

1234
**THE MONTHLY
REVIEW**

EDITED BY
CHARLES HANBURY-WILLIAMS

VOL. XVII.
OCTOBER—DECEMBER 1904

TORONTO
MORANG & CO., LTD.
90 WELLINGTON STREET WEST
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

INDEX OF AUTHORS

	PAGE
BARNES, MONSIGNOR	Suggestions on the Origin of the Gospels—II. St. Mark . . . Oct. 72
BLACK, CHARLES E. D.	Tibet : The Treaty and Trade . . . Nov. 82
BROOKS, SYDNEY	The Presidential Election . . . Nov. 28
COURTNEY, LEONARD	The Decline of Parliament . . . Dec. 13
CUMMING, A. N.	The Free Kirk and the "Wee" Kirk. Oct. 5
DOBBIE, I.	Rhodesia and the Charter . . . Dec. 94
EGERTON OF TATTON, THE EARL	The Medals of the Italian Renaissance Dec. 33
ELWIN, THE LATE REV. WHITWELL	Thackeray in Search of a Profession . Oct. 88
FELLOWS, ALFRED	The Law of Husband and Wife . . Dec. 146
FISHER, W. J.	Liberal Clubs and the Liberal Party . Dec. 127
HUGHES, REGINALD	Mountaineering Accidents . . . Dec. 137
JERROLD, LAURENCE	Russia, England, and M. Prudhomme Dec. 1
KHALIL SAADEH	Sultan Murad V. Nov. 44
LEGGE, F.	The Secret of the Templars . . . Nov. 93
LOW, A. MAURICE	The Coming Radical Party in America Oct. 106
MANSON, JOHN	The Salvation Army Nov. 56
MARGOLIOUTH, PROFESSOR D. S.	The Autobiography of Zubair Pasha . Oct. 136
MAXWELL, SIR HERBERT, M.P.	Sir William Harcourt Nov. 15
MOLESWORTH, MAJOR P. B., R.E.	The Markings on Mars Oct. 46
NEWBOLT, HENRY	Epistle to Colonel Francis Edward Younghusband Oct. 1
OUSPENSKY, GLEB	"Concerning One Old Woman" . . . Nov. 106
PARKER, E. H.	The Bear's Paw and the Dragon's Claw Oct. 27
PEARSON, NORMAN	Evil Nov. 143

INDEX OF AUTHORS

	PAGE
QUAIL, JESSE	The Postmaster-General as Debt-Collector Oct. 61
ROBERTS, J. SLINGSBY	Elizabethan Crime-Plays Dec. 79
ROSS, JANET	A High-Born Adventuress Oct. 154
ROUND, J. HORACE	The Bayeux Tapestry Dec. 109
RUSSELL, T. O.	The Revival of Gaelic in Ireland Nov. 123
SHEE, G. F.	The Organisation of National Resources Dec. 22
TATHAM, F. S.	How Englishmen are Destroying England Oct. 146
TEASDALE-BUCKELL, G. T.	Instinct in the Making Nov. 134
WARD, WILFRID	Church and State in France Dec. 54
WYLLY, LT.-COL. H. C., C.B.	The Soldiers of the Sirkar Oct. 118
X	Japanese Barbarism Nov. 1

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

	PAGE
Accidents, Mountaineering	REGINALD HUGHES Dec. 137
America, The Coming Radical Party in	A. MAURICE LOW Oct. 106
Autobiography of Zubair Pasha, The	PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH . Oct. 136
Barbarism, Japanese	X. Nov. 1
Bayeux Tapestry	J. HORACE ROUND Dec. 109
Bear's Paw and the Dragon's Claw, The	E. H. PARKER Oct. 27
Church and State in France	WILFRID WARD Dec. 54
"Concerning One Old Woman"	GLEB OUSPENSKY Nov. 106
Crime-Plays, Elizabethan	J. SLINGSBY ROBERTS Dec. 79
Decline of Parliament, The	LEONARD COURTNEY Dec. 13
Elizabethan Crime-Plays	J. SLINGSBY ROBERTS Dec. 79
England, How Englishmen are Destroying	F. S. TATHAM Oct. 146
England, Russia, and M. Prudhomme	LAURENCE JERBOLD Dec. 1
Epistle to Colonel Francis Edward Young- husband	HENRY NEWBOLT Oct. 1
Evil	NORMAN PEARSON Nov. 143
France, Church and State in	WILFRID WARD Dec. 54
Free Kirk and the "Wee" Kirk, The	A. N. CUMMING Oct. 5
Gaelic in Ireland, The Revival of	T. O. RUSSELL Nov. 123
Harcourt, Sir William	SIR HERBERT MAXWELL, M.P. . Nov. 13
High-born Adventuress, A	JANET ROSS Oct. 154
How Englishmen are Destroying England	F. S. TATHAM Oct. 146
Husband and Wife, The Law of	ALFRED FELLOWS Dec. 146
Instinct in the Making	G. T. TEASDALE-BUCKELL . . Nov. 134
Japanese Barbarism	X. Nov. 1
Law of Husband and Wife, The	ALFRED FELLOWS Dec. 146
Liberal Clubs and the Liberal Party	W. J. FISHER Dec. 127

	PAGE
Markings on Mars, The	MAJOR P. B. MOLESWORTH, R.E. . Oct. 46
Medals of the Italian Renaissance, The	THE EARL EGERTON OF TATTON . Dec. 33
Mountaineering Accidents	REGINALD HUGHES Dec. 137
Murad V., Sultan	KHALIL SAADEH Nov. 44
On the Line Oct. 154, Nov. 157, Dec. 158
Organisation of National Resources, The	G. F. SHEE Dec. 22
Parliament, The Decline of	LEONARD COURTNEY Dec. 13
Postmaster-General as Debt-Collector, The	JESSE QUAIL Oct. 61
Presidential Election, The	SYDNEY BROOKS Nov. 28
Prudhomme, M., Russia, England and	LAURENCE JERROLD Dec. 1
Radical Party in America, The Coming	A. MAURICE LOW Oct. 106
Revival of Gaelic in Ireland, The	T. O. RUSSELL Nov. 123
Rhodesia and the Charter	I. DOBBIE Dec. 94
Russia, England, and M. Prudhomme	LAURENCE JERROLD Dec. 1
Salvation Army, The	JOHN MANSON Nov. 56
Secret of the Templars, The	F. LEGGE Nov. 93
St. Mark: Suggestions on the Origin of the Gospels—II.	MONSIGNOR BARNES Oct. 72
Soldiers of the Sirkar, The	LT.-COL. H. C. WYLLY, C.B. . Oct. 118
Suggestions on the Origin of the Gospels— II. St. Mark	MONSIGNOR BARNES Oct. 72
Sultan Murad V.	KHALIL SAADEH Nov. 44
Templars, The Secret of the	F. LEGGE Nov. 93
Thackeray in Search of a Profession	THE LATE REV. WHITWELL ELWIN Oct. 88
Tibet: The Treaty and Trade	CHARLES E. D. BLACK Nov. 82
"Wee" Kirk, The Free Kirk and the	A. N. CUMMING Oct. 15
Younghusband, Epistle to Colonel Francis Edward	HENRY NEWBOLT Oct. 1
Zubair Pasha, The Autobiography of	PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH . Oct. 136

6
3
7
4
8
2
3
1
8
1
16
23
14
1
56
33

EPISTLE

TO COLONEL FRANCIS EDWARD
YOUNGHUSBAND

72
18
72
44
93
88
82
15

A CROSS the Western World, the Arabian Sea,
The Hundred Kingdoms and the Rivers Three,
Beyond the rampart of Himálayan snows,
And up the road that only Rumour knows,
Unchecked, old friend, from Devon to Thibet,
Friendship and Memory dog your footsteps yet.

1
36

Let not the scornful ask me what avails
So small a pack to follow mighty trails :
Long since I saw what difference must be
Between a stream like you, a ditch like me.
This drains a garden and a homely field
Which scarce at times a living current yield ;
The other from the high lands of his birth
Plunges through rocks and spurns the pastoral earth,
Then settling silent to his deeper course
Draws in his fellows to augment his force,
Becomes a name, and broadening as he goes,
Gives power and purity where'er he flows,
Till great enough for any commerce grown
He links all nations while he serves his own.

Soldier, explorer, statesman, what in truth
 Have you in common with homekeeping youth ?
 " Youth " comes your answer like an echo faint ;
 And youth it was that made us first acquaint.
 Do you remember when the Downs were white
 With the March dust from highways glaring bright,
 How you and I, like yachts that toss the foam,
 From Penpole Fields came stride and stride for home ?
 One grimly leading, one intent to pass,
 Mile after mile we measured road and grass,
 Twin silent shadows, till the hour was done,
 The shadows parted, and the stouter won.
 Since then I know one thing beyond appeal—
 How runs from stem to stern a trim-built keel.

Another day—but that's not mine to tell,
 The man in front does not observe so well ;
 Though, spite of all these five-and-twenty years,
 As clear as life our schoolday scene appears.
 The guarded course, the barriers and the rope ;
 The runners, stripped of all but shivering hope ;
 The starter's good grey head ; the sudden hush ;
 The stern white line ; the half-unconscious rush ;
 The deadly bend, the pivot of our fate ;
 The rope again ; the long green level straight ;
 The lane of heads, the cheering half-unheard,
 The dying spurt, the tape, the judge's word.

You, too, I doubt not, from your Lama's hall
 Can see the Stand above the worn old wall,
 Where then they clamoured as our race we sped,
 Where now they number our heroic dead.¹

¹ In the school quadrangle at Clifton, the site from which, upon occasion, the grand stand used to overlook the close, is now occupied by the Memorial to those Cliftonians who fell in the South African War.

As clear as life you, too, can hear the sound
Of voices once for all by "lock-up" bound,
And see the flash of eyes still nobly bright
But in the "Bigside scrimmage" lost to sight.

Old loves, old rivalries, old happy times,
These well may move your memory and my rhymes ;
These are the Past ; but there is that, my friend,
Between us two, that has nor time nor end.
Though wide apart the lines our fate has traced
Since those far shadows of our boyhood raced,
In the dim region all men must explore—
The mind's Thibet, where none has gone before—
Rounding some shoulder of the lonely trail
We met once more, and raised a lusty hail.

"Forward!" cried one, "for us no beaten track,
No city continuing, no turning back :
The past we love not for its being past,
But for its hope and ardour forward cast :
The victories of our youth we count for gain
Only because they steeled our hearts to pain,
And hold no longer even Clifton great
Save as she schooled our wills to serve the State.
Nay, England's self, whose thousand-year-old name
Burns in our blood like ever-smouldering flame,
Whose Titan shoulders as the world are wide
And her great pulses like the Ocean tide,
Lives but to bear the hopes we shall not see—
Dear mortal Mother of the race to be."

Thereto you answered, "Forward! in God's name :
I own no lesser law, no narrower claim.

Our free-born Reason well might think it scorn
To toil for those who may be never born,
But for some Cause not wholly out of ken,
Some all-directing Will that works with men,
Some Universal under which may fall
The minor premiss of our effort small ;
In Whose unending purpose, though we cease,
We find our impulse and our only peace."

So passed our greeting, till we turned once more,
I to my desk and you to rule Indore.
To meet again—ah! when? Yet once we met,
And to one dawn our faces still are set.

HENRY NEWBOLT.

EXETER, *Sept. 10, 1904.*

THE FREE KIRK AND THE “WEE” KIRK

THE remarkable decision of the House of Lords in the case of *The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland v. Overtoun and Others*, delivered upon August 1, has been received in England with more of surprise than appreciation. All that the general public knows is that the overwhelming majority of one Dissenting body in Scotland, which carried out a union with another, has been declared on that ground to have violated the trusts on which it held its property, and has been ordered to make restitution of that property to a small protesting minority. In consequence, buildings and funds, which are estimated at anything between one and ten millions sterling, are now to be handed over to a body of twenty-seven ministers, representing one hundred and three congregations, for the most part living in the Highlands, and with no great knowledge of the world or experience of affairs. As to the reasons for this ecclesiastical upturn, the average Englishman does not concern himself. It used to be said that it required the intellect of a Dean Stanley to understand the Church controversies of Scotland. Certainly the Dean took eccentric views as the result of his understanding. He was wont to say that, taken man for man, the Scots clergy were superior to the English, and yet he was so little converted from his native Erastianism as to declare that, in his opinion, a man would preach and exercise his ministerial functions all

the better for the knowledge that he was a servant of the State and drew a salary in that capacity. Therefore, it is perhaps questionable if Dean Stanley ever really understood what was meant by "spiritual independence." It is probable that he as little appreciated the Evangelical fervour of the Free Church as the missionary zeal of the United Presbyterians, which for two-thirds of a century have produced such extraordinary results, financial and otherwise, and which seemed to have suitably fused in the United Free Church. It is rather to the High Church party that the spirit of the Free Church has been congenial. We cannot forget that Pusey said of its founders: "These men are right, if they are the Church."

HISTORICAL

The difficulty with the Church of Scotland, at all events since the Second Reformation, has always been the question of lay patronage. Strangely enough this did not arise directly out of either John Knox's Confession of Faith, or that of Westminster which was substituted for it in 1647, the First or the Second Book of Discipline, which laid down the constitution of the Church, or the Book of Common Order which settles its service. In 1689, after the struggle under Charles II., the Confession was ratified and the Church established, the Creed, be it noticed, being thus established before the Church. After the Revolution Settlement, a statute of 1689 confirmed what had taken place, and the Presbyterian Church was finally declared to be the Established Church of Scotland. In the same year private patronage in the Church was abolished, the right of nominating ministers being vested in the heritors and elders, with the approval of the congregation and collation of the Presbytery. But in 1712 came the unfortunate statute of Queen Anne, reimposing private patronage which has been the "fons et origo mali" ever since.

The General Assembly protested, but in practice gave the right of election to the heritors and elders alone, thus ignoring the congregations. This led to the secession of Ebenezer

THE FREE KIRK AND THE "WEE" KIRK 7

Erskine, who founded the Church of the Secession in 1733. Similarly, in 1752, Thomas Erskine founded "the Relief Church." In 1747, the Secession Church divided into Burghers and Anti-Burghers on the question of the oath to be taken by burgesses. These again branched off into Old and New Light Burghers and Old and New Light Anti-Burghers.¹ In 1820 the burgesses' oaths were abolished, and the New Light Burghers and Anti-Burghers united to form the "United Secession Church," which again, in 1847 (four years after the Disruption), joined with the "Relief Church" in forming the United Presbyterian Church, which is now the junior partner in the United Free Church.²

THE DISRUPTION

Meanwhile, the issue as to patronage had developed. In 1834 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland passed the Veto Act, prohibiting Presbyteries from inducting a presentee to whom the congregation objected. Several cases were brought to trial in the Law Courts, and in the *Auchterarder* case it was held that a Presbytery which obeyed the Act was acting illegally, since the Veto Act itself was *ultra vires*. On this followed the "Ten Years Conflict," which did not end until, in 1843, one third of the General Assembly seceded and formed the Free Church. As time went on this body drifted further and further away from the Established Church, and approximated to the United Presbyterian Church. But various attempts at union were frustrated. In the early seventies it was decided that no barrier of principle stood in the way,³ and the Union would probably have taken place but for Dr. Begg,

¹ Something of this, at all events, ought to be known to English readers through Mr. J. M. Barrie's delightful "Auld Licht Idylls."

² According to Lord Beaconsfield, in "Lothair," the United Presbyterian Church was really founded by emissaries of the Pope, sent from Rome to Scotland for that purpose.

³ The Mutual Eligibility Act was passed, allowing the ministers of each denomination to take livings in the other.

the great leader of the Constitutional party in the Free Church, who, for reasons which will appear hereafter, dared the majority to take the final step, and warned them that they would do so at the risk of losing their entire property. Thus early were they warned, and the view then taken has been justified in the result.

But during all this time the Established Church had not been idle. In the year 1874, Mr. Disraeli's Government was induced to abolish lay patronage in Scotland, in the hope that such a step would lead to Presbyterian reunion. Only a few of the Free Church came back, and the result was rather to drive the majority of that body into the arms of the United Presbyterians. After prolonged negotiations, the Union was finally agreed to in October 1900 by a majority of 642 to 27 in the Free Church Assembly, and unanimously in the United Presbyterian Synod. As the *Scotsman* has recently observed, the union was purely a business transaction. It was thought that the two Churches in combination would be better able to compete with the Established Church for the ecclesiastical favour of Scotland. In combination its membership amounted to 495,300, as against 661,629 of the Established Church, communicants only being reckoned.

But the minority of twenty-seven in the Free Church Assembly of 1900 was not done with. They objected to the union between the two Churches, holding that the application of the funds and property, congregational or non-congregational, of the Free Church to the purposes of the United Free Church constituted a breach of the trusts on which the funds of the Free Church had been subscribed from 1843 on. By joining the United Presbyterians, the majority had departed from a fundamental principle of the Free Church with regard to the Establishment of Religion, and had also abandoned the doctrine of Predestination, as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

THE ACTION

The action was originally brought¹ in the Scottish Court of Session by the minority, still claiming to be the Free Church of Scotland, against the surviving trustees of that Church who had gone over to the United Free Church and taken the property with them.

It asked for a declaration that the pursuers lawfully represented the Free Church of Scotland, and were entitled to the beneficiary use of all its property. In the alternative, it was claimed that the pursuers had not, by declining to join the United Free Church, lost their claim to a proportionate share in the funds; that these ought not to be handed over to the United Free Church; and, finally, that the defendants ought not to be molested by the pursuers, or excluded from their enjoyment of their proper share.

Such was the general issue raised in the dreadfully long-winded pleadings. There was a second action of a test character brought to determine the ownership of a particular church at Aultbea, held under what is called the "Model Trust Deed"² of the Free Church. The peculiarity of this deed is that the church and buildings are conveyed on the trust that they are to be used as a place of religious worship by a congregation of the Free Church of Scotland, "or of any United Body of Christians composed of them, and of such other body or bodies of Christians as the said Free Church of Scotland may at any time hereafter associate with themselves under the aforesaid name of the Free Church of Scotland, or under whatever name or designation they may assume."

It is not necessary to enter at length into the judgments delivered in this case by the Scottish Court of Session. Lord Low, the Lord Ordinary, or Judge of First Instance, held that the Union with the United Presbyterian Church

¹ The Union was "consummated" in October 1900, and the action was brought in the following December

² This was drawn up in 1844, the year after the Disruption.

did not involve the giving up by the Free Church of any doctrine or principle which formed an essential or fundamental part of her creed or her constitution, but only involved the modification of views which the Church had held under different circumstances in regard to the application of the doctrine of the Confession as to the duty of the State—a modification which it appears, to me, it was entirely within the power of the General Assembly to make.

In the second place, his lordship held that, under the provision in the Model Trust Deed set out above, it was not necessary to have absolute unanimity amongst its members. The minority being, therefore, not the Free Church, had separated themselves from the Free Church, and had consequently no right whatsoever to participate in its property.

As regards the case of the particular church at Aultbea, the same conclusion was arrived at, the case having been exactly contemplated by the Model Trust Deed.

The judgment thus given was affirmed in the Second Division of the Inner House, or Court of Appeal, for Scotland, in July 1902. I do not think it necessary to deal with those judgments at length, and that out of no disrespect to the judges who delivered them, although it is notorious that some extremely disparaging remarks have been made by others in this connection. My reason is rather that every consideration of moment in the earlier judgments, and a good many others, is resumed, traversed, and I think refuted, by the judgments subsequently delivered in the House of Lords. Suffice it to say, that the judgments went on the lines that the Establishment principle was not a fundamental doctrine of the Free Church, and that under the Barrier Act such changes as had been made were legitimate. The Barrier Act had been passed by the General Assembly of the Established Church as long ago as 1697, and "taken over," as it were, by the Free Church when it seceded in 1843. It provided that innovations in "doctrine, worship, discipline, and government" could only be effected after being submitted by the General Assembly to the various Presbyteries, and the consent of the latter bodies obtained. Lord Young added his opinion that "any

THE FREE KIRK AND THE "WEE" KIRK 11

two or more dissenting churches may lawfully unite so as to form themselves into one church, and that nothing more is necessary to their union than their own consent"; and further that there is, in my opinion, no rule of law to prevent a dissenting Church from abandoning a religious doctrine or principle, however fundamental or essential, or from returning to it again with or without qualification or modification. *Whether or not a property title is such that a forfeiture of property will follow such abandonment or return is another matter.*

It was the whole matter, as the Scottish judges were soon to see. Lord Trayner, the third judge, regarded the difference between the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church on the subject of Predestination as "not concerning a matter of faith, but of polity." So, in effect, his lordship adds, was the principle of Establishment. It was a "principle of polity" and not *de fide*. In practice, the Free Church was a voluntary body. If she once believed in the Establishment principle, she had a right to abandon it. The Barrier Act "conferred" on the Established Church a certain legislative power.

The judgment of the Lord Ordinary was accordingly confirmed.¹ Up to this point, therefore, the case had been heard by four judges—all Scotsmen. And all four had decided in favour of the majority of the Free Church.

THE APPEAL

As I have said, it is undesirable to make derogatory remarks about the Scotch decision. But it will at least strike the observer that the judgments delivered in the House of Lords are infinitely more thorough-going than those in the Courts below. From a volume containing a report of the whole proceedings,² it appears that, while the two judgments of Lord

¹ Lord Low decided merely the question of relevancy, whether the action would lie. The Second Division decided it as if on a "concluded proof" and "assoilzied," or absolved the defendants, that is, found in their favour on all points.

² *The Free Church of Scotland Appeals, 1903-4*: by R. L. Orr, M.A., LL.B., Advocate: Macniven and Wallace. London: Hodder and Stoughton. For documents relating to the Free Church position, see "Contentings of the

Low occupy jointly ten pages of print, the judgments of the Inner House are responsible for fourteen. The "opinions" of the House of Lords, on the other hand, occupy fifty-seven pages in all. It is, moreover, certain that no one who really desires to understand the real issues involved in the case can afford to dispense with a perusal of the latter.

The remarkable fact is that, but for the lamented death of one of Scotland's representatives in the Final Court of Appeal, these judgments would probably have been delivered in a different form, and would certainly have had another conclusion.

The appeal against the decision of the Court of Session was first argued in the House of Lords during eight sittings in November and December 1903. The tribunal then consisted of six judges—the Lord Chancellor, Lord Macnaghten, Lord Davey, Lord Robertson, Lord Shand, and Lord Lindley. Before judgment could be delivered Lord Shand unfortunately died. It is believed that he sided with Lords Macnaghten and Lindley in favour of the United Free Church. Had he lived to deliver his judgment, the judges would have been equally divided, in which case the decision of the Court of Session would have stood. It was open to the Lord Chancellor to have decided the matter in spite of Lord Shand's death, in which case the judges would have been three to two in favour of the appeal. As it was, the head of the judiciary decided that a re-hearing should take place, though it is well known that one at least of the law lords protested strongly against such a course being taken, and refused to alter by one jot or tittle the judgment which he had prepared after the first hearing. The Lord Chancellor, however, took the obviously right course. Scottish opinion would not have been satisfied with what must have represented a scratch or casual decision. In room of Lord Shand, two additional law lords—Lord James of Hereford and the Lord Chief Justice of England—were Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland." William Nimmo & Co., Leith.

brought in. The President of the Scottish Court of Session, Lord Kinross, was also invited. But, as he occupied the unique position of having given opinions in favour of both sides when at the Bar, the latest, in 1900, being that the Union might legally take place, his lordship thought better of it, and the country lost what must have been an interesting pronouncement. At the best, or worst, his presence would not have affected the final result.

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE

The opinion delivered by the Lord Chancellor is one of extraordinary virility and independence for a man of seventy-nine. No one can form a true judgment on this great Free Church case without reading it. The question, as he put it, was whether the Free Church, by uniting with the United Presbyterians, had maintained her identity or lost it? Had she changed her views, and if so, had she a right to change them? The law on the case is quite clear. There had been many disputes as to the property belonging to religious bodies, and the Courts are fairly unanimous that the identity of such a body depends on the unity of its doctrine. What were the views held, and what did the founders think important? are the questions to be answered. On this head there is a leading case, which has been affirmed and applied, not only in England but also in Scotland and Ireland. In the case of *Craigdallie v. Aikman*,¹ Lord Eldon said :

With respect to the doctrine of the English law on this subject, if property was given in trust for A. B. C., &c., forming a congregation for religious worship; if the instrument provided for the case of a schism, then the Court would act upon it; but if there was no such provision in the instrument, and the congregation happened to divide, he did not find that the law of England would execute the trust for a religious society, at the expense of a forfeiture of their property by the *cestui que* trusts, for adhering to the opinions and principles in which the congregation had originally united. He found no case which authorised him to say that the Court would enforce such a trust, not for

¹ 1 Dow 16.

those who adhered to the original principles of the society, but merely with a reference to the majority.

The principles thus laid down were adopted for Scotland by Lord Moncrieff in the case of *Craigie v. Marshall* (the *Kirkintilloch* case),¹ and also for Ireland in the case of *Dill v. Watson*.² The principle of these decisions is thus stated by the Lord Chancellor: "No question of the majority of persons can affect the question, but the original purposes of the trust must be the guide."

THE ESTABLISHMENT PRINCIPLE.

The issue thus becomes one of fact. The Free Church minority asserts that the majority, by uniting with the United Presbyterians, has altered its fundamental contract as regards both the principle of Establishment and the acceptance of the Confession of Faith. What are the facts? The Free Church is alleged to have held, as one of its essential principles, that it is the duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God's Word. It also claimed to be the Church of Scotland, freed merely from the control of the Civil Courts in matters spiritual.³ Therefore, at the Disruption, it stood midway between the Established Church and the two Voluntary bodies, the Secession Church and the Relief Church, to which reference has been made.

The proof of this is to be found in the original "Claim,

¹ 12 Young, Tennent, Fraser, and Murray, 560.

² 2 Jones' Reports, 91. Court of Exchequer, Ireland, 1836.

³ Lord Robertson's statement of this claim deserves to be quoted, since it has a literary touch which is somewhat unusual in our judicial pronouncements. "Her theory was, that she was, amid right-hand and left-hand defections, the Church of Scotland, the Church of the first and the second Reformations, the burning bush never consumed. With all Presbyterians, this is a noble claim to allegiance; nor was it the less inspiring in 1843, because the Church had been (as some held unjustly) deprived of the benefits of Establishment, and her loyalty to the principles of National religion was proving itself to be of the sort that is true, although it be not shone upon."

Declaration, and Protest," resolved on by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1842, and adopted by the Free Church in its protest of 1843, made on leaving the Established Church, in which it was declared that the Claim, Declaration, and Protest of 1842, together with the Act of Separation and Deed of Demission, must be "holden as setting forth the true constitution of the Church." In accord therewith, and further explaining them, are Acts of Assembly of 1846 and 1857, with questions and formula thereby sanctioned. These recognise as an essential principle of the Free Church the assertion of the duty of the State to "maintain and support an Establishment of religion in accordance with God's Word," and, as an essential standard of her belief, the Westminster Confession. Even more important, in the Lord Chancellor's view, is the fact that the great opening address, entitled the "Affectionate Remonstrance," delivered by Dr. Chalmers after the Disruption, was circulated by the Free Church for the purpose of obtaining financial support. In order to show how entirely this differs from the principles of the United Presbyterian Church, which has throughout maintained Voluntaryism, short extracts from the two may be printed side by side.

Dr. Chalmers' Address.

The Voluntaries mistake us, if they conceive us to be Voluntaries. We hold by the duty of Government to give of their resources and their means for the maintenance of a Gospel ministry in the land. . . . In a word, we hold that every part and every function of a commonwealth should be leavened with Christianity; and that every functionary, from the highest to the lowest, should, in their respective spheres, do all that in them lies to countenance and uphold it. That is to say, though we quit the Establishment, we go out on the Establishment principle—we quit a

View of the United Presbyterian Church (before the Union) as affirmed at the Meeting of Synod on May 7, 1897.

It is not competent to the civil magistrate to give legislative sanction to any creed in the way of setting up a civil establishment of religion, nor is it either his province to provide for the expense of the ministration of religion out of the national resources. It is Jesus Christ, as sole King and Head of His Church, who has enjoined upon His people to provide for maintaining and extending it by free-will offerings; that this being the ordinance of Christ, it excludes State aid for these purposes, and that adherence to

vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one. To express it otherwise—we are the advocates for a national recognition and national support of religion, and we are not Voluntaries.

it is the true safeguard of the Church's independence.

It is obvious that there is no identity of religious belief here.

PREDESTINATION *v.* A FREE GOSPEL

The second great issue is that of the attitude held by the two uniting Churches towards the Confession of Faith, and in particular towards the doctrine of Predestination set forth in the former. Up to the year 1892, every minister of the Free Church had to declare on being admitted to the Ministry as follows: "I do sincerely own and believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith approved by General Assemblies of this Church to be the truths of God; and I do own the same to be the Confession of my faith." In the basis of Union of the United Presbyterian Church, on the other hand, adopted at its constitution in 1847, it was ordained (Head 2): "That the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms contained the 'Authorized Exhibition of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures.'" In May 1879, the Synod of this Church passed a Declaratory Act, by which the Confession was in future only to be regarded as the "Authorized Exhibition of the sense in which the Holy Scriptures were understood," when qualified by the explanations contained in the said Declaratory Act. It was to meet this modification and to pave the way for future union that the Free Church in 1892 passed its own Declaratory Act. The extent to which this in turn modified the creed of the Free Church may be seen by placing in juxtaposition the original statement of the Confession of Faith, and that of the Declaratory Act on the subject of Predestination.

THE FREE KIRK AND THE "WEE" KIRK 17

*The Confession of Faith. Chap III.
Of God's Eternal Decree.*

III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated into everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

*Act declaratory anent Confession of Faith,
made 26th May, 1892*

That this Church also holds that all who hear the Gospel are warranted and required to believe to the saving of their souls; and that in the case of such as do not believe, but perish in their sins, the issue is due to their own rejection of the Gospel call. That this Church does not teach, and does not regard the Confession as teaching, the foreordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin.

It may be news to many that the fantastic view expressed in the first quotation is still held by the majority of the Scottish people: still more, that, as a consequence of the decision under consideration, the Scottish churches apparently cannot divest themselves of it. But that the two views, which are known respectively as the Calvinist and the Arminian view, are as incompatible as "Aye" and "No," the plain man cannot have a doubt. Mr. Haldane, K.C., argued in the House of Lords that the two doctrines were not incompatible, and that the supposed difference between them arose from the "pictorial conception" which we are wont to form of things. But the Lord Chancellor replied that the question was not what we moderns think on the subject, but what was thought at the time, and he had little difficulty in showing that Calvinists and Arminians regarded each other as heretics, and treated each other accordingly.¹

THE TERMS OF AGREEMENT

Whatever may be the views of lawyers as to the compatibility of these doctrines, the two Churches obviously held that they differed. For the Declaration of the United Free Church runs as follows:

¹ It is but fair to add that only the Lord Chancellor and Lord Davey took this view, the other members of the majority deciding the case on the Establishment principle alone.

The various matters of agreement between the Churches with a view to Union are accepted and enacted without prejudice to the inherent liberty of the United Church, as a Church of Christ, to determine and regulate its own constitution and laws as duty may require, in dependence on the grace of God and under the guidance of His Word. Thirdly. As this Union takes place on the footing of maintaining the liberty of judgment and action heretofore recognised in either of the Churches uniting, so, in particular, it is hereby declared that members of both Churches, and also of all Churches which in time past have united with either one of them, shall have full right, as soon as they see cause, to assert and maintain the views of truth and duty which they had liberty to maintain in the said Churches.

Neither body departed from its own peculiar views. "What was done," in the language of Lord Robertson, "was simply to drop the subject and unite."

THE RIGHT TO CHANGE

One more quotation from the Lord Chancellor's judgment must be given. For it has been represented that he denies to a Dissenting Church any power to develop or change her doctrine. His exact words are as follows, and may for convenience be set out in two sections :

My Lords, apart from some mysterious and subtle meaning to be attached to the word "church," and understanding it to mean an associated body of Christian believers, I do not suppose that anybody

(1) will dispute the right of any man, or any collection of men, to change their religious beliefs according to their own conscience ; but

(2) when men subscribe money for a particular object and leave it behind them for the promotion of that object, their successors have no right to change the object endowed.

To this the weighty words of Lord Davey may be added :

I appreciate and, if I may properly say so, I sympathise with the effort made by men of great intelligence and sound learning to escape from the fetters forged by an earlier generation. But, sitting on Appeal from a Court of Law, I am not at liberty to take any such matter into consideration.

The question in each case is, what were the religious tenets and principles which formed the bond of union of the association for whose benefit the trust was formed.

The judgments henceforth concern themselves rather with

the *right* to change, than with the *fact* of change. It is not seriously contested, except, perhaps, by Lord Macnaghten, that the Free Church did, for the sake of uniting with the United Presbyterian Church, depart from her original and fundamental principles. The issue is simply whether she had a right to do so. And the opinions upon this question vary from that of Lord Macnaghten, who

cannot form a conception of a National Church, untrammelled and unfettered by connection with the State, which does not at least possess powers of revising and amending the formula of subscription required of its own office-bearers, and the power of pronouncing authoritatively that some latitude of opinion is permissible to its members in regard to matters which, according to the common apprehension of mankind, are not matters of faith ;

and who held that a Church in such a position would be "a dead branch, and not a living Church," to that of the Lord Chancellor, who holds that

there is nothing in calling an associated body a Church that exempts it from the legal obligations of insisting that money given for one purpose shall not be devoted to another. Any other view, it appears to me, would be fatal to the existence of every Nonconformist body throughout the country.

In the first place, the question has been raised whether there really was a trust binding the Free Church at all. It is obvious that the effect of the House of Lords' decision is to declare that the Claim, Declaration, and Protest (which were ordered to be recorded by every Presbytery as the ground and warrant of their proceedings), taken together with the subsequent acts of the Free Church Assembly, do form a declared public trust on the basis of which money has been subscribed from time to time by the public, which there is no power to alter. Lord Low, in the first judgment, declares that

the Union did not involve the giving up by the Free Church of any doctrine or principle which formed an essential or fundamental part of her creed or her constitution, but only involved the modification of views which the Church had held under different circumstances in regard to the application of the doctrine of the Confession as to the duty of the State—a modification which, it appears to me, it was entirely within the power of the General Assembly to make.

Or, as the *Glasgow Herald* of August 8 puts it :

The alleged "trustees" (who were, in fact, givers to a free corporation which itself constituted and could lawfully modify its trust) were not, as a rule, concerned to prevent their gifts from being utilised for such purposes as they were put to in 1900.

