

The first-sight phenomena of historic time, and the ocular mechanism of historic memory : developing organic principles for the most rapid possible acquisition and affixment of historical knowledge, and forming an elucidatory and illustrative companion to the fifth edition, coloured, of Major Bell's twenty-five royal folio synchro-historic and biographic tables / by Major James Bell.

Contributors

Bell, James, Major.

Publication/Creation

London : Printed for the author; and sold by Robert Baldwin, 1853.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/shhcs94n>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

TABULATED TIME

FIRST SIGHT PHENOMENA
OF
HISTORIC TIME
BY
MAJOR JAMES BELL
1853.

MNEMONICAL CHRONOLOGY



22102359620



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b21782453>

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WOODFALL AND KINDER,
ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET.



WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	Wellcome
Call	Gen. Coll.
No.	
	M
	13189

DEDICATION

TO THE **7066** SUBSCRIBERS TO, AND PURCHASERS OF, MAJOR
BELL'S 25 ROYAL FOLIO TABLES OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY,
UNIVERSAL LITERATURE, AND THE SEVERAL SCHOOLS OF
PAINTING.

(FIFTH EDITION, COLOURED.)

To the **7066** Subscribers to, and Purchasers of, my laborious Tabular Presentment, in 25 Royal Folio Charts, of the whole Classified Surface of Historical, Literary, and Artistical Time, I respectfully dedicate my present Publication, elicited, as it has been, by the numerous applications that have been addressed to me by subscribers to the Tables, and expressly prepared as an elucidatory and illustrative **COMPANION** to that tabular work, which is itself so largely indebted to the generously-fostering bounty of those numerous patrons to whom this Dedication is devoted, for the many improvements (and, as it is hoped, largely-increased practical utility) which, in the course of FIVE EDITIONS, I have had the opportunity of introducing into it.

And while I thus render homage to my Subscribers and the Purchasers of my tabular work,

as the practical patrons and promoters of my earnestly-directed efforts for the introduction, into the vast Empire of Britain, of an OCULAR SYSTEM of Chronological Classification, on the broadest scale, for the more rapid and scientific advancement of the GREAT STUDY OF HISTORY, I hail with eagerness so appropriate and so coveted an occasion for re-testifying how vividly and fervidly I cherish the recollection of all the variously-displayed acts of cordial courtesy and protective kindness with which, during the protracted period of a widely-extended explanatory literary canvass, I was so graciously honoured and befriended by that numerous, talented, and influential body of Subscribers to my Historical Tables, including personages of the highest eminence and of the most exalted station, **TO WHOM THIS** humble but heartfelt DEDICATION IS, **WITH OVERFLOWING GRATITUDE, INSCRIBED** by

Their earnestly-devoted, obedient,

and humble Servant,

JAMES BELL.

Scarborough, August 20th, 1853.

PREFATORY ADDRESS

TO THE

BRITISH PUBLIC.

NEXT to communing with the ever-treasured and beloved members of my own family and my intimately-connected relatives and personal friends, my greatest pleasure may be said to be to communicate with the friends, the patrons, and the real amateurs of that great study to which my own mind and my own time have so passionately and perseveringly been devoted.

Having had the delightful experience, as I shall ever have the delightful recollection, that my two eldest and excellent daughters, at the early ages of ELEVEN and NINE, whom it was my solace, during a long and severe illness, to instruct, were capable of thoroughly mastering and consecutively repeating, by rote, without one single error, as I earnestly aver, the dates and duration of all the several dynasties and successive reigns on historical record, in every sovereign State of modern Europe, I was fully authorized and stimulated further to direct my

thoughts and practical experiments to the advancement of scientific historical teaching. These experiments, I believe, are admitted to have succeeded beyond all expectation.

And, indeed, it hardly needed the confirming testimony of actual experience, to prove that a systematic principle of historic reading and teaching must triumph over a NO!-system principle . . . a NO!-system principle, to which, wondrously enough, we have, for century after century, been so tenaciously adhering.

In the frequent repetition of my experiments, I have become variously and daily more and more confirmed in the twofold conviction—1st, of the perfect practicability of conveying a considerable body of valuable historical instruction to young persons at a very early period of life; and 2ndly, that the main secret, or tact, of communicating such instruction, lies in securing the co-operation of the eye and the mind; or, in other words, in making the eye and the mind work together.

The philosophic Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam (1560–1626), recommends, “as the surest division of human learning,” that which is derived from “the three faculties of the soul,” viz. “reason, imagination, and memory:”

Philosophy	being relative to Reason;
Poetry	„ to Imagination;
and HISTORY	„ to MEMORY .

MEMORY, therefore, being the great faculty which, in the teaching and the acquirement of history, we

have first, and most largely, to address, upon *Memory* it is that I have naturally based my systematic principle of acquiring for ourselves, or of communicating to others, historical knowledge.

And Memory I have alike addressed through the EYE, so truly described by HORACE to be "*the most faithful organ of memory*;" and through that ORDER, which has so emphatically been pronounced to be "*the Soul of memory*."

The whole system, however, that I have introduced, and am now seeking to carry into more extended use, may most appropriately be designated an OCULAR one, since the MEMORY OF THE EYE is that to which it makes its most constant appeal; and since THE EYE is the organ to which I have made even "ORDER" subservient, by bringing the whole of the coevally-columnar array of nations, compassed within each of the consecutive great leaves of historic time, under such a rigidly-synchronised form of classified and coloured presentment, that *the eye* may ever have at its command a ready and rapid—an eagle-winged flight over the whole tabulated surface of the historical, literary, and artistical records of man.

In the course of the five editions, to which, thanks to the generous patronage of my literary encouragers (to whom this elucidatory and illustrative *Companion* is gratefully dedicated), my tabular work of 25 royal folio coloured Historical, Literary, and Artistical Charts has attained, I have (especially in the *fifth* edition), by means of colour-

ing, by new varieties of type, by rigid re-examination of the dates, and by very laborious and greatly improved readjustments of the *synchronical* arrangement, so far, I hope, succeeded in perfecting my **OCULAR SCHEME OF ORGANIC CLASSIFICATION**, that hardly any further alterations whatever, in future editions, will be needed.

Our groundwork of historical presentment, then, being fully worked out, my hope is, in the present **COMPANION** to my Tables, to raise up, upon that groundwork, such a superstructure of further fully-explained aids and mnemonical appliances, as may effectively and permanently advance the acquisition of a scientific and philosophic acquaintance with all the great features and influences of the PAST, amidst that wondrous, and hitherto unsurpassed, British people, who are leaving so largely their own historical impress on the **PRESENT** Grand Era of historical time.*

JAMES BELL.

Scarborough, August 20th, 1853.

* As a most desirable accompaniment to the *Royal Folio CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES*, and the present elucidatory and illustrative **COMPANION** to those Tables, it is in contemplation, as soon as the necessary number of Subscribers shall have been obtained, to publish a short series of **PROGRESSIONAL Maps of Political GEOGRAPHY**, Asian, European, and African, territorially illustrative of the most memorable changes of empire depicted in the author's *Consecutive Grand Regions of Historical Time*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

BOOK I., SECTION I.

UNRECORDED TIME, from 4004 to 2000 before Christ; occupying 2004 years. **MAN IN BARBARISM**—Classification of Barbaric Life; with interspersed Prolusional Remarks on the Study of History. Perplexed Origin of Nations, p. 39. Chronological Difficulties and Anomalies: Supererogatory Official Cleverness—the *Unhappy New-Year*, pp. 47, 48. The inchoate Monster-pile of Legislation, pp. 14, 15. Catlin's Illustrations of Savage Life, pp. 56, 210 to 212.

BOOK I., SECTION II.

ANCIENT TIME, from 2000 *before* to 476 *after* Christ; comprising 2476 years. Formation and progressive Changes—Rise, Meridians, and Passing away—of Empire, in the four Great Regions of Ancient Time, illustrative of the *Tabular* Teaching of the Science of History. The Columnar Form, and Colouring, of the successive Tabular Sheets, pp. 61, 62. Mnemonical Chronology, p. 65. The Autobiographic *Inscription* of Darius I. Hystaspes, at *Behistûn*, p. 69. The Roman Republic; the Roman Empire: Roman Rule in Britain; the Boadicean Coin, p. 80.

ANCIENT LITERARY TIME, Hebrew (and other Oriental), Greek, and Roman Writers, to 400 after Christ.

**INTERTEXTURE OF ANCIENT } First-Sight Phenomena
AND EARLY MODERN TIME. }** of Table V., the earliest
compartment of MODERN TIME, from 476 to 888
after Christ; occupying 412 years. Formation of
Modern States. Goths, Franks, and Vandals, p. 96.
General Ignorance in Alfred's Day, p. 121. Rise,
Meridian, and Disseverance of Early Modern Empire;
Franks, and Saracens. Saxons. Empire of the Ocean,
Sea-Kings of Scandinavia, p. 110. Contemporary
Identifications of remarkable, and easily tenable
Character. Charlemagne, Harún-ur-Raschíd, and
Alfred: their *Ocular* Emplacement is *triangular*,
p. 126, and thus immovable from Memory. The
Monarchs of a Thousand Years, p. 127. Harún's
Presents, p. 124, Elephant, Clepsydra. Charlemagne's
Signet in his Sword, p. 123. Alfred; and Alfred's
Ashes, pp. 128 to 154. Plea for the local Preserva-
tion and Perpetuation of the Monumental, Inscrip-
tional, and remote Architectural Remains of our
Isle—Carisbroke Castle, p. 142. Empire of the
Desert, pp. 157 to 208—*Khalifs* of Medina, Da-
mascus, and *Bagdad*: the Lamp of Science and
Learning, during European darkness, is kept burning
by the Arabs. Ecclesiastical Architecture, p. 191.
Paradoxical and inappropriate Conversion of *Jewish*
into *Christian* Names, p. 194.

THE WHOLE, CONJOINTLY WITH THE APPENDED "**TABU-
LAR TEACHER OF THE THEORY AND THRIFT OF
COMBINATIVE AND CORROBORATIVE HISTORIC ME-
MORY,**" ILLUSTRATIVELY AND VARIOUSLY EXHIBITING THE
OCULAR ELEMENTS AND AGENCIES OF RAPID TABULAR
HISTORIC TEACHING; AND THE NATURAL MNEMONICS OF
HISTORICAL CHRONOLOGY.

FAC-SIMILE

of

A Gold or Electrum (*i.e.* an argentiferous gold ore) coin of the reign of **BOADICEA**, the earliest recorded British queen, referred to in pages 80 and 81 of this work, now in possession of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

THE OBVERSE



OR CONVEX SIDE.

THE REVERSE



OR CONCAVE SIDE.

This coin, which is dish-shaped or hollowed on one side, and slightly convex on the other side, was found at the village of Stanwick, a few miles from Oxford, in 1849 [being the year of the *millennial celebration* of the *birth of Alfred the Great*, at Wantage, in Berkshire, 25th October, 1849], amongst gravel carted away in the formation of a watercourse, in a newly-enclosed common field.

On the *reverse* or hollowed side is a rudely-executed horse, with a well-formed chariot wheel, and various rings, as well as small crosses or stars, and balls, indicative, most probably, of the value of the coin; and on the *obverse* or raised side is the word

ODVOC, thus wanting the *initial* B; while, singularly enough, the *only other extant coin* (and, previously to 1849, the solitary specimen of coinage) of *Boadicea's day*, which is preserved at the British Museum, bears only BODVO, thus wanting the *termination* C to complete the BODVO-C, there not being sufficient space on the surface of either coin to admit the entire name.

The fac-simile was obtained through the obliging and handsome kindness of P. B. Duncan, Esq., M.A., the keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

NOTICE.

A Supplementary Preparation Book for Historical Examination, entitled

THE TABULAR TEACHER OF THE THEORY AND THRIFT
OF

COMBINATIVE AND CORROBORATIVE HISTORIC MEMORY,

Exhibiting the ocular and *natural* Mnemonics of Historical Chronology, and embracing the same amount of time as the first book of the Elucidatory and Illustrative Companion to the Royal Folio Tables, will, for the convenience of class use, be published herewith in a detached form.

Price 4s. 6d.

BOOK I.

SECTION I.

UNRECORDED TIME, FROM 4004 TO 2000 BEFORE CHRIST, EMBRACING A PERIOD OF 2004 YEARS.

MAN IN BARBARISM; WITH, INTERMIXED, PROLUSIONAL REMARKS ON THE STUDY OF HISTORY.

To run over all that has been said, or might be said, in praise of History, would be tediously trite to the instructed Reader.

We shall, therefore, briefly remind ourselves that history, amongst its other attributes, is the sanctuary of the good and wise, the perpetual pillory of the perverse and bad; that it is the communing of the mind of the present with the mind of the past; and that to be at home in History is to be carried at pleasure into the midst of the stirring spirits and the arousing scenes of all times and of all climes.

Our business is not with the praise of History, but with the means by which it may be the most effectively and systematically pursued.

In asking for the fostering aid and indulgent protection of the British public to my present humble effort toward the advancement of a branch of study of such acknowledged vast importance, as is the history of the human species, I seem to have at least one claim to their attention, namely, that this study, although of such magnitude and interest, did not appear, in this country, up to the time that I introduced my condensed *Ocular System of Classified Tabular Presentment*, to have received that full attention which it so eminently called for. Great pains had been bestowed to simplify and render more easy of acquisition every other branch of knowledge. Lectures throughout the country had been delivered upon almost every stock and scion of human research and speculation; all sorts of *ologies* have been started and run after; but how few—if indeed *any*—had been the published attempts to *systematize the study of the universal history of man, as a whole, i. e. as a science complete?* Or, whatever might have been the *attempts, efficiency of scheme*, it was fully acknowledged and felt, there had been none to reduce to SCIENTIFIC principles the natural aidances to the study of history, upon the most extensive scale, of course, I mean; for, without pursuing it upon the broadest basis, it can be but of little use either towards the expansion or improvement of the understanding.

The manifold advantages of the OCULAR *principle of tabularizing the whole surface of historic time*, which many years ago I brought before the public,

I believe now alone require to be more practically and fully understood, to be universally adopted for instructional as well as referential purposes.

Until a correlative depiction of the *earth's surface* had been effected by means of *geographical maps*, the correlative position of place was a chaos to the human mind; and equally vague and vain to the memory ever has been, and ever will be, the attempted recollection of the distributive position of universal historical events, until *chronological maps*, presenting a *visible* surface, depictive of the correlative and classified bearings of the great progressional aggregates of historical time, shall be brought as largely and habitually into daily use, alike for reference and for instruction, as are now geographical maps.

Latitudes and longitudes, arithmetically applied, are only chargeable upon memory to a very limited extent. Nor can arithmetical dates be distributively affixed without the conjunctive agency of order and the eye.

Blindfold is the reading of History without the two eyes of chronology and geography; and blind are the two eyes of chronology and geography until they assume, or are condensed into, an *ocular* capability of appliance.

Isolated arithmetical latitudes and longitudes, however accurately learnt by heart, could never, without geographical mapping, have conveyed to the mind or embodied in memory the varying *form of the earth*; nor can isolated historical dates,

without the adjunctive agency of chronological mapping, ever convey to the mind or embody in memory the varying progressional "*form* and pressure" of historical time.

Slowly, and but very recently, have geographical maps been taken into popular use; but not a mechanic in this country, is there now, who does not fully understand the difference between geographical reading *with* and *without* the accompaniment of geographical maps; the difference between merely having a letter-press gazetteer to refer to for the situation of isolated places, and having an embodied and generalised view of entire districts of place in geographical maps: and not long, I hope, it will be, before every one will become aware of the difference too between historical reading with and without chronological maps; of the difference between having to apply for every isolated date to an historical or biographical dictionary or other historical letter-press work, and having the correlative relation of historical dates and events to each other embodied and generalized in consecutively *mapped* depictions of regions of historical and biographical time.

Among the *motives* to the study of History, we may cursorily mention that exercising, as we do, either by our example or our immediate rule considerable influence upon the political destinies of mankind in every quarter of the globe, we are even *nationally* called upon to use more strenuous exertion than ever toward attaining a high degree of

BARBARISM.

mental culture, and especially toward calling ourselves into historical reflection on the condition, habits, prejudices, and capabilities of that species over which we have acquired such extraordinary sway: a sway, indeed, so wonderfully varied and extended as was never before known on the earth; for either in friendship or in war we are in constant communion or conflict with mankind in every division of the habitable globe. And we urge a *national* motive, because we conceive that every increase of national *knowledge*, and especially of historical knowledge, may reasonably be hoped to be accompanied with an increase of national *dignity* and national *moderation*! As a motive of more private character to all classes of our great community—by no means, of course, excluding ladies, who, by-the-bye, singularly enough, are generally infinitely better versed in history than even their legislative husbands and brothers—we may mention, now that *travelling* has become so general and so widely extended, *conversation* necessarily more frequently than formerly touches upon historical topics, and thus more than ever, in our day, the want of a competent knowledge of history must be found inconvenient.

In this introductory section we shall, interspersed with general remarks for the student's consideration, simply seek to feel our way through those dark regions of time which *precede* the era of written history, and further consider what, on arriving at the verges of *written* time, are likely to be the earliest impedi-

BARBARISM.

ments to our progress that will require, preparatorily, to be pioneered out of the way.

Ascending to the contemplation of man in his rudest stages of existence, in his earliest state of helpless, and, seemingly, hopeless barbarism, we propose *not* to limit ourselves to the bourn of his *written* recollections—which stands, with Moses, the earliest recorded historian, about 1470 *before Christ*, within $394\frac{1}{2}$ years of being exactly MIDWAY between the creation, 4004 before Christ*, but passing beyond even the period of his purely traditional memorials, remoter still, we shall seek to gather glimpses of what may be designated the *analogous* history of man, or of that portion of man's history which can alone be studied by analogy.

The *natural* history of man, or rather the history of man's natural existence, seems to differ *not* materially from that of many inferior animals; *his* body, like theirs, is subject to accidents, to pain, to diseases, and death! Nor does man, in the vicissitudes and inequalities of fortune and condition, stand alone, as we shall see strikingly exemplified by merely casting our eyes upon those animals which are nearest at hand for observation. Instance

* If we exclude *retrospective* history, 2534 years of the world will constitute the *unrecorded*, and 3323 years the historical ages of mankind; if, therefore, we add but $394\frac{1}{2}$ years to the 2534 *unrecorded* years, we make up 2928 $\frac{1}{2}$ years, being exactly one-half of the 5857 years from the Creation, 4004 before to 1853 after Christ.

BARBARISM.

but the dog and the horse. *One* dog we see pampered with delicacies, amid daily caresses, on cushions of down; while *another* is as plentifully receiving kicks and cuffs and hard words wherever *he* goes in search of that chance food on which *he* is constrained to subsist. *One* horse, with a skin sleek and shining, we see prancing and curveting, carefully attended, sumptuously fed, endlessly *curried*, and, to all exterior appearance, enjoying a state of undisturbed bliss; while *another*, mournfully neglected, is doomed (perhaps, too, under a scanty supply of unwholesome food) to daily drudgery and stripes in an overladen waggon or cart; or, still worse, to an everlasting giddy and blinding round about and about in a mill. And of the *changes* or *falls* in what we may term animal fortunes, perhaps no illustration more feeling can be offered than that which is so eloquently depicted in the well-known series of prints styled the "High Mettled Racer."

Again, inferior animals, individually and in *societies*, effect works which justly excite our wonder and admiration: the spider in forming his web, the bird in building its nest, the beaver in erecting its dwelling, and the bee, in societies, perfect labours, which man, if he can imitate, decidedly cannot surpass.

But here the resemblance ends—the tale of the works of the spider, the bird, the beaver, and the bee, *once* told are told for ever. The inferior animals, having no deliberative functions, no choice

BARBARISM.

of action, are directed by instinctive feeling to their course of life, and in *their* labours they are borne *at once* to perfection—one generation cannot improve upon the works of another.

But man! although *he* too HAS instincts, has faculties of a different order—faculties of such slow development, powers so deeply hidden, that, although he dwell upon the earth for thousands of years, the invisible mine and collective power of thought will still seem to be as inexhaustible as ever.

Man is distinguished by a characteristic capability of *progressive* improvement. All man's institutions, his discoveries and attainments have been more or less matured and improved by practical application—nay, ages have passed away before the *value* even of many of these have become fully understood. And we may decidedly assert, as most immediately connected with our present theme, that all which man knows of the degree of happiness, either individual, or more particularly *social* and *political*, to which his nature is capable of attaining, is the result of *experiment* no less than of close observation.

All human improvements may then be said to be mainly dependent upon *experience*, and HISTORY is, or ought to be, the faithful record of experience. If then we value present improvement, we must acknowledge how vast the importance has been to us that past generations have preserved and have transmitted for *our* instruction the records of *their* experience; and in proportion to the value which

BARBARISM.

attaches to *their* having transmitted us such records, will be the importance of our consulting such records; or, in other words, of attentively pursuing *that* branch of study which it is the object of our present labour to develope and to recommend.

And History, which is naturally the *professional* and indispensable study of the statesman and legislator, and of all who have influence upon the enactment of laws, is scarcely less imperatively demanded in every other class of educated society. It is equally required in the gentleman and the (transmarine) traveller; and, above all, HISTORY AND HEROISM being so intimately united, it is required in the high-minded warrior.

"To be ignorant of the past," saith Cicero, "is to dwell in perpetual infancy! What *is* the fleeting existence of man if it combine not the MEMORY *of the past*, with the perception of the present?"

But *before* mankind attain to a competency for *writing* History, or of transmitting, even in the rudest form, any regularly-connected record of the transactions of their day, or of the events which befall them, *millenniums* may be literally said to pass away. To substantiate this assertion we need not resort to Hindoo, to Chinese, or to Japanese chronology, nor yet to Buffon's "Ages of the World," nor, indeed, to any other computation wearing an appearance of extravagance; but simply take the *lowest* of THE *three* different computations that have been drawn from the Hebrew

BARBARISM.

writings, as the era of the creation, namely, the year 4004 before Christ.

[The three computations of which we are speaking are these, namely—

1st. That text or manuscript of the Old Testament, termed the *Hebrew Text*, deemed alone to be the genuine text by those among the Jews whom we may, in modern ecclesiastical language, denominate the Roman Catholic Hebrews, gives, as already stated, the year* 4004 as the era of creation ;

2nd. That text which is declared to be the genuine by the *Samaritans*, or Protestant Hebrews, gives the year 4700 ;

3rd. And that, Greek translation of the Old Testament, generally known by the name of the Septuagint, gives the year 5872 before Christ as the era of creation.

The three several computations then are, 4004, 4700, and 5872, making a difference between the first and the last of no less than 1868 years.]

In America, that prodigious region, touching one Pole and projecting nearer than any other on the globe toward the other Pole, when discovered by Columbus, in 1492 after Christ, or, according to the Hebrew text, about five millenniums and a half after the creation of the world, mankind (although they

* This is the date given by Archbishop Usher. The great chronologer *Petavius*, so highly eulogized by Dean Prideaux, author of the connection of the Old and New Testament, gives 3984.

BARBARISM.

were, indeed, on the high road to it, having attained to picture-writing in Mexico) had not arrived at letter-writing, and were therefore, of course, yet very far removed from the capability of keeping regular historical records. And, to return to our more domestic regions of the old world: the first historian of whom we have, there, any authentic notice is *Moses*, who flourished about 1470 before Christ; if, then, we deduct 1470 from 4004 we shall perceive that at least 2534 years had fled before anything in the shape of written history was known on the earth, and much later before it was known on that European earth, which now, as a Koh-i-núr of intellectual light, irradiates the globe.

And Moses, although he does, in his introduction to the History of Abraham and Abraham's Descendants, take a retrospective glance at the earliest ages of mankind, he passes it over with such a rapid hand that we cannot possibly gather from him the shadow even of a connected historical view of man's gradual emergence out of that state of barbarous wretchedness into which his offence in Eden had cast him.

We may, therefore, be said to have a blank of momentous extent before we arrive at the columns of written History: and the student, as he stands on the verge of this vast historical solitude, must determine either to bolt himself over it, by a sort of harlequin stride with his eyes shut, and seat himself down, without any preparatory reflection, into the midst of all the difficulties, all the forgeries,

BARBARISM.

fabrications, and falsifications attendant upon what we may designate the numismatical and diplomatical period of man's history, or that period from the commencement of which we are habituated to rely, almost exclusively, for the history of mankind upon engraved, stamped, or written documents. He must, I say, either encage the flight of examining thought, and habitually tether down his mind, for historical examples and illustration, to the narrow confines of written records—to the secular limits scratched out by Herodotus's pen—or, he must pursue the sole other course that lies open to him. If, namely, he should think that there is something highly unphilosophical in taking a flight blindfold over a territory in time expanding itself through thousands of years; if he be highly averse to leaving behind him so *vast* a region *wholly* unexplored, he will try, at all hazards, though unprovided with either compass or chart for his *regular* historical guidance, to gain at least a glimpse at its general features, and he will thus naturally be led to study the earliest periods of the history of mankind by ANALOGY—a method which, by the way, is perhaps the least fallacious of any that can be employed in gathering especially early historical knowledge. For into the earliest *written* records of secular history, the vanity, the ignorance, the credulity, prejudice, or self-interest of man will infallibly introduce much erroneous matter: but where, from the want of written records, we are compelled to resort to *living* history, to read man

BARBARISM.

himself—it is our own fault if we do not read him aright; for here is nothing which interposes between us and truth; here is nothing to darken or to cloud our historical vision.

As this latter mode of commencing historical study is decidedly that which, to a certain extent, I would recommend, I must beg, although with all possible brevity, to offer some further remarks explanatory at once of my reasons for preferring this mode, of the interest which attaches to it, and the means which we have for carrying it into effect. In civilized life we are so intergrown and interwoven with endless conveniences and comforts—conveniences and comforts which identify themselves so strongly with our earliest emanation of thought, and appear so completely to *belong* to our nature, that we may safely say that many thousand individuals come into mature life and pass out of it without once hitting upon the idea that there ever could be a general state of society *materially* differing from that with which they are themselves surrounded. Whatever they want they send *out* for, or they order to be sent *in*. If they want a house or want fields, they go and they hire or they buy them. If they fall ill they send for a medical adviser, if they want to make a will they send for a legal adviser: and, in short, they *know* of no bounds to the commanding of other men's services, in any line, excepting *the* bounds prescribed in not having the means to pay for such services; nor does it occur to them that there *ever was* a

BARBARISM.

period of any other bounds to the procuring of the conveniences and comforts of human existence.

