

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*TESTIMONY OF NAPOLEON I. WITH REGARD
TO CHRIST.*

MANY of our readers have, without doubt, in the course of their reading, come across statements that professed to be the testimony of Napoleon I. with regard to Christ. They may have met with those statements sometimes in the form of a mere sentence, sometimes as an extract of less or greater length, and sometimes in the form of a separate tract. But if their experience has been the same as ours, they must often have asked, but asked in vain, What is the authority on which such statements rest? For whatever their form, we have all but invariably found them given without any exact and explicit reference to the original authority, a defect which to many minds must deprive them of most of their weight.

We recently had occasion to look somewhat carefully into the question of the genuineness of this alleged testimony, and after a little trouble succeeded in getting pretty well to the root of the matter, and reaching such 'ground as the case seems to admit of. We venture to think that it may be interesting to not a few of our readers to learn the result of our investigation; and accordingly we proceed to lay before them, first of all a statement with regard to the authority on which the alleged testimony rests, and then a tolerably full translation of the testimony itself.

The reader may find the narrative of a careful investigation of the question by Dr. Schaff, of New York, the well-known Church historian, in his interesting volume on the *Person of Christ*.¹ Dr. Schaff there tells us that he found the testimony in Abbot's *Life of Napoleon*, and also in Abbot's *Confidential Correspondence of the Emperor Napoleon with the Empress Josephine*, "without however being

¹ Pp. 219-250.

traced to a reliable source." He made what investigation he could in America, but without any more definite result than the discovery of the name of the book which he suspected might be,¹ and which actually is, the original source, although he failed to ascertain the fact, through not being able to find a copy of it in the libraries of New York. He refers to a printed letter of Professor de Felice of Montauban, in which the professor "asserts, that the testimony as published in the French tract [referred to below] is undoubtedly genuine, but gives no proofs." He latterly entered into correspondence with several gentlemen in France, and amongst them Pastor Bersier, who however, while they affirmed the genuineness of the testimony, were unable to trace it up to the unquestionably original authority. At the close of the narrative of his investigation, Dr. Schaff prints the testimony in the form in which it is given in tract No. 200 of the Religious Tract Society of Paris, and then as given in tract No. 477 of the American Tract Society. He adds, "It will be seen that the French and English differ considerably, but they breathe the same spirit." We shall immediately see the complete explanation.

In endeavouring to hunt up the original source we fared no better in Edinburgh than Dr. Schaff did in New York. But in trying Paris we met with more success. The book which is the original source is now lying before us, and in its latest edition bears the title, *Sentiment de Napoléon I^{er} sur le Christianisme, d'après des témoignages recueillis par feu le chevalier de Beauterne.*² Nouvelle édition. Par M.

¹ In the first edition (1880), he says the testimony is "probably derived" from the book referred to; and in the second edition he says, "It seems to have been published first in 1842 and 1843 in periodicals and tracts, and also in the [said] book" (p. 224 in both editions).

² Beauterne was an ardent Roman Catholic and a great admirer of Napoleon. He was the author of other two works: *Mort de l'Enfant impie*, and *L'Enfance de Napoléon*.

Bouniol (Paris : Bray, 1868). It is from the *fifth chapter* of this work, according to the numbering in this edition, that all the different forms of the testimony have been originally derived. The exact title of the third edition of Beauterne's book (1843) was, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme : conversations religieuses recueillies à Sainte-Hélène par M. le général comte de Montholon* ; from which it appears that the earlier editions actually bore on the title-page the name of Montholon as the authority for the conversations therein reported. The new edition now before us professes to have been in some respects abridged and in others enlarged by Bouniol, its late editor ; but its fifth chapter seems to have undergone no change, except it may be the omission of sentences or portions here and there. Further, we may add that this same chapter, which is indeed the kernel of the book, was also reproduced in pamphlet form with the title, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur la Divinité de Jésus-Christ : pensées recueillies à Sainte-Hélène par M. le comte de Montholon, et publiées par M. le chevalier de Beauterne* (2^e édition, 1841, Debécourt).¹ Unfortunately however we have not been able to find copies either of this pamphlet or of the third edition referred to above.