In the House of Lords judgments only two of the law lords support this view. One is Lord Macnaghten, whose declaration that he cannot conceive of a National Church without the power to alter its doctrines, has been already quoted. It is a proposition proceeding from an amiable mind, but appears to be destitute of legal authority. This is shown by the further statement that in this case the Establishment principle is a "very small question indeed." Much more subtle and convincing is the argument of Lord Lindley. He endeavours to prove that the power of change always existed. It is given, he alleges, in the "Second Book of Discipline," in respect of abrogating and abolishing "all statutes or ordinances concerning ecclesiastical matters that are found noisome and unprofitable, and agree not with the time or are abused by the people." The Confession itself disclaims infallibility and bases itself on Scripture. The power of change, of course, must be used *bonâ fide*, and not for the purpose of destroying the Church. The Barrier Act of 1697 points to very great powers as existing in the General Assembly. The Model Trust Deed of 1844 actually contemplates union with other churches like the United Presbyterians. The Declaratory Act was within the powers of the General Assembly. Similarly, the Union of 1900, carried in accordance with the Barrier Act, did not, in the opinion of Lord Lindley, constitute or involve any breach of trust. In other words, the learned lord apparently holds the view that spiritual independence does not mean what one of the Free Church leaders has recently defined it to mean, the mere power of contracting out of the common law of the land, but involves a right on the part of the United Free Church to do exactly what it likes without giving redress to anybody. In a word, it is not the headship of Christ that is in issue, so much as the headship of Principal Rainy.

THE REPLY.

It is perhaps sufficient to answer with Lord Robertson that this claim, which was put in its crudest form by Lord Young,¹ is in flat contradiction to the decision in the *Craigdallie* case, which, as we have seen, was adopted by the judges both of Scotland and Ireland. All the judges seem to admit that, if the Free Church had retained a power of doctrinal change in or by her original constitution, the question could never have been argued against her. But, failing such a reservation (which will no doubt be added in the future), her advocates were driven to rely on that vague inherent right to make changes in doctrine, to which Lord Macnaghten referred? How far does that power go? The Dean of Faculty, when arguing the case for the United Free Church, was apparently prepared to admit that the power would cover the abandonment of the Confession of Faith altogether, or even, as Lord Trayner seems to hold, the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, or, in fine, the adoption of the Roman Catholic Faith. When this was being stated in argument at the bar of the House of Lords, a bystander observed: "I wonder if the Free Kirk people really know what these men are being paid to say on their behalf?" The very exact analysis to which both Lord Davey and Lord Robertson subjected these arguments, led them to the conclusion that "neither by inherent right, nor by usage, nor by contract, has the General Assembly of the Free Church any such right as has been claimed." The Barrier Act did not "confer" any power, as one of the Scotch judges said. It was merely regulatory of the powers then existing, and was designed to prevent such innovations as those in whose favour it is now cited. As for the Model Trust Deed, the property held under it belonging to the congregations is subject to a "general over-riding trust"

¹ "There is nothing to prevent a Dissenting Church from abandoning a religious doctrine, however essential and fundamental, and that an *ex facie* absolute property title cannot be limited by reference, not expressed, to the essential doctrines and fundamental principles in the Constitution of the Church."

in favour of the Free Church, and no union which is illegal on the part of the Free Church can be justified merely by the terms of the Model Trust Deed. It was on this basis that the House of Lords accordingly held that the United Free Church has no right or title to the property formerly belonging to the Free Church.

THE TWO THEORIES.

The fact is, that this particular litigation has brought into prominence the divergence between two entirely different views as to Nonconformist bodies. These may be defined as the static and the dynamic theory respectively. According to the one view, when any question as to the right to property arises, the Courts will have regard to the original intentions of the donors, and will not allow members of the Church, who have departed from the doctrines of the founders, to divert the trust funds to the support of other doctrines. Still less will they permit the majority, who desire change, to monopolise the funds and to exclude from their enjoyment a minority of members which has remained true to the original principles of the foundation. This is the view of Lord Eldon in the *Craigdallie* case; and in the form given to it by the present Lord Chancellor, viz., that "a majority of beneficiaries cannot alter the character of a trust," it is the foundation of the judgment just given by the House of Lords. On the other hand, there is the opposite doctrine, which I have ventured to call the dynamic theory, that every Church is a living and growing organism, with power to expand and contract, to develop or modify its doctrines, and, finally, to apply even such funds as it owes to pious founders in the past to such new or different purposes as the majority for the time being approves. Undoubtedly the Scottish Free Church is a developing body of the latter kind, and for years it has been the subject of a struggle between the Conservative and the Liberal elements. The Free Church has resembled a lobster casting its shell, but the new shell has been irritating and obtruding itself before the old was quite cast off. Forced to fight its way in the world

and to progress by means of that magnificent generosity to which its finances bear witness, it is little wonder if the principle of Establishment fell into the background, or that the Free Church should have practically become a Voluntary body. Similarly, as regards doctrine, though a semblance of formal unity has been maintained, no candid judge can deny that the doctrinal attitude of such men as Dr. Robertson Smith, Dr. Marcus Dods, or Dr. George Adam Smith is at all events entirely different from that of the Disruption heroes. Principal Rainy, who has guided the Free Church for so long, and who was the real "consummator" of the Union with the Free Church, has in the course of his skilful career been called at one time Jesuit, at another time Sophist. It is curious how close a parallel can be drawn between both his intellect and career and those of Mr. Gladstone. Both of them had enthusiastic followers and bitter enemies, and the policy of each has ended in a grand fiasco. Yet Principal Rainy has now at last declared himself. Since the judgment of the House of Lords, he has stated that "the idea of a Church held absolutely and for ever by the faith of men who died two hundred or two hundred and fifty years ago—good men, no doubt—that idea is simply to be denounced as thoroughly *ungodly*."

That saying represents, no doubt, the mental attitude of the Free Church majority. No further comment need be made than to place side by side with it an extract from a prayer (!), delivered on the same day, at the meeting of the Free Church (minority) Assembly by the Moderator, the Rev. Murdo Macqueen, of Kiltearn, as reported in the *Scotsman* of August 10: "We thank Thee that the counsel of Achitophel¹ has been turned to foolishness." Poor Dr. Rainy!

¹ "Of these the dire Achitophel was first;
A name to all succeeding ages curst;
For close designs and crooked counsels fit;
Sagacious, bold, and turbulent of wit.
Restless, unfix'd in principles and place;
In power unpleas'd, impatient in disgrace."

THE FUTURE

The hardship of the position at present occupied by the United Free Church is twofold. The greater part of their accumulated funds do not date from the time of the Disruption, as the law lords seem to think. In the first ten years after 1843, only £18,000 was raised, and the bulk of the funds was given in the period after 1872, in which year the Free Church Presbyteries decided that there was no barrier in principle to union with the United Presbyterians. Yet all such gifts are now held to have been stamped with the original trust of the Free Church. In the second place, both branches of the United Free Church have been admirably managed from a business point of view. If the judgment of the House of Lords is carried out in its entirety, the twenty-seven ministers of the remnant Free Church must find great practical and financial difficulty in administering the various schemes and institutions which will be legally theirs. No doubt they represent a growing body. They have already over a hundred congregations, and the stand which they have made for principle will probably bring many waverers over to their side. Still, they have only at present one minister, as opposed to fifty-five of the majority, in Edinburgh, and two out of twice that number in Glasgow. How could they, in these circumstances, undertake to manage and finance funds, missions, and colleges, practically at a month's notice? Recognising the true position, the Law and Advisory Committee of the Free Church has been given full powers by that body to meet with a similar committee of the United Free Church, the latter being composed of business men, with only one clergyman upon it. The only limiting conditions on which the Free Church insists are its own right and duty to administer as much of the property as it efficiently can; and, secondly, to see that there is no deviation from the underlying trusts on which the property is held. Therefore, as regards congregational property, the Free Church will

resume both churches and manses where it has congregations of its own, but will allow the United Free Church to continue to occupy the remainder, at all events, until June 30 next, as tenants on sufferance,¹ on the honourable understanding that the premises shall not be used for dogmatic teaching contrary to the judgment of the House of Lords, nor for attacks upon that judgment itself. Similarly they propose to conduct the foreign missions by trustees, whose duty will be to see that a "simple gospel" is taught, and that no dogmatic teaching is given of the kind to which the controversy relates. When the United Free Church protested that even these conditions would tie their hands and deprive them of their theological freedom, the reply was given that the indications set out above were not to be regarded as conditions precedent to a meeting. A conference was therefore arranged for the last days in September, which was to be of a perfectly free and open character. Sir Edward Fry had, before this stage was reached, begged the Rainy party to accept the conditions, pointing out that there was surely enough Christian doctrine to occupy them for a year without referring to controversial matters. The Archbishop of Canterbury had also offered his services as mediator, and Lord Rosebery is believed to be not unwilling to act in a similar capacity. Should the conference result in a general agreement, the details might be referred to arbitration, and the result embodied in an application to the Courts, or even in a private Act of Parliament.² Only in the last case would the Government interfere. They do not, it is stated, contemplate legislation of their own. Common sense dictates a friendly and businesslike settlement of this kind. But the Free Church are in the position of "dominus litis," while Dr.

¹ Three hundred of the churches are said not to be held under the Model Trust Deed at all.

² The *Times* has referred to the case of Lady Hewley's Charities. Money left by a Trinitarian fell into Unitarian hands, and this was held to be in breach of trust. To prevent consequent hardships, the *Dissenters' Chapels Act* was passed in 1844 by the Government of the day.

Rainy and his friends must, if possible, recover some of the Free Church funds. Their recently declared intention not to act upon the test cases, but to insist that separate actions shall be brought for the possession of every individual church and manse is not likely to facilitate an amicable settlement. They have, moreover, offended many of their congregations, since it is alleged that these were never consulted about the Union, which was carried through entirely by the ministers themselves. Consequently, a great subscription to place the despoiled Church in its original financial position is impossible, even if Scotland had the money to spare. Times are bad and people unwilling. The Emergency Fund has fallen comparatively flat. Therefore, from the financial aspect, the Free Church have a very powerful lever in their hands, with which it will be possible, at least with some chance of success, to tackle the problem of Presbyterian reunion in Scotland on an Establishment basis. There is every reason to believe that it is their intention so to use it, and, if possible, to preserve and crystallise the ancient Calvinistic orthodoxy of Scotland.

A. N. CUMMING.

THE BEAR'S PAW AND THE DRAGON'S CLAW

IT is a well-known fact that Russia, under the name of "Oros," was a dependency of the Mongol hordes who dominated from the Danube to the China seas (1220-1368). During the latter half of this period Russian bodyguards were much affected by the Mongol Emperors at Peking: these guards were mostly war captives, or complimentary gifts sent as tribute from the nominally vassal princely kinsmen in the West. Between the disappearance from China of the Mongol Tartars and the conquest of the Manchu Tartars there reigned for three centuries a purely native Chinese dynasty (1368-1643). The records of this period contain not one single mention of the word Russia, a forgotten country, hopelessly isolated from China by the independent Mongol khanates, whose one aim was to try and recover the plains of the Flowery Land which their ancestors had lost. Towards the end of this period, it is true, the Czar endeavoured to re-open relations with China, and Russian adventurers were even sighted to the west of Peking by the Portuguese traveller Pinto and the Jesuit missionaries; but Chinese records know nothing of these alleged facts.

The Manchus heard of the Oros two or three years before they achieved the conquest of Peking and became Emperors of China. They themselves had only just awaked to the notion of Tungusic unity, and, in their determined efforts to weld into

one military engine all the Tungusic tribes (of which "Manchu" was but one), they came into collision with the Cossack pioneers following in the wake of Yermak and the Russian trading guilds. The place of collision was Yaksa or Albazin, a Tungusic hunting tribe's stronghold, almost exactly at the apex of the great northerly bend of the River Amur, below the junction of its tributaries the Argun and the Shilka. "Yaksa" is the name of a rivulet, and it was the Tungusic practice to name the leading town on each river after the river itself. "Albazin" is taken from the name Albazi, the Tungusic prince from whom Pojarkhoff and Khabaroff (1643-1651) took the town: in the course of their extensions, the Manchus from Ninguta had captured it—possibly from the Russians—in 1640; but they do not actually mention the Russians until 1652, when news was brought to Peking of Khabaroff's victory over the Ninguta forces. The "White Khan of the Oros," as the Czar is called, in imitation of the Mongol appellation, sent several missions during the next few years; but owing to this or that defect in form none of them were received; at least, until 1660, when, in consideration of Russia's hopeless ignorance, the Emperor, whilst declining to give audience himself or to send a return mission, was graciously pleased to order the "acceptance of tribute and the bestowal of presents and of a banquet" in his name. These respective missions include those of Baikoff, Perpilyeff, and Yarykin; and meanwhile Stepanoff was giving practical effect to the wishes of the Czar Alexis by exploring the Sungari River, where in June 1658 he ultimately lost his life at the hands of the Manchus. Albazin was destroyed in the following year; the junction of the Sungari with the Amur was cleared of Russians; and Chinese influence was now fully established among the hunting tribes.

It must be remembered that the petty Manchu race, having first consolidated itself on a formidable military basis, had now imposed the "pigtail" upon conquered China, and that "Manchu" and "Chinese" from this time become politically the same thing. But the Manchu dynasty of China and the

Romanoff dynasty of Russia both developed their imperial careers at the same period, and each consequently had an equal moral right to extensions on the virgin Amur soil. There being no prominent Manchu towns or settlements in the contested region, which was practically the northernmost of what we now call the "Three Manchurian Provinces" (Tsitsihar), the Manchu conquerors were obliged to withdraw to Ninguta and Kirin, in order to recruit after each victory, just as the Russians were able to draw fresh supplies from their unassailable bases at Nertchinsk and Irkutsk. This "No Man's Land" of Tsitsihar had always been nature's barrier between the Turkish and Tungusic races; and, the Turko-Mongol races having now become weak and divided, Russia was viewed by the Manchus as a fresh-blooded tribe allied to the Kipchak and Kirghiz groups of the Far West, simply renewing a contest for supremacy which had been going on intermittently for 1800 years. Tchernigoffski rebuilt Albazin in 1665; in 1669, after a two years siege, the Russians were forced to surrender: in 1672 two more unsuccessful missions were sent to China by the Czar, apparently those under Milovaioff and Kavyakoff. In 1676 the young Emperor K'ang-hi, who was now beginning to take the administration out of his 'Regents' hands, showed a more kindly disposition to the envoy Nicholas Spafari, who, like his predecessors above enumerated, was still firm on the question of *kotow* or prostration. The Mongol Superintendency, or Foreign Colonial Board, were instructed to define the issues as follows:

If your master desires friendly relations with China, let him send back our renegade Gantimur and despatch a further special envoy to conform with our customs: you will then be allowed to trade.

Gantimur,¹ it must be explained, was a Tungusic military chieftain who had accepted Christianity and entered the Russian service.

¹ Forty years later one of the friendly hospodars of Moldavia was named Gantimur, but I cannot say if this fact has any significance, or is a mere coincidence.

In 1683 the Emperor came to the conclusion that the conquest of Albazin ought to be permanent, so he at once drew up a careful scheme of attack with a flotilla of boats, and with European guns made under the guidance of the Jesuit Verbiest : the organisation bases were Kirin and Ninguta ; various Mongol and Tungusic tribes were made to supply cattle and grain at convenient sub-bases. The name Nipchu now first appears in the Chinese documents ; but it is not Nertchinsk, as usually supposed ; it seems to be identical with a little station called Nertchinskoi, on the River Argun. During this year the Emperor utilised for messages the services of two captive or renegade Russians, named Ivan and Michael, in order to state his terms to the Siberian authorities, and thus endeavour to secure a peaceful settlement. Through them he learnt of the arrival of a new Russian chief, named Alexis Tolbuzin : it was reported that he was awaiting, some little distance off, further instructions from the White Khan in reply to Chinese remonstrances, and that meanwhile he was doing his best to restrain the Russian pioneers from committing further outrages upon the sable-hunting tribes. As no decision had arrived from the Czar by the summer of 1685, when the Manchu preparations for a vigorous attack were complete, the grand assault contemplated was actually delivered ; Albazin was taken ; Tolbuzin surrendered ; and the various Mongol and Tungusic individuals found serving there under Russian compulsion were restored to their respective homes. The Emperor had magnanimously ordered that in the event of success all the surrendered Russians were to be allowed to return to their nearest town, *i.e.*, to Nertchinsk or to Irkutsk ; but a priest named Vassily Leontyeff and about twenty-five others accepted the Chinese alternative offer of a settlement in Mukden or Peking.

This generous treatment appears to have been lost upon the rough Cossack adventurers, for the very next year news came to Peking that

Ivan, chief of Nipchu, had instructed Alexis to re-occupy Albazin, and to throw into the fortress 500 men, furnished with ample supplies. Moreover, no replies

THE BEAR'S PAW AND THE DRAGON'S CLAW 31

from the ruler of Russia have come to the various orders sent to him through Nicholas and Alexis.

The Emperor goes on to explain to his subjects what and where Russia was, and how the "Dutch Envoy" had suggested obtaining a reply by sea. As there was certainly no Dutch Envoy then at Peking, it seems clear that the reference must be to Verbiest. The same generals who had effected the *coup* of 1685 were promptly sent to invest Albazin once more; but just at the critical moment a messenger named Nicephorus Wenyukoff arrived from Russia, saying that a special envoy from the White Khan was now on his way to arrange matters; that the Chinese letters had been found undecipherable at the Russian Court, and that the grievances about Gantimur and the sable-hunters had only just been verbally explained by Nicholas Spafari. The Chinese Emperor's orders to raise the siege did not arrive, or at least take effect, until Alexis Tolbuzin had been killed, which seems to have been in July 1686 (28th day, 5th moon); and the person actually in charge when the Chinese withdrew a little in the tenth moon was Beuthen, a German exile, who had done Tolbuzin's engineering for him, and who was probably the only competent commander left alive. The year 1687 was taken up with desultory local negotiations, and in the autumn the Chinese withdrew altogether to Ninguta.

The special mission sent by China to meet the Czar's envoy, Feodor Golovin, included in its staff the Jesuits Pereira (the Superior at Peking), and Gerbillon, who had arrived as a freshman from Europe in March 1688, a few days before Verbiest died. Their progress was delayed for nearly a year owing to a fierce war which was then raging between two rival Mongol States. Ultimately they reached Nipchu at the end of July 1689, and on the 27th of August was signed what is usually called the "Treaty of Nertchinsk." Under its provisions both sides of the River Amur are ceded to the Chinese, from the junction of that river with the Shilka and the Argun right down to the sea. The River Argun itself forms the

Russo-Chinese frontier on the right bank of the Amur, and on the left bank the Shilka is the dividing line up to the point where a small river called the Gorbitsa enters it, after which the Gorbitsa becomes the frontier. The Gorbitsa takes its rise in what the treaty styles the "Stony Hing-an Range," and this range, which extends eastward to the Amur mouth, is the northern boundary, all the tributaries of the Amur even on the left bank of course falling to China. In May 1690 a Manchu officer, named Langtan, who from 1682 onwards had under various exalted Commissioners been practically the guiding spirit in Russian affairs, proceeded to the junction of the Shilka and the Argun, and there set up a stone recording this agreement in the Chinese, Manchu, Latin, Russian, and Mongol languages.

The eventful year 1689 coincides with the assumption of complete administrative independence by Peter the Great, who in this year shook off the intriguing influences of his elder sister Sophia. Peter had already surrounded himself with Dutch, Scotch, Danish, and German instructors, and amongst these was the Schleswig-Holsteiner Ysbrands Ides, nominated envoy to the Court of China, who, leaving Moscow on March 14, 1692, reached Peking on November 5, 1693. Gerbillon, assisted by two Portuguese Jesuits, again acted as go-between, and it is generally understood that Ides consented to *koto* at his audience (November 15), and to sit or squat crossed-legged in Manchu style at the banquet given in his honour (November 19). On account of the too independent wording of Peter's letter it was returned, as were also the presents brought by Ides; no concessions of any kind were made; but as Ides' well-known account of his mission was published under the Czar's command, it is impossible to say exactly how far Peter glossed over his humiliations and failures. In the 10th moon of 1693, however, the Emperor of China thus prophetically speaks of the White Khan's "memorial" and "tribute envoy." He says:

The Russians are of robust material, but they have a biased, persistent character,

THE BEAR'S PAW AND THE DRAGON'S CLAW 33

and very unaccommodating ideas of right and wrong. It appears their country, the frontiers of which are just beyond Turfan, is 20,000 *li* (6000 miles) in extent. Many will think it a glorious thing for us thus to receive the tribute of distant foreign vassals, but personally I very much fear all this business may contain the seeds of trouble for our sons and grandsons. Still, if China keeps strong and true to herself, foreign complications are not likely to arise.

The above-mentioned Mongol war which had detained Pereira in 1688 was between the Eleuths (otherwise called Kalmucks) in the west towards Ili, and the Kalkas in the east towards Urga and Manchuria. The Emperor K'ang-hi at last found it necessary to intervene: he "personally conducted" an expedition to the River Tola, where the Kalmuck ruler Galdan was signally defeated in 1695. It was much feared that he might fly to Russia, but luckily for China a nephew of Galdan, hostile to his interests, had married the daughter of Ayuki Khan of the Turguts, and Russia refused to grant asylum.

Bell of Antermony has left us a very graphic account of the Kalmuck empire of those days; but, of course, the Chinese records are more specific. There were four allied branches, of which the Turgut branch occupied the province now called Tarbagatai. Galdan, unable to reach Tibet—the only remaining refuge open to him—committed suicide in 1697. His ambitious nephew, whose name was Arabtan, secured Chinese sympathy by surrendering the corpse, in reward for which China recognised as Kalmuck territory everything west of the Altaï Mountains. But Arabtan's domineering ways did not suit Ayuki, who promptly migrated with 50,000 tents to Russia. Meanwhile Arabtan annexed Ayuki's son, Sanchab, with 15,000 tents, and endeavoured to secure a monopoly of all Kalmuck intercourse with Tibet. This action ultimately led to the conquest of Tibet by Arabtan and China successively. The presence of Kalmucks in Russia is signalled as early as 1705, when Peter employed them in preparing the site of his new capital, St. Petersburg. Ayuki, from his encampment on the banks of the Volga, still kept up a correspondence with China: he sent a mission in 1711, and in 1712 a Manchu,

named Tulishen, was despatched to him, *via* Russia, by K'ang-hi in order to try and secure his co-operation against the Kalmucks of Ili. Excellent accounts of Tulishen's mission have been published in European languages: he was well received at Tobolsk by Prince Gagarin, Governor-General of Siberia, and would have probably been equally well received by the Czar had not Peter then been too busy with his Swedish wars; but he sent back with Tulishen in 1715 a dozen priests, headed by one Hilarion, who was to take the place of the recently deceased Vassily Leontyeff (mentioned above), as spiritual director to the Russian colony, or "Albazin bodyguards," at Peking. Between 1705 and 1715 there were at least three Russian trading missions to China, but the members were so riotous and drunken that it had become necessary to check, and at last even totally prohibit, this commerce; at least at Peking.

Partly on this account, and partly because K'ang-hi in his old age had asked for some "inspiring medicines," a mission under the Swedish engineer, Laurence Lange, was despatched by Peter in 1715: it was accompanied by an English surgeon, and reached Peking on November 11, 1716. Peter made a return request for a porcelain stove, and his ambassadors were as usual handed over to the care of the Jesuits. In 1719 took place the well-known mission of Ismailoff, accompanied by the Scotch doctor Bell, whose interesting narrative is the standard Western authority on the Kalmuck empire, then at its prime, and on contemporary life at Peking. Ismailoff who, like Lange, seemed to have yielded the point of the *kotow*, or obeisance, to the Emperor, left Peking on March 2, 1721, after a stay of three months; but Lange was allowed to remain there as Consul, and arrangements were made for the formal establishment of an Orthodox Church. The old Emperor had become rather hostile to Roman Catholicism just before his death, partly owing to the dispute with the Popes touching ancestor worship and the meaning of "God," or "Heaven," and partly because one of his sons had been

intriguing with the missionaries. The Jesuits naturally endeavoured to work the Russians to their own advantage, and even applied for the good offices of Peter and of the Roman Emperor Charles VI. The Pope's legate Mezzobarba arrived in Peking in 1721; but the Emperor was firm, resisted all influences, and made no concessions. It was in 1721, too, that Peter the Great (as he was now already officially called) had an interview with Ayuki Khan on the banks of the Volga. Peter was then on his way to punish the Usbeg Powers of the Caspian, and had called upon Ayuki to furnish a contingent of warriors. He heard meanwhile of Arabtan's strong position in Ili, and the following year despatched Unkoffsky on a mission to him: his headquarters were found to be near the Khorgos River, west of Kuldja. Thus it comes that the Russian Kalmucks, or Turguts, and the Chinese Kalmucks, or Dzungars, formed a "double-barrelled" buffer between the two great empires. But north and east of the Kalmucks there were the Uriangkai, Buriat, and Kalka Mongols, subject to China, upon all of whom, in the absence of any powerful buffer State, Russia showed a steady tendency to encroach. Peter died, however, in 1725, and it was left to his relict, Catherine, to despatch Count Vladislavitch in 1726 in order to try and arrange this difficult question. By the autumn of 1727 the matter was settled with the co-operation of Tulishen and Lange, and with the full approval of the Buriats and other Mongol princes interested. About this part of the frontier, *i.e.*, from the River Argun in the East, past Urga and Kiachta, to the Upper Yenisei River in the West, there has never since been any dispute; stones were set down in suitable places by Chinese deputies acting in conjunction with Ivan Ivanovitch, one of the Count's staff. A trading site was selected at Kiachta, and the Russian hotel at Peking was repaired for the adequate reception of Consul, students, and other recognised Russian residents. Tulishen went on a special mission to Russia in 1727; and Lange, who had made four journeys in all from Russia to Peking, seems to have

remained there until about 1740. Relations with Russia were thus placed on an excellent basis by the stern but just Emperor Yung-chêng (1722-1735).

Meanwhile, after Arabtan's death, the Kalmuck Empire of Ili had become so arrogant under its new ambitious ruler, Amursana, that in 1755 the extremely capable Emperor K'ien-lung determined to crush it once for all. This campaign brought him into immediate contact with the Kirghiz (always termed Kazaks by the Chinese, and by the Russians inaccurately styled Kirghiz-Kazaks). The chief, Abul-ai (the Abul-khair of the Russians), who had hitherto paid tribute to the Dzungars, was now obliged to trim between Russia and China until it could be made manifest to him on which side of the fence it would pay him best to jump. After Amursana's defeat by the Chinese he escaped to the Russians, who refused to surrender him. A powerful Chinese force demonstrated with such show of vigour on the Russo-Kirghiz frontier that Abul-khair saw his best account in endeavouring to capture Amursana for China. Meanwhile, the Emperor directed the Peking Board to address a formal reclamation to the Russian Senate (founded by Peter in 1711). After a good deal of fencing on the part of the Russians, Amursana at last himself solved the difficulty by conveniently dying of small-pox at Tobolsk; this was in 1757, and shortly afterwards his dead body was carried, under orders from the Senate, for exhibition to the Chinese agents at Selinghinsk or Kiachta. Meanwhile, yet another Kalmuck chief, named Shereng, had escaped to Russia: Shereng had murdered a Chinese military officer who was trying to prevent Amursana's escape to Russia by way of the Irtish valley. In this case Russia positively declined to surrender the man, and as a reprisal the Chinese Emperor, therefore, stopped all trade at Kiachta. On the other hand, the Russians put in a claim to the whole three "divisions," or *yuz*, of the Kirghiz race. Whether the grapes were sour, or he really wished to be magnanimous, the Emperor K'ien-lung addressed a communication to Abul-khair and his two divisional

colleagues stating that they were quite at liberty to please themselves,

and in this sense we have replied to the Russian claim, reminding them, however, that when we conquered the Dzungars, we always treated the Kazaks with kindness, not endeavouring to extort oaths of allegiance and tribute, but leaving them freedom to choose.

An attempt of the Russians to open a new trade with China through the Kirghiz, as their agents, was stopped promptly; but in 1768 thirteen articles were drawn up, under which the old trade was reopened at Kiachta.

The Russians literally "caught a Tartar" when they gave asylum to Shereng. Finding that the Chinese conquest of Ili had left those pastures vacant, in 1770 he managed secretly to persuade the 100,000 Russian Kalmucks encamped on the Volga to migrate *en masse* back to their ancestral home. The task was all the easier in that Ubasi Khan (great-grandson of Ayuki) was dissatisfied with the inquisitorial and exacting demands of the Russian administration, and found that his Buddhist subjects did not take kindly to Christian principles. With the greatest possible privacy the whole horde accordingly packed up its traps and suddenly quitted the Volga (which the Chinese call the "Echil") towards the end of 1770. After over six months' trying journey by way of the Kirghiz steppes and Lake Balkash, about half of them succeeded in reaching Ili, whence the astounding and totally unexpected event was reported to K'ien-lung at his summer hunting-box north of Peking. At first there were some suspicions that treachery was at work, and every preparation was made to massacre the whole immigrant nation should it transpire that some Russian or Kalmuck trick was being tried. But the robust common sense of the Emperor had convinced him from the first that the event arose from genuine dissatisfaction with Russian methods; and therefore, whilst taking these precautionary steps, the Chinese monarch behaved with extreme generosity, setting apart broad pastures, ordering up 200,000 animals of all kinds for the use of the destitute refugees, and making

liberal grants to them of tea, grain, skins, and cloth. In his delight at being able to hoist the Russians with their own petard, the Emperor even forgave Shereng his murder, and looked forward with eagerness to the pleasure of refusing to surrender him, and of thus paying Russia back in her own coin should she complain of deserters being harboured.

China reached the *acme* of her prestige in Tartarian wilds towards the end of the eighteenth century, and after this great event the Russians hid their diminished heads: they kept quiet during the remainder of K'ien-lung's reign. In 1796 his successor, Kia-k'ing, announced his intention of maintaining the *status quo* "if Russia would also keep quiet." Early in 1806 some Russian trading ships appeared at Canton, and although on this occasion no objection was made locally, the Viceroy and the Hoppo were both censured by the Emperor for allowing it: "Kiachta is their proper sphere." I presume, though I do not know for certain, that these ships must have been the same as those which, in the autumn of 1806, committed various outrages upon the coasts of Sagalien and the Kurile Islands, in revenge for the refusal of the Japanese to permit Russian trade; the commanders were Davidoff and Khvostoff. In 1806, and again in 1809, the Kalka authorities at Urga seem to have rather summarily rejected advances made by the Russian "Gubernator"; and the Emperor, who was personally quite prepared to receive a mission "behaving with proper form" at Peking, had to chide them for their arrogance; but no mission appears to have really got through to the capital. In 1813 there were some trade squabbles between certain Russian Andijans and the Kazak ruler Khanbar: the Military Governor (or "Tartar-General" as he is generally called) duly settled the affair; but even in this case the Emperor had to warn his lieutenant not to be so harsh in his zeal for China's interests. The same thing occurred in 1824: "If the Kazaks ask us for any favour, treat them kindly; if their relations with Russia and their allegiance to us are doubtful, steer clear of them."

THE BEAR'S PAW AND THE DRAGON'S CLAW 39

After this Russia is scarcely heard of for a generation, but of course she woke up to the advantages obtainable through our first war with China. In 1848 some of her trading ships came to Shanghai, but were sent away on the ground that the land trade only was Russia's prerogative: the persuasive influence of the British Consul was sought as a reinforcement in order to convince the Russians of their presumption. Promptly next year followed some encroachments on the Kirghiz frontier: it appears that both Chinese and Russians were in the habit of levying taxes on Kirghiz horses, and the Senate, having been invited to explain Russia's trespasses, pleaded that trade at Kiachta was now insufficient "in view of growing populations"; the Chinese Government was invited to sanction the opening of Ili, Tarbagatai, and Kashgar. The imperial kinsman Yi-shan (or Yik-shan, as it is pronounced in Canton) was in local charge, and he reported that the Russian request might be granted so far as the two first-named places were concerned, but that it would be highly imprudent to give way on the question of Kashgar, for the simple reason that

the Chinese subject population between Ili and Kashgar consisted of Kazaks (Kirghiz) and Buruts (Kara-Kirghiz), and that Russia, who always collected horse-taxes and imposed stage-post duties upon her Tartar tribes, would be certain to do so in the case of the same tribes belonging to China, when allowed passage through their country, and would then perhaps advance a step further by claiming *all* the Kirghiz as hers.

In this particular case the Russians hastened, with suspicious promptitude, to direct their Kirghiz "Sultan" to restore a number of horses and camels to China on the ground that "the Kirghiz being our subjects, of course we are responsible." Further inquiry elicited the fact that no such robbery or restoration had taken place, and the shrewd Emperor, whilst warning Yik-shan not to "let out" the exact knowledge he possessed, managed to work this sentence into his reply to the Senate: "China does not notice any robberies of cattle beyond her own frontiers, but will herself punish any thefts which may take place within her own dominions." Subsequently the

whole question of the Ili and Tarbagatai trade was regulated by the Treaty of Kuldja (1851, Article XIII.).

The Chinese Intelligence Department soon after this reported that the Russian Gubernator had transferred his permanent headquarters to Kiachta, and in the summer of 1852 movements of Russian troops to the eastwards were observed across the Amur. The timid and contemptible Emperor Hien-fêng was now on the throne, and these mysterious movements of Muravieff caused him great uneasiness; but "don't on any account alarm Russian susceptibilities" was all he could say. It is well known that in 1851-2 the energetic Governor-General of Eastern Siberia in question had made an investigation of the Pacific Coast, and had ordered Nevelsky to take possession of the Amur embouchure: moreover, the surveys of Colonel Achte showed clearly that the Chinese administration had never extended across the Amur, and that the territory between it and the "Stony Hing-an watershed," surrendered by the Treaty of Nipchu, had never been actively colonised or officially occupied in any way. Of course the Chinese knew nothing of Muravieff's activity; but in the autumn of 1853 the Tartar-General of Tsitsihar sent the following introductory "poser" to Peking: "The Gubernator has sent to inquire how it is that there are no stones at the Gorbitsa boundary, or near the Pacific Coast." The Colonial Office duly hunted the matter up, and found, to the Emperor's horror, that there were no records of any. Officers were at once sent to examine the mountains north and south of the Gorbitsa River and to report how the frontiers had been marked in 1689; also to discover whether China really ought to have had other boundary stones near the coast. Whilst the Chinese, with their usual apathy, were doing this work on paper, Muravieff had obtained from Nicholas I. a decree authorising him to open negotiations for a new frontier (1854). He sailed from the Shilka down the whole Amur to Mariinsk, and in 1855 took the river into the formal occupation of Russia. Hence his sobriquet "Muravieff Amurski." The

excuse given by the Russians when asked the meaning of their war-ships sailing on the Amur was: "We are going to forestall England, and take possession of the islands." (The Crimean War was responsible for this.) The Chinese now took steps (1857) to colonise and defend their Tsitsihar province; but it was too late, the Allied War was upon them. In the spring of 1858 Canton was in the occupation of the British and French forces, and the Chinese were only too glad to utilise the Russian men-of-war at Shanghai and Tientsin to endeavour by moral suasion to stave off the Allies. As a reward for her services as honest broker, Russia obtained her Treaty of Aigun (May 16), stipulating that the whole of the left bank of the Amur, from the Shilka junction to the sea, should belong to Russia, provided that the hunting tribes of Manchu and Tungusic race living on the left bank, from the River Zea to the village of Khormoltchin, should for ever remain unmolested under Chinese protection. (This stipulation was faithfully observed until the "Boxer" war of 1900, when, according to Leo Deutsch, who was present, most of them perished during the massacres beginning with Blagoveschtschensk.) The right bank from the Shilka junction to the Usuri junction was to belong to China; but below the Usuri junction Russian and Chinese rights were to be "combined, as now," until a delimitation should have taken place. Another article of the treaty provided for trading on the Amur, Sungari, and Usuri rivers, but in Chinese and Russian craft only. Besides all this, the Russians obtained their Treaty of Tientsin a fortnight earlier than England and France, and even five days (June 13) before America, whose services had also been called in to coax over the obdurate Allies. There had meanwhile been some trouble at Tarbagatai, where the Russian factory had been burnt down; an agreement was come to, under which compensation by instalments, partly in tea, should be paid to Russia for this "regrettable incident."

