

France can plead that he is only adopting an expedient to which public men of high moral tone have given the sanction of their example. Nevertheless, we cannot wonder that some of his well-wishers have joined his estimable uncle in asking what he does or expects to do *dans cette galère*.

The Republic—though weakened and at some points especially—has too much vitality to be killed outright by any coalition. The Opposition is mainly composed of those who call themselves Conservatives, but the conservative instincts of a large and important class are in favour of the Republic, simply because the members of that class hate change. It is vain to tell them that they will be better off if the Opportunists were put out of the way. They are Opportunists themselves, and only ask to be left in quiet. They are doing very well, and the hubbub of a *coup d'état* or a revolution is the last thing that they desire. The Republic has already exceeded the years of Louis Philippe's reign, and equalled those of the Second Empire, and its hold on power is still too strong to be shaken off by a man who has shown so much regard for his personal safety and comfort as Boulanger has during the crisis of the last few months.

#### A PLEA FOR AN OLD INSTITUTION.

The African negro has of late been coming, in a remarkable way, to the front. The nations of Europe are vying with each other for his protection against his natural foe. The nations of America that once regarded him as a chattel are considering how they may best elevate him in the moral and intellectual scale. An emperor and an emperor's daughter have not scorned to take a friendly and personal interest in his welfare. Men of philosophic mind have written the story of his enslavement and asked whether it was the discipline itself that was wrong or only the horrors of cruelty with which it was associated. The greatest of English generals has deemed the negro's military capacity not unworthy of his study and has devoted a thoughtful article, based on history and multifarious recent observation, to the subject. Lord Wolseley's conclusion is virtually the same as that at which Col. Williams, himself of African origin, arrived in his history of the negro's share in the Civil War. The British and the American writer agree that the negro can be made an excellent soldier by strictly enforced subordination, whereas, if left to himself, he would flee from danger on the first opportunity. Perhaps, in that respect, he is not very unlike the majority of other races. There are, doubtless, nations and men to whom valour comes by nature, being an inheritance, but, after all is said, most commanders know how little confidence can be placed in natural bravery (save in exceptional cases) without discipline to fall back upon.

But, whatever may be the possibilities of the negro, as citizen or as soldier, it must be admitted that, left to himself, he would never emerge from the obscure savagery of his native home. How, then, is he to be rescued from the influences that surround him—influences that have kept him degraded since history took cognizance of him? The Christian world has recently been aroused from apathy by the fervent words of Cardinal Lavigerie, which were uttered just in time to give Germany a pretext for intervening for ends of her own in the affairs of East Africa. The want of tact with which her operations for the salvation of the natives were carried on seems to have caused grave misunder-

standing in the minds of the latter as well as in those of their Arab masters. The Arab has for some time past been denounced as all that is bad and his treatment of the negro has been represented to be inhuman. A quarter of a century ago, before Christendom had quite discarded slave-holding, milder language was used, and even now there are a few Christians (some of them even clergymen) who decline to join in the outcry. The negro, they say, is the better, not the worse, for intercourse with the Arab, who is, at least, superior to himself. Only by some such ordeal as the Arab would now impose, as the Christian has only ceased to impose, can the negro's status be improved.

If we cannot hear the Arab's side of the question from his own lips, we have had the opportunity of hearing a similar plea, even at this late day, from a clergyman of the Southern States. Addressing an audience in Calvary Church, New York, some months ago, the Rev. Dr. A. Toomer Porter gave his own experience of the condition of the coloured people in the South before the Civil War. He points to 6,000,000 of less or more civilized Americans of African blood, and asks whether such a result could have been accomplished in any other way than servitude. Could the half million, that have grown into six millions, have come and settled in New England or in the Southern States on a par with the other inhabitants? The answer must be in the negative. The naked savage, who was taken from a state of slavery in the first instance, was housed, fed, clad and, at least to some extent, enlightened by contact with civilized masters. The house servants, nurses, cooks, butlers, coachmen, and other favoured slaves, were taught courtesy and good breeding, which, in turn, they imparted to the field hands. The moral status may not have been of the highest, but at any rate, argues Dr. Porter, it was above barbarism. Occasionally slaves learned to read and write. They could all be members of churches—half a million being so classed in 1861. The condition of the negro to-day is not due to emancipation but to the training that preceded it. Dr. Porter, like other Southerners, thinks that the truth of the matter should be acknowledged by the North as well as the South, now that they are co-operating to complete the education of the negro. Now, the Arab culture is, doubtless, inferior to the American. But, such as it is, it is claimed for it that it raises the African to at least a higher status than he held before. There is, moreover, no distinction of colour in the Moslem creed. Before Allah, black, yellow and white are alike. Hardly as much can be said for American Christianity. But for whatever the latter has done for the negro, it was, in Dr. Porter's opinion, the peculiar institution of the South that gave it its largest opportunities.

