

open battle, but even these could not make him a nobler specimen of manhood than the Indian, nor an enemy more to be dreaded in the final outcome of a quarrel. While, too, with the European a faculty for combined movement originated a duty of fealty and strict obedience, the Indian kept himself always free to live and fight as he might choose. Nor was this independence of spirit a source of wrangling and vulgar dispute, since the spirit of individualism was not accidental but natural; and whilst it ultimately made the red a victim to the white race, it demonstrates the proud superiority of the Indian character. The excess of European chivalry was not less fantastic than grotesque, but the extreme of Indian chivalry was never such as to rouse us to laughter or contempt. If we compare the Don Quixotes of the period of the decline of chivalry with King Philip, Tecumseh or Thayendanege, representatives of the closing years of Indian racial existence and domination, we shall see how the one becomes ridiculous because it was not natural, while the other moves us to sadness because of its end.

If, too, repose is the flower of greatness, then must it also be added to the general picturesqueness of the Indian character, for surely no people have possessed it in greater perfection.

With regard to vices, of which both races had their share, it is but simple truth to say that the Indian race was the much less vicious of the two. In the Indian age theft was unknown amongst red