Yik-shan was China's evil genius during this troubled

period, and it appears from the Emperor's repeated decrees on the subject that it was he who was chiefly responsible for "lending" the left bank of the Amur to Russia; he had been given full power to arrange the Aigun Treaty with Count Poutiatine, but even the timid Emperor turned when he perceived that the Russians were surveying the Usuri up to Lake Hanka, building a town on the right bank just below the Usuri junction with the Amur (Khabaroffsk), and forcing their way up the Suifên River to Hun-ch'un (near Vladivostock). The wretched monarch says piteously :

Let Mu-li-fei-yo-fu (Muravieff) be clearly instructed by the Sansing authorities that it was kind enough of us in all conscience to lend the left bank; but that Kirin is the province whence we derive our ginseng and pearls, so that we cannot admit his countrymen there; also tell him that Lake Hanka nowhere touches the Russian frontier, so that they may not survey it.

In the summer of 1859 some "Russian ships, manned by Chinese crews calling themselves English," were reported off Shan-hai Kwan. In other words, the British and French were now again at war with China, owing to the treacherous attack upon the ratifiers of the treaty at the Taku forts. Count Ignatieff at Peking was invited by Prince Kung to explain this furtherthreatened encroachment: that supple diplomat hastened to explain that "under no circumstances could a Russian ship ever fly the British flag," and he at once sent specimens of the flags of all nations for the elucidation of the Shan-hai Kwan authorities. Count Ignatieff availed himself of the opportunity given by the Emperor's flight from Peking in October to clinch the Treaty of Aigun by the Treaty of Peking (November 1860), under which the "combined rights" below the Usuri junction became the sole rights of Russia (as they stood until the "Boxer" wars). In return for this complaisancy, the Russian Government voluntarily sent to China a present of 2000 muskets and six guns, by way of Kiachta, in charge of an expert or instructor.

No sooner was the Manchuria question thus cravenly disposed of, than the Kazak and Tarbagatai difficulties cropped

up again. The Kirghiz "Sultan," Altan Shala, with his heir, had now repudiated the Chinese khanship and gone definitely over to Russia. It had been agreed that Commissioners should meet to delimitate the Tarbagatai frontier during the 4th moon of the 12th year (1862); but as the Emperor died during his eleventh year (August 21, 1861), the Treaty of Tchuguchak (another name for Tarbagatai) was not concluded until 1864, though on February 20, 1862, the abortive so-called "Land Trade Treaty" was really signed by some one. Perhaps this abandoned convention only refers to Kiachta and Urga, from which place Kiachta is distant about 220 miles. Shortly after the Emperor's death, the Russians took advantage of the musket and gun transaction to attempt an illicit commerce with Urga; they also caused alarm by their persistent endeavours to rent houses in the immediate neighbourhood of the Saint's palace. (This Saint is the "Cheptsun-damba," whose friend Dordji has mixed him up with present Tibetan difficulties. He showed a truculent demeanour towards every thing English when Mr. Hawes visited the place this year.) This action led Prince Kung and the Regents to issue the following decree:

The Russians themselves proposed to give us these guns and muskets: we never asked for them: if their Consul at Urga exhibits any shiftiness about the balance due, it will be more dignified for us to drop the matter altogether.

Later on the Russians offered their assistance against the Taiping rebels, and a detachment of them fought alongside of the British and French under the brave American adventurer Ward, notably at the battle of Wang-kia Sz (April 3, 1862). Notwithstanding these civilities, the Chinese Government was kept in a state of perpetual tension by Russian aggressions, real or fancied. For instance, there were trespasses over the frontier at or near Hurun Pir and the upper waters of the Argun; robberies of grass, fodder, &c.; surreptitious erection of unauthorised extra frontier stones at Barluk and other points north and south of Tarbagatai City; annexation by

Russia of Dzaisang Nor and Temud Nor, although old marks existed which proved that the Emperor K'ien-lung had included them within Chinese bounds; trespassings upon Ili territory; using the Kirghiz and Kara-Kirghiz as catspaws in order to extend the Russian frontiers at the expense of China; and so on. The Chinese were able to prove to their own satisfaction that Altan Shala and his son Tchakal Ahmed had up to 1855-6 accepted their Khanships from China. On the other hand, the Russians claimed that Abul-khair went over to them in 1738, and that his descendants were Sultans under Russia; they accommodatingly added, however, that these Sultans were at liberty to call themselves Khans when they visited China. China, therefore, made Chotan, a second son of Altan Shala, Khan over her own Kazaks, and ignored the father. A civil war broke out in Kokand whilst all this was going on. The ruler was assassinated, and his successor Shah Murad was constrained to surrender the throne to one Khudayar; but the Kipchak-Burut party opposed Khudayar with another aspirant named Shah Rukh, and one of the Mussulman rebels against China supported this last competing interest. Although Kokand was admittedly beyond the Chinese sphere, yet these incidents caused great uneasiness on account of the suspicion that they were all being engineered by Russia to the future injury of China.

The great Mussulman rebellion in north-west China was now bursting into flame. It is comparatively fresh within the memories of the present generation how the Andijan Yakub Beg succeeded in establishing a powerful empire in Kashgaria; how Russia, fearful for her Ili-Tarbagatai interests, "temporarily" took over the Kuldja province; how the great Chinese general Tso Tsung-t'ang reconquered Kashgaria in 1877; how the Russians cajoled Chunghou at Livadia in 1879; and how they were at last constrained in 1880 to surrender (with certain deductions) the province to China. Until the breaking out of the Japan-China war in 1894 the Russians remained remarkably quiet. The "defeat" of the French in Tonquin, the rise

of the new navy, Chinese activity in Corea, &c., had given them a wholesale dread of China's "resources." Alarmed for the future of her Siberian railway, which had meanwhile been sanctioned, and was progressing in a normal way, she then developed fresh activities with the Cassini Convention. The "Boxer" wars led to her "temporary" occupation of Newchwang and Manchuria. The fears of Japan, on the other hand, were now seriously aroused, and we are consequently in the throes of a devastating war, the political end of which it is impossible to foresee. A rapid survey of the above sketch will show, however, that on the whole Russia's "record" with China has been a peaceful one, and, as human affairs go, not at all a wicked one—at least, up to the deplorable and fatal moment when it was decided to break public faith and to try and fill the pockets of certain high-placed speculators at the expense of Corea and Japan.

E. H. PARKER.

THE MARKINGS ON MARS

A PLEA FOR MODERATE VIEWS

MUCH attention has of late years been paid by astronomers, both amateur and professional, to the planet Mars. It has been carefully triangulated and charted, and much information has been gained as to the markings on its surface. Increased knowledge showed many analogies, and several points of resemblance, between Mars and the Earth, and these naturally led to surmises and theories as to the habitability of Mars.

Up to this point it was merely an object of study to the astronomer, but the suggestion of life on its surface at once widened the field. Novelists saw the possibilities of the new idea, and general interest was at once aroused.

One consequence has been the formation of two great parties holding widely divergent views. The first party claims that we have distinct evidence in the visible markings on Mars of the work of sentient beings, possibly of even a higher order of intelligence than man. They have built up most plausible theories of vast systems of irrigation and cultivation rendered necessary by the failure of the water-supply—systems to which the irrigation works of Egypt and India are insignificant trifles. The extremists of the party, piloted by some of the more sensational papers, have even gone so far as to imagine giant schemes of communication by signal with the Earth, and to picture the Martian Teslas and Marconis anxiously

waiting at their instruments for an answering "Hello!" from our irresponsible planet.

For a little while this party held the field almost unchallenged; but of late years a second school of thought has arisen, and has laid most irreverent hands on all these cherished views. They have carried out experiments, from the results of which they contend that the details, on which so large a superstructure of theory has been built, are themselves non-existent, and are merely due to effects of contrast, fatigue of the eye, defects in focus, or some such mundane cause.

The views of this school have been ably expressed by the Rev. Edmund Ledger, who, after an exhaustive review¹ of the evidence, draws the following conclusion:

It is, I think, probable that the so-called canals (with the exception, perhaps, of a few of the darkest and most prominent seen with telescopic power) may not really exist on Mars, and also that the apparent doubling seen in many of them may be still more delusive.

The tendency seems to be for all who are interested in the subject to join one or other of these rival camps, without considering the possibility that the truth may really lie somewhere between the two extremes. In avoiding the Scylla of credulity it seems that we are in some danger of falling into the Charybdis of scepticism, and there are many strong arguments in favour of more moderate views.

In the first place, it is as well for us to have a clear idea of the scale (so to speak) on which we are working.

Under the most favourable conditions, at his nearest approach, Mars presents to us a disc subtending roughly thirty seconds of arc; while its real diameter, according to Lowell, measures just over 4200 miles.

The apparent diameter of the moon is 31' 8" on the average, and its true diameter nearly 2200 miles, or just about half that of Mars.

Their respective distances at these times are roughly 35,000,000 miles and 239,000 miles.

¹ "Nineteenth Century and After." May 1903.

Assuming, therefore, that we study Mars with a power of 500 diameters—a power which can only be employed under very favourable conditions of atmosphere—the disc under these conditions would appear roughly seven times as large as that of the moon to the naked eye; but the details on his surface would only appear as large, but not nearly so distinct, as those on the moon when studied with an opera-glass magnifying $3\frac{1}{2}$ diameters. Now try the experiment on the moon with such an opera-glass, and, having done so, endeavour to conceive what our knowledge of the lunar surface would be under these circumstances. If $3\frac{1}{2}$ diameters were the maximum power we could employ on the moon, we should certainly be able to tell that the surface was rugged and uneven; but any pronouncement as to the existence of life (as we know it), air, or water upon it would be the height of folly under such conditions. Yet, on equally flimsy evidence, mountains of theory have been built up as to human intelligence and artificial works on Mars. We must also bear in mind that the most favourable conditions with Mars only occur for a very short time once in fifteen years. Once in two years, for a short time, less favourable conditions occur, but in these the maximum apparent diameter of Mars varies from the 30" quoted above down to half that amount.

I should like here to say a few words on the size of telescope which can be usefully employed on Mars. It is an apparent paradox that the largest telescopes in the world have failed to detect some of the more delicate details on Mars at a time when they could readily be seen in instruments of more modest dimensions. At first sight the obvious explanation would seem to be that the detail is non-existent, and due to some illusion. But there is another aspect to the question. Mars is an object which, to use a telescopic phrase, "stands high powers well." But in studying it, or any other celestial object, a certain ratio between "power" and "light" is necessary. Now, with any telescope we can obtain practically any magnifying power we like by the employment of

different eye-pieces; but the "light-gathering power" remains unchanged, as it depends entirely on the aperture of the telescope; and the image gets fainter with every increase of magnifying power. In my experience with a $12\frac{1}{2}$ -inch reflector, I have found that a power of 450 gives the best results as regards brightness of image with Mars. With a lower power the image is too bright, and with a higher power too faint, for the delicate details to be seen at their best.

Comparing my $12\frac{1}{2}$ -inch with the great Lick 36-inch refractor, the "light-gathering power" of the latter is approximately nine times as great; therefore, to obtain equally bright images with the two telescopes, we must employ a power of 450 on the $12\frac{1}{2}$ -inch, and a power three times as great, viz., 1350, on the 36-inch. At this point another factor comes in. All riflemen are well acquainted with what is called in Bisley parlance "mirage"—*i.e.*, unsteadiness of the image of the target, due to heated air-waves rising from the ground. These air-waves are present in our atmosphere in a greater or less degree, even on the finest nights. In using a power of 450, not only is the image of the planet magnified 450 times, but every tremor of the air is magnified to the same extent. Even on a perfect night, 600 or 800 is about the highest power which can be used effectively on Mars, owing to the presence of these air-waves. But with the Lick 36-inch, even this high power would be too low to reduce the glare sufficiently to enable the delicate detail to be seen well. The image, in consequence, would probably be inferior, as regards detection of delicate detail, to that obtained with the smaller aperture and lower power.

The next point to consider is the character of the markings which have been seen on Mars. These may be roughly divided into: Obvious details which can be seen with low telescopic power; and delicate details which require high powers and fine air.

The obvious details are: (1) The polar cap; (2) The brighter areas or "continents"; (3) The darker areas; the

“maria” or “seas.” The more delicate details are: (4) The so-called “canals” and “lakes.”

Of the obvious details there can be no doubt. They have been recognised by all observers of Mars from the earliest days, and both parties are agreed as to their reality. The rigid division of the planet into light and dark areas has always seemed to me to be a mistake, which has given rise to many false impressions. I shall return to this point later on.

En passant, I may mention that certain variations appear to take place in the “maria,” dependent on the Martian seasons. These variations synchronise with the increase and diminution of the polar caps. They appear to be connected phenomena, but it is hard to say whether it is a case of *post hoc* or *propter hoc*.

For many years what I have called the “obvious detail” was all that was recognised on Mars. In 1877, however, Schiaparelli discovered several delicate lines and streaks crossing the continental regions. He recovered these two years later, and added to their number at every subsequent opposition, until the whole planet was covered with a regular network. On referring back, some of the larger ones were found to be indicated in earlier drawings by Herschel, Dawes, Secchi, and others.

The announcement of their discovery was received with frank incredulity at first, especially in England; but they were seen later by numerous observers. The evidence in their favour grew stronger every year, and was, until quite lately, held to be overwhelming.

Schiaparelli, when he discovered them, christened them “canali,” or channels. This has been anglicised into “canals,” a rather unfortunate description, which has given rise to many false impressions as to their size and breadth. They were at first thought to be confined to the “continents,” but in the last decade Lowell, Douglass, Cerulli, and others have traced them across the “maria” as well.

The descriptions of the perfect straightness and extreme

narrowness of these lines gave the first suggestion of their artificial character, and Lowell in 1892¹ elaborated a theory which attributes these lines to vegetation, springing up along a colossal network of irrigation channels. His arguments are plausible and carefully worked out, but their value is greatly diminished by his evident bias in favour of life on Mars.

The same suspicious geometrical arrangement set others thinking whether there might not be some simpler explanation of the canals; while the doubling of several of them was so inexplicable a feature that many thoughtful men refused to admit its actual reality. Green, and later Maunder and Kempthorne, suggested that some at least of the canals might not be lines at all, but merely the edges of slightly shaded areas.

In 1896 Antoniadi,² De Boë,³ and Moreux⁴ brought forward the theory that the gemination of the canals was caused by slight errors of focus, and reproduced most of the phenomena of double canals with experimental discs. Stanley Williams,⁵ however, showed that this explanation was by no means final; and the theory was later abandoned by Antoniadi.⁶

In 1902 very suggestive experiments were carried out by Lane,⁷ Maunder,⁸ and others. In these a sketch of Mars was made on a large disc, showing the main outlines of the "maria," but no canals. These discs were placed some distance away, and copied by boys who had no knowledge of what they were expected to see, and no previous idea of canals. On nearly all these drawings canals were shown, generally almost identical in position with those drawn on the charts of

¹ Percival Lowell, "Mars." 1894.

² *Journal B.A.A.*, vol. viii. 176. *Memoirs B.A.A.*, vol. vi. 102.

³ Flammarion, "La Planète Mars," 588.

⁴ *Journal B.A.A.*, vol. viii. 240.

⁵ *Journal B.A.A.*, vol. xi. 113.

⁶ *Memoirs B.A.A.*, vol. ix. 106.

⁷ *Knowledge*, Dec. 1902.

⁸ *Monthly Notices R.A.S.*, lxiii. 488.

Schiaparelli and Lowell. Hitherto the strongest argument in favour of the canals had been the general agreement of the drawings of independent observers, yet in these experiments there was the same unanimity among all the sketchers in the position of details which were non-existent on the copy.

Antoniadi, later still, has by experiments with artificial discs reproduced a great many of the well-known phenomena on Mars, and believes them to be due to contrast, accentuated by fatigue of the eye, strained with long gazing.

From this recapitulation it is evident that a very strong case has been made out against the reality of the canals.

Let us now regard the question from the point of view of the observer. As I have already stated, a certain amount of misconception has been introduced by the rigid division of the disc into light and dark areas; the "continents," and the "maria" or "seas." This is to a great extent the fault of the nomenclature. As a matter of fact, there is no definite boundary between the two. On Mars there is every shade from the most brilliant whites down to sombre grey-greens and grey-blues, which appear almost black at times. Every gradation of tone is present, and in hardly any case have we to deal with broad masses of uniform tint. Under perfect definition the "continents" are seen to be shaded, mottled, and variegated to a marvellous extent; and the "maria" are streaked, splashed, and shaded with faint stippings till all idea of uniform tone is lost. No one who has not seen Mars with an adequate aperture under perfect definition in really good air can have any conception of the "great gulf fixed" between what we should normally regard as first-class definition and what I may call perfect definition. Under the latter conditions the detail visible is bewildering in its complexity, and I think that half an hour's observation would convince even the most sceptical of the objective reality of the majority of the canals.

With perfect definition one great salient fact is impressed upon the observer; and that is, that the nature of the detail in

the "continents" and "maria" is identical. We have the same vein-like streaks in the "maria" with slightly darker diffuse knots at their intersections, in prolongation of similar streaks in the lighter areas. The only difference is in the tone of the groundwork on which these details are seen. There is no hardness anywhere, but all the detail is extremely soft and delicate.

Nearly all the objections to the canals have been based on their extreme narrowness, straightness and regularity. There is a general impression that all the Martian canals are perfectly straight, narrow to the point of invisibility, and absolutely uniform throughout their length.

I quote Lowell's description of them¹:

A network of fine straight dark lines. . . . The lines are as fine as they are straight. As a rule they are of scarcely any perceptible breadth, seeming on the average . . . about thirty miles across. Some are a little broader than this; some a trifle finer, possibly not above fifteen miles across. Speaking generally, the lines are all of comparable width. They are practically nearer one dimension than two.

I cannot protest too strongly against this being regarded as in any way a fair description of the appearance of the canals. As a matter of fact, they are of all sizes; the larger members being practically indistinguishable from the smaller "maria." As in the case of the "maria" and "continents," there is no demarcation-line. The canals range from these large coarse markings by infinitesimal gradations down to the most delicate streaks, practically at the limit of vision.

Schiaparelli, their discoverer, is not nearly so emphatic as Lowell on the line-like appearance of the canals, but appears to regard them as streaks or shades rather than lines.

Denning² (1886) writes:

The most delicate and complex details of the planet appear to my eye under the best conditions as extremely faint linear shades, with evident gradations

Lowell, "Mars," 131-132.

² Flammarion, "La Planète Mars," 389.

in tone; and irregularities, which produce here and there ruptures and condensations.

Meares,¹ speaking of the aspect of the planet in fine air at Calcutta, says:

I was surprised to find that few of the canals seen appeared as a sharp hard line as usually represented.

Antoniadi²

fully corroborates Captain Molesworth's and Mr. Meares' statements on the broadish and diffuse appearance of the linear markings (which is a corollary of their indistinctness); for out of some fifty-five of these streaks seen in 1894 and 1896, only the Laestrygon was found during both oppositions as an exceedingly fine black line.

Phillips³ (1898) writes:

Such canals as I have certainly seen have been very broad and diffused, reminding one forcibly of Mr. Mee's "amorphous smudges."

Both in 1896 and 1898, in the reports on my own observations, I specially mentioned the streaky appearance of the canals. Perhaps I may be permitted to quote from my report for 1900-1⁴:

What has struck me most during this apparition is that almost all the canals appear as *streaks*, and not as *lines*. This "streaky" aspect cannot be ascribed to the imperfect seeing of a narrow black line. Curiously enough, I have found their appearance more "streaky" with the 12½-inch than I did with the 9¼-inch. This cannot be explained by any defect in the larger instrument, which defines most exquisitely; while the clock driving and the stability of the mounting give it an enormous advantage over the altazimuth stand of the smaller telescope. Some few canals, very few, are straight and line-like; but the great majority are diffuse with all powers, even when seen under perfect definition in the most favourable circumstances. . . . After careful consideration, I am inclined to believe with Signor Cerulli, that the canals are not true continuous lines at all. I think that an increase of power (if attainable) would show many of them as chains of discontinuous irregular markings; giving the idea of straight hard lines by their combined impression. . . . Under the best conditions I have seen not only this canal ("*Eumenides*"), but others of the larger canals . . . very "spotty," as if consisting of a chain of lakes. "Chaos" this year was

¹ *Memoirs B.A.A.*, vi. 63.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.* ix. 68.

⁴ *Ibid.* xi. 89.

repeatedly seen almost disconnected in this way. "Agathodæmon" in 1896 was another example.

To my eye the canals are far more like streaks made with a crayon or stump on rough paper than hard ink lines ruled with a pen.

It is evident, therefore, that to many eyes the canals are by no means so regular and hard as they are generally represented to be.

Let us now return to the experiments of Lane and Maunder with artificial discs. It has been generally assumed from these experiments that, under certain conditions, "canals" will be drawn in positions where there is absolutely nothing to suggest them on the copy. This is the case with Lane's experiments, in which the "canals" drawn were due either to a kind of contrast effect, or to the suggestion given by the mere shape of what may be termed the "coast lines" of Mars.¹ In Maunder's experiments, on the other hand, wherever a "canal" was drawn there was in every instance *something* on the copy to predispose the eye to see a "canal" there. Maunder is most emphatic on this point :

In no single case, out of considerably more than 200 drawings, did we find a "canal" drawn which seemed to owe its origin entirely to the shape of the neighbouring "oceans" or dark markings. Whenever the bright regions, the "continents," in the diagram were left absolutely free from detail of any kind, then the copyists all, without exception, left it free also. We had not a single instance which could be taken as confirming Mr. Lane's result—at least in the form in which he has expressed it. . . . If Mr. Lane's effects were never secured with an entirely blank "continent," it was astonishing to see how effectively three or four dots, absolutely invisible at the distances occupied, would suffice to make those effects plain. Nor was it at all necessary that the dots should be put in a straight line where the canal ought to run. They might wander from it a good deal on either side, if only the mean line between them ran in the right direction.²

In other words, the detail is there, but the eye of the observer cannot appreciate it, and consequently translates it in an erroneous form.

¹ *Knowledge*, November 1902, p. 250.

² *Ibid.* November 1903, pp. 249-250.

I believe that this is the real explanation of the "canal" system. It is the integration of markings far too small to be separately defined.

In the paper in *Knowledge*, already cited, Maunder also writes :

The general distribution of the true markings on the planet must approximate to that shown on the charts of Schiaparelli and Lowell, and the details, if not straight lines in their ultimate conceivable resolution, are at least straight lines to the eye. ¹

In Antoniadi's experiments the principal phenomena he ascribes to contrast are :

- (1) The "canals" in the dark areas.
- (2) The darker edgings to the "maria."
- (3) The brighter edgings to the "continents."
- (4) The interior lighter streaks in the "maria," and the doubling of the "canals" and "lakes."

In the discussion on the reality of the "canals," observations of Mercury, Venus, and the satellites of Jupiter have been adduced to show that illusory canal-like markings have been seen on them as well as on Mars. Acting on this precedent, I propose to put the planet Jupiter, the largest and most important member of our planetary family, into the witness-box to give evidence on this question of contrast.

On Jupiter we have very similar phenomena, but none of the disciples of the optical theory have ever, to my knowledge, claimed them as illusions. We can parallel the supposed contrast phenomena on Mars, which I have already detailed, by the following analogous phenomena on Jupiter :

- (1) The oblique darker streaks in the dark belts.
- (2) The dark spots along the edges of the equatorial belts.
- (3) The brilliant white spots in the edges of the equatorial zone.
- (4) The white rifts in the equatorial belts, and the fainter double belts.

All these phenomena on Jupiter are unquestionably real.

¹ *Knowledge*, November 1903, p. 250.

Their motions have been observed, and their rotation periods calculated; and they are even shown on some of the very imperfect photographs which have been made of the planet.

In this case we have an image sufficiently large for the eye to appreciate the irregularities of the delicate details, while with Mars the image is so small that only a general impression is caught by the eye, which naturally interprets this impression in its simplest form.

Are we, however, justified in claiming that certain appearances on one planet are purely illusory, when we have almost identical phenomena on another and larger planet which are demonstrably real?

I do not mean to argue that illusion plays no part whatever in what we see, or think we see, on Mars; but I am certain that many of the phenomena which are often ascribed to illusion or contrast have a real existence.

M. Antoniadi claims that all these contrast phenomena are produced by a tired eye, overstrained by long gazing. If we are to press this theory to its logical conclusion, we should have, in the case of Mars, a planet bereft of all *nuances* of light and shade; both "maria" and "continents" being broad masses of uniform tone, unrelieved by any shading or detail. First impressions would be more reliable than those based on continuous study; and no prolonged gazing could be indulged in, as it would tend to strain the eye and produce illusion.

The doubling of the "canals" is certainly difficult to explain. We cannot, however, shirk the responsibility by assuming that it is impossible, simply because we cannot explain it.

Most observers of Mars have recognised that the "maria," especially the narrower and straighter ones, are liable to the formation of central whiter streaks, and they are a most striking feature in all the charts of Mars. Maunder, in 1892, recognised the strong analogy between these streaks in the "maria" and the doubling of the "canals"¹:

It cannot escape notice how similar the appearance, say, of the "Mare

¹ *Memoirs B.A.A.*, ii. 197.

Sirenum," or of the "Sinus Sabæus," when bisected by these islands, is to that of the double "Ganges" or "Cyclops." Can there be any reasonable doubt that the two phenomena are really of the same order?

Any explanation which will satisfactorily account for the one should also account for the other; just as, on the moon, any explanation of the larger ring plains and circular "maria," should also account for the smaller rings.

All those who have seen the double canals agree that the geminations are only seen under the finest conditions of definition. Undoubtedly a double image can be produced by variations of focus or unsteady definition. But these false doublings are always accompanied by a general indistinctness of outline and blurring of detail; and, to the experienced observer, the deception is so patent that it ceases to be a deception at all.

Another weak point in the optical explanation of the double canals is this: If the "canals" themselves are optical delusions, how is it possible by any error of focus, strain of the eye, or effect of contrast to obtain a double image of a line which is non-existent?

The hard narrow "spider's web" form in which the detail on Mars appears in the drawings of some observers is probably simply due to "personal equation" in the observer himself. Any one who has examined a collection of astronomical drawings by different hands cannot fail to be struck with the different methods in which the same details are rendered by different observers. One will represent a feature by a combination of hard black lines and circular spots, while a second shows the same feature with faint diffuse streaks and irregular masses of shade. From the delicacy of its markings, Mars, almost more than any other celestial object, is peculiarly liable to these variations in interpretation or misrepresentations of detail.

If we once admit that these hard, straight, uniform lines are not a fair representation of the soft and delicate detail on Mars, it seems to me that many of the objections to the reality of these markings fall to the ground.

What, then, is the meaning of the minor detail? Is it real or is it an illusion? Is it a gigantic system of expansion cracks on an enormous scale; or is it merely a deception, due in some way to the instrument or the eye of the observer?

The best answer is, I think, contained in an extract from a recent letter of Mr. Maunder. Referring to his experiments with drawings of Mars, he writes:

If on the "continents" (or in the seas for that matter) a few minute markings are introduced, much too minute to be seen individually, these will be inevitably translated into "canals" by nearly every observer. It is simply a matter of experiment to make the sketchers bring up any particular "canal," or any particular combination of them.

This translation by the observer of markings, too small to be seen individually, into canal-like lines is, in my opinion, the key to most of these mysterious phenomena on Mars. It is a rational explanation which fits in with the facts, and satisfies both observation and experiment. The detail is there, but is so minute that the eye cannot appreciate it truly, and often interprets it into hard linear forms which are unfair representations of its true nature.

If we accept this explanation, we may sum up generally the present state of our knowledge of Mars as follows:

- (1) The markings on the surface of the planet are more or less permanent, but subject to minor changes.
- (2) Their intensity probably depends in some way on the Martian seasons.
- (3) The structure of the delicate detail is the same all over the planet, both in the light and dark areas, the only difference being in the varying tone of the "background."
- (4) This detail is "the integration of markings far too small to be separately defined."
- (5) The evidence at present available is insufficient to enable us to form any valid conclusions as to the condition or habitability of the surface of Mars.

Even with our limited knowledge of Mars, we can see enough to show us that we are dealing with a world absolutely

different from our own. Admitting the same primary composition of the two, they must have passed through very dissimilar experiences and must have developed on very different lines. Supposing, for the sake of argument, Mars to be inhabited, its organisms must be absolutely different to ours, with different existences and different needs. Its primal forms of life must have been of a distinct type from any on the earth, and must since have been perfected by methods of evolution of which we can form no conception.

P. B. MOLESWORTH.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL AS DEBT-COLLECTOR

MR. HERBERT SPENCER laid down the principle that "It is in the very nature of things that an agency employed for two purposes must fulfil both imperfectly; partly because while fulfilling the one it cannot be fulfilling the other, and partly because its adaptation to both ends implies incomplete fitness to either." Macaulay said much the same thing, adding a superabundance of illustrations drawn from railway companies, banks, clubs, and joint stock companies of various kinds, in pointing out the desirability of States confining their machinery to the ends of civil government and not also undertaking spiritual duties. We have enlarged our conception of the State considerably since Macaulay's day, and it becomes more difficult than ever to draw a hard and fast line around the province of government. But Herbert Spencer's principle—that is, the principle of division of labour—is none the less a sound one. He used it as an argument against thrusting upon the State paternal duties for which that political organisation was not fitted. It may be applied specifically and *a fortiori* to the Post Office. That Department was instituted primarily for the conveyance and delivery of letters, and as far as the developments of the postal service follow the lines of the original design it has worked with fair success. In the course of two centuries and a half, during which the Post Office has enjoyed its letter

carrying monopoly, its machinery has become adapted to its work, which it is able to perform on the whole to the moderate satisfaction of its clients. Yet, much as our single successful example of State Socialism is vaunted, the Post Office by no means discharges all its duties well. It has been slow to adopt improvements and to increase the facilities which the public required. Each important postal reform, which the progress of the times has called for, has required much discussion, pressure and agitation before the Postmaster-General of the day would take it up. Even the letter-carrying business is not conducted as well as it might be were the spur of competition applied. Mr. Henniker Heaton has shown that the Post Office to this day persistently overcharges the public for the services it discharges, and that it maintains anomalies and stupidities worthy only of the wise men of Gotham. Not many years since he wrote, "This very Department, that trifles with hundreds of thousands of pounds, refuses to allow a local postmaster in my constituency to expend 1s. 6d. in mending a lock of a door, but insists on despatching an officer from the Board of Works to the scene at a cost of £3 10s." The red-tape methods of St. Martin's le Grand are still incurring unnecessary expenditure of this kind.

Let us, however, give all credit to the Post Office for the degree of efficiency and despatch with which it does its letter-carrying.

Outside this special business of letter-carrying many supplementary services, more or less foreign to its end and design, have been thrust upon the Post Office. These it cannot, by any straining of language, be said to do well. What with parcels, telegraphs, telephones, money orders, banking, insurance, annuities, and other business, the Department has become a veritable "Jack of all trades and master of none." It is overwhelmed with supererogatory work, which it performs inefficiently and indifferently.

As an illustration of its muddling, take the telegraphs. After thirty-four years of monopoly and steady growth of the

business, the Post Office has not yet succeeded in making the telegraphs pay. Last year there was the enormous "net" deficit on their working of £983,681, in the previous year £601,711, and in 1901 £651,881. It is sometimes urged, by way of apology for this loss, that it is a result of the initial blunder of paying too heavy a capital sum for the telegraph lines which were purchased. But the above deficits, though described as "net," do not include interest on capital. If this be added, last year the loss was £1,282,541, in 1902 £892,365, and in 1901 nearly a million. Foreign and submarine telegraph companies manage to conduct their business at a profit, and yet offer facilities to the public which compare favourably with those provided by the British Government. The inland telegraph service is by no means efficiently worked. None knows this better than the journalist who has to deal with telegraphic "flimsy" of the speeches of our leading statesmen. When there is much political oratory in progress, the trouble and inconvenience occasioned by the slovenly work of inefficient and ill-paid Post Office operators give rise to much profanity in newspaper offices, for which the Postmaster-General will one day assuredly be called to account. The telephone system, again, under Post Office meddling has become a terrible muddle. Not until a private company had made some progress in establishing telephones did the Postmaster-General take any notice of this modern invention. But when private enterprise had succeeded in instituting telephonic exchanges on business lines the Postmaster-General interfered and claimed the telephone as a Post Office monopoly. Although a *modus vivendi* on a royalty basis was subsequently arrived at, the National Telephone Company has had to contend against Post Office obstruction ever since, in consequence of which the telephone is not used in this country to anything like the extent that it is abroad, and its facilities cannot be provided at so low a cost. At present the Post Office is in the position of not being able to make up its mind whether to buy out the company's interest or not. And now, too, it is adopting the

same dog-in-the-manger attitude towards wireless telegraphy, which, by the Act passed last session, has been placed under the Postmaster-General's embargo. The establishment of any wireless telegraphy station or installation is forbidden, even for experimental purposes, except under licence from the Postal authorities.

