

And not only (to make an end of fault-finding), not only has Mr. Wilson made himself a mouthpiece for all that the fervid genius of the Scots has ever found to say in praise of itself, but he has been somewhat hasty and inexact in his historical enquiries. Certainly, in 1414, the English King Henry IV. did not take James I. along with him on his second expedition to France. If there were no other reason, Henry IV. had then been some time dead. And certainly Mr. Wilson ought not to have printed Lapraik's "When I upon thy bosom lean." They are shocking bad verses, whatever Burns may have thought. And besides, good or bad, they are not Lapraik's. They are a bungling plagiarism from an English piece in the *Weekly Magazine*; and the really lamentable manner in which they have suffered in the stealing is the last article in the charge against

"the odd kind chiel
About Muirkirk."

We have him convicted on two counts; not being able to write verse himself, and not knowing what was good in other people's verses. Again, the fable of the "Eagle and Robin Redbreast" should certainly have appeared in the collection, but as certainly, I apprehend, should not have appeared under the name of Alexander Scot. "Ar. Scot" was the signature with which Allan Ramsay chose to send abroad his forgeries; it contains, it will be seen, his initials and a declaration of his nationality which is characteristic of the race. The fable in question, which is here attributed to the "Scottish Anacreon," and the "Vision" which has been rightly enough placed among the selections from Ramsay, both appeared for the first time in the *Evergreen* under the same signature of Ar. Scot. And, unless Mr. Grant Wilson has some other light unknown to me upon the matter, I cannot understand upon what principle he has separated them. Either they are both by Scot, or both by Ramsay. There is no third way. And, as a matter of fact, I believe they are both Ramsay's.

But Mr. Grant Wilson is not without qualifications for the task he has set himself to do. Of course, all anthologies make bad blood. Of course, one is far more sorry for the good things left out, than pleased that so many have been put in. I am inconsolable for Drummond's sonnet, beginning "In vain I haunt the cold and silver springs." Where is "Auld Lang Syne?" What strange blindness fell upon Mr. Wilson when he began to make his selections out of Scott? Scott, of all men, is the man to gain in a properly made anthology. And here he has not gained; here he has lost cruelly. The death of Marmion has been printed, the admirable battle-scene immediately preceding is left out. And of all those inspired fragments of song he scattered here and there about the pages of the novels, we have no more than the barest representation. On the whole, however, the selection is well done. There might have been a little less of what is Scotch in no real sense, and the same principle which led Mr. Wilson to include Susanna Blamyre might have led him, not without advantage, to leave some others out. She was English by birth, but wrote

in the Scotch spirit; these others were born Scots, but aped the English manner just well enough to fall between two stools. And, indeed, they will not long detain the reader—they are so dead and so dead-heavy—and he will pass on to what is genuinely national in the collection, to the specimens of that merry, coarse, and somewhat prosaic poetry which began with James I. and is yet scarcely cold.

"Christ's Kirk on the Green" is a direct descendant of the Canterbury Tales, and its best successors are all more or less in the same vein. A clear stream of narration, a plentiful scarcity of serious images and similes, a sort of dry slyness, a gross, unflinching realism in humorous disquisition or description—these are notes common to almost all that is good in Scotch poetry. Even when an author seeks to move pity, it is not by strong language that he sets about the task, but by dramatic truth. In the simplest words, he makes his characters say what they might have said and do what they might have done. He relies entirely on the inherent pathos of the situation. He does not seek to heighten or idealise. He is no Shakspeare, only a sort of provincial Boccaccio at the most.

All this is fairly well illustrated in the volume under review. Here also the reader will find that gem of a poem, Alexander Hume's "Day Estivall." In speaking of such work, one must beware of the Grant-Wilson school of oratory. Let an earnest recommendation here suffice.

A point of curiosity is the rest of Burns's ode about Washington, some lines of which appear already in his Correspondence. It is a very poor performance, but interesting as another testimony to the profound sympathy of Burns for all democratic movements. Why does Mr. Wilson tell us no more about the history of the piece; and why (since we are at fault-finding once more) does he not give us explicit notice when a piece is original and when it is a translation from Gaelic.