It would be interesting to know what the more enlightened of the African race on this continent think on this question. Not long since a storm of indignation was raised in a Southern town by the unflattering comments of a coloured editor on the moral and intellectual condition of his white fellow-citizens. He went so far as to say that, if the whites (meaning, doubtless, that element in the white population that used to be contemptuously described as "poor white trash") were driven from the South altogether (and he even indulged in a prediction that such a forcible exodus would ultimately—at no distant date, perhaps—take place), the coloured people would make it a very different country from what it is. Such language,

though uttered, we may suppose, under strong provocation, is simply absurd. There is nothing in the record of either Hayti or Liberia to justify such a boast, which is an insult not only to the South which enslaved, but to the North which emancipated. Even before the Civil War there were in the South (in Louisiana especially) many free negroes, some of them men of property—some of them even slave-holders. Since the war negroes are found in the professions, in mercantile life, in the magistracy, in the ranks of the nation's law-makers. Of the six millions and more that constitute the coloured population of the United States, a considerable proportion has, at least, the rudiments of education, and the present generation enjoys fair educational facilities. There is nothing, certainly, to match this in the results of missionary operations in benighted Africa, and, whether it be palatable or not, the fact is there that, by making the black the bond slave of the white man, the former has, in the course of time, been initiated into the habits, industries and aspirations of civilized life. The school may have been a harsh one, but it was not, even in its day of terror, without redeeming features; and, if any one should be inclined to excuse the past for the sake of the present, it is the civilized, educated, enlightened negro of the South, who stands on a level so far above his kinsman of the Dark Continent—a level to which Siberia and Hayti have not attained, and probably never will attain.

#### THE ROLL OF BATTLE ABBEY.

The roll of Battle Abbey is not in existence. There was such a roll suspended in the great hall of the building, and it bore the names of 645 knights; but it has disappeared long ago, as well as the other relics of the battle, which were removed to Cowdray and perished in the conflagration of 1793. We are, therefore, reduced to deal with copies or imperfect lists, of which there are several. The four lists which appear to be most authentic are (1) Duchesne's list, taken from the Abbey charter, containing 405 names; (2) Leland's collection, with 498 names; (3) Magny's catalogue, with 425 names; (4) Delisle's, called "The Dives List," with 485 names. These are all of a much later date than the Conquest, and it is well known that the heralds of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were not scrupulous in adding names to the "Libro d'Oro" of Battle. The most unquestionable record is that of Wace in the "Roman de Rou." He names 118 knights or barons, and he says he could have named many more. Twenty-seven of these are progenitors of noble English families or otherwise celebrated. The difficulty of identifying these doughty personages is increased by the fact that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries family surnames were not commonly in use. Christian names were given in baptism, and territorial names, taken from the place of abode or from the estates or fiefs held by the family or the individuals, were added. Sometimes the name of an office, or a nickname derived from some personal peculiarity, was assumed, such as Conestable, Le Brun, or Le Fort, which became in time the family names of Constable, Browne, Fortescue. The royal house of France had no family name. We doubt if the descendants of Rollo the Norseman had any name; they became Robert or William of Normandy. Throughout the Middle Ages the families and their branches were known by their territorial possessions. Their place of origin or *habitat* becomes, therefore, the essential key to their genealogies. After the Conquest the Norman lords of British fiefs frequently added their foreign appellation to their English manors. The following are instances: Hurst-Monceaux, Tarring-Neville, Drayton-Bassett, Melton-Mowbray, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Stanstead-Rivers, and many others. —*The Edinburgh Review*.