The Post Office Savings Bank, again, is another extraneous branch of activity of the letter-carrying department. It has been successful in attracting the savings of the humbler classes, but it does not give facilities equal to those of the Trustee Savings Banks, or even the Penny Banks, which are private enterprises. And yet the Post Office Savings Bank has shown a deficit for several years; last year's amounted to £107,403. Post Office Assurance and Annuities, still more foreign branches of business into which the Department has adventured, have been dismal failures. The Post Office cannot offer anything like the advantages of ordinary or industrial insurance companies, while the amount of business it transacts is insignificant compared with that of the larger offices, and is decreasing yearly. Only 722 life insurances," says the Postmaster-General's Forty-ninth Report, "were taken out in 1902, the sum insured being £34,646. The corresponding figures for 1901 were 920 and £44,296." Last year there was another decrease; the insurances numbered but 592, for sums amounting to only £31,413. These are about equal to the figures of one of the smaller private offices.

The latest addition which the Postmaster-General has been asked to make to the multifarious and heterogeneous services which he, with variable success, performs for the British public, is that of small debt collector for tradesmen who supply goods by Parcel Post. What is called the "Cash on Delivery" or "value payable" system of "shopping by post" has received the qualified approval of Lord Stanley, and only the absence of any clear public demand for it, and the opposition of small shopkeepers, deter him from giving it experimental trial. In his Fiftieth Report the Postmaster-General states that

deputations have waited upon him or his predecessor from both advocates and opponents of the "C.O.D." system. As the system is in operation in India and some other countries however, he is "by no means satisfied that the apprehensions expressed by retail traders in this country afford sufficient cause for withholding a convenience from the community at large." This is not a definite promise to introduce the system, but an intimation that he is willing to do so if the "community at large" demand it. But this demand the community at large has neither made nor shown any inclination to make. Certain advertising associations and large "universal providing" firms which lay themselves out for Parcel Post business have petitioned for it, a few chambers of commerce have, without consideration, passed perfunctory resolutions in its favour at the request of interested parties, and two or three newspapers of Socialistic proclivities have vainly endeavoured to work up agitations for it. But the general public is unresponsive, and has given no signs of any wide-spread desire to see the Post Office turned into a small debt-collecting agency.

On the other side, the Grocers' Federation sent a deputation to the Postmaster-General to ask him to hold his hand, and many retail traders' associations in provincial towns have petitioned against the scheme. It is significant that Mr. Henniker Heaton, the stalwart Post Office reformer, although at one time favourable to the "C.O.D." system, has dropped his advocacy of it, because he found his constituents strongly opposed to it.

In one of his deliverances on the subject (*Nineteenth Century* for December 1903) Mr. Henniker Heaton admitted that the present proposal had received the "determined and not altogether unreasonable opposition of an important section of the commercial population." The principal objections of country tradesmen to the scheme are that it would "enable trade to be done from Paris, Berlin, and London over the heads of the ordinary traders of our provincial cities and towns," and that it would open a wider door to fraudulent advertising. Small

provincial shopkeepers very naturally view with alarm an official contrivance which would take trade out of their hands, by giving special facilities to the large advertising firms of London and the great towns to supply the small tradesmen's own local customers direct. Their fears on this head are not wholly imaginary. Already the supply of goods per Parcel Post by large firms in London and Paris has become a great business, from which many small tradesmen in provincial towns have suffered very seriously, even to the extent of being driven by it into the Bankruptcy Court. The bitter cry of poor shopkeepers, ruined by these advertising firms, is heard throughout the land. The practical utility of the Parcel Post to the many may be held to vindicate it against objections urged on the ground of the harm it has so far done to the comparatively few. But such a plea can scarce be advanced for making the Post Office debt-collector-in-chief for the traders whom it has helped to thrive at the cost of their brother tradesmen. It is hardly the place of a public department thus to act as agent of one class to the detriment of another.

The advertising of goods supplied by post has also undoubtedly led, as the retail traders assert, to the spread of a certain class of fraud for which the "C.O.D." system would offer increased facilities. The artful advertising of flashy but trumpery goods for sale by post—goods of the "cheap and nasty" order—has developed in late years to an enormous extent, to the prejudice both of the credulous customer and the honest trader. The "C.O.D." system would lead to the unsuspecting public being further beguiled by advertising sharpers. Why should the Post Office be made both the dumping and debt-collecting agency of this fraternity? If it is not the duty of the department to protect the public against fraudulent advertisers, still less is it the duty of the department to assist these in carrying on their nefarious business, by freeing them from the risk of bad debts, as it would do in insisting upon cash on delivery when their wares are taken by the postman to their customers' doors. And a public department

cannot discriminate or become a respecter of persons. As with the Parcel Post, so with the Value Payable Post: once it is instituted, the Post Office must be debt-collector for the evil and the good, financial agent for the fraudulent and the honest.

But there are other objections to the proposal besides those based on the economic ruin it would help to bring upon a large and deserving class of the community. It is questionable whether to impose upon the Post Office the task of collecting the invoice value of goods supplied by post will confer any advantage on the public commensurate with the general inconvenience it may cause. Mr. Henniker Heaton, before his constituents induced him to give up the scheme, seemed to think its smooth working a very simple and easy matter. He wrote: "On a book or other article being ordered, say by post-card, the purchase is brought to the writer's door by the letter-carrier, who receives the price, which is remitted by the department to the sender." On paper, truly, the process is "as easy as winking." But has the hon. member for Canterbury ever had any experience of collecting tradesmen's debts? If he had, he would probably not have written so airily of this new service which it is proposed to require from the letter-carrier. How many of the purchasers will be ready to pay for their parcels at once, without examining the goods? Not a very considerable proportion, probably. How long will the letter-carrier be permitted to wait on the door-step for payment, meantime keeping others waiting for their letters and parcels? What will happen when payment is refused? What, when the letter-carrier finds the lady of the house "not at home," and is asked to leave the parcel and call again for payment? What, if the parcel is opened and he is told that the goods are not according to order? What, when the purchaser says the price charged is not that agreed upon, and insists upon making a reduction from the bill? These are but common every-day incidents in the experience of tradesmen. But, of course, they are all "in the day's work" of their assistants, and they adapt

themselves accordingly. But with the postman it would be otherwise, and there would be complications. The frequent delays occasioned by these hitches, and the confusion and friction caused by the local post offices having parcels left on their hands because the consignees reject them or refuse to pay, may be "better imagined than described." The probability is that the public would lose more by the disturbance of its postal business and the delay in delivery of its correspondence than it would gain in the increased facility for shopping by post.

Under existing circumstances postal delays are the occasion of much loss and inconvenience to business men. What will they be with the added difficulties this system would introduce into the delivery organisation? Every Christmas-time at present, without money to collect, but merely with extra packages to deliver, the Post Office arrangements literally "go to pieces." It often takes two or three days then to convey a letter from one London postal division to another, and a parcel has been known to occupy a week in working its way through the glut at St. Martin's-le-Grand from a south to a north London suburb. The Post Office does fairly well at ordinary times, but it cannot bear the strain of unusual pressure, and the service collapses under it. What, then, may we expect, at times when there is an extra influx of business, if, in addition to delivery of many parcels, the overburdened letter-carriers have to collect the bills for them? The "C.O.D." system would, to use a simile of Mr. John Morley's, be like thrusting an iron rod into a complicated piece of machinery in motion. The various railway companies, common carriers, and parcels delivery agencies are generally enterprising and alive to their opportunities. Under the healthy stimulus of competition, which the Post Office lacks, they have in some respects given the public better facilities than the Post Office. For instance, they carry parcels for certain distances at lower rates than the Post Office, and they will collect parcels from the senders, which the Post Office does not do. Yet they have

never attempted any cash on delivery service on their own account, knowing well the risks and difficulties that would attend the business. They find it trouble enough to have to collect their own charges for carriage of parcels not prepaid, let alone acting as the supplier's agents for the collection of the value of his goods. The Postmaster-General may be quite sure that were the "Cash on delivery" plan considered practicable by business men in this country, some of these enterprising companies would have tried it before this. For what they doubtless consider very good reasons some of the common carriers decline to act as debt-collectors for their clients.

The employees of the Post Office have been for years in a state of revolt, and at the present time there is active discontent among several branches, owing to their unredressed grievances and illiberal treatment. The work is hard and ill-paid, and even the moderate recommendations towards improvement recently made by the Bradford Committee have been rejected by the Postmaster-General. Not very long since the secretary of a postman's union described the Ministerial head of their department as a "taskmaster worse than the vilest East End sweater." Making allowance for the exaggeration of language to which trade union officials are prone, this expression of opinion discloses a spirit of mutiny which is the measure of the failure of the Postmaster-General as an employer of labour.

The position of the letter-carriers is a particularly hard one. They are only paid the wages of unskilled labour, and yet their responsibility in regard to the valuable property often entrusted to their care is heavy. So is their work physically. Since the delivery of parcels has been added to the labours of the letter-carriers, and the weight carried at letter rates has been increased, it has been no uncommon thing to see the unfortunate postman staggering under burdens grievous to be borne. He needs now to be something more than a "light porter." And yet to the labours this under-paid and over-worked class discharge, it is now proposed to add that of collection of small debts, for which surely they are scarcely qualified. Their "rounds" will then be

indefinitely prolonged, for at many doors they will have to wait long for payment for the parcels they deliver.

To make a State department a debt-collecting agency for private traders would impose upon it a rôle going beyond all theories of the manifold functions which may properly be performed by that institution. Even Socialists draw the line at debt-collecting: they would have the State ignore private contracts altogether. Surely we have not yet obtained all the postal reforms the utility of which is evident, that we need overburden the service with a task the utility of which is doubtful. This might, at least, stand over until the more urgent and useful measures in Mr. Henniker Heaton's programme have been achieved. When, for instance is the Postmaster-General going to remove the anomalies in the conveyance of printed matter? When is the absurd distinction between "news" papers and periodicals which are not newspapers to be abolished? Under that distinction a registered newspaper is carried for a halfpenny, even if it weighs over a pound, as the "special" numbers of certain journals do; whereas other periodicals, of a higher character from an educational point of view, but which cannot be registered as newspapers, are charged a penny for every 4 oz. and their postage would be over 4*d.* if weighing a pound. Other countries have abolished this anomaly, here it is still retained, and both publishers of periodicals and the reading public are placed at a disadvantage by it. And when is the Post Office going to reduce its systematic overcharges for letters? Sir Rowland Hill estimated the cost of carrying letters in his day at one thirty-sixth of a penny each. If we put the average cost of conveyance, in view of the increased weight of letter packages, at one-sixth of a penny per packet, it shows an excessive over-charge in current postal rates. The Post Office was not intended to be a revenue-earning department. But by reason of its present high charges, it is able, after defraying the heavy and unaccountable loss on the telegraphs, to show a profit of between three and four millions per annum. It might

easily reduce the letter rate to one halfpenny the ounce, and would probably soon recoup any shrinkage in its profits so caused. The vogue of the pictorial post-card, which travels for a halfpenny, has largely increased the revenue of the Post Office, the amount derived from the postage of cards and halfpenny packets, other than newspapers, last year, being nearly three millions. Further, there are many glaring shortcomings and misdoings in the working of the Department, which Mr. Henniker Heaton has frequently pointed out, still waiting to be remedied. A Royal Commission on the laches and blunders of Post Office administration would probably result in disclosures of inefficiency as discreditable as those which the Royal Commission on the Boer War revealed in the conduct of that much mismanaged military enterprise. When more urgent and useful postal reforms, which need not here be particularised, are carried out, and the service generally is raised to a higher level of efficiency, it will be time to consider seriously the propriety of making the Post Office a debt-collecting agency for traders who deliver their goods by post. Meantime the case for the "C.O.D." is "not proven."

JESSE QUAIL.

SUGGESTIONS ON THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS

II. ST. MARK—(*continued*)

THE examination of the traditional accounts of the origin of St. Mark's Gospel, which we made in the last article, yielded a very clear and simple result. The separate items of the evidence proved to be fragmentary, but always resting on a basis of truth. No one of the Fathers was possessed of the whole story, but each has handed down to us that portion of it which he had received, and out of these separate portions the whole story can be reconstructed. Taken one by one, the fragments seem contradictory. Sometimes they have been made more so, because two separate portions of the whole story have come to the knowledge of one of the Fathers, and have been by him combined into a single statement which in that form is inaccurate. Only when we get the whole mass of evidence together and sort it out afresh into its component atoms, does it become clear that there is a possible solution which violates no probability, and at the same time allows its full weight and force to each one of the many statements which have come down to us. The resulting story has a certain probability of its own, for it is unlikely that traditions at first sight so discordant could be combined into a single plausible narrative of this kind, which itself should not more or less closely conform to the truth. But still it remains a

conjecture only, even if a plausible one, unless on further examination it proves to fit in with other facts, and to throw a new light on existing difficulties. Our next task, therefore, is to test the story we have so far arrived at, and which we adopt for the present as a working hypothesis only. There are several tests which are open to us, and from among them we choose the three which seem to be most important and to give the best hopes of an effective result. We can test it, first, by the internal evidence of the texts of the three Synoptic Gospels, in their relations one with another; secondly, by the text of St. Mark's Gospel alone, seeing how far it seems probable that it should have sprung from such an origin; and thirdly, by contemporary and subsequent literature, if we can find anything in it that bears upon the point.

But, before we go on to make this inquiry, we may well pause a moment to notice the singular coincidence, if it be a coincidence, that the instruction given by St. Peter to Cornelius, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles (x. 34-43), is, as has been often noticed by commentators, a kind of *précis* of St. Mark's Gospel. It is quite possible, if our hypothesis is well founded in fact, that St. Luke when he wrote this passage had St. Mark's Gospel in its early form before him, and knew it to be the record of St. Peter's preaching and to have been given to Cornelius. In that case the coincidence is very simply explained.

In a comparison of the texts of what we may call the Marcan portions of the Synoptic Gospels there is one phenomenon which at once forces itself upon our notice. It is that St. Luke is much shorter than either St. Matthew or St. Mark, and that this brevity results not from a more compendious way of relating the same matter, but from the fact that many sections of the narrative, as given by the other two Evangelists, are entirely absent from the pages of St. Luke.

This is an important point, and it is one which has not received at all adequate consideration hitherto. For it is not merely small scraps of discourse or of narrative which are

omitted, but, in one case, a consecutive portion extending over nearly two chapters (Mark vi. 45-viii. 26 = Matthew xiv. 22-xvi. 11). The passages omitted in this section are by no means unimportant, but include our Lord walking on the sea, the healing of the Syro-Phœnician's daughter, and the feeding of the four thousand, besides a great deal of detailed teaching on the attitude to be preserved by our Lord's disciples towards such questions as ceremonial defilement and the special doctrines of the Pharisees. It is hardly conceivable that St. Luke should have deliberately declined to include all this important matter in his Gospel if he found it in that one of his sources which he treats throughout with the greatest respect, and which, indeed, provides the backbone of his narrative. It is still more difficult to believe that he would have omitted it if it came to him, as we must suppose it did, on direct Apostolic authority, as the preaching of Peter written down, practically from his lips, by the hand of St. Mark. There is a real difficulty here, and one which, as we have already said, has not hitherto been adequately considered.

But all difficulty disappears at once if we may accept the ideas arrived at in the last article as to the history of St. Mark's Gospel. If the authority on which St. Luke relies is the Cæsarean or original edition of St. Mark, while that which is incorporated in St. Matthew is the second or Alexandrian edition, these omissions are clearly seen not to be omissions at all, but to be due to the fact that the two editions were not identical, but differed one from the other. St. Luke has not got these portions of the story, not because he deliberately rejected them as not being of any value or interest for those for whom he was writing, but because they were not in his edition of St. Mark, but were added in the later edition. They formed no part of St. Peter's preaching at Cæsarea, but were added by St. Mark to that preaching at a later date, and derived by him from some other authority.

Here there comes in a fresh point to be considered. On a

closer examination of the matter contained in the various sections we are now supposing to have been added to the original account of St. Peter's preaching, it appears not altogether to consist of new matter, but to be a parallel, if not a repetition in a somewhat widely differing version, of much that has already been told in the earlier portion of the narrative. How much is identical and how much is new it is not very easy to say, but a careful comparison of Mark vii. 32-37, viii. 1-22, with vi. 32-56, vii. 1-24, will leave on the mind a strong feeling that the incidents recorded are at least partly identical, and this feeling will be strengthened if the parallel passages in St. Matthew are also looked up and studied. There seems at least a *primâ facie* case for supposing that a second account of these events, differing a good deal in detail from the first, but identical with it in the main outlines of the story, has been incorporated in our present Gospel of St. Mark, and placed in a position immediately following the original account. This interpolation, which may quite probably be due to the Evangelist himself, must have been made after the copy used by St. Luke was made, but earlier than the copy which is included in St. Matthew. If so, we have a new light thrown on the practice of St. Luke. That Evangelist is commonly said to object to duplications on principle, and to have cast out of his Gospel much material which was in his hands, in order to avoid all suspicion of duplication. But it seems more likely that St. Luke avoids duplication, sometimes at any rate, not by the exercise of his own critical faculties, but rather by the accidental circumstance that the sources of which he makes use are as yet free from the interpolations which are themselves the real origin of the duplications in question.

We return now to the comparison of the Marcan portions of the three Synoptics. The first peculiarity we have noticed, namely, "St. Luke's omissions," is certainly explained and made more intelligible by our working hypothesis. We have

to see now how it will be with any other points we may notice. Perhaps the next most prominent phenomenon is the way in which St. Luke's narrative constantly varies from that of St. Mark, sometimes merely verbally, but sometimes also in the order of sentences, without any motive which we can readily assign for the change. Of course St. Matthew also varies, and varies constantly, but here the motive is, as a rule, far more easy to detect. In a great number of instances he is clearly aiming at abbreviation, for St. Mark's style is very redundant and verbose, the style of one who thought in Aramaic while he was writing in Greek, and so the story as told by him lends itself easily to compression and abbreviation without any real loss of sense. Very often too, both in St. Matthew and St. Luke, changes have been made from St. Mark's words for the sake of improving the style: the historic present, for instance, almost always disappears, so that the tense may be more accurately marked, and harsh and provincial expressions are replaced by others which are more polished. In the case of St. Matthew's Gospel we shall find that almost all the changes may be codified under one or the other of these two heads. He abbreviates constantly, so that the famous criticism of St. Augustine¹ on the two Gospels, which is, as it stands, so singularly contrary to the truth, will come very near to the real state of affairs if it is reversed. *Matthæus Marci pedisequus et abbreviator videtur.* 'Matthew merely followed in the footsteps of Mark, and abbreviated his Gospel.' But the changes of St. Luke are much more difficult to account for. He, too, abbreviates a good deal, though much less than St. Matthew does, and he constantly makes changes which seem obviously designed for the improvement of the style. But when we have made all possible deductions for these two classes of alterations, there will remain a great number of minute and seemingly purposeless variations, so constant and so useless that they seem to have been made for no reason except change for its own sake. Such alterations are difficult

¹ "De Consensu Evang." i. 2. 4. 12.

to reconcile with the hypothesis that St. Luke was writing with a written document before him which he believed to contain the record of St. Peter's preaching, and which, therefore, he would naturally wish to alter as little as possible.

Here, again, a good deal of relief from the difficulty is obtained if we turn back to tradition. St. Clement of Alexandria¹ has recorded that St. Mark after he had written his Gospel gave it to those who had asked him for it. St. Chrysostom again has recorded that he wrote his Gospel in Egypt. If we take both of these statements literally, in connection with the order of events which we are trying to establish, we shall see that not only is there no contradiction involved, but that, on the contrary, a very simple and apparently adequate explanation is provided for the difficulty we have just stated. We have only to suppose that the re-issue in Egypt was an actual re-writing, rendered necessary by the fact that the original copy was no longer in the author's hands, to account for the variations of which we have spoken. Such a re-writing of material which was exceedingly familiar, and indeed practically known by heart, especially if it was also based upon copious rough notes, would no doubt give a result very like that by which we are confronted. The main story would be identical paragraph by paragraph. There would be, no doubt, in some places actual verbal identity of whole sentences and more at a time. But at the same time there would be a constant variation in unimportant matters; constant substitution of synonymous words and expressions; now and then a sentence inverted, or the order of the narrative slightly changed. No doubt there may be other explanations possible, and, indeed, other explanations have been offered. But in none of these have we a solution which is so simple and at the same time so probable, and which fits in so well with the complicated details which have to be explained. There is, too, a merit in this explanation, which the others do not share, that it is not a theory constructed merely with a view to solving particular

¹ Hypotyp. 6.

difficulties, but that it has been drawn independently of them from the earliest records which have come down to us by tradition.

There is a third point which rises out of the comparative analysis of the Synoptic Gospels, which in some ways is the most difficult and perplexing of all. It is the fact that, whereas in almost every case there is clear evidence that the Gospel of St. Mark underlies and is embodied in those of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and must therefore be earlier in date than either, there is also evidence, hardly less clear than the other, which goes to prove that, in its present form at least, it is later than either, and depends on them rather than they on it. This is the evidence which has seemed to German critics clearly to prove that there must have been an earlier Gospel narrative, an *Ur-markus* as they call it, which underlies our present Gospel of St. Mark, and is in fact one of the sources from which it, as well as the other two Synoptic Gospels, are derived. But it is obvious that such an *Ur-markus*, by itself, will only partly explain the difficulty, or, rather, it explains it only by introducing a fresh and very serious difficulty of its own. For how can it be supposed that such an *Ur-markus*, a document containing evangelic material which was contemporary with the Apostles, if not actually drawn up by the hands of one of them, has been allowed to perish and disappear without leaving the smallest trace of its existence behind in any ecclesiastical document? This difficulty is so real that it has produced a strong disinclination among conservative critics in England to accept any such theory of an earlier lost Gospel, even though the refusal has left them with no answer to give to the other difficulty of which we have just been speaking. Yet that difficulty is a real one, and rests on very definite evidence, so that we have no right to ignore it or to pass on without attempting an answer. The matter, stated quite simply, is as follows. In nine cases out of ten St. Mark's narrative underlies that of St. Matthew and St. Luke. They have abbreviated it, altered it, and added to it, and the treatment which it has

received at the hands of one differs from that which the other has given it. But still it remains clear that it, and not either of them, is the original, and that it is, of course, to the later writers rather than to the earlier that the changes are due. But in the remaining cases the position is exactly reversed, and they are too clear and too numerous to be merely accidental. In these instances we have St. Matthew coinciding with St. Luke against St. Mark, and, since it is here inadmissible to suppose that either of the two Evangelists in whose work such agreement is found has derived his matter from the other, we are driven back to the solution that each has accurately preserved the wording of the source, and that it is St. Mark who has varied it. But, if that be so, an earlier source in some form becomes a necessity, and that is precisely what conservative critics are eager to avoid.

Most of the instances in which St. Matthew and St. Luke are agreed against St. Mark are negative. That is to say, both St. Matthew and St. Luke omit certain passages which are found in St. Mark. Instances of this kind are not nearly so forcible as those of a positive nature, where both have retained a clause which St. Mark has omitted, but still it is very difficult to imagine such constant agreement with regard to omission to be merely accidental. The passages thus omitted are of considerable length—the healing of the deaf man, the cure of the blind man at Bethsaida, and the parable of the seed growing silently.¹ It is hard to imagine either of the two other Evangelists having these passages before them in the source they were following, and deliberately determining to suppress them. It is much more difficult still to suppose that both of them can have acted thus independently of one another. Again, among other omitted passages are almost every one of those specially fresh, vivid, life-like touches which are the special charm of St. Mark's Gospel, and which record for us so often the mood, the attitude, and the actual expression of the Master as He was doing His works of mercy

¹ St. Mark iv. 26-29; vii. 31-37; viii. 22-26.

or delivering His discourses to the people. It is easy to account for the absence of these details from either of the other Synoptics by saying that these were not the things which interested the early Church, and that early Christians cared nothing for local colour and vivid portraiture. Even so the explanation seems itself hardly in agreement with all that we know from other sources, and is therefore not entirely satisfactory. But, even if we accept it as an explanation why one Evangelist should not have cared to perpetuate these details, it breaks down hopelessly when we consider that it is not one only but two who have acted thus. It is simply impossible to believe that both St. Matthew and St. Luke, while in the main following their source accurately and carefully, could have arrived independently at such a singular agreement to suppress so many details which gave life and atmosphere to the story they were telling.

The case is the same again if we turn to proper names. St. Mark supplies quite a number of proper names which are not to be found in either St. Matthew or St. Luke. Are we to suppose that these Evangelists had them before them, but did not care to record them? If so, their conduct was in direct opposition to the usual tendency in such matters. No trait is more marked in the Apocryphal Gospels than the desire to supply the names of each of the actors in the story. It is unlikely, therefore, that both the earlier Evangelists should have been actuated by the opposite feeling. One example, among many which might be chosen, must suffice. St. Mark¹ tells us that at the gate of Jericho "the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the wayside." St. Luke in the parallel passage has simply "a certain blind man." If St. Mark is the earlier writer, and St. Luke had his Gospel before him, how are we to account for this deliberate preference for anonymity?

But there are also a few passages of the other type, where a passage which is found both in St. Matthew and St. Luke,

¹ Mark x. 46.

and which therefore must have been found in the source which they used, is yet missing from St. Mark. A good instance may be found in Mark xiv. 65, where the words "who is he that struck Thee" are not to be found, although they are in both of the parallel narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke. These words are necessary to the sense, and the "Prophecy unto us, thou Christ," which immediately precedes, is explained by them. Here, then, is a case where the two later Evangelists have preserved the original story more accurately than St. Mark has done; and it is difficult to see how this is possible if St. Mark's Gospel, in its present form, was the only source from which they have acquired their knowledge. Several other instances of the same kind could easily be given.

Now all these points are most easily and naturally cleared up if we adopt the hypothesis of the three editions of St. Mark which we have already put forward. There is no need of any *Ur-markus* and no difficulty in explaining how the earlier documents have come to disappear. They disappeared partly because they were so closely akin to the actual Gospel of St. Mark that they would have seemed nothing but imperfect copies of it, and partly because they were already incorporated in the Gospels of St. Luke and of St. Matthew. There would be no desire to copy a manuscript which contained practically nothing which was not also contained in the larger Gospel.

According to this view the omissions in the two later Gospel of so much Marcan material are not omissions at all. All this extra material; all these vivid touches; all this detailed nomenclature, was not to be found at all in the documents they incorporated. All this was added by St. Mark himself in the final revision of the Gospel at Rome after the death of St. Peter, and the added detail is, as we may well believe, due to St. Peter himself. For St. Mark was, as we know (1 Peter, v. 14), in attendance on St. Peter during the last period of his life, and not impossibly acted once again as his interpreter, as he had done in the old days at Jerusalem. In

any case, he must during that period have had frequent opportunities of hearing St. Peter preach, and so may well have become possessed of many additional details of the well-known stories—details which, now that so many years had passed, seemed to him of greater value than they had done in former years. We can understand, too, that objections which would have prevented the actual naming of persons still alive in A.D. 42 at Cæsarea would have ceased to be felt in A.D. 70 or thereabouts at Rome. The explanation is complete and, it must be acknowledged, is much less complicated and difficult than any other which seems available.

Our next subject of inquiry is the internal evidence of St. Mark's Gospel itself. How far is the style and wording of the Gospel consistent with such an origin as that which we are discussing? Has it, in other words, retained any peculiarities of diction which tend to confirm or to discourage the notion that it may have been originally composed, in its earliest form, for the use and instruction of the Roman soldiers, soldiers of the Italian cohort (Acts x. 1), who followed Cornelius the centurion and composed the first body of Christian believers at Cæsarea?

A great deal has been written on the alleged tendency to use Latinisms which is noticeable in this Gospel, and which is taken as an evidence of the truth of the tradition that it was written at Rome and for the use of Romans. There can be no doubt that Latinisms, though they are not unknown in the other Gospels, do occur with especial frequency in St. Mark. Thus we have the words *κεντυρίων*, *σπεκουλάτωρ*, *λεγέων*, *κοδράντης*, *κῆνος*, *οὐά*, *πραιτόριον*, and others, which are simply Greek transliterations of the Latin words *centurion*, *speculator*, *legio*, *quadrans*, *census*, *vah*, *prætorium*. It is doubtful whether the use of these words really implies anything more than a knowledge of the corrupt Greek of the Empire. Words of this kind which are constantly in use by a governing oligarchy soon get adopted into the language of a subject people. They are just the words which would be current in such a place as Jerusalem,

or still more at Cæsarea, which was the headquarters of the Roman garrison, and any support they give to the idea of the Gospel having been originally composed at Rome would equally avail, and even more so, to support a theory of an origin at Cæsarea. The same is also true of all the many details in the Gospel which tend to show that it was composed for Gentile and not for Jewish readers. On the other hand, there is much in the Gospel which is much better suited to an origin at Cæsarea than to the idea that it was composed at Rome. There is a definite military note about the Latin words which are employed, and about certain sentences in the Gospel, which has led to at least one book being written to prove that the author of the Gospel must himself have been a Roman soldier.¹ To speak thus is to strain the evidence altogether beyond anything it can fairly be made to bear, but the fact may quite reasonably be taken to support the contention that it was, as St. Clement of Alexandria has recorded, a military circle of Gentile readers who were originally addressed.

The geographical notices are more important, and these although slight are all in favour of a Palestinian origin for this Gospel, rather than of any theory of its having been written at Rome. Roman readers could scarcely be expected to know the name of Capernaum, or of Gadara, or of Decapolis. St. Luke finds it necessary to explain where these places are, for the benefit of his Gentile readers, but St. Mark introduces them without a word of explanation, as if his readers are sure to know all about them. So, again, the Lake of Tiberias is spoken of as "the sea," without any qualification, an expression which would be sure to prove misleading to Italian readers, but is natural enough if a Palestinian circle is being addressed. The neighbourhood of Jerusalem is with especial clearness assumed to be familiar to all. Jericho, Bethany, Bethphage, the Mount of Olives, the River Jordan, Arimathea, all alike are introduced without any of the explanation which St. Luke so often thinks

¹ Da Costa, "The Four Witnesses," p. 110 *seq.*

it necessary to provide, and apparently without a suspicion that any of the readers for whom the narrative is intended will have any difficulty in following the story. Such a familiarity with the general outlines of the topography of the district would be found, no doubt, among men who, although foreigners, yet were spending a long term of years in the country, but it could hardly be expected among a general audience of Gentile Romans most of whom, we may suppose, would never have gone far beyond the confines of their city, and to whom Palestine and Jerusalem would be a far-off and unimportant outpost of the widely extended Roman Empire.

The same general impression is given by the way in which the special customs of the Jews are discussed. The Scribes and Pharisees are classes who need no introduction. The institution of the Sabbath and the way in which it was kept is assumed to be familiar to all. The Preparation is defined to be the day before the Sabbath. A general knowledge of the Temple, too, and the part it played in Jewish national life is presupposed. At the same time there is no appeal to Jewish Scriptures, nor is any such exact knowledge of Jewish ritual suggested as we find in the parallel Gospel of St. Matthew. The whole fits in admirably with the idea that the Gospel was written for Gentile converts in Palestine, some of whom were already proselytes of the gate, "men fearing God," as it is phrased in the Acts (x. 2); but it is less in accordance with a theory that a purely Gentile audience in Rome itself was the objective aimed at.

There is one other detail which is perhaps worth noting in this connection. It is the way in which Pilate is introduced as one whose name and office is so familiar that no explanation can possibly be required. In St. Matthew he is spoken of quite clearly and definitely as the *governor*. "They bound him and led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor" (St. Matt. xxvii. 1). So again in St. Luke, "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa" (St. Luke iii. 1). But St.

Mark introduces his name without any such qualification. "They bound Jesus and carried him away and delivered him up to Pilate" (St. Mark xv. 1). Roman soldiers at Cæsarea in A.D. 42 would have known all about Pilate, as a matter of course, and would have needed no explanation about him, but this would hardly have been true of a civilian audience at Rome itself in A.D. 70. A similar conclusion might be drawn from a careful comparison between the Evangelists on the point of the custom of liberating a prisoner on the great Jewish Feast (St. Mark xv. 6, compared with St. Matt. xxvii. 15, St. Luke xxiii. 16-17, and St. John xviii. 35).

We come now to the last point which we proposed to examine, and that is the witness of contemporary literature. As we have already seen, there is plenty of evidence in the writings of the Fathers for the tradition that St. Mark's Gospel was written at Rome, and there is also a less strong, but still noteworthy, body of evidence which can be adduced in favour of Alexandria. But no one of the Fathers has connected Cæsarea with this Gospel. This fact is the more weighty because Eusebius, whose name stands first of all among those to whose labours we owe it that such scraps of early tradition as we do possess have been preserved, was himself Bishop of Cæsarea. We may take it, then, that his silence is positive proof that no tradition existed in Cæsarea itself as to the Gospel having been written there. The argument from silence is always dangerous and not very conclusive, but in this case it is much stronger than such arguments commonly are, and it is supported by the fact that in none of the superscriptions and appendages which are attached to the Gospel in various MSS. of early date, is there any allusion to a tradition which connected it with Cæsarea.

But, while we give full weight to this argument from silence, we must not neglect to consider a remarkable series of notices which occur in the various books of the pseudo-Clementine romances, and which do seem to have preserved some tradition of this sort. The pseudo-Clementine romances

are the writings which naturally suggest themselves in a case like this, where there is a question of a connection of the Apostle St. Peter with the town of Cæsarea. For they consist of a series of disputations, supposed to have taken place at Cæsarea and certain other coast towns of Syria, between the Apostle and the arch-heretic Simon Magus. Their date is a matter of great dispute among scholars. Some place them as early as A.D. 150, while others with greater probability urge that in their present form no one of them can be earlier than the first quarter of the third century, though they rest on earlier documents. They emanate from the Ebionite faction, that is to say, the extreme Judaistic section of Christianity, and the present form is the result of various re-castings. They may easily, therefore, here and there have preserved fragments of an extremely early date.

Both the two chief works of this series, the "Clementine Homilies" and the "Recognitions," are constructed on an identical plan. Clement, having been converted to Christianity in Rome, goes to Cæsarea to find Peter. Peter takes him and instructs him, and he then reports the discourses of the Apostle with a view to sending them to James at Jerusalem. But the point which concerns us is that in each book there is found a remarkable reference to an earlier work which Clement has already written and sent to Jerusalem, a work which was itself written from Peter's dictation and which had for its theme the life of Christ, who is here, as always in Ebionite writings, spoken of as "the true Prophet." The actual passages are as follows :

(1) *Clementine Homilies*, i. 20.—However when I had written this discourse concerning the Prophet by Peter's order, he caused the volume to be despatched to you (James) from Cæsarea Stratonis, saying that he had a charge from you to send you his discourses and his acts year by year.

(2) *Recognitions of Clement*, i. 17.—Whence by his command, reducing into order what he had spoken unto me, I compiled a book concerning the true Prophet, and sent it you from Cæsarea by his command. For he said he had received a command from you to send every year an account of his sayings and doings.