Our next object must be to consider whether we can make good the authenticity of the alleged testimony ; and here we must first let Beauterne speak for himself. He says :

“ Of the sources from which I have drawn, the first line is formed by the Emperor's companions in exile [in St. Helena]. But the person to whom my most respectful thanks are due is Count Montholon. I might almost say that the entire collection is much more his work than mine. The literary form is mine. But I affirm, and I repeat it, that the thoughts, the arguments, are the spirit, the language, the work of Napoleon himself.”²

¹ In Lorenz's *Catalogue général de la Librairie française* this brochure is actually entered under the name of Montholon.

² *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*, pp. 14, 15.

Again he says :

“The style and even entire phrases belong to the Emperor, sometimes literally, as for example that sentence which stands at the head of his conversation concerning Jesus Christ: ‘I know men, and I tell you that Jesus is not a man.’”¹

And once more he says :

“I repeat then that my documents are authentic, having emanated from *living and contemporary personages, who have given them to me as the authors or the witnesses of the facts which I recount. All my book is true with regard to principal and essence.*”²

In so far as chapter v. is concerned, the portion with which we have immediately to do, the capital authority is General Montholon. Accordingly we naturally ask, What is the value of Montholon’s authority? There can be no doubt that it is of the highest order. He had the best possible opportunity for being able to report the Emperor’s conversations and sayings. He was his close and faithful companion during all the time of his exile in St. Helena, and in his will the Emperor appointed him one of his executors, leaving him a bequest of 2,000,000 francs, “as a proof of my satisfaction and the filial care which he bestowed on me for six years.”³ M. Marchand, the chief *valet de chambre* of the Emperor in his banishment, wrote to Beauterne: “No one can contradict anything that has been communicated to you by Count Montholon, for he enjoyed the most intimate confidence of the Emperor, and was therefore in a better position than any one else to be acquainted with everything that took place at Longwood” (Napoleon’s home on St. Helena).⁴

We can now take a decided step forward, and one which is of the utmost importance. After Beauterne had published the first edition of his work, he sent an early copy of it to Montholon, who was at that time a political prisoner

¹ *Sentiment de Napoléon*, p. 13.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

in the State prison of Ham. Along with that copy he wrote to him as follows: "I hope that the religious views of the Emperor, collected from your lips, and which I have already read to you in part, I believe, will please you still more in the citadel of Ham than in your apartment in the Luxembourg." To that letter Count Montholon replied on May 30th, 1841: "I have read with a lively interest your work, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*, and I do not think it is possible to express better the religious beliefs of the Emperor."¹ It should also be remembered that Montholon survived until 1853, so that before his death Beauterne's book and extracts from it must have been circulating in France for years with his knowledge, and even with his consent; for, as we have seen, the earlier editions bore his name upon the title-page. Dr. Schaff says that "General Bertrand [to whom the utterances are alleged to have been at least partly addressed] and General Montholon would be the proper vouchers, since they heard and must have repeated the utterances at St. Helena."² We have thus succeeded in getting this condition so far fulfilled, by tracing up the report of the conversation or conversations to Montholon, and in having his authentication of that report.

But now we have to consider whether General Bertrand has anything to say in regard to the matter. He has, and apparently in direct contradiction to the above. When he was in St. Helena with the Emperor, he wrote out to his dictation the memorials of the campaigns in Egypt and Syria. These memorials the general had prepared for publication, but he died on January 31st, 1844, before his purpose had been carried out. The work however was

¹ *Sentiment de Napoléon*, pp. 156 f. Cf. also p. viii. The French is, "J'ai lu avec un vif intérêt votre ouvrage, *Sentiment de Napoléon sur le Christianisme*; et je ne pense pas qu'il soit possible de mieux exprimer les croyances religieuses de l'Empereur."

