

stration. In the reign of Charles I., Turkish—or Barbary—pirates swept the English Channel, not only capturing vessels, but landing on the coasts, carrying off men, women and children. Under the Commonwealth, “complaints of piracy, in the strict sense, are very few, and there is not a single reference to the presence of a Turk in the narrow seas.”

A. T. MAHAN.

*Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu.* Par GABRIEL HANOTAUX. Tome II., Première Partie. Le Chemin du Pouvoir; Le premier Ministère (1614–1617). (Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie. 1896. Pp. 199.)

M. HANOTAUX belongs to the distinguished Frenchmen who have won laurels both in politics and literature. As secretary for foreign affairs he has displayed a sagacity which shows that he has not studied in vain the career of a great diplomat like Cardinal Richelieu. To literature M. Hanotau has made but one contribution, his History of Richelieu, the second volume of which has just appeared, and this has already secured for him a seat in the French Academy. Possibly his success as a diplomat has somewhat assisted in his prompt reception as an academician, for the Immortals are not averse to receiving among their number those who occupy prominent political positions. Yet the merits of the work well entitled M. Hanotau to be admitted into the body which is supposed to contain the most eminent of French writers.

The size of the present work may possibly discourage those who wish to absorb their historical knowledge in the most condensed form. M. Hanotau has already completed one portly tome, which covered Richelieu's early life, together with a masterly review of the political and social condition of France at the beginning of his career. The present publication contains apparently only half of the second volume, and it extends to the close of Richelieu's brief and somewhat inglorious ministry under Mary de' Medici. If the work is continued with the same ample proportions, several volumes will be required for the seventeen eventful years during which Richelieu controlled the destinies of the French people. Yet the career of the great cardinal was so influential in the development of the French government, it was so filled with dramatic interest, so connected with great crises in European history, that it deserves to be examined with a degree of care which only historical students would bestow on less important periods.

Of the manner in which M. Hanotau has done his work there is little to criticise. When his labors are completed the history of a great man will have been fitly told. This is high praise and it is just praise.

The present volume begins with the States-General of 1614, the last session of that body until 1789. Richelieu, the bishop of Luçon, was naturally selected as one of the deputies of the clergy, and had the opportunity, for which he greatly longed, to show himself on the field of politics. M. Hanotau has a taste for pictorial delineation; it is an art

in which he excels. He describes the long procession, brilliant in the varied costumes by which rank and office were then distinguished, in which the States marched to Notre Dame and there listened to the opening address in which they were bidden by Cardinal Sourdis, as a maxim for their future labors, to fear God and honor the king. If there was much that is curious and interesting in the proceedings of the States-General of 1614, there was little of permanent importance; the most important service they rendered the country was the opportunity they furnished the young bishop of Luçon to bring himself to the attention of the court.

Mary de' Medici was then the ruler of France; her son was no longer a minor, having passed the age of thirteen, but he was an ill-educated, slow-minded and backward boy, and she exercised as complete authority as when she was regent of the kingdom. To the source of power the young aspirant at once turned his attention. In later years Mary de' Medici hated Richelieu with an intensity that few could equal, and certainly she had no cause to love him, but at the beginning of his career his hopes of political prominence seemed to rest in the favor of the queen. Even if the future cardinal did nurse visions of personal power, he knew that he must first find his way to office through the good will of those who controlled the appointments to office.

Richelieu took no very prominent part in the debates of the clergy; his practical mind must have realized how void of effect their deliberations would be. But he became known by his discreet conduct in the questions which occasionally disturbed the tranquility of the States. In January, 1615, the session was about to close and the three orders were ready to present to the king the results of their labors, with the prayer that he would receive them with favor. To represent one of the orders on this great and solemn occasion was an honor dear to the ambitious. The friends of the queen-mother suggested that it would be agreeable to her if the bishop of Luçon were chosen as spokesman for the church, and such an intimation was received with submission by a loyal clergy.

The address of the bishop of Luçon was labored and creditable, but it gave little intimation of any extraordinary political ability in the orator. He expressed, indeed, an earnest desire that the clergy should take an active part in the councils of the king, and the wisdom of such a policy he demonstrated by many instances from the past. Such an utterance was, however, to be expected from any one who acted as spokesman for the order. As for Richelieu's real desires, if the bishop of Luçon could be raised to power, he cared little whether the church had any other representatives in the royal councils.