Besides the "Homilies" and "Recognitions" there exist also two shorter recensions of the same story which seem to have been merely abbreviated, though with considerable alterations, from the older and longer forms. In these, however, the passage about the earlier volume on the life of the True Prophet is not to be found. Still it is manifest that it is they who have omitted it, and not the longer accounts which have added it in, and we are left therefore with the very remarkable fact that the pseudo-Clementine literature, as we now have it, looks back to and is professedly the continuation and completion of St. Peter's teaching on the True Prophet, which was written down from his lips at Cæsarea by the hand of one of his disciples. One has only to change the name of this disciple from Clement to Mark to obtain all that we could wish for as a traditional statement of the origin of St. Mark's Gospel. Not only does it appear to provide us with a strong confirmation of the theory that that Gospel was originally written at Cæsarea and not at Rome, but it also opens up a most interesting possibility, which will come up again for discussion later on, that St. Mark's Gospel may be the original germ from which has sprung all that long and well-marked series of apocryphal writings, which begins with the Gospel of Peter, and goes on through the "Preaching of Peter," the "Journeys of Peter," and the "Acts of Peter" to the "Clementine Homilies" and the "Recognitions of Clement." Such a connection of a series of apocryphal and heretical writings with an orthodox document included in the Canon of the Church will, if it can be shown to be founded in fact, throw great light on the genesis of similar writings in the second century and on the choice of the names by which they were known.

A. S. BARNES.

THACKERAY IN SEARCH OF A PROFESSION

THACKERAY left Cambridge in June 1830 without completing the University course. On every account it was an advantage that the remaining time before he would be qualified for what to him would have been a useless degree should not be spent in the sterile sameness of college, but that he should be growing familiar instead with foreign nations, their languages, literature, and modes of thought. By a wise decision, the month of July 1830 saw him on his road to Germany. He halted first at Godesberg, and next moved on to Weimar. There, as he wrote to Mr. Lewes, five-and-twenty years later, "a score of young English lads used to live for study, sport, or society, all of which were to be had in the friendly little Saxon capital." A few sentences put together from his information to Mr. Lewes will show that he could not have been more favourably situated for obtaining an intimate knowledge of a people in their upper and middle ranks. Speaking of the Weimar English colony, he says:

The Grand Duke and Duchess received us with the kindest hospitality. The Court was splendid, but yet most pleasant and homely. We were invited in our turns to dinners, balls, and assemblies there. The Grand Duchess, a lady of very remarkable endowments, would kindly borrow our books from us, lend us her own, and graciously talk to us young men about our literary tastes and pursuits. We knew the whole society of that little city; and but that the young ladies, one and all, spoke admirable English, we surely might have learned the very best German. The society met constantly. The ladies of

the Court had their evenings. The theatre was open twice or thrice in the week, where we were assembled, a large family party.

In October, he and his comrades were admitted to an interview at mid-day with Goethe, who was past eighty, and verging towards his end. "His voice," Thackeray says, "was very rich and sweet. He asked me questions about myself, which I answered as best I could. I recollect I was at first astonished, and then somewhat relieved, when I found he spoke French with not a good accent." The conversation, therefore, of which he had nothing more to tell, was not in Goethe's native tongue; and, indeed, Thackeray wrote to his mother, "Everybody speaks French here, so that I have had more practice for my French than my German." He was never again in company with Germany's literary magnate, though he twice had an outward glimpse of him, once stepping into his chariot, and once walking in his garden. His daughter-in-law, Madame de Goethe, who lived with him, kept almost open house, but he himself "remained in his private apartments, where only a very few privileged persons were admitted." Thackeray elsewhere said of Weimar, "It is a hospitable place, as far as tea-parties are concerned, but I never was in one where dinners were so scarce." The daughter-in-law's hospitality followed the economical rule in vogue, and was more frequent, easy, and instructive in consequence. "Her tea-table was always spread for us. We passed hours after hours there, and night after night, with the pleasantest talk and music. We read over endless novels and poems in French, English, and German." Such evenings must have been something like a school of European literature to the English guests. Independent of Madame de Goethe's lettered gatherings, the entire Weimar intercourse had a lasting charm for Thackeray, from its pervading refinement and good-will. "With a five-and-twenty years' experience since those happy days, and an acquaintance with an immense variety of humankind, I think I have never seen a society more simple, charitable, courteous, gentlemanlike, than that of the dear little Saxon city where

the good Schiller and the great Goethe lived and lie buried.”¹ There was a drawback, to a student of German, in the widespread use of French and English in conversation. But if Thackeray had been slow in learning dead languages, he had a remarkable facility in mastering a living tongue; and whatever limits there may have been to colloquial practice, he could speak German before he returned to England, and read all manner of German works at sight. He had a full measure of admiration for the famous authors of the time, and went so far as to say of Schiller, “I believe him to be, after Shakespeare, the Poet.” His ambition was to naturalise him in England by a translation.² The French writers, novelists especially, had the ascendancy with him later, and his German partialities receded somewhat into the background.

Led by the effigy on a crown piece of George IV. to recall some of the scenes of his early life, Thackeray conjures up a vision, which was almost certainly part of his personal career, and probably belonged to his Weimar period. After describing his exit from Cambridge, he continues:

And now I see one of the young men alone. He is walking in a street—a dark street—presently a light comes to a window. There is the shadow of a lady who passes. He stands there till the light goes out. Now he is in a room scribbling on a piece of paper, and kissing a miniature every now and then. They seem to be lines, each pretty much of a length. I can read *heart, smart, dart; Mary, fairy; Cupid, stupid; true, you;* and never mind what more. Bah! it is bosh.²

“Every man,” he said, “ought to be in love a few times in his life; you are the better for it when it is over.” He makes Fitz-Boodle, in his “Confessions,” construct three separate tales of his successive love fits for three German girls. Thackeray himself had one acknowledged love fit during his stay at Weimar, and the incident of walking before the window at night was then the approved method in Germany, by which suitors announced the fervour of their passion to the lady who

¹ G. H. Lewes’ “Story of Goethe’s Life,” pp. 368–371.

² “Roundabout Papers”—“De Juventute.”

was the object of it. From the delight he took in the sympathy and tenderness of women he was not likely to remain long without a favourite, and, if the first failed, to have recourse to a second, and next to a third, after the manner of Fitz-Boodle, whose history in part represents his own. He was nineteen when he set foot on German soil, an age prone of itself to that exalted estimate of female qualities, mental and personal, which begets unbounded homage. He had stated, with lively force, in his half burlesque vein, the source of the sentiment which attaches to the most trivial intercourse between mutual admirers of different sex. "You offer her anything—her knitting-needles, a slice of bread and butter—what causes the grateful blush with which she accepts the one or the other? Why, she sees your heart handed over to her upon the needles, and the bread and butter is to her a sandwich with love inside it." From the verdict, "Bah! it is bosh," which his dispassionate judgment pronounced on his lines, he lets us see that he set down his misplaced adoration, and the expression of it, for a youthful folly which only required to be dismissed with an exclamation of contempt. It admits of a kinder view. The instinctive propensity is a special provision of nature, and has a beneficent purpose. One undoubted gain is that, out of love in its romantic stage, has grown much of the chivalrous bearing to women which is prominent among the forces that civilise the world.

From about the middle of 1831 to the middle of 1832, which was the year of his life from twenty to twenty-one, Thackeray had chambers in Hare Court, Temple, and was the nominal pupil of a special pleader. On coming of age he would inherit an income of five or six hundred a year, and, with an assured independence, would be free to follow either of his favourite pursuits, art and literature. In his visions of the future he set both aside, and preferred the calling of a barrister. This appeared to him in prospect "a noble and tangible object," and a not unpromising road to fame. But the initiatory technicalities of special pleading were notoriously

dull, subtle, and not seldom irrational, and were to many men intolerable. The illustrious Burke said of himself that he had "a kind of earnest and anxious perseverance of mind moulded into his constitution," which enabled him to follow up an object "without regard to convenience, ease, or pleasure." The students of 1831 who became very learned in the law were endowed with Burke's temperament. Thackeray witnessed its operation at the Temple, and described it in the person of Mr. Paley—pale from study—who pored ceaselessly over his law, from his getting up at seven to his going to bed on the following morning at two.

He has been bringing a great intellect laboriously down to the comprehension of a mean subject, and, in his fierce grasp of that, resolutely excluding from his mind all higher thoughts, all better things, all the wisdom of philosophers and historians, all the thoughts of poets; all wit, fancy, reflection, art, love, truth altogether. . . . He could not cultivate a friendship, or do a charity, or admire a work of genius, or kindle at the sight of beauty, or the sound of a sweet song. He had no time and no eyes for anything but his law books. All was dark outside his reading lamp.¹

Reviewing his past with his ripened judgment and his experience of his chequered career, Thackeray did not wish that he had emulated Mr. Paley's invincible diligence. He reprobated the misapplication of it. His first opinion, after trial of the study he had selected, agreed with his last. "This lawyer's preparatory education," he wrote to his mother, "is certainly one of the most cold-blooded pieces of invention that ever a man was slave to. A fellow should properly do and think of nothing else than Law." The experiment was foredoomed to failure. He would presently be of age, had not to work for a livelihood, had steadily declined, when most under discipline, to labour against his inclination, had recently extended and confirmed in Germany his ingrained taste for the magic world of letters, art, and nature, and it was not to be supposed that he could suddenly divest himself of the enthralling characteristics which constituted his personality, and take in their place

¹ "Pendennis," chap. xxix.

the narrow, and to him repulsive personality of Mr. Paley. His year at chambers had its lessons for him, but it was not law he learnt there. He might appear bodily from time to time at the scene of study, but mentally he stopped at the entrance of the dreary labyrinth, and trod none of its mazes.

"The chief news of this week," writes Fitzgerald, December 7, 1832, "is that Thackeray has come to London, but is going to leave it again for Devonshire directly. He came very opportunely to divert my blue devils; notwithstanding, we do not see very much of each other; and he has now so many friends (especially the Bullers) that he has no such wish for my society." The central figure of the Buller group was Charles, who obtained somewhat later a reputation in the House of Commons for his enlightened views on colonial affairs, the debating ability of his speeches, and the dash of humour he elicited from the driest topics. There was a natal affinity between him and Thackeray; both were born in Calcutta, and the fathers of both were servants in the East India Company. Both, too, were members of Trinity College, Cambridge, but were not in residence together, Charles Buller, who was five years the elder, having taken his degree in 1828, and Thackeray not arriving till 1829. To the points of sympathy from outward circumstances was added the stronger tie from their marked benevolence of disposition. "He is as full of good humour and kindness as you," Fitzgerald said of Thackeray, when mentioning that he was being drawn to other friends, and Charles Buller had the same emphatic testimony to his amiable virtues from all who knew him. With these resemblances, their leading pursuits were dissimilar—Thackeray devoted to literature and art, Buller a practising barrister, and pre-eminently a politician. Both were of the same school in politics; but though Thackeray held firmly the ultra-liberal views of his friend, they were the product of his feelings independent of study, and did not take up much of his time and thoughts.

Certain undergraduates in Thackeray's college days ascribed

the hardships of mankind to misgovernment by the upper classes, and, fearing no evil from the ignorance, envy, poverty, and covetousness of the lower, they believed that the road to a just and prosperous freedom was by a fierce and unrelenting annihilation of authority. In his review, in 1843,¹ of the rabid political verses by the German Herwegh, whose panacea for social evils was the extermination by civil war of rulers and clergy, Thackeray, in ridicule of his savage rant, said that, twenty years earlier, some young philosophers might possibly in part have applauded his doctrines at a Union debate. Arthur Pendennis was one of these precocious philanthropists.

From having been an ardent Tory in his freshman's year, his principles took a sudden turn afterwards, and he became a Liberal of the most violent order. He avowed himself a Dantonist, and asserted that Louis the Sixteenth was served right. And as for Charles the First, he vowed that he would chop off that monarch's head with his own right hand, were he then in the room at the Union Debating Club, and had Cromwell no other executioner for the traitor.

"The razor," Thackeray said, in his article on Herwegh, "crops off a number of those sentiments which beset the growing boy," and it might be suspected from his advanced Radicalism that he himself had been for a while a theoretical convert to the destruction and bloody principles preached by Herwegh and Pendennis. But there is no indication of it. Any outrage upon humanity and Christian institutions was alien to his nature. He seems to have been guided throughout by the simple desire that those who were worst off should have a larger share in the blessings of life, and he supported every measure which seemed to be directed to that end.

Buller was Member for West Looe, in Cornwall, and when the Reform Bill of 1832, which disfranchised it, had surmounted the opposition of the House of Lords and was about to pass, and he had settled to stand for Liskeard, his managers there summoned him to come down immediately to secure the votes of his new constituency, against the coming dissolution.

¹ In "The Foreign Quarterly Review," April 1843.

THACKERAY IN SEARCH OF A PROFESSION 95

He was too ill [Thackeray wrote to his mother, on June 25], but instead deputed Arthur Buller and myself. So off we set that same night by the mail, arrived at Plymouth the next day, and at Liskeard the day after, where we wrote addresses, canvassed farmers, and dined with attorneys. On Wednesday last I was riding for twelve hours' canvassing—rather a feat for me, and considering I have not been on horseback for eight months, my stiffness yesterday was by no means surprising.

Buller was to follow a week later. "I should like," said Thackeray, "to wait for the Reform rejoicings which are to take place on his arrival, particularly as I have had a great share in the canvassing." He would not in general have been considered an adept at the business, for he scorned to employ the artifices of language and manner by which exacting voters are conciliated. Fortune favoured him in his present mission. The excitement roused by the Reform Bill was intense, and that Buller had supported it was enough for the majority of his electors. He was returned for Liskeard in December 1832, and represented it till his death in 1848.

Two months after the electioneering visit to Cornwall there appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* for August 1832 the first half of "Elizabeth Brownrigge, a tale, Dedicated to the author of 'Eugene Aram, a novel,'" and this has been ascribed by competent judges to Thackeray. There is not any direct evidence that it is his, but the internal evidence is strong, from the affinity of the theme, and the handling of it, to some of his subsequent productions. "Eugene Aram" appeared in December 1831, and Thackeray, who reprobated the whole class of novels that had murderers and highwaymen for their heroes, had a special antipathy to Bulwer's style of writing and assailed him in coming years with peculiar acrimony. The purpose of the tale in *Fraser's Magazine* was to ridicule his then recent novel, very popular with the public, and Elizabeth Brownrigge is the heroine whose crimes and attractions are intended to rival those of Bulwer's hero, Eugene Aram. The real Brownrigge was a London midwife, conspicuous among murderers for her savage cruelty to her apprentices, and was hanged at Tyburn in 1766, for having mangled one of them

by ferocious whippings till the girl died of her wounds. This miscreant was already noted in literature through Canning's lines, in 1798, entitled, "Inscription for the door of the cell in Newgate where Mrs. Brownrigg, the Prenticide, was confined"—a parody designed to make fun of Southey's juvenile politics as indicated in his "Inscription for the apartment in Chepstow Castle, where Henry Marten, the Regicide, was imprisoned thirty years." The tale of Elizabeth Brownrigge has not much merit. The whole is broad burlesque, and the writer allowed himself every opportunity for farcical effects by a total disregard of nature and probability. It suited the bent of Thackeray's mind in his early time that he should have kept to parody in prose as well as in verse, and the author of "Elizabeth Brownrigg" did not tax his invention. He drew his materials from the Newgate Calendar, the novel of Bulwer, and the solitary sentiment in Canning's mocking lines, but with all these helps his incidents are scanty and ill-pieced, and the narrative and dialogue diffuse and tedious. The very satire which should have been the warrant for the offensive details is nugatory. The parallel between the novel and the tale is framed upon forced analogies. Eugene Aram's actual history and Bulwer's version of it were widely different from the Mrs. Brownrigg of the Newgate Calendar, and the representation of her in the Magazine. The assumed coincidences did not exist, and the dissimilarities are too extravagant to be applicable. Canning hardly dealt more justly with Southey's Inscription; but Canning's travestie, like the original, consisted only of sixteen lines in blank verse, and, however inappropriate, was brief and ludicrous. The prose travestie of "Eugene Aram" was neither. The talent shown in it was chiefly confined to the language. Bulwer's style in "Eugene Aram" was, in many parts, too ostentatious for a novel—an error he acknowledged and partly corrected in his latest version, imputing the faults to "defects in youthful taste"—and, if the imitation in the Magazine of the high-flown passages was by Thackeray, he had already attained at twenty-

one to a mastery over the English tongue, and to much of his later dexterity in mimicking forms of composition unlike his own. Viewed in the light of an attractive story, a witty burlesque, or a lesson in morals, "Elizabeth Brownrigge" gives no promise of what was to come.

The concluding part of "Elizabeth Brownrigge" came out in September. Eight months later we get from conjecture to certainty. Thackeray took a decided turn to literature, and became proprietor and editor of a weekly periodical called *The National Standard and Journal of Literature, Science, Music, Theatricals and the Fine Arts*. It had been first started on January 5, 1833, and had existed for about four months when, as he tells us in "Lovel the Widower," under the guise of fiction, his swindling friend Honeyman, "with his wheedling tongue," induced him to purchase it.

I dare say [he goes on] I gave myself airs as editor, and proposed to educate the public taste, to diffuse morality and sound literature throughout the nation, and to pocket a liberal salary in return for my services. I dare say I printed my own sonnets, my own tragedy, my own verses. I dare say I wrote satirical articles, in which I piqued myself upon the fineness of my wit and criticisms, got up for the nonce out of encyclopædias and biographical dictionaries; so that I would be actually astounded at my own knowledge. I dare say I made a gaby of myself to the world: pray, my good friend, hast thou never done likewise? If thou hast never been a fool, be sure thou wilt never be a wise man.

His management of the journal commenced with No. 19, which was published May 11, 1833. The previous editor was named Bayley, and beyond the intimation of better things that might seem to lurk in the incoherent pun, "We have got free of the *Old Bailey* and changed the governor," Thackeray's opening address had the opposite defect to that of boastful professions, and was modestly inane. "We promise," he said, "nothing, and if our readers expect nothing more they will assuredly not be disappointed." He commenced his contributions with rough pictorial caricatures of public characters, accompanied by verses equally rough. The week before he printed his opening address, he took Louis Philippe for his

subject, and held him up to scorn for his personal appearance, his plebeian dress, and his greed for money. His next butt was the celebrated tenor singer, Braham, noted for the dramatic force of his delivery, as well as for his splendid voice. "His singing," said Lamb, "when it is impassioned, is finer than Mrs. Siddon's or Kemble's acting." In Thackeray's caricature he is personating a common sailor on the stage. He had retained much of his powerful voice beyond the usual term, and because he had been long before the world his derider thought it a telling joke to assert that he had made his first appearance in the reign of Queen Anne. He was by birth a Jew, but had abandoned the creed of his fathers; and, that he might not escape the discredit attached to his race, his Jewish extraction was made prominent by introducing in the background of the sailor portrait an old clothes-man wearing the three-storied hat, and by depicting a jew's-harp encircled with laurels in the sky. The critics who disparaged Wordsworth's poems at that date taunted him with the trivial topics he chose for his verse; and therefore Thackeray, who had not emancipated himself from the trammels of parody, feigned him to be the author of the mimic sonnet which has the jew's-harp and the praises of Braham for its theme. The intention was to make sport of both singer and poet, and was a dreary failure. The mechanical structure of the sonnet ascribed to Wordsworth has a resemblance to some of the poet's mannerisms. In matter the likeness is not apparent, and the verses are nonsensical without being droll. The rest of Thackeray's verse and picture squibs in the *National Standard* are not superior to his Louis Philippe and Braham. They are only curiosities to show by what unpromising paths he was advancing to his goal.

Thackeray was in Paris at the end of June 1833, and for four successive weeks he furnished a letter to the *National Standard*, in which he maintained that "all creeds, political, literary and religious," had changed for the worse since the revolution of 1830. In describing the evil, he made use of

facetious irony, clever in places, but wanting the delicacy of his later sarcasms in the same vein. His third letter is an abridged translation of an article by Jules Janin, which he gave for "a tolerable specimen of the French style of periodical writing"; and as the style was not in favour with him, he must have been unconscious that the ironical railleries in the article strongly resembled his own.

He followed up the letters by a tale, the "Devil's Wager," written in a strain of festive levity, but with the serious purpose of representing, from personal observation, the religious and moral degradation of French society. A devil of the minor order has twined his tail round the neck of a mediæval knight, Sir Roger de Rollo, who had been flagrantly wicked upon earth, and is dragging him to his doom. His sister said *aves* for him at his death, but died herself before she could utter the last *ave* that was requisite to rescue him. The devil who had the custody of him lays him a wager that none of his remaining relations—a niece, a nephew, and a clerical brother—will have piety enough to say the indispensable *ave*. He tries each in turn without avail, until finally he circumvents the brother. Sir Roger pretends to be an inmate of Paradise, sent to warn him that his death and damnation are due on the morrow, and that he can only avert his fate by saying an *ave*. He has no sooner said it than he is seized by the devil in charge of Sir Roger, is whisked to the pinnacle of his own abbey steeple, and thence carried downwards screaming, while the triumphant knight, released by the *ave*, soars gaily upwards. "The moral of this story," says Thackeray, at the close, "will be given in the second edition," by which he intimated to the reader that a moral was intended, and left him to discover it for himself. Under the thin veil of laying the scene in mediæval times, he meant to expose the depravities of modern France. His fourth letter to the *National Standard* was in the form of a speech, supposed to be addressed by the statue of the Emperor Napoleon from the top of his column to the populace below, and he is there made to say, "From this elevation I can look

on most parts of your city; I see the churches empty, the prisons crowded, the gambling-houses overflowing." The "Devil's Wager" conveys Thackeray's conviction that Christianity had been replaced by infidelity and vice, and that those who had not openly renounced their faith had ceased to be influenced by it. "We may set down as axioms," he wrote seven years later, "that religion is so uncommon among the Parisians as to awaken the surprise of all candid observers; that gallantry is so common as to create no remark, and to be considered as a matter of course." The historic element in the story is its interest, and may be the reason that Thackeray reprinted it in his "Paris Sketch Book" of 1840. The tale itself is not well constructed, and the moral intended to be deduced from it is left enigmatical and confused. The single circumstance that a profligate, on his entrance into the eternal world, should procure for himself the rewards of the righteous by a nefarious fraud, is an enormity that tends to mask the real purport of the narrative.

"The Devil's Wager" was completed in Thackeray's weekly number of August 24. In the following month he had returned from Paris to London, and writes, September 6, 1833, "*The National Standard* is, I am glad to say, growing into repute, though I know it is poor stuff." A few weeks later, October 23, he was able to announce that the turn in its favour continued: "The paper is very rapidly improving, and will form, I have no doubt, a property, in which case it would be pleasant as an occupation and an income." In another three weeks his confident prognostication had received a check, and he had to report, on November 12, that the increased circulation during the previous month had been only about twenty. "At this rate," he says—the rate of five a week, representing tenpence in money—"I shall be ruined before it succeeds." To avert the catastrophe, the language of his opening address in May was succeeded at the close of the year by an address of big promises, such as he laughed at and justly excused in "Lovell the Widower," and under cover of them he raised the

price of his paper from twopence to threepence. This simple expedient for converting a losing into a paying concern was rather calculated to drive away present purchasers than to attract new supporters. It quickly put an end to the *National Standard*, which stopped on February 1, 1834. The speculation was fore-doomed. To extend the sale and control the expenditure an energetic and knowing publisher should have been the proprietor, and not an improvident youth, ignorant of the business, incapable of attending to it, and dependent upon agents prodigal of money not their own. The management on the literary side was defective. Thackeray was diligent in his editorial duties at times. "The only fault I find with the *National Standard*," he said, December 13, 1833, "is that at the end of the day I am but ill-disposed, after writing and reading so much, to read another syllable or write another line." But his industry was intermittent, and his literary judgment not yet at its best. With taste to perceive that the bulk of his journal was "poor stuff," he sometimes mistook very bad work for good. He printed, under the head of "Original Papers," a "Tale of Wonder," which his mother condemned, and in defence of it he confessed that his original tale was a translation from what he called "a very clever French story." Addressed to grown-up persons it was the silliest trash, and if meant for children was nothing more than a poor copy, slightly varied, from a traditional class of nursery marvels. Worst of all, the articles really his own were indifferent, and could have little attraction for any class of readers. His genius at twenty-two had not yet begun to force its way to the front.

On June 25, 1832, Thackeray wrote to his mother :

I have been lying awake this morning meditating on the wise and proper manner I shall employ my fortune in when I come of age, which, if I live so long, will take place in three weeks. First, I do not intend to quit my little chambers in the Temple. Then, I will take a regular monthly income which I will never exceed.

Though he justly called his patrimony of five or six hundred a

year a fortune, his resolution, if it was to be kept, required that he should regulate his expenditure by his wants, regardless of impulses and desires, and his nature was cast in the opposite mould. He was by constitution liberal, not frugal, and could with difficulty be a niggard to himself or others. His capital soon began to waste. "Certain it is," says Mr. Hannay, "that he lent—or, in plain English, gave—five hundred pounds to poor old Maginn." We may suppose it lent, but with the tacit understanding on both sides that it was not to be repaid, its return being as much against the nature of things as that water spilt upon the ground should be gathered up again.

He was in the trustful season of youth, and his freedom from suspicion was costlier to him than his generosity. He was lured at the Temple into the snares of a cardsharper.

In my young days [he says in his "Roundabout Paper" on "Ogres"] there used to be play ogres—men who would devour a young fellow at one sitting, and leave him without a bit of flesh on his bones. They were quiet, gentleman-like-looking people. They got the young fellow into their cave. Champagne, *paté-de-foie-gras*, and numberless good things were handed about; and then, having eaten, the young man was devoured in his turn.

An ogre of this description fleeced him in the manner here intimated, and minutely related in the "Amours of Mr. Deuceace." Many years afterwards, when walking with Sir Theodore Martin through the play-rooms at Spa, Thackeray pointed to a tall man in a seedy frock-coat, and said, on leaving, "That was the original of my Deuceace; I have not seen him since the day he drove me in his cabriolet to my broker's in the city, where I sold out my patrimony and handed it over to him." The portion sold to satisfy the claims of this shameless cheat, callous in villainy, was fifteen hundred pounds. "Poor devil!" was Thackeray's reflection on his shabby appearance at Spa, "my money doesn't seem to have thriven with him." Deuceace is seldom a provident man, but his chief extravagance is that he commonly spends his winnings in losing them again. He cannot command a consecutive series of dupes, and is driven by his needs and insane propen-

sities to risk his gains where the chances are even or against him. The "poor devil" at Spa probably owed it to his occasional opportunities for fraud that he had been left with a seedy coat to his back, and a few coins for a stake to carry on his trade.

The varieties of swindling are endless, and after Deuceace came Honeyman. It is said of this oily-tongued rogue, in "Lovell the Widower," that being in dreadful straits for money he could not resist the temptation of extracting it from a greenhorn, or, to speak more exactly, from a confiding friend, whom he persuaded, as we have seen, to buy the bankrupt *National Standard*, under the pretence that it was a profitable investment. The process was easy. He had only to answer questionings and hesitating misgivings by reassuring lies. Thackeray's endeavour to make the best of his bad bargain turned against him. To the loss of his purchase-money was added the heavier loss from the deficiencies for nine months of an unremunerative sale.

The breaking of an Indian bank, at some undetermined period, is said to have been another of Thackeray's misadventures. He had been master of his income for only a year and a half, and a considerable portion of the principal had already disappeared. "When a man is young and generous and hearty," he says in his "Virginians," "the loss of money scarce afflicts him," and the observation was certainly true of himself. Whether his reverses arose from the mischances of fortune, the indiscretion of his years, or the treachery of companions, he accepted them with placid good will, undisturbed by resentment and regrets.

In his altered circumstances, and a probable marriage in the future, a money-making calling was now indispensable to him. There were only two employments to which he had a decided leaning, literature and art; but the failure of the *National Standard* seems to have disheartened him with the first, and he took to the second with the intention of qualifying himself to be a professional painter. Drawing had been a

fascination to him from childhood upwards. He is describing himself when he says of Clive Newcome that his delight in the pencil was manifest to all, that his school-books were full of caricatures of the masters, that at home he sketched horses, dogs, servants and relatives, and, more abundant than the rest, the fancies of his brain. Many of the drawings he executed at school and college were preserved by his companions, when they could derive no value from his name. In his onward career he got to Weimar, and his German friends treated specimens of his ready art with equal regard. "My delight," he says, "in those days was to make caricatures for children"; and having paid a passing visit to the little Saxon capital twenty-three years after his sojourn there, he adds, "I was touched to find that they were remembered, and some even kept until the present time; and very proud to be told, as a lad, that the great Goethe had looked at some of them." Later, in a year not specified, he was staying at Paris with his cousin, Captain Thomas Thackeray, who lived there, and his passion for sketching was still his predominant characteristic. Mr. Planché, the herald and dramatist, was simultaneously a guest in the cousin's house, and says of our Thackeray, in his "Recollections":

He was at that time a slim young man, rather taciturn, and not displaying any particular love or talent for literature. Drawing appeared to be his favourite amusement; and he often sat by my side while I was reading or writing, covering any scrap of paper lying about with the most spitted sketches and amusing caricatures. I have one of Charles IX, firing at the Huguenots out of the windows of the Louvre, which he dashed off in a few minutes beside me on the blank portion of the yellow paper cover of a French drama.

Thackeray and his grandmother, Mrs. Becher, left England in the autumn of 1834, and they occupied jointly a house in Paris. A letter from thence to his mother gives us his reflections on his position:

I have been very comfortably installed in the new house for ten days, and like much my little study and my airy bedroom. I am sure we shall be as happy here as possible; and I believe that I ought to thank heaven for making

THACKERAY IN SEARCH OF A PROFESSION 105

me poor, as it has made me much happier than I should have been with the money. I spend all day now, dear mother, at the *Atelier*, and am very well satisfied with the progress that I make. I think that in a year, were I to work hard, I might paint something worth looking at, but it requires at least that time to gain any readiness with the brush.¹

Frugality and industry are not hardships. They are virtues which confer more blessings than they take away. Thackeray was realising, in his addiction to art, the truth of Gray's maxim, that to be employed is to be happy, and he had the presentiment that the domestic ease of a simple home would be preferable to richer surroundings. But the losses productive of benefit in the issue appear disasters while they are fresh, and his equanimity at the wholesale encroachments on his inheritance was the trait of a manly, generous nature.

For nearly three years from the breakdown of the *National Standard* it is not known that Thackeray sent a line to the press, and when he began again to write for the public it was not to literature that he returned. He only reported Paris news. Any inclination he may once have had to authorship was extinct, and all his efforts in working hours were directed to making himself an artist.

¹ The date, December 23, 1833, that Mr. Merivale has prefixed to this passage is the same date that Mr. Johnson has attached to an extract from another letter, in which Thackeray represented himself to be working hard at his journal, to be laying fresh plans for its success, and "anxious for the first number of the new year to be a particularly good one," in vindication of its claims. Clearly Mr. Merivale has ante-dated a letter after the *National Standard* had stopped, and its editor had abandoned literature for art.

THE LATE REV. WHITWELL ELWIN.

THE COMING RADICAL PARTY IN AMERICA

ENGLISHMEN have asked wherein lies the difference between the Republican and Democratic parties in the United States. Americans have asked the same question. The shortest answer, which also has the merit of truth, is that to-day the line of division has ceased to exist. The difference between a conservative democrat and a conservative republican—note the adjective—is a difference in name only but not in principle. The difference between a radical republican and a radical democrat—note the adjective—is a difference in name only and not in principle. The difference between a radical republican or a radical democrat and a conservative republican or a conservative democrat is as great as the gulf that separates an infidel and a devout churchman. Here, in a word, is the question answered. In the United States we are rapidly approaching that alignment of the social forces when the forces of conservatism will be opposed by the forces of radicalism. To-day conservative men call themselves republicans or democrats largely because of inherited tradition and accidental environment, but, as a matter of fact, there is no real difference to distinguish them.

The republican party was born in the throes of civil war. A nation was rent in twain at its parturition. Like Pallas Athene the republican party was brought into being out of the black tempest cloud and 'midst the roar and crash of the

storm. When the whig party went to pieces over the question of slavery the republican party was born, and no political party ever came into existence with its duties so clearly defined and its responsibilities so great. It was a party made up of all the elements opposed to the extension of slavery, of men who were resolved to prevent, at all cost, the transplanting of the Upas tree of slavery to States where its noxious roots would find fertile soil, and to resist the repeal of the famous "Missouri Compromise," which would have widened the area of the slave-holding States in that vast region of the Louisiana cession. Lincoln was the first republican President, and it was the republican party that fought the war of the rebellion.

The line of cleavage between the cavaliers and round-heads was not more sharply drawn than that between republicans and democrats, because the democrats, like the cavaliers, regarded their opponents as trying to subvert the power of lawful authority. The Southern States claimed the right to secede; the compact between the States, they asserted, was a voluntary compact that was terminable at pleasure at the will of any of the parties of the contract; but the republicans maintained that the Union was more than a mere confederation, it was a Union one and indissoluble, and an attempt to disrupt the Union was rebellion and treason. Without warrant of the Constitution, without sanction of law, the South maintained, but simply by the exercise of *force majeure*; the North, which was the republican party, compelled the Southern states to submit to this reading of the Constitution, and the Southern States yielded, not relinquishing their contention, but because they had staked all on the dubious hazard of war, and fate juggled with the dice.

For fourteen years following the election of the first republican President, that is, until 1874, the republicans controlled the government, and those were years of momentous consequence to the United States. Not only had the war to be fought, great armies to be raised, and the means to be devised

to pay the troops in the field and provide for the other extraordinary expenditures of government, but, when peace was restored, there were the great questions arising out of the war pressing for settlement. It was necessary that certain liberties should be taken with the Constitution, or at least that the powers granted to the Federal Government should be broadly and liberally construed, against the protests of the democrats, who were strict constructionists by belief and education, to whom the Constitution was the ark of the covenant that the hand of man might not profane, who were doubly strict in their guardianship of the Constitution because the republicans, drunk with victory, laid violent and impious hands upon it.

Judicial interpretation grafted new amendments on the Constitution and broadened the powers of the general government. The Government had to reconstruct the civil governments of the Southern States, to finance an enormous war debt, to raise revenue, to maintain its credit. The protective system now became a cardinal political principle, both as a means to raise revenue to meet pressing demands and to foster home industries. The South, an agricultural region, believed that protection was solely in the interest of the manufacturing North. At every point of contact there was friction between the two parties. The social, no less than the economic, beliefs of the South, the democratic party, were opposed to the social and economic views of the North, the republicans. No man in those days had to ask wherein lay the difference between the two parties. They were so radical, they were so antagonistic, that their lines never converged.