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

THE SUEZ CANAL.

Lettres, Journal, et Documents pour servir à l'histoire du Canal de Suez. Par Ferdinand de Lesseps. Première Série (1854, 1855, 1856), and Deuxième Série (1857-1858). (Paris: Didier et Cie, 1875.)

(Second Notice.)

THE second period, which is by far the longest, extending through nearly all 1855, and ending with July, 1858, forms the greatest part of the work. It is by no means the most important or the most interesting; still it deserves careful study by the historian of the period, and by those whose fate it may be to apply for similar concessions. M. de Lesseps, who seems to have lived on the railway and in the steamer, once narrowly escaping shipwreck, ranged over the whole of Europe, Scandinavia alone excepted. His conviction evidently was that nothing could be done without his personal influence to correct the apathy of the public, in presence of such absorbing eventualities as the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny. At the same time we can-

not but think that much of this work was demanded by the restless energy of his temperament, and, especially, that he wilfully wasted the whole of his time at Constantinople, where Abd el Aziz was known as "Sultan Stratford," or "Abd el Canning."

The first trip begins at the end of January, 1855, when English influence determines itself against him in Egypt. *Tous les Anglais, au Caire et à Alexandrie, surtout les hommes du chemin de fer* (Suez-Alexandria), *ont fait tout ce qu'ils ont pu pour nous nuire.* There is some truth in this exaggerated statement: I could quote the name of more than one adventurer who came to the banks of the Nile simply with the object of "putting a spoke in the Frenchman's wheel." It is a curious contrast with the fact that the 10,600,000*l.* advanced by the Viceroy came chiefly from English loans protected by the revenues of Egypt—briefly, that we supplied the money for the canal. But his mission was in vain. He received from His Imperial Majesty *l'audience la plus bienveillante*, but nothing more; Rashid Pasha, *enfoncé jusqu'à la barbe dans les eaux de lord Stratford*, granted him everything save a *réponse concluante*, and the "great Eltehi" whose *ecclésiologie britannique . . . devient intolérable pour le crédit de la France en Orient*, contents himself, while disclaiming any hostility to the project, with uttering the ominous words, *dans une position comme la mienne, l'indépendance personnelle a ses limites, et ne saurait s'effacer devant les éventualités officielles.* Yet he wins one important victory, a Vizerial letter addressed to Mohammed Sa'id Pasha, provisionally approving of the *affaire du Canal*. About the middle of March he returns to Cairo, convinced that his *seules difficultés viennent de l'Angleterre.*

This campaign is the type of its numerous successors. After two months' work at Cairo in promulgating the *avant-projet* and in preparing the *projet définitif* of the Viceroy's engineers, in encouraging and comforting his "dear prince," and in corresponding with all who could be useful to him, he repairs, firman and report in hand, on June 5 to Paris, and to London on June 25. Supported by the "excellent Minister" Count Walewski, he has not the fear of Lord Cowley, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Clarendon before his eyes; and he determines to oppose them by means of public opinion—*travailler l'opinion* is his motto. "The editors of the *Times* and other journals have assured me of their good will," he writes to the Emperor: "the adhesion of the *Times* is now an accomplished fact," he writes to the Empress, far from guessing the nature of that assurance and adhesion. He then returns to France, and prints his circular, announcing the formation of the Scientific International Commission, paid by the Viceroy, and consisting of some thirteen eminent professionals, nine of whose names are given in p. 273 (vol. i.). On November 19, 1855, the "anniversary of his birth," he concludes the second campaign by returning to the "Pure Region."

The commission is courteously received by Mohammed Sa'id, who munificently placed at its disposal one of his steamers for a trip to Upper Egypt; and all set out on November 27. The excursion ends on December 16,

and the journal abounds in interest. "M. Mac-Clean," the chief engineer for England, calculates that Europe could now build for 1,000,000. a monument equal to the largest pyramid of Gizeh; and that for only eight times that sum (200,000,000 francs) he could finish the Suez Canal, which represents in excavation and transport of earth thirty times the amount of work. Verily an "age of wonders!"