Staggering, indeed, it might still be to the belief of many a comfortable citizen to propound to him periods in which there was—

Nor pill-taking,
Nor will-making.

Times of little surgery, less physic, and, throughout this land, *no* statute law! Especially now that we are so full gorged with law as to be positively apoplectical. The average number of our new laws (independently of the anterior upheaped piles of the old) made in the first quarter of the present century, presents us with the overwhelming picture of the numerical rate at which we are going on in law-making and law-cobbling.

Staggering, indeed, it might well be, I say, to the credence of many a wealthy citizen to tell him of regions of time in which *there was no* statute law; if he were conversant with the fact, that, through the indefatigable zeal and kindness of our legislative bodies, we have been provided, within the first quarter of the present century, *i. e.* from 1st January, 1801, to 31st December, 1825, with more than **9125** new Acts of Parliament! each containing diverse sections or items of law, thus yielding us *one Act of Parliament* for our reading *for each day in the year* for 25 years together, and a few extra ones for perusal on saint days and Sundays.

BARBARISM.

And this great fact, while it might well stagger some, might lead others into reflection and inquiry as to which of the two is the greater evil, namely, to be without law altogether, or to be so redundantly supplied with it that no person can profitably read, and much less understand, all the laws now in force within this realm. There is much matter of chance in both cases; and if the weight of the club prevails in one case, the weight of the purse will as often, in our present confused state of law, be found to prevail in the other.

The wisdom of law-making with us would now be to abstain from all law-making until the existing enactments had been reduced into some readable and comprehensible form and compass. But what a Luther or a Hercules in law it would require to pull down and scatter to the winds such mountainous masses of ill-digested legislation, or to rumble them into any sort of available order! The legislative expense to the country of the present system of law-multiplying is as incalculable as it is incredible.

We may take, as an example, railway legislation. Instead of one general bill, in which the whole principle of railway law might be embodied, every new company, if but for one-half mile of railway making, must have an entirely separate Act of Parliament, and have to pay all the costs thereunto belonging.

Considerations of this, as well as of much graver, character, will, in themselves, I think partly deter-

BARBARISM.

mine us where to break ground in historical study (if instruction be our object) ; independently of the extreme *interest* which attaches to beholding man—looking down upon him, as it were, from a place of concealment, while making his infantile efforts to conquer his own ignorance and shake off his own barbarity—and to watch him onwards, at every stage, as he toils against and overcomes difficulties ; gradually fighting and working his way upward toward knowledge and civility with *no* other auxiliaries than the inherent faculties with which the Almighty has been pleased to gift him ; having no light from history, no guidance, nor consolation, as yet, from true religion ; surrounded with real hindrances and perils, and having, besides, to buffet with the imaginary terrors and obstacles which superstition conjures up around him. To see him, I say, NOT sinking down under all this with a broken spirit, but still going on and going on (though retarded, though driven back again and again), till *at last* we behold him lifted up, by his manly perseverance and heart, to a *firm* footing on the rampart of civility, is a glorious spectacle—a spectacle which claims our warmest interest and most fixed regard : at the same time that it at once stamps a knowledge of the almost *immeasurable distance* that lies between savage and civilised existence, and of the *immense* DEBT which we owe to the activity and patience, the ingenuity and perseverance of man for the endless conveniences, and now almost indispensable comforts which daily wait

BARBARISM.

upon us all. Upon *all*, I say, because our *very cottagers* in England, at this day, would deem it wretchedness to be deprived of many articles which the arts of life can furnish even to *them*, but which no emperor, in savage or semi-barbarian life, though he might sway millions of mankind, could ever have commanded.

But again comes the question, *How* are we to study all this? and I again answer, *solely* by analogy. For of course we can no more expect man, in the infancy of society, to have kept a rational record of his own barbarity, than we can expect from a child a rational account of its own first years of existence. But the child grown to maturity will, on beholding other infants, readily learn, by analogy, what must have been its own earliest state of being. And in like manner the student of History may, by looking around him in the world, by not confining his vision to one spot, gain a pretty accurate idea of what man must have been in his first periods of barbarous helplessness. For navigators and travelers have opened to us such ample fields for the study of this first branch of man's history, that we shall find no difficulty in forming for ourselves a graduated scale of man's social existence, from zero up to boiling heat. *Columbus* alone has opened to us a whole hemisphere of gradations in savage life, carrying us downwards to the most humiliating points of human existence, and showing us mankind, even in considerable bodies, straying about without the slightest covering, like herds of wild

BARBARISM.

cattle, and browsing, if we may so call it, upon raw vegetable productions of spontaneous growth. While on the other hand, his cotemporary *Vasco* has conducted us to a social atmosphere of the highest culture that human nature, unassisted by any extraneous instruction whatever, and without even the feeblest ray of true religion, was ever dreamt to have the power of attaining to.

Indeed, the student of History in our day possesses this extraordinary advantage that there is *no* state of society whatever, either among those *recorded in the pages* of time, or those comprised in the ultra-savage stages, which we cannot, by turning to one region of the earth or another, corroborate or illustrate upon a larger or smaller scale, by *living* examples.

We all know (for I believe there are few of us who have not, since the peace of 1815, on one errand or other crossed to a foreign shore)—we all of us I say know that, howsoever much we may have read, or howsoever minutely been verbally informed, of a foreign country or people, how very differently that country or people will present itself to our mind from the first moment that we have set foot in the midst of it, or *seen it in REAL LIFE*; and hence we can feel and fully understand the immense advantage towards thoroughly unfolding to ourselves, towards carrying ourselves into the very midst as it were of the manners and feelings of any past stage of social existence in Europe, or elsewhere; of not only reading of, but also attentively considering the

BARBARISM.

nearest living analogy with which we can compare it. Thus, towards Poland we may look for a tolerably faithful living picture of the filth, sloth, and oppressive tyranny of the feudal ages of Europe; and again, to the modern Turks we may look if we wish to view many strongly resemblant features to the character of the ancient Roman rule. For not alone in the fabulous tradition, by each of those nations, of their earliest chieftain, or founder, having been suckled by a *she-wolf*, did the shepherds of Latium, and the shepherds of Scythia, without any mutual intercourse, offer a striking point of resemblance; but for *many* generations (aye, during at least the five hundred and fifty years from the foundation of Rome, which passed away before a taste for literature was first introduced, or brought into fashion by the Scipios) the Turks and the Romans will appear in personal character to be precisely the *same* description of rude and fortunate military adventurers. Each nation subsisting upon military spoil, each proudly holding itself aloof from, and refusing in manners or in blood to amalgamate with the conquered, each cherishing an overbearing military ferocity as the *haut ton* of their nation, and each (generally speaking) esteeming martial prowess to be the sole estimable or essential qualification. And in imperial rule, the Roman and the Osmán have had alike their formidable and turbulent Prætorians and Janizaries, and alike their rapacious and distant *governors*, who, when they arose to such wealth or influence as to excite the jealousy

BARBARISM.

or fear of the head of the State, would on the one hand often quietly submit to the individual and *well-known* messenger of disgrace or death, or, on the other hand, openly erect the standard of revolt.

But to return to the consideration of the periods of unwritten History. On comparing the progress of inventions in one savage region and another, we shall find that implements of offence and defence are among the very first efforts at invention. The club, the spear, and even the *sling* and the buckler, are soon found out ; and, what is somewhat remarkable, hardly in any region of the globe shall we find savage man without the *bow and arrow*.

Calculated to excite our wonder is the very early period at which man, in many instances, appears to acquire a daring mastery over that element which one would suppose he would be tardy and fearful in approaching ; the savage is seldom discovered before he has contrived to build some sort of canoe, and not unfrequently he already is found seated in a dauntless attitude beneath his leaf-formed or grass-woven sail. Very few persons would, I believe, in our days choose to hazard themselves in making excursions backwards and forwards, between this island and the Irish shores, in that sort of portmantau bark, composed of wickerwork and hides, which was so fearlessly used by the Aborigines of these isles.

Another very striking characteristic is that which may be termed the corporeal heroism of savages, that unflinching firmness, that heroic endurance,

BARBARISM.

may, almost superhuman sporting, amid the infliction of the most frightful and long-continued bodily tortures that human ingenuity can conjure up. And more particularly is this striking as applied to the Aboriginal Americans, a large proportion of whom being persons of fragile frame and feeble constitution, would have seemed more likely to scream out under the stripe of a straw, than to exhibit under the torments of their enemies such immoveably heroic fortitude as might incline a spectator to believe that, not of flesh and fibres and sensitive nerves, but of malleable iron must be their frame. A fact which, by-the-bye, tends greatly to cast into the shade those individual instances of bodily heroism in early Greek and Roman story, which we have accustomed ourselves to regard as so unparalleled, whereas by turning to present Africa, or America, or indeed to any quarter of the globe in ultra periods of barbarism, we should have no difficulty in collecting parallels by the gross if we needed them. The death-song of *Regner Lodbrok* is breathed in exactly the same spirit of taunting, irritating, and contemptuous defiance and foreboding vengeance, by the Danish warrior in the tenth century, as is still witnessed in the American warrior of the nineteenth century. Showing that mankind (no matter under what name or in what region) will, while in the *same stage of social* existence, act in identically the same manner everywhere.

This corporeal heroism may assist in explaining why the savage is seen almost invariably yielding to

mental tyranny earlier than to bodily domination. For, while in a savage state, man will surrender his *mind* to enslavement long before he will habituate himself to acknowledge any bodily coercion, but when he becomes a civilized being his case is exactly reversed: his *body* is then the first to surrender; his body may be readily coerced, while his *mind* will spurn, with indignation, at any offered restraint. Nor can we reprove man for thus almost constantly offering checks to power either with body or with mind, for were he patiently to submit with both, there are no depths too humiliating, there is no slavery too cruel into which superstition, and despotism have not shown themselves ready to trample him.

Extremely interesting, as connected with the earliest emanations of literature, are the various forms, characters, and materials that have first been employed in writing. Some, for example, having used stones, others the skins or the bones of animals, the bark of trees, leaves, wax tables, &c. Some have written *vertically*, i. e. single word beneath word downwards, to an indefinite length, while others have carried their writing *horizontally* onward upon a single line, also to an indefinite length. Two extreme systems which mankind in general have blended into a medium method of writing both horizontally and vertically. The Western nations, however, differing from the Eastern in this respect, that while *we* write from the left to the right, the Easterns commonly write *from* the right hand to-

BARBARISM.

wards the left. The India House library possesses a rich store of *Tal Patras* (or manuscripts on palm leaves), *Curruttums*, and other specimens of the early or primitive modes and materials for registering thought in India well worthy the attention of all who have an opportunity of inspecting them.

Again, how numerously varied must have been in themselves the signs for thought, or the symbols of sounds, which mankind have attempted before they had thoroughly learned to write, *i. e.* what an infinite variety of attempts there must have been made, and methods adopted, from the commencement of abridged picture-writing, or what we may term *idea*-writing, onwards through *word*-writing, or the expression of an entire word to *syllabic* writing, until at last the human mind, in the person of Cadmus, the Phœnician, arrives at the *era* of *transposable* alphabetic LETTER-writing, or that era from which mankind have attained to (and afterwards gradually improved upon, the sixteen alphabetic characters introduced by Cadmus), the rudimental capability of manœuvring, as in Europe, four and twenty letters, and ten (*Arabic*) arithmetical figures or cyphers*, into such an infinitude of transpositions as can transmit to distant regions or generations every variety of human thought, and express every production and application of numerical power.

Again the earliest *national*, as well as afterwards *private* acquisition of property, in land, presents

* In use among the *Arabs* about 700 after Christ, but not introduced into England until the eleventh century.

matter for much interesting reflection; for while some of the wandering hordes continue wholly nomadic, others we shall see becoming *half* settled, as it were; and while some claim the earth they occupy for the time being, but on quitting it abandon all idea of further property in it; others again will reclaim (as in India) the village or tent-ground they have formerly occupied; on this score, perhaps, that they had sown their corn before they, as hunters or warriors, had undertaken an expedition elsewhere; and on their return hold that they have a right to the produce to be found on the spot. Further, in America; in New Holland, or *Australasia*, how curious it is to observe what immense tracts of country (beneath the surface of which lie *fields of gold!*) there are, even so late as our own times, in which *no one* can properly be said to have any claim of property. This inquiry is perhaps rendered the more interesting since the French revolution has been the means of calling up many speculations as to the validity of the tenure in many cases of private landed property; but we believe that there are few private *individuals* who cannot exhibit a much better title to the property they possess than almost any *nation*. For there is every reason to suppose that there is no existing sovereign State, especially in Europe, that did not originally, and within easily recollected time, become possessed of its national domains through blood and violence. How otherwise, to speak of our own island, could that, especially *Saxon* and Norman ancestry, from which so

BARBARISM.

very large a majority of us have sprung; how otherwise than by blood and violence could these have become possessed of *national* territory in Britain? If, then, I say, the advocates of uprooting revolution would attain, or wrest away the possessions of individual holders, they must also, in common reason, as a matter of justice, go further back, and restore to the earliest known possessors the property of nations. They must call back from Armorica and down from the Welch hills the ancient Britons, to take quiet possession of all the flourishing counties of England now in the hands, and the cultivation, of the descendants of the Saxons and Normans, or they must call back the old Roman rulers of the isle. And then the Ancient Britons would have to call back again those weaker and earlier aboriginal tribes whom they had themselves either extirpated, enslaved, or territorially dispossessed.

In carefully attending to, and comparing, the impositions and superstitions which the savage has often but too readily allowed to be inflicted upon him, under the name of religion, we shall have occasion to observe how completely and literally he has IMAGED the Almighty to be of his *own* features and complexion, whether Hottentot, Grecian, or American; and how liberally too he has ascribed to the Almighty all his *own* passions, wants, and failings, and identified his Creator with his own appetites, offering sacrifices of *human* flesh as long as he, being yet a cannibal, regards this *NON-transub-*

stantion food as the most delicate that he can offer. And when he happily leaves off this diet, we shall still see him invariably offering such animals, or other articles of food, as are to his *own* palate the most savoury or most agreeable.

Again, we shall see how the savage hastens to offer fat sacrifice when he hears the dread rumbling in the sky, which he thinks is the voice of the Deity reproaching him, and complaining of want of food, well knowing that nothing so soon raises uneasy and angry sensations in *himself* as a hungering after food. And next to the Deity, whose stomach he fancies he thus appeases, he early strives, by the same mode of fat offerings, to satisfy him whom he holds to be the nearest ally of the Deity, viz. the Pagan priest, whose rumblings and grumblings, when there is any want of food, are scarcely less audible than the thundering voice of the Deity himself.

But I believe it to be wholly unnecessary to dwell longer upon the endeavour to show that there *is* considerable interest attaching to the study of man through all his several stages of savage and semi-social existence; and that commensurate to the interest of the subject is the scope which we have for pursuing it. For although abstract reason would tell us that mankind having *all* attained to such a degree of social culture as to be able to construct the tower of Babel, that being all apparently upon one footing of knowledge, and thus all starting fair at the dispersion; they would, whithersoever they

BARBARISM.

wandered, have each carried with them, and improved upon, the degree of social attainment which each had already arrived at; and consequently left us, for ever in the dark as to the proceedings of our species when first cast into barbarism.

Abstract reason, I say, would tell us this, but *facts*—the most undeniable *facts*—strike down our abstract reasoning, and practically tell us that some portions of mankind have *retrograded* as deeply into the torpor of barbarity, as others have shot upward into civility. The two poles are not wider asunder than an enlightened Englishman, or even a highly-polished Brahminical Indian, and the human beings discovered but yesterday, as it were, by our bold Arctic navigators. Indeed, the difference is so prodigious, that one might almost seriously imagine the savages who approached Captain Ross with salutations of nose-pulling, who took his vessels for large birds and the sails for the wings of the birds, must (like the oysters we have heard of being boxed up in marble beds for ages and still found alive) have verily been locked up in icebergs some thousands of years, until by some lucky cleft they had at length been let out. But then it immediately recurs to us that examples of such intense barbarity are not confined to iceberg regions alone, but may still daily be witnessed in the most genial climes of the earth, as in different parts of America, in New Holland, and variously elsewhere.

As a counterpart to Arctic barbarism, we may recall to memory that the natives of the Marian

BARBARISM.

Islands, or Ladrones, northward of the Carolinas, and eastward of the Philippines, when discovered by Magellan, 1521, were so totally unacquainted with *fire*, that they believed the flame to be a living animal which fed upon wood, and from which they stood aloof, in the utmost terror, particularly after some of them, who had incautiously approached it too closely, had been *bitten*, as they called it, by the fire-animal.

How to account for this our reason may be puzzled, but sufficient it is, for our present purpose, to know the *fact*, that there exist, at this moment, on the earth, two extreme, and, one might almost think, nearly *impassable* bourns of human barbarity and human culture; and, that between these extreme points we shall find every intermediate gradational link. And in witnessing this fact, strange as it may strike us to be at first sight, we shall acknowledge that there is, in reality, in *it* nothing more strange than to witness the immense inequalities in the attainment of knowledge, which, within the narrow limits of our own isle, daily meet our sight. Some favoured, diversely, by fostering causes, we behold (as at the one extreme) possessing themselves of boundless knowledge, or rising to the most elevated pedestals of literary fame, while others (as at the other extreme) are condemned, some by natural sloth, but more by hard necessity, for ever, to the most torpid depths of ignorance.

There is one more feature connected with this subject which seems worthy of remark, viz. that,

BARBARISM.

although it is extremely easy to lift an *individual* of barbarous parentage at once (*i. e.* in his own single generation) into the highest culture, by giving him the necessary advantages from early youth; history does not, as far at least as my reading goes, furnish us with any example of an *entire nation* having been, through extraneous aid, *lifted* into civilization. Indeed, there is every reason to believe, that were any *considerable* body of savages at this moment to be transplanted into the heart of a highly-civilized State, *many* generations might pass away before they found themselves even comfortable in the presence of, and much less upon a par with, their surrounding neighbours.

If, then, in the midst of civility, an entire nation would be so slow to learn, how much more tardy must be the progress of instruction at a distance, and where there can comparatively be but so few examples to stimulate to improvement; and thus we are inclined to believe that there never will reign an equality of civilization throughout the world. Nay, thousands of years may perhaps yet pass away (if any of the Aborigines should thus long survive) before even those tribes of the Aborigines of America who *border closest* upon the Anglo-Americans, and have thus daily under view incitements to improvement, can rank themselves in arts and knowledge as the equals of the Anglo-Americans.

On an attentive perusal and consideration of all the information that has been given of savage life,

I believe that the student may satisfy himself of the following general results, namely:—

That man commences his career of action as a hunter, he takes the field as a warrior against all the beasts of the field. He next takes the field, more like a *hunter* than a warrior, against his own species, whom he soon learns to dread, to hate, and to hunt down, as among the worst of his enemies.

These two primary avocations occupy him long; and by the time that he presents himself, *thirdly*, as a herdsman, we may assume that he has already gained some useful knowledge; he has begun to reflect, for he has found out that the inferior animals may be rendered as valuable to him when treated as friends, as when pursued as enemies; and that as domestic auxiliaries they are calculated to render him services of the highest importance. And we shall now, too, behold him, instead of carrying on *individual* warfare as before, conducting in petty parties, hordes, or clans, the predatory prize-cattle-making excursions in which, in addition to his herdsmanship, he is sure to employ himself.

When, fourthly, and lastly, we observe the migratory herdsman learning to till the ground—finding out that *he* can increase the earth's produce (which, by the way, would require no small effort of his reflection and observation)—we shall see him at first partially settled, which will naturally lead to his becoming wholly stationary, as a HUSBAND-MAN! And from this fourth period of change,

BARBARISM.

we may date the era of his commencing a career of *steady* advancement toward civility; and thus husbandry, to which many are accustomed to attach an exclusive idea of rudeness, we behold to be the basis of all man's inventions and improvement in the arts of life, and of all man's advancement in the career of mental culture.

Whether man be *naturally* of migratory or of stationary disposition may, perhaps, be difficult satisfactorily to determine; for, in some cases, he seems as uncontrollably averse to any infringement on his locomotive habits, as, in other cases, it seems death to him to be removed from the chosen (though, perhaps, sterile) haunts of his tribe or ancestry. But of this fact we may, I think, readily convince ourselves, viz. that when man's *body* first becomes properly stationary, does his *mind* first appear to be visibly moving onward in improvement. The ever-wandering Tartarian tribes, although of such known vast antiquity, appear, in *their* successive generations, NOT to have made any material advances in the arts of life. Their bodies wander, but their minds, as to improvement, appear to be at rest. And it is not until man, as a husbandman and (by natural progression) as a citizen, has largely multiplied, that the prodigious difference between man in a savage, and man in a civilized state, fully bursts upon our view. For then we first forcibly read how frail and feeble man is as an individual, and how gigantic are the powers which he wields when his mental energies are at once awakened and concen-

BARBARISM.

tred in a state of civilized social union. Then we first perceive (especially in free communities) that, as society keeps swelling in numbers, strength of intellect seems also to be in a state of perpetual growth; and that, building himself upon the experience of others, man, at every new invention which he hits upon, seems but to be striking out so many fresh sparks to ignite other and still more important discoveries. In fine, it is then that we first become aware that the *mind* of man can leave memorials (pyramids of the mind) on the earth, surpassing in durability, as much as they excel in glory, the pyramids which his grosser manual powers have reared.

And, again, it is only in a state of extended social union that all the diversities of temper and disposition among mankind become beneficially blended. Just as drugs of opposite tendency and quality will, when intermixed, correct or neutralize each other; and that which in itself would be destructive or baneful, will thus become wholesome, or, in many cases, highly salutary.

To return to our subject. As a husbandman, man, we may suppose, turns up the earth at first with the very rudest wooden implement, and by the very slowest manual process. He next, perhaps, learns with less bodily fatigue to scratch up the soil with a sort of harrow, rather than a plough, made of hardened wood or the horns of cattle. By these, and the like uncouth and inadequate means, man helps himself onward, until having, at

BARBARISM.

last, propitiously discovered the *metals*, previously hidden by the earth's surface from his sight, and learnt ever so rudely to apply them to the purposes of life, he gains at once centuries of advancement; for then properly may be said his real empire over the beasts of the forest to be fully established; and then first may be said the soil of the earth to be properly brought into subjection to the use of man.

Iron he is, of course, long before he uses; because wholly unacquainted with the processes almost always necessary (for it very rarely indeed is found in a pure state) to convert it to his use. We, therefore, first find him applying to the purposes of life, silver, gold, and, above all, copper—all these coming to his hand in a more ready state for use than iron. *Copper*, indeed, in the higher periods of antiquity, appears to have been in the same general use that iron is in our day. In some Egyptian mines, which, after having fallen in and long been disused, were in later times re-opened, every implement discovered was of copper. In some districts too of *Siberia*, where traces of ancient mining have been discovered, all the tools and the manufactured implements (as knives, daggers, and arrow-points) were found to be of copper. On the discovery of America, the metallic weapons and utensils of the Aborigines were mostly of copper; although iron in a tolerably pure state was, in America, to be found very near the surface of the earth. And with the Japanese, at this day, almost

BARBARISM.

all the articles are of copper, which with us are of iron. But iron would naturally be long before brought into use, from the high temperature of heat required in the working of it.

In what *manner* the metals might first be discovered we may gather from the two following facts:—

A native herdsman, in South America, about the year 1545, while scrambling after a stray *Lama* (a goat of the camel species), tore up, among the steep rocks, a shrub which he had accidentally caught hold of for support, and thus, to his surprise, laid bare the first seen silver of the immeasurably rich *Potosi* mines.

Again (to go further back), about the year 972, during the reign of Otto the First, a horse left fastened to a tree in a forest near Goslar, in Germany, had, before his master's return from pursuing the chase on foot, so impatiently pawed up the ground that he had uncovered a metallic substance which led to the discovery of those mines which have ever since been worked in the Rammel's Berg, or the Mountain of *Rammel*—so called out of grateful memory to the horse, whose pet-name was *Rammel*.

In the tardy adaptation of metals as a representative of value for the convenience of traffic, and as least incommodious in bulk, copper would probably be the earliest in use; next silver, the French retaining to our time *argent*, or silver, as a general designation for money; and, in like manner, the

BARBARISM.

Hebrews used a term equivalent to *silverlings* as the general name for money. The first rudely-attempted coins were of various form; round, square, or triangular; on which the worth was struck by a hammer, or roughly graven. And as cattle and sheep were primary articles of barter, the representation of an ox is found on the earliest Greek coins, and the coin itself was called an ox; and, in France, we early find a gold penny bearing the stamp of a lamb, and the *gold-sheep* coin of larger and smaller size and value. In Persia it was that the usage was introduced of stamping the coin with a likeness of the ruling sovereign, in the reign of *Darius* I. Hystaspes, about 500 before Christ; and hence the Persian coins have been designated *Daricks*. *Ducats* derive their name from *ducatus*, dukedom, the Italian dukes having first coined them.

Finally, the very simplest processes in the existing arts of life, such as bread-making and beer-brewing, would, in their discovery, call for no ordinary degree of ingenuity and observation.

The earliest mode of cake-baking was to place the bruised corn, moistened into a sort of dough, between two heated flat stones; but burnt and steeped corn would precede this rather advanced operation.

The application of heat to the preparing of animal food would be sufficiently various; at first the object would be to give merely that warmth to the

BARBARISM.

animal which it had when first killed. One mode of recorded cookery is the roasting of wild boars by filling them with red-hot stones. And, in this manner, too, for the boiling of animal food and vegetables, hot water was procured in the hollows of rocks; these hollows being first filled with water, which was heated by means of large red-hot stones.

