistance of the Ottoman arms against the house of

Austria. If he means the assistance which the Turks were desirous of giving to the French, the fact itself is false, and the very supposing of it ridiculous; if he means a diversion to be made by the Turks in Hungary, or elsewhere, any man who knows the world, or has the smallest idea of Cardinal de Richelieu, well knows that such offers are seldom refused.

14. As it appears, from the first chapter, that the impostor wrote after the Peace of the Pyrenees, of which his imagination was full, it appears, by the second, that he wrote after the reformation which Louis XIV. made in every part of the administration: "I remember having seen in my youth," says he, "gentlemen and other lay persons possessed, in trust, not only of the greatest part of the priories and abbeys, but also of curacies and bishoprics. At present these trusts are much rarer than the lawful possessions were in those days." Now, it is certain, that in the latter part of the cardinal's administration, nothing was more common than to see laymen possessed of benefices. He himself was the cause of five abbeys being given to the Count de Soissons, who was killed at La Marfée; M. de Guise was possessed of eleven; the Duke de Verneuil had the bishopric of Metz; the Prince de Conti had the abbey of St. Denis in 1641; the Duke de Nemours had the abbey of St. Remi of Rheims; the Marquis de Tréville that of Moutier-Ender, under the name of his son; in a word, the keeper of the seals, Châteauneuf, was in possession of several abbeys till his death, which happened in 1643; so that we may judge whether this example was followed. The number of laymen who enjoyed those revenues of the state is

almost infinite. It is sufficient to look into the "Memoirs of the Count de Gramont" to have an idea of the manner in which benefices were then obtained. I do not inquire whether the practice of giving away the revenues of the church to secular persons was good or evil; but I say, that a dexterous impostor would never have made Cardinal de Richelieu mention a thing which had no existence at the time he was writing.

15. In the same chapter, this projector, who is assuredly some churchman, overflowing with zeal for the pretended rights of the clergy, and altogether as regardless of those of the crown, declaims against the right of the Regale. He forgot, that in 1637, and in 1638, Cardinal de Richelieu had caused several arrets of council to be passed, by which every bishop who should deem himself exempt from the right was obliged to send into chancery the titles on which he grounded his pretensions. This writer knew not that a bishop who was minister of state, interests himself more in favor of the rights of the crown than of that of ecclesiastical pretensions. One should know the character of a first minister to be able to make him speak consistently. This is an ass who clothes himself in the lion's hide, but who is easily found out by the enormous length of his ears.

16. This ignorant forger, in the chapter before us, where he entertains the king with a discourse about universities and colleges, instead of talking to him about his interests, expresses himself in his clownish style (section 10) thus: "The history of Benedict XI., against whom the Cordeliers, who

were piqued on account of the perfection of poverty, to-wit, of the revenues of St. Francis, were exasperated to such a degree, that they not only waged war with him by their writings, but also by the arms of the emperor, under the shadow of whose wings arose an antelope, to the great prejudice of the church, is too strong an example to be under any necessity to allege any more." Certainly Cardinal de Richelieu, who was very learned, was not ignorant that this adventure, of which this impostor speaks, happened to Pope John XXII. and not to Pope Benedict XI. There is not a fact in all the ecclesiastical history better known than this; the ridiculousness of it has rendered it famous; the cardinal could not possibly have been mistaken in it: besides, to inform a king of the great danger arising from religious quarrels, there were a hundred more striking examples to have been quoted.

17. In the same section, chapter ii, speaking of the Jesuits: "This order," says he, "which has submitted, by a blind vow of obedience, to a perpetual head, cannot, according to the laws of good policy, be much favored in a state to which any powerful community might appear dangerous." I know well this stroke is somewhat softened a few lines after; but, to be plain, is it possible Cardinal de Richelieu should have thought the Jesuits dangerous, a set of people whom he used only for his purpose, and punished at his will; he who feared neither the queen, nor the princes, nor the house of Austria, could he be supposed to stand in awe of a few monks? He had even banished several of the order, as likewise some fathers of the oratory, and other priests who

had been concerned in cabals; but neither he nor the state had anything to fear from those communities. It had certainly been extraordinary that the conqueror of Rochelle should in his testament have been more distrustful of the Jesuits than of the Huguenots. This reflection is not convincing proof; but, joined to others, it serves to show that the author, though he usurped the name of a first minister, was yet incapable of assuming his spirit.