Person of Christ, p. 223.

published by his sons in 1847, with a long preface from the hand of Bertrand himself, in which he touches on a variety of matters in a somewhat fragmentary way. In this preface he refers to Beauterne's work under its original title,¹ *Conversations religieuses de Napoléon*, and speaks of it with bitterness as a "libel," because of statements which it makes offensive to himself and his wife. He then goes on to say: "In that book one has dared to present to the public, as collected in St. Helena, two pretended conversations between the Emperor and his grand-marshal [Bertrand], the one on the divinity of Jesus Christ, consisting of little less than fifty pages, the other on the existence of God. These two conversations, inclosed in inverted commas, are a pure invention; they do not contain a single word of truth, NOT ONE." Again he says, "Neither in France, nor in the army, nor in the Island of Elba, nor in St. Helena, have I heard Napoleon discussing the existence of God or the divinity of Jesus Christ."² This is very explicit, and is emphatic even to capitals.

What then are we to make of this apparent contradiction? On the one hand, we have the strong and repeated asseverations of Beauterne already given. We have the facts that the contents of the book were read over to Montholon, at least in part, before it was printed, and that an early copy of the printed work was sent to him and read by him with lively interest. Above all, we have Montholon's

¹ *Conversations religieuses de Napoléon*, récit authentique de sa mort chrétienne, avec des documents inédits de la plus haute importance, où il révèle lui-même sa pensée intime sur le christianisme, 1840.

² *Guerre d'Orient : Campagnes d'Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. i., pp. 1, li (Paris, 1847). The French is: "Dans cet écrit on a osé présenter au public, comme recueillies à Sainte-Hélène, deux prétendues conversations entre l'Empereur et son grand-maréchal, l'une sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ, et n'ayant guère moins de cinquante pages, l'autre sur l'existence de Dieu. Ces deux conversations guillemetées sont une pure invention; elles ne renferment pas un seul mot de vrai, UN SEUL. . . . Ni en France, ni à l'armée, ni à l'île d'Elbe, ni à Sainte-Hélène, je n'ai entendu Napoléon disserter sur l'existence de Dieu, ou sur la divinité de Jésus-Christ."

attestation of the contents of the book, and very specially of chapter v., as the best possible expression of the Emperor's religious views. No doubt it must be confessed that the form of this attestation is somewhat general; he does not say in so many words that the conversations are correctly reported; nevertheless, in view very particularly of the strong and repeated protestations and asseverations contained in the book, it practically amounts to this. Furthermore we find Montholon speaking of Beauverne as a "conscientious author," and on one occasion writing to him to "correct certain mistakes to which his standing as a conscientious author might give weight,"¹ so that we may with all the greater confidence accept the material which the general not only allows to pass current for years with his name attached, but which he explicitly endorses. We even find Montholon in another letter confidently referring Beauverne to Bertrand himself as certain to substantiate his report of the Emperor's "religious conversations."² On the other hand, Bertrand's statement is not less, is even more emphatic. It is indeed a flat contradiction. How then is the difficulty to be explained?

If we are to have regard solely to the opinion of the English chroniclers of Napoleon's exile in St. Helena, we should place but little reliance on the veracity of either Montholon or Bertrand, when the supposed glory of the Emperor is concerned. O'Meara speaks of Montholon as one, who, "were he not a poltroon and a liar, would be a most excellent man, and who, but for these two little defects, is a perfect gentleman."³ Forsyth denies "Bertrand's claim to be regarded as a person of veracity," and declares that he "never failed to bear false witness against Sir

¹ *Sentiment de Napoléon*, Letter, pp. 148 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 40.

³ Forsyth's *History of the Captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena*, letter quoted vol. i., p. 186.

Hudson Lowe [the governor of St. Helena], whenever he thought the interests of Napoleon required it.”¹ Of course French writers give the two generals a character directly the opposite; but perhaps it is of more consequence for us to remember that both of them were the close and highly esteemed companions of the Emperor, who was a thoroughly good judge of men, and was not in the least likely to select as his friends men who were mere fools, poltroons, and liars. Moreover both Montholon and Bertrand, especially the former, have left behind them memorials of the Emperor’s life, by which their general veracity may be tested; and from these it appears that, while they show the usual bias of men enthralled by a more powerful personality, there is no sufficient reason for doubting the genuineness of their evidence in reference to such a matter as that before us. Accordingly we regard it as utterly incredible that Montholon should have fabricated, or sanctioned the fabrication of, such a tissue of lies and forgeries, and not only permitted them to be published with his name attached, while his brother general was still living, but even appealed to him for confirmation. On the other hand, we hold it equally incredible that the strong, categorical denial of Bertrand is merely a bit of deliberate hard lying, though it may militate somewhat against its force that it should have been withheld during his life, and only published by his sons three years after his death.