But I have already, I fear, dwelt longer upon and gone more into detail in this division of my subject than may have been generally acceptable to my readers; but I have been anxious to press upon their attention a preparatory portion of historical study, which, though it is so generally either slightly regarded or wholly neglected, I hold to be of first-rate importance towards rightly understanding the history of man; and upon which, if we do not choose to model it into a systematic body of instruction, we ought at least to have our eyes attentively fixed in the reading of voyages and travels, amid uncivilized nations; for we ought at least to know and to recollect, that in contemplating the manners and habits of these, we are but reading the history of our own national progenitorship at an easily-defined distance of time. We ought to recollect that, in surveying the *punctured*, *painted*, or otherwise fancifully-ornamented islander of the Pacific of our day, we do but behold the compeer, to the very life, of the Britannic islander of past times. We do but behold, in manners and character, the living representation of the punctured and woad-

BARBARISM.

stained human beings whom Julius Cæsar, in 55 before Christ, encountered upon our own Britannic shores 1908 years ago.

When we behold man settled in husbandry, we must necessarily *pre-suppose* a union, by one means or other, of several tribes to have been already effected; for any one small tribe would be too much harassed and perilled by the soundings of the war-whoop, ever to think of sitting regularly down to a life of husbandry. A sort of social union must then have been formed, and in *what* way? We shall assist ourselves in conceiving when we reflect that, an individual in savage life is sure to be guided by no other law than the weight of his own club—that he will as assuredly take away, if he can, from another human being whatever he covets, as one dog will (in defiance of all law and equity), if daring or powerful enough, snatch away from another growling animal an inviting beef-bone.

And the savage tribe, or family, will, like the savage individual, be ruled by no law but that of superiority of strength; and, in proportion to its strength, it will, either through pride, caprice, revenge, or for the sake of plunder, assail, exterminate, or render wholly subservient to its own purposes and will, any neighbouring tribe; or it will slay all the men of a stranger tribe, and adopt into its own body the women and children.

A tribe thus successful on a few occasions in the beginning may easily, especially if it does *not* extirpate, but adopt as slaves or subjects, the males of

BARBARISM.

the succumbing tribes, soon swell into such numbers as to enable it to go onward to fresh victories, attacking and subduing in succession (like the Romans) single tribe after tribe with a united and ever conglomerating strength, until, at last, a sufficient number of people are brought to acknowledge one sway, and to be called by one name, as to begin to assume something of the appearance of a State, or of what is generally known by the word *nation*.

Among the earliest of the nations of whom we have any record are those eight which, in collateral columns, are presented to our view in the first sheet of the twenty-five royal folio Tables, which hereafter we shall require to have constantly under our survey. And among the earliest national characteristics of that Table we shall behold the *Assyrians* as most widely expanding the wings of conquest; Egypt as most densely consolidated into the semblance of a civilized State; and the enterprising *commercial* Phœnicians presenting themselves unpretendingly and unobtrusively as nearly co-equal with the Egyptians in useful arts and knowledge, and supplying the Jews with architects to build their first temple.

Moses, in the Hebrew language, gives us the earliest periods of Jewish history; and Herodotus, in the Greek, opens to our view the principal part of the historical matter relating to the other columns.

Greek may thus be said to offer to us the earliest page of *universal*, secular or profane, history; that is, supposing the Hindus and other Eastern nations

BARBARISM.

to be unable to substantiate *their* claims to written historical memorials of higher antiquity (for which see the columns of ORIENTAL History in Table XIV.). And *Greek* further possesses a peculiar claim to our attention as being the language in which the *New Testament* was earliest written: for though the Divine precepts were delivered in Syro-Chaldaic, a corrupt and mixed dialect of the Hebrew, they, as well as the historical portions of Evangelical Writ, were earliest compiled in Greek.

Between Herodotus and Moses, however, we must not fail to note this observable distinction, viz. that Moses writes the history of but *one* nation, while Herodotus treats historically of *all* nations; and it is thus that he acquires the title of the "FATHER of UNIVERSAL History."

I have already given a rough and rapid sketch of what I conceive to be *primitively* the general or COMMON origin of nations or political unions. But nations are not (any more than individuals) always to be satisfied with a *common* origin: they therefore contrive to trump up the most fantastical theories about the wonders and prodigies that have attended them in their birth, or waited upon them in their infancy; such theories being designed, of course, to establish a claim to an origin so extraordinary and miraculous as shall be quite different from the vulgar or common way of coming into national existence, and thus raise *them* proportionably, in the eyes of the world, *above* their neighbours. But, unfortunately for them, it happens that so

BARBARISM.

many nations have hit upon the same trick, and are so marvellously alike in the fictions which they obtrude, that, instead of trying to *surpass* each other, one would suppose that they had all jointly agreed to be of one story. Gods and goddesses coming down among them to lend them a hand; meetings of men with angels, and discussions as to how matters ought to proceed; giants and supernatural sovereigns, and heroes, and so on, are as thick and common (to seize the only adequate comparison) as hops in Kent. So that, instead of there being anything to wonder at or to admire in them, they become quite a bore: the tale so often told becomes tedious and *homely*, and does away with even the shadow of a chance of establishing higher or lower *grades* of national origin. Nay, it really effectually chastises all further desire for Divine pedigree tracing, when we perceive that even the illiterate and barbarous *Peruvian*, though totally unacquainted with the tact of mankind in contriving such matters in this hemisphere, had boldly and poetically hit upon quite as *Godolphic* an ancestry for himself as the everlastingly-inventive Greek.

And the Greek, we must acknowledge, with all his subtilty of mind, has been but a sorry contriver of his own fame. All his fictions and filigree works about his own origin, all his never-ending conjurings up of god-like ancestry, form but a very sandy ground-work for the masonry of glory. They do not answer his purpose half so well as if he had plainly and bluntly told us the downright truth at once. If

BARBARISM.

he had simply said, I know that one considerable body of my ancestors (viz. the Pelasgi), and, most probably, like the social parentage of *all* other nations, the whole of them were, so or so many years ago, nothing but cannibals, nothing but ravenous man-eaters; and here am I a poet, a painter, an architect, and a philosopher! Why, *there* would have been built up in half a dozen words an imperishable rock for fame to stand upon for ever. Whereas, on the contrary, if the Greek fictions had all been true stories, they would at once have been *death* to his fame, and ought, therefore, to have been carefully kept out of sight. For, if he had really enjoyed those celestial communings, and joinings of his nature with the gods; if he really had enjoyed such supereminent advantages; had been at the parlour-boarding-schools of the Upper Regions, and gods had been his instructors and playfellows; we should only have said, what a dunderhead he must have been not to have got faster on to the upper classes of science than he did—not to have attained to his meridian pitch of civility at least half a millennium or more BEFORE the age of Pericles.

We may save ourselves much valuable time, much useless perplexity, if we learn betimes—in the very outset of our attention to history—that it will be wholly unavailing for us to allow ourselves to be worked into anxiety to find out satisfactorily every distinctive particular of the MINUTE ORIGIN of a State.

BARBARISM.

Every nation (as long as it has its own way) claims to have come from the clouds; and howsoever ready it may be to assist in clearing away the fogs and mists that hang around the origin of *other* States, it will, decidedly, as far as regards its *own* origin, do all in its power to baffle our seeing *through* the clouds from which it pretends to have itself descended.

The Greeks and the Romans can reciprocally tell us what was the uncouth and bear-like origin of the *other*, but neither nation likes to help us to see clearly when its own origin is in question.

The priest of the Nile and the priest of the Ganges will both swear that the source of their respective rivers is not on the earth, but high up in the heavens; and yet each will perhaps openly mock at the credulity of the followers of the other. But they neither of them can *now* deceive us; for, thanks to commerce, to enterprise, to navigation, and science, *geography* tells us that *all* rivers spring from the earth, as plainly as history convinces us that the *earth*, too, was the womb of all mankind; that mankind have *no* where been shot down, like silver arrows, from heaven, wearing at once the highest possible exterior polish and an unimprovable intrinsic worth; but that *all* primitive nations *must* have toiled themselves up out of the clays of barbarity.

We are all aware how very difficult, nay, how quite *impossible*, it sometimes is to determine satisfactorily to every one what is and what is not the

BARBARISM.

very first starting point of a *river*; for a river never bursts upon us at once in magnificence from the bosom of the earth. On the contrary, its beginnings are generally so very inconsiderable and so variously branched, that many a little hair-breadth rill may seem to have quite as good a claim to be called the *source* as any of the others; for it is not until several of these little rills have, by some casualties in their course, flowed into one bed, that any appearance of a river (how great soever that river may afterwards become) can be traced. The *precise* and *undeniable* FIRST *source* of the Nile or the Ganges, mighty rivers as *they* are, who shall to the satisfaction of all mankind definitively determine? Nay, it is notorious that the *exact source* of the DANUBE even, which takes its rise in the heart of civilized and enlightened Europe, has afforded matter of warm dispute up to the other day; and if now apparently settled, it is more likely to have become so from the parties at last feeling the futility of all further argument, than from any *proof* having been established that one little spring has a positive preference over another little spring, in the same chain of mountains, to be called the source of the largest river in Europe.

Equally difficult (and equally *unimportant*) to determine are sometimes the first *tribal* springs of the greatest nations, which could not be sensible, in their small beginnings, that they were destined for such subsequent grandeur.

I would say, then, to the student, waste not your

BARBARISM.

time in trampling again and again among the little rills which (to use a hunter's phrase) have been so often foil'd by the foot of the *over*-curious and microscopic antiquarian; muddle not your head with scrupulously trying to find out (that which, if you do find it out, will profit you nothing) the very first little beginnings of even the greatest nations; nor muddle with your feet, ever more and more, by fruitlessly trampling, the very first little rills of even the mightiest waters.

But be satisfied by tracing a river, or a national history, up to a point from which it may safely be said in round language to begin; that is, to a point where it first sensibly strikes the eye by opening itself authentically into importance.

Be satisfied with reflecting (as already pointed out) that the *general* origin of nations, as well as of rivers, is very insignificant (hardly *distinguishable* on the nicest examination), and that in essentials they so nearly resemble each other, that if we gain a pretty accurate general idea of the origin of any one of them, we can never be very far misled as to the nature of the origin of all of them.

Coming, then, to this general conclusion, the period embraced in the first Table of the royal folio series of chrono-historical charts already referred to, although occupying no less than 1445 years, will not demand much of your attention. It may be called the Marvellous Magazine period of ancient history—the period of the *surmises* of general history rather than of general history itself; for down

BARBARISM.

to Cyrus's day, at the bottom of that Table, we can hardly be said to have gained any firm historical footing, particularly as regards the *time reckoning*; the chronology of this period being mostly regulated by the dates which mankind have partially agreed among themselves *to accept* as coming nearest to the mark, or constituting the best general *guess* on the subject that can be framed.

And, indeed, throughout the whole of *ancient*, and even during many ages of the early part of *modern* history, we must not be startled if we here and there meet with a discrepancy of a few years; and that, too, among authors of equally high repute for careful research and antiquarian knowledge; for we must all recollect that, after the wise and learned men of so many generations had, as it were, been closely laying their heads together to render early chronology as little knotty as possible, down came Sir Isaac Newton among them, like a bowl among ninepins, telling them they need no longer keep gravely fixed to their seats, higgling and niggling about a few odds and ends of Olympiads and years; for they had one and all (great and small) missed the whole matter by some hundreds of years! Here was, *indeed*, a squandering knock down all at once to the result of the united and sleepless ponderings of the gravest sagacity during ages upon ages. And what rational man would, after this, be either disquieted or startled by small discrepancies; and much less confine himself twenty or thirty years to his chamber (as some have almost literally done),

trying most determinedly to reconcile those discrepancies in the minute retrospective reckonings (or assumption of dates) of early time, which we may now boldly affirm to be irreconcilable?

To say nothing of the periods in which mankind kept *no* time reckonings at all (knowing *no* distinction of days under proper names, *no* division into weeks, into months, or into years), we may readily form an idea of the difficulties which rigid chronologers have to contend with even after mankind *did* begin to attempt time reckonings, when we reflect that they had still neither any one general point to measure from, nor yet any one general standard to measure by. And thus we may easily conceive what an infinite variety of modes they would adopt; among which we may mention, by way of example, that one nation would measure day and night by military *watches* (from which by the way probably originated the appellation of that invaluable little time measurer which we carry in our fobs or our waistcoat pockets), while others would simply designate the day as one undivided space between sunrise and sunset. And when, afterwards, the day began to be divided into hours, still no uniformity was observed in *beginning* the day. One made the day begin at sun-RISE, others (like the Jews and Italians to the present day) at sun-SET; and again others (like ourselves, extraordinary as it may seem) would begin their day in the *middle of the night*; added to which there are regions in which there is during one-half of the

BARBARISM.

year continuous light, in the other half continuous darkness, one long day and one long night making up their dismal year. Again, at the equator they have daily equal day and equal night, without varying above one hour all the year round. And if such be the varieties that would attach to the short space of a day, how much more importantly varied would be the reckonings by cycles, by generations, by months, and by years. At one period the Romans divided their year into *ten* months, and afterwards into *twelve* months. The Jews began their year in our September; the Athenians began theirs with the first new moon after the summer solstice; but still more calculated to confuse, and more odd to one's ordinary association of ideas than the discrepant beginnings of the year by contemporary and perhaps contiguous nations, is the circumstance that some nations were not contented with ONE beginning, but had two beginnings, and of course two endings to the *same* year. The Jews began their year for *secular* purposes at a period answering, as already stated, to our September; but for *ecclesiastical* purposes they did not begin their year until the month of April. In like manner, at Papal Rome, one beginning of the year is at the nativity, and another at the incarnation of Christ. Nay, we had *ourselves* in England, until 1752, *two* beginnings of the year, one in January, and the other on the 25th of March. And *we* have, too, very recently (*who would believe it?*) had the quaint ingenuity to devise, under the auspices of the Right

BARBARISM.

Honourable John Cam Hobhouse, as Secretary-at-War, the creation of a NEW *military* year, from *the 1st of April* to the 31st of March; thus appropriately beginning, what we may term our April Fool Year, on April Fool Day. So that *New-Year's Day*, in the War-office calendar, no longer falls on the 1st of January, but on *the first of April*; making New-Year's Day and April Fool Day exactly one and the same thing. And thus all the battles fought in the Burmese war, for example, during the late months of January, February, and March, which common chronology would affix to the year 1853, War-office chronology registers as being in 1852.

The vast advantage of this bright gem of official cleverness cannot be fully understood or gusted until all the other heads of official departments, and of incorporated public bodies, shall have followed the Right Honourable Gentleman's example, by each creating or establishing for themselves their own independent year. For when, in addition to the new Military year, we get the new Naval year, the new Colonial, the new Home-Office year, and the new Foreign-Office year, with the natural sequence of a new Post-Office year, a new Stamp-Office, Excise, and Custom-House year; and, of course, a new Bank of England, a new East India-House, and a new Railway year; a new Apothecaries'-Hall year, with the innumerable suite of the Tailors', the Saint Crispin's, and other separate Trades' new years, then alone shall we have succeeded in rendering the confusion of our national chronology quite confounded.

BARBARISM.

To have made the matter complete, the Right Honourable Gentleman should also have favoured us with a new military mile, and a new geographical degree, and then we should have had a confusion of distances as well as a confusion of years.

I quote not these examples as offering in themselves any insurmountable difficulty, but merely to show, if such be the perplexing varieties with which, down almost to the *present* day, we are surrounded, *what* must be the sum total of the varieties, and of the difficulties arising out of those varieties, which present themselves between the period of 2000 *before* Christ, with which our first royal folio Table opens, and the present 1853 *after* Christ? And be the differences ever so seemingly small, when taken singly, they will, as generations roll on, become collectively VERY considerable.

Indeed the accurate admeasurement of the year is a much more difficult matter than it is perhaps generally supposed to be, as we may conceive from the fact of its never having been properly adjusted in Europe until so late a period as 1582, or but 271 years ago. The best admeasurement of the solar year, down to 1582, was effected, in the year 1079, by MALEK SHAH *Jalal-ud-din*, the greatest ruler of the house of Seljuk; whose capture of Jerusalem, in 1072, we shall historically recollect, led to the *Crusades* of 1095. It was under the auspices of Pope *Gregory XIII.*, who acceded to the pontifical chair 13th May, 1572, (year of

BARBARISM.

the massacre at Paris, night of the 24th to 25th August,) that, 503 years later than Jalal-ud-dín's corrected year, the final correction of the Calendar* was ushered into the world in 1582; and although speedily adopted in those countries where the spiritual supremacy of the Pope continued to be acknowledged, the *Protestant and the Greek-Church States* were so pertinaciously averse to learn even profane science under a mandate from Rome, and especially from that Pope Gregory XIII. who is said to have had medals struck in approving commemoration of the horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew's night, 1572, just ten years before the introduction of the new calendar, 1582, that some, among whom the Greeks and Russians (of the parent Greek Church), down to the very latest years, have refused to admit the proffered improvement; and hence the necessity of often adding to a date the $\frac{o}{s}$ or the $\frac{n}{s}$, to indicate whether we mean the *old* style or the *new* style, there being a difference between the two of ten days up to the 1st of January, in the year 1700; of *eleven* days from the 1st of January, 1700, to the 1st of January, 1800; and of *twelve* days since the commencement of the present century, or the year 1800. And thus those who still adhere to the old or uncorrected style celebrate, in the present century, their New Year's Day, not on the 1st of January, as they profess, but on the 13th of January, according to the more

* By *Aloys. and Greg. Lilius.*

BARBARISM.

accurate calculation of Gregory's *new style*. *In England the new style was not adopted until the 3rd of September, counted the 14th, 1752.*

It may here perhaps be not irrelevant gratefully to recall to recollection that it was an Italian, named DIONYSIUS EXIGUUS, who rendered to history and chronology the invaluable service of introducing into Europe one general era for chronological computation ; *i. e.* he was the first who computed the dates of historical events *from the era of the birth of Christ*. Dionysius died in the year 536, and thus his system, or proposed *general basis* of time calculating, must have been promulgated early in the sixth century after Christ ; but so slow were the nations of Europe in perceiving its supereminent advantages, that it was not until about the period of our Magna Charta, 1215, or about *seven hundred years* after Dionysius Exiguus first introduced it, that the practice had become general of dating from the birth of Our Saviour.

From the view which we have thus rapidly taken we may, I repeat it, be assisted in forming an idea of the insuperable difficulties of reducing to mathematical nicety all the various admeasurements, the endless divisions and subdivisions, of that formidable expanse of time which stretches from the first recorded date of history down to the present day ; and those who have most vigorously laboured in the irksome and toilsome, and, as it would appear, the *unprofitable*, if not the *impossible*, field of early time adjusting, seem to have been much

more successful in supplying us with arguments for believing that their predecessors in the same field of toil have been *wrong*, than in making us believe that they are themselves finally *right*; for we meet with hardly any who can give anything like tranquil permanency to their early chronological positions. A chronologer, like a boxing champion of England, can overturn an adversary of previous renown, but, like the boxing champion, he seldom long retains the belt; another starts up, and he, in his turn, is himself overthrown.

We have, then, in our present essay, being desirous of getting over the ground as fast as we can, glanced at the history of mankind during at least (to take the very narrowest computation) 20 centuries, or 2000 years. But these 2000 years, we have stated, faded away before any portion of mankind had arrived at the scholastic capability of leaving any written traces of their having dwelt on the earth, and even before we arrive at that point in time (viz. 2000 years before Christ) to which the earliest records of secular or profane history *retrospectively* ASCEND. We are, therefore, of course precluded from assuming for these 2000 years any regular succession of historical divisions in time, or, in other words, any regular series of chronological computations. But because we cannot assume any regular time reckonings for this portion of man's existence on the earth, are we, we have asked, therefore wholly to neglect and silently pass over these 2000 years? and we have answered, *no*!

BARBARISM.

And why? Because, although we cannot compute by time, we may in some measure compute by *classification*; for the living analogy of savage and semi-barbarian life will open to us the successive stages of man's advancement out of ultra-rudeness: living analogy, as we have stated, showing us that man commences by being simply a hunter and fisherman, or indeed a war-maker upon all around him, not excepting even his own species, chiefly to satisfy the immediate cravings of his appetite; and he next advances into the rank of a herdsman, or shepherd, and thence goes onward to become settled as a husbandman, or villager, and, by natural progression, as a citizen. The movable village of tents or wicker-work dwellings will become the less unsettled village of huts; and the village of huts will by degrees be changed into the more substantial and the more widely-extended burg, town, or city. Further, that all *aboriginal* inhabitants of the earth (if we may so term them) have, without any exception, wandered, or become gradually more or less settled, in little tribes, families, hordes, or clans, under petty chieftains or elders, until, by adventitious circumstances, these have become amalgamated into larger *national* unions.

To the several classifications laid down we cannot indeed assign any specific number of years, because various causes (to some of which we shall hereafter have occasion to allude) may operate to compel mankind in one region to linger much longer in particular stages of this advancement than in

BARBARISM.

others; but these classifications will, I say, answer as a sort of *chronological* clue to the progressional history of savage life.

I shall only further, in concluding this recapitulation, state, that we have (while endeavouring to open to view what we conceive to be the student's natural historical beginning and natural track towards written history) thus *strongly* urged (as the most judicious and philosophic mode) that some attention and reflection should be bestowed on the *unwritten* periods of man's history, because we conceive that it is through the wide and wildly-varied expanses of savage existence that we shall find at once the most satisfactory, the most attractive, and most commanding approach to the ages of man's written annals—to the portals of recorded time.

For not only is this course the best calculated to awaken the student's interest, and to yield him the most solid and useful instruction, but it may ultimately materially conduce to his more rapid advancement through written time; for when once he has thoroughly considered the history of savage existence, and what are the earliest natural approaches to civilized life, he will easily be convinced how *worse* than futile it would be for him (especially in days like the present, when, to keep upon a par with our neighbours, we have so many studies besides history to apply to), how *worse* than futile it would be, to bestow much labour on the wearisome, backwards and forwards, contradictory, and ponderous volumes, that have been ushered into the

BARBARISM.

world on disputed points in chronology, which never CAN be *determined*, or on disputed points in the local and tribal origin of nations, which are in their nature equally *un-determinable*, and in their results equally unprofitable; and which, if they did not wholly deter from following up the study, would be only calculated to divert the inquiring mind from the main, broad, and, as it would appear to us, only profitable road of historical study.

We may then be said, besides directing the student's historical observation to the memorials of man in his stages of barbarism, to have bestowed, in this introductory section, especially towards its close, some attention on the *negative* means of the student's advancement, viz. the avoiding of much waste and laborious reading.

And while with the *negative* means of advancement we close this division of our theme, with some observations on the *positive* means of advancement we propose to open the second section of this work.

BOOK I.

SECTION II.

ANCIENT TIME FROM 2000 *before* TO 476
after CHRIST, COMPRISING 2476 YEARS.
FORMATION AND PROGRESSION OF EMPIRE
IN THE FOUR FIRST GREAT REGIONS OF
ANCIENT HISTORY. ANCIENT LITERARY TIME.
FIRST-SIGHT PHENOMENA OF THE EARLIEST COM-
PARTMENT OF **MODERN TIME** IN TABLE V.

IN our last section, among other introductory and miscellaneous matter, while gathering glimpses at the *History of Man* in BARBARISM, we inferentially pointed out the advantage of closely attending to, and comparing the descriptions of savage life abundantly supplied to us in BOOKS OF VOYAGES AND TRAVELS, which do in themselves constitute a branch of History; and thereto we may emphatically add the recommendation of a few visits to the so splendid and admirable collection of illustrative objects connected with savage life in North America, which Mr. CATLIN, the able, laborious, and

enterprising historian of savage life is still exhibiting in this country: such descriptive books and striking illustrations furnishing us, at once, with the best materials for understanding the real condition and attributes of man in barbarism, as well as the real origin and vital principles of all man's social and political institutions; and best enabling us to judge, by comparison, of the authenticity or otherwise of the earliest records of ancient history. For human nature varies not materially in any quarter of the globe in its slowly-progressive advancement, in successive stages, from ultra barbarism to the most dignified and refined civilization.

And the earliest *written* records, especially such as ascend *retrospectively* high above the period in which the author flourishes, being necessarily mostly compilations from popular traditions, would seem to require the confirmation of living analogy, in more recent time, before they can be fully admitted to our credence.

The history of mankind, then, we have stated, *begins* with the history of savage life, and the history of savage life in PAST TIME is amply verified to us by the various gradations of savage existence in the PRESENT TIME.

1. **UNRECORDED BARBARIC LIFE** extends over 2004 years, viz. from 4004, the Hebrew text era of the creation, to *about* 2000 *before Christ*; that being the highest point to which even *retrospective* universal history has been carried up by Herodotus.

2. ANCIENT HISTORY, or that compass of time

which in Europe we are accustomed to designate *exclusively* as the period of ANTIQUITY, or of *ancient* written *history*, commencing about 2000 *before* Christ, and terminating with the destruction of the Western Empire of the Romans in 476 *after* Christ, comprises a total of 2476 years.

3. MODERN HISTORY, commencing with the disruption of the West Roman Empire in 476 after Christ, and extending to the present year, 1853, covers a surface of 1377 years.

The three PRIMARY DIVISIONS OF HISTORICAL TIME, then, stand thus, viz.:—

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. <i>Unrecorded time</i> , occupying 2004 years. | |
| 2. <i>Ancient history</i> , | 2476 „ |
| 3. <i>Modern history</i> , | 1377 „ |

Making a <i>grand total</i> , from	} 5857 „
the creation in 4004 <i>before</i>	
Christ to 1853 <i>after</i> Christ,	
of	

This summary we may readily and advantageously commit to memory, and the grand total of 5857 years we may mnemonically recollect as 58 and 57.

And it will, of course, be understood, that, down to the *birth of Christ*, we keep continually DIMINISHING the numerical amount of years, so that the *highest* numbers *before* Christ are the *earliest*, while *after* Christ the *smallest* numbers become the earliest.

Having rapidly passed our thoughts over Unrecorded Time, we next, on arriving at the confines of

written records, naturally apply ourselves to that **OGULAR** principle of tabular presentment which it is the main object of my present publication fully and practically to explain.

