

stand." The perfect silence that prevailed throughout the day, broken only by the bands and these speeches, preserved the ceremony from any theatrical effect. After every one of the pilgrims had been admitted to visit the memorial rooms, entering to the south and making their exit to the north of the house, all dispersed over the island to collect relics—coral, shells, red granite, sparkling mica, myrtle, lentisk, broom, wild olive branches and cistus, uprooting the entire trees if possible. Nor did Signora Francesca complain, though the gardens were utterly despoiled—despoiled in vandal English fashion, and it is the first time that I have seen such a thing done in Italy. I say, "Donna Francesca permitted it." Garibaldi's three children by Anita (who, by the way, was Garibaldi's lawful wedded wife, nor ever the wife of any other man, as biographers report) resigned all claim to the island, wishing to present it to the country; but, as the youngest boy, Manlio, is a minor, his mother objected, and so the question remains in abeyance until he comes of age. Manlio was not at Caprera, as he is just passing his examination at the military college at Leghorn, but sent a magnificent wreath to his father's tomb.

Were I to recount all the incidents and episodes that occurred during the forty-eight hours, my letter would be far too long; but one is worthy of note. On board the *Baldurino*, a large steamer of the Rubattino-American line, the third-class passengers complained of their fare as scanty and savorless, while the table of the first and second class was most amply provided with viands and four sorts of wine. So a vote proposed was carried by acclamation to have but one table in common, the first and second-class passengers contenting themselves with only ordinary wine and two instead of six dishes of meats and vegetables. That trait of Garibaldian equality was a real bit out of the past.

Arriving at Genoa, such of the pilgrims as were not compelled to start by train wound their way up to Mazzini's tomb at Staglieno. Here, with a translation made by an American lady, is Carducci's sonnet, bearing the motto of young Italy, and referring to the actual first meeting which took place between Mazzini and Garibaldi in 1830:

ORA E SEMPRE.

(Davanti il Pantheon.)

"Ora—: e la mano il giovine nizzardo
Biondo con sfavillanti occhi porgea,
E come su la preda un leopardo.
Il suo pensiero a l'avvenir correa.

"E sempre—: con la man fisso lo sguardo
L'austero genovese a lui rendea;
E su 'l tumulto eroico il guardardo
Lume discese di Petrarca idea.
Ne l'aer d'alte vision sereno
Suona il verbo di fede, e si diffonde
Oltre i regni di morte e di fortuna.

"Ora—dimanda per lo ciel Staglieno,
Sempre—Caprera in mezzo al mar risponde:
Grande su 'l Pantheon vigila la luna.

"Now! And the fair-haired youth of Nice extends
His hand, with flushing cheek and sparkling eyes,
And, like a leopard on the prey it rends,
His thoughts rush on to where the future lies.

"FOREVER! While his steadfast gaze he bends,
Genoa's austere son accepts that hand;
And on th' heroic tumult of the land
The light of the eternal Thought descends,
And in the heaven of visions high and fair
Resounds the word of faith, and through the sky,
Beyond the realms of death and chance, spreads free.

"Now! lone Staglieno's tomb calls through the air;
Forever! cries Caprera from the sea,
Over the Pantheon the moon watches high."

GEFFROY'S 'MADAME DE MAINTENON.'

PARIS, June 17, 1887.

M. GEFFROY, member of the French Institute, has undertaken a somewhat ungrateful task, not in publishing a critical selection of Mme. de Maintenon's letters, but in preceding it with a long biography, which aims to be a complete apology of this famous royal favorite. It seems difficult to make a complete edition of the letters of

Mme. de Maintenon. It is well known now that the edition issued by La Beaumelle has but little value, and that he completely disfigured the admirable documents which fell into his hands. Mme. de Maintenon destroyed, so it was said by her contemporaries, all her correspondence with Louis XIV., and it must be much regretted that she made this sacrifice, as these letters would have an extraordinary value. M. Lavallée, who undertook to publish all the correspondence of Mme. de Maintenon, found many inedited letters; but his work was interrupted, and his fifth volume, which is very rare, does not go beyond the year 1705. We have in reality nothing on the latter period of the reign of Louis XIV., during which she played such an important part. Of the earlier period we have chiefly mere copies made at Saint-Cyr, and composed of fragments which served for the education of the young ladies in this establishment. It is not impossible that we shall find some day the letters of Mme. de Maintenon to Boufflers, to the princes of the royal family, to the Duke of Burgundy, to the Queen of Spain, to the Duc du Maine. M. Geffroy gives us chiefly her correspondence with her spiritual director, the Abbé Gobelin, her letters to the "dames de Saint-Louis," to the Archbishop of Paris, who became Cardinal de Noailles, to Mme. de Dangeau, to Mme. de Caylus, her long correspondence with the Duc de Noailles, and with Mme. des Ursins.