We suggest the following as an explanation of the difficulty. Montholon had apartments and lived in the same house with the Emperor all the time of his exile; Bertrand always lived with his family in a separate house, and for some time at the distance of a mile and a half. Montholon not only lived under the same roof with the Emperor, but in constant and close companionship, dining with him every day. There was thus the most natural and ample

¹ *History of the Captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena*, vol. iii., pp. 303 f.

opportunity for Montholon having numerous conversations on Christianity with Napoleon in the absence of Bertrand. Our solution therefore is, that two or three of the pregnant sentences at the beginning and the close of Beauterne's report may have been incidentally addressed to Bertrand, and the fact forgotten by him, or they may have been related by Montholon through mistake of memory as having been addressed to Bertrand; but that in either case the body of the chapter consists of fragmentary reports of different conversations of the Emperor which took place casually with Montholon or in his hearing, and were worked up and expanded by Beauterne. This view of the chapter is strongly confirmed by the title which it bore when published in the separate pamphlet form referred to above, in which it is described as *Thoughts Collected at St. Helena by Count Montholon*. Moreover this solution, as we shall presently see, is supported by internal evidence, and is in full accordance with the view of the chapter which we had adopted before we were aware of Bertrand's explicit denial. Indeed, Bertrand's volumes prove quite conclusively that, so far as Napoleon's religious views are concerned, he might very well have uttered all that is to be found in Beauterne's chapter, while at the same time he informs us that the Emperor frequently spoke "more like a philosopher than a general."¹

We do not mean to enter at any length into the internal criticism of the special chapter of Beauterne's book now before us, but a few sentences on the subject are necessary. The French editor of our copy says in a foot-note: "Napoleon never uttered at one breath this magnificent apology. The author must have collected and joined together here what was said in different conversations."² This is almost

¹ Cf. *Campagnes d'Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. i., pp. xvi., liv., and very specially a long passage on the Christian religion, vol. i., pp. 205 ff.

² *Sentiment de Napoléon*, p. 87.

certainly correct; and we infer it, not merely from the length of the chapter, but from the fact that we find reduplications in it, which suggest that it consists of reports of different conversations on the same or a cognate subject. Furthermore, the want of a clear, straight line running through it, the obvious roughness of the joinings here and there, and the distinct feeling of fragmentariness occasionally produced in the mind of the reader point to the same conclusion. In any case we cannot accept such a lengthened report taken down after the lapse of years as at all *verbatim*, notwithstanding Beauterne's assertion that the companions of the Emperor faithfully preserved the memory of his conversations "with that scrupulousness and respect which everything inspires that proceeds from a great man." But while there can be no reasonable doubt that the declaration of Bertrand greatly detracts from the weight of the evidence in favour of the genuineness, nevertheless, in view of all the circumstances of the case, we think we may still accept the report as a fairly correct, if somewhat worked up and expanded, reproduction of the substance, with many of the expressions and even occasional brief sentences, of casual conversations of the Emperor. Indeed, the expressions at times authenticate themselves by their characteristic nerve and point, for, as Beauterne remarks, "one cannot counterfeit genius."

The general conclusion to which our investigation has conducted us is supported, so far as we have seen, by the consensus of competent men who have expressed an opinion on the matter. Auguste Nicolas, in a work of decided importance in its day, entitled, *Études philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, quotes a large portion of Beauterne's fifth chapter *verbatim*. He then adds in a footnote: "This judgment of Napoleon with regard to Jesus Christ was published in a book written in 1841, after communication received from General Montholon. Quoted repeatedly and in circum-