We therefore now place before ourselves a copy of the *fifth greatly-improved edition* of THE 25 ILLUMINATED OR COLOURED CHRONOLOGICAL CHARTS to which this work is designed to be an elucidatory and illustrative **COMPANION**; and we proceed to turn over quickly those four earliest great leaves of Recorded Time, into which the 2476 years of ancient history are, for the convenience of memory and study, divided. Leaf after leaf, exhibiting monarchy after monarchy, will rapidly show us the dawning, the meridional, and the dissolving views of all the great empires and republican powers of antiquity.

The *first* Table closes with the universal monarchy of *Cyrus*, and the dawning importance of the *Greek* republics; the *second* closes with the universal empire of *Alexander*, and the coeval rising of the *Roman* republic; the third closes with the universal conquests of the republican Romans; and the fourth with the wreck of the Roman empire of the West, and the rising of the modern States of Europe; and where each Table closes, the next in succession, without the intermission of a single year, naturally begins.

We next take, singly, a more steadfast and contemplative survey of each of the four successive sheets, which jointly embrace the whole surface of Ancient Time.

And if we cannot exactly phrenotype on memory, that is, impress upon the brain, through the eye, the *whole* of the details of each successive plate, as it lies within the compass of the eye before us, we may, at least, rapidly and deeply imprint upon memory its general and chronological characteristics, viz. its columnar FORM, its COLOURINGS, its commencing and terminating BOUNDARY DATES, its large-letter heading, its most conspicuously typed *marginal* dates, and what events such dates do severally refer to ; also some of the scattered typal distinctions which the most conspicuously court attention in the body of the sheet.

In other words, our first attempt is to phrenotype time on the memory ; that is, through the eye to imprint the boldest outline features, and next some of the most important minutiae of each of the four tabular sheets of Ancient Time. The alto-relievo recollections of every column we separate, by distinctions of type, from the diminutive or ordinary dates and detail.

Placing before us Table I. of Ancient History, we first observe (and should commit to memory) *the large-letter heading*, including the total amount of historical years that the Table embraces. Table I. begins from the year 2000 *before* Christ, the highest boundary line in time to which Herodotus, the “father of universal history,” attempts to ascend ; and it ends with the universal monarchy of Cyrus, as indicated, 555 before Christ, by the world-overspreading Persian purple.

We next observe the

COLUMNAR STRUCTURE, *or* FORM,

of Table I. now before us. It opens with *eight* sovereign columns, severally headed: 1, *Egypt*; 2, *Phœnicia*; 3, *Palestine*; 4, *Aram* (or Syria and Mesopotamia); 5, *Assyria*; 6, *Asia Minor*; 7, *Greece*; and 8, *Italy*; and it is through these eight columnar headings that, with Herodotus, who knows of no other sovereign States or nations at this period, that we enter the portals of written history about 2000 years before the birth of Christ.

Centrally, after the division of the Jewish monarchy, 975 before Christ, into the two separate kingdoms of Judah and Israel; and the breaking of the first Assyrian monarchy, 888 before Christ, into the three separate sovereignties of the *New-Assyrians*, the *Babylonians*, and the *Medes*, we count eleven columns, all of which at the close of Table I., about the year 555, we perceive to be contracted into the three columns of the all-absorbing **PERSIAN** monarchy, and of the *Greek* and *Italian* republics.

The broadest of the commencing columns is **ASSYRIA**, the earliest recorded monarchy of territorial magnitude, and close to it we observe the narrowest of the eight columns, headed *Aram*, or Syria and Mesopotamia.

By attentively surveying all the *peculiarities* of

FORM,

induced by the varying characteristics to which we have adverted, we might very soon be enabled to fill in upon a *blank* tabular *outline* chart

of this first great sheet of Ancient Time many of the memorable historical items that belong to its surface, in their proper chronological emplacement.

The columnar *absence* (from Table I., for example) of nations of subsequent renown, may furnish us, in *negative* chronology, with the recollection that all such absent nations are still historically unknown. For instance, it is not until we come to nearly the close of Table III., that we shall observe even the *name* of Britain; and it is not until we arrive near the close of Table IV. that we find Britain to have assumed a continuously-separate column, indicating independence or distinctive sovereign existence.

THE COLOURING,

or staining, in its most general application, calls the attention *emphatically*—1st, to the ascendant or *most important* national COLUMNS within each tabular era; 2ndly, to the most attractive or influential period or periods of any separate nation's history; and thus serves in some measure as a guide to the student's most essential reading. And without some guide we might very easily be bestowing our attention and reading on the *inconsequential*, or, as they stand in the Tables, the *uncoloured* portions of a nation's history, to the total neglect of those specific periods in which a nation may have held a universal historical celebrity; or we might be inflicting upon ourselves a great amount of totally *waste* reading. To economize

time in the prosecution of so widely branched a study as universal history, will be found to be a matter in itself of no mean consideration.

The coloured columns, then (or any coloured portions of columns), within each sheet, I repeat, are the important ones, the UNcoloured are those which less immediately or materially demand our attention and recollection.

In fine, it is by the colourings that we are directed to those vitally important FIRST-SIGHT PHENOMENA of Historic Time, which in their conflicting and volcanic formations have given, to every successive tabular region, so undulating a variety of ever changeful surface.

The colouring of Table I., differing somewhat in its application from the colouring of the other Tables, serves mainly to show by the horizontal streakings of the green, the blue, and the purple, the comparative magnitude of the *first Assyrian* (green), the *second Assyrian* (also green), the *Babylonian* (blue), and the all-overrunning *Persian* (purple) monarchies; Cyrus's monarchy, as will be seen by the comparative extent of the several colourings, far outstripping the other three, although each of these in succession claimed to be a "*universal*" monarchy. In like manner, that the sovereigns of China and Ava have even affected to sway the heavens as well as the earth; ruling the sun, moon, stars, and seasons, *in addition* to those [anti-climax] "*Umbrellas*," under which they have brought the whole earth.

The orange-lead streaks, under the *Egyptian*,

Hebrew, and *Phœnician* "**GOLDEN AGES**," serve to call attention to the *comparative* periods at which these nations severally arrive at their so-called *Golden Ages*, which would imply a certain amount of consolidated institutions; although the obtaining of an important victory, through the fall of one (merely *physically* formidable) man, and the primitive use of the sling, the rudest of all the missive appliances of war, in David's day, would seem to argue so tiny a character of development as to be somewhat at variance with one's ideas of a proximate golden age.

The earliest registry of the *Olympic victors*, July, 776, in the Greek column, and the *foundation of Rome*, 754, in the Italian column, the two great eras of Greek and Roman time-reckoning, are severally underlined by the orange and the red or crimson lake, colourings chosen to represent, during their flourishing career, the two most distinguished republican powers of antiquity.

The continuous column staining of the orange commences at the bottom of Table I., with *Pisistratus*, the cotemporary of Cyrus; so that the coevally-commencing purple and orange may write upon memory, at once, that *the erection of the first MONARCHY of primary grandeur*, by Cyrus, is coincidental with the dawning into historical importance of the *first great REPUBLICAN power* with which we are historically acquainted.

And thus it is that we can, by the commencing orange colouring, further very conveniently affix chronologically the era of the rise of Greece by the same marginal 555 (the three fives) before Christ,

underlined with purple, which serve to denote the epoch of the erection of the mighty Persian sway.

The marginal 555 (three fives) thus used to affix two great eras, as well as the earlier marginal 888 (three eights), rising boldly to the eye, will readily suggest that as part of a system of

MNEMONICAL CHRONOLOGY,

which is engrafted on the royal folio Tables now before us, we have, wherever we could do so with rigid chronological propriety, seized upon figures of similar import for the affixment of great eras of recollection; because we thus avoid all danger of the transposition or reversal, either in memory or print, of the figures taken to denote great eras. Whereas, if we took, say the first year of Cyrus's reign, viz. 559, to denote his general era, instead of 555, we should incur three efforts of memory, *i. e.* we should have to recollect whether the date was 559, 595, or 955; and although we might be certain of the three figures, we might by no means feel assured, on *cross-examination*, of the correlative emplacement of those figures; but if we take 555, transpose them as you will, they must come to 555, for 555 constituting but a triple repetition of one power of number, involve but one effort of memory, instead of three, independently of the greater confidence of memory with which they inspire us. In like manner the triplicate S. S. S. would be much easier of retention than V. P. C., or any other three *distinctive* initial letters, because V. P. C. would be liable to six varieties of transposition, viz. :—

V. P. C.

V. C. P.

P. V. C.

P. C. V.

C. P. V.

C. V. P.

Thus involving a sixfold effort of negative or affirmative memory, to avoid mistake; while the triplicate **S. S. S.** would require but one effort.

After having secured the boundary dates at the top and the bottom of the Table, viz. 2000 before Christ to 555 before Christ, we may next apply ourselves to the principal MARGINAL OR SYNCHRONISTIC (CROSSWISE) DATES.

And first we prominently observe the 1184, exhibiting to us, cross-wise, the two great synchronisms of the *building of the Pyramids* and the *destruction of Troy*; next we have 888 (the three eights), carrying us to the fall of Sardanapalus and the breaking up of the first Assyrian monarchy, coevally with the reputed era of the foundation of Carthage, as well as of the flourishing of Lycurgus, the lawgiver of Sparta.

And we may further note in memory, before closing our first-sight glance at the bolder memorials which rise on the surface of Table I., that *Phœnicia*, the first maritime trading power, and the colonial parent of CARTHAGE, is, at the era of the exode of the Israelites from Egypt, about 1500, sending forth **CADMUS**, the *inventor of alphabetic characters*, to Greece; and at a later period supplying architects to assist in the construction of the Temple, at Jerusalem; and that HOMER, in the column of Asia Minor, is among the Ionians in 944 before Christ: that Sal-

manassar, 721 before Christ, destroys Samaria, annihilating the monarchy of Israel, and carrying away captive *the ten tribes* of Israel into Assyria and Media; and that Nebuchadnezzar, 587, destroying Jerusalem, makes an end of the kingdom of Judah.

Such, then, as I have described them, are the headings, the boundaries, the great marginal dates, and some of the principal first-sight memorials of Table I., all so readily admitting of being committed to memory, in their correlative emplacement, on the first great plate of Ancient Historical Time, that we could speedily almost place the finger upon any one of them the moment we open the Table.

Having now exemplified, as I trust, how readily the eye may compass and retain the leading points of the classified surface of the 1445 years which Table I. comprises, we may turn encouragingly to

Table II.,

which commences, without the intermission of a single year, where Table I. closes; and Table II., although it comprises but 248 years, instead of the formidable extent of 1445 years, which we have traversed in Table I., will perhaps offer subject-matter more narrationally attractive than Table I.; for, excepting in the Hebrew column of Table I., we shall find the matter entitled to our minute attention but very thinly scattered.

Moreover, as already is pointed out in Section I., it is *not until we arrive at the era of Cyrus*, that we gain any *confident footing in the time-reckoning*

affixment of historical events, and get rid of the conflicting contradictions of earlier chronology.

HERODOTUS identified with the age of Pericles the golden period of Greece, 444 before Christ, in commencing his histories from 2000 before Christ, which is 1556 years earlier than his own time, 444, and having little else than perhaps Bardic ballads, and other traditionary evidences, with scanty scraps of national histories, to furnish his materials, he is, we may be quite sure, ascending very high into the misty regions of mingled truth and traditionary fable; and thus he not unfrequently, in the vast stretch of the 1445 years of Table I., runs largely into the marvellous.

From the 555 to the 333, the eye instantly compasses, in the purple and orange, the whole extent of the two hundred and twenty-two years, within which are comprised the influential recollections of Greek and Persian history; for the short compass of 222 years sees alike the *monarchical glory of Persia* and the *republican glory of Greece* arise and pass away! both falling under the sword and sway of Alexander the Great.

And at the moment that *Alexander* rears the second mighty monarchy of antiquity, viz. the *Macedonian*, indicated by the *green colouring*, 333, we behold, by the coevally-appearing *red*, the rise of the *republic of ROME*: so that the *passing away* of republican Greece we perceive to be coincidental with *the rise* of republican Rome. And

this, notwithstanding that, in the earlier part of the Table, we observe that the expulsions of Hippias from Athens and of Tarquin from Rome both happen in the year 510 before Christ.

The reign of Darius I. Hystaspes, 521 to 485, the earliest invader of Greece, has recently received a greatly-increased interest from the inscription on a rock at *Behistún* (signifying "the dwelling of the Gods"), a summer palace of the Persian rulers, lying between Hamadan and Kèrmanshah, which has been furnished to us by the adventurous spirit and high Oriental attainments of Colonel Rawlinson. The inscription, which had never before been deemed capable of being deciphered, is at such an elevation as to be illegible from the ground below, except by the aid of a telescope, and it was only by the utmost ingenuity that any scaffolding could be erected so as to obtain an accurate copy of it. The marble rock on which it is inscribed, and of which I have seen a fragment bearing the arrowed-headed words, "Greatest King of Kings," is so beautifully cut, that it might be supposed to have been engraved with the chisel of a Chantrey, and is of such remarkable hardness of surface, that one might imagine it to have been the cutting of but yesterday, instead of being the cutting of *at least* 2338 years ago. This inscription, which has been given to the public by the usual handsome liberality and literary spirit of the East India Company, having, in its execution, been *personally* superintended by Darius Hystaspes, may be said to

be the earliest piece of *autobiographic* imperial history of which we are in possession. And while, toward the top of Table II., we have thus pleasingly to advert to so remarkable a memento of the reign of *Darius I. Hystaspes*, 521 to 485, we have, toward the close of Table II., at the overspreading of the Greek (orange) column by the Macedonian green colouring, an equally imperishable recollection of the reverence for genius exhibited so extraordinarily, by ALEXANDER; who, amidst his rage against the Thebans and the demolition of their city, 335 before Christ, forgot not to spare the humble habitation of the poet *Pindar* :—

“Perish their city, down with ev’ry tower,
But spare, oh spare the Muse’s sacred bower!”

This is 155 years after the 490 in which Pindar flourished, or exactly 100 years after the reputed date of his death, 435 before Christ.

The letter-press, under the Macedonian *green* colouring, will further show us the same Alexander who, in the year 335 before Christ, is demolishing Thebes and sparing the house of *Pindar*, to be, in the year 327, encountering PORUS in the Punjab and erecting *his altars* on the *Hyphasis* (or Sutlej).

He dies, in Babylon, conveniently for chronological memory, 323, exactly ten years after his triumph at Issus, 333 before Christ.

Equally identified is *Darius I. Hystaspes*, with the *Indian Punjab*, he having, in 508 before

Christ, effected considerable conquests to the *Hypphasis* in the same north-western (or Punjab) districts of India, which, in 327, at a distance in time of 181 years, were again penetrated by *Alexander*.

Thus Table II. revives the recollection of the two memorable invasions by the *Darius I.* Hystaspes, of the Persian, or purple, column, and the *Alexander* of the Macedonian, or green, column, of that very Five-River (or *Sutlej*!) region of India which has so recently, and resplendently, shed new lustre on the British arms.

The "*Five-River*," or "*Punjab*," region is not unfrequently called the Punjab *Basin*, or *Cup*; the five rivers forming the cup or basin; and the river *Indus*, into which the five rivers jointly fall, the *stalk* or handle to the five-ribbed River-Cup.

We perceive that so intimately are interwoven the histories of Greece and Persia, in Table II., that if we read the one, we largely read, at the same time, the other. The first (or Marathon) invasion of Greece by the generals of *Darius I. Hystaspes*, was in 490 before Christ; and ten years later, 480, witnessed the still more celebrated invasion of XERXES the Great, in person. Thus, from the battle of Marathon, 490, to the battle of Plateæ, 479, followed by the final evacuation of Greece by the Persians, the Persian invasions of Greece occupied eleven years. To the great recollections of those eleven years the eye will be naturally attracted, as well as to the *Edict of Cyrus*, 536, for the re-

lease of the Jews from their Babylonian captivity of 70 years, seen in the subject column of Palestine, under the purple colouring; and finally, to the compilation of the *Books of the Old Testament*, 468, by Ezra, the restorer, in 458, of the Mosaic religion.

The central cross-line which, from the marginal 444, intersects Table II., I need hardly repeat, gives us the golden era of Greece, the age of Pericles.

And these central three fours, 444, of Table II., we shall perceive, in aid of technical memory, are exactly the one-half of the 888, which, centrally, run across Table I.

Table II., in the remarkable items of recollection that it embraces, may perhaps exemplify the interest that may be awakened in the mind by the mere glancing over the tabular leaves of Historical Time, independently of the advantage of having such Tables, during the more amplified reading of history, constantly at hand for *synoptical* reference, and for the connecting of one nation's history with another.

Before quitting Table II., I may observe that, had the Macedonian Empire held together in its integrity, it is not improbable that the same character of warlike conflict might have taken place between the Macedonian monarchy and republican Rome as had previously been witnessed between the Persian successors of Cyrus and republican Greece.

But on turning to Table III., in the twelve

TABLES I. TO IV.

columns *beneath* the widely-stretching *green* line, which has been brought over from Table II. to exhibit the extent of Alexander's empire when entire, we behold the twelve shreds of sovereignty into which Alexander's robe of empire has speedily been rent. So that the Romans have not, like the Greeks, to contend against a monarchy united, but, most conveniently for their piecemeal conquests, against a monarchy dissevered into twelve separate columns of empire.

The gradually-outspreading *red* of Table III. brings to our view, in the changing destiny of nations, this new feature, viz. that no longer the *monarchical* rulers of the earth, but the *republicans* it is who now carry aggressive warfare and conquest into the columns of all other sovereign States.

But the puny scale of the Roman warriorhood, antecedently to Table III., as exhibited in their "village fights" of Corioli and others, as their own poets sarcastically call them, will be sufficiently evinced by the crosswise line of Table III., chronologically marked by the 222, the year in which, and not until which, the Romans have at last subjugated the whole of *Upper* Italy as well as the previously-conquered Lower Italy, 266. They have thus, according to their own date of their city, 754, been 532 years, or above half a millennium, in subduing that little boot-formed country, the conquest of which, in our day, costs a detached republican army of France but a single battle or a

TABLES I. TO IV.

short campaign. It is not until 222 (all twos) the Romans have subjected Upper Italy; and it is not until after the fall of Syracuse and the death of Archimedes, 212 (two twos), that in 210 before Christ the column of Sicily, as their *first* EXTERNAL conquest, is absorbed, as indicated by the over-spreading red, into a *province* of the republican rule of *Rome*. And it is not until the overthrow of the great HANNIBAL at Zama, 202, that Rome could prospectively aspire to become mistress of the world.

Mark the mnemonical tenability of the above three great eras in developing the destinies of Rome:—

In the first of them we have the (three twos)	222
In the second	212
And in the third	202

Thus the whole of the figures of the first date are *twos*, so also the *outside* figures of the other two dates are *twos*, with the *central* figure decimally descending first from 2 to 1, and next from 1 to 0 (nothing).

And looking downwards in the column of Rome, in Table III., we shall find further technical aids in the 88 (two eights) before Christ, indicating the era of the first Mithridatic war, equally with the great *civil war* of **MARIUS** and **SYLLA**; also the two fours, 44, exactly the half of the 88, giving us in the *Ides of March*, that foul and ineffaceable blot on the memory of Rome, the deliberate ASSASSINA-

TION of JULIUS CÆSAR in the public Senate, just eleven years later than his first invasion of Britain, in the year 55 (two fives) before Christ, or just ten years later than his second and latest invasion of our isle, in 54 before Christ.

We may, besides, technically and *decimally*, strengthen the following recollections thus, viz.—

		Before Christ.
1st. That <i>Catiline's Conspiracy</i> , in <i>Cicero's Consul-</i>		
<i>ship</i> , was in	63	
2nd. The slaughter of <i>Crassus</i> and the Roman legions		
by the Parthians in	53	
3rd. That <i>Cicero</i> was put to death the year following		
the assassination of Julius Cæsar, 44, viz. in .	43	

So that, while *Demosthenes*, the greatest orator of Greece, poisons himself (in 322) the *year after the death of Alexander*; *Cicero*, the greatest orator of Rome, is put to death (in 43) the *year after the assassination of Cæsar*.

Casting a further range of the eye over Table III., we remark, in the year 183, alike the death, in Bithynia, of HANNIBAL, the greatest of the Carthaginian warriors, and the most dreaded foe of the Romans; and of *Philopæmen*, “the last! of the Greeks.”

The marginal crosswise line from 146 carries us, in the selfsame year, to the *destruction of* CARTHAGE and of CORINTH, involving the extinction of the liberties alike of republican Carthage and of republican Greece. The columns of *Egypt* and of *Syria* constitute the two most consequential sovereignties that arise out of the wreck of the Macedonian Empire of Alexander. Near the top

of the column of *Egypt* we view, under the *Ptolemies*, the golden era, 323 to 221, of the ALEXANDRIAN LEARNING AND COMMERCE; and the column closes in the self-immolation of **CLEOPATRA**, last of the Lagides, 30 *before Christ*. The column of Palestine presents us with the *Septuagint* translation of the Old Testament into Greek, under Ptolemæus Lagi; and the later breaking away of the column of Palestine, by the transfer of the Jewish allegiance to Syria, as indicated by the change from the *dotted* line of dependency to the *rule* line of separation between Egypt and Palestine.

In Table I. ROME, underlined by the crimson colouring, first shows itself as a speck, 754 (deceivably small as the African "Ox-Eye" indicator of a storm); in Table II., 333, we behold the dawning rise of that Roman crimson which, in Table III., spreads into an all-devastating hurricane of war, prostrating into subjection, as indicated by the, sooner or later, over-running red, all the sovereign columns of this sheet, save Parthia, which maintains a real, and Palestine, which is allowed a sufferance, independency.

In tracing out with the eye the first sight phenomena of the three earliest great leaves of time, we have in every successive sheet witnessed a universal change of warrior dominion.

In our two earliest Tables the (historically-so-called) *world*, in its two successive subjugations, had bent beneath the sway of the single-handed and chivalric monarchs of Persia and Macedonia; but,

in Table III., the world, in succumbing a third time to universal dominion, does not, as we have already noted, crouch beneath a single arm, but is riveted in chains by a *republican* people; and here we behold, for our instruction, that a *democratic* State is no less prone to, no less fiercely bent upon, the enslavement of mankind than a single-headed despotism.

But though the Romans, as republicans, had wrenched the sovereignty of nearly all the States of Table III. into their own hands, they had also, at the close of the same Table III., finally forfeited their own freedom; the imperial purple having been assumed over them in the year 30 *before Christ*. And thus the terminational boundary line of Table III., bringing us to the third great era of universal change in the political destinies of man, brings us also to the *close of the republican* and the *commencement of the monarchical* rule of Rome.

After the achieved Roman subjugation of the world at the close of Table III., and the coeval organic change in the form of Roman government, the world sinks, internally and externally, into that lull of quietude amidst which, in Table IV. and under the rule of Cæsar Octavian, the first of the *imperial Cæsars* (30 *before* to 14 *after Christ*), it is that the **BIRTH OF CHRIST** takes place. And from this great era we cease to number chronologically *downwards*, or by diminishing years, and we begin to number upwards.

In Table III., harvesting with her warrior

sickle, one after another, fourteen out of the sixteen smaller columns, which that Table exhibits, ROME CONQUERS THE WORLD; in Table IV., presenting in its formation the opposite extreme of the small-columned Table III., in one broad and majestic column, down to 395, ROME RULES THE WORLD, and the undisputed Roman paramountship canopies with the Roman red the historical surface of 506 years. But these are divided by the black cross-line, which, in the year 180 after Christ, intersecting this Table, divides, with Gibbon, the flourishing from the

DECLINING PERIOD

of the Roman monarchy—the FLOURISHING, from 30 before to 180 after Christ, occupying 210 years; and the DECLINING, from 180 to 476 after Christ, occupying 296 years.

The next great feature of Table IV., downwards, is the separation of the Roman monarchy into *two distinct*, Eastern and Western, *empires*, under the two equally-beloved sons of Theodosius I., namely, Honorius and Arcadius, in the year 395, being twenty years later than the GREAT MIGRATION OF NATIONS, 375.

In adverting to our own Historic Memorials, which first assume a tangible form in Table IV., we perceive that after the second *invasion*, 54 *before* Christ, of JULIUS CÆSAR, who was the first with sword and pen (which in him were so wonderfully combined) to leave an historical imprint on our shores the Romans never deemed it worth their while

again to cross the narrow channel which separates the continent of Europe from the island of Britain, until the Emperor **CLAUDIUS** sent Plautius to commence, in 43 *after* Christ, that *conquest of Britain* which was completed by Julius Agricola, 84 *after* Christ; thus leaving an interval from **JULIUS CÆSAR'S** second invasion, 54 *before* Christ, to the commencement of the *conquest of Britain*, by Claudius, 43 *after* Christ, of no less than *ninety-seven years*; and the time that the conquest occupied, namely, from 43 to 84, being *forty-one years*.

Among the incidents and memorials connected with the subjection and occupation of Britain by the Romans, may be interestingly noted, the capture and conveyance to Rome of the brave **CARACTACUS**, by Ostorius Scapula, in 51 *after* Christ; and the cruel outrages inflicted by Suetonius Paulinus, in the tyrant Nero's reign, on **BOADICEA**, the earliest recorded British queen, in 61. The building of the three several Roman walls across Britain; 1st, the Emperor **ADRIAN'S WALL**, 121; 2ndly, the Emperor **ANTONINUS'S WALL**, 140; and 3rdly, the Emperor Septimus **SEVERUS'S WALL**, 211. The arrival in Britain of **JULIUS AGRICOLA**, accompanied by his son-in-law *Tacitus* the historian, was in 78, being thus but one year before the terrific

ERUPTION OF MOUNT VESUVIUS, under Titus, in 79, which buried Herculaneum and Pompeii, and destroyed Pliny the Elder; Julius Agricola commencing his career in Britain under **VESPASIAN** (in whose reign the **COLISEUM** was

begun), *one of the best* of the emperors, and completing his conquest to the Caledonian mountains, 84, under *Domitian* (the last of Suetonius's twelve Cæsars), *one of the worst* of the Roman rulers.