The next year opens with an international note, announcing that the commission, after finishing its labours—in less than a fortnight—has sent in the report to the Viceroy. The *bouquet final* was the important discovery of a new maritime basin (Port Sa'id), which at once took the place of the dangerous Pelusiac Gulf. The triumph was celebrated in heaven by another *signe de l'alliance*, in other words a rainbow whose "tender colours gradually assumed more vivid hues; and, rising gradually from its extreme point in the west, ended by forming a complete arch." Much comforted by this phenomenon, which had been predicted to him by his mother-in-law, and provided with his two documents, the firman and the second report, M. de Lesseps, after nearly two months and a half in Egypt, again turned his face northwards, *pour faire de l'agitation partout*, especially in Austria and Germany, Russia and England. He still does not despair of the latter. *John Bull a généralement la conscience de sa situation*. Moreover, *l'Angleterre n'ose pas avouer les motifs de son opposition; mais il faut bien qu'elle se persuade qu'elle ne peut plus ambitionner le monopole du commerce du monde, ni la domination de toutes les mers*. The generation which has seen the naval precedence of England wiped out by a stroke of the Foreign Office pen, without impeachment of the Minister, will hardly want that information.

The line led through Trieste, where a friend was found in the wealthy and powerful Signor Revoltella. At Paris he establishes his *organe spécial et en quelque sorte officiel*, the *Isthme de Suez*, and informs the Emperor that despite Lord Palmerston, "ever the man of 1840," *l'opinion publique en Angleterre s'est prononcée favorablement*. He has audiences with Lords Palmerston and Clarendon which convince him that their opposition arises from *la crainte de favoriser le développement de la prospérité et de la puissance de l'Égypte*, all of which is duly reported to the Viceroy. Yet he persuades Mr. Wyld to exhibit in his Great Globe in Leicester Square a relief-plan of his canal, with the observation, *cette propagande populaire est excellente*. At the Royal Geographical Society he received *une salve d'applaudissements*, which were renewed at the end of his "speech"; and in Paris he enlisted the sympathies of the Académie des Sciences; and in Vienna he obtained the favourable opinion of the "illustrious doyen of diplomacy," Prince Metternich, then in his eighty-fourth year. After thus ably advocating the *grande entreprise*, he returned to Egypt in mid-July, 1856.

At Alexandria he issued his report to the Viceroy concerning the Fellahs to be employed by the Company, and nothing can be more thoughtful or more humane; the whole

document (No. 103) does him honour, and he justly observes:

"En effet, le livre [the *Koran*] qui a proclamé la charité comme la principale règle de la vie, où il est dit qu'aux yeux de Dieu le meilleur homme est celui qui fait le plus de bien à ses semblables, ne s'opposera jamais à l'application des mesures que pourra conseiller la civilisation la plus avancée."

After working the King of the Netherlands, which he undiplomatically calls *la Hollande*, he flies back to Paris, and issues in his journal an admirable note, entitled "Considérations sur l'Égypte." He shows that this great and wealthy valley, with its five homogeneous millions of industrious and intelligent inhabitants, has a life of its own, exceptional as its position; that it has been ruined whenever reduced to the rank of a mere province; and that, whilst administrative centralisation is its bane, its prosperity, and even its existence, depend upon the good or bad will, the force or the feebleness of those who preside over its destinies. The last noticeable document in the first volume is that entitled "Description sommaire de l'Égypte et de l'isthme de Suez." The geological part considers all lower and middle Egypt to be a tertiary formation, whilst the Italian savants would make it of much later date, the newer Miocene.

With the second volume (1857-58) we may be more succinct. The first twenty-five pages relate a trip in which the projector accompanied the Viceroy to the White Nile as far as Khartum and the second cataract; it begins badly with setting fire to the *concessionnaire's* mosquito-curtains, and burning him severely; but he rejoices at thus having paid his *dette au mauvais sort*. This part ends with orders issued by the Viceroy to the governors of the Súdán, Senaar, Kordofan, and other provinces, regulating the taxation and ameliorating the condition of the Fellahs. Nothing can be more amiable or patriarchal; but, we ask, who was to carry them out? The frightful development of the slave-trade is a curious commentary upon this enlightened policy.