stances of responsibility, that judgment passes as historical. Besides, its value does not consist merely in its authenticity, but consists especially in the force of truth which distinguishes it, and the touch of originality of which it bears the stamp. And that again contributes to the support of its authenticity; *one sees there the claw of the lion.*"¹ Lacordaire, who, like Nicolas, was a contemporary and likely to have been well acquainted with the facts, also quotes from the conversations, and evidently accepts them as unquestionably authentic.² Professor de Felice, of Montauban, another contemporary and thoroughly competent authority, as we have already seen, regards the conversations as undoubtedly genuine.³ The late Pastor Bersier held the same view: "I believe in the perfect authenticity [of the reported conversations]. No one, especially at that time, could have invented them"; and then he finishes with almost the same expression as Nicolas, "There is the claw of the lion there."⁴ The author of the article on Napoleon in the *Nouvelle Biographie générale*, after some hesitation, decides in favour of inserting Beauterne's book among the genuine, and not among the apocryphal, Napoleonic literature. The conversations are also accepted as genuine by Luthardt in his *Grundwahrheiten des Christenthums*,⁵ and among English authors by Canon Liddon in his *Divinity of our Lord*,⁶ and Cardinal Newman in his *Grammar of Assent*.⁷ Dr. Schaff also, at the close of his careful investigation, arrives at the same general conclusion: "The conversations are authentic in substance; because they have

¹ Vol. iv., pp. 89 f., 9th edition (Paris, 1855).

² *Conferences on Jesus Christ*, pp. 36 ff. (London, 1870).

³ Schaff, *Person of Christ*, pp. 224 f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, letter to Dr. Schaff, p. 284 (1880).

⁵ Pp. 234, 293, fourth edition.

⁶ Pp. 150 f., eleventh edition.

⁷ Pp. 489 ff., eighth edition. Cf. also Geikie, *Life of Christ*, chap. i.; Farrar, *Witness of History to Christ*, p. 81; and Naville, *The Christ*, p. 174 (Edinburgh, 1880).

the egotistic manner of Napoleon, and are marked by that massive grandeur and granite-like simplicity of thought and style which characterize the best of his utterances."¹

The original source of Napoleon's testimony in regard to Christ is thus to be found in the fifth chapter of the edition of Beauterne's book now before us. When we turn to it we see the difficulty at once cleared up which presented itself to Dr. Schaff; namely, the difference between the French and English tracts as printed by him. Beauterne's fifth chapter is a somewhat long one, extending over thirty-three pages,² and both tracts, being much smaller than the original, consist only of selections therefrom. The selections of which the French tract is composed are naturally to a considerable extent different from those of which the English one is composed. But the French tract is made up of passages taken *verbatim* from the chapter in question. It is indeed sentence for sentence, and word for word, the same as the extracts we find in the work of Nicolas referred to above. The English tract again, as given by Dr. Schaff, is a somewhat larger collection of extracts than the French one; but in going over it carefully we find that every sentence, with the exception of an unimportant one of five lines, which comes in quite abruptly, has its corresponding sentence in the original of Beauterne. It has also a brief introduction to make the tract more intelligible, which is not to be found in our fifth chapter, and which may possibly be derived from the reproduction of this chapter separately published in the form already referred to.

¹ *Person of Christ*, p. 225. The same series of extracts as in Schaff's English tract is given as genuine in a little volume, entitled, *The Table Talk and Opinions of Napoleon*, pp. 112-122 (London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston, 1868); cf. also a brief series of extracts in O'Meara's *Napoleon at St. Helena*, vol. ii., pp. 353 ff. (1888). In none of all the above is Beauterne's book given as the original source, although it is mentioned by Liddon; and, singularly enough, not one of the French authors mentions Bertrand's contradiction. Liddon however does so in a note on p. 151.

² Pp. 85-118.

We now proceed to give a translation of the portions of this chapter which especially bear upon the Person of Christ. Of course our selection differs somewhat from both the French and the English tracts reprinted by Dr. Schaff, but the explanation will now be plain; and we need scarcely add that every sentence has its corresponding sentence in the original.