The emperors who have personal identity with Britain are—*Vespasian* (then second in command to Plautius, but afterwards emperor), who, amongst the earliest conquests of the Romans, subjects *Vectis*, Isle of Wight; **CLAUDIUS** himself, who, bringing reinforcements, lands for a few months, and is present at the taking of Camalodunum (now Maldon); **ADRIAN**; **SEPTIMUS SEVERUS**, who dies at Eboracum (or York) in 211, the same year as the date of his wall; **Carausius**, murdered at Eboracum, 293; **CONSTANTIUS Chlorus**, who dies at Eboracum, 306, the father of **CONSTANTINE THE GREAT**, who commences his imperial career in Britain 306; Constantine the Great becomes *sole* emperor 323 *after* Christ, being exactly 646 years after the death of Alexander the Great, 323 *before* Christ. The Emperor Constans, son of Constantine the Great, we find to be in Britain, 343. Finally, Maximus, in 383, and a Constantine in 408, each usurp the imperial purple in Britain. The usurping Constantine, crossing into Gaul about 408, is overthrown by Honorius, 411, from which period the Romans never return to the island of Britain.

A most interesting memorial of Boadicea's reign I saw at Oxford, through the kindness of P. B. Duncan, Esq., M.A., keeper of the *Ashmolean*

TABLES I. TO IV.

Museum, viz. a *gold* or *electrum* (*i. e.* an argenti-ferous gold ore) *coin* of this earliest British queen's reign, which, neither in its metallic purity and beauty, nor in its inscriptional data, appears to have suffered the slightest damage by the lapse of at least 1788 years, dating even from the latest year of Boadicea's rule, 61 (to 1849). It is of a slightly convex, or dish-shaped form, bearing on the concave side a rudely-executed horse, with a well-formed chariot wheel, and various rings, as well as small crosses, or stars, and balls, indicative, most probably, of the value of the coin; and on the convex side the word ODVOC, thus wanting the *initial* B; while, singularly enough, the only other extant coin of Boadicea's day, which is preserved in the British Museum, bears only BODVO, thus wanting the *terminational* C to complete the BODVOC; there not being sufficient space on the surface of either coin to admit the entire name. The Oxford coin was found at Stanwick, a few miles from Oxford, in 1849 [The year of the *one thousand years'* commemoration, at Wantage, of *Alfred's birth*,] by workmen inclosing a common field, amidst the gravel that was carted away in the formation of an inclosure watercourse*.

An evidence like this would seem to afford reasonable ground for believing that the ancient Britons were at least some stages in advance to-

* Of this coin I have given a facsimile in the commencement of this work.

wards civilization of the islanders of the Pacific, and the aborigines of North America, of the present day.

Indeed, the use of *war-chariots*, never heard of in existing ultra-savage life, appears to have been as familiar to the earliest recorded inhabitants of Britain as to the Pharaohs of Egypt, the Cyruses of Persia, and the Alexanders of Macedonia, in the earliest periods of ancient time.

Very many years ago I well remember to have had shown to me, by the late Rev. Mr. Stillingfleet, of Hotham, near Beverley, an ancient British chariot wheel, in the most perfect possible preservation, both in its metallic tire and its wooden nave and spokes, which had, shortly before I saw it, been dug up from one of the ancient British tumuli, or Barrows, on the Yorkshire wolds, near Market Weighton, in the East Riding of the county.

Two of these wheels, placed upright upon their edge, widely apart at the bottom, were crossed supportingly against each other at the top; and canopied beneath them lay the skeleton (or perhaps the sword, the spear, and buckler) of the fallen warrior chief. The large tumuli contain the ashes of the many, the smaller ones those of the chieftains alone.

These chariot wheels, with the sharp scythes attached to them, being *human* REAPING MACHINES, may, not unlikely, have furnished the idea to modern inventors of the CORN *reaping* machines.

Two of the Roman walls across Britain were

erected before the decline of the Roman Empire, from 180; viz. Adrian's, in 121, and Antoninus's, 140; Severus's, the strongest of all, was erected during the decline, in 211.

The total period of the Roman supremacy in the island, as indicated by the dependent *dotted* line, instead of the *disjunctive rule* line, and by the covering of the red colour, extends from 43 to 411 after Christ, giving a total period of 368 years.

The withdrawal of the authority of Rome, in 411, is exactly 200 years later than the building of the last of the three walls across Britain, viz. Severus's, in 211.

The short column of the Jews, in Table IV., radiant with

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST,

is darkened, 33 after the birth of Christ, by the

CRUCIFIXION*.

Judæa is finally subdued, 73, and totally desolated by the Romans, 135; the Jews, thenceforth wanderers, ceasing, to the present time, to constitute a State.

Amongst the latest memorials of interest connected with the expiring column of the Jews, will not fail to be recollected the capture of JOSEPHUS, the Jewish historian, during the campaigns of Ves-

* The cruel *death of the cross* was not *especially* used in the case of our Saviour, but was then, as it still is, a common mode of execution in the East. *The cross*, with many Eastern nations, is what *the gallows* used to be with us.

pasian and his son TITUS, in Palestine, 67-68, and the *destruction of Jerusalem* by TITUS, in the year 70 after Christ, being but eight years before Julius Agricola was sent, in 78, by Vespasian, to complete the conquest of Britain. Moses was the earliest, and Josephus may be regarded as the latest, historian of the Jews.

We have already remarked that, dating from the foundation of Rome, 754, the Romans were occupied to 222, *i. e.* during *five hundred and thirty-two* years, in subjecting all Italy; and that, before they had attained to universal sovereignty, 30 before Christ, *seven hundred and twenty-four* years had passed away; remarkably contrasting with the so rapidly acquired universal sovereignties of Cyrus and Alexander. But if the Roman universal sovereignty was so much slower in acquisition than the Persian and Macedonian, so, as will be seen by the comparative continuation of the colourings in purple, green, and red, was the Roman universality of correspondingly longer duration than either of the other two.

To recapitulate: the great outline formations of the four Tables of ancient time stand thus, viz.—

Table I. commences with eight columns, at the period of 2000 before Christ; and closes with the purple-coloured empire of Cyrus, 555 before Christ, coevally with the commencing greatness of the Greeks, in orange colouring.

Table II. commences, 555, with seven columns, among which, most memorably, are seen the *purple* Persian monarchy and the *orange-*

coloured Greek republics; and it closes with the Macedonian *green*-coloured monarchy of Alexander the Great, and the rising *red*-coloured Roman republic, 333—307.

Table III. commences with the Macedonian green, oversteaking the several sovereign States into which Alexander's monarchy becomes dissevered; and centrally exhibits the gradually outspreading Roman red; and it closes with the universal sovereignty of the Romans, as indicated by the red colour overflowing and terminating all the sovereign columns, except two, as they have severally, by the year 30 before Christ, become merged, as mere provinces, into the vast Roman rule.

Finally,

Table IV., commencing with 30 before, and ending 476 after Christ, exhibits, by its one broad column and its one overspreading colouring, that monopoly of rule which is exercised by the imperial Cæsars during 506 years.

And if I have succeeded in making myself understood, it will, I trust, by this time have become fully apparent to the reader that, by thus DIVIDING, separately COLOURING, and MNEMONICALLY marking the most tenable chronological eras of empire, we have secured to ourselves a **TRIPLICATE** POWER OF MEMORY for aiding us in the retention of the great outline features or formations of ancient time, viz.:—

1st. By the changing COLUMNAR STRUCTURE, or

the PECULIARITIES of linear FORM in every consecutive sheet;

2ndly. By the changing adaptations of various COLOURING, correspondingly to every change of empire;

And 3rdly. By the MNEMONICAL appliance of peculiarly tenable dates deeply to affix great eras of recollection.

And bad, indeed, must be the memory that cannot, under this conjunctive THREEFOLD AIDANCY, rapidly and for ever secure the whole consecutive suite of the great eras of change thus vividly depicted on the four tabular regions of ancient historical time.

Such portions of the four Tables which we have ranged over as might advisedly be committed to memory, viz. 1, the large letter table headings; 2, the NATIONAL column headings; 3, the *commencing* and *terminational* dates and eras; 4, some of the most consequential marginal dates, and what such dates apply to; 5, the national *colourings*; and 6, the prominent mnemonical aidancy of technical numbers, as well as lists of the Persian monarchs and the Roman emperors, together with a very limited number of interrogatory exercises, I propose, for the convenience of class use, to publish separately, as "The Student's Theory and Thrift Book of Combinative and Corroborative Historic Memory."

Language, whether applied orally or in written composition, as the rhetoric of the tongue or of the pen, being the sole vehicle for embodying and

transfusing thought—being the sole carrier or conducting medium for dispersing knowledge, and as having ever acted as a potent lever in the affairs of men, is so peculiarly deserving of the early attention of the inquirer into the history of mankind, that the HISTORY OF LITERATURE, jointly with general history, ought never to be lost sight of.

AUXILIARILY, therefore, to the chronological Tables of ancient history will be found, chronologically arranged, in Table XVI., LITERATURE (A),

ALL THE AUTHORS OF ANTIQUITY, in their several national columns. Literary history is given in a *separate* series of Tables; for it is part of our *ocular* system first to secure, as the primary bases of chronological classification, the NATURALLY *formed* GRAND ERAS in every variety of historical time of which we may treat. And universal literary history not admitting of the *same* grand divisions as universal political or national history, required to be separately arranged. We have, however, conjoined a *telegraphing* side column of leading historical events, by means of which we may connectingly at once refer from the Tables of history to the writers of any period of great political interest, as, for instance, to ascertain

Who were the writers of Cyrus's day at the era of the 555?

Who in the age of Pericles, the golden era of Greece, about 444 before Christ?

Or who in Alexander's day, at the period of the 333?

For we have only to look synchronically, cross-wise, from any one of those great historical dates in the side column of "Important Political Events," in Table XVI., to gain a view in the different national literary columns (coloured in correspondence with the national colourings of the historical Tables) of all the contemporary authors of different nations.

Or, *vice versâ*, we can by the same great dates refer *from* the Tables of authors to the Tables of history, to remind ourselves, preparatively to the reading of any author, of all the recollections of political history connected with the period in which such author flourishes.

And if we never relaxed in the reading (whether in translation or in the original) of any author, without first surveying his tabular position on the *literary* surface of nations, as well as on the *historical* surface of his day, we should gain the same advantage that we, in the reading of geography, obtain by a previous survey, on a geographical map, of the geographical position of the region or city that we are about to read of.

If geographical maps have relieved us from a chaos of confusion as to the correlative distributions of place, so will chrono-historical and biographical charts equally relieve us from confusion as to the correlative distributions of time; that form of mapped presentment which gives perspicuity to the *one* EYE OF HISTORY, viz. **GEOGRAPHY**, being equally, as I am now endeavouring to show, adaptable to the *other* EYE OF HISTORY, viz. **CHRONOLOGY**.

The four Tables of literature are, like the Tables of universal history, of columnar, comparative, synchronistic, and separately-national structure; and the colourings of the *literary* national columns correspond, as already remarked, with the colourings that are applied to the several historical columns in the first series of Tables. The graduated varieties of type will of course be understood to indicate comparative grades of genius, excellence, or celebrity in the authors.

By applying the same principles of generalized or large-leaved structure to the literary, as to the general historical series of Tables, we are enabled to show what are the general *great eras of change* in literary time, as they come in succession; and to collect at a synchronical glance [in Table XVI., Literature (A), for example] not only when the nationally various chief writers of antiquity flourished, correlatively to each other, but also what comparative advantages one nation possessed over another as to anterior models of literary composition.

For instance, accustomed at school to begin with Latin authors, we naturally acquire a pre-impression that the Latin authors must be the earliest writers of antiquity (else why begin with them first?); and although we might be orally *told* to-day that the Greek literature was of earlier date than the Roman, we might, by to-morrow, although recollecting that one literature was developed long before the other, still fall into doubt as to *which* of the two was the older, viz. the Greek or the Latin?

But if we once survey, above the red colouring of the Roman column of Table XVI., that immense blank which so eloquently tells of the absence of even the homeliest Roman literature, down to 300 before Christ, we shall never afterwards ask ourselves whether the Roman Horace and Virgil, or the Greek Euripides and Sophocles flourished the first? for we shall instantly perceive that nearly *half a millennium* intervenes between the *golden era of the Grecian* and the *meridian glory of the Roman literature*; the *age of Pericles* being identified with the 444 before Christ, and the *Augustan age* not until 30 before to 14 after Christ. Indeed, not until thirty-three years after the era of Alexander, 333, do we see *any author whatever* in the Roman column; C. Fabius Pictor, the first recorded author, not appearing until 300 *before Christ*; and not until CICERO, 106 to 43, do we behold any LARGE CAPITAL name among the Romans.

In looking connectingly at the history and the coeval literature of the two great republican powers of antiquity, we are struck by observing that they each attain to their *twofold political and literary* glory in the selfsame eras of time; so that *one* date in each case serves the *double* purpose of alike affixing the separate data of the climax of *national literature* and of *national empire*; the Greeks having alike attained to their highest pitch of political influence and their meridian era of literary fame in the age of Pericles, 444; and the

Romans having equally attained to their highest ascent of power and their meridional celebrity in literature in the age of Augustus, 30 before to 14 after Christ.

Modern history will, too (alike in monarchical Arabia and republican Italy), furnish us with further exemplifications of the coeval rise and fall of national literature with the rise and fall of national power, thus pleasingly associating, as identical in time and in memory, the meridians of the mind with the meridians of empire; great developments of successful national energy seeming to call forth corresponding efforts of national genius.

We may further remark, in contemplating Table XVI., how much more durable is the empire of the mind than even the mightiest political arm of power. The political grandeur, nay the very national existence, alike of Greece and the infinitely greater Rome, have long since passed away; but to their literary empire mankind, in Europe, continue to do homage to the present day.

In looking from the column of historical events, in Table XVI., crosswise from CYRUS, 555, we observe ÆSOP, PYTHAGORAS, and ANACREON among his cotemporaries; preceded by SOLON, 594, and THALES, who predicts the total solar eclipse of 585, two of the SEVEN WISE MEN of Greece. Crosswise from PERICLES, 444, we behold SOPHOCLES, HERODOTUS, EURIPIDES, THUCYDIDES, ARISTOPHANES, and HIPPOCRATES, with other memorable names; while on the same alignment

with ALEXANDER, 333, we observe DEMOSTHENES, ARISTOTLE, and *Diogenes* the Cynic (and his tub); together with ARISTOBULUS and PTOLEMÆUS LAGI, living historians of Alexander's day. Diogenes, too, we may recollect, died in the self-same year with Alexander, viz. 323; and both (the Philippic) DEMOSTHENES and the philosophic ARISTOTLE die the following year, viz. 322. And in the interim *between* Pericles, 444, and Alexander, 333, we have SOCRATES, who perishes 399, XENOPHON, and PLATO.

Question.—To what war, and what Table, does the solar eclipse of 585 refer?

Answer.—To a war between *Cyaxares*, King of Media, and *Alyattes*, King of Lydia, the father of CROESUS, in the lower part of the columns of Media and Asia Minor, Table I. *Thales* subsequently constructs the bridge on which CROESUS crosses the Halys, previously to his overthrow by CYRUS, 548.

Question.—What Roman authors flourished during the reign of *Trajan* (98 to 117), styled the “best” of the Roman emperors?

Answer.—*Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, historians, and Pliny the Younger, who wrote the *Panegyric on the Emperor Trajan*, in ten books.

Question.—Does any monument rise in memory on the mention of *Trajan*?

Answer.—Yes; *Trajan's Pillar*, at Rome. So that the *Pillar* and the *Panegyric* rise up in memory together.

Having thus arrived at the termination of ancient

history (at the close of Table IV.) in arriving at the final dissolution of the western half of the Roman rule, 476 after Christ; and having shown how the literary history may conveniently be combined with the more general history of nations, we next proceed, in Table V., to

MODERN HISTORY,

for where the Old World of history breaks up, the New World of history begins.

At the close of Tables I. and II., we beheld empire sweeping away empire; at the close of Table III. we arrived at a new variety of universal sovereignty, the world having been then, for the first and (hitherto) only time, subjugated by a republican people.

But toward the terminational confines of Table IV., bringing us to the fourth great era of changing empire, we have from about 375 and 395, when fast approaching, and, in 476, when arriving at the close of ancient history, so uniquely astounding an era of change in the features of universal history, presented to us in our

HISTORICAL TRANSITION,

OUT OF ANCIENT INTO MODERN TIME, that we naturally pause to contemplate it.

The Romans, who had held a chief station amidst the columns of nations in Table III., and who, in Table IV., had for so many centuries exercised undisputed sovereignty over the rest of mankind; again, those Romans, who for so many ages had occupied themselves in the subjection of barbarian

nations, were now, in their turn, at the close of Table IV., to be conquered by barbarians, and to fall back themselves into barbarism.

We are, in our day, so accustomed to think of NATIONS only, as of sedentary character, that the GREAT MIGRATORY movements of 375 are to us of doubly extraordinary aspect.

This was not one great people overcoming another for some specific object of ambition, or one great nation conquering smaller States one after another; but vast migratory concourses of innumerable hordes, tribes, or nations, living under tents, and all huddling and crushing onwards together, not like modern armies, but with their wives and their children, their flocks and their herds, their goods and their chattels, under various rude leaders, exercising over them some loosely-acknowledged federative sway; and each federation impelling forward another; for instance, the Huns driving onwards the Alani, the Alani dislodging the Ostro-Goths and Vandals, and these again pushing forward the Visi-Goths; (the first impulse being given, as seen in Table IV., by the HUNS, on their being driven out of Mogul-Tartary *by the Chinese*, 374): all seeking to gain more room in new territory; and all ultimately directing, although without any apparent concert, the overflowing waters of warrior population, in various channels, to that widely-extended ROMAN FRONTIER, through which they soon forcibly burst at various points. Those of the migratory masses who first broke through the Roman barrier,

would, by the continuously-accumulating tide of nations behind them, be forced precipitately into the midst of the hostile population they came to dispossess, and even over and beyond the territory they designed to hold as well as conquer. And thus Spain was obliged to disgorge into Africa some of the warrior multitudes forced into her bosom; and *Britain*, in this mighty spring tide, this volcanic heaving of migration, felt the waves of Saxon population, forcibly propelled from their own shores, rushing with increased violence upon her insular borders. In short, every corner of Western Europe must, either directly or indirectly, have sensibly felt the shock of that GREAT MIGRATION OF NATIONS which so totally re-undulated and fragmented the whole political surface of Europe.

Out of the midst of such an armed chaos, such a bed of anarchy, there must have been trampling down of friends as well as foes, and extermination of a large portion of the population previously ruled by the Romans; and hundreds of years of tribal broils and buffetings, before mankind in Europe could settle down into anything approaching to tranquillity again. But the doings in detail of such tempestuously-chaotic days it would be as hopeless as un instructive for us to attempt to follow; and if there did even exist the possibility of our retracing them, they, like the tribal warfare of the aborigines in America and Africa of the present day, would, after all, as the great Milton expresses it, but furnish an endless narration of the "Combats of Kites and Crows."

It is, however, consolatory to us to know that, even out of such a chaos as this, man could lift himself up, by his own strength and endurance, into civilization again, as manfully as in our first section of this work we saw that he could raise himself triumphantly out of his primary lair of barbarity. For here we behold the formative *origin* of the existing, and now so highly cultured, *modern nations of Western Europe*.

The appellations of "*Goths*," "*Franks*," "*Vandals*," and otherwise, appear to have been generic rather than specific, and comprehending an indefinite number of loosely-connected tribes or clans, just as the general name of "*Britons*" was applied to the numerous small clans, tribes, or nations, either partly or wholly independent of each other, who occupied Britain at the time of the Roman invasions.

Gradually, however, amalgamating into the appearance of monarchies, we find recorded (at the close of Table IV., and in Table V.), a KINGDOM OF THE VISI-GOTHS (in Southern France) with Toulouse as their capital, 416; a KINGDOM OF THE VANDALS (in Africa) with Carthage as their capital, 429; a *kingdom of the Franks* (in Belgic Gaul), 429; and a KINGDOM OF THE OSTRO-GOTHS (in Italy), 489-93.

Of the **ORIGIN** of those great branch appellations among the Germanic migrators (most probably first applied to them by stranger-nations, as most other national designations ever have been), there have, of course, been many speculations, but probably

TABLE V.

none of them accepted as finally satisfactory solutions.

The **FRANKS** are said to have obtained their name from being all *free* men; and, although it is difficult to know how *they* could be upon a different footing of freedom to their rude and barbarous neighbours, they *might* nationally, in some form or other, have exhibited a more fierce and fiery impatience of control than other tribal confederative unions.

The **GOTHS** are said, and probably upon good grounds, to have derived their designation from the natural goodness or friendliness of their disposition. "Got," or "Gott," (whence our word God!) with the silent *h* signifying evidently *good*: and the word "*Got-hen*" (or "*Gothen*," Goths), with the silent *h*, like the modern "*gut-en*," or the Low-German "*gouden*," or "*gouten*," being also equivalent to good; and as applied in the *plural* to a nation, would signify "*the good*."

The **VANDALS**, also of Germanic origin with the Franks and the Goths, might equally with them have a Germanic appellation.

Vandal, written as here exhibited, would seem to show us nothing of lingual Germanic derivation. But the word "*Wandeln*" signifies to "wander," and the Germans as invariably pronounce the *w* like our *v*, as do those good natives of the City of London, who, adhering to the pronunciation of their Saxon progenitors, change Wife, West-Wickham, and Windy, into Vife, Vest-Vickham, and Vindy.

TABLE V.

And thus the pronunciation of the verb "*Wandeln*," or "*Vandeln*," to *wander*, brings us so closely to the substantive *Vandal*, that we seem to see our way to a Saxonie derivation.

The *Vandals* might, not improbably, be more restlessly disposed to *wander* than other neighbouring tribes; and in this respect they certainly did not belie their name, since they *wandered* the furthest of any of the great migratory nations, having founded a kingdom in *Northern Africa*, 429, extending from the Atlantic to the Red Sea.

I am strengthened in the hypothesis of this "*wandering*" derivation by the fact that the Chinese designated the restless Tatar, or "*Tha-tha*" tribes, against whom they built their *wall* defences, as the "*Hing-kuo*," signifying the "*ERRATIC nations*;" indeed the Chinese word "*Tha-tha*," from its hatefulness to the Tatars or Turks themselves, would seem, in its worst acceptation, to have a meaning equivalent to the term *vagrant* or vagabond with us.

In further illustration, we may remind ourselves that the epithet of "*Scots*," supposed to be derived from the Gaelic term "*Scuit*," or "*Scaoit*," signifies a "*wandering horde*;" and of similar etymological derivation, most probably, is also the generic name of "*Scythians*," so famous in the annals of remoter ages.

We may therefore, perhaps, upon the whole, assume or admit, without danger of being very far wrong,

That the Goths, *Gothen* or *Guten* people, exhi-

TABLE V.

bited more prominently than their neighbours a friendliness or humane kindliness of disposition ;

The *Franks*, the most intemperate and vehement aversion to every description of control ; and

The *Vandals*, or *wanderers*, the most restless inclination to be perpetually locomotive.

I throw out these observations with a view of eliciting a little thought as to the origin of national denominations while we proceed along the beaten track of universal history. In fact, from the so-often widely contradictory opinions of eminent antiquaries, national derivatives, we may conclude, are *mostly* matter of *conjectural* speculation.

In taking our preliminary survey of the first tabulated sheet of modern time, exhibiting, in 476 after Christ, the form into which, after the first effervescence of general change, from 375 to 476, Europe is beginning to settle down, we shall naturally be struck by the many-coloured and troublous surface of Table V., as contrasted in its aspect with the smooth one-coloured, and seemingly finally settled, presentment of Table IV. In the twelve separate columns at the top of Table V., we begin a totally new political organization of the whole surface of Western Europe, neither so barbarous as the Romans had found the world beyond the Alps, nor so instructed as the Romans left it ; and now begins the real parentage from which nearly all the still existing nations or states of modern Europe originate.

Our earliest care of memory, on breaking ground

TABLE V.

in modern time, is to observe that, out of the wreck of ancient time, at the close of Table IV., into the historical re-structure of modern time, in Table V., but *two* sovereign States have an intertexture of both ancient and modern historical existence, or an onward survivorship out of ancient into modern time; these two States being the *Eastern* half of the Roman rule, which does not break up with the Western sister-half, and the *Parthian*, or the *New-Persian* monarchy; and both these, by way of distinction from the rest, have, in Table V., their respective national colourings of crimson and brown pink carried to the *TOP of their column headings*. All the rest of the columns are occupied in their infantine efforts to constitute themselves into States. Such of them as are over-streaked, in their columnar headings, with the widely-stretched *Roman red*, namely, *Germany, France, Italy, Venice, the Pyrenean Peninsula, and Britain*, are thus depicted as having emanated from beneath the previous sway of the now-broken-up rule of the Western Empire of *Rome*.

Among the nations that first boldly meet our view on the outspread canvas of the first compartment of modern history, we perceive westward, to the left hand, the broad *green* column of the **FRANKISH MONARCHY**, and on the opposite side of the sheet, eastward, to the right hand, the still more imposing purple column of the **ARABIAN KHALIFAT**.

So that, among the first-sight memorials of Table V., we have to affix in memory that two ancient

TABLE V.

States alone survive into modern time, viz. the East Roman and the Parthian, they having thus a *two-fold* existence in ancient as well as in modern time; and that but two monarchies of conspicuous magnitude strike the eye in the first great region of modern history, viz. the *Saracenic* and the *Frankish*.

The Frankish monarchy founded by **C**lovis I., 486, arrives at its meridian under **C**HARLEMAGNE (768 to 814); and is broken up on the deposition of **C**harles the Gross, at the close of Table V., in 888. Thus the Frankish monarchy furnishes us, besides the 888, with the little additional mnemonical aidancy of the three **C**'s, to recollect **C**lovis as the founder, **C**HARLEMAGNE as the meridian maker, and **C**harles the Gross as the final ruler of the Frankish monarchy; lasting from Clovis, 486, to Charles the Gross, 888, 402 years.