M. de Lesseps again runs over to London and Paris, where he publishes *Observations hydrographiques dans la baie de Péluze*; it contained the reports and log-books of Captain Philigret, who had ridden out six months of exceptional winter in an Egyptian corvette—a practical reply to certain objectors. He now works H.H. Pius IX. and the Cardinals, and so true a son of the Church is he that the Patriarchs of Syria and Palestine are duly "squared." A note addressed to M. Elie de Beaumont (pp. 50-65) in reply to certain questions of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, discusses—from hearsay—the anthropology and ethnology, the zoology and nosology of the Upper Nile, with historical remarks upon the Empire of Mervé, and theories concerning the origin of the White Nile. It must be borne in mind that these were the work of 1857. The ethnology, however, is utterly untrustworthy: there can be no greater mistake than to compare the gay and light-hearted Egyptian of the present day with the staid and formal men of old. In London, Manchester, and Liverpool; Dublin, Cork, Belfast, and other places of minor note, public

meetings greet him as a friend to humanity and commerce. But again Lord Palmerston is the bitter drop in his cup of sweets, and a very pretty quarrel presently results from the reply in the House of that irrepressible Minister to Mr. H. Berkeley, M.P. His lordship's *triste campagne contre le Canal de Suez* culminates in the debate of June 1, 1858. Shortly after his administration had been replaced by that of the late Lord Derby, Mr. Roebuck, with abundant strong language, proposes, and Mr. Milner Gibson seconds, what seems to be a very moderate motion, namely "that in the opinion of this House, the power and influence of this country ought not to be used in order to induce the Sultan to withhold his assent to the project [what English!] of making a canal across the Isthmus of Suez." Mr. Fitzgerald opposes a censure which in reality suggested want of confidence, and which committed the House to an indirect support of the enterprise. Then Lord Palmerston, the last of the philo-Turks, throws off the diplomatic mask, and openly declares that the measure, however beneficial to Egypt, is likely to compromise the safety of Turkey. The Conservatives unhesitatingly adopt this view of the question and, despite the eloquence of Lord John Russell and the "chaff" of Mr. Bright, the motion is rejected, after a prolonged debate, by a majority of 228.*

Meanwhile the *Times* had also declared a violent hostility; Mr. R. Stephenson mildly but persistently maintained his opinion, and M. de Lesseps, having embarked at Trieste, came to the conclusion that *le gouvernement Anglais, représentant d'un peuple puissant, civilisé, et loyal, n'a pas honte d'employer les moyens des faibles et des barbares, c'est à dire l'hypocrisie et la ruse, et de cacher sa propre opposition à l'abri d'une porte qu'elle croit pouvoir ouvrir ou fermer à son gré*. At Constantinople Aali Pasha cannot dissemble his impotence; the Sultan is reported to be personally favourable, but he is, as usual, little more than a political prisoner. And thus the curtain falls upon the second act.

The third and last of the drama sees (July 28, 1858) the "interests of the *concessionnaire* and the Company placed under the infallible protection of the Emperor of the French." The resolution to ignore the ratification of the Porte is approved of by the Ambassadors of Russia and Austria, and by the Ministers of Prussia and Spain. The cause is virtually won, and nought remains but to sing *Io Pæan* at the banquets of Odessa and of Marseilles, and at receptions in Barcelona and elsewhere. Mr. Stephenson is finally knocked down by M. Paliocarpa, and the rival English and French projects are heavily jumped upon.