18. Were it necessary to confute all the mistakes with which this performance swarms, I should make a volume as large as the "Political Testament," a work which knavery has compiled; which ignorance, prepossession, and respect for a great name have caused to be admired; which the patience of the reader can scarce endure to read; and which had remained absolutely unknown had it appeared under its real author's name. I have already, in a small work, pointed out some of these proofs, which serve to demonstrate the imposture to any one possessed of the least judgment or taste. The following, among the rest, is unanswerable. The author, who is fond, however unseasonably, of making a parade equally useless and false, of his knowledge in the history of the affairs of the Church, of commerce, and of the marine, takes it into his head in chapter ix. section 6, to talk thus with regard to the settlements in the Indies: "As for the West Indies, we know there is very little trade carried on there; Drake, Thomas Cavendish, Herberg, l'Hermite, Lemaire, and the late Count Maurice, who sent twelve ships thither with design to carry on a trade either by force or friendship, not being able to find any

place proper to make a settlement." Remark, I beseech you, at what time the impostor makes Cardinal de Richelieu speak in this manner. It is in 1640, at the very time when the late Count Maurice, who was then actually living, governed the Brazils in the name of the United Provinces, and that the Dutch West India company had been making a very considerable progress from the year 1662, without the smallest interruption: observe also how, in the beginning of the same section, the author confesses that "the Dutch give no small trouble to the Spaniards in the West Indies, where they are in possession of the greater part of Brazil." And, indeed, is it possible to lay to the door of a statesman such a hodge-podge of errors and contradictions? England, of which he speaks, had already immense countries in America. As to Drake and Thomas Cavendish, their example is very unseasonably quoted: they were not sent to make settlements, but to ruin those of the Spaniards, to disturb their trade, and to make prizes, in all of which they succeeded.

19. Any person inclined to take the trouble of reading the "Political Testament" with attention, would be greatly surprised to see that this book is rather a criticism on the administration of the cardinal than an exposition of his conduct, and a connected account of his principles; the whole of it turns on two points, the first of which is unworthy of him, and the second an insult to his memory.

The first object is vague, puerile, commonplace, a catechism for a prince of ten years old, and most egregiously ill adapted to a prince in his fortieth year; such are the following chapters: "That the

foundation of the happiness of a state is the reign of godliness; that reason ought to be the rule of human conduct; that the interest of the public ought to be preferred to that of individuals; that foresight is a necessary quality; that every person in the state ought to be employed at that for which he is qualified; that it is very necessary to keep flatterers, informers, and plotters, at a distance"; with twenty other discoveries, equally profound, accompanied with advice which would have been an insult to so enlightened a prince as Louis XIII., who might, with great justice, have answered his minister and servant: "Talk in this manner to my young son, but know better the respect due to your master."

The second point, which makes the principal part of his ninth chapter, turns on ministerial projects, which are all of the author's own invention; and every one of them the direct reverse of those followed in the cardinal's administration. The author takes it into his head to abolish the private money edicts, or, out of his great condescension, to fix them at a million in gold. These edicts are for issuing private sums for secret services, of which no account is given. This is the most valuable privilege attached to the place of prime minister. No one but an enemy would demand its abolition.

20. The ninth chapter of the "Political Testament" bears on each page the most evident proofs of a forgery, the most wretchedly executed that can be imagined; here reflections, facts, computations, and everything else, are equally false: in this place the author advances, that for every new tax imposed, the minister is obliged in justice to augment the pay

of the soldiery; which, however, has never happened either under Louis XIII. or Louis XIV.; here, too, while he eases the shoulders of the people of seventeen millions of the *taille*, he carries the king's revenue all at once to fifty-seven millions, which he supposes commonly to amount to no more than thirty-five; which is a further proof of his ignorance, for the *taille* alone commonly amounted to thirty-five millions, the farms to eleven, etc. In this he also proposes to reimburse the annuities created by the cardinal, whereof several were at the twentieth penny, which he rates at the fifth penny; to take from the treasurers of France two-thirds of their salaries; to cause the parliaments, chambers of accounts, the grand council, all the courts which he calls sovereign, to pay their share of the *taille*, while he classes them at the same time with the peasants. Would it not have been extremely becoming in Cardinal de Richelieu to propose so wild and extravagant a measure, in order to vilify a body of which he had the honor to be a member by his quality of peer of France, a dignity which he held equal to his rank as cardinal!

21. With respect to the war, it has been already observed that he has not so much as mentioned that in which the kingdom was then engaged. But in his vague, general, and chimerical reflections, he recommends the taxing all the fees of gentlemen, to enrol the noblesse, and to keep them in pay; he would have every gentleman compelled to serve at the age of twenty-five; he would have none of the roturier, or lower class, admitted into the cavalry till twenty-five; the care of provisions should be

committed only to persons of quality; that, when there was necessity to raise fifty soldiers, they should raise a hundred; and this for no other reason that can be discovered, but to double their clothing and enlisting money. What a project this for a minister! It is true, the notion of enrolling the nobles, and causing the parliament to pay the taille, might have been the offspring of a better head than that of a projector, who, being out of employment, takes it into his head to govern Europe. In the same chapter, he treats of the affairs relating to the marine: he speaks learnedly of the great dangers of navigation between Spain and Italy, and between Italy and Spain, equally chimerical with that of Scylla and Charybdis: he pretends that the single province of Provence has a much greater number of seaports, better as well as safer, than those of Spain and Italy put together; a hyperbole sufficient to persuade one that this book was the work of some Provençal that had never seen any place but Toulon and Marseilles, rather than a statesman acquainted with the situation of all Europe.

These are part of the chimeras which this clandestine politician has published in the name of that great minister, with a hundred times less discernment than the Abbé de St. Pierre has shown, in ascribing a part of his political ideas to the Duke of Burgundy.

The project relating to the finances, which takes up almost the whole of the last chapter, is taken from a manuscript still in being. I have seen it: it was written in 1640. This piece makes the king's revenues amount to fifty-nine millions of those times,

by the arrangement which it proposes. The author of the "Testament" subtracts two of these; in everything else they perfectly agree. Nothing is so common as projects of this sort; the ministers frequently receive but seldom read them. The forger, while he copied those ideas, makes it very clearly appear that he never was at the pains to acquaint himself properly with the state of the finances of Louis XIII. He boldly states that each of the five years of war had lost no more than sixty millions and nine hundred thousand livres. It is, likewise, false that this expense was paid without extraordinary means: there were a great many taxations, a great many increases of salaries, which were brought into the finances; the duties were raised in the provinces; a tax of a crown per tun was laid on wine; the taille, which amounted to thirty-six millions two hundred thousand livres, was carried to thirty-eight millions nine hundred thousand livres. In a word, most of the things related in this book are as wide of the truth as the propositions in it are extraordinary.

22. It will, no doubt, be asked, how it was possible the public should have passed such an affront on the memory of Cardinal de Richelieu, as to imagine this book worthy of him. I answer: men seldom reflect; read with very little attention; judge with precipitation, and receive opinions as they do money, because they are current.

23. If the argument is raised, that Father Lelong and others have thought this book the work of the cardinal, I will acknowledge that Father Lelong has accurately compiled about thirty thousand

titles of books, and will add, that for that very reason he had no time to examine the books themselves: but above all, I will answer, that had we as many authorities as Father Lelong has composed titles, they would not be able to counterbalance one solid reason. If, however, the weakness of men must needs rest their belief on authorities, I will oppose to Father Lelong and others, Aubery, who has written the life of Cardinal Mazarin; Ançillon; Richard, the writer who took the title of Vigneul de Morville; and lastly La Monnoie, one of the most enlightened critics of the last age; all of these pronounced the "Political Testament" spurious.

24. But, say they, in 1664 the Abbé des Roches, formerly a domestic of Cardinal de Richelieu, gave his library to the Sorbonne, after the example of his master; and in this library there was found a manuscript of the "Testament," which tallied exactly with the printed copy, together with the same epistle dedicatory, and the same table of contents. It is this very manuscript, so transmitted to the Sorbonne, which finishes the proof of this forgery. It is transmitted twenty-two years after the death of the cardinal, without any document or information from the Abbé des Roches. This work was thrown by for a time both by the servant of the cardinal, and even the Sorbonne itself, and it is within these two years it has been classed among the rest. Had this manuscript been copied from the original, it had been more respected, some marks of its authority would have been discovered, the signature of Cardinal de Richelieu would have been found at the end of the letter to the king. But no such signature is

to be seen. They who composed it had not the effrontery; they did not dare to sign that name. Had the cardinal left ever so few memoirs, and had they had the smallest, and even the most distant relation to the "Testament," some mention would have been made of them, and then some degree of credit might have been given to the boldness of him who imputed the whole of this work to the minister. This is by no means the case: there is not a single word, either at the beginning or end of this manuscript, whence the smallest inference can be drawn. Therefore the Abbé des Roches must have looked upon this manuscript with the same indifference with which it has been regarded in the Sorbonne.

Let us imagine for a moment the "Testament" to be really the work of the cardinal; the single word "testament" supposes an indispensable duty in this domestic to ascertain the genuineness of the copy, and to declare its being juridically compared and collated with the original. If he has failed in this, he is certainly culpable; he gives the world a right to accuse him of forgery. But the Abbé des Roches had this manuscript in his possession just as any other person of curiosity might have had. This manuscript must certainly have been written before it was printed; and even, to favor the design of the imposture, several manuscript copies of it must have been made, which ought to have been handed about in a very private manner, as a monument of singular curiosity. Further, the silence of this domestic proves the master not to have been the author of this testament, as all the other arguments are a solid proof he never could have been its author.

25. But, it is said, it has been affirmed about seventy years ago, that the Duchess d'Aiguillon should have said fourscore years ago, she had once had a manuscript copy of this testament. An original note of M. Huet has been found; which note says that somebody had seen this manuscript in the possession of the Duchess d'Aiguillon, niece of the cardinal. Are not these very fine proofs? Most assuredly. I can easily believe that all those who interest themselves in behalf of the cardinal's memory would have been glad to have had any manuscript that bore his name; and from this circumstance I conclude that this manuscript was evidently supposititious, since among all the relatives, all the domestics, all the friends of that minister, no one has ever given himself the smallest trouble to ascertain the authenticity of this performance.

26. Let human curiosity weary itself in idle inquiries after the name of the forger; I, for my part, do not choose to trifle away my time in such a manner. What imports it to know the name of the cheat, now the imposture is discovered? what imports it to know that Courtils, or some other, forged the testaments of Mazarin, Colbert, and Louvois? what imports it whether it were Stratman or Chevremont that insolently usurped the name of Charles V., Duke of Lorraine? does it entitle a man to fame, to be the author of an execrable book? what advantage should one reap by knowing the authors of all the low calumnies and impertinent criticisms with which the public is overwhelmed? we ought to leave those authors who cover themselves under some great name in their native obscurity, in the

same manner as we do those who every day attack what is most praiseworthy, and commend what is most execrable, thus making the profession of letters as base and contemptible as themselves.