Mme. de Maintenon has remained to this time a psychological problem: she has her enemies and her friends. Some call her ambitious, others believe her to have been humble and afraid of her own power and influence. Was she an intriguer, a ruling spirit, had she the head and the heart of the greatest statesmen, or was she merely placed by circumstances in the sphere of absolute power, and did she long, in her brilliant Olympus, for a quiet and obscure existence? Was she a victim of her own beauty, of her own wit, of the charms which had made her the favorite and the secret wife of the greatest sovereign of her time; or was she an artful, wicked, cruel, hypocritical woman, determined to establish and to maintain her empire, and to sacrifice everything to her love of power? Was she the cleverest of women, at a time when French society produced so many remarkable women, or had she a common, ordinary intelligence? It has been said that in the seventeenth century the cooks wrote the best of French; her detractors will not even admit any great literary merit in her letters; they pronounce them to be no better than the letters of any other lady of the day. "Adhuc sub judice lis est." M. Geffroy is on the side of the apologists; he is, indeed, the most passionate among those who have dared to take up the defence of Mme. de Maintenon.

Is it necessary to name her enemies? Their name is legion. Who does not remember the burning invectives of the honest Duchess of Orleans, the mother of the Regent? She expressed a real horror for Mme. de Maintenon. What shall we say of the judgment of Saint-Simon, written not for his contemporaries, but for posterity? He speaks of her extraordinary fortune in terms which cannot be forgotten. He tells us how M. and Mme. de Montespan knew Mme. Scarron, at the house of Marshal d'Albret; how, when Mme. de Montespan became the mistress of Louis XIV. and had her first children by him, she proposed to the King to confide them to Mme. Scarron, to whom a house was given for that purpose in the Marais. Afterwards, the children were brought to court and their governess with them. Louis XIV. did not like Mme. Scarron at first, but was induced by Mme. de Montespan to give her the estate of Maintenon. She repaired the old château and became Mme. de Maintenon. Louis XIV. could not understand the great

friendship which Mme. de Montespan had for her, and asked several times for her dismissal. He began to change his mind when the governess took the young Duc du Maine to certain spas, and travelled with him to Flanders, to Barèges in the Pyrenees; Louis XIV. read her letters and found them sensible and well written.

Mlle. d'Aubigné cannot be blamed for having married at the age of sixteen the poet Scarron. She had no protector, no fortune. Scarron was to her a friend, not a husband. She became a widow at the age of twenty-five. Scarron had made her acquainted with good society; she cannot well be excused for having consented to become the governess of two children, born of a double adultery. This is, in my eyes, the critical part of her life. She was essentially wrong in accepting the situation which Mme. de Montespan offered her. She professed to be very religious, and speaks constantly in her letters of the charms of conventual life; she would have done much better, if she could not marry again, to enter a convent than to live in equivocal relations with Mme. de Montespan and with her royal lover. Mme. de Sévigné, who had much good sense, knew her as Mme. Scarron, and, as such, liked her. "We take supper every evening with Mme. Scarron. She has a mind amiable and naturally right. It is a pleasure to hear her discuss; . . . her society is delicious." Afterwards, when people began to see the favor of Mme. de Maintenon increase, Mme. de Sévigné writes to her daughter: "I will show you, my dear, a *dessous de cartes* which will surprise you. This great friendship between Mme. de Montespan and her friend became two years ago a real aversion. It is a bitterness, an antipathy: it is white and then black. And why? Because the friend's pride is in revolt against the other. She does not like to obey. She consents to belong to the father, not to the mother."

Mme. de Montespan's love for the King was a continual tempest. The favorite was proud, ill-tempered, exacting; the King longed for rest. He longed for a quiet, solitary, decent *liaison*. He could not bear solitude, but he wanted a companion who would be to him what the shadow is to the body. He discovered by degrees, and somewhat to his astonishment at first, that the governess of his illegitimate children could fill his leisure hours noiselessly, pleasantly. She was discreet, reserved, sensible; she could keep a secret like a confessor; she could give advice and not boast of it; she could enter wholly, completely into the occupations, the preoccupations, the anxieties, the emotions of his own life—lose herself, so to speak, completely, and give him the sense of a sort of dual existence. Greatness is solitude; and who was ever as great as the "Grand Roi"? He was naturally sad and needed a companion, an echo. Mme. de Maintenon became this echo.

She was an echo much more than an inspirer. She was not of a despotic and overruling disposition. The pamphleteers and even the historians have made her responsible for many acts and resolutions which were really not her work. In one sense, however, she might be said to be responsible: she acquired a great influence—the influence due to a constant assiduity and to a complete devotion; and she might have used this influence in sometimes resisting and counteracting the royal resolutions. But who knows if the influence we speak of was not due to the complete abdication of her will? When two human beings have lived long together, like Mme. de Maintenon and the King, inseparable, tied together by the strongest of human ties, it becomes very difficult to say which of the two has had more influence in such or such a determination.

When Mme. de Montespan fairly fell into disgrace and was reduced to the honorary post of

superintendent of the Queen's household, Mme. de Maintenon was appointed *dame d'atour* of the Dauphine. She thus became entirely independent of Mme. de Montespan. Her favor soon became apparent; the King entered with her into a new and unknown country, which Mme. de Sévigné calls "la commerce de l'amitié et de la conversation, sans contrainte et sans chicane." The courtiers whispered that Mme. de Maintenon's real name was Mme. de *Maintenant*. She spent all her evenings with the King, and how did she employ her new favor? First, in converting or trying to convert all the members of her family, who were still Protestants. She stopped at nothing, and employed means which were a sort of anticipation of the methods followed at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. She sent M. de Villette, who refused to be converted, on a long journey (Mme. de Villette was the favorite daughter of the famous Agrippa d'Aubigné, and an ardent Calvinist), and during his absence she procured the abjuration of his young son, and placed him in a military academy. She also took advantage of the absence of M. de Villette to get possession of Mlle. de Mursay, who became Mme. de Caylus. Mlle. de Mursay left her mother and arrived at Paris with some cousins—young Saint-Hermine, Mlle. de Saint-Hermine, and Mlle. de Caumont. "We arrived together in Paris," says Mme. de Caylus in her memoirs. "Mme. de Maintenon came immediately and took me to Saint-Germain. I wept much afterwards; but the next day I found the King's mass so beautiful that I consented to make myself a Catholic, on condition that I should hear mass every day and that I should never be whipped. This was the only controversy employed, and the only abjuration I made." The other cousins, being a little older, resisted a little longer, but finally they all gave in.

These conversions are not a glorious page in the history of Mme. de Maintenon, and her conduct towards the children of M. de Villette lends much probability to the opinion of Saint-Simon, who makes her afterwards chiefly responsible for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It is well known that converts are often intolerant, and easily become persecutors. The religious intolerance of Mme. de Maintenon was a sort of self-justification. M. Geoffroy tries in vain to upset the theory of Saint-Simon; he finds no good arguments. It is true that in her letters she recommends to her brother, D'Aubigné, tolerance towards the Calvinists in his government, but she applauds constantly after 1685 the destruction of heresy, and even the massacres of the Camisards in Languedoc. In an answer to a memoir written in 1697, 'On the best manner of effecting the conversion of the Huguenots,' she declares that it would be dangerous to recall the Huguenots and to abolish the decrees published after 1685. We do not attach much importance, in this question, to the opinion of Voltaire, who wrote to Formey, on January 17, 1753, "Why do you say that Mme. de Maintenon had much part in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes? She had no part at all in it. This is a certain fact. She never dared to contradict Louis XIV." We may easily believe that she did not often contradict the King; but an artful woman has many ways of bringing her lover to her own opinion. Mme. de Maintenon was artful, though some writers would try to persuade us that she was a simple-minded person. She first used her increasing credit in trying to separate the King from his mistresses, and preached to him virtue and conjugal fidelity. Did she ever really work in the interest of the Queen? Would she have been contented, by the side of the Queen, with the part of a confidante and an adviser? She was older than Maria Theresa, older than Louis XIV.; but in

1680 she was only forty-five years old. She could not foresee that the Queen would die in 1683. She had already become indispensable: she had brought Louis XIV. to the point where he could refuse her nothing. She was married to him secretly, and D'Aubigné, her profligate brother, called Louis XIV. boldly, "my brother-in-law." Saint-Simon pretends that her ambition even then was not satisfied, that she wished to be declared Queen, that Louvois, the Archbishop of Paris, Harlay, Fénelon, the Duc de Beauvilliers, fell into disgrace for having determined the King to refuse her this last favor. M. Geoffroy tries to prove the contrary. There are mysteries which are never unravelled. Louis XIV. was weak as a man, but he had a very exalted idea of royalty. He could not live without his Maintenon; he did not wish to present her as the Queen to his own people and to his brother-kings in Europe.

Correspondence.