The beginning of the end is entitled "Souscription publique," followed by a list of the agents, correspondents, and the bankers of the "Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez." The 25,000 French shares are taken up at once; and the direct holders must long have regretted the day; a *coup d'œil* at the subscribing classes is rightly characterised as a curious study of the moral,

* M. de Lesseps gives (vol. ii. pp. 255, 256) the names of the minority; the *Pall Mall Budget* has lately printed (December 31, 1875) those of the leaders of the majority.

intellectual, and economical state of France. We have then a *Tableau des Départements dans l'ordre d'importance de leur souscription*; a schedule of the "Composition du Conseil d'Administration," whilst the conclusion is a letter to Mohammed Sa'ïd, with a note to the Duke d'Abulfira. The link in the chain which is to connect the two hemispheres has been effectually riveted. The tongue of ground which separates them is evidently doomed.

In order to appreciate M. de Lesseps' strictures on the English Government, we must go back nearly a score of years, and fix our attention upon the conditions of the day. A costly and deadly war, which most of us deeply regretted, had impressed the English brain with the idea that the highest political wisdom was to maintain the integrity, as well as the independence, of the Porte. A quarter of a century has utterly dispelled the illusion, but what will that period not do in the present condition of Europe? The end of the Crimean war left a bitter flavour on the English palate, and no wonder; we were compelled, by governmental mismanagement, to play what is popularly called "second fiddle." And, when our happy rivals proposed a measure which was evidently calculated to raise Egypt, and to depress Turkey, we felt that at last the time for resistance had come. Thus only the most exalted order of Liberals sided with M. de Lesseps: the Moderates and the Conservatives united their strength against him. And late events must have convinced him, if he can be convinced, that he was wrong, and his opponents were in the right. His canal has become so necessary to the very existence of Great Britain, that, after openly declaring we care nothing about what becomes of the Turk, we are ready to support the Egyptian by force of arms. And the French are at the present moment the least influential and the most unpopular nation of strangers in Egypt.

The *Chauvinisme* of the Parisian press has to answer for much of English opposition. The prospect of the canal was hailed because it would throw open the gates of the Orient, it would Europeanise the Eastern world, it would democratise commerce and navigation, in fact it would abolish our supremacy in the Indian and Chinese seas. For the French, with all their show of sympathy during the Sepoy mutiny, have ever envied us the immense possessions which rose upon the ruins of their own. Those living in Paris during 1857-58, may remember that pity for *ces pauvres Indiens* mingled strangely with the desire to see the white man victorious. Nor was M. de Lesseps wholly free from the extravagant ambition of his compatriots, or he would not have penned such a sentence as this, *Quand nous serons les plus forts à Constantinople nous ferons ce que nous voudrons*. He perfectly understood the racial antagonism between the two peoples when he asserted, *En France l'opposition Anglaise sera notre principale force d'attraction*. If anything reconciled Frenchmen to the *coup d'état*, it was the almost unanimous reprobation of the English press.

On the other hand, although Lord Palmerston's prognostic was right, we cannot support him in his treatment of the case. The jaunty

Irishman did not fight fairly. He persuaded a number of notable names to lend him their support in asserting the thing that was not: and the general belief now is that many of them lived bitterly to repent their subservience. Hence the sands which would fill the canal; the currents which would choke the entrances with silt, and the deadly nature of the Pelusiac Bay, found ready credence with the English public. A well-read man must have known that an idea 3,000 years old can easily be revived, that what has been done twice can be done again; why, then, should he demean himself by characterising the project as a "bubble," a "hollow dream," a "swindle" invented only to drain the pockets of the credulous? But with the lord of Broadlands it was pre-eminently "après moi le Déluge," witness his conduct in the matter of Fenianism, the terrible legacy which he left to his successors. It may be true that *populus vult decipi*; but these manoeuvres did not deceive the public of Europe, as the general furbishing up of the rusty Mediterranean ports shows. And what does the French boaster now say? "If de Lesseps be spared, he will unite Paris and Peking by a trans-Asiatic line; he will gird the globe by a boulevard, with avenues of planes, gas-lamps and cafés where we shall drink our absinthe between 5 and 6 P.M." And so forth.