“One evening at St. Helena the conversation was animated. The subject treated of was an exalted one; it was the divinity of Jesus Christ. Napoleon defended the truth of this doctrine with the arguments and eloquence of a man of genius, with something also of the native faith of the Corsican and the Italian. To the objections of one of the interlocutors, who seemed to see in the Saviour but a sage, an illustrious philosopher, a great man, the Emperor replied: ¹

“I know men, and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man.

“Superficial minds may see some resemblance between Christ and the founders of empires, the conquerors, and the gods of other religions. That resemblance does not exist. Any one who has a true knowledge of things and experience of men will cut short the question as I do. Which of us contemplating in the spirit of criticism the different religions of the nations cannot look their authors in the face and say, “No; you are neither gods nor the agents of the Deity? You have no mission from heaven; you are rather the missionaries of lies. Assuredly you have been kneaded out of the same clay as other mortals.”

“I see in Lycurgus, Numa, Confucius, and Mahomet merely legislators; but nothing which reveals the Deity. On the contrary, I see numerous relations between them and myself. I make out resemblances, weaknesses, and common errors which assimilate them to myself and humanity. Their faculties are those which I possess. But it is different with Christ. Everything about Him astonishes me; His spirit surprises me, and His will confounds me. Between Him and anything of this world there is no possible term of comparison. He is really a Being apart. His ideas and His emotions, the truth which He announces, His method of producing conviction, can be explained neither by the organization of man nor by the nature of things.

There is a long report of a similar conversation given by Las Cases, *Journal of the Private Life and Conversations, of the Emperor Napoleon at St. Helena*, vol. ii., Part Fourth, pp. 129 ff. It begins thus: “In the evening, after dinner, the conversation turned upon religion. The Emperor dwelt on the subject at length. After having spoken for some time with warmth and animation, he said, ‘Everything proclaims the existence of God; that cannot be questioned.’” (Cf. also *Campagnes d’Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. i., chap. v.)

“His birth and the history of His life, the profoundness of His teaching—which truly reaches the very summit of the difficulties, and which is their most admirable solution,—His gospel, the uniqueness of this mysterious Being, His appearance, His empire, His march across ages and kingdoms, all is to me a marvel, a mystery unfathomable: a mystery which I cannot deny, and yet which I am just as unable to explain. Here I see nothing of man. The nearer I approach Him and the more closely I examine Him, the more everything seems above me; everything continues great with a greatness that crushes me.

“His religion is a secret belonging to Himself alone, and proceeds from an intelligence which assuredly is not the intelligence of man. There is in Him a profound originality which creates a series of sayings and maxims hitherto unknown. Jesus borrows nothing from any of the sciences. You find in Himself alone the ideal or example of His life. He is not a philosopher; for He proceeds by the method of miracles, and from the beginning His disciples are His worshippers. He persuades them by an appeal to their moral sense, rather than by the ostentatious display of method and logic. His business is with the soul; He occupies Himself with it, and to it He addresses His gospel. The soul alone satisfies Him as He satisfies the soul. Until the time of His coming the soul was nothing; matter and force were the masters of the world. At His voice everything falls into order. Science and philosophy are henceforth but secondary matters; the soul has regained its sovereignty. All scholastic scaffolding collapses in ruin before that single word, FAITH. What a Master! what a word that must be which effects such a revolution!

“Christ expects everything from His death. Is that the invention of a man? On the contrary, it is a strange course of procedure, a superhuman confidence, an inexplicable reality. In every other existence than that of Christ, what imperfections, what changes! Where is the character which does not bend aside when overthrown by obstacles? Who is the individual that is not moulded by event and place, that does not yield to the influence of the age, that has not compounded with its manners and its passions? I defy you to cite any existence, other than that of Christ, exempt from the least vacillation, free from all such blemishes and changes. From the first day to the last He is the same, always the same, majestic and simple, infinitely severe and infinitely gentle. In the intercourse of a public life He never gives a handle to the smallest criticism; His conduct so prudent compels admiration by its mixture of force and gentleness. Whether He speaks or acts, Jesus is luminous, unchangeable, unmoved by passion. The sublime, some one says, is a mark of the Deity; what name shall we give to Him who unites in Himself all the features of the sublime?