And, in like manner, the contemporaneous monarchy of the Arabs, founded by MUHAMMAD, 622, era of the HEJIRA, attains to its meridian splendour under the so celebrated Harún-ur-Raschíd, 786 to 808, the perpetual hero of the 1001 Nights' Entertainments, and of all the wild songs of the Arabian Desert to this day. *He*, too, somewhat remarkably, is *the contemporary of Charlemagne*, the most popular and powerful ruler of the Frankish monarchy; and with Charlemagne he interchanges presents.

The accession years of these two so memorable monarchs happening to be, the one in 768 and the other in 786, being simply in each case a *transposition* or *reversal* of the two final figures, viz. from

TABLE V.

7[6]8] to 7[8]6], or *vice versâ*, from 7[8]6] to 7[6]8], we shall have no difficulty by this little technical appliance in firmly affixing the respective years of accession in memory; always recollecting, however, that Charlemagne both accedes the earliest and reigns the longest; and where names and dates are historically so important as those of Harún and Charlemagne, it is worth our while to try the agency of mnemonics to give them the firmest possible affixment. The year of Harún's demise is marked by the two *outside* eights in 808. Charlemagne died, 28th January, 814, being six years later than Harún, or six years later than the 808.

The MILLENNIAL commemoration of Charlemagne's death was held in Germany, 28th January, 1814, being about three months after the liberties of Germany were regained by the overthrow of Napoleon, in "the **BATTLE OF NATIONS**," at LEIPZIG! 16th, 18th, and 19th October, 1813; and in the same year as the *entrance of the Allies into Paris*, March, 1814.

The 888 which terminate the Frankish power at the close of Table V. bring us also to the splitting up of the Arab monarchy; thus the *meridional periods*, as well as the *breaking up of these TWO FIRST GREAT POWERS OF MODERN TIME*, are CO-EVAL.

The 888, in thus bringing us to the close alike of the Arab and the Frankish monarchies, the two *first* great powers of modern time, furnish this extraordinary stronghold to memory, viz. that in like manner that the first great monarchy of *ancient*

TABLE V.

time, the *Assyrian*, broke up in 888 *before* Christ, the first great empires of *modern* time date their dissolution in 888 *after* Christ, thus constituting, by the doubling of the 888 *before* and *after* Christ, an interval of 1776 years between these *two earliest* eras of dissolving empire in *ancient* and in *modern* time.

In the commencement of our own column, as well as in the commencement of any other of the newly-appearing columns of Table V., we shall, in beginning, as it were, the historical world anew, naturally find ourselves again beset with the same character of difficulties, contradictions, and obscurities, as were attendant upon the opening of ancient history; and we shall thus have to be as constantly on our guard against the mal-information of the early annalists of modern time, as against the earliest writers of the histories of antiquity; for the same pride of pedigree, the same credulity, and the same fabulous misapplication of the pen of the historian, are as sure to take place in the one instance as in the other.

The earliest attempted historical depiction of our own country, at the period of the breaking up of the Roman rule in Britain, or rather of the withdrawal from the island of the Roman legions, about 411 after Christ, is by the monk Gildas, who, dying about 570, wrote not of events of which he was an eye-witness, but *retrospectively* at the distance of probably 130 years, or more, from 411, on the authority, as far as we can learn, of nothing better

than the confused, doubtful, and exaggerated testimony of local tradition.

This writer, who has so servilely and indiscreetly been followed by some of our modern historians, has, however, by others (and especially by Mr. *Sharon Turner*, who has dealt out to him his death-blow,) had his fabulous tales so ably exposed and so thoroughly dispelled, that he needs now only to have his name mentioned to serve as a general warning of the little confidence that is to be placed upon the early compilers of modern histories.

His great mistake seems to consist in referring to the *whole* island of Britain those calamitous *Border* recollections which might largely have affected the localities of the Strath of Clyde, and about which Gildas, who was born, it appears, at Alclud, or Dumbarton, might in his early youth have heard many distressful recitals.

But it would be repugnant to all probability to suppose that the whole of that Roman Britain which could supply such valiant bodies of youth to the Roman legions, and which must, at the time the Romans quitted the island, have been pretty well acquainted with the Roman mode of warfare, should suddenly on the departure of the Romans, about 411, have been seized with such marvellous dastardism as not to have been able *unitedly* to resist the marauding inroads of a few half-starved hordes of Picts (Pehiti) and Scots, and thus to have immediately dispatched ambassadors, with that "*memorable* letter," as it is sometimes styled, which

TABLE V.

Gildas probably was the first to indite, praying for the return of the Romans; and equally wonderful it was that, after this mission failed, another should be sent off to Saxony, praying for the aid of Hengist and Horsa, who curiously enough *landed in the Isle of Thanet* to cover the Strath of Clyde. And this irrespective of the difficulty, in both instances, of assembling a deliberative meeting of the chiefs of the island to determine upon such embassies; since, in the absence of posts, and of all other means of intercommunication, it might have been months or years, or even half centuries, before that which was doing in the Strath of Clyde could be made known to the people of present Cornwall.

Indeed, as an evidence of how little mankind are disposed, in periods of barbarism, to act with unanimity, we may quote the words of *Tacitus* in speaking of Britain, viz.—“Nothing gave the Romans such advantage over the bravest nations as *their want of unanimity*. It SELDOM HAPPENS that TWO or THREE STATES unite against the common enemy; and thus, while separate parties carry on the war, the whole are overcome.”

Another notable instance of the little dependency that is to be placed upon monkish history, of even much later date than Gildas's, may be quoted in the case of Geoffrey of Monmouth (1138), who professes to *translate* his Latin compilation of legendary traditions of *King Arthur* and the *Knights of the Round Table* (in the sixth century), from an

TABLE V.

ancient British manuscript, the existence of which has in nowise yet been verified.

The SAXON CHRONICLE is deemed to be the "ONLY ORIGINAL AND AUTHENTIC SOURCE" of English history from the arrival of the Saxons, in 449, to the close of the Chronicle in 1154 (the year of the accession of the *Plantagenet* race); or during a period of *seven hundred and five* years.

When these Saxon annals, found in the keeping of the monks of Peterborough, and ascribed to the monks of Crowland, were actually commenced, or by whom? or from what materials the early parts of them were collated? we shall probably never ascertain. We may, however, assume that there has been, as in most similar cases, some rounding and systematizing of the earliest and most confused parts of them, according to the ideas and capacity of the first regular compilers.

That in these annals of 705 years, towns are mentioned as lying near the scene of different battles, which are now nowhere to be found, may readily be conceived when we reflect that many places then dignified with the designation of towns would probably be nothing more than an assemblage of mud- or camp-huts, surrounded by rude entrenchments, which could be built up or knocked down at pleasure, as caprice, necessity, or convenience might dictate. These entrenched villages or towns, within which flocks and herds could be gathered for safety during the night, would probably

TABLE V.

assume the general appellation of *burgs*, signifying *mountains*, from the mountainous positions in which they were for the most part erected.

Although we are habituated to use the word CONQUEST, without distinction, both to the Roman and the Saxon occupation of our country, we must not forget that the two occupations were of widely different character.

The Roman legions sent over in the year 43 after Christ by the mightiest empire of its time, and supported by inexhaustible resources, effected in 41 years the regular conquest of the island. The *Britons* [probably from BRYTHIN, or BRYTH-ern, variously translated as the SEPARATED, the mixed, the mottled, variegated, or variously-PAINTED people or races?] or aboriginal islanders, were fully aware of what they came for, and they therefore met them with all the forces they could muster openly in the field, until finally overwhelmed. And to such a mode of gaining possession of the British soil no other designation than *conquest* can appropriately be applied.

But the Saxons came as buccaneers rather than as soldiers; after long-continued piratical depredations, during even the Roman occupation, they were subsequently drifted, by the GREAT MIGRATION of nations, which began in 375, in more formidable numbers as plunderers upon our shores—first as temporary encampers, and next as more stationary or permanent settlers; leaguings, from 449, first with one native chieftain, then with another, they belted themselves as it were (before even the Britons

TABLE V.

appear to have apprehended much danger from them) in petty military factories half round the isle; and, by mere chance rather than by concert, they found themselves, at last, masters of nearly all the British soil.

They poured down to the assault from the extensive opposite Saxon shores to Britain, the moment that the Romans were out of the isle, about 408 or 411 after Christ; but they do not pretend to have founded even the most puny of their States before 455, when we behold KENT (on the reverse half sheet of Table V.) assuming the appellation of a *kingdom*! And not until 586, according to their own Saxon Chronicle, do they found MERCIA as the last of the seven or eight kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy or Octarchy; thus leaving an interval of 131 years between the founding of the first and the last of their little kingdoms; or an interval of 175 years, or one century and three-quarters, after the Romans, in 411, had left the island wholly open to their inroads. And even after they had established their *last* kingdom, 586, they were very far from having effected the subjection of the whole island; for in Cornwall, North and South Wales, Cumberland, Galloway (and northward), they were still firmly and undauntedly opposed.

The reverse of Table V. at once shows us the three ascendant States to be *Wessex*, Northumbria, and *Mercia*. But Northumbria was too much divided within itself, by turbulent chiefs, ever to make effectual head against the other two. The four

TABLE V.

smaller States, viz. Kent, Essex, Sussex, and East-Anglia, were sometimes independent of, and sometimes dependent upon, some more powerful neighbouring kingdom. *Mercia*, although the latest founded, becomes, especially under *Penda*, 626-655, and under **OFFA**, 755 to 794, who erects the "OFFA'S DYKE" against the Welsh, and who corresponds with Charlemagne, the most formidable kingdom, long threatening to overwhelm Wessex. But the **BATTLE OF WILTON**, by the overthrow of *Mercia*, gave the permanent sovereignty of the Heptarchy to Egbert, 827.

By the same *reverse* half-sheet of Table V., we shall perceive that the Saxon settlers did not *intermix* with the aboriginal Britons, but gradually pressed them backwards (as do now the Anglo-Americans press westward the aboriginal tribes of America), so that, from 586, as already noted, the Ancient Britons are hemmed westward into Galloway, Cumberland, North and South Wales, and Cornwall, and many, too, are pressed over-sea into Armorica, which from them assumes the name of *Britany*. The *non*-admixture of the Saxon and the Gaelic*

* The terms *Gael* (plural) or *Gauls*, substantively, or *Gaelic*, adjectively, appear preferable to those of *Celts* or *Kelts*, substantively, or Celtic, adjectively; for the Celts were, in fact, only a particular division of the Gael or Gauls. The Celts were "*Caoiltich*," or the inhabitants of the "*woody country*," so called from *caoill* or *wood*, the same element which enters into the composition of the epithet *Caledonii*. The *Celtic* Gauls were the woodsmen Gauls, and they answered to the "*back-woodsmen*" of

(or Celtic) races is, indeed, sufficiently evidenced by the great substratum of the Anglian tongue being *purely Saxon*, with the slightest possible amalgamation of Ancient British words or idioms. If we compare the earliest Lord's Prayer, for example, in English with the pure Saxon of that day, we shall find it nearly word for word to agree with the Saxon. The only Gaelic words adoptively intermingled with the Anglo-Saxon are the names of *hills, forests, rivers*, and other *natural features* of the country, as is pointed out by Bishop Percy, who well and acutely remarks "that although the names of towns and villages are almost universally of Anglo-Saxon derivation, yet the hills, forests, rivers, &c., have generally retained their Celtic names."

No sooner had the long-continued intestinal warfare of the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms ceased, by their becoming settled and consolidated under one sway, than new calamities assailed the isle. New hordes of piratical freebooters, coming from the shores *northward* of the Franks, the Frisii, the Saxons, and the Angli, and from the *eastward*-lying shores of the Baltic, began to play the same game with the Anglo-Saxons that the Saxons had been so long playing with the divided Britons. These hordes, variously designated by different nations as *Nor-*

Anglo-America in the present day. The general name given to the inhabitants of the northern part of the island of Britain, before, and for some centuries after, the Christian era, was not "Scots," but "*Caledonians*," i. e. "*Caoilldaoín*," or "*men of the woods*."

TABLE V.

mans (*i. e.* as coming from the *north*), as *Ostmans* (*i. e.* as coming from the *east*), as Warägi in Russia, and by the Anglo-Saxons as *Danes*, probably from their *thanes* or leaders, after having made their earliest recorded descents in 787, and, at Lindisfarne and Weremouth, in 792, begin their more serious and regular irruptions by ravaging the isle of Sheppey, in 832, five years after Egbert, by the victory of Wilton, had become sole ruler of the Heptarchy, 827. In 833, they *defeat Egbert* at Charmouth (Dorsetshire); but, in 835, although then joined by the Cornish Britons, they are defeated by Egbert with great slaughter, at Hengston Hill (in Cornwall): this was in the year preceding the death of Egbert in 836. They do not again infest the Anglo-Saxon coasts until about 860; but, in the reign of Ethelred I., the brother of Alfred, they land in such force that, before the accession of Alfred, on the death of Ethelred I., slain in battle against the Danes, 871, they have got possession of nearly the whole of the Anglo-Saxon territory; and Alfred, in 874, driven into concealment in the isle of Athelney, has hardly a foot of land to stand upon, until, by the great victory of Ethandune, or Edington, the scales of war are again turned in Alfred's favour, 878*. Meanwhile, by the widely-extended black

* Thus, the two outside *sevens*, with 8 in the centre, 787, give the year of the earliest recorded Danish invasion, and the two outside *eights*, with 7 in the centre, 878, the era of the decisive battle of Ethandune; these piratical inroads having been continued for ninety-one years.

(flag) colouring of the Baltic, we perceive that not merely the small Anglo-Saxon kingdoms are cut up column after column, and Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, equally subjected to the Danish invasions, but that even the consolidated Frankish monarchy itself is not exempt from their marauding irruptions. They run up the rivers, seize territory, receive reinforcement after reinforcement, until, at last, they firmly erect the great dukedom of NORMANDY, having Rouen as its capital, in 911, which might fairly have competed in power with the monarchy of France itself, dissevered as it was from Germany from 888. It is from the sixth ruler of this Northmanic dukedom, as seen by the dotted line down the column of France in Table VI., that, in 1066, England receives, in the person of *William I. the Conqueror*, arising as it were from off the waves, the founder of the first Northmanic dynasty in England.

This piratical black-flag and, in Tables V. and VI., black-patch and black-streak era of the most northern European shores and of the Baltic, teaches us emphatically the vastitude of power that, even in the rudest stages of modern European recollection, is wielded by whatever arm holds dominion on the ocean.

The column which is stained with red indicates to us the continuous history, from the point where we left off in Table IV., of the *Eastern* Empire of the Romans, or of the *Greek* Empire, as it became denominated. For only one-half, or the western division, of the Old Roman Empire was broken up; the other half, or eastern division, having survived

TABLE V.

the great rush of the migrating nations, had a codicil of existence of nearly 1000 years' duration, viz. from 476 down to 1453, when the OSMANIC Turks enter Constantinople by storm, 29th May, thus finally closing the wire-drawn existence of the last semblance of the ancient Roman sway.

Justinian's reign is memorable for the famous compilations of the scattered and confused Roman statutes into more condensed and systematized bodies of law; and it is also remarkable as the last splendid reign of any Roman emperor.

The Greek Empire, or East-Roman, which so rapidly waned in extent and importance subsequently to the reign of Justinian, wore at the time of this emperor, the last whose name appears in Roman capital type, a very formidable aspect; for he made, through his celebrated generals Belisarius and Narses, a resolute attempt to reconquer, and permanently to attach to the Eastern Crown, an important portion of the broken-up empire of the west; over-running the kingdom of the Vandals, in Africa, and re-conquering from the Ostro-Goths the whole of Italy, which, however, was maintained entire only for the short space of 14 years, from 554 to 568; for, in 568, three years after Justinian's death, the LONGOBARDS broke in so formidable a manner into Northern Italy that they soon constituted their considerable conquests into what is called by historians the *Kingdom of the Lombards*; it was, however, in effect (like the kingdoms of the Ostro-Goths and Visi-Goths), rather a State of wild feudalism than

of regular monarchy; so much so, indeed, that at one time we read of a declared aristocratic form of government, consisting of no less than 36 sovereign dukes, over the Longobardic portion of Italy.

In order chronologically to impress on the memory the era of Justinian, we assume for it, as easiest of retention, the tenth year before the close of his reign, viz. 555 *after* Christ, in like manner that we indicated Cyrus by the 555 *before* Christ, making a total distance in time from the era of Cyrus to the era of Justinian 1110 years. The *three fives* after Christ thus flashing upon recollection, at once, the proudest period of the surviving empire of Constantinople, and the commencement of its subsequent so rapidly withering decay.

The fighting Franks, like their compeer conquerors, in the opposite side column, the Saracens, had their Charlemagne and their favourite dynasty of Carlovingians, at the same period that the Arabs had their Harún-ur-Raschíd and their House of Abbás.

Charlemagne, son of Pepin the Short, was the second sovereign of the Carlovingian race, and was, as I need hardly remind you, descended from those celebrated *Mayors of the Palace*, Pepin d'Heristhal and Charles Martel, who had, like their predecessors in the same office, assumed a sort of right to rule for the Merovingians, the descendants of Merovæus, an early king or paramount chief; and having long successfully wielded the sword for them,

TABLE V.

and having long exercised all the substantial powers of monarchy, thought that they might as well, at last, take also that little ornamental thing, the sceptre, into their own family keeping.

The Frankish monarchs of the Merovingian dynasty had never assumed any higher title than that of king. Charlemagne revived in his person, in the year 800, the title of ROMAN EMPEROR, which had *lain dormant during a period of 324 years!* For after the ABDICATION OF ROMULUS AUGUSTULUS, 476, not one of the savage conquerors who planted his banners on the walls of Rome, would deign to throw around his brawny shoulders the dead lion's skin, which he thought would neither grace nor profit him; nay, the very name of Roman was but used as a term of the most contumelious reproach, concentrating everything ignominious and contemptible.

The revival of this once so celebrated title grew out of that intimacy between the Popes of Rome and the Carlovingians which had originated in a sort of truck between them. For the Pope, Stephen II., having conferred the sanctifying unction of his countenance on the usurpation of the Frankish sceptre by *Pepin* the Short (son of Charles Martel and father of Charlemagne), in the year 752, being twenty years after the defeat of the Arabs at Tours, 732, received in return from Pepin the feudal grant of territory which belonged of right to the Roman or Greek emperor at Constantinople, from whom it had been wrested by the Longobards, or Lombards.

TABLE V.

Pepin marched down with his Franks upon the conquering Lombards, who were besieging Rome, and retaking from them a large portion of their Greek conquests, instead of restoring these to the rightful owner, he conferred, as already stated, the recovered territory on the pope.

Again, *Charlemagne*, having finally crushed the Lombards and possessed himself of their whole Italian territory, 774, *confirmed* the territorial grant of *Pepin* to the pope, and, in return, CHARLEMAGNE was proclaimed **ROMAN EMPEROR**, 25th December, 800; being the year of the accession of *Egbert* to the throne of *Wessex*.

Emphatic attention is called by the patches and shading of the Frankish *green*, in Table V., to those influential transactions between the Frankish and Italian States, through which the pope, who had previously been nothing more than an ecclesiastical dignitary, or bishop, residing within the duchy of Rome, a dependency of the Greek Empire, and bearing only the title of *Papa*, or *Pope* (signifying *father*), in common with all other bishops (for it was not exclusively applied to the bishop of Rome until the imperious Pope *Gregory VII.* Hildebrand, issued a bull to that effect toward the close of the 11th century), became all at once a temporal sovereign; getting rid, moreover, of all further semblance of dependency upon *Constantinople*, by the final rooting out from Ravenna of those Greeks whose bishops the popes of Rome so rancorously hated, particularly on the score of pre-

TABLE V.

cedency and of the title of "ŒCUMENICAL" or "UNIVERSAL" Bishop, assumed at Constantinople, "a DEVILISH TITLE," as Pope Gregory I. is pleased to term it. Although from the subsequent very willing adoption at Rome of the equivalent title of "CATHOLIC," or "UNIVERSAL," the holy wrath of the Roman bishops would appear to have been less directed against the title than against the bearing of it by the metropolitan bishop of Constantinople instead of its being borne by the bishop of Rome.

The pope of Rome not only gained all this triumph and territory at once, but what was, perhaps, of still greater consequence to him, he got himself thoroughly hitched into that feudal relationship with the sovereigns of the Franks, then become the most potent in Europe, which so greatly contributed to his spreading over all Western Europe that mental tyranny which was neither less gloomy, less baneful, nor less degrading, than that tyranny of the sword which had previously from the bosom of Rome been erected over Europe, and which we beheld, at the close of Table IV., so happily, as events have since proved, broken up.

At the commencement of Table V., Europe appeared to have recovered its freedom; but before the close of Table V. Europe was again in thralldom; that SECOND *Roman* tyranny, infinitely more lamentable and direful than the first, had gone forth: the tyranny of the Roman warrior was a tyranny over the body alone, but the tyranny of the Roman pontiff was a tyranny over the human soul as well

TABLE V.

as the body; a tyranny, too, which so sadly lasted during the awful period of 717 years, dating merely from the era of Charlemagne, 800, to the LUTHERAN era of mental emancipation, 1517; the exode of the European mind from beneath the tyranny of the pope taking place about the same number of years *after* Christ, as the exode of the Abrahamites from Egypt (viz. 1500) *before* Christ.

Charlemagne's monarchy had, as its geographical boundaries, the Ebro, the Tiber, the Raab, and the Eyder; resembling, in position and extent, the recent monarchy of the French under Napoleon Buonaparte, *i. e.* including the States dependent upon as well as immediately ruled by Napoleon; and chronologically it stands as a sort of intermediate universal monarchy between the ancient West-Roman rule and the preponderant era of Charles V.

In turning again to Table V., we perceive that *Italy*, the heart of the old Roman rule, variously changing its masters, is rent and re-rent equally with the other and more distant-lying of the West-Roman territories.

On the abdication of Romulus Augustulus, 476, Italy falls under the sway of the Heruli and Rugii;

Next, under Theodoric, it constitutes part of the kingdom of the Ostro-Goths;

Thirdly, it is reconquered by the Greek emperor *Justinian I.*, and once more under one head for 14 years; but,

Fourthly, from the time that the Longobards make

TABLE V.

their irruption into it, in 568, it has continued a divided and piecemeal country down to the present day.

Venice arises out of the waves thus: many persons flee from Italy to the little isles of the Adriatic, to escape from the murderous King of the HUNS, **ATTILA**, 452; and still more retire thither after the irruption of the savage Longobards, 568. As fugitives and fishermen, all being at first upon an equality, a pure democracy prevails, and every island has its tribune.

But they gradually become commercial upon a large scale, get wealth, erect towns, unite under one doge or duke, join their little isles by means of bridges; and thus we have, about the year 800, when Egbert mounts the throne of Wessex, the city of **VENICE** assuming its present name.

Looking then horizontally across the Table V., in the year 800, we have four correspondent points with which reciprocally and unitedly to impress the memory, viz.—

1. **CHARLEMAGNE** reviving the Roman imperial title.

2. **THE POPE OF ROME** becoming a confirmed temporal sovereign.

3. **VENICE** assuming the name it now bears; and

4. In our own island, **EGBERT** mounting the throne of Wessex (on which he made so distinguished a figure) in that *very same year*, 800, in which **CHARLEMAGNE** (at whose court Egbert had previously been protected) hears himself first hailed as **ROMAN EMPEROR**.

The *horizontal* streak of red colouring in the column of Italy shows the period in which Justinian repossessed himself of *all* Italy; the red *shading*, from the period of the inroad of the Longobards, in 568, on *both* sides, indicates that *Southern* Italy still remains, *in toto*, under the Greek emperor, until his territory is narrowed, on the papal sovereignty being erected, into *Lower* Italy, part of which being overrun by the Saracens in 820, who also conquer Sicily in 827, Naples alone remains feudally subject to the Greeks, as indicated by the *single* or one-sided columnar red shading; while the other side, as denoted by the single-line shading in purple, is feudally dependent upon the Saracens. The purple shading, from 711, on both sides of the column of Spain and Portugal, shows that the whole of the Pyrenean Peninsula has become subject, through the rapid conquests of the great Tarik, to the Saracens. The horizontal streaks of purple, alike in the Frankish, the Papal, and Venetian columns, denote threatening inroads of the Saracens, or temporary occupancy.

In the Papal and Greek columns it will be seen that, after long-continued hostile feeling and jarrings, **THE GREEK AND ROMISH CHURCHES, from 861, BECOME FINALLY AND DISTINCTIVELY SEPARATED.**

Thus, whatever may be the fierce denunciations of the see of Rome against PROTESTANTISM, let it never be forgotten that these denunciations strike first and most forcibly the Romish Church herself; since she it was who set the earliest EXAMPLE OF AN

TABLE V.

ABRUPTION FROM THE PARENT GREEK Church, and from the authority of the *Œcumenical* Bishop of Constantinople.

It is highly gratifying to recollect that the two (most appropriately entitled) GREAT monarchs, who stand forward to our notice in large Roman capitals in the new European world, towards the close of Table V., viz. CHARLES THE GREAT and ALFRED THE GREAT, like the great HARÚN-UR-RASCHÍD of the purple Saracenic column, although at humble distance from Harún, were both fosterers of literature, were both ardently desirous of promoting education and diffusing knowledge, and both so fully understood the advantage of cultivating that desert of the mind, that wilderness of ignorance, which they viewed around them.

Alfred complained that, from the Humber to the Thames, there was hardly a priest who understood the Liturgy in his mother tongue, or who could translate the easiest piece of Latin; and that from the Thames to the sea the ecclesiastics were still more ignorant. "Very few there were," writes Alfred, in a letter to Wulsige, "on this [south] side of the Humber (and I dare say not many on the other) who could understand the service in English, or translate a Latin epistle into their own language, when I ascended the throne."

