

government by ministers of the Khedive. A well-known banker of Alexandria, a European, was travelling in the same carriage with us, and on the way we had some conversation. At an unimportant station he was greeted by two men of the country, cultivators or corn-dealers of a superior class, Mohammedans, who at once engaged with him in earnest talk. On resuming the journey, I asked my fellow-traveller what had been the subject of discussion, so full, judging from the manner of those engaged, of interest and amusement.

"Oh!" he replied, "they were talking to me about Mr. Cave's report. They say that in anticipation of Mr. Cave's enquiry, the Khedive ordered the collection of a year and a half's taxes in one sum, and in advance, and that the amount was then set down as one year's payment, in order to deceive the British financier. And the worst of it is," he added, "the wretched fellahin expect that the tax-gatherers will come round all the same, and treat the payment, which was said to be for a year and a half, as an extraordinary affair—a sort of backshish for the Khedive."

In passing through Egypt, I looked with all the care I could command to find traces of that intelligent government which has been so often attributed in England to the Khedive. I compared what I observed with all that I have seen in Turkey and Persia; and though in this comparison there was a marked difference, with much advantage on the side of Egypt, I saw everywhere, in native hideousness, in the rural districts and in the towns, beneath the sham civilization of modern Egypt, the horrid features of slavery and its twin, polygamy, with the universal degradation which follows in the train of these institutions of Mohammedanism. The people of Egypt are far less civilized, less intelligent, incomparably more ignorant and cruel, than the most wretched of the Christian subjects

of the Porte; and Egypt differs notably from European Turkey in the fact that the overwhelming majority of the people are Musselmén. There are many in England who, in the devotion of their lives and language to horses, seem as much disposed to serve as to rule the four-footed animal; and that a horse can show itself superior to men is officially demonstrated at least once a year in Cairo, when the mounted Sheik-ul-Islam rides over the prostrate bodies of fanatics, or, as some say, of hirelings. The unwilling quadruped, shoved forward by the hands of modern Egyptians, its brute nature revolting from a cruelty to men, while they, the bipeds, affect to regard the animal as the instrument of a miracle, is a spectacle the human degradation of which is perhaps deepened by the presence of cultivated Europeans as interested spectators. My impression is, that a good many English *en voyage* (and the French and Germans are very often no better) are attracted, rather than repelled, by disgusting exhibitions; and that if only a spurious halo of propriety were thrown over the scene by the name of religion, they would throng to observe circumcision, or human sacrifice, or even the culinary operations of cannibals. Yet as to the last I am perhaps wrong, for in that there would be an element of personal danger. It is then they shrink—it is then they show a surprising keenness of apprehension. "See how they run" when cholera has invaded their hotel, or the waves their steamboat. But they will stand, in seeming approval, while the people of the foreign country in which they are sojourners degrade and deface humanity; they will smile at the performance of horrid cruelties of which the law would take cognizance at home; they will flock to witness the performance of exercises associated with gross, and to them patent, superstitions; they will do all this, without a sign of disgust or disapproval.