As the bitterness of the war receded, as changed industrial conditions changed the South from a purely agricultural section to a manufacturing region, there came a change in the view of the South. Democratic it remained, because the suffrage, placed in the hands of the negro by the republicans, made the negro a republican, and made, in sheer defence, every Southerner a democrat, but the old clinging

to ideals was gradually growing less intense; the manufacturing South no longer looked upon protection as a thing abhorrent. Protection was found to have some merit, it might bring to the South that same measure of prosperity that it had brought to the North.

This change of sentiment was seen when Mr. Cleveland was elected for the second time, and attempted to secure the passage of a Tariff Bill that should radically reduce the existing rates of duty. The democrats had a majority in both Houses of Congress, and therefore were in an impregnable position to carry through their policies. Mr. Cleveland believed in a low tariff; and a Bill embodying his views was introduced in the House, but it was not until nearly a year and a half of his administration had passed that the Bill became a law; and when it left the hands of Congress it was so false to the democratic principles of tariff reform, as Mr. Cleveland conceived them, that he denounced the measure and refused to sign it, and the Bill became a law without his approval.

Observe here that this democratic Bill differed in no respect in principle to the McKinley Bill which it superseded. In no sense could the democratic measure be termed a Free Trade Bill. It was in essence protective. Trifling additions were made to the free list, the average rate of duty was reduced a few points, schedules were here and there re-adjusted, but the Bill recognised the principle of protection. No other Bill could have run the gamut of Congress.

Mr. Cleveland went out of power in 1896, and with the close of his administration began the movement to weld conservatism in one party, even although conservatives are found under two party names. Mr. Bryan was nominated as the democratic Presidential candidate in 1896, and the effect of his nomination was to make every conservative, whether republican or democratic, work and pray for the election of McKinley. Mr. Bryan was a propagandist, and the very word implies revolt against the established order. No propa-

ganda can hope for success that does not attempt to subvert existing authority. Mr. Bryan appealed with frank sincerity to radicalism. Silver was merely a name, never a concrete fact. Economics are too abstruse for the multitude, and in all the realm of scientific economics there is nothing so absolutely incomprehensible to the masses as the fine distinctions of money in the abstract. The farmer of the West no more understood the merits of the currency question than did the petty shopkeeper of the East or the labouring-man East or West working long hours for insufficient wages. But to make the proletariat flock to his standard the leader must have a seductive battle-cry, and what more seductive than "free" silver? what more alluring than to be told that the thing the rich detested was the thing that should make the poor happy and wealthy? In the mental condition in which millions of Americans were at the time, "free" copper or "free" anything else would have made as effective a battle-cry, only free silver had the advantage of hoary tradition behind it, and fitted in so well with the social argument that Mr. Bryan always made.

Examine the democratic platform of that year and the speeches made by Mr. Bryan and the other democratic campaign orators, and you will see that things other than free silver were relied upon to draw to the support of the party the radicals and the dissatisfied. The platform denounced the protective tariff as "enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry," which had "proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and deprived the producer of the great American staples of access to their natural markets." The democrats had tried to impose an income tax, but the Supreme Court of the United States had declared an income tax to be unconstitutional. The platform attacked the Supreme Court for its decision, and it severely condemned the federal judiciary for having granted writs of injunction against strikers, declaring "government by injunction" to be "a new and highly

dangerous form of oppression, by which federal judges, in contempt of the laws of the States and rights of citizens, become at once legislators, judges and executioners." These "planks" in the platform were not economic, they were social; they were arguments addressed to the proletariat. The income tax was popular with the masses because the masses believed it was a tax that would be paid by the classes; the condemnation of "government by injunction" was equally popular because under the writs issued by the federal Courts strikers had been arrested and imprisoned for violating the prohibitions of the writ. "Free" silver, taxes to be paid by the rich, the power of the Courts rendered impotent—what more could the proletariat desire?

When the Chicago Convention in 1896 adopted this platform it wiped out the narrower lines of sectionalism, it almost obliterated party divisions already half effaced, and drove a wedge dividing conservatives and radicals. The conservatives flocked to the McKinley standard, the radicals ranged themselves under the Bryan banner. The Presidential election four years later marked with increased emphasis this sharp line of division. The radicals, nominally calling themselves democrats, still attempted to flog a dead horse into life by making silver an issue, and weighted it down with denunciation of the republican policy in the Philippines; but the one was as futile as the other. Silver was dead beyond the hope of resurrection; the Philippines could not be abandoned, even although many men regretted that circumstances which could not have been foreseen or guarded against forced them upon the United States.

Coming now to the present year we find both sides proclaiming their "conservatism" as their greatest asset, and relying upon it for popular support. The control of the democratic party has been wrested from the radicals and passed back again into the hands of the conservatives. Judge Parker was nominated at St. Louis because he was supposed typically to represent conservative thought and action; because he was

personally the antithesis of the somewhat impetuous, ill disciplined and "radical" Roosevelt; and the republicans ask for a verdict for their candidate on the ground that his administration has been distinguished for its "conservatism" and the careful manner in which it has safeguarded the rights of the people from "radical" attack.

In American politics, more important than the personal characteristics of the candidates are their utterances and the party platforms. Either candidate might stand on the platform of the other without undue violence to his feelings. A careful analysis of these election manifestoes shows that while they differ in verbiage and non-essentials that in which they differ least of all is essentials. Both parties agree that the gold standard is no longer open to debate; the republicans affirming it "to be the duty of the republican party to uphold the gold standard," the democratic platform ignoring the subject; but the Convention put the seal of its approval upon the telegram sent by Judge Parker, in which he said, "I regard the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established." On the question of protection the republican platform declares that "the measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad;" and the democratic platform favours "a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff . . . keeping in view the ultimate end of 'equality of burdens and equality of opportunities.'" The republicans denounce the democrats for their revisions of the tariff, and pronounce protection to be "a cardinal policy of the republican party." The democratic platform denounces protection "as a robbery of the many to enrich the few," the context showing that the "few" are the republican party. Judge Parker in his speech of acceptance advocated preparing the Filipinos "as rapidly as possible for self-government, and giving to them the assurance that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it." Mr. Roosevelt in his speech said on the same subject: "We have already given them a large share in their government, and our purpose is to increase

this share as rapidly as they give evidence of increasing fitness for the task." On the subject of capital and labour, the republican platform contains this declaration: "Combinations of capital and labour are the result of the economic movement of the age, but neither must be permitted to infringe upon the rights and interests of the people. Such combinations, when lawfully formed for lawful purposes, are alike entitled to the protection of the laws, but both are subject to the laws and neither can be permitted to break them," and that Bunsbylike platitude is met by this equally oracular assertion in the democratic platform: "We favour enactment and administration of laws giving labour and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labour ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labour are certainly no less 'vested,' no less 'sacred' and no less 'inalienable' than the rights of capital." The republicans pride themselves on having enforced the laws against trusts, the democrats insist that laws should be passed to curb the powers of the trusts.

But platforms after all are merely a declaration of intentions. They have no legal validity. They are not binding in law, even if they are supposed to have a moral force. The true intent of parties must be found in the temper of their partisans. Circumstances have compelled the ignoring of party platforms, and parties have frequently adopted new platforms after election. If it should happen that Judge Parker is elected to succeed Mr. Roosevelt we may feel assured that there will be no radical reversal of the policy that has been in force for the past eight years. There will be no attempt to attack the gold standard; there may be a readjustment of the tariff, but not an abandonment of the principle of protection; the Philippines will not be relinquished; work on the Panama Canal will not be abandoned; the navy will not be sold for junk; the Monroe doctrine will not be abrogated; the trusts will not cease to exist; capital and labour will not end their war. The democrats may show

less ability for constructive statesmanship than the republicans or a great deal more; but, so far as the country or the world at large is concerned, it will make little difference whether a conservative of the republican or democratic stripe rules in Washington.

In a speech recently delivered by ex-Senator David B. Hill (and Mr. Hill is one of the foremost men in the democratic party), the only way he could distinguish between the two parties was by the use of this meaningless language: "The difference between the parties is that the republican party stands for private purposes and the democratic party for public purposes." On the tariff Mr. Hill was forced to this impotent conclusion: "I do not care to say much about the tariff question, because it is one on which very few of us agree." Senator Bailey, another leading democrat, in a speech said: "Our republican friends are constantly affirming that the democratic party favours absolute free trade. Whatever any individual democrat, or, indeed, what all democrats, think about free trade as a theory, the dullest man in all this audience knows perfectly well that free trade is an utter impossibility in this Republic." Senator Lodge, who has the same standing in the republican party that Mr. Hill has in the democratic, said of the tariff: "The republican party is a party of protection, in favour of and ready to make revisions of the tariff when business requires it."

After reading these speeches one may ask with Carlyle, "What is there? Once there was a Papistry and Protestantism, important as life eternal and death eternal; more lately there was an interest of civil order and horrors of the French Revolution, important at least as rent roll and preservation of the game; but now what is there?" There is now no longer a Republic to be preserved; a Union to die for. Statesmen that were have been succeeded by pettifoggers; casuistical discussion of percentages or "when business requires it" is the strong meat fed to the hungry. Hill or Lodge, democrat or republican, what difference does it make?

No difference, except to the radicals, and the radicals are no mean factor in the American electorate. There are radicals in both parties to-day, and the republican radicals are no more satisfied with their party than the democrats are with their party, and the radical sees nothing to choose between republicans and democrats. More than six million men voted for Mr. Bryan in 1896. Not all of them were radicals—some of them were conservatives in whom the spirit of party loyalty was so strong that they followed the party leader even against their inclination; but of these six millions a large number, perhaps a majority, although it is difficult to know the exact proportion, voted for him because he satisfied their desires. It becomes more evident every day to close observers of American politics that to the man of extreme views neither of the existing parties afford him lodgment. The radical cares very little, practically nothing at all, whether there is a high or low tariff, because the tariff, like the money question, is too abstract, too complicated, too scientific for him to comprehend, and a schedule never yet aroused the faintest emotion in the bosom of any man. The concentration of enormous wealth in the hands of a few individuals, the vast power that wealth gives them, the knowledge that they use that power still further to increase their wealth, and with the increase of wealth comes still further increase in power—a never-ending process, an anabolism that works with automatic regularity; the knowledge that these men of great wealth influence and shape legislation, practically that no legislation may be enacted without their sanction; the existence of what for the sake of convenience has been denominated the trusts, another machine used by the men of wealth to increase their wealth—these are the things that arouse the passions and emotions of the radicals, not the colourless discussion of schedules or the wrongs of the Filipinos.

The radical asks for bread and he is given—a platform of platitudes. A doughty champion enters the lists, a champion heralded by the victories he has won over the trust Minotaur,

and, behold, helmet and breastplate and lance bear the mark of the trusts; Bucephalus is no more an untamed steed, he caracoles as daintily as any lady's palfrey, for he has been groomed and bitted in the trust stables. From the other end of the lists comes his opponent, not yet the slayer of the trusts but fired with a holy zeal to exterminate them, for he is armed with excalibur, but, alas, its edge is turned, it has been dulled in the workshop of the trust.

Valiant figures both, fitting champions both to battle for the rights and liberties of the down-trodden and the oppressed, heroes in the eyes of their knights and squires, but figures of buckram only to the radical. The candidate of one party was at one time denominated with fine scorn a "trust buster," and the trusts are now filling his coffers; the champion of the other was longing to "bust the trusts," and the most damaging charge brought against him by his opponents is that he is too closely affiliated with the trusts. Could hypocrisy further go? The real radical, the radical by conviction, whatever else he may be, is never a humbug, hypocrisy is not one of his vices. The radical knows that whether Roosevelt or Parker is elected it will profit him not in the least; it is merely a change of masters; it is simply passing the sceptre of power from republican to democratic trusts, and too often they have joint owners.

The six millions and more men who twice voted for Bryan will, roughly speaking, vote for Mr. Parker, because there is no alternative for them. A few will vote for Mr. Roosevelt because in their eyes Mr. Roosevelt is more radical than Mr. Parker, because Mr. Roosevelt is more virile, more "rough and ready," more of a "trust buster" than, to them, his anæmic and more self-possessed opponent; but neither Roosevelt nor Parker can put passion in the heart of the radical, no radical will vote for either as he voted for Bryan—with a fervour comparable only to religious frenzy, to whom Bryan was the embodiment of a vaguely pictured ideal, who crystallised thoughts so fugitive that they found no expression, who fused

the molten flux of longing for what men scarcely knew, but longing for something better, higher, nobler even than that which was vouchsafed to them, fired by an aspiration that led them on, but which when they tried to grasp it was as elusive as an *ignis fatuus*.

Bryanism is dead in the same sense that the raising of the standard of free silver is no longer a signal to war; but Bryanism, which is a synonym for radicalism, is a living dynamic force that *may* rend society and *must* shatter parties. In a government of parties there can be no place for two parties that offer a choice merely of names and not of principles, for then principles disappear and parties cease to exist. Great as the United States is, it is not great enough to support two great conservative parties.

It was Carlyle, fifty years ago, who wrote :

America, too, will have to strain its energies in quite another fashion than this ; to crack its sinews and all but break its heart, as the rest of us have had to do, in thousand-fold wrestle with the pythons and mud demons, before it can become a habitation for the gods. America's battle is yet to fight ; and we, sorrowful, though nothing doubting, will wish her strength for it. New spiritual pythons, plenty of them, enormous megatherions, as ugly as were ever born of mud, loom huge and hideous out of the twilight future on America ; and she will have her own agony, and her own victory, but on other terms than she is yet aware of.

The pythons, the mud demons, and the enormous megatherions are there. No one can doubt they are still to be wrestled with.

A. MAURICE LOW.

THE SOLDIERS OF THE SIRKAR

THE expedition to Lhasa has evoked so much interest that it may perhaps not be out of place to offer a brief description of the fighting men of the Bengal and Punjab armies from which the *personnel* of the expeditionary force has been mainly drawn. To the ordinary Englishman and to the well-informed foreigner the success of the expedition has come to the one as a surprise, to the other as one more disappointment, while to those who know the Indian Army nothing less than complete success was looked for. Not only is the Headquarters Staff at Simla *facile princeps* in the organising of minor, though difficult, expeditions whether by land or water, but the officers of the Indian Army are all, in the strictest sense of the word, *professional* soldiers, better trained, less dry-nursed, and more experienced than their brothers of the British Service, while the men who follow them are splendid material, admirably taught, and imbued with a real admiration for and belief in the Englishmen who lead them.

The classes from which we now enlist recruits for the native regiments of the two northern armies of India are as follows: Brahmans, Dogras, Garhwalis, Gurkhas, Jats, Mahomedans (Hindustani and Punjabi), Pathans, Rajputs, and Sikhs; and in this paper I propose to give a brief account or description of each of these races or sects, and to point out the different attributes from which each derives his special value as a fighting man.

For the sake of convenience I have arranged my list alphabetically, but the result of this is that the least valuable soldier finds himself at its head, while the first of our fighting men—the best of Eastern mercenaries—brings up the rear.

Brahmans.—In the old Bengal Army Brahmans were very largely recruited and did good service, but their caste prejudices reduce their value as soldiers, and in the present day there are only two regiments of Brahmans in the Bengal army, recruited almost exclusively from the *Kanaujia* Brahmans of the North-West Provinces and Oudh. Brahmans are of course, to be found in all parts of India, but, however scattered they may now be, they all belong to the same stock. There are two great divisions among them—the *Gaur* and the *Dravida*, the former comprising all Brahmans north of the river Narbudda, and the latter all south of it; the great majority of these latter, too, have no soldierly instincts whatever, and are rarely enlisted. The Brahman sepoy makes a fine cantonment soldier; he gives no trouble, and is smart on parade; but his caste, which obliges him to wash and strip before he can cook and eat his food, prevents his roughing it on service with other troops. Perhaps he is more adapted for a policeman than a soldier; in that profession he is not called upon to do violence to his religious belief and teaching by taking life, while the influence which a high-caste Brahman possesses over all Hindus must help him greatly in the maintenance of law and order.

Dogras.—The Dogras are a mixed race of Highlanders, with Rajput blood in them, who inhabit the hills and valleys of the Himalayas lying between the rivers Sutlej and Chenab, and divided by the Beas. Their country is about 150 miles long by 80 broad, and includes the districts of Kangra, Hoshiarpore, Gurdaspore and Sialkote with the native states of Chamba, Mundi and Jammu. The word Dogra is derived from an Indian word meaning hill or mountain, and it is said that the Rajputs, who emigrated from the plains of India to the northern hills, and founded the Dogra principalities, called themselves Dogras

or hillmen, to distinguish themselves from their brethren of the plains. These principalities or states were originally twenty-two in number, and were constantly at war with one another, and often with the Mahomedan rulers and invaders of India. When early in the eleventh century Mahmoud of Ghazni invaded India, the Dogras united together to help their Hindu brethren to oppose the advance of the invader, but were defeated in a great battle near Peshawar. They were subjugated by Akbar, controlled by Shah Jehan and Jehangir, and finally, like the rest of the Punjab, became subject to the Sikhs in the days of Runjeet Singh. The Dogra has neither the grit, the "go," nor the vigour of some of the races of India from which our recruits are drawn, but he is a self-respecting man with a high sense of honour, law-abiding, full of quiet and resolute courage when face to face with danger, and with the sentiment of loyalty deeply engrained in his nature. The Dogras are more superstitious and priest-ridden than men of the plains, but fling aside their caste prejudices when the necessities of active service require them to do so. Kangra supplies the majority of our Dogra recruits, and of these the *Mians*, the highest class of Rajput Dogras, make the best soldiers. It is only of quite recent years that Dogras have been formed into class regiments, and it was in 1891—barely thirteen years ago—that a Dogra regiment, as such, first went on active service, when at Ghazikote, although practically driven in by overwhelming numbers of *Yusafzais* of the Black Mountain, they stuck to their post, beat off the attack, and earned no fewer than five "orders of merit" for their Regiment.

Garhwalis.—Garhwal—"the land of forts"—is a mountainous district in the Himalayas, forming the north-western part of the Kumaon Division of the Lieutenant-Governorship of what until the other day was called the "North-West Provinces and Oudh." Its area is about 5500 square miles, and its population some 350,000. On the north it marches with Thibet, while on the south it is bounded by the Bijnor district of Rohilkhand, on the east by the Kumaon district,

and on the west by Dehra Dun and Tehri. The dominant race in Garhwal—the *Khasiyas*—claim to be Rajputs from the plains fallen in the social scale because they have not strictly adhered to the caste rules of their forefathers, but originally, no doubt, these Khasiyas were Aryan emigrants from Central Asia, who entered India at some remote period and occupied lands in the Punjab and in the North-West Provinces, but who were driven into the hills by the Scythian hordes and by the early Mahomedan invaders. But centuries of close contact with Thibet have naturally resulted in a fusion of the Aryan and Mongolian elements in the population of Garhwal, and there can be no doubt but that it is largely due to his Mongolian blood that the Garhwali makes the sturdy fellow and the good soldier that he does. Garhwal has no history to speak of, and tradition records little but years of internecine warfare; in the thirteenth century the district contained no less than fifty-two petty states, varying in size and in population and constantly at feud one with another, and it was not until a century later that one chieftain, more powerful or more fortunate than his compeers, succeeded in reducing the other states to subjection, and established the kingdom of Garhwal. During his dynasty, which survived until the Gurkha conquest early in the last century, Garhwal suffered many invasions from neighbouring hill states and from the Rohillas of Rohilkhand; while during the twelve years that the Gurkhas ruled Garhwal the country was nearly ruined and the people almost exterminated by the barbarities of the conquerors. But yet the fact that the Garhwali maintained his independence for so many years in spite of the proximity and the harrying of fighting races like the Gurkhas and the Rohillas, compels one ungrudgingly to cede him something of a soldierly reputation. Until we began, only a very few years ago, to enlist Garhwalis for a special class regiment, there was always a large proportion of these hill men in all Gurkha regiments, and many of the best of the Gurkha officers—(in a Gurkha battalion the British officer does not speak, as in down-

country regiments, of his *Native* officers, but of his *Gurkha* officers)—came not from Nepal but from Garhwal; while in the war of 1814-15, which the Government of India undertook—not with initial or conspicuous success—against the Nepalese, a large number of Garhwalis fought in the ranks of the Gurkha Army.

The Garhwali is a man of good physique, vigour and endurance, and although not perhaps so sturdy as the Gurkha or so free from caste prejudices, he is, at the same time, far more intelligent, and likely for that reason to make, perhaps, a better officer.

Gurkhas.—Nepal is bounded on the north by Thibet, on the east by Sikkim and the Darjeeling district, on the south by the districts of Purnea, Durbhanga, Mozufferpore, Bhagulpore, Champarun, and Gorakhpore—this last the seat of the Gurkha recruiting or, perhaps, more strictly speaking, *receiving* depot; on the south-west by Oudh; and on the west by Kumaon. Previous to the year 1815 Nepal extended its western borders right up to the Sutlej; but by the treaty of Segowlie, Kumaon and all the hill country west of the Kali river were ceded to the East India Company. The total area of Nepal is roughly 54,000 square miles, and its population is probably about four millions; the country has usually been divided by its people into five districts, and one of these—the Central district—contains the original petty state of Gurkha, a small tract on its eastern frontier, whose raja ultimately conquered the whole of Nepal. The chief inhabitants of Gurkha were the almost purely Mongol races of Magars and Gurungs and mixed Aryo-Mongol races known as *Khas* and *Thakur*. Other tribes and races of Nepal, unconnected with the Gurkha district, are, strictly speaking, not Gurkhalis at all.

In Mr. Bonarjee's interesting book on the "fighting races of India" he writes as follows:

Nepalese traditions mention a long line of Aryan Chiefs from India who established themselves as rulers over parts of the country. Doubtless they are mostly mythical characters, but underlying this tradition of a succession of

Rajput Kings from India, is this substratum of truth, that it represents the struggle which undoubtedly took place in Nepal between two waves of emigration—one Mongoloid from Thibet, the other Aryan from India. For several centuries this struggle for mastery between the Mongol and the Aryan continued, which ultimately ended in the spiritual and intellectual supremacy of the Aryan, but which left the Mongolian element largely unassimilated ethnically and unconquered politically. The Aryans took unto themselves wives from among the Mongols, and thus a mixed race sprung up. Much the same thing happened in the case of the Aryan conquest of Nepal as happened in the case of the Norman conquest of England. The Normans, although they conquered England, in course of time were gradually absorbed into the English stock; and though retaining a nominal supremacy actually exercised no real sovereignty when once they had been incorporated with the English. So in the case of the Aryan conquest of Nepal. These Aryans found the country peopled by a Mongol race, differing very much from them in customs, manners, blood and speech. By their superior intelligence and not by superior courage, they contrived to gain a dominant position in the country, but this position they could only retain by identifying themselves with the native inhabitants and coalescing with them, thus giving rise to a feeling of community and nationality between all classes.

It was about the year 1600 that a cadet of a Rajput family overthrew the reigning raja of Gurkha and established himself as chief of the little state, and it was one of his successors who, nearly a hundred and fifty years later, invaded the Nepal valley and commenced the Gurkha career of conquest. It may be said without exaggeration that from the year 1736 to the present day the Gurkhas have been fighting—either, as at first, for their own hand or in these latter days in the armies of the *Sirkar*. Having become master of the valley of Nepal the Gurkhali conqueror transferred his capital to Khatmandu, which has ever since remained the capital of the Gurkha kingdom. The Gurkhas conquered Sikkim and invaded Thibet, were defeated by the Chinese, and yet two years later had annexed Kumaon and overrun Garhwal; in the war with the English the Gurkhas displayed brilliant courage and won the ungrudging admiration of their adversaries. Since the peace which followed our war with the Nepalese our relations with the Nepal Durbar have been of a most cordial

character. Assistance was freely offered us in the Sikh wars, and was accepted and nobly rendered during the dark days of the Mutiny. It was Mr. Brian Hodgson, who was at Khatmandu from 1820 to 1843, first as Secretary and later as President, who was probably one of the first to suggest to the Government of India, in two memoirs which he drew up on the military system of Nepal, the expediency of procuring the services for our armies of a considerable body of Gurkha soldiers, whereby we should diminish the chances of collision with Nepal, caused by the pressure on its Government of an excessive soldiery. For some years the supply of Gurkha recruits which we were able to obtain was small and intermittent, but quite within recent times the Nepal Durbar has relaxed its restrictions and the military authorities in Simla have been able to increase the number of battalions of Gurkhas in the army of India. The history of that army is full of glorious deeds of arms of which the Gurkha is the hero; he is the Thomas Atkins of the East, and is the one native soldier of whom the British linesman makes a friend and companion. Sturdy, phlegmatic, cheery, and indomitable, his ardour in action springs rather from the warmth of enthusiasm than of mere excitement. He has been often credited with cruelty and blood-thirstiness in the field, but it may be doubted whether the Gurkhas can really be so judged from the few isolated and substantiated instances of savagery which have come to light. For more than fifty years the Gurkhas have fought for us in the forefront of the Empire's battles; one can only wish that we had more of them and that the *Pax Britannica* may never destroy or diminish their fighting value.

Jats.—Cunningham is of opinion that the Jat is half Afghan, half Rajput; Ibbetson says that the Jats and the Rajputs are ethnologically identical, and that any distinction between them is social rather than racial; other authorities maintain the Rajput to be Aryan and the Jat Scythian or Turanian. The Jats are now found all over the Punjab, in parts of Rajputana and

Central India, and in the western parts of the North-West Provinces, but Bhurtpore is now the only important Jat state, and its chief is looked upon as their head by all the Eastern Jats. These are nearly all Hindus, and supply the bulk of the Jat recruits for the Indian Army, being drawn chiefly from Bhurtpore, from the Jumna-Ganges Doab, and from the districts of Muttra, Delhi, Agra, Gurgaon, and Hissar. The Jats of the Western Punjab are mostly Mahomedans, but these are not recruited into our Hindustani regiments. Mainly agriculturists, of great industry and skill in husbandry, the Jats are of good physique, though not perhaps so sturdily made as some of the northern races of India; but they are undeniably of good fighting material and of soldierly instincts, and have always done well in the different campaigns in which Jats have fought for the British Raj.

Hindustani Mahomedans.—Hindustani Mahomedan recruits come chiefly from the North-West Provinces, from Oudh, and from the neighbourhood of Delhi; this latter is, of course, the great centre of Mahomedan supremacy in India, while in the North-West Provinces and in Oudh the Mahomedans number over twenty per cent. of the whole population. Hindustani Mahomedans are either converts from Hinduism or descendants of the Mahomedans who originally conquered India; among the converts may be named the Rajput Mahomedans—of whom the *Ranghars* from the Delhi division, though turbulent and somewhat troublesome, make the best soldiers—and the Mahomedan Jats, while among the original Mahomedans are, with others, Moguls and Pathans. The Moguls claim descent from the Mogul conquerors and are of Tartar origin, proud, indolent, and consequently poor, and although, in common with the Pathans—descendants of the settlers who entered India with the conquering Afghan or Mogul—their martial qualities are doubtless to some extent impaired, they can and do still supply the Army of India with numbers of recruits of good quality.

Punjabi Mahomedans.—Of better class, however, as fighting

material are the recruits we obtain from the smaller Mahomedan clans of the Punjab, who claim either Mogul or Arab origin though really of either Rajput, or Jat, or Tartar descent, and who are grouped together as "Punjabi Mahomedans." They are not so strictly warlike as the Sikhs and the Pathans, but are more martial than most of the other Punjab castes, and having, in the years past, acquired by the sword lordship over certain localities, they have retained a pride of race which makes them in every way desirable recruits for our ranks. They are very intelligent, and make excellent native officers, and few Punjab regiments—not being class regiments—are complete without at least a couple of companies of Punjabi Mahomedans. The men of the following Mahomedan tribes of the Punjab furnish perhaps the best class of recruit—*Ghakkars* from the Salt Range; *Sials* from the Jhang district; *Tiwanas* from Shahpore; *Chibbs* from the Jammu Hills and the district of Gujrat; *Kharrals* from Montgomery and about the banks of the Ravi; and lastly *Bhattis*, a large Rajput tribe from the districts of Amritsar, Sialkote, Lahore, Gujranwallah, Multan, and Ferozepore.

Pathans.—No doubt strictly speaking the Pathan should not be included among the fighting men of the Punjab, since his home is really beyond our border; but in the past he has fought so much against us and has of late years proved himself so excellent a soldier in our ranks, that no account of the fighting races of Northern India from which our recruits are drawn could be complete without mention of the Pathans. They constitute, too, a reserve upon which the *Pax Britannica* has had in the past and can have, for many generations, but little if any too-humanising an influence. The races from whom, within our boundaries, we now draw the recruits for our Indian regiments *may*—I do not say they *will*—lose something of their warlike spirit and their martial ardour with the spread of civilisation and the cultivation of the arts of peace; and here at our very threshold we have an inexhaustible recruiting-ground, where from their boyhood upwards the young men

have been trained in the arts of the skirmisher and imbued with the love of fighting.

Our North-West Frontier touches that of Afghanistan at only three points—at Landi Kotal in the Khyber, at the head of the Kurram Valley, and at the foot of the northern slopes of the Khojak. Everywhere else the country of the Pathan tribesman intervenes. This is a long strip of unutterably rugged and unattractive mountain country; stony, barren heights; deep abrupt valleys seamed by occasional torrents; the farms represented by a patch of corn on a hillside or a thread of cultivation on a narrow bit of alluvial soil along a mountain stream; no highways save those made by British columns; the village roads—mere tracks straggling over hills and among the roughest ravines, always difficult and often dangerous. The dwelling-places—caves in the hillsides or fortified towers on the edge of the fields. Such is the country of the Pathans—"the Bloody Border." The tribesmen are without exception Mussulmans; "Sunnis by faith, Pathans by speech, warriors by right of their courage and physique, and robbers by nature," and since robbery—except on an Imperial scale—is abhorrent to the British Government, they have been for years past our inveterate foes. The Pathans are probably of Indian origin as the Afghans are most likely of Arab or Israelitish extraction, but the term *Pathan* is applied indiscriminately to every Pushtu-speaking man along or across our Border. They have no education, and only nominally a religion; they are superstitious and priest-ridden, avaricious and predatory to the last degree; no oath, however sacred, is binding if against their own interests; nothing is finer than their physique, nothing worse than their morals. On the other hand, the Pathan is gallant and courageous, and, if reckless of the lives of others, he is certainly not sparing of his own. As an enemy he is at his best in swooping down upon a convoy or in harassing a rearguard, and those who have experienced his attentions on these occasions are not likely to forget them. He is said to be hospitable and charitable, while he has over

and over again proved himself a good and faithful soldier in our service. The tribesmen are perpetually at war with each other; "each tribe and section of a tribe has its own private wars, each family its hereditary blood feuds, and every individual his personal foes." Colonel Holdich says: "The Pathan will shoot his own relations just as soon as the relations of his enemy—possibly sooner, and he will shoot them from behind." The Pathan enlists freely in our service, but there is "one thing he will not give up, but brings with him to his regiment, keeps through his service, must have leave to look after, will resign promotion to gratify, and looks forward to retiring to thoroughly enjoy, and that is—his cherished blood feud."

There are probably more than two million Pathans within and without our Border; their country is bordered on the west and east by Afghanistan and the Indus, on the south and north by Baluchistan and Kashmir, and the following is a brief description of some of the more important or better known of the tribes.

The *Khattaks* are one of the finest and best disposed of all the tribes on the whole border; they inhabit the Kohat district, the northern fringe of their country being wedged into the angle formed by the junction of the Kabul river with the Indus. Their land is bare and barren, and produces little but rock salt, of which commodity the Khattaks are the chief carriers. Part of the Peshawar valley was given them by Akbar, and it was a Khattak who was that Emperor's first "Lord Warden of the Marches"—filling much the same post as used to be occupied by the Commander of the Punjab Irregular Frontier Force. They are a brave, hospitable and warlike race, great dancers and pipers, and very loyal to their tribal chiefs, who have unusual influence over them.

The *Yusufzais* are one of the largest, one of the most important, and also one of the most powerful of the Pathan tribes. They occupy a large tract of country north and east of the Peshawar valley, and also a good deal of plain country in the Peshawar district itself, occupying the hill country of

Boner and Swat, the western face of the Black Mountain, part of the Chamla valley, and the tehsils of Mardan and Swabi in the Peshawar District.

The *Yusufzais* of the Black Mountain have given us endless trouble, and have been the cause of numerous expeditions—in 1852, in 1868, in 1869, and one every alternate year from 1889 to 1893. The men of Boner, on the other hand, have given us but little trouble; we have only fought them twice—in 1863 and in 1898—the first being one of our severest, and the last one of the simplest of our frontier expeditions. The country of the Bonerwals marches with the valleys of Swat, reached from India by way of Nowshera, Mardan and the Malakand Pass. This pass had never been actually crossed by us until the Chitral Relief expedition of 1895, but in 1847 and 1849 there were operations in Baizai on the left bank of the Swat River, while in 1852 Sir Colin Campbell led a force into the Ranizai country at the western end of the valley—an expedition which had to be repeated in 1878. The Swati has never been looked upon as a very formidable fighting man; his valleys are very rich and fertile, but feverish and generally unhealthy, and his physique is consequently not to be compared with that of some of his neighbours.

The *Utman Khel* country lies to the west of the Malakand, and closely adjoining the Swat valley; this tribe is ever ready to give trouble and to join in any fighting which may be going on. There have been expeditions against them in 1852 and in 1878, and a large percentage of Utman Khels undoubtedly took part in 1897 in the persistent attacks on the Malakand.

The Momands inhabit the hilly country to the north-west of Peshawar, bounded on the east by British territory and by the country of the Utman Khels, on the north by Bajour, on the west by Kunar, and on the south by the territory of the Shinwaris and Afridis. The Momand is proud, treacherous, and cruel; he does not at present enlist much in our service, the younger and more restless spirits of the tribe being

generally absorbed in the regiments of the Amir of Afghanistan, to whom the Momands own a nominal and grudging allegiance. They first came into collision with us during the first Afghan War, and this led to an expedition into their country in 1851; the *Michni* Momands were coerced in 1854, while in 1863 there were several minor operations against the tribe in the neighbourhood of Peshawar, and in 1873, 1878, 1880, and again in 1897 the Momands had to be proceeded against. As the Momands are Afghans by right of kinship, they should not, perhaps, really be looked upon as true Pathans.