THE FRENCH FINANCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your issue of May 26, No. 1143, contains an article entitled "The French Crisis," which it is impossible for a Frenchman, and, I may add, for an impartial and well-informed reader, to let pass without a word of protest. Neglecting all minor errors—such as the bold assertion that popular sentiment demands Gen. Boulanger as a necessary member of the Cabinet—I willingly point to that most astonishing phrase: "The shrewdest financial heads in France, in fact, such men as Léon Say and Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, believe that a Treasury collapse of some kind is not far away." I have read with the greatest care for the past five years every book, every article, written by Say and Leroy-Beaulieu. I consider both of them to be clever, patriotic, and sincere men, not afraid to speak harshly when it is necessary to enforce a painful truth on public opinion. Now, I can declare that neither one nor the other ever wrote or spoke a word predicting a Treasury collapse in our country; further, I maintain that Leroy-Beaulieu, the only one who writes regularly in the *Économiste Français*, has not ceased to repeat that if the state of our Treasury is embarrassing, French finances and French public wealth are very far from being in danger. About six weeks ago Beaulieu, examining the returns of the taxes on donations and legacies, showed how steadily and speedily those taxes have increased for the last twenty years, and came to the conclusion, which is shared by all financial authorities, that the improvement of our finances would be a matter of no difficulty if only peace and interior tranquillity could be maintained. What must Americans think of French statesmen who are accused, without the slightest foundation, of having uttered words of treason such as the foretelling of a financial collapse would be? And what must American readers think of the French public which is mad enough to pay 82 francs for 3 per cent. funds, when those 3 per cents are in danger—according to your writer—of not being paid to-morrow or the day after?

I will not trespass upon your space by trying to give a correct idea of the state of French finances and of the real or unreal embarrassments of our exchequer. But two points I must briefly insist upon, (1) that Gen. Boulanger, whatever may be said against him, has not had the least influence on the French budget and deficit: any Parliament and any Minister of War would have felt the necessity of modifying our rifles when Germany had adopted a similar change in her armament, and this has been the only extraordinary

expense for the War Department during the last twelvemonth; (2) that people ought to reflect, before they speak about a possible, nay, a probable, collapse of the French Treasury, on the privileged and exceptional nature of the French public debt. Not only is the debt almost entirely in the hands of Frenchmen, so that the payment of the interest does not make the country a franc poorer, but—and I am afraid many Americans do not know this—all the French railways must become the property of the State a hundred years after their opening to traffic. In fact, as early as 1950 the greater part of our railways will already be State property, thus affording at once the means of repaying, if it be thought necessary, more than half of the public debt. A country which possesses the bare ownership of all the railways built on its soil is not in danger of a "Treasury collapse."—Truly yours,

SALOMON REINACH.

PARIS, JUNE 5, 1887.

[We were thinking of going over M. Leroy-Beaulieu's articles on French finances in the *Économiste Français* during the last two or three years for the purpose of showing, by numerous quotations, how rash M. Reinach's assertions are, and how defective his memory is, when we took up the last number, of June 14, containing another discussion of the same subject by the same writer. In it M. Leroy-Beaulieu shows that the public debt of France is per head of population more than one-third greater than that of England, Austria, or Italy, and three times as great as that of Germany, and calls this a low estimate. He winds up by saying: "In spite of all these devices [imperfect statements of liability] of our budget, although we have been constantly taking pains to conceal its real amount by special accounts or occult methods (*quoique nous ayons eu une préoccupation constante d'en dissimuler, par des caisses spéciales ou des expédients occultes, la grosseur réelle*); it is, nevertheless, plain, from all the testimony, that the French budget largely (*d'une façon considérable*) surpasses in all its principal features the budgets of the other six great States of Europe. This situation," he adds, "cannot last without, in the long run, seriously affecting the national vitality (*sans que la vitalité nationale à la longue en soit profondément atteinte*)." It will be seen that this is a far more serious charge than the one we have ascribed to him, of thinking a "Treasury collapse of some kind not far away." If the latter be "words of treason," what must the former be? And let us add that there could not be, to our minds, a stronger illustration of the risky condition of French finances than the fact that a Frenchman of M. Reinach's intelligence thinks it treasonable to express alarm about them. Our assertion about what other "shrewd financial heads" thought of the situation was possibly indiscreet, because it was based on private information, which is—of course, without meaning to reflect in any way on M. Reinach's good faith—more valuable to us than his general denial can possibly be.

As to the condition of popular sentiment about Gen. Boulanger, that is, of course, a matter of opinion about which it is useless to bandy contradictions. All we can say is, that our view of it is shared by hundreds of excellent political observers, both in France and in foreign countries. That Gen. Boulanger himself shares it, may fairly be inferred from the