

touched with the skill and care of a shrewd, observant, and indefatigable inquirer.

The obvious drawback to the acceptability of the work is a lack of the judicial spirit manifest from first to last. In the preface our author says, "It is a doctrine of Confucius, that 'True virtue consists in avoiding extremes ;' and in the following pages I shall do my utmost to profit by this instruction, in order that the Turk may be weighed fairly in the balance." But we do not get to the end of the introduction without finding that, sincere as Col. Baker's desire to be impartial no doubt was, he could not succeed in being so. "Broad and sweeping condemnation of the whole nation," he rightly reproves ; and, unfortunately, it is too common a practice. Still there is no use in striving to present the Ottoman Empire as the victim of destiny, circumstances, or the inveterate hostility of "a foreign power." Russia is to him a *bête noire*, to whose charge must be laid all the bad government, all the feuds, all the rebellions, all the atrocities. Now in Mr. Ralston's admirable paper on "Turkish Story-books," in *The Nineteenth Century*, we have proof conclusive that the rottenness of Turkish administration was apparent to the satirist Nabi Effendi, in 1634. Peter the Great had been joint Czar for twelve years at that date ; he was not sole Muscovite ruler until two years after. Let us listen to Nabi's expostulation. Every office was purchasable, as it is now ; every pasha received bribes and extorted money. "His officers are so many bare and hungry oppressors, who go about pillaging, leaving behind them universal ruin and desolation. When laws are respected they stifle rebellion and stay the course of all disorders, for who would dare to spoil the weak ? Who would vex the rajahs and drive into revolt ?" So it is clearly evident that long before Peter's apocryphal will, there was tyranny, cruelty, and extortion in European Turkey. Col. Baker admits the venality of Turkish officials, from the tide-waiter up to the Sultan's relatives. He even proposes to change the Moslem battle-cry to "There is no God but God, and *backshish* is his prophet." He denounces the abominableness of the judicial system, —the cause of which is not Russia, but the Koran and the horrible legal code, fully exposed by Captain Osborne in his admirable articles in the *Contemporary*. He tells us that there are no roads, properly speaking, in the country ; that the money squeezed out of the rajahs is expended on palaces and seraglios at the capital ; and every word he utters about the richness of that unhappy country in agricultural, mineral, and manufacturing resources, makes against his client. For the Bulgarian atrocities of May, 1876, he makes no apology ; but it was all Russia's fault. The entire troubles of 1867 and 1875-6, are all traced in imagination to Russia ; in fact, no further than the Slavonic Committees of Bucharest and Belgrade. That Russia has fomented these intrigues is not only probable, but proveable ; still there is no necessity for laying the guilt at her door, just of getting up a "so-called" rebellion, and then of ordering "panic-stricken authorities" to order the massacre ; for Col. Baker has too much regard for truth to deny that the May atrocities were deliberately ordered from Constantinople. He denies that the Bulgarians even rose in rebellion. The natural inquiry then is, What possible justification could be pleaded for the outrages of last year ? Every argument urged about the