The session of the States-General came to an end to the great satisfaction of the court; their cahiers were received by the king to be answered in due time, and were allowed to be forgotten; but the bishop of Luçon preferred watching the opportunities for political promotion to returning to an obscure and remote diocese, there to minister to the wants of his flock. He did not have to wait long. Concini had married

a waiting woman whom Mary de' Medici brought with her from Florence, and both the husband and the wife were firmly intrenched in the favor of the queen. He was given great establishments, he was made a marshal of France, and as *Maréchal d' Ancre* the Italian adventurer, under an Italian queen, became the most powerful man in the kingdom. Richelieu did not hesitate to enroll himself among the followers of the prosperous adventurer. When his own power was established he was the haughtiest of men, but he did not scruple to prostrate himself before one whose weak and greedy character he must soon have discovered. The future cardinal had the qualities by which men insinuate themselves into place, and he had also the qualities which fit men to hold place. Those who would shine in public station, but cannot bring themselves to take the steps by which often it must be secured, may be estimable citizens, but they do not help to shape the destinies of a nation.

The ministers of Henry IV. were still in office, but they were not viewed with favor by Concini, and in 1616 they were dismissed. Their places were filled by men little known in political life; two were lawyers, the third was a financier, and the fourth was the bishop of Luçon. He was only thirty-one when he became secretary of state, and an influential member of the government. No one suspected the extraordinary fortune that lay before him, nor the manner in which he would exercise his power. In the States-General he had manifested zeal for his order, and since then he had actively espoused the interests of Concini and the queen-mother. "We could desire nothing better than the bishop of Luçon," wrote the papal nuncio, a sentiment that would not have been echoed by the pope twenty years later. The Spanish ambassador was equally complacent and equally deceived. "In all France," he wrote, "I do not believe there are two men as zealous as he for the service of God and of the Spanish crown, and for the general good." By the enemies of Concini the new secretary was included in a common category of abuse. "This stranger," said the manifesto of the princes, "has dismissed men of merit, and put in their places his own creatures, unfit persons, inexperienced in matters of state and born for servitude."

The new minister had little time to show whether his character was correctly judged by friends or foes. The attention of the court was occupied by the intrigues for Concini's overthrow, and the insurrections of unruly nobles, jealous of his power and desirous of making fresh inroads upon the treasury. On such malcontents in later years Richelieu was to lay a heavy hand, but his time had not yet come.

In the instructions he gave the representatives of France in foreign lands we can, however, find suggestions of the policy which he was to follow in the future. He wrote Schomberg to cultivate the good will of the minor German states, and declared that the Protestant princes should seek the friendship of France; in words that would have surprised his friend, the Spanish ambassador, he said no one need fear that as a result of the Spanish marriages France would forget her own interests in her zeal for Spain. "In matters of state," he added, "no one is so blind as to think a Spanish Catholic better than a French Huguenot."

In November, 1616, Richelieu was made secretary of state, and in the following May he was dismissed from office. When the Maréchal d'Ancre was murdered, the ministers he had chosen were involved in his overthrow. Richelieu fared better than some of his associates; Barbin was sent to the Bastille, but Richelieu's ecclesiastical character secured for him respectful treatment. He even hoped for continuance in office, and showed a willingness to treat Luines, the new favorite, with the same subservience that he had shown Concini. He had no opportunity to do so; the seals of office were taken from him and he retired from court to follow, very reluctantly we may be certain, the declining fortunes of Mary de' Medici.

Here M. Hanotaux for the present leaves his hero. We hope that political success will not too much interfere with the completion of a great historical work. M. Hanotaux has exhausted the sources of information, not only as to Richelieu's own career, but as to the period in which he lived. He possesses the qualities of an historical investigator, unwearied industry, skill in narrative and ability to enter into the feelings and politics of another age. In the science of history French writers during the last twenty-five years have proved themselves the equals of those of any other country. Taine, Broglie, Sorel and their compeers have shown that accuracy of scholarship can be combined with the artistic skill which makes the history of the past alike interesting and instructive; and M. Hanotaux deserves an equal meed of praise.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

*The Physiocrats.* Six Lectures on the French Économistes of the Eighteenth Century. By HENRY HIGGS. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1897. Pp. x, 158.)

THE publication of Professor Oncken's edition of Quesnay's complete works in 1888 has been followed by a shoal of monographs from Professor Oncken's pupils and others which have cast a good deal of fresh light on the personal and literary relations of the Physiocrat group. But this new "literature" is scattered, and some of it not readily accessible; and Mr. Higgs has done a real service to students of the history of economic thought in bringing together in a brief and compact form the chief biographical and bibliographical conclusions which emerge from all this recent investigation. "Biographical and bibliographical," I have said; for Mr. Higgs informs us in his preface that he has intentionally "restricted critical and doctrinal comment within the narrowest limits." Mr. Higgs is one of those who believe, for their own happiness, that "a clear and cogent theory of value, the kernel of economic science," has actually been "established," and that "in the present generation" (p. 125); so that he would seem to enjoy advantages as a critic of Physiocracy denied to some of his predecessors. But the pages actually devoted here to criticism (especially p. 124) incline one to believe that Mr. Higgs's strength lies rather in historical investigation (where he has already abundantly exhibited it in his papers on Cantillon) than in