It is to be regretted that more care has not been taken in editing these volumes. The Egyptian contingent sent to the Crimean war is now 30,000, then 37,000, then 40,000. The saving of distance by the canal is anything between 3,000 and 4,500 leagues; the length of the canal (86 miles) is 120 kilomètres, or 140, or 40 leagues. Why insert that negro nonsense about the crocodile carrying off its victims under its arm? M. de Lesseps speaks, he tells us, Italian and Spanish: he is utterly innocent of English and Arabic; but any reader for the press could have spared us such eye-sores as M. Rœbuck, Withby (Whitby), Count Zichi, M. Rehmann (Rebmann), Dr. Abbate (Abbott); M. Murchisson and Murchieson; le "shoking;" British railway Euphrate Valley; Anstralia and Zealand Gazette; and, to quote a few where many are, "le croschet de lord Palmerston." The Arabic shows ignorance equally elementary, in Machalla (Mash'al, a lantern); Mokattan for Mukattam; El-Hami (Ihâmi) Pasha; Jemazul and Djemmizul Akir for Jemadi or Djemadi'l Akhir; Abou-dja-far for Ja'afar, and Hatu' Houmayoum for Humayûn. And in Africa we see "Kœnia" and "Kali Handjarv." So much for "Zulu criticism."

We now possess the "historique" of the studies and labours which brought into being that particularly hideous and "monumental" work, the Egyptian Bosphorus—a work whose example may, in course of time, convert into islands South America, the Morea, Denmark, and the Iberian Peninsula. But we want more. M. de Lesseps must have stored up an enormous mass of correspondence, public and private, which would be infinitely interesting not only to this generation but to those which are to come. We can only hope that he will not be niggardly of his wealth. R. F. BURTON.

A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857-1858. By John William Kaye, F.R.S., Author of the "History of the War in Afghanistan." Volume III. (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1876.)

THE last volume of Sir John Kaye's deeply interesting narrative of the *Sepoy War* left the reader in the camp before Dehli. Nicholson had joined; the smart affair at Ludlow Castle had been succeeded by the dashing victory at Najafgarh; and the curtain had fallen on a devoted army preparing for the assault on the stronghold of Mughal royalty and prestige. More than five years have elapsed since the publication of that section of the record: an interval of trying length to those who await the promised sequel, and unfavourable to those who cater for the expectant. Fortunately, the power of the writer is equal to the theme; and no sooner is the narrative resumed than we are again willingly carried away to the hot plains of the far East, and, as it were, unwittingly absorbed in the stirring events of the period, which, with all its clouds of bitter sadness, is lustrous with examples of national and individual honour. The dramatic incident, appreciative analysis, and fascinating style of the *War in Afghanistan* are credentials which cannot be lightly regarded by the reading public; and a remembrance of these will naturally ensure a fair augury to forthcoming works by the same author. But the *Sepoy War* may safely rest upon its own merits and the intrinsic interest of the scenes it describes—scenes which have won the admiring attention of other than English reviewers. It was neither an Englishman nor a Protestant who, in bearing high contemporary witness to the general conduct of the "poignée d'Anglais" concerned, eulogised in the following terms the martyrs to patriotism and order:—"Victimes d'une lutte engagée entre la civilisation et la barbarie, ils ne sont étrangers à aucun peuple chrétien; tous peuvent les admirer sans restriction et sans réserve. Ils font honneur à l'espèce humaine."*

The story to be told is a long one, though the period to which it is limited is one rather of months than years. It may be said to have commenced fairly in Chapter iv. of Book iii., or to take up about a fifth of the first volume, closing in May, 1857. The second volume, similarly divided into three books, reaches into August of that year, but is mainly descriptive of events in the months preceding. The third, or volume under review, only carries on the narrative to September—for the marginal mention of 1858 (pp. 490-1-2) refers to an episode of individual suffering and deliverance distinct from the thread of narration. To mature the full and comprehensive chronicle of a revolt extending over so extensive an area, it would be difficult to suggest a disposition of data fitter than that which has been adopted. The panorama is so vast and intricate that it becomes essential, in the interests of the spectator, not only to arrest the progress of the moving canvas, but to separate the picture into geographical parts and make a

* *Débat sur l'Inde au Parlement Anglais, par le Comte de Montalébert, l'un des quarante de l'Académie Française*, p. 40 (London: Jeffs, 1858).