This ruthless Anglo-Saxon ignorance, so closely upon the beginning of the tenth century, need not, however, startle us, need not raise up blushes

for our island in particular, since we read in Dr. Robertson's "Charles V.," page 22, that, in *much* later time, "persons of the highest rank and most eminent station could not read or write. *Many of the clergy* did not understand the Breviary, which they were obliged daily to recite; some of them could scarcely read it." And again, page 279, "*Many dignified ecclesiastics* could not *subscribe* THE CANONS OF THE COUNCILS in which they sat as members," and which Councils had to teach or to settle what articles mankind must believe or not believe in, and what perhaps many would ultimately be burnt for believing or not believing in. Canons, therefore, of such paramount and awful importance had to be "SIGNED" by such of the dignified ecclesiastics as could not write their own names; *i. e.* they merely had the SIGN of the *cross* affixed to them, precisely in the same manner as is now practised by illiterate persons, who make a *cross* (instead of subscription) to whatever document they may have to *sign*, with the necessary explanation, of course, that it is John Mason, Peter Robson, or whatever else the name may be, *his* + MARK.

Thus, when all were alike ignorant, no exclusive disgrace could anywhere attach; for when the dignitaries of the hierarchy could make nothing but *their* MARK, Alfred's priests might well not be able to distinguish their great letter **A** from their great letter **B**.

The rugged old Charlemagne, of the Frankish column, who, by the rude daring, the energy, and

TABLE V.

decision of his character, was so admirably adapted to the rule of mankind in a semi-barbarian age, and who withal could so fully appreciate the value of learning, conquered the disgrace of not being able to write *his* own name by submitting to the tedious toil of *learning to write* even after his finger-joints were somewhat stiffened by age, but more by the long use of his formidable broad-sword. He had, too, in his military progresses, occasionally the vexatious bar to the taking of his writing-lesson of not being able to find a drop of ink in some of his Frankish cities. Charlemagne, we may mention, as characteristic of the man, had his signet engraven on the *pommel of the hilt* of his *Sword*; so that when he applied the signet to his treaties with the Saxons, he was wont to say, "Here is the signet with which I confirm this treaty, and here" (brandishing his unsheathed blade) "is the sword with which I will enforce its provisions, or punish the breach of them."

The planned and partly-executed cutting of a canal from the Rednitz to the Altmühl, to *connect the Rhine with the Danube*, and thus to secure *an uninterrupted inland navigation* from the *mouths of the Rhine*, in the North Sea, to the *mouths of the Danube*, in the Black Sea, with ready access thence to Constantinople; his engaging the invaluable educational and diplomatical services of ALWIN (or ALCUINUS), from York, the most learned, accomplished, and gifted man of his age; his interchanges of friendship with Harún-ur-Raschíd (the Khalif of the 1001 Nights' Arabian Entertain-

ments); and his hospitable protection of *Egbert*, at the Frankish Court, during Egbert's exile from Wessex through the jealousy of Brithric; all concurrently testify most favourably to the public character and regnal genius of the great Charlemagne.

Eghinhart, who writes the history of Charles the Great, and who is the earliest historian of Germany, thus describes the arrival of Harún's celebrated presents, in 807, being one year before Harún's, and seven years before Charlemagne's death:—

“Harún, who associated, with the returning Frankish embassy, ambassadors of his own, sent over with them an *Elephant* of monstrous size, with apes, balsamic oils, lard, and various sorts of ointment, colours, frankincense, and drugs of various virtues; silk mantles of such splendour, and in such profusion, as if he wished to empty the East of them in order to fill the West. He sent also a tent, or pavilion, and canopies of wondrous size and beauty, composed wholly, both in the sheet and the appended cordage, of cotton dyed in every variety of fine colours. Therewith was also an HOUR (water) CLOCK of copper, put together with wonderful mechanical art. Turned round by means of water was a pointer, or hand, to the twelve hours in succession. There were, too, brass balls, which, as each hour was completed, fell upon a metallic basin placed below them, the basin resounding as they fell in succession. At mid-day, or twelve o'clock, twelve horsemen at the same time, in correspondence with the hour, when the

TABLE V.

pointer had completed its revolution, issued through twelve windows, closing, by the shock of their advance, twelve other windows which had previously been open. Many other peculiarities of this *clepsydra*, or water-clock, are too tedious to enumerate. Besides the already-mentioned presents, there were two candlesticks of brass, of surpassing size and elegance, which, with the rest, were lodged in the Emperor's palace at Aachen" or Aix-la-Chapelle.

As regards the ELEPHANT [which appears to have been a distinctive present, although classed amongst those already mentioned], it arrived some years before the other presents from Harún. Charlemagne had, on account of this rare and never-before-seen animal, sent three ambassadors to the Khalif, at Bagdad, 797; two of whom, Lantfrid and Sigismund, died; and the third, a Jew, named Isaak, was four years before he returned. He landed in October, 801, on the Genoese coast, with the elephant; but the Alps being impassable on account of the snow, both the man and the animal wintered at Vercelli. In the summer they began their journey towards the Rhine; and so memorable was deemed to be the appearance of the first elephant ever seen in Germany, that some of the annalists note the day of his arrival at Aix-la-Chapelle, which was the 20th of July, 802; while others record the year of his death, 810; for in the summer of that year he suddenly died at Lippe (Lippenheim). His name was ABULABAZ (*Pater devastationis*, the Desolater, or the Monster potential). Yea, his fame spread into

TABLE V.

foreign lands; and the monk Decuil, who writes from *Ireland*, 825, notifies of him, appealing to the people of the Frankish monarchy as his witnesses, they having seen him in the Emperor Charlemagne's time, that "the elephant, like the ox, lies down to repose, which Julius Solinus has denied."

This hubbub about the *Pater devastationis* seems somewhat akin to the astoundment of the *Sikhs* on the arrival in the Punjab of the "*elephant-*" (*q. d.* the "*large dray-*") *horses*," as a present from His Britannic Majesty William IV. to the Maha Raja *Runjeet Singh*, in 1831, the crescented shoes of which, as the courtiers affirmed, by their brightness and size, when the horses' feet were turned upwards, made the moon with envy turn pale.

As return presents, Charlemagne sent to Harún many first-rate hunting dogs, fine linens, and other works of the loom, in which the Frankish and Frisian women greatly excelled.

The **OCULAR**
emplacement of

CHARLE-	{ [EGBERT,]	{	HARÚN-UR-
MAGNE,				RASCHÍD,
800,		800,		800,

and

871,

ALFRED,

TABLE V.

the only three purely *modern* sovereigns who rise to the eye in *large Roman capitals* in Table V., is TRIANGULAR; *Charlemagne* and *Harún* being seen, in Table V., spread left and right (westward and eastward) at the crosswise marginal date of 800; and *Alfred*, in 871, placed at the central triangular point below them.

CHARLES THE GREAT was born in 742, being 107 years before the birth of **ALFRED THE GREAT**, in 849. They are thus widely removed from being contemporaries (indeed **EGBERT**, the *grandfather* of Alfred, will readily be recollected as being the regnal associate of Charlemagne and of Harún); nevertheless they have a combinative affinity in time, which conjoins them in historic memory, viz.—

THEY are the TWO SOLE LARGE ROMAN CAPITAL sovereigns that either Table V. or any other Table of MODERN time can exhibit to us as being now, in their respective countries,

THE MONARCHS OF A THOUSAND YEARS!

Charles, born 742, closed his eventful life in his 72nd year, dying on the 28th of January, 814; while Alfred, born 849, and dying 901, attained but to the age of 52, being exactly the same age as our immortal Shakspeare reached (born 1564, and dying, on his birth-day, 23rd April, 1616—*Cervantes* died in the same year, and *on the same day*, aged 67).

And these two so memorable sovereigns have, within the first half of the present century, been called prominently up to memory again by the

TABLE V.

MILLENNIAL CELEBRATION, in *Germany* and in *England*, of the yet so well remembered and revered rule of the *two first great monarchs of modern Europe*.

Had the Arab Empire continued to exist to the present century, **HARÚN-UR-RASCHÍD**, who forms one of the *triangular great triplicate* of the large capital sovereigns who adorn, in Table V., the first great leaf of modern time, might have been added to the **CHARLEMAGNE** and **ALFRED** of a thousand years; and Harún would thus have been the "*Arabian Khalif of a thousand years*," as well as the wondrous Bagdad "*Khalif of the 1001 Arabian Nights' Entertainments*."

The Germans held *their* millennial commemoration, as I have elsewhere stated, on the 28th of January, 1814, thus dating from the day and year of their Charlemagne's **DEATH**; while the millennial celebration of King Alfred's memory, held in England on the 25th of October, 1849, was dated from the era of Alfred's **BIRTH**. It was held, too, at the *place* of his birth, viz. *Wantage*, in Berkshire. This meeting, which I had myself the satisfaction of attending, offered at least the charm of novelty and of uniqueness in the character of its chronological data; and it told, notwithstanding the meagre and unsatisfactory way in which the study of general history is but too often prosecuted amongst us, most favourably for the latent feeling in the country for historical revivals.

One marked abatement, however, to the pleasure

TABLE V.

of this millennial meeting was as follows, viz. that while we dwelt largely and warmly on the virtues and valour of him who was at once the peaceful and the warrior king; while we heaped reverential and grateful praises on the embalmed memory of so great and good a monarch; a monarch who could, against such direful odds, by his 56 battles under the white horse banner, cripple and crush the ill-omened Danish raven's wing; and who, amidst that fearful havoc and harassment of war in which he was so incessantly engaged, quitting the battle-field for the council board, could there sit down with equal calmness, clearness, and deliberative wisdom, to devise *laws* for the happiness and to secure the liberties of his people; and who could withal so assiduously apply himself to the encouragement of literature; making himself at once the rescuer of England from the Danish domination, and the great founder of our laws, our liberties, our literature, our commerce, and our navy; in fine, the founder of the grandeur, the glory, and welfare of England!—while thus, I say, we were calling, on this memorable occasion, for a loud All Hail! to the memory of our monarch of a thousand years—a loud All Hail! of honour, again and again, to the unparalleled and immortal Alfred!—when we turned to inquire of the inhabitants of Wantage for the ruins of the palace in which Alfred was born *not one stone*, alas! could be pointed to as indicating or verifying the almost sacred spot which once was *Alfred's home!* and where once the boyhood days of Alfred sped.

TABLE V.

Is there no shame to Wantage—no shame to the families around it—no shame to *Oxford*, so near it, and so connected in its endowment with the memory of Alfred—no shame to the seven counties that touch upon Berkshire—*no shame, in short, to all England*—that thus has been left unheeded and unprotected all physical evidence of those walls within which one of the greatest and noblest of sovereigns first drew breath?

But if thus unworthily, at *Wantage*, have been neglected all means of preserving some coeval identity of Alfred's *birth*, what shall we find on turning to *Winchester*! his place of *burial*? for while Wantage had to boast of the birth of Alfred, Winchester had to witness his glorious manhood's close.

Reader! will you believe in the possibility of Alfred's ashes—*aye*, ALFRED'S ashes!—being suffered to be covered with a common chain-clanking county *bridewell*! and within that very city, too, which once was his capital, and in the very midst of those ecclesiastical bodies which he had so richly and so splendidly endowed; and whose father, moreover, was that very Ethelwulf who, from the self-same city of *Winchester*, had promulgated the edict of 855, which so gorgeously provided the clergy of his day with *tithes*.

Where, on this *bridewell* occasion, were the natural guardians of the illustrious dead? Where were the Bishop, the Canons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester, that all should have stood aloof

TABLE V.

from, or looked quiescently on, so rank a desecration?

If *they* could not themselves afford the paltry few hundreds that would have sufficed to save themselves, and to save all England, from so foul a disgrace, could not the Crown have been petitioned to—could not the country have been appealed to—to save relics so revered from outrage so revolting? to avert the blood-curdling indignity of beholding, in 1788, a *bridewell* arising, as a new sort of astounding *Mausoleum*, for so nationally sacred an entombment? while the so uniquely illustrious ashes which had previously reposed there were, to make room for felons, to be torn up and scattered, by dig and spade, from beneath the very altar table of the once so reverentially hallowed Hyde Abbey.

The first to call attention to this monstrous profanation, this *county!* insult to the nation, was Captain Henry Howard, of the 1st West York Militia, who, after having been quartered with his regiment at Winchester, addressed a letter, dated the 26th of February, 1798, to George Naylor, Esq., York Herald, F.A.S., extracts from which are as follow, viz.:—

“ Dear Sir,

“ The high veneration I feel for the character and principles of our renowned Alfred, led me, whilst we were quartered in Winchester last year, to make the discovery of his tomb an object of research.

TABLE V.

“ History informs us that *Alfred* and his *Queen Alswitha* were buried in the church of Newanminster, which he founded and began, and which after his death was finished by Edward the Elder, who was also interred near his father. In the reign of *Henry I.* Newanminster was taken down, on account of its being too near the cathedral church; and in the year 1112, that King, attended by the Bishop of Winchester and his whole Court, translated with great pomp the body of Alfred to a tomb at the foot of the high altar of the magnificent abbey church, which he built for that purpose at a place called Hyde, near the walls of the city of Winchester; the body of Edward the Elder, and, I believe, also of the Queen, were removed at the same time.

“ You will lament, with me, the failure of my researches, and feel some share of the same indignation that I myself have felt, when I inform you that the ashes of the great Alfred, after having been scattered about by the rude hands of convicts, are now probably covered by a building erected for their confinement and punishment. And when you are told that this occurred so late as the year 1788, and that no one in the neighbourhood, led either by curiosity or veneration for his remains, attempted to discover or rescue them from this ignoble fate, your surprise will not, I think, be less than my own.”

* * * *

“ The foundations of Hyde Abbey Church, for I

TABLE V.

am informed that little else remained of the structure, were situated in an enclosure which is raised two feet above the level of the valley. In the year 1787-8, this small field was purchased by the county, and in it they erected the new gaol or *bridewell*.

"About *a*" [in the ground plan which Captain Howard furnishes] "was found a stone coffin, cased with lead both within and without, and containing some bones and remains of garments. The lead in its decayed state sold for two guineas; the bones were thrown about, and the stone coffin broken into pieces. There were two other coffins, and no more, found in this part, which were also, for the sake of the garden in which they lay, broken and buried as low as the spring. At *h*" [in the plan sent] "there were remains of a solid basis of masonry, and fragments of several small columns of Purbeck marble. Part of one of these I have obtained. It is ornamented in a spiral direction, with two animals coupled together on one side, and rudely-carved flowers on the other. May not this have been part of the high altar, or of the tomb of Alfred, near it? Possibly the two other coffins contained the remains of Edward and of Queen Alswitha." * * * "On the whole the *dimensions*, as given to me by Mr. Page, the keeper of the bridewell, who is a very intelligent, and apparently accurate man, and of much respectability in his line of life, and who was the overseer of the prisoners and other workmen there employed during the whole

TABLE V.

time of the building of this gaol, the removing of the stones and rubbish, and the preparing of the garden, *coincide with the dimensions left us by Leland* in his account of this abbey."

* * * *

" I have the honour to remain,

" Dear Sir,

" Sincerely your obedient humble Servant,

(Signed) " HENRY HOWARD.

" George Naylor, Esq., York Herald."

The following more amplified particulars are from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Milner, the able historian of Winchester, vol. ii. p. 222, *et seq.*:—

" The founder of this" [original Hyde] " abbey, in its former situation, was the Great Alfred. He had already built a convent for monks at Athelingay, the place of his retreat, whilst the Danish tyranny prevailed throughout this part of the kingdom; and another at Shaftsbury, for nuns, of which his daughter Ethelgiva became abbess.

" He had also assisted his religious Queen Eanswitha or Alswitha, in erecting and endowing her abbey of St. Mary, in this city, whither she retired on Alfred's death; still, however, this pious monarch meditated another great work of this kind, viz. a royal monastery, in this his capital city, which might serve as a burying-place for himself and his family, and where the accustomed rites of religion might for ever be performed for them."

TABLE V.

[Alas! for the disappointed aspirations of the Great Alfred here to *repose* in *peace* and *honour*, after his so toilsome, arduous, and courageous reign for the good of his people.]

“ He only lived to begin this great work, which was finished by his son and successor, Edward the Elder, in 903, two years after the death of Alfred, when it was solemnly dedicated, by Archbishop Plegmund, in honour of the Holy Trinity, the Blessed Virgin, and St. Peter and St. Paul.

“ As soon as this ‘Newan Mynstre,’ or ‘New Monastery,’ as it was called, occupying the whole north side of the ‘Ealden Mynstre,’ or ‘Old Monastery,’ as the cathedral was henceforward named, with some portions of the ground to the east of it, was completed (903),

“ In conformity with the directions of the original founder, Alfred, his remains were translated hither from the cathedral, where they had been buried in the interim. In this same monastery were interred Alfred’s pious Queen Alswitha, though she had died at St. Mary’s Convent, of which she was abbess; his youngest son, Ethelward, who devoted himself to a studious life, and resided chiefly at Oxford; Edward the Elder himself; Alfred, son of the last mentioned, who died in his non-age; Elfleda, and Ethelhilda, two of Edward the Elder’s daughters, the former of whom was Abbess of Romsey, while the latter led an exemplary life in the world; King Edwy and the aforesaid St. Grimbald. It is plain from the uncommon number of stone coffins, and

TABLE V.

other marks of distinction found in the graves, which were lately opened amongst the ruins of Hyde Abbey, that these formed a small part of the illustrious personages who had been buried in this monastery in one or other of its situations."

* * * *

"The castle built by William the Conqueror at the west end of this city, with ditches admitting a branch of the river, occasioned so unwholesome a stagnation of water round the New Minster, that, however strong the attachment of the monks must necessarily have been to the walls and soil which had been given them by the Great Alfred, they began to look out for a new and more extensive situation, to which they might remove their monastery.

"There was, moreover, another very material inconvenience, and one, too, that had subsisted ever since the foundation of the abbey. Its church had been built parallel with the cathedral, and stood so near to it that the voices and organs of the two choirs mutually confounded and interrupted each other.

"For these reasons it became the general wish of both monasteries, and of the Bishop himself, who was William Giffard, that the later of these foundations might remove to some other place. The King" [Henry I., 1100-35] "concurring in the same opinion, a magnificent church and monastery were erected, chiefly at his expense, in Hyde Meadow."

* * * *

"This work being completed, the monks of New

TABLE V.

Minster left the situation which they had now occupied for more than two centuries (viz. from 903), and marched in solemn procession to their new abbey, carrying with them not only the relics of the saints, but also the remains of the illustrious personages that had rested in their old church, which they deposited in the new one now erected for them at Hyde.

“ This event took place in 1110. The situation which had been abandoned was surrendered into the king’s hands, who transferred it to the Bishop, for the benefit of the cathedral monastery, to which it had originally belonged.

“ In return, the King” [Henry I.] “ granted various benefactions to the new abbey of Hyde, settling and confirming all the rights and privileges of the establishment.

“ The abbey thus founded and protected, no doubt the members of it flattered themselves with the prospect of long-continued peace and security. This, however, was not granted to them, for in the very next reign, that dreadful civil war breaking out between the Empress and King Stephen, which spent its first and most destructive fury upon our city, this royal abbey was burned to the ground, by the party of King Stephen, the fire which then consumed it having been enkindled at the north gate.

“ The church and abbey of Hyde, however, were rebuilt with increased magnificence in the reign of Henry II., and it soon became one of the most distinguished abbeys in the kingdom. Hence its

TABLE V.

superior was one of the 24 abbots, who, as soon as parliaments began to be held, were summoned to attend them in the upper house.

“ Upon the dissolution of Hyde Abbey, many of its best estates, particularly the manors of Micheldever and Stratton, were obtained by Henry Lord Wriothesley, afterwards Earl of Southampton, from whose family they passed, by marriage, to that of the Russells, which was already gorged with church property.

“ The site of the church and monastery was granted to Richard Bethel, after the term of a lease made to the aforesaid Lord Wriothesley. What the intent of the lease was we may easily judge, viz. that he might have leisure to dispose of whatever was saleable on the premises. In conformity with this plan, he was in such haste to pull down the magnificent fabric, that Leland” [dies 1552] “ when he visited the city a very few years after, spoke of the abbey as of a fabric that *had* existed, but then existed no longer.”*

“ In Camden's time” [1551-1623] “ the ruins of it were still magnificent, but” [Dugdale, 1605-86] “ the author of the ‘*Monasticon*,’ complains, that when he wrote the very ruins of it had perished. It is plain that on the destruction of the church at the time above mentioned, the tombs of the illustrious dead which it contained were broken into; since

* “ In this suberbe stoode the great Abbay of Hyde, and hath yet a ‘*paroche church*.’ ”—*Leland's Itin.*, vol. iii. p. 102.

TABLE V.

we are assured that two little tables of lead, inscribed with the names of Alfred and his son Edward, were found in the monument which contained their remains. What became of these we are not informed; most likely they were left among the ruins."

* * * *

"The present age being unhappily no less distinguished (such is the state of its morals) for the erection of gaols and bridewells, than many past ages have been for the building of churches and monasteries, amongst other sacred spots which have been chosen for these receptacles of guilt * has been the *exact site of the most sacred part of Hyde Abbey, namely, the church and choir*. Thus miscreants couch amidst the ashes of our Alfreds and Edwards; and where once religious silence and contemplation were only interrupted by the bell of regular observance and the chaunting of devotion, now alone resound the clank of the captive's chain and the oaths of the profligate!

"In digging for the foundations of that mournful edifice, at almost every stroke of the mattock or spade, some ancient sepulchre was violated, the venerable contents of which were treated with

* "A GAOL" [ANOTHER GAOL! talk of Goths and Vandals indeed! ANOTHER GAOL! or pestilence of a bridewell!]

"HAS ALSO BEEN ERECTED UPON THE RUINS of the famous ABBEY OF READING, the FOUNDATION AND CHOSEN BURIAL-PLACE OF HENRY I." [last of the house of Normandy].—*Milner's Winchester*, vol. ii. p. 287.

marked indignity*. On this occasion a great number of stone coffins were dug up, with a variety of other curious articles, such as chalices, patins, rings, buckles, the leather of shoes and boots, velvet and gold lace belonging to chasibles, and other vestments; as also the crook, rims, and joints of a beautiful crosier, double gilt.

“ Nothing now remains of this magnificent edifice, once judged worthy to form a cathedral, except some ruinous outhouses, and a large barn, once probably the Abbot’s Hall, which seems to bespeak the workmanship of the 12th century.”

I have gone into this subject at large, as well from my own daily-increasing admiration of the glorious character and the incomparable excellence of Alfred, as from my naturally-excited indignation against at once the *perpetrators* and the *abettors* negatively or actively, of this stigma upon Englishmen—this indelible brand on the face of all England.

What should we say if we were, now, to behold a man coming down with a warrant from a bench of magistrates to some village church, perhaps in a state of decay, for the substitution on the identical site of the church, of a *bridewell*, and who should suffer the convicts, employed in digging a founda-

† “The writer of this” [Rev. Dr. Milner] “was in some degree witness to the scene which he describes.”

TABLE V.

tion for their future place of confinement, to break up the coffins, and to scatter, amidst jeers and jests, the revered ashes and bones of the villagers' forefathers? *What* should we say?

Why, that the whole of the villagers would rise up as one man, and if they did not massacre the wretch with the warrant, they would pursue him with hootings and execrations to the end of the world.

And if the villagers did *not* so rise, why then I say that the whole country would rise to point at and hoot, and execrate the villagers.

But no! not for the remains of villagers, but for the remains of Alfred!—of all persons who had appeared on the earth—was reserved this crying insult, this perfectly insufferable indignity.

As Wantage and Winchester to this day make no sign, show no stone, Alfred is yet at his birth-place and burial-place the *monarch of no monuments!*

If Wantage, his birth-place, neglects him, and if Winchester, his burial-place, once the metropolitan seat of his rule, so dishonours and outrages him, it doubly becomes the duty of the historian to ask for *justice!* to his memory.

Wantage has to regret that so little pains have been bestowed to preserve some fitting memorial of the birth, and boyhood's days, of our revered and renowned Alfred. She has deprived herself for ever of the proud dignity of having to show at least some remnant of the walls within which he first drew breath. But beyond neglect the country has

nothing to reproach Wantage with; but Hampshire and Winchester have aroused the strongest feeling of national contempt, and have covered themselves with everlasting national reproach.

Attached as I am, and devoted as I long have been to historical study, I have, during no inconsiderable portion of my reflective life, been an anxious advocate to have some society formed for *the preservation and perpetuation of the monumental and inscriptional* remains of our isles, in their exact and faithfully-maintained ORIGINAL *form and wording*. Since they thus give a sort of real life to the localities and personalities of Historic Time, and so much more vividly arrest and interest the mind than the mere dead-and-alive reading of printed books of history and biography.

The case of Alfred affords a gigantic proof of the national want of some protective public body or widely-extended private association to prevent, in this age of the most piling saving, after the wildest extravagance, the further and final destruction of all those yet remaining memorials that give poetry to our isles, and poetry to human life.

I but too greatly dread, for I know that it was but very recently contemplated, that *Government*, from motives of *economy*, may SELL, and thus pervert to some homely purpose of *bridewell* (again), work-house, or mere building speculation, the all-beauteous CARISBROKE CASTLE, in the Isle of Wight. The soothing and subduing effects produced by which, in a fine summer's evening, partly by the sur-

TABLE V.

rounding and widely-stretching scenery, partly by the majestic grandeur of the picturesquely overgrown castle itself, and partly by the *historical associations*, elicited by this so splendid remnant of the multiform ages long since sped, and sped for ever, are such as are not, and cannot, be purchased by any amount of money elsewhere.

Then why not perpetuate that which we *never* can reproduce?

Twenty acres of land within its walls testify to the magnificent scale of its fortified enclosure.

Historically we are reminded that on this wondrous site first was raised an *ancient British mound*, or fortification, being that on which now stands the keep of the castle; next, outside thereof, the *Romans*, in their early (and by Vespasian, then second in command to Plautius,) conquered "Vectis," Isle of Wight, formed their beautiful encampment ground, afterwards used, by the *Norman* lords, for their Saracenic *tournaments*, and now graced by ladies' archery meetings. So that here we come into historic contact at once with the *Ancient Britons*, the conquering *Romans*, the *Norman* lords, and the all-subduing archery belles of the present day.

The springy turf of the fine broad ramparts makes a splendid walk of about three-quarters of a mile outside the walls and dry ditches.

Excepting the well-known Heidelberg Castle, I know of no scene that ever so delightfully absorbed my mind as the Castle of Carisbroke.