Peshawar, the "Guard-room of India," lies at the western extremity of the valley, almost in the jaws of the Khyber Pass, and but 170 miles from Kabul. The Pass itself is nominally in our hands as far as Landi Kotal, but is handed over to the joint care of the local militia and of the six clans of the Khyber Pass Afridis, who, in consideration of certain allowances, safeguard the caravans which go to and fro between India and Afghanistan. The country of the Afridis lies south of the Khyber up to and beyond Landi Kotal, and they are the most powerful, the most numerous, and physically one of the finest of all the border tribes; of the remaining two Afridi clans, one lives south of the Bara river in the Peshawar valley, while the other inhabits the hills between Peshawar and Kohat. The tribesmen enlist very freely into our service—recruiting has never been brisker than since the close of the Tirah campaign—and they make excellent soldiers, but their character does not stand high even among the Pathans; they are cruel, treacherous, merciless, and revengeful, but all the same the Afridi is perhaps *the* Pathan whose manliness and manner most strongly prejudice Englishmen in his favour, and of a certainty he has, individually, gained a great reputation for fidelity as a soldier. It can never be forgotten that, when in 1897 we left the Khyber garrisons in the lurch, it was 500 Afridis who, against their own kith and kin, upheld British honour in the Khyber while 10,000 British troops on the

Peshawar border *looked on*. We first met the Afridis in 1839, when Colonel Wade with a Sikh force entered the Khyber, but since 1850 we have undertaken at least six expeditions against them.

The country of the Afridis is reached from the Khyber Pass, from Peshawar through the Bara valley, or by way of Kohat over the Samana range and through the Orakzai country.

The *Orakzais* inhabit the mountainous country to the north-west of the Kohat district; on the north and east is the country of the Afridis, on the south is the Miranzai valley, and on the west are the mountains of the Sufed Koh. They are wiry-looking mountaineers but by no means such fine-looking men as their neighbours, the Afridis, though strong and hardy and inured to fatigue and exposure. They have given us their fair share of trouble—an expedition about every eight years or so during the last half-century. Between the Orakzai country and Waziristan lies the Kurram valley, which has been in our occupation since the last Afghan war and which, though not so important a gateway to Kabul as the Khyber, is one whose occupation gives us little if any trouble; its inhabitants—a small tribe called *Turis*—are *Shiaks*, and this sect, whether on the frontier or in Afghanistan, has invariably been friendly to British interests and well disposed towards the British officer. The Kurram is best entered from Thal, midway between Kohat and Bunu.

The land of the *Waziris*—the Switzerland of the North-West Frontier—lies between the Tochi River on the north and the Gomul River on the south, but some sections of the tribe inhabit the country up to the right bank of the Kurram River; the Tochi is a wide, cultivated valley, while the Gomul is narrower, but both are high roads to Ghazni, and the former was probably the route generally selected by that arch-raider Mahmoud, “early in the eleventh century, when he swept down with hordes of irregular cavalry through the band of hills at the head of the Tochi and laid waste the Indus valley

from Bannu to Multan." The Waziris have given us endless trouble and cost us fifty years of punitive expeditions, with the usual expenditure of blood and treasure, and the main difficulty in regard to their coercion has hitherto been that their back doors open into Afghanistan, where they were always assured of an asylum in troublous time. "Physically the Waziris are a fine race, tall, muscular, and courageous—in many respects noble savages. They never spare an enemy of the male sex, but the Waziri is so far chivalrous that he will never kill or rob women; he is credited with some regard for honour, and with comparative truthfulness." The blood-feuds of this tribe are not so *indiscriminate* as are those of other tribes, it being generally ruled that the slaying of the actual murderer is enough, and they are satisfied, unlike many of their neighbours, with what they call "make up" money, the fixed price for a male Waziri being 1800 rupees, a woman half price, and so on down a regular tariff.

As soldiers the Pathans are resolute and self-reliant, born skirmishers, with plenty of grit and nerve, full of *élan*, but they require a strong hand over them, and to be led and commanded by those who appreciate and understand them. Fortunately such men are not wanting among the British officers at the head of our Punjab regiments, and round the mess-tables of the officers of the old Frontier Force can be heard many stirring tales of devotion, daring, and sacrifice by the wild men of the Border who have eaten our salt.

Rajputs.—Rajputs are not necessarily—as is often imagined, and as the name seems almost to imply—natives of Rajputana, for not only do they form only a small percentage of the population of that province, but they are found anywhere between Benares and the Indus, and are really the modern representatives of the early Aryan immigrants. The Rajputs originally settled in the Punjab, colonising also the North-West Provinces and Oudh, and giving their name to Rajputana when they conquered that province and became in it the

ruling race, subduing therein the Bhils and other aboriginal tribes. There is little or no history of the Rajputs as a race, but each Rajput state or clan has its own. The more pure-blooded the Rajput, the more free he is from any taint of other blood, the better soldier does he make, and for this reason the western Rajputs are more sought after by the recruiting officer than the eastern. Udaipore, Jodhpore, Jaipore, and Bikanir are all Rajput states, and the Rahtor horsemen are famous all over India—the land of light cavalry. “The dominant characteristic of the Rajput is pride of blood”: he is at his best when things are going well, and is not so good as some other of our troops under reverses; he is a somewhat haughty but brave soldier, and has fought for us from the days of Clive up to now, but his caste prejudices are rather against him on active service, though even in this respect things are very much better than they used to be.

Sikhs.—And now what am I to say about the Sikh—the finest type of fighting man to be found in all Asia, the model of everything that is best and noblest in a native gentleman?

The British Army has never fought against finer foes or alongside better fighters than the warriors of the Khalsa, and the Sikh is, perhaps above all other mercenaries, invariably to be relied on alike in the moment of victory or in the dark hours of defeat or disaster. “A Sikh is, as the name implies, one who learns, a follower or disciple. They are the descendants of those who, in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries followed the reformed Hindu religion as preached by Nanak, Govind Singh, and others,” so that “born as a peaceable and tolerant religion, Sikhism was gradually transformed from a purely religious movement, by the persecutions of fanatical bigots like Aurungzebe and his successors, into a military and political movement directed against the weakness and inhumanity of the later Mogul Emperors.” The doctrine taught by Nanak combined all that was best in both Hinduism and Mahomedanism—the unity of God, the spiritual and religious equality of all men—“Hinduism purged of its

grossness by the more elevated religious precepts of Islam"—and he was a religious teacher pure and simple. It was Guru Arjan and his son Har Govind who made of the young community a political factor to be reckoned with, and it was Govind Singh, the tenth, last, and greatest of all the Gurus, who finally set the seal upon the conversion of the Sikhs from a semi-religious sect into a strong political community full of warlike ardour. It was his followers who were called the Khalsa—the pure or elect; he directed that they should all take the name of *Singh*, or Lion, to show that their chief attribute was to be courage in war, and he it was who instituted the rite of initiation—the *pahul*, for a Sikh, though born of Sikh parents, is not actually a Sikh until he has gone through this ceremony. A Sikh should be initiated at the age of seven, but all recruits for Sikh regiments are initiated on attestation, and it is perhaps one potent reason for the attraction of our military service to the Sikh community that Sikhism is largely kept up by and in the Sikh regiments of the Punjab Army. With the commencement of the gradual decay of the Mogul Empire, the Sikhs began to recover from the persecution they had undergone and to prepare for the struggle for independence. Leading Sikhs commenced to carve out kingdoms for themselves from the ruins of the Mogul Empire, until the rise of Runjeet Singh—the Lion of the Punjab—united all the Sikhs under one sovereignty.

The tracts occupied by the Sikhs lie to the west and east of the Sutlej—the Manjha and the Malwa Sikhs—and the finest specimen of the Sikh is the Jat Sikh, possessing all the good qualities of the Punjabi Jat grafted on the virtues developed by Sikhism :

In the Jat Khalsa Sikh therefore, the Sikh is seen at his best and highest—the truest and best embodiment of Sikhism. The Jat Singh is an exceptionally fine type of Asiatic; of splendid physique, of well proportioned and solid build, with manly and handsome features, the Jat Singh, with his sturdy self-respect and social pride, constitutes the *beau-ideal* of an Oriental soldier, inspired as he is with the knowledge that brave deeds and proud traditions are the heritage which the past has given into his keeping.

Of the lower class Sikhs, the Muzbis—originally sweepers and now agriculturists—are strong and hardy, and though not such fine men as the Jat Sikhs, make capital soldiers and are specially enlisted for the Punjab Pioneer Regiments. The Sikh is an excellent gunner and a superb infantry soldier—there are few finer sights in the world than a Sikh regiment on parade—(unless it is a company of Sikhs covering a retirement in a nasty rearguard action on the Indian Frontier)—every man a Goliath and a Nazarene. He is also a splendid horseman, though not an especially good horse-master. But take him all in all, the Sikh is an ideal fighting man, the first of our fighting men in India, true as the steel he wears, a brave soldier and a courteous gentleman, loyal, resolute, and cool in action, a warrior both by instinct and by tradition.

Oh! for the mad excitement, the joy of war's alarms,
 Call thro' the Punjab's provinces—to arms, to arms, to arms!
 See from the yellow Sutlej to the black Indus fords,
 The warriors of the Khalsa are girding on their swords.

* * * * *

“ And when the time shall come, Sahib, as come full well it may,
 When all things are not bright and fair, as all things seem to-day,
 When foes are gathering round you fast and friends are far and few,
 Remember Hodson trusted us—and trust the old blood too,
 And as we followed him—to death—our sons will follow you.”

H. C. WYLLY.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ZUBAIR PASHA

IF the name of Zubair Pasha is remembered at all in this country, it is in connection with Gordon's last and fatal mission to the Sudan. Watching the progress of Mahdism as it overran the Sudan, the English Governor, from the day of his arrival at Khartum, "urged in the strongest terms that he could employ that power should be placed in the hands of a single man, and that man Zubair Pasha."¹ This recommendation he continued to urge in the most persistent way; and the Journals of his last months at Khartum contain many an expression of regret at the rejection of his advice, and of his belief in the marvellous influence which Zubair could have exercised over the minds of the Sudanese. That Gordon should have longed for the co-operation of Zubair was indeed a noteworthy case of the whirligig of time bringing its revenges. That co-operation had been offered him in 1879 at the time of "the Slave-dealers' Rebellion" by Nubar Pasha, and he had rejected it with scorn;² declaring that Zubair alone was responsible for the slave trade of the last ten years.³ The refusal of the British Government in 1884 to let Zubair be sent to assist Gordon was due to the representations of an Anti-Slavery

¹ Sir H. W. Gordon, in "Gordon's Journals," edited by Hake, 1885, p. lvii.

² "Col. Gordon in Central Africa," by Birkbeck Hill, 1881, p. 336.

³ *Ibid.* p. 337.

Society;¹ but indeed in Hill's edition of Gordon's Letters Zubair had been described in a way which would prevent any self-respecting Government from making such a man a K.C.M.G., or indeed employing him in any capacity whatever. The passage is fervidly rhetorical, as follows: ²

On one great criminal had not yet fallen the punishment due to his boundless wickedness. Sebehr Pasha had been a king among the slave-traders of the world. His strongholds had been pushed far into the heart of Africa; and over hundreds of miles of fertile lands, whose fruits had once nourished a teeming and a happy population, he had spread desolation and sorrow. He had kept up an almost princely court; but the flood of his prosperity had been swollen to its monstrous height by the tears of thousands and tens of thousands. The ebb had at length come, and for a time that vast stream of human misery had ceased to flow. To add yet a deeper stain to his guilt, he had been a traitor to the government under which he held high office. He was a Pasha of Egypt, and against Egypt he had raised this fierce revolt. By his orders her troops had been treacherously surprised and massacred.

Who then was this Zubair, who, in the first set of Gordon's Journals figures as the villain of the piece, and in the last as a benevolent *deus ex machina*, on whose approach the star of the Mahdi would at once begin to wane? Gordon's biographers ordinarily describe him as a scoundrel³ and a notorious slave-trader. A fairly detailed account of him and his career is given by the traveller, W. Junker, whose work has been translated into English by Mr. A. H. Keane;⁴ another (not yet translated), which agrees with the former in most matters, by the contemporary traveller, Nachtigal;⁵ and an Arabic biography of Zubair was published by Gordon himself.⁶ In the present year, however, Zubair has published his autobiography, which he communicated orally to Na'oum Bey Shoucair, Chef de Bureau in the Agent-General's office, Cairo, who has incor-

¹ H. D. Traill, "England, Egypt and the Sudan," 1900, p. 74.

² "Col. Gordon in Central Africa," p. 388. The words are Hill's.

³ A. E. Hake, "Gordon in China and the Sudan," 1896, p. 131; cf. D. C. Boulger, "Life of Gordon," 1896, i. 149.

⁴ "Travels in Africa," 1890, i. 170-173.

⁵ "Sahara und Sudan," Leipzig, 1889, iii. 410-417.

⁶ Sir H. W. Gordon, "Charles George Gordon," 1886, p. 331.

porated it in his monumental work on the history, geography, and physical characteristics of the Sudan;¹ a work accessible at present to Arabic scholars only. Owing to the remarkable manner in which Zubair figures in the Journals of the "Christian Hero," there may be many in England who would like to know more about him. We shall therefore abridge his autobiography, and then estimate the amount of justification which it gives for the above treatment of him.

Zubair,² son of Rahmat, was born on an island in the White Nile (?) called Wawissa, in the year 1831. He regards himself as a descendant of the Abbasid family, which gave Caliphs to Baghdad for more than five centuries. When the Mongols put an end to the series his ancestors fled to Egypt. But, disliking the rule of the Fatimides (which, by the way, had ceased for a century), they went South, and emerge in the nineteenth century as members of the tribe Jami'ab, located in Darfur. At the age of seven he was sent to school at Khartum, which even before the erection of Gordon College was regarded as a seat of learning.

His family were traders, and his first expedition of importance was brought about by his anxiety to dissuade a cousin from undertaking a hazardous journey into Bahr al-Ghazal. The cousin refused to be dissuaded; and Zubair, who was then twenty-five years of age, swore, under penalty of divorcing his wife, that either the cousin must yield, or he himself would share the perils of the journey. As his cousin persisted, Zubair was compelled by his oath to make the journey also. They took with them a supply of beads and other ornaments, to be exchanged for ivory, rhinoceros horn, ostrich feathers, and other products of the Bahr al-Ghazal province. Both of them were in the employ of that Ali Abu Amouri whose name occurs occasionally in Schweinfurth's "Travels"³ and Sir S. Baker's "Ismailia."⁴

¹ "The History and Geography of the Sudan," Cairo, 1904.

² The form Sebehr was got by Gordon from the English translation of Schweinfurth's "Travels," where the Germanised form was retained unaltered.

³ "The Heart of Africa," 1874, ii. 339.

⁴ *Ibid.* 1874, i. 217.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF ZUBAIR PASHA 139

An occasion soon arose enabling Zubair to display some of his talents. An attack was made on the traders by the natives of the Jur country, where were pitched the zareebahs of the party. Zubair organised the defence, and, probably owing to the possession of superior weapons, defeated the assailants with great slaughter. Thereafter the traders began to look to Zubair as their natural protector; Ali Abu Amouri gave him a tenth of his ivory, and appointed him his agent when he left for Khartum. By 1858 Zubair was himself able to return to Khartum with profits valued at £1,000. With this sum he purchased a dahabieh, loaded it with goods, and hired a company whom he armed with rifles. His intention was to explore unknown lands.

This intention he presently carried out. Leaving his dahabieh at the furthest navigable point on the Bahr al-Ghazal,¹ he proceeded across country to the region called Kolou,² where he was favourably received by the ruler, and collected great stores of ivory. Thence in 1859 he advanced westward to the Nyamnyam country, where reigned a king with four hundred wives, and where camels, horses, and asses were unknown. Zubair would have presented the king with an ass, but the king thought it must be a man magically transformed, and would have none of it. But other presents won his favour, and he gave Zubair the eldest of his many daughters. Alliance with the king enabled him to do business with safety and success.

His return was marked by a strange adventure. He and his former employer endeavoured to save themselves a long land journey by navigating the Pongo, a tributary of the Bahr al-Ghazal. They built themselves a couple of boats, and embarked, taking two months' provisions; but presently the tributary widened out into a vast lake—unknown, it would appear, to the maps—where they lost their bearings, and were compelled to wander seventy-five days. Then they perceived

¹ "Meshra al-Rek."

² Called Golo in A. H. Keane's "Africa," 1895.

some smoke, which it was found proceeded from a large and populous island in the lake, where in the afternoon quantities of ox-dung were burnt in order to provide ash-beds for the inhabitants to lie on at night. Thither they proceeded, having already lost several of their number from privation or despair. On their arrival at the island, where they were hospitably received, many more perished, through partaking too greedily of the first meal offered them.

The hospitality was, however, only a cloak for treachery; the king of the island arranged that a night attack should be made on the guests, themselves slaughtered and their goods seized. But Zubair, who was keeping guard, shot a lion, which, like its ancestor of Nemea, had been devastating the island, and this drove all idea of treachery from the king's heart, who proceeded to bestow a daughter on the hero. But on leaving the island fresh disasters overtook the party, and only Zubair, his former employer, and six men got back safely to Khartum.

After a few months' rest and preparation at Khartum, Zubair started again for the Nyamnyam country (1864), with a new idea in his mind. It was the custom in that land that malefactors should be sold in the market to be killed and eaten. Zubair made large purchases, but only of such criminals as were fit to bear arms, whom he proceeded to train in their use. Zubair's father-in-law the king, not unnaturally, took alarm at this proceeding, and, when Zubair obtained leave to go ivory-hunting in the neighbouring but hostile King Duyah's country, sent an army to waylay his son-in-law: which army Zubair met and utterly routed, thereby ensuring himself a favourable reception from King Duyah.

Peace was presently patched up between Zubair and his father-in-law, but on condition that he should seek some other country; and he goes to Kolou, where he has the death of a brother to avenge. With his army of rescued malefactors he makes war on the king of this land, kills him, takes his son and successor prisoner, and instals himself in their place. He

re-names the capital after himself Dem Zubair, lays claim to the surrounding regions as far as the Bahr al-Arab, proclaims his readiness to receive recruits into his army, and organises a State in accordance with the principles of Islam. Eight years have transformed him from a commercial traveller into a despot.

His first task was to open up a trade route between Bahr al-Ghazal and Kordofan, which he effected by treaty with the sheykhs of the Arab tribes, called Rizegat. They swear fifty oaths on the Koran that in return for a fixed percentage they will allow traders to transport their goods through the country unmolested.

In 1869 occurred the brush between Zubair and the Khedivial troops, which has been frequently narrated,¹ and on which Zubair adds no fresh information. His victory, he tells us, led to his name becoming renowned far and wide, and to applications from various tribes begging to be allowed to put themselves under his protection. The growth of his power alarmed his father-in-law, the Nyamnyam king, who first cut off his princely allowance to his daughter, and in the year 1872 invaded the new kingdom. So Zubair states; whatever may have been the rights of the affair, a year of warfare ended with the death of the Nyamnyam king, and the incorporation of his dominions in those of his son-in-law.

In this country, known as Dar-Fertit, there were at the time eight "kings" in constant warfare with each other, whose subjects hunted each other. When Zubair became master, he showed them the error of their ways, and established peaceful commerce.

Meanwhile the Arabs, known as Rizegat, who occupied the route *via* Shaka from Bahr al-Ghazal to Kordofan, had broken their treaty, and resumed their attacks on the traders. These tribes were nominally under the authority of the autonomous Sultan of Darfur; when the latter paid no attention to a demand that they should be kept in order, Zubair proceeded

¹ By Schweinfurth, Birkbeck Hill, Boulger, &c.

to deal with them himself. In a series of battles, fought in July and August 1873, he defeated them, and thus became master of their capital Shaka (in Gordon's time "a nest of slave-dealers") and the surrounding country. In one of these battles he took prisoner Abdallah al-Ta'a'ishi, who afterwards won fame as "the Khaleefah"; he was at that time employed as sorcerer by his tribe, and his life was spared owing to the representations of the legal experts who accompanied Zubair on his expeditions, with strict orders to restrain him if he was ever about to violate the precepts of the Koran.

About the time when relations were becoming strained between Zubair and the Sultan of Darfur, the former thought fit to affect the position of agent for the Khedive, and wrote to Cairo, laying his conquests at his master's feet, and requesting that some one be appointed to administer the newly conquered territories. This act he declares to have been dictated solely by loyalty; and it is the more surprising since in his correspondence with the Sultan of Darfur, he declares himself certain of victory on the ground of his Abbasid descent: for the Prophet Mohammed had prayed that the offspring of his uncle Abbas might always be victorious. Whatever motive this descendant of the Caliphs may have had for seeking to be a vassal of a vassal of the Sultan, he obtained his request. On November 22, 1873, a missive arrived from Cairo, bestowing on him the title Bey, and investing him with the government of the new provinces, on condition of his furnishing a tribute of £15,000 annually, that matter being the chief concern of the home government.

Meanwhile the Sultan of Darfur had sent an army to recover Shaka. It was routed by Zubair, who then wrote a despatch to the Sultan formally demanding his abdication in favour of the Khedive and his deputy. The politics of Darfur were at this time not free from complications, owing to a disputed succession; but on this matter Nachtigal is better informed than Shoucair. The answer to Zubair's demand was a fresh army sent against him, which, he confesses, was

sickened and disheartened by the cannibalism of the troops who represented Egypt. It was also routed by him, as presently another in which the Sultan Ibrahim himself took the field; Zubair, who had till then been defending Darah, now assumed the offensive, and in a final battle, that of Mene-washi, fought October 25, 1874, the Sultan was killed, and Darfur left undefended for Zubair to seize.

It is in the Darfur campaign that Zubair's career gets mixed up with those events that have led to the interest of England in the Sudan. While Zubair was conquering Darfur, the Governor of Khartum, Isma'il Pasha Ayyub, was sent to Darfur by the Khedive to assist in the conquest; probably, as some of Gordon's biographers assert, to prevent Zubair being too independent. The latter asserts that he had achieved his work when Isma'il proffered his assistance; that nevertheless he welcomed the Khedive's emissary at Fasher, the capital of Darfur, and discharged a hundred guns in his honour; that he handed over the government of the conquered countries to Isma'il Ayyub, proceeding himself with a picked force to deal with the relics of the defeated armies. With these he easily came to terms, but a dispute broke out on his return to Fasher between himself and Isma'il Ayyub with respect to a proposition that the son of the late Sultan of Darfur should be made governor of the province, subject to the Khedive, and to pay £100,000 annually, a proposal favoured by Zubair, but rejected by Isma'il Ayyub. Zubair was, however, entrusted with the command of an expedition to quell a rebellion got up by a son of the deceased Sultan; and in this, his last expedition, he advanced as far as Wadai, whence, however, he was summarily recalled. He then asked leave to return to Cairo to interview the Khedive, and received in reply an invitation to do so, accompanied with the title Pasha. He brought as a present to his master "1000 Sudanese soldiers, completely armed, 100 Arab horses, 8 tons of ivory of the finest quality, four lions, four panthers, and twelve parrots." But in spite of his munificence he was not allowed to return to the Sudan, and

the defence of his kingdom passed to his son Sulaiman, whom Gordon some years after caught and shot.

Portions of this narrative certainly bear some resemblance to the adventures of Sindbad the Sailor; yet in the main it corresponds well with the records of Junker and Nachtigal, while it contains many details unknown to them. Throughout Zubair appears as what Wingate¹ describes him, a born leader of men. The reputation which he enjoyed in the Sudan, and which nine years after he had been exiled from it would have sufficed, in Gordon's well-grounded opinion, to keep the Sudanese from joining the Mahdi, was based on his marvellous success in war, but also, it would seem, on the strict justice of his rule, of which he boasts, though he admits that his punishments were occasionally severe, including hanging with the head downwards. The references to him in Gordon's later Journal do not contradict Zubair's description of himself in these respects.

On the other hand, the autobiography affords little justification for the hysterical passage cited above from Birkbeck Hill, the impression produced by which on the British public probably cost the gallant officer his life. Zubair's omission of all mention of the slave-trade in his account of his life is doubtless intentional, and his connection with it is too well attested for us to attach much importance to the omission. But the phrase "criminal of boundless wickedness" is as unsuitable as the term "scoundrel" for a man in the position of Zubair, pursuing a form of traffic which his own religion tolerated, and which, as Gordon admits, had been discovered in Europe to be illicit only one generation before. From Baker's "Ismailia" it appears that it was difficult to do business in the Sudan without becoming a slave-trader; and if Zubair contributed to the desolation of the Sudan, some credit should, on the other hand, be given him for having in places arrested the process by the introduction of strong government. Nor can we treat his conduct in fomenting a rebellion which might

¹ "Mahdiism in the Egyptian Sudan," 1891, p. 109.

lead to the restoration of his sovereign rights as very heinous. Having conquered some provinces by his own arm, he had then presented them to the Khedive, who rewarded him for the gift by interning him in Cairo. Some sympathy is surely due to his son, "the Cub," in his attempt to save for his family some relics out of his father's kingdom.

Had Zubair been permitted to return to the Sudan in 1876 or 1884, the history of that vast region would have been different, and much bloodshed would have been spared—at least for a time. The course of events has provided it with a permanent source of good government, which Zubair could not have given it. His autobiography, however, gives us the ground for Gordon's anxiety for his services in 1884, just as Gordon's earlier Letters explain the prejudice by which he was deprived of them.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

HOW ENGLISHMEN ARE DESTROYING ENGLAND

SOUTH AFRICANS have observed with lively satisfaction the birth and growth of interest in England with regard to the most important subject of shipping freights.

During its Session of 1902, the Natal Parliament unanimously adopted the following Resolutions :—

(a) That this House is of opinion that the systems known as "Shipping Rings" are working grievous injury to Inter-Imperial trade and commerce by fostering and assisting the competition of foreign manufacturers against British, and that such Rings are otherwise inimical to the best interests of the Empire :

(b) This House, therefore, most respectfully suggests that this subject should be considered at the Conference of Colonial Representatives at the Coronation of his Majesty the King, in conjunction with the question of Inter-Imperial trade.

These Resolutions had been preceded by similar ones passed in previous Sessions, beginning with that of 1899, in one and all of which the same principle was affirmed.

It is to be noted that while the subject is of very great importance to the South African Imperialist, it nevertheless interests him in its Imperial aspect only : and this notwithstanding that it is one vitally affecting the trade of the United Kingdom with her Colonies and Dependencies, and that there are alarming indications of a gradual supplanting of the British manufacturer in South Africa by his European and American rivals.

ENGLISHMEN DESTROYING ENGLAND 147

In his Budget speech delivered during the 1904 Session of the Natal Parliament, the Prime Minister gave the following figures in illustration of the import trade of the Colony during the last three years:—

	1903.	1902.	1901.
United Kingdom . . .	£8,560,177	£8,253,684	£6,523,129
Australian Colonies . . .	825,516	1,459,995	872,123
New Zealand . . .	287,813	89,534	48,685
Canada . . .	208,111	15,686	287
All other Colonies . . .	726,330	661,267	557,675
Foreign Countries . . .	4,457,507	2,836,279	1,553,851
	£15,065,454	£13,317,445	£9,555,750

A glance at these figures makes it clear that while Natal's imports from the United Kingdom showed in 1903 an increase of £306,493 over the previous year, her imports from foreign countries increased by no less than £1,621,228, or more than five times the increase of those from home ports!

Nor is this the case in Natal alone. An examination of the trade returns of the other South African Colonies discloses an exactly similar state of things, a growth of foreign rivalry which it is impossible to regard with equanimity if we desire to see England maintaining her position in the world. Thus the imports from the United Kingdom to Cape Colony declined from £22,304,990 in 1902, to £21,703,663 in 1903, a decrease of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. During the same period foreign imports increased from £7,841,969 to £9,827,416, an increase of 25 per cent., mainly due to the growth of American imports, which are favoured by unfair shipping rates.

In view of the awakening of the nation to the vital importance of England's trade relations with her Colonies, it is the object of this paper to direct attention to the subject of sea freights, which, in a greater degree even than that of preferential tariffs, are bound to affect, injuriously or otherwise, the trade of the United Kingdom with her oversea possessions.

Apart from the South African Colonies, a close study of the question cannot fail to convince the inquirer that Great Britain's Colonial trade generally is being steadily undermined and imperilled by foreign competitors, whose task is made easier by English men and English methods. The following considerations will make the truth of this plain.

In no respect is the competition of the foreign manufacturer more heavily subsidised than in the charges levied on the carriage of British goods from the British manufacturer to the British Colonial consumer.

In the year 1887, when competition began to threaten the profits of the Shipping Companies then trading with South Africa, a circular was issued by the Companies concerned, intimating that a rebate of freight to the extent of five per cent. would be allowed to all shippers in steamers despatched from the United Kingdom, subject to certain conditions by which provision was made for a quarterly computation of the rebate and its payment six months after it had been earned, the payment being limited to those shippers who, up to the date of payment, had shipped exclusively by these lines.

In 1891, when in opposition to the Shipping Ring formed in 1887, the Bucknall Line began to trade with South Africa, the Ring sought to strengthen its hands by the issue of a new circular, which not only offered further inducements to shippers to confine their shipments to the Companies at that time forming the Combination, but also increased the rebate to ten per cent. The natural effect of such increased rebates, which in many cases amounted to very large sums, was to prevent any South African merchant from importing goods by any other Line than one of those forming the Combination, without forfeiting to the Companies concerned the large sums due to him by way of rebate. It is obvious that such an arrangement placed and keeps South African importers and merchants at the mercy of the Shipping Ring, and tends to destroy useful competition affecting shipments from British ports. Moreover it must be understood that since the

f
t
l
e
y
-
l
o
e
l
r
l
y
e
e
n
e
v
s
-
r
h
t
y
l
e
t
-
l
n
e

destruction of such competition does not extend to foreign ports, the necessary result is that the freight from New York to Durban averages less than half that from London to Durban, a British port, which is one thousand miles nearer to London than it is to New York. In the case of Continental ports, competition has already brought the freight down to a point which is rapidly making it impossible for the British manufacturer to compete in the South African market.

It was pointed out by Sir Alfred Hickman, in a letter addressed by him to the *Times* on July 1, 1899, that while the cost of transporting eleven cases of hardware from Wolverhampton to Durban is £10 15s. 9d., the cost of transporting precisely similar articles from Pinneberg to Durban is £6 13s.; such instances can be multiplied to any extent. For instance, the cost of transporting hardware from Dusseldorf to Durban is 43s. 6d. per ton, while the cost of carrying the same goods from Wolverhampton to Durban is 60s. 7d. Certain classes of goods are conveyed from German to South African ports by the German East African Company at sea freight rates varying from 5s. to 20s. per ton under the rates enforced at British ports; and the published tariff of the German line for iron screws from Bremen to Delagoa Bay is equal to 35s. a ton, against 42s. 6d. charged by British Shipping Companies from British ports.

The American figures are even worse. The rates from British ports, by boats belonging to the Conference Lines, vary from 30s. to 55s. per ton, the average standing at about 40s., a striking contrast with the rate now obtaining between New York and Durban, which is 17s. 6d. per ton, or considerably less than one-half the average rate exacted from British exporters for the carriage of goods over a distance less by a thousand miles than that which has to be traversed by the American competitor. A few concrete figures are the best proof of my contention :

Articles.	From United Kingdom.		From New York.	
	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Spirits, per ton	52	6	...	17 6
Agricultural machinery, provisions, oil- man's stores	40	0	...	17 6
Mining machinery, candles, beer . . .	32	6	...	17 6
Furniture, wire fencing, soap, aerated water, bricks	30	0	...	17 6
Deals	27	6	...	17 6
Galvanised iron	25	0	...	17 6
Cement	22	6	...	17 6

The Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Steamship Subsidies, dated July 1902, contains the following pregnant statements :

Mr. Albert Spicer, representing the London Chamber of Commerce, and engaged in business as a wholesale stationer with warehouses in various parts of the Empire, gives another instance. On several occasions it has naturally occurred that his firm has had certain paper stock to procure for its Australian houses, and the question is where can that stock be bought to the best advantage? The rates of freight for paper between New York and Melbourne and Sydney in 1899 to 1901 have varied from 17*s.* 6*d.* to 20*s.* to 25*s.* a ton; the usual rate between London and Melbourne and Sydney during the same period has been 42*s.* 6*d.* per ton of 40 cubic feet. We could have placed those orders, says Mr. Spicer, in the home markets for those requirements, as the first cost has been much the same in England as in the United States. "Sometimes in fact there has been a small difference in favour of the home manufacturer, but the difference in freight has been so large that it has compelled us to place the orders in the United States, because of course in Australia we were competing with America as well." So that the British manufacturers have been the losers, and the United States manufacturers have been the gainers in consequence of the higher rates of freight from Great Britain, as against the rates of freight from New York. The case of cement is also to the purpose. There is a large demand for cement in China. English cement is cut out by Belgian of first natural quality, shipped by German steamer, entirely on account of the difference in freight.

Not only, however, is the British manufacturer hampered by an exorbitant sea freight, but he is compelled, within the United Kingdom itself, to pay railway charges which are rapidly destroying his chances of successfully competing with foreign rivals. The following table will illustrate this view :

	British.	For same distance.		
		German.	Belgian.	Dutch.
Hardware—				
Birmingham to London	23s. 6d.	11s. 4d.	13s. 11d.	11s. 3d.
Cotton Goods—				
Manchester to London	36s. 0d.	20s. to 23s.	18s. 1d.	14s. 4d.
General Machinery—				
Leeds to Hull	25s. 0d.	4s. 6d.	8s. 0d.	5s. 6d.

These illustrations have been selected as having reference to the main export trade routes which the British manufacturer is obliged to adopt in regard to his foreign and colonial trade. For instance, Birmingham hardware, for export to the Colonies, is carried to London and there shipped; cotton goods go from Manchester to London for the same purpose, while Leeds sends its export machinery to Hull.

Not only, however, are British manufactures thus handicapped in regard to the export trade, but raw material is increasingly finding its way to the continental manufacturer in preference to the British, for the same reason. As an instance, it may be stated that, whereas the cost of carrying wool from Liverpool to Manchester is 9s. 2d., for the same distance in Germany the manufacturer pays only 4s. 2d., or less than one-half. In face of such facts we need feel no surprise when we learn that one of the largest exporters of wool and wattle bark in Natal no longer sends his produce to the London market, the whole of it now finding its way to the markets of Germany, to which it has been driven by the excessive dock charges in England.

The truth then forces itself upon us, that not only is the Englishman handicapping himself in regard to his exports, but that he is also shutting the door upon the raw material. Only the most fatuous folly will deny that the situation is serious enough to demand searching investigation and the application, before it is too late, of drastic remedial measures.

We, in the self-governing Colonies, are doing all we can to foster trade with the Mother Country; but our efforts are necessarily futile, and will continue to be futile, until the United Kingdom herself awakens to the necessity of devising

some method by which the British manufacturer, after he has produced his goods, may be able to forward them to the Colonial consumer on terms of not less than equality with his foreign competitor. I do not hesitate to affirm my belief that if Mr. Chamberlain's fiscal proposals should be carried into effect, they will be doomed to failure until this vital question has been dealt with and satisfactorily settled. No system of preferential duties which the Colonies may adopt can possibly neutralise the disadvantages under which the British manufacturer has been placed by those who are engaged in the carriage of British export goods.

