

before. In the development of the plot, we see the machinations of the Society involving in ruin all that is good and loveable among the *dramatis personæ* of the piece : the just, the generous, the honourable,—the unsuspecting maiden,—the kind master,—the attached father,—the devoted friend,—all become, in turn, the victims of the meanest and basest villany ; and Jesuitism, devoid of all tinge of pity and remorse, exults over them as they perish. We do not wonder how the admirers of such a work should learn to hate the Jesuits. It seems suited to accomplish, amid the superficiality of the present age, in the innumerable class of French novel-readers, the effects which were produced in a higher order of minds rather more than a century and a-half ago by the “Provincial Letters of Pascal.” The English reader who has read the “Wandering Jew” will be better able to estimate from the perusal than before, the intense hatred of the Jesuits which animated, in their late outbreak, the insurgent Switzers of Vaud and Argovia.

But we can see no elements of permanency in the principles marshalled against them, either as embodied in the characters of Eugene Sue, or as illustrated from time to time by the minute portions of passing history. The controversy does not lie between truth and error, but between antagonist errors. The determined assailants of priestly superstition and villany are themselves the asserters of principles which, if reduced to practice, would subvert all public morals ; and for the false belief which they would so fain extinguish, they would substitute an unnatural vacuum, into which other false beliefs would assuredly crowd. Nay, in the fictions of Eugene Sue we already see the phantoms of a false faith crowding into the gap. All the honest devotees which he draws are exhibited as weak in proportion to the strength of their religious feelings. Their religion is represented as forming a mere handle, by which they are converted into the tools of designing