I may here, perhaps, not irrelevantly mention, as

strengthening my argument for the organization of some protective agency to save our remaining historic mementos, that the discredit of neglecting our national monuments does not attach *exclusively* to England, but may also be referred to Scotland; aye, to Scotland! albeit so nationally tenacious of every item of her national history, and so well provided with long-organized literary and archæological societies.

Who would believe that the interesting, and to the royal mother once so anxious, state chamber, in which the unfortunate Mary Queen of Scots was confined of the only child she ever bore, viz. James (I.), who was so romantically lowered in a basket from a window in the castle almost immediately after she gave him birth, was, until the intervention of an English officer, used and let out as a common canteen, or suttling, drinking, and smoking room for the private soldiers quartered in the castle. Again, at Dunfermline, no less than 14 royal personages (amongst whom the famous and popular *Robert Bruce*) are reputed to be buried; but, says the "Stranger's Companion to the Antiquities of Dunfermline," published by Messrs. Miller and Son, "when visitors in search of the royal tombs ask, where are they? echo answers, where?—for not a stone tells where they lie." No, not even the so historically remarkable Malcolm III. Canmore, the *founder of Dunfermline*, his favourite residence; the *successor to Macbeth* and the consort of Edgar Etheling's sister Margaret, who expires four days

TABLE V.

after the news of her husband's death, while besieging Alnwick Castle, reaches her. Maude, too, or Mathilda, *daughter* of Malcolm III. and Margaret, marries Henry I., thus *uniting the Saxon and Norman* lines. It is, possibly, from this "good Queen Maude," a worthy daughter of her mother Margaret, and herself the mother of the Empress Mathilda, that Maude or Maud is one of the names bestowed on the Princess Alice, second daughter of her Majesty the Queen Victoria.

But to return to our own *Alfred*: the inconsistency of mankind is strongly exemplified in the treatment of his remains. While the days and the deeds, the virtues and devoted heroism of the *monarch of a thousand years* are heralded forth with national exultation, how humiliating is the contrasted spectacle of his ashes being scattered by the rude and branded hand of the culprit! We can join in the expressed national exultation and in the praises of Alfred, because these seem to give unto us individually higher feeling, more elevated station; but where there is either the slightest trouble or smallest cost, then we stand aloof from the object of our homage, howsoever high that object may be. Trouble and expense we leave *to others*, we will have none of them ourselves.

Our great Shakspeare's self-protective epitaph shows how perfectly that great master of all the feelings and failings of the human breast understood, and fore-felt, for what a small amount of gain or convenience, as is startlingly verified in the

case of the Hampshire magistrates of 1788, mankind will violate the last sanctuary of man, and mock at the sad, but, it may be, the soothing hope of the departing spirit, that the no-longer-tenanted body may thenceforth be left in honoured and undisturbed rest.

“ Good Frend for Jesvs’ Sake forbear
To digg THE DVST enclosed heare
Blesse be y^e man y^t spares THES Stones
And cvrst be he y^t moves my Bones.”

But we now quit the subject which makes the mind tingle with mingled horror, sorrow, and shame. We leave the convict-broken coffins, the convict-scattered remains of our Alfred! of our Alfred’s queen! and of our Alfred’s son and successor! and of others most dear unto them, to the contemplation of the HAMPSHIRE magistrates of 1788, and equally to the contemplation of the bishop and dignified clergy of Winchester of 1788, who will stand pilloried and pelted at throughout all coming time by the indignant spirit of the nation.

And we return to the deeds and days when the now hovering spirit of Alfred above us yet animated his (in Winchester) so cruelly and unrighteously treated ashes.

Few words will suffice to reimpress the career of Alfred the Great, the brave, the good, and the wise. The foundation-piles of his fame are the foundation-piles of England’s unparalleled might and glory.

First we behold him gallantly and signally turn-

TABLE V.

ing the tide of war against a fierce, a well-practised, and in every way most formidable foe, in the field of Ethandune, 878, just ten years before the disruption in 888 alike of the Frankish and the Saracenic monarchies, the two first great powers of Modern Time.

So that coevally with the fragmental dissolution of the Frankish and Saracenic Empires, we repeat, was the rise and consolidation, through Alfred, of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy.

1. His *fifty-six* battles (for, with Alfred, going to battle was no more than going out to the chase in our day) ought to have afforded a better read lesson to the Ethelred II. of later time *how to pay DANE-GELT*. He swept from the west, the south, and the centre of his realm, that fierce and sturdy foe that had covered, and darkened, and disputed with him his kingdom, and against whom his elder brother and predecessor had fallen in battle at Merton, 871, limiting them to Northumbria and East Anglia.

And if thus in offensive and strategetic warfare he shone as a star in the field of fame! as a crown to his victories he founded or organized a new form of *defensive* warfare for his shores. To meet the enemy upon their own bold element, the waves, he himself CREATED an infantine NAVY; and he may thus be said to have first shown how the so-oft-disturbed British shores could alone be secured from hostile descent—how alone they could be ringed around with the defences of a *thousand years*.

Brave and subtle and skilled in warfare, alike for the recovery and for the defence of his realm, greater still, in such an age as his, rises Alfred,

2ndly, before us as the digestive selector and consolidator of LAWS. By laws not impracticable, incomprehensible, contradictory, and *explanatory*, with smothering enactments upon enactments, making confusion daily more confounded—but by laws wise, just, simple, and eminently fitted for his people—he laid the foundation of that equitable constitutional and judicial organization which, perhaps, has yielded a greater amount of real civil and political happiness than ever before was known in the world.

And with such effect and energy did he enforce the laws once given, that a child with a purse of gold might ramble unharmed over his realm.

But his laws had the benefit of that natural feeling of moral fitness, and that apt appreciation of the really good, that has ever so conspicuously characterized the Saxon race.

3rdly. He was the first effectively to foster learning; he was *the first* to encourage an Anglo-Saxon *literature*, and thus the first to improve the language in which he daily spake or wrote; and he was himself one of the earliest translators of various valuable works from the Latin into Anglo-Saxon. In an age of pedantry he was *no pedant*. He wished not his subjects to write bad Latin but good Saxon. He wanted to introduce a taste not for an extraneous but a *vernacular* literature; well know-

TABLE V.

ing that the power, the beauty, the music, and the charm of thought can alone be expressed, imbibed, and transmitted in a mother-tongue. He thus was the founder of that *national* literature, which, by the genius of a Shakspeare, was lighted into a Halo of national glory (1564-1616). Such are the great and sound and deeply-driven foundation-piles on which Alfred's name and fame repose; and if time be the test of wisdom and power, Alfred's are the institutions and monarchy, as well as the defences, of a *thousand years*!

And when we add, that all which we have thus rapidly adverted to was achieved between the age of 22 and 52; and achieved, moreover, while suffering under an agonizing internal disease, which, from his 20th year, although it did not incapacitate him for the performance of any of his royal functions, tormented him so unremittingly as hardly to leave him an entire day's exemption from misery during the remainder of his life—or, to quote the affecting language of his biographer, Asserius or Asker, who died about 910, “if it ever was, through the mercy of God, withdrawn from him for a day or a night, or even a single hour, it would yet continue to make him wretched by the thought of the excruciating distress he would have to suffer when it returned”—then I think the measure of our affectionate reverence, our grateful and sympathetic admiration for the heroically patient and resigned Alfred will be full!

The following extract from Hume will show the tone in which philosophic history treats of Alfred, namely—

TABLE V.

“The merit of this prince, both in private and public life, may, with advantage, be set in opposition to that of any monarch, or citizen, which the annals of any age or any nation can present to us. He seems, indeed, to be the model of that perfect character which, under the name of a sage, or wise man, philosophers have been fond of delineating, rather as a fiction of their imagination than in hopes of ever seeing it really existing; so happily were all his virtues tempered together; so justly were they blended; and so powerfully did each prevent the other from exceeding its proper boundaries! He knew how to reconcile the most enterprizing spirit with the coolest moderation; the most obstinate perseverance, with the easiest flexibility; the most severe justice, with the gentlest lenity; the greatest vigour in commanding, with the most perfect affability of deportment; the highest capacity and inclination for science, with the most shining talents for action. His civil and military virtues are almost equally the objects of our admiration; excepting only that the former, being more rare among princes, as well as most useful, seem chiefly to challenge our applause. Nature also, as if desirous that so bright a production of her skill should be set in the fairest light, had bestowed on him every bodily accomplishment—vigour of limbs, dignity of shape and air, with a pleasing, engaging, and open countenance.”

Finally, on the 25th October, 1849, as we stood assembled each to render our share of humble and grateful homage to the memory of so uniquely

TABLE V.

great a sovereign, and at so uniquely distant a time, I could not help thinking that while we were unshrouding his memory to re-embalm it with fresh incense, re-blessing his name, and re-heralding his fame; while we were re-contemplating, through the long vista of a thousand years, his deeds and his manifold merits and virtues, and mentally beholding him, from the Guildhall windows of his birthplace, Wantage, one day scouring the plains on his fleet-footed snow-white steed of Saxony, in pursuit of the discomfited foe and the tattered bird-of-prey banner, the black flag of the Baltic, and on the next day sitting in calm council for the maturing of his laws, or the securing of his coasts, or delighting himself in the peaceful bower of literature and science with his Asserius and other literary associates, as cheerfully as if no war were raging around him; how it would have exhilarated his noble heart and mind if, while we were looking *backward* through 1000 years, he, reversing time's telescope, could, from his own day, have looked *onwards* for 1000 years—to behold the character and attributes of that Anglo-Saxon people, among whom he was the first to scatter the seeds of future grandeur; to behold the Anglo-Saxon race so greatly multiplying, spreading out the fair forms of the daughters of Anglo-Saxony like a silvery girdle encircling the earth; to hear the anvils of industry in our day unceasingly resounding; to behold the realm to which he had given cohesion unlimited in power, unrivalled in its gigantic commerce and its marvellous maritime

TABLE V.

and colonial potency; to have beheld England's flag of commerce and flag of war triumphantly carried into every quarter of the globe and to the very ends of the earth; to have beheld his laws expanding into the great constitutional forms of our realm; and, above all, to have beheld that rude Anglo-Saxon literature, which Alfred was the first protectingly and encouragingly to foster, rising to its **SHAKSPEREAN** era! then, indeed, would all the sufferings, the toils, and sorrows of his hard-earned reign and fame have been at once, and for ever, amply soothed and compensated. If his *ashes* at Winchester were thereafter to be disturbed, his spirit, before quitting this world, would then, at least momentarily, have fore-tasted embalmed rest.

The fact is, I believe, now so generally known as hardly to require being re-mentioned, that although *Egbert* held, virtually, from 827, sway over all the *Saxon* States of Britain, he never assumed the title of King of England: indeed, it was not, as we perceive by the columns of Tables V. and VI., until about 100 years after *Egbert's* death that all the scattered sovereignties of England, *Danish* as well as *Saxon*, were thoroughly united under *one* rule, and all the English crowns resting upon *one* head.

The gallant *Athelstan*, the worthy grandson of *Alfred the Great*, was properly the first monarch of England, *i. e.* of the *Danish* as well as of the *Saxon* portions of it, and probably the first who would assume the title of King of England. *Alfred the Great*, at all events, we know designates himself, *in*

TABLE V.

his will, NOT King of England, but simply, "*King of the West Saxons*."

This is the famous will to which so many modern historians of high repute have most erroneously and unwarrantably attributed the memorable words, that "Every Englishman ought to be as free as his own thoughts!" a sentiment in noble keeping with the great character of Alfred, but which might, with much greater truth, have been ascribed to Alfred's heart than to his testament: for in his *will* the words are certainly not to be found, or at least not in that *sole* authenticated copy of his will, which is preserved in Dulwich College, near London; a fact which greatly disconcerted and mortified the late patriotic Major Cartwright, when he went down to Dulwich College purposely to feast his eyes on the very words. He, however, as soon as he recovered from his first disappointment and chagrin, exclaimed (with certainly greater love of liberty than of historic accuracy), as the late Mr. Allen, Master of Dulwich College, informed me, "Well! no matter! since the sentiment is so good in itself, and has been believed in so long, the best thing we can do, I think, is to let the belief of it go on as before!"

It was, however, never very historically rational to attribute to the will of so wise a sovereign words so very unsuitable to the time in which he ruled. Words which, in fact, could have conveyed nothing more than an empty sound of rhetoric to the mind when the labours of husbandry were chiefly per-

TABLE V.

formed by acknowledged *slaves*, and when *slave-selling* in the Anglo-Saxon fairs and markets (for export as well as for home use) was quite as common as the buying and selling of horses, at present, in the fairs and markets of Yorkshire.

The export of slaves from Bristol to Ireland was very considerable down to as late a period as the Norman Conquest, in 1066, that is, about 165 years after Alfred's death in 901. Boys and girls, of the finest forms and tenderest years, are represented as having been fastened together in rows when exhibited for sale in the markets.

And with regard to the *legalized* slavery of nearly all the peasantry of England, who, possessing nothing in the shape of property of their own, subsisted solely upon what it was the will of their masters to bestow upon them, it will be unnecessary for me to remind you that it remained in force about 600 years after Alfred's death, namely, until the reign of Henry VII. (1485-1509); and that in the reign of Edward III., 1327-77, one of our most heroic and popular kings, an Act was passed directing a large letter to be burnt on the forehead of every bondsman or slave who had escaped from his master.

All this, I think, is quite enough to show how entirely *misplaced* and anachronistic would have been any showy phrase about universal liberty, if inserted in Alfred's will.

We have already treated of the difficulty of ascertaining *when*, properly, the title of *King of ENG-*

TABLE V.

LAND was first assumed. But infinitely greater, perhaps, would be the difficulty of finding out when the name itself of *England* became first generally applied to our island. Indeed, *when* it first came into use I know of no means whatever of satisfactorily determining. But *how* it came into use I have hazarded a conjecture near the top of the Saxon columns on the reverse of Table V.

The various *Ænglian* tribes of the Saxons, whose parent settlement, if they *had* any settled residence, is supposed to have been northward of the Elbe, and elbowing the Jutes, whose territory (adjoining Holstein) is still called *Jute-land*, possessed themselves by degrees of nearly the whole line of the most projecting or bulging part of our eastern coast. The communication most frequent from the opposite Frisian or Saxon shores would naturally, as most convenient, be, therefore, with the *Anglian* or eastern coast.

And thus the visitants of those shores would gradually become habituated to say that they had been making, or were about to make, voyages, not to Britain or the land of the Britons, but to the **ÆNGLIAN** land, or the land of their Saxon brethren, the *Ængelen*, or the, in Latin, so-called *Angli*.

The Saxon plural for the *Anglians* is written *Ænglen* or *Ængln*; the diphthong rendering the pronunciation *Englen*. If then we add land, we have *Eng-len-land*; and from *Eng-len-land*, we have, by dropping the central *len*, a very easy and natural contraction into our present *Eng-land*.

TABLE V.

This is the way which occurs to me to account for the weaker clans of the Anglians having given their absorbent name to the whole land in preference to any of the other branches of Saxon settlers, particularly the *West Saxons*, by whom, subsequently, all the Anglian tribes were subjugated.

To substantiate my hypothesis, that the name of England originated, or was first generally applied, from *without* our country, I may quote the example of the French, who call all Germany *Allemagne*, from their most frequent collision or communication having been with the Swabian border, in which were situated the *Allemanni*.

And it is very probable that we should ourselves, from a similar cause, namely, from the Saxons being nearest to our own shores, have applied the general name of Saxons to all the different Germanic tribes or nations, had we not, from the Latin, become habituated to call them *Germans*.

Holland, although but one province of the Batavian Republic, has, from being commercially the best situated, and the most frequented, as well as the most generally known to foreign nations in the struggle for Batavian liberty, swallowed up the names of all the other provinces, in the same manner that, at the other extremity of the Rhine (for the *Rhine* has the standard of freedom upreared at its fountain, as well as unfurled where it meets with the waves of the ocean), the little canton of *Schwyz*, or of the *Schweitzers*, has given its name of *Schwyzerland* to the whole Helvetic territory. Again, the

TABLE V.

Arabs of Africa now know Spain, not by the name of Spain or Hispania, but by the appellation of "*Andaloos*," because Andalusia is the province, or part, of Spain most proximate to Africa, and the Andalusian Port of Cadiz the most familiarly known to the African traders.

So that it appears that the province, people, or district that has become (no matter from what cause) most known to *foreigners* is that which is most likely for them to adopt as a designation for the whole country to which such district or people may belong; and that nations do thus oftener, I repeat, acquire their names, or general appellations, from *without* their own country than from within.

As corroborative of the belief that a considerable portion of the Saxon settlers in Britain had a common tribal origin with the present occupiers of Holstein, or that the ANGLES *did* issue from the spot assigned to them there, we may quote the fact that the division of lands or fields (by means of quick-thorn hedges or otherwise) in a similar manner to the division of lands prevalent throughout England, is nowhere to be seen on the Continent but in Holstein, if we except Bretagne or Britany, where the long-continued intercourse and intimacy with our own island might easily have induced to a resemblant practice.

Table V., which, in its European columns, I have thus copiously surveyed, on account of its being the FIRST Table of MODERN *Time*, I shall conclude by a sketch of the most brilliant column

TABLE V.

of the whole of that introductory table to modern history, namely, the ARABIAN, or Saracenic, which we shall thus synchronistically associate in memory with the European changes and characteristics to which we have already directed the reader's marked attention, and which will be found, in itself, and independently of the extraordinary interest otherwise connected with Table V., to present us, in the very first great leaf of modern time, with more memorable subject-matter, with a revolution more unforeseen and more wonderful in its character than any of the revolutions we have passed over in the four great pages of *Ancient Time*.

We now turn from the western regions of the old Roman rule to those portions of the earth which were, in part, comprised in their eastern sway; to that tract of the earth which, lying between the borders of the Mediterranean Sea, the Indian Ocean, and banks of the Indus, has so much more often than our own European region been swept over by great and memorable revolutions: thrice within the period of written records, and within the columns of antiquity, as we have already set forth, has the political surface of these districts been completely changed—

1st, by the Persians, under Cyrus;

2ndly, by the Macedonians, under Alexander;

3rdly, by the Roman rule;

and this, independently of the minor revolutions among the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Medes,

TABLE V.

some of which, in their day, were deemed of no inconsiderable magnitude.

But still more wonderful and more attractive to our attention are the universal monarchies, which, in *modern* time, properly so called, have been stretched over the same geographical division. And it is worthy of your attention (as I shall hereafter have occasion more particularly to point out), that the *first* of the mighty, or so-called *universal*, monarchies of *modern* time is partly identified in local origin with the earliest of the recorded universal monarchies of antiquity.

For while the FIRST *Persian* Empire of antiquity arose out of a partly sandy and partly mountainous, or rocky, region eastward and northward of the Persian Gulf, the *first* great empire of modern time, viz. the *Saracenic*, or Arabian, was erected by the wanderers over the geographically-contiguous regions southward and westward of the same Persian Gulf—out of a region which stretches itself *north-westward* to the head of the Red Sea, and nearly touches the Mediterranean; *south-eastward* points, in nearly a direct line, to Bombay, and *south-westward* narrows itself to a fashionably-peaked point, at the Strait of Babel-mandel, as, indeed, nearly *all* other *southern* extremities of the earth do, especially in India, Africa, and America.

This geographical position brought the Arab frontier, *eastward*, into contact with the PARTHIAN or NEW-PERSIAN EMPIRE of the Sassanides, while it equally, *northward* and *westward*, brought

TABLE V.

it into contact with the **EAST ROMAN EMPIRE**, having its capital at *Constantinople*; and which, at the period of JUSTINIAN'S death, 565 (being but five years before the birth of Muhammad, in 570, and three years before the irruption of the Longobards into Northern Italy, in 568), having, through Justinian's generals, *Belisarius* and *Narses*, effected the conquest of the African kingdom of the Vandals, as well as of the whole of Ostro-Gothic Italy and Sicily and the whole southern coast of Spain, had become possessed of a considerably wider range of territory than had ever acknowledged its sway before the Western empire was broken up, and thus wore towards Arabia a more overpowering aspect than it had ever before assumed.

The Parthians, too, had lost none of that martial fame and prowess which had enabled them to meet and overthrow the Roman armies when Rome was in the meridian of her mighty power: ORODES slaughtering Crassus and his legions, in 53, and *Phraates* IV. overthrowing Antony, in 35 before Christ: two dates, by the bye, which we shall not fail to perceive will enable us, by merely transposing or reversing the two figures of each date, viz. 53 into 35, or 35 into 53, to establish a mnemonical hold upon both these achievements of the Parthian arms.

Although thus immediately contiguous to and hemmed in between the two powerful empires, which alone had withstood the shock of the great migration; and which alone, as will be seen by their two (red and

TABLE V.

brown pink) colourings being alone carried up to the very top of their column headings, in Table V., *had* CROSSED the GREAT BOUNDARY LINE, in 476 after Christ, OUT OF ANCIENT, continuously, INTO MODERN TIME; and although, of course, equally contiguous to the anterior empires of Cyrus, of Alexander, of the Ptolemies, and the Seleucidæ, and, above all, to the united empire of Rome,—the Arabs had never, down to the era of Muhammad, properly been subjected to any foreign sway; for, although they submitted to the arms of Augustus and Trajan, these submissions were of short duration; and although, about the year 502 after Christ, the *Happy* Arabia, or Yemen, was subjugated by the Ethiopians, from beyond the Red Sea; and again, 574, by the Persians from beyond the Gulf of Persia, the largest portion of Arabia continued free. Thus, *externally*, Arabia may be said to the remotest ages to have been free; and, *internally*, she had equally refused, down to the era of Muhammad, to acknowledge any one permanent political head—the natives of Arabia submitting, in larger or smaller clanships, hordes, or tribes, to the rule alone of their immediate shekhs and amírs. Many of these might cordially unite for temporary purposes of aggressive enterprise or warlike defence, but as soon as these temporary purposes were accomplished, their union also was dissolved, and they returned to their former relations, to their family, or tribal chiefs.

The surface or soil of Arabia is unequally divided

TABLE V.

into the *Happy*, the *Stony*, and the *Sandy*. But by far the largest portion is the *Sandy*; and equally varied with the soil were the avocations and the degrees of culture among the inhabitants of Arabia. For while some were the professional promoters and the regular carriers of commerce, by means of that wonderfully useful animal the camel, the *ship* of the desert, as it is emphatically styled, others were the habitual impeters of commerce, or the *pirates* of the desert, who would either seize or levy tribute upon every caravan (or fleet of the desert) that had not with it a warlike convoy sufficient for its own defence; two combinations of character attaching (by the way) no *exclusive* disgrace to the Arabs as a people. For the same combinations of character, while in the *same stage of social existence*, are observable everywhere on the earth, whether we look towards Europe, Asia, or elsewhere. In India, up to the latest period where there has existed the power, there has been exercised the practice of imposing an arbitrary and capricious ransom, or duty; or, in case of demur or denial of payment, a positive *seizure* of merchandize in its transit from one country towards another. And in Europe, in the early modern period, during how many centuries were not the twofold characters of merchants and pirates united by the inhabitants of the shores of the Baltic. And for what, but to curb the incessant depredations, or exorbitant and excessive (arbitrary) impositions of the castellated chieftains of Europe, were the great commercial leagues of the *Hanse*

TABLE V.

and the Rhenish cities formed, so late even as the 13th century after Christ?

If the avocations of the Arabs were thus varied, certainly not less discrepant, as already remarked, were the degrees of mental culture or approximation towards civilization that were to be witnessed among them. For while some of the Arabs were contending for literary glory—for the inscription of their prize poems in letters of gold at the annual poetical competitions, held in the Occadh during the great religious festivals at Mecca (and which strikingly remind us of the Olympic Festivals among the Greeks)—others of the Arabs were yet in such a state of ultra ferocity, that we read from Gibbon, while speaking of the siege of Constantinople by the Visi-Goths, which immediately followed the great defeat of the Romans at Adrianople, in which the Emperor Valens perished, 378 *after* Christ, that a vigorous and successful sally having been made by a party of Arabs, who had been engaged as auxiliaries in the service of *Valens*, “A Gothic soldier was slain by the dagger of an Arab, and the hairy, naked savage, applying his lips to the wound, expressed a horrid delight while he *sucked* the *blood* of his vanquished enemy.”

And between these extremes we may picture to ourselves an infinite variety of gradational shades, such as would naturally be perceptible to every observant traveller who should now traverse Africa or aboriginal America, the two regions which offer the most capacious fields for the study of savage

TABLE V.

life. Among the Arabs, however, generally we may readily suppose, that as conspicuously predominant as the Sandy and Rocky over the *Happy* surface, fragrant with its spices and perfumes, was the waste or wilderness of the human mind over the spots of mental verdure. And here it is essential for us to remark (for we shall thus be assisted in obtaining an insight into the causes which lead to that unequal distribution of civility and knowledge on the earth to which we adverted in our introductory section),—it will here, I say, be essential for us to remark, that, labouring as they did under such adverse peculiarities of locality, mankind were, in Arabia, *precluded* from becoming wholly settled in husbandry.

They had, indeed, become sedentary in those narrow districts which partially admitted of their becoming so, but in the remainder of the *mostly* desert region which they inhabited, covering, in all, nearly five times as much surface as the whole of present Germany, and stretching, between its extreme points, about 1400 miles in length and 1200 miles in breadth,—the Arabs, I say, being precluded, over nearly all this region, from settling as husbandmen, were *compelled* to linger in the less advanced stage toward civilization of herdsmen, and, at the same time (as naturally concomitant upon such a stage of existence), as hunters and predatory warriors.

Being thus compelled to linger at a particular stage of social advancement, they would probably present, at the era of Muhammad, a faithful pic-

TABLE V.

ture of the manners and habits which prevailed in the same wilds in the days of Abraham, which is ascending nearly to the heads of our highest columns of recorded history, or to about 2000 years before Christ.

And if the manners and habits of the wandering Arab had undergone so little change during the long period of 2622 years which *preceded* the era of Muhammad, so neither are they likely to have exhibited any very striking change, even *since* the era of Muhammad, or since 622 after Christ. For although these deserts have poured forth the armies which have erected and overwhelmed mighty monarