

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1843.

No. II.

ART. I.—*On the Elocution of the Pulpit: an Introductory Lecture, delivered at the Theological School of Montauban*: By Professor Adolphe Monod.

THE author of the following discourse is the celebrated Adolphe Monod, who, though still a young man, has been for some years regarded as second to no pulpit-orator in France. He is at present a member of the Theological Faculty at Montauban, a Protestant seminary, in which evangelical Christians ought to take a special interest, as well for what it has been, and is, as for the dangers which impend over it from the hostility of the government. It is believed, that no one can read Professor Monod's lecture, without being awakened by its vivid originality, and convinced by its native truth.

ALTHOUGH the art of recitation depends more on practice than on theory, it nevertheless has certain rules, which must be presented to the mind before you can address yourselves with profit to the exercises which are demanded, and which form the object of this course. In commencing the lectures of the year, I think it my duty to lay these rules before you, or rather to recall them to your memory. In so doing, I limit myself to such general views as may be

exalt the ability of human reason, have reasoned away the obvious and philological meaning of the scriptures, in explaining their doctrines by certain abstract intellectual conceptions; and thus substituted a philosophical theology in the place of divine revelation, thereby declaring themselves wise above what is written.

We have now, in this article and the one on the Baconian philosophy, exhibited an outline of the method of investigation, the processes, the starting points and the foundations, of the English philosophy, and contrasted them with those of the other systems of philosophy, in order, that our readers might see, in comparison with all others, the solid foundations of that philosophy which has formed the opinions and the mental habits of the Anglo-Saxon race; and also, that they might have a touchstone of philosophical criticism, by which to test the validity of the reigning speculations of the day. For such is the increasing taste, both in this country and England, for the transcendental speculations of the German and French philosophy, that unless something is done, to check its progress, our old English philosophy will be cut loose from its strong anchor of common sense, and be driven off from its ancient safe moorings, to be dashed and tossed, by every wind of speculation, upon the boundless ocean of skepticism.

ART. IV.—*History of Europe from the Commencement of the French Revolution in 1789, to the Restoration of the Bourbons in 1815.* By Archibald Alison F. R. S. E. Vols. 10. W. Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh and London.

“AMONG the countless multitude whom the extraordinary events of the period had drawn together from every part of Europe, to the French capital, and the brilliancy of this spectacle, (the entrance of the allied armies into Paris, in 1814) had concentrated in one spot, was one young man, who had watched with intense interest the progress of the war from his earliest years, and who, having hurried from his paternal roof in Edinburgh, on the first cessation of hostilities, then conceived the first idea of narrating its events, and amidst its wonders inhaled that ardent spirit, that deep

enthusiasm, which, sustaining him through fourteen subsequent years of travelling, and of study, and fourteen more of composition, has at length realized itself in the present history."—pp. 528-29.

Such is the account which the author himself gives of the circumstances under which the first idea of the work before us was conceived. In penning this paragraph, it is not impossible that Mr. Alison had his eye upon the well known sentence with which Gibbon concludes his history of the Decline and Fall of the Roman empire. However this may be, the passage just quoted, is for several reasons deserving of notice. From this account of the origin of the work, it is manifest that it is not—like Sir Walter Scott's *Life of Napoleon*—a hasty production. Though it embraces a period of only twenty-six years, the author has devoted nearly as long a time to the preparation of his history, as Gibbon devoted to the production of the *Decline and Fall*. Every page of Mr. Alison bears evidence of extensive historical research, and that almost every spot in France, Germany and Italy, which was the scene of any important conflict has been personally, and very minutely examined. In a recent memorial to the British government, on the subject, if we mistake not, of the copyright law, the author states, that to the preparation of this work, he had given a very large portion of the best years of his life; that in order to collect the requisite materials he had travelled six times over the greater part of Continental Europe, and at an expense of more than £4,000. Whether the author will ever obtain any thing like a fair pecuniary remuneration for all this travel and literary toil, may perhaps be doubted; but there can be no question, that he has taken the true way to produce a history worthy of being read by his contemporaries, and one which "posterity will not willingly let die." It should not be forgotten, especially on this side of the Atlantic, that the author of these ten large volumes, has not been a mere historical student; on the contrary he has been all the while, actively engaged in the business of a laborious profession.

The passage already quoted, furnishes, to say the least, presumptive evidence, that the author, with all his patient and laborious research, is not, and could not be an unprejudiced historian, for, though not himself an actor in the scenes he describes, he was, according to his own confession, a deeply interested spectator of them. Mr. Alison is a

British Tory ; he was educated in the principles and prejudices of that party ; the hatred of the Tory party to the French Revolution was probably more intense than that of any other class of men in Europe ; from the very first dawns of it, before there had been the least outbreak of violence, while the Whigs were hailing it as the precursor of a political millennium, the Tories looked upon it with more than a jealous eye. The reins of government were in the hands of this party, during the whole period of the Revolution, with the exception of a very brief interval, and so far were their prejudices carried, that they never recognised the authority of Napoleon as emperor of France, though it had been recognised by the most absolute and aristocratic governments of Europe. (Alison, p. 492.) Now we do not believe it possible for a man educated in such prejudices, and himself an actual partaker of the strong passions by which Britain was agitated during the progress of the Revolution, and the long subsequent contest, to write an impartial history of such a period. Mr. Alison obviously aims at being a candid historian, and while his work contains many manifestations both of his political and religious prejudices, justice at the same time requires us to say that there are instances of candour, for which, from our knowledge of his political sympathies, we had not looked.

The materials for the history of this remarkable period are very ample, as any one may see, who will be at the pains to examine the list of works quoted : these are every year on the increase by the publication of memoirs and letters ; it has been made the theme of historical disquisition by some of the first writers of the age, by men of various nations, and of every shade of political sentiment. But ample as are the materials, it may still be doubted whether these writers do not live too near the period whose wondrous events they describe, to do them and it perfect justice. Besides, we do not believe that we have even yet seen all that the French Revolution was intended to accomplish, though Mr. Alison, in narrating the events of 1814 and '15, repeatedly speaks of it as at an end—"these words," says he, "*signed the death warrant of the Revolution.*" He seems to consider it as just a wild popular outbreak, which the legitimate governments of Europe soon crushed, when once they were heartily united for its destruction. But this view of the case is very wide of the truth. The overthrow

of Napoleon by no means brought the Revolution to an end; the temporary restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, was a very different thing from restoring the French monarchy to its state in 1788. What other period in the whole history of Europe is to be compared with that from 1789 to 1815? In whatever aspect it is viewed, whether we regard the events by which the period is marked, or the characters of the individual actors who appear upon the stage, it is without a parallel; what an infinite variety of talent of the highest order was developed; what vast armies were mustered on the great battle field of Europe; Austerlitz, Jena, Wagram, Borodino, Leipsic, Waterloo, cast all other fields of human conflict into the shade; what vast conquests, how soon effected, how soon lost; what an overturning, and setting up of dynasties; what extraordinary elevations from the dunghill to the throne! "In that brief period," says Mr. Alison, "were successively presented the struggles of an ancient monarchy, and the growth of a fierce democracy; the energy of republican valour, and the triumphs of imperial discipline; the pride of barbarian conquest, and the glories of patriotic resistance. In the rapid pages of its history, will be found parallels to the long annals of ancient greatness, the genius of Hannibal, and the passions of Gracchus, the ambition of Cesar, and the splendour of Augustus, the triumphs of Trajan and the disasters of Julian." Now can any one believe that Europe could be the same at the close of such a period, as she was at its commencement? Does it accord with the analogy of past ages, to suppose, that the seed sown during such years as these, could have wholly grown up and produced fruit within a space so short as that which has elapsed since even the first outbreak of the Revolution?

In a single article, it would be out of the question to attempt an analysis of such a work as the one before us. No mere outline of its contents could do any thing like justice to it, nor is it necessary, as the work bids fair to obtain in this country a wide circulation; not wider, however, than it richly merits, notwithstanding the political heresies with which it abounds, and its other, and in our judgment, more serious defects. Long as it is, we believe that no one who begins its perusal, will rest content until the whole has been gone through. The style of Mr. Alison has been rather severely criticised by the *Edinburgh Review*, and numerous instances are given in which he has violated

some of the plainest rules of good writing. With all its rhetorical defects, and its numerous Scotticisms, the style of the work is eminently attractive; the blemishes which are readily seen by the eye of the critic, will hardly be observed by the ordinary reader, through the absorbing interest of the narrative. Mr. Alison especially excels in his narration of military events; his descriptions of the great battles, by which this period is distinguished, are minute, animated, and most graphic; the reader is at once transported to the field of conflict, and becomes a spectator of the fight; he is enabled to perceive every new phase of the contest, to appreciate every new movement of the contending hosts. In these portions of his work, Mr. Alison far excels any other writer with whom we are acquainted, with the single exception of Napier, whom he frequently quotes, with high and just admiration, and whose descriptions of the battle-field have never yet been equalled, as they never can be surpassed.*

The limits within which we must confine ourselves, forbid our spending longer time upon the mere style of the historian. In a work, such as the one before us, in which the author, besides giving a narrative of events, indulges freely in speculations of his own respecting them, there cannot fail to be much to engage the attention of critics of every class, of military men, political economists, politicians, moralists, and even of theologians. We shall confine our remarks to a few points, which come fairly within our province, as Christian reviewers; points, in regard to which, we think it very manifest that Mr. Alison has been blinded, partly by the prejudices to which reference was had in the outset of this article, and partly, perhaps we should say chiefly, by those which he has imbibed in that self-styled Reformed Catholic Church, of which he is a member, and of which his father was a distinguished minister—the Scottish Episcopal Church.

In the introductory chapter, a comparison—and on the whole a just one—is drawn between the first English revolution, and that which forms the subject of these volumes. These have been sometimes pronounced quite parallel in all their leading and most important features, But, as Mr.

* It is perhaps but proper to mention that these parts of the work have been severely censured, by a writer in a late number of the *London Quarterly Review*.—Art. *Life of Blucher*.

Alison well observes, while there certainly are some very striking points of resemblance between them, a close inspection will show that no two events can be more unlike. In both cases indeed a war was waged between the crown and the people which terminated fatally for the former; in both cases, the reigning monarch was dethroned, and brought to the scaffold; in both cases a great military leader, rising from the ranks of the people, attained, by the force of surpassing military genius, the supreme power in the state; in both cases the legislative was overturned by the military power; and in both cases, the exiled royal family was temporarily restored to power; though ultimately and permanently excluded by the nation from the throne. These, it must be owned, are very remarkable points of resemblance between two revolutions occurring in different kingdoms, and at different periods; but, after all, those of which we speak, were totally unlike each other, in the causes which produced them, the objects for which they were begun, the character of the agents by whom they were accomplished, and the results which they ultimately produced.

Of the English revolution, religion was the moving cause. It was the offspring of those religious disputes between the Puritans and the established hierarchy, which, commencing in the reign of Elizabeth, were continued and aggravated during the reigns of her successors of the Stuart family, until the nation was involved in a civil war. In the long and ardent discussions respecting religious liberty, the great principles of civil freedom were in a measure brought to light, or, at all events, were better understood than they had ever been before; but the political and civil contests were regarded by the actors of all parties as quite subordinate to their religious differences. But in the French Revolution, irreligion was one of its most marked features. Not only did the Jacobins, for long (to use a favorite phrase of our author) the most powerful section of the revolutionists, ridicule every species of devotion; the Girondists, though much less bloodthirsty than the former, were quite as hostile to the Christian faith; even the royalists were as irreligious as either. It is a singular fact that no party ever attempted to raise the cry—‘the Church is in danger.’ All parties, in fact, for a while, seemed to be labouring to efface every vestige of evidence that France was once numbered among Christian nations.

In the English revolution, fierce and bloody as was the

strife, we at no time, from its commencement to its close, discover any of the odious features of a servile war. There were no proscriptions of the vanquished; there was no wanton destruction of property; there were no massacres by an infuriated populace. Even Clarendon, with all his bitter prejudices against the Puritans, acknowledges in emphatic terms the moderation with which they used their victory. Mr. Alison states the fact, but he states it in such a manner, as really to withhold from the Puritans the justice which is peculiarly their due. He would have his reader believe that the Royalists exercised a similar moderation; and that the cause of it in both parties is to be looked for among the peculiar elements of English character. Now to what was it really owing? Certainly not to any thing in the natural temperament of the English people, as Mr. Alison intimates; for the wars of the Roses were quite as cruel, and marked by crimes as atrocious as any recorded in the history of France. The victors in that strife were any thing but moderate in their use of victory. It was the Puritanism of England that taught the masters of England mildness and moderation in the day of triumph. In France, just the reverse of this took place; the storming of the Bastille was the signal for a general invasion of private property in all the provinces, with the exception of La Vendée, and a few other districts; every where almost, the peasantry rose as one man against their landlords, burnt their mansions, plundered their property, and subjected themselves and their families to the most revolting cruelties. The universal cry was not so much *liberty* as *equality*; the contest was not between those of the rich and the poor who favoured monarchy, and those of the rich and the poor who opposed it; it was a war of classes: a strife between the rich and the poor. The simple fact of superiority, whether in the accomplishments of education, the advantages of fortune, or the dignity of birth, was almost certain to render the person who possessed it, the object of popular vengeance, in the districts most infected with the revolutionary mania.

The ultimate, though not the immediate result of the English revolution was the establishment of many of the rights for which the popular party had so long contended. That revolution was consummated in 1688, by the just expulsion of the Stuarts from the throne they had so long disgraced; and the security of the British subject has, ever since that

event, stood upon a very different basis, from what it had been on before. Even during the times of the Commonwealth, the great features of the old constitution of England were preserved; the judiciary was untouched; the laws relative to property were improved, but changed in no other respect; the two great seats of learning were never before in a more healthy condition. The result of the French revolution was a total and radical change affecting every part and parcel of the body politic; though every man not blinded by party prejudice will admit, that the condition of the mass of the nation has been immensely improved.

In pointing out the difference between these two events, Mr. Macaulay very justly observes, that "all the great English revolutions have been conducted by practical statesmen. The French revolution was conducted by mere speculatists. Our constitution has never been so far behind the age as to become the object of aversion to the people. The English revolutions have therefore been undertaken for the purpose of defending, correcting and restoring, never for the mere purpose of destroying. Our countrymen have always, even in times of the greatest excitement, spoken reverently of the form of government under which they lived, and attacked only what they regarded as its corruptions. In the very act of innovating they have constantly appealed to ancient prescription; they have seldom looked abroad for models; they have seldom troubled themselves with Utopian theories; they have not been anxious to prove that liberty is a natural right of man; they have been content to regard it as the lawful birthright of Englishmen. Their social contract is no fiction. It is still extant on the original parchment, sealed with wax which was affixed at Runnymede, and attested by the lordly names of the Marshals and Fitzherberts. Very different was the Constituent Assembly. They had none of our practical skill in the management of affairs. They did not understand how to regulate the order of their own debates, and they thought themselves able to legislate for the whole world. All the past was loathsome to them. All their agreeable associations were connected with the future."^{*}

This spirit which the English nation have always displayed in a greater or less degree, and particularly since the era of the Reformation, was also strikingly manifested in

our own American Revolution. This was a civil but not a social revolution; the rights of persons, and the laws of property were to a great extent unchanged; the old constitutions of the colonies were modified, but not fundamentally changed, and in some cases have remained unaltered down to our own times; even the property of known royalists was not confiscated, unless they became active partisans. Who can doubt that it is to the influence of the principles of the Reformation, or in other words, of true religion with which the Puritans were so thoroughly imbued, we are to ascribe the vast difference between our own revolution, and that of France, on the one hand, and that of the South American States on the other?

Into the examination of the causes of the French Revolution, Mr. Alison enters with considerable minuteness, and gives a very clear and satisfactory statement of what may be called its proximate causes. Among these the chief were: 1. The social constitution of France. The distinction between the noble and the base born was carried to a length of which it is almost impossible for us, in this free country, to form a just conception. All offices of any dignity and value in the Church and in every department of the state were confined to the former. There was a barrier in the way of the common man, no matter what his talents, attainments, or moral worth, which was perfectly impassable. It was this abominable distinction that caused the mass of the nation to demand in such terrific tones—"equality." 2. The local burdens imposed upon the peasantry, and the legal services due to their feudal superiors. These were to the last degree oppressive and odious. The most important operations of agriculture were either fettered or wholly prevented by the absurd game laws, which, however were rigidly enforced. The *Corvées*, or obligations to repair the roads, were also rigidly enforced, to the ruin of vast numbers, every year. "It is vain to attempt a description of the feudal services," says Mr. Alison, "which pressed with so much severity upon industry in every part of France. Their names cannot find parallel words in the English language." 3. The taxation of France was another enormous grievance. From all the heavier imposts the clergy and nobility were exempt, though they possessed two thirds of the landed property; thus leaving the heaviest burdens of the state to be borne by the remaining third. 4. The administration of justice; this was

often partial, venal and infamous. 5. The corruption of the Court, the Church, and the Nobility. 6. The Royal prerogative, which had grown to a height wholly inconsistent with the freedom of the subject. 7. The derangement of the national finances. To these we should no doubt add the influence of our own revolution on the one hand; and the extraordinary spread of infidelity on the other. These, we have already said, may be called the proximate causes of the French Revolution; they immediately preceded it; and there are not a few who imagine that there is no necessity for looking beyond them, for they rendered a revolution inevitable. But the question arises, what brought these causes into existence? What brought France, of all the other kingdoms of Europe, into a condition, whose inevitable result was a social convulsion unequalled in modern, or even ancient times? Mr. Alison has obviously felt the necessity of considering this question; in searching for a solution of this problem, he carries us back to the earliest days of the monarchy, and he thinks he finds it in the original feudal constitution of France. "In this original separation of the different ranks of society, consequent upon the invasion of the Franks into Gaul, is to be found the remote cause of the evils which induced the French Revolution." That the evil influence of feudalism may have reached thus far, we are not at all disposed to deny; we have no doubt that it should be taken into account, in considering all the influences, remote and near, primary and lesser, which combined to produce this extraordinary event. At the same time we are quite as strongly convinced, that no institutions, or laws, or customs merely of a political nature, are to be regarded as the remote originating causes of the French Revolution. We believe that we can point to a moral cause fully adequate to its production. There is no need of going quite so far back as the early days of feudalism: indeed, it seems to us absurd to talk of the feudal system as indirectly giving character and colouring to the French Revolution, for this system prevailed in other parts of Europe, besides France, but no where has it as yet produced similar results; in no other land has it issued in a Reign of Terror. We believe that *the* cause of the French Revolution is to be sought for, as it will be found, in the *ecclesiastical* history of that kingdom. Every intelligent believer in the doctrine of a Divine moral government, we think, will see in the acts of Charles IX. and of

Louis XIV. amply sufficient reasons for just such a revolution as France was made to endure under the reign of Louis XVI. They cannot fail to perceive a moral connexion between the policy of those two monarchs towards the Protestants, or we should rather say, the Christian Church in France, and those proximate causes which gave to the revolution its terribly bloody character. We refer to the St. Bartholomew massacre, and to the revocation of the edict of Nantes; or if, after the example of our author, we should go back to a still earlier period, we might point to the crusades against the Albigenses, by which the dawning light of gospel truth, of pure religion and of civilization, was extinguished by torrents of blood, and a perfect tide of desolation was poured over the most cultivated, and loveliest provinces of France. Here are crimes perpetrated by the monarch and sanctioned by the nation; national crimes unmatched, certainly unsurpassed, by any recorded even in the dark annals of European guilt.

Yet, strange to say, Mr. Alison no where intimates the least connexion between these unexampled national crimes, and the equally unexampled punishment of the revolution. He, indeed, can see clearly enough the connexion between the crimes and the sufferings of the revolution itself; he is very quick to discern the connexion between the terrible crimes of the Reign of Terror, and the horrors of the conscription and the disasters of the Russian and the Peninsular campaigns. Whenever he indulges in moral reflections, as he usually does at the commencement and close of each chapter, he rarely fails to remind his readers of the connexion. We might quote a multitude of passages in which he enlarges upon the proofs afforded of the moral government of God, of the connexion between sin and suffering—national guilt and national punishment,—of the great moral law of retribution by which the world is governed. In the chapter which is specially devoted to the consideration of the causes of the revolution, all that is said on this branch of the subject is contained in the following brief passage. “The Reformation, so important in its consequences in other states, failed of producing any material effects in France from the scanty numbers of the class who were fitted to receive its doctrines. The contest between the contending parties was disgraced by the most inhuman atrocities; the massacre of St. Bartholomew was unparalleled in horror till the revolution arose, and forty thousand persons were

murdered in the different parts of France, in pursuance of the perfidious orders of the court. Nor were the proceedings of the Huguenots more distinguished by moderation or forbearance." We shall have occasion to comment on this statement in reference to the influence of the Reformation in France and the character of the Huguenots, but we quote it here in proof of our position that Mr. Alison has failed to point out, what we cannot but regard as the cause of the revolution. Justice to our author, indeed, requires us to say that in his concluding remarks to his whole work, in which he incidentally refers to the remote causes of the revolution, he observes, "The revocation of the edict of Nantes was the chief remote cause of the French Revolution; and the terrible evils brought upon the nobility and the government, the natural consequence and just retribution of that abominable act of religious oppression. Whence was it that these giants of thought (Voltaire and Rousseau) so vehemently directed their efforts against a religion which in England had so long been supported by the greatest and most profound intellects? Simply because the revocation of the edict of Nantes, while it sent eight hundred thousand innocent citizens into exile, had removed all restraint upon the established church in France; because spiritual tyranny had in consequence become insupportable, and spiritual intolerance universal; because religion, confident in the support of government, had disdained the aid of intellect." p. 1003. Here then is a virtual admission of the correctness of the views we have already expressed, respecting the causes of the French Revolution. But if the revocation of the edict of Nantes was, according to the confession of Mr. Alison himself, "the chief remote cause" of it, why was it passed over without the most distant allusion to it, in a chapter specially devoted to the consideration of the causes of the revolution?

Now though this is not the only fault we have to find with the historian, it is one of the chief. He has failed to point out what, we think, can be clearly shown to have been the moral reason of that extraordinary event, whose history, in other respects, he has so fully given; and while he often refers to the great doctrine of the moral government of the King of kings, he has at the same time neglected to adduce the most remarkable and awful proof of it to be found, we had almost said, in the annals of the world.

Here it seems to us very plain that Mr. Alison has been

blinded by his fondness for Romish Catholicism, just as it is evident from his political reflections on the events of this period, that he had been blinded by his political prejudices. In various parts of his work, there are remarks to be met with, which, though not very consistent with each other, prove that he has no very warm sympathy with the principles of the Reformation. On the other hand, while he admits that the Popish Church of France had fallen into a very corrupt state, as he does in the passage we have already quoted, it is manifest that he regards that corruption as a mere accident, and of course not growing out of the Romish system itself. He everywhere identifies that system with Christianity, and of course represents the bitter enmity manifested against it by the more violent revolutionists, as an exhibition of hostility to Christianity itself. Having some knowledge of what Scottish Episcopalianism is and has been for more than a century, we are not surprised that Mr. Alison should have expressed himself as he has done in reference to the Popish Church of France. Certain it is that his work contains many passages which never could have come from the pen of a sound-hearted Protestant.

Mr. Alison describes the massacre of St. Bartholomew as unparalleled until the revolution—while he represents the latter period as one marked by the perpetration of unexampled crimes, and the endurance of unexampled sufferings. Did our limits permit, we should like to institute a minute comparison between the days of Charles IX. and Louis XIV. and the days of the Jacobins; between the Reign of Persecution under these two monarchs, and the Reign of Terror under Robespierre and his associates: in these two aspects—as periods of crime, and periods of suffering. We believe that such a comparison will demonstrate to every candid mind, that in both these aspects the period of the revolution is not so unexampled as is commonly supposed, and as Mr. Alison uniformly asserts. We shall however, at present, only go into the comparison so far as is sufficient to establish the position before laid down, that the Reign of Persecution was *the* cause of the Reign of Terror.

In comparing these events, we should not forget that we know far more about the nearer of the two, on account of this very proximity to our own times. The supposition is no way improbable that there were many thousands of individual murders during the Bartholomew massacre in 1573,

of which the historians of that day were entirely ignorant, or which were not deemed by them worthy of special record. But taking such accounts as have come down to us, we believe that the averment in reference to the comparative atrocity of the massacres during the reign of Charles IX. and those during the revolution can be fully made out. The whole number of victims murdered at the instigation of this royal butcher, is variously estimated from 30,000 to 100,000. Mr. Alison says 40,000. A contemporary Romish writer and an Archbishop of Paris puts the number down at 100,000. But however the truth may be on this point, it is a recorded fact that in many of the provincial towns not a single Huguenot was left alive. "The heretics," says Capilupi, a writer of that day, "were taken calmly and quietly, one by one, like so many cattle, and fearful and wonderful was the spectacle to see the greater part of them lying with their throats cut, in the Piazza, naked as the beasts." Lest the populace should be excited, the same writer testifies, "another division was thrown into the river, so that in less than two days not a soul remained." A provincial governor writes to the king, "I most deeply regret to hear that any one individual has been saved, not a single one has been so by my means." Another Romish writer declares, that in Paris, every Huguenot that could be found was slain; they were hunted out of all their lurking places, and it was a source of general regret that so many were enabled to make their escape. Allowing, then, the number of revolutionary murders to have been tenfold greater than the number during the Bartholomew massacres,* we still hold that the spirit of the Reign of Persecution (if we may be allowed the phrase) was more ferocious and blood-thirsty than that which prevailed during the worst periods of the revolution. The extracts, just made, clearly prove that the butchery of Charles IX. would have been increased an hundred fold in amount, if the victims could have been found. The design was deliberately formed, and carried out as far as circumstances would allow, of destroying at one blow the whole body of Huguenots in the kingdom; of murdering in cold blood one entire class of subjects, a class then amounting nearly, if not quite to two millions. When was

* Mr. Alison states the whole number of victims to the Revolution, from 1789 to 1815, of course including those who fell during the wars of the Republic and the Empire, at 1,200,000.

any similar design either conceived or attempted during the times of the Revolution? Look again at the unequalled treachery of the act; every thing is done to allay the suspicions of the Protestants; the most distinguished leaders and ornaments of the party are allured, on various yet friendly pretexts, to the capital. As if to remove every ground of suspicion the royal guards are placed in palaces of the most eminent Huguenot nobles, ostensibly for their protection, really for their more certain destruction; the whole confirmed by the royal promise. What scene of the revolution can be adduced to surpass or even equal this instance of treachery and baseness? Mr. Alison particularly dwells upon the horrible circumstances attending the murder of the princess Lamballe, and he would leave his readers to infer that never were the remains of a human being subjected to such indignities. But look at those to which the dead body of the noble Coligny was exposed; his head severed from his body and sent as a trophy to Rome, his body left for three days in the streets, kicked and trampled on by princes of the blood, and then ignominiously hung. And by whom were these atrocities respectively perpetrated? That massacre by which one entire class of subjects was meant to be exterminated, by which France was truly made "drunk with the blood of the saints," was contrived and carried out by priests and princes, by the monarch of France himself; the massacres of the revolution were the work of an ignorant and degraded populace—a populace maddened by ages of oppression, and just then intoxicated by the first draught from the cup of liberty.

Our position is, that the French Revolution, considered as a whole, (and the Reign of Terror in particular,) was the moral consequence of the Reign of Persecution; we believe too, that the crimes committed and the misery created under the latter, are, all things considered, far greater and more atrocious, than those by which the former was marked.

We have noticed one period of the Reign of Persecution. There is another quite as remarkable; more dreadful, in fact, than the preceding one, just as instant death is less dreadful than death by lingering and exquisite torture.* We refer to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes—which Mr. Alison himself pronounces to have been "the chief remote cause of the revolution." Without entering into any mi-

* See Laval viii.

nute historical details, we would only say, that the conduct of the Bourbon family towards the Reformed Church of France presents a combination of guilt to which no equal can be found even in the long annals of royal iniquities.

To persecute any class of men on account of their religious opinions, is to adopt a principle as absurd as it is abominable; and whether the persecutor be a Papist or a Protestant, his conduct deserves eternal reprobation. The guilt of the Bourbon family arises not merely from the fact that they persecuted subjects confessedly among the best in the kingdom; that they persecuted even unto exile and death, an immense body of citizens whose morals were pre-eminently pure, whose loyalty was unquestioned and unquestionable; a body of citizens, peaceable, honest, intelligent, enterprising, whose active pursuit of commerce, the arts, literature and science was advancing the best interests of France, and rapidly repairing the dreadful desolations of civil war; a body of citizens claiming as their members not a few of the most distinguished in any rank and profession among the nobles, in the army, the courts of law, the pulpit, and the schools of learning; who could point to not a few merely, but to a long roll of names which have shed an imperishable lustre on the pulpit, the literature, and the arms of France. The attempt to dragoon such a body as the Reformed Church of France into the Romish communion, to banish her pastors; to hunt them like wild beasts, through their native land; to rob them of their people, their families, their posterity; to fine and imprison their parishioners; to send them by thousands to the galleys; to murder thousands more by methods of the most refined cruelty; to forbid, under pain of death, their going to countries where they might enjoy liberty of conscience; to do all this under the pretext of religion, was to descend indeed into an awful depth of guilt. But there was a "lower deep" still, into which the Bourbons descended. It was to this very party of Protestants that the Bourbons were, in no small degree, indebted for their seat upon the throne. Amid the fierce conflicts and ambitious schemes of contending factions—while the fanatical Parisians were ever ready to lend a hand to treasonable ambition, provided their bigotry had the promise of gratification, the Protestants remained unshaken in their attachment to the fundamental law of the kingdom, respecting the succession to the crown. But for the steady loyalty of the Protestants, Louis XIV.

would probably never have had the power to send so many thousands of them into exile.* Here then was the basest and blackest ingratitude. Nor was this all. The most solemn promises were broken; fundamental laws of the kingdom, which had been declared inviolable, were violated; solemn edicts, on the faith of which the Protestants had denuded themselves of all power of resistance, were set aside; they were recalled, not in consequence of some great crisis, on account of some anticipated convulsion, but in a moment of profound peace, when France was internally more united, than she had ever been since the days of Charlemagne. Here, then, were two great national crimes; and if, as Mr. Alison says, (p. 1019) "provision is made for the righteous retribution of nations—signal wickedness cannot fail to work out its own appropriate punishment even in this world"—these two great crimes could not fail to bring down upon their guilty perpetrators a manifestation of divine vengeance as signal as the crimes themselves were unexampled. Though ample space was given for the purpose, there never was the slightest symptom of national repentance for the St. Bartholomew massacre; never was the least effort made to repair the enormous injury inflicted upon the Reformed Church. On the contrary, her members were proscribed and persecuted up to the very moment when the flames of the revolution burst forth; so late as 1752, a Protestant minister was burnt to death for no other offence than that of preaching the gospel! Not one of the laws which sanctioned the atrocities of the reign of Louis XIV. was repealed, until the Bourbon throne was overturned. If ever a house "wore ont the saints of the Most High," it was the house of Bourbon. If ever a kingdom was made "drunk with the blood of the saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus," it was that of France. Space was given her to repent, but she repented not, and the day of vengeance came.

The crimes and the sufferings of the Revolution were, therefore, just the natural result of causes which kings and priests, nobles and parliaments had themselves set in operation; they sowed with their own hands the terrible seed; is it at all wonderful that they were made themselves to reap the terrible harvest? Who can fail to see in the banishment of the Bourbon family, and of the Romish priest-

* Laval viii.

hood, not only a most just, but also a most appropriate punishment for their own perfidious banishment of thousands of the noblest sons of France? Looking at Louis XVI. only as an individual, our sympathies are deeply excited on his behalf, but looking upon him as one of a bloody race, we see, in the terrific tempests amidst which the sun of his house sunk forever, only righteous retribution; a proof that signal wickedness cannot fail to work out its own appropriate punishment, even in this world; a fulfilment of the word of Him who hath said, "I am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me." The sentence of eternal banishment from the throne of France had gone forth against that house, by which thousands guiltless of a crime had been sent into most cruel exile. Never was a throne more justly forfeited, and though the whole continent, almost, united for their restoration, even the mighty hosts of allied Europe have thus far been, and forever will be, unequal to the work.

We have dwelt the longer upon this point, because we view it as one in regard to which, the work before us is exceedingly defective. Mr. Alison not only fails to point out, or at least to give due prominence, to what we believe to have been the moral cause of the Revolution; but in the remarks which he does make respecting the ecclesiastical history of France, he does great injustice to her once glorious Reformed Church. In a passage already quoted, he declares that the Reformation produced no impression upon the French population, because the nobles were too wicked, and the populace too degraded, to feel the influence of gospel truth. Supposing the fact to be as he states it, we should refer it to a very different cause from that which he names. How could the Reformed Church of France be expected to prosper when she had to contend with such bloody perfidy as that which produced the St. Bartholomew massacre, with such treacherous bigotry as that which revoked the edict of Nantes? But the observation to which we refer, is just of a piece with the flippant remarks which often occur on the pages of historians who profess to be philosophical, especially when they speak of the church and of religion. The statement of Mr. Alison is true neither in theory nor in fact. How absurd to represent France of the sixteenth century, as so wicked and degraded as to be beyond the reach of the influences of that gos-

pel which is the "wisdom of God and the power of God" unto the regeneration of the world? that gospel, which has, within the space of a single generation, raised up the degraded cannibals of the southern seas, to the dignity of a Christian nation! Nor is the statement true in fact; for within sixty years after the commencement of the Reformation there were no less than two thousand reformed churches in France; at least two millions, and in some parts of the kingdom (e. g. Bearn) the entire population of all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, had become Protestants. Indeed, for a while it was a question if France would not become wholly lost to the Romish See. If the moral soil of France had been so ill adapted to receive the seeds of the Reformation; if it had been impossible for the Reformed Church to exert any material influence on the mass of the French population, and the number of her members had been so insignificant, why was the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve deemed necessary; why the peculiar exultation of the Roman Pontiff, on receiving the news of that atrocity; why the measures of extermination adopted by Louis XIV. in 1685, and renewed by Louis XV. in 1724; if the mere overflowings of the stream were sufficient to enrich nearly all the Protestant kingdoms of Europe, what must the stream itself have been? The Reformed Church encountered in Spain and Austria, a bigotry as intense as that by which the Bourbons were enslaved; but no where did she meet with perfidy like that of which they were guilty.

We are no apologists for the bloody actors of the French Revolution; we detest both the actors and their crimes; but we do not believe them to have been the *unexampled* monsters they are often described to be. Even Mr. Alison admits as much in drawing their individual portraits. We can find their parallels in the annals of France. Charles IX. and Louis XIV. committed quite as many murders as Robespierre, Danton, and their associates. Charles IX. and Louis XIV., were the authors of more misery to France, than all the revolutionists put together. The Reign of Terror was an awful, yet a brief period; but through how many long, long years did the crusades, and dragonades of Louis extend. The worst crimes of the former were committed by a populace which kings and priests had themselves degraded and debased; by a populace maddened for a moment, but soon and permanently

sobered; the crimes during the Reign of Persecution, were perpetrated by the highest orders, the constituted authorities of the kingdom, and were persisted in for generations.

“The great sin of the French Revolution,” says Mr. Alison, (x. 1007) “was the confiscation of the estates of the church.” The limits within which we must confine ourselves, will not allow of our entering so fully into the consideration of this statement as we could wish, and also of the more serious charge of the same nature which he brings against the Reformation. We shall only say, in reference to the confiscation of the estates of the French popish church, that any one who looks without prejudice at the vastness of those estates, must conclude that they were dishonestly obtained; and that even if honestly got, the purity of the church herself imperatively demanded that these estates should be used for some better purpose than the maintenance of idle abbés and prelates, in a style of princely splendour. “The church!” says Carlyle, “what a word was there; richer than Golconda, and the treasures of the world.” The revenues of the French church, says Mr. Alison, (i. 128) derived from tithes alone, amounted to 130,000,000 of francs annually; and this was exclusive of her landed possessions, which embraced nearly one half of the kingdom. Is it possible that this vast wealth could have been obtained by justifiable means? It should also be remembered that the confiscation of the property of the church was concurred in by the court party, and was in fact their work. And how was it at the Reformation? Mr. Alison says that “the great sin of the Reformation was the confiscation of so large a portion of the property of the church for the aggrandizement of temporal ambition and the enriching of the nobility, who had taken part in the struggle.” He does not hesitate to say, that “almost all the social evils under which Great Britain is at present labouring may be ascribed to this fatal and most iniquitous spoilation under the mask of religion, and of the patrimony of the poor, on the occasion of the Reformation.” (x. 1009.) He must have read the history of the Church and of the English Poor Laws to very little purpose, else he never could have made such a statement. How is the Reformation to be charged with this sin, when the Reformers, both in Germany and Scotland, (where the greatest spoilation took place) bitterly denounced it? Knox laboured all his days to get not only a suitable provision for the church,

but also a school in every parish, a college in every town, a university in every city, besides hospitals for the sick and indigent. Did the Reformation convert superstitious nobles into avaricious ones? Has the English Church had reason to complain of poverty, even since the Reformation? Was the "patrimony of the poor," as Mr. Alison calls it, *ever* used for the relief of the poor? Did not the history of the church for ages prior to the Reformation prove beyond all reasonable doubt that she was a very unfit trustee of so vast a patrimony?

We have already adverted to the strong antipathy which Mr. Alison manifests to the principles of democracy. He constantly asserts that the wars of the Republic and also of the Empire were not owing to the ambition of Napoleon, but were just the natural result of that democratic spirit by which the French people were infected. He fortifies himself in this opinion by the declaration of Napoleon to the same purpose. That Napoleon should say so is not surprising; it was a convenient cover for his own insatiable ambition. This history itself furnishes the most decisive proof of the falseness of this opinion. How can it be true, when the French people, as the historian himself relates, though ardently attached to Napoleon, and the army which adored him, were heartily sick of his incessant warfare? Never had man a finer opportunity of building up a magnificent empire, and of founding a glorious dynasty, than Napoleon Buonaparte on the field of Jena, or on the raft of Tilsit. The rock on which he split was selfish disregard of the rights of the nations he overran, and an insane infatuation as to his own invincible powers.

Though there is much in these volumes in which we cannot concur, we think the extensive circulation of the work on many accounts exceedingly desirable. We, therefore, are glad to see that the enterprising firm of the Harpers have already commenced its republication in this country, at a price which is almost incredibly small.