“ Christ proves that He is the Son of the Eternal by His contempt of time; all His doctrines mean one and the same thing, Eternity. How the horizon of His empire extends, and prolongs itself into infinitude! Christ reigns beyond life and beyond death. The past and the future are alike to Him: the kingdom of the truth has, and in effect can have, no other limit than the false. Jesus has taken possession of the human race; He has made of it a single nationality, the nationality of upright men, whom He calls to a perfect life.

“ Christ commands us with authority to believe Him, without giving any other reason than that tremendous word, *I am God*. He declares it. What a chasm He scoops out by that declaration between Himself and all the fabricators of religions! What audacity, what sacrilege, what blasphemy, if it is not true! There is no middle position; either Christ is an impostor or He is God. But the divinity of Christ once admitted, the system of Christian doctrine presents itself with the precision and clearness of algebra. We must admire in it the connectedness and unity of a science. The existence of Christ from beginning to end is a tissue entirely mysterious, I admit; but that mystery meets difficulties which are in all existences. Reject it, the world is an enigma; accept it, and we have an admirable solution of the history of man.

“ Christ never varies, never hesitates in His teaching; and His smallest affirmations are marked with the seal of a simplicity and a depth which captivate the ignorant and the educated alike. Nowhere else do you find that series of beautiful ideas, of beautiful moral maxims, which defile before us like the battalions of the celestial host, and which produce in our mind the same feeling as we experience in contemplating the infinite expanse of the heavens in a clear summer night, resplendent with all the brilliancy of the stars.

“ Christ speaks, and henceforth generations belong to Him by bonds more close, more intimate than those of blood, by a union more sacred, more imperious than any other union beside. He kindles the flame of a love which kills out the love of self, and prevails over every other love. Without contradiction, the greatest miracle of Christ is the reign of love. All who believe sincerely in Him feel this love, wonderful, supernatural, supreme. It is a phenomenon inexplicable, impossible to reason and the power of man; a sacred fire given to the earth by this new Prometheus, of which time, the great destroyer, can neither exhaust the force nor terminate the duration. This is what I wonder at most of all, for I often think about it; and it is that which absolutely proves to me the divinity of Christ.’

“ Here the voice of the Emperor assumed a peculiar accent of ironical melancholy and of profound sadness: ‘Yes, our existence has shone with all the splendour of the crown and sovereignty; and yours, Montholon, Bertrand, reflected that splendour, as the dome of the

Invalides, gilded by us, reflects the rays of the sun. But reverses have come, the gold is effaced little by little. The rain of misfortunes and outrages with which we are deluged every day carries away the last particles. We are only lead, gentlemen, and soon we shall be but dust. Such is the destiny of great men; such is the near destiny of the great Napoleon.

“What an abyss between my profound misery and the eternal reign of Christ, proclaimed, worshipped, beloved, adored, living throughout the whole universe! Is that to die? Is it not rather to live? Behold the death of Christ, and behold that of God!”

“The Emperor was silent; and as General Bertrand equally kept silence, the Emperor resumed, ‘If you do not understand that Jesus Christ is God, ah well! then I did wrong in making you a general!’”

ALEXANDER MAIR.

THE LANGUAGE AND METRE OF
ECCLESIASTICUS.

A REPLY TO CRITICISM.

3. I HAVE, both in my essay and in this paper, shown that when the true glosses are discovered, the lines as a rule agree with the metrical canon; I will however quote a few more specimens before I proceed.

i. 6, *ρίζα σοφίας τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; καὶ τὰ πανουργέματα αὐτῆς τίς ἔγνω;* 7, *εἷς ἐστὶ σοφὸς φοβερὸς σφόδρα καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, Κύριος αὐτός.* 8, *ἔκτισεν αὐτήν, καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐξέχεεν αὐτήν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.*

שרש חכמה אל מי נגלה
ותעלומותיה מי ידע

אחד הוא חכם נורא לחדא

ישב אל כסאו יהוה הוא
בראה וראה וספרה
ויסכנה על כל מעשיו

vii. 12, *μη ἀροτρία ψεύδος (evil, Syr.) ἐπ' ἀδελφῶ σου.*

אל תחרש רע על אחיך