Nothing will better illustrate the destruction which has been wrought as regards British trade in South Africa than our experience with reference to cement. While at one time the whole of the cement used in Natal was imported from England, hardly a cask now comes from there. And why? Because the cement market as regards Natal has been entirely captured by the Germans, who are also fast ousting British cement in the Transvaal. This, it is but fair to say, is not entirely attributable to the sea freight charges, although largely due to them. The Transvaal Railway Administration levy a heavier charge upon cement imported *via* Natal for use in the Transvaal than upon cement imported *via* Delagoa Bay, the difference being 2s. 8d. per cask in favour of the latter route, upon the land journey alone. As the Delagoa Bay route is to a great extent in the hands of the Germans, it follows that German cement thus secures an enormous advantage over British. Oddly enough, this advantage is conceded by the Transvaal Administration, which is entirely in the hands of the Imperial Government. It is, indeed, difficult to contemplate with patience so short-sighted a policy on the part of those responsible for the government of the Transvaal, the conquest of which has cost the British people so much blood and treasure.

The root of the evil lies in the maintenance of the rebate system by the Shipping Ring, the effect of which, as I have already indicated, has been to destroy competition as regards

British ports, while it flourishes at foreign. The adoption of this system by lines trading between the United States and South Africa is impossible, in consequence of the rigid legislation which the United States has adopted under the "Elkins Anti-Rebate Act, 1903," which makes it a misdemeanour for any common carrier by land or by sea to offer any sort of rebate or preference to a shipper, under heavy penalties which ensure a due observance of the provisions of the Act. Competition is thus secured in regard to shipments from United States ports to British Colonies, with the result, as has already been stated, of reducing freights from such ports to about half those obtaining from British.

The South African Colonies are about to meet in conference to discuss the question of shipping freights; and, without anticipating the outcome of that conference, I fail to see what relief can be obtained unless the United Kingdom will herself co-operate to protect the interests of her own manufactures.

It is from this point of view difficult to understand the recently cabled statement by Mr. Lyttelton of his opinion that the subject is one which requires to be dealt with by the Colonies themselves. Looked at from a trade standpoint, the matter hardly concerns the Colonies at all, seeing that we are the customers, and that in such cases it is the seller, and not the buyer, who is most concerned. Nothing short of an Imperial Act of Parliament, on the lines of the Elkins Act, can destroy the rebate system, and thus at a stroke bring about that competition, through the lack of which, in so far as regards British ports, a high freight rate is maintained as against the low freight rate of the foreigner. The passing of such an Act would still leave open the question of inland rates, as levied by the English railway companies. That is, however, a matter too large to be examined within the limits of this article, and I shall hope to have an opportunity of dealing with it on another occasion.

F. S. TATHAM.

(Member of the Natal Parliament.)

A HIGH-BORN ADVENTURESS

“ON December 23, 1663,” writes a Bolognese chronicler, “the Marquis Paleotti arrived from Turin with his wife Donna Christina, daughter to the most excellent English lord, the Duke of Northumberland, a lady of the Court of Madame of Savoy, about fourteen years of age. Few, if any, equals had she in beauty, wit, or caprice, or in rank and other qualities, and her fame is so widely spread that all princes, highborn cavaliers, and others who travel this way desire to wait upon her.”

*Le grazie al viso, parole il gioco,
Le neve al petto et all guancie il foco,¹*

sang an enthusiastic admirer of the beautiful Christina, who evidently inherited the good looks and fascination of her great-grandfather, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, joined to the sprightly wit of her French mother. Leicester married secretly at Esher Lady Douglas Howard, widow of Lord Sheffield, and had by her a son, Robert, born at Sheen, whom he afterwards branded as a bastard when he married Lady Essex. It would take too long to record the romantic life of young Robert Dudley, who, after discovering Guiana and conquering Trinidad when only twenty-one, entered the English Navy and led the van-guard at the battle of Cadiz. He inherited Kenilworth from his father, and married Alice, daughter of Sir

¹ Loveliness in her face, wit in her speech,
Snow in her bosom and fire in her cheeks.

Thomas Leigh. After vain attempts to clear his mother's good name and prove his own legitimacy he left England, but not alone, for with him went his fair young cousin Elisabeth, eldest daughter of Sir Robert Southwell. At Lyons they became Roman Catholics, and were married by Papal dispensation as being within the forbidden degrees of relationship; of the Protestant wife and her four little children not a word was said.

They then went to Florence, where Robert Dudley, Earl of Warwick as he called himself, entered the service of the Grand Duke Ferdinand I., as Controller of the Navy. He was a remarkable man—almost a genius. The ships designed and built by him were excellent, so good that King James, according to Lotti, Tuscan Minister in London, commanded him to return to England, and promised him an earldom. But he preferred to remain in Tuscany, where, besides building ships, he was engaged in draining the marshes between Pisa and Loghorn, which place he induced the Grand Duke to fortify and declare a free port. He invented various nautical instruments, now in the Museum of the Specola at Florence; patented a new invention to improve the quantity and quality of silk, its manufacture, and designs; he was an author and a mathematician, and concocted a marvellous curative powder, called in Italian dispensaries *Pulvis Comitum Warvicensis*. Handsome, agreeable, and an accomplished courtier, he became Grand Chamberlain to Maria Maddalena, the young Grand Duchess of Tuscany, wife of Cosmo II., and sister of the Emperor Ferdinand II., from whom she obtained a patent granting the title of Duke of Northumberland to him and his heirs. Charles, a good-for-nothing scapegrace and spendthrift, succeeded his father as Duke of Northumberland and Earl of Warwick, and married a very pretty Frenchwoman, Maria Gouffier, daughter of the Seigneur de Crèveccœur. One of their daughters was our beautiful Christina; she soon aroused the jealousy of the Bolognese ladies whose lovers she annexed, while she ridiculed their manners and showed a superb dis-

regard for appearances. Satirical leaflets were circulated in the town, in which, it is true, other reputations besides Donna Christina's were torn to shreds. Oddly enough the author or authors had not discovered that as a child of twelve she had been seduced by her father's friend, Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna, Grand Constable of the Kingdom of Naples, and husband of the handsome Maria Mancini, who once aspired to be Queen of France. The daughter of Colonna and Christina was recognised as belonging to the House of Colonna, and died in Rome in 1750. This was the reason why Christina Dudley married the Marquis Andrea Paleotti, who had neither rank nor fortune to recommend him. Before she was sixteen her eldest (legitimate) daughter was born, to whom the Grand Duchess of Saxony stood godmother.

When the twenty-year-old Cardinal de Bouillon passed through Bologna in 1670 he was the guest of the Vice-Legate Monsignor Buratti, and solemnly walked in various processions through the streets. But no sooner were his religious duties done than the scarlet robes were thrown aside, and, dressed as a *preux chevalier*, with a small scarlet skull-cap, just to remind people that he was a cardinal, he went to pay his court to the fascinating Donna Christina. Right glad was the Vice-Legate when he departed.

The following year all Bologna had matter for many days' conversation. By the orders of Cardinal Pallavicino, the Legate, Marquis Paleotti was seized and imprisoned on his way to the palace to assist at the installation of the new Gonfalonier and his Council, called Anziani, or Elders. Paleotti was an out-going Elder, and as such could not legally be arrested. Soon the piazza was filled by an excited crowd, and the old and new Elders went to remonstrate with the Legate, who shrugged his shoulders and said the Bargello had only been too precipitate, as his orders were to arrest Paleotti as he came out of the palace, not as he went in, for certain illegalities committed some years before; but as he was in prison he had better stay there; it would be absurd to release him

only to arrest him again. Christina's handsome and dissolute father was then staying with his daughter at Bologna, and amusing himself by paying assiduous court to the Signora Ippolita Pasi, much to the chagrin of her husband and family. Their complaints reached Rome, and orders were sent that a scandal was to be prevented. The Legate's method was simplicity itself. As Donna Christina drove one day to visit her imprisoned husband she was seized and taken to the convent of Santa Margherita, and then the Bargello went in search of her father. But, forewarned, the Duke of Northumberland had time to retire to a safe hiding-place until the storm had blown over.

Four long months did Paleotti pass in prison and his wife in the convent, where she was bored to death. At length the Elders, moved to compassion by their old comrade's imploring letters, and finding it useless to petition the Cardinal-Legate, appealed to Rome. Clement X. ordered the immediate release of Paleotti, who, not thinking himself safe, left the Bolognese territory, while Donna Christina, far bolder than her husband, returned to her own house and resumed her former way of life. Soon afterwards she came to great honour; the Empress, mother of Leopold I., Grand Duke of Tuscany, sent a decoration instituted by her to eleven ladies of Bologna, and after High Mass, celebrated by the Archbishop, and "an eloquent discourse" by a Jesuit priest, their names were proclaimed in San Pietro. The first called was Donna Christina di Northumbria Paleotti. Her progress up the nave at the head of the other ten fortunate ladies was triumphal, and we can imagine the glittering smile and ostentatiously low obeisance she bestowed on the Legate as she passed.

In 1679 Mazarin's sister, wife of Christina's first lover, Colonna, passed through Bologna, and made friends with the woman who as a child had aroused her fierce jealousy. The well-assorted pair went off together to amuse themselves at Milan, and the Governor was soon besieged with entreaties to send Christina back whence she had come. We read that

the reason given for not permitting her to remain here is that she allowed many gentlemen to wait on her, amongst whom arose jealousies which threatened grave danger. Inasmuch as she had received from Count Antonio Trotti 1000 doubloons, to be paid yearly, besides 100 lire every day for her table, and other gifts of value, he would not permit that others should aspire to her good graces.

So many were the complaints that reached the ears of the Governor that he feared evils might arise on account of the lady, and resolved to exile her from Milan and its territory. But her rank and quality was represented to him and he was begged not to carry out his intention, particularly as there were others who gave rise to quite as much scandal; the "others" alluded to may have been her companion, Donna Maria Colonna. Christina, however, thought discretion was the better part of valour and departed, carrying away with her "fine jewels of great price, obtained," says a malicious chronicler, "with the knowledge of her husband, who prides himself on having so popular a wife who is courted by all."

Many coaches full of her relations and admirers met her some miles outside Bologna, and escorted her to Palazzo Paleotti. A grave Senator, Filippo Barbazza, became so enamoured of her that his wife gathered together her goods and chattels and returned to her father's house. The scandal was great, and was even alluded to on the stage; the actor was stabbed next night as he left the theatre, and public opinion accused Donna Christina of paying the assassins. With a fine assumption of injured innocence she declared she would leave Bologna and pass the carnival at Venice, where she immediately became the cynosure of all eyes. On her return to Bologna she openly defied decorum by appearing, magnificently dressed, at an official dinner given by Senator Barbazza to Gonfalonier and the Elders. She entered the hall after the reverend signors had taken their places, seated herself by Barbazza, and enchanted the company by her wit and beauty. This was more than the Legate could bear; he wrote to Rome that morality and decency were outraged by this English firebrand, and the return courier brought an order to expel Donna

Christina at once from Bologna. She left in Barbazza's carriage with him and her husband for Venice, where one evening her gondola was upset, and it is said the rivalry between the finely dressed and bewigged cavaliers who sprang into the Grand Canal to save so precious a life was most edifying. After some time the Pope was induced to permit her to return to Bologna to occupy herself with the marriage of her daughters, and she found match-making so amusing that her house became a regular matrimonial agency. Her husband, as was the fashion among gentlemen in those days, often assumed the direction of operatic and theatrical companies, and the stars frequented Donna Christina's receptions to the horror of the old-fashioned patrician families, whose sons preferred passing their evenings in Casa Paleotti to playing round games with their sisters and cousins. But sometimes they were caught in the toils of a brilliant *prima donna*, and when Count Grassi, who had been brought up for the Church, and whose great uncle was a cardinal at Rome, threw off his priest's robes to marry the pretty and lively singer Teresa Rossi, the Legate was furious.

The journal of one of the old-fashioned gentlemen of that time is still in existence, in which he laments the degeneracy of the young people :

Vices have increased [he writes], truth and honesty no longer exist. Monks and nuns who once lived on alms are now rolling in riches. Ladies and burghers' wives who were content with one rich dress when they married, which lasted a life-time, now have several, and every season buy a new one at much expense. When our nobles went to their country seats they used to have coaches drawn by oxen, filled with provisions like a Noah's Ark ; now this is considered old-fashioned and ridiculous. The young men exercised themselves in manly sports; early in the morning they went to the tilting-yard, then they fenced or played racquets, thus they became agile and strong ; and after dinner they would dance our Italian dances, which make the body more supple and lithe than the French dances now in vogue. Pike and double-handed sword exercise, the game of pallone, &c., were also much in fashion. Now our young nobles lie abed till mid-day, spend the afternoons in idle amusements in ladies' houses and their evenings at assemblies. In former times challenges and duels were frequent ; now every one lives in peace because they

know not how to handle a rapier, and think only of amusing themselves with women. When ladies left the house, whether to attend Mass or to pay visits, they always bore their rosary in their hands; now they are ashamed to take it even to church, and they are imitated in this by the wives of our citizens. On going to early Mass a page or servant would carry a large satchel full of books of devotion; but nowadays the office of the Blessed Virgin is almost considered a superfluity. The husbands used to represent the nobility of the house; now it is the women who, instead of one serving-man or at most a page, go about attended by a perfect court, while the men walk alone or have but a single attendant. Now an assembly is announced in the house of such a lady, the husband is never mentioned. Waiting-maids used to be guarded like virgins in a cloister—in some houses they never quitted their own apartments—the windows were secured by padlocks so that they might not look out into the courtyard or the street, and their food was passed to them in a turnstile. Now they have every liberty in the house and outside, and go dressed like their mistresses instead of soberly and simply.

And so the old grumbler, whose wife and daughters probably liked to “represent the nobility of the house,” and his sons to pay court to pretty actresses, continues for many pages.

In October 1686, Charles Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland, died in Florence, and only forty days afterwards Adelaide Paleotti, Christina's second daughter, married Count Alessandro Roffeni. Three years later the Marquis Paleotti died, and his widow was advised by the Legate “that it would be well if she withdrew to the country for awhile and attended to her family concerns quietly and with decorum.” She answered that she was sorry not to be able to content His Excellency, but that as she was under the protection of the Duke of Mantua he must first be consulted, and in a few days the Duke sent his secretary to intercede for her, but the Legate remained obdurate. Donna Christina then left for Mantua with her third daughter Anna, who soon after married a Mantuan nobleman. Meanwhile Adelaide, whose marriage had been most unhappy, left her husband's house and took refuge, without the Legate's permission, in the convent of San Lorenzo. Declaring that it was easier to rule a state than such a family, he ordered her sister Victoria Bargellini to fetch the Countess Roffeni away

and place her in the keeping of the nuns of San Giacomo. As the two sisters were returning from San Lorenzo the young Marquis Paleotti, with some dozen men at arms in the service of the Duke of Mantua, stopped the horses, lifted Adelaide out of her sister's coach into one standing ready, and bore her off as fast as six horses could go, to Mantua. Next day the theatrical company which had been delighting the people of Bologna, and was engaged for the season, packed up their scenery and baggage and departed on receipt of orders from their protector the Duke of Mantua.

In 1691 a new Legate, Cardinal Pamfilio, ruled in Bologna and Christina must have made peace with him, as the Bolognese chronicles contain long dissertations about a terrible mishap in Casa Paleotti. At an evening party the guests were regaled with sweetmeats and "most excellent chocolate." A few hours later the doctors had their hands full. Victoria Bargellini, Christina's eldest daughter, just escaped with her life, Count Pepoli died after twelve days of agony, and all who partook of the "exquisite chocolate" were more or less ill. One version was that "the Marquis Paleotti had made certain experiments with arsenic and sublimate," some say out of mere caprice and curiosity, others for some hidden end directed against his mother; another that "the Marquis was mixing certain ingredients to make women beautiful, such as rouge and white lead, and the chocolate pot had not been washed out before it was used again that evening." An autopsy, conducted by the Minister of Justice, various doctors, barbers, and notaries was held upon the body of Count Pepoli, and the verdict, which was not unanimous, declared that "death was owing to a fistula in the breast arising from an old wound received in a duel, which had probably been inflamed by the hot chocolate, and had caused an inflammation of the lungs, which had proved fatal." The Minister refused to accept the verdict, and called in the Legate's doctor, who said the Marquis "had without doubt died of poison, but might have recovered like the others had he been in good health." Luigi Paleotti

was put in prison, and there he remained until bailed out by two friends after some months.

When Christina's fourth daughter Diana appeared in society the admiration of the Bolognese was unbounded. "La Bellissima" had fair hair and black eyes, her figure was perfect, her wit brilliant; she sang and played the *cembalo* admirably, and danced like a sylph.

The operatic season of 1694 was a particularly good one in Bologna, and the town overflowed with strangers from all parts of Italy. Among others came Don Carlo and Don Marc' Antonio Colonna, sons of Christina's old lover, and therefore half-brothers of her first child. Marc' Antonio fell desperately in love with the beautiful Diana, all his spare time was passed in Casa Paleotti singing duets with her or accompanying her on the *cembalo*. But the season came to an end, and the Colonnas returned to Rome, to the disappointment of Donna Christina and the grief of her daughter. The young people corresponded, and some of her letters are still extant, charming in style, and written in a neat flowing hand. The following year a new opera, *Nerone fatto Cesare* was given with the best singers of the day, and the Colonnas returned to Bologna, but it was clear that the younger brother came more to see Diana than to hear the music.

Don Marc' Antonio was dependent on his brother, who, by his father's will, was bound, in case he had no heir, to provide a proper appanage for him, so that he might marry and continue the family. After some altercation between them as to the relative merits and demerits of various young ladies, Don Carlo lost patience and told his brother to marry the devil if he chose. Marc' Antonio, on the pretence of a shooting expedition, immediately left Rome and offered his heart and hand to Donna Diana Paleotti. The question then arose how and where the marriage was to be celebrated, for they well knew the Colonnas, the Spanish ambassador, who had proposed a Spanish bride, and the Curia, would combine to prevent it, and Diana might run the risk of passing the rest of her days in a

convent. Donna Christina proposed Venice, where she had many powerful friends, and the Patriarch, "a perfect cavalier," was a great admirer of hers. After attentively perusing the papers, he pronounced that Donna Diana's were not in order, and advised them to return in all haste to Bologna and declare themselves husband and wife in the presence of their parish priest and of two witnesses.

At daybreak one morning two Bolognese gentlemen knocked at the door of the parsonage of the little church of San Michele dei Leprosetti and asked to see the priest, Don Silvio, on urgent business. The maid said he was still asleep, and as she went to call him they opened the door to Donna Christina, her daughter Victoria Bargellini, and the two lovers. The whole party ran upstairs, and before Don Silvio had time to tuck his bare legs into bed again, Marc' Antonio said in a loud voice, "In the presence of your reverence and these two witnesses I declare Donna Diana Paleotti to be my legitimate wife"; and Donna Diana declared Marc' Antonio Colonna to be her legitimate husband. The poor priest put his hands to his ears, exclaiming, "I have heard nothing, I have understood nothing; I refuse to understand anything, the marriage is not valid." They laughed at him, the lovers embraced, saying, "My husband," "my wife," and the wedding-party went off to a notary, who drew up the contract and declared them to be legally married.

In 1696, Count Roffeni, the husband of Christina's second daughter Adelaide, died in a wretched pothouse where he was engaged as a waiter; and a few years later Bologna was startled by the news that his widow had become a Protestant and the wife of "a rich and mighty English Prince, the Duke of Shrewsbury." The Legate was exceedingly irate, and Donna Christina expressed the greatest horror and grief at her daughter's change of religion, for like most women who lead adventurous lives she had thrown herself, when her beauty began to wane, into the arms of the Church. Instead of the passionate love poems of her youth, some of which are above

the average, she wrote sonnets deploring her past errors, and consecrating her tears and her few remaining years of life to God. The shameful death of her youngest son, Ferdinand, an incorrigible scamp, who followed his sister to England and was hung at Tyburn for the murder of his Italian servant on March 30, 1718, hastened her end. She died and was buried, habited as a nun, in the church of Corpus Domini at Bologna in February 1719.¹

JANET ROSS.

¹ For fuller particulars see "The Life of Sir Robert Dudley," &c., by John Temple Leader (Florence : G. Barbera, 1895), and "Una Illustre Avventuriera," by Corrado Ricci (Milano : Fratelli Treves, 1891).

ON THE LINE

Duchess Sarah, etc. By one of her descendants (Mrs. Arthur Colville. Longmans, 1904, 18s. net). The great Duchess of Marlborough is best known by Macaulay's description of her; like other descriptions by Macaulay, a blaze and a blackness without much chiaroscuro. She has the reputation of the worst temper in history. Malignity, implacability, ingratitude, want of natural affection, avarice, are freely laid to her charge, and she has had few defenders, if any. Here is a new and more friendly account of her, and we approach it with some prejudice in favour of the traditional estimate, but with a suspicion that, as sometimes happens, here is a verdict of history to be reconsidered. Mrs. Colville's book helps to redress the balance, though it is amateur work and not of the highest order. It calls itself "the social history of the times"; but that is more than can be contained in a volume of 375 pages, and the historical part is negligible; but it is easy reading, and if it does not add much to our knowledge of the Duchess and her times, one is glad to spend a few hours in her company, and in that of the company which she kept, always the very best.

For good or evil, Sarah was always magnificent. Beautiful, virtuous, imperious, she ruled every one she came near, always convinced of her own wisdom and rectitude, and of the wickedness and folly of all who differed from her, or did not bow down to the only human being whom she admired besides

herself. Her temperament was the cause of great unhappiness to herself and to most of those with whom she came into contact. It is part of the greatness of Marlborough that her explosions never ruffled him, and, as we know, he kept locked up all his life, unknown to her, the golden hair which she cut off one day to vex him. "She never learnt," says Lord Wolseley, "in childhood to curb her temper, nor was any effort made to train her mind." She could do anything when she was in a rage, paint her daughter's picture black, [and write under it "She is blacker within"; tear off the brass furniture from the doors of her lodging when she was turned out; run downstairs after Dr. Meade to pull his wig off; but she never lost good sense: her business capacity was nearly as great as that of her husband, she was respected and liked by some of the best men of her time—we are not sure that she loved any woman—and was adored by her servants, which is no slight praise.

It was easy to lose Sarah's friendship if one was unworthy of it. She did not care for flattery, did not resent being told plainly of her faults, if it was not expected that she should mend them; and did not value apologies, knowing that they are seldom sincere. She did not easily forgive. Yet Pope retained her friendship, who lampooned her as "Atossa," received £1000 for suppressing his satire, and left it to be republished after his death. Pope was too good company to be parted with; as for his virtue, why should she trouble herself about that?

The story of her quarrel with the Queen has been told by herself, and is overlaid with a great deal of unnecessary detail. It is, in fact, a very simple story. Queen Anne was an affectionate, commonplace, well-bred woman, as obstinate as her father; whilst her position at Court as heir presumptive was painful and embarrassing, she was grateful to the warm-hearted and passionate champion whom she allowed to domineer over her until her ascendancy became intolerable. What the Princess might endure the Queen could not. Anne was always *grande dame*, and knew the Duchess's position

better than the Duchess did. One must not say to a Queen Regnant, "Lord, madam, it must be so," nor make a fuss about standing up or sitting down. The Duchess should have remembered that if she and her husband had fought Anne's battles for her—and the Duke the greatest man in Europe—still he and she were subjects, and sovereigns will not bear neglect. She puts the whole case herself in a letter to "an unknown correspondent" (p. 216), dated April 23, 1711:

I fancy that anybody that had been shut up so many tedious hours as I have been, with a person that had no conversation, and yet must be treated with respect, would feel something of what I did, and be very glad, when their circumstances did not want it, to be free from such a slavery; we must be uneasy at all times, though I do protest that upon the account of her loving me and trusting me so entirely as she did, I had a concern for her which was more than you will easily believe, and I would have served her with the hazard of my life upon any occasion; but after she put me at liberty by using me ill, I was very easy, and liked better that anybody should have her favour than myself at the price of flattery, without which I believe nobody can be well with a king or queen, unless the world should come to be less corrupt or they (the monarch) wiser than any I have seen since I was born.

On the one hand a royal lady claiming the honours of her place, and well aware of the solid advantages reaped by the Marlboroughs from their connection with her; on the other a tempestuous friend, who must always be in the right, "tumbling out the truth just as it came into her head" (her own expression), and who neglects customary civilities, and each rather tired of the other, and you have a situation the most favourable for intrigue that could be wished; a Harley and an Abigail are sure to be at hand. If the result of the quarrel affects the fortunes of half the world, so much the worse for politics, whether conducted by a Czar or a removable Prime Minister; personalities are the pitiful side of public affairs.

Sarah did very well for herself. By her own exertions and her husband's genius she attained to a greater position than has been held by any Englishwoman; she built palaces and pulled them down, and adorned them magnificently with

hangings of velvet and satin; she gave away £300,000 in gifts and charities, and left more than £100,000 in legacies, besides Blenheim and her other houses, and estates in twelve counties. It was her misfortune that most of the persons she loved died before her; but it was in great measure her own fault that she quarrelled with the greater number of those who remained, and gave it as her verdict upon life—

Alas, there is [so] much change in this world since I knew it first, that though one's natural pleasure is to love people, the generality of the world are something or other so disagreeable that 'tis impossible to do it.

Could Swift have said anything harder?

Great as her fortunes were, they were not great enough for her genius. Queen Sarah, with the hereditary right to command everybody and everything, would have been greater than Queen Elizabeth.

Although this is not the occasion for a critical judgment of the works of Henry Seton Merriman, the publication of *The Last Hope* (Smith, Elder, 6s.)—a novel equal to the best of its predecessors—inclines one mentally to review the record of his work, and to feel that death has deprived English fiction of a star which, though it shone with variable light, was surely growing to the first magnitude. This volume completes a series with singular propriety, for in it are all the particular qualities of Mr. Merriman's art—the conscientious workmanship, the carefully constructed plot, the clearly drawn characters, the felicity of phrase. When Captain Clubbe's vessel, *The Last Hope*, crept up the river to Farlingford, it bore with it one who was with greater significance the representative of its name—the last hope of the despairing Royalists of France. Loo Barebone was no weakling—as so many a monarch out of place seems to have been; but a strong man with a light heart, who could count the hazards and play the game. France is, always has been, and—while there are Frenchmen in the world—always will be, paradise

for the political gamester: certainly the time for this story, from 1849 to 1851, was the hour for a man. He who was to win that round of an eternal game was already on the scene, but until his *Coup D'Etat*—which brings the climax to this story—the “Prince-President” was merely a wire-puller half hidden in the background. Meanwhile, the decayed and impoverished nobility, who sighed for the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty, whispered and conspired, not without a due sense of their importance and a full appreciation of the proper theatrical effect; and when Loo made his bow to them they welcomed him gladly. If there were doubts they were hidden by those who had them. It was enough for the aristocrats that a man with the Bourbon face, a kingly presence, and an energy hardly characteristic of his royal fathers, had come to claim the crown, and to give them something better suited to their sentiments than a republic ruled by a Prince-President with the lurid shadow of a restored Empire behind it. Loo Barebone had his qualms, as well as a strong inclination elsewhere. There was this alternative before him—a throne and its dazzling opportunities, or love and happiness in obscurity? The unselfishness of a girl sent him thronwards, and so indirectly brought the end, which was not all failure. There is a temptation in such a note as this to dwell on the details of the plot. To do so in this instance would be inopportune and unfair, especially when so much of the book is due to the play of characters. It is a happy gallery, every individual being touched with life, and, in due proportion, necessary to the development of the story. While it is impossible not to lament that this should be the last romance to bear Mr. Merriman's name on the title-page, it is equally impossible not to rejoice that he should have completed his work with so appropriate and lasting a monument to his genius.

Mr. Morley Roberts, in *A Tramp's Note Book* (F. V. White, 6s.), discourses sometimes as a tramp, sometimes

as a globe-trotter. In the former capacity he shows that he has "been there," that he has suffered, and can describe what he has suffered. In the latter he is merely like many another man who travels, a dilettante observer and impressionist, or a contributor to newspapers in search of copy. We follow the steps of the globe-trotter through Lisbon and Madeira, Johannesburg and Cape Town, and listen, without any particular interest or excitement, while he expounds to us his views of indolent easy-going Portuguese, of lonely, wind-tanned, sun-dried Boers, of President Kruger, unkempt and imperturbable. But the true and genuine tramp when he consents and is able to talk is always sure of an attentive audience; for he lives and moves close to the borders of fairy-land and the realms of romance, no matter how sordid and woebegone the scenes he describes. "By many names men call them, from many lands they come!" Ulysses, the man of the cunning heart, storm-tossed by Fate, is King of Tramps, taller by head and shoulders than any man in Tramp-land. And there are knights errant riding alone "through forests and enchantments drear," and pious citizens who in the spring-time "longed to go on pilgrimage," and gentlemen-adventurers who sailed into distant seas and singed the King of Spain's beard; and little David Copperfield—embodiment of the soul of Charles Dickens—who tramped the London-Dover road; and de Quincey, who trod the weary London streets; and Josiah Flynt, the stout-hearted Yankee, who has made all Tramp-land his own, and has lived with the gentlemen of the road in his own United States, and in Canada, Russia, England, Scotland, Spain, and France.

Of this select band is Mr. Morley Roberts an associate and confederate, when he travels, not as globe-trotter, with portmanteaux, dressing-cases, steamer tickets, and letters of introduction, but as tramp proper, encumbered by no impedimenta, save the stick in his hand, the bundle over his shoulder, and the few shillings in his pocket.

Many and evil have been the days of Mr. Morley Roberts'

pilgrimage and the pursuits which he has essayed. He has been cowboy and stableman in California, sheep-herder in Texas, roustabout in the Thames, "dead broke" in San Francisco, and sailor-man in the Southern Ocean. To do him justice, he seems to have been equally disgusted with each of his experiences, and writes with comprehensive dislike of them all. To him gentle England has been no "kindly nurse," and the United States he has found hard, barren, and unprofitable. With sardonic emphasis he points to the fact that in the United States is no poor-law, and therefore no machinery for the relief of the unfortunate and improvident. This, it may be remarked in passing, throws a curious side-light upon the social organisation of the Great Republic. The absence of a poor-law is often alluded to by English philanthropists as a mark of the thrice-blessed superiority of the American social system. But on a point of this kind the mutterings of the vagrant teach more than the smug deductions of the philosopher.

But though Mr. Morley Roberts has found that the way of the tramp, like that of the transgressor, is hard, his pages are not by any means devoid of illumination and very human interest. We like him best when he is sullenly watching his stupid sheep in the dreary Texas plains, or is the admiring friend and mentor of El Toro, the mighty Californian bull. If his note-book contains more of such reminiscences we hope that he will give them to us in due time. All true tramps are interesting, whether their attitude be that of the enthusiast or of the pessimist. Some, like sturdy George Borrow, pass along the road whistling and singing the time away, and smacking their lips with zest, appreciative of past and future adventures. "Be the day weary, or be the day long" something 'pleasant will certainly occur very soon. Jasper Petulengro will beckon out of the copse as evening draws in, and bid him to supper beside the fragrant camp-fire. In yonder dingle is he not sure to find beautiful Isopel Berners, the outcast of the "great house," sitting beside her little

cart, pondering strange things in her wild heart, her face covered by her hands, and her fair hair falling over her shoulders? Or if sterner joys please, is there not the Flaming Tinman of mighty stature and ferocious aspect with whom he must do battle for his life?

Mr. Morley Roberts is in sooth no George Borrow. Where the one whistles and sings, the other curses, mutters and groans, but it is not unlikely that his attitude is at least as true to life as that of his valiant predecessor.

What a blessing it is that Mr. Wells has humour! If he had been born without that golden gift what terrifying books he might have written! As it is **The Food of the Gods and How it Came to Earth** (Macmillan. 6s.) is effective enough for the person who dreams, considering the assortment of monstrosities which spring to life in its pages—the gigantic earwigs, portentous wasps, prodigious mushrooms, rats that overpower and eat horses, chicks as large as bustards, eels that could venture ashore and kill sheep, cockchafers that buzzed like motor-cars, Bloomsbury cockroaches “of a quite terrible sort!” These are a few of the less dreadful examples, yet how much farther could nastiness go? Fortunately, the Children of the Food are entirely splendid. They are mortals idealised, mortals with ideals. Where Gargantua and Pantagruel were things of flesh and beastliness, Mr. Wells’s new people have all the majesty of man. Herakleophorbia—or Boomfood, as the voice in the street called it—the cause of all these abnormalities, was the invention of two modest professors of science, a chemist and a physiologist, whose only earlier claims to fame had been that they had read papers to the British Association at its Congress. The trouble began when some of the food was carelessly left lying about at the experimental farm where Bensington, the chemist, was trying its effect on chickens, and the rats and wasps got it. It was Redwood, the physiologist, who first experimented with

it on a child, his child—when Mrs. Redwood's back was turned.

The consequences were immediate. The food once taken had to be continued. It was not even necessary that the act of assimilation should be voluntary, for germs of it could be absorbed unwittingly, the effects were just the same so long as the creature absorbing it had not already reached the limits of growth. Hence it was that, in the twenty-one years occupied by this voracious history, men and women forty-foot high, with brains of force proportionate to their bodily girth, came to be. But their vastness roused ordinary humanity to jealousy and fear, and civil war was the consequence. The result of the unique conflict is left uncertain, the fate of the giant-children remains undecided, when the end of the book is reached. What will be the future proportions of the mankind of the world—giant or pigmy? Everybody does not appreciate Mr. Wells's games with the may-bes and might-have-beens. Many a severe man of science must regard him as the Sunday-school teacher does the boy with a pin. Certainly not everybody will like this, his latest effort. Yet no one could justly deny its power, brilliance, imagination, ingenuity, eloquence and humour. It has all these qualities in generous measure. Mr. Wells has never done better work than he has shown here. Packed in these pages are the seeds of many a social problem. Many a sore point in our modern system is touched by this mordant seer, whose irony is not always hidden under a guise of humour. But the humour is a saving grace. Though Mr. Wells's satire is sometimes very cruel, it is never savage. Even at his most pitiless moments when holding to scorn Lady Wondershoot, the village tyrant, he is careful to show that, with all her vanity and foolish self-importance, she was really lady-bountiful and unconsciously funny. His treatment of the giants is skilful. It is difficult to find pathos and poetry among the great folk of Brobdingnag, yet the story of Caddles, the lonely, doomed yokel-giant, is touched with pathos; while the loves of Redwood and the Princess is as nearly an idyll as pen

of man could make an *affaire-du-cœur* of giant lovers. The picture of a fair maiden, seven times the size of the damsels of to-day, plucking branches of a chestnut-tree to make a posy, would be grotesque if almost any one other than Mr. Wells had described it. Under his tactful treatment it is not grotesque. It is merely impossible. The pity is that it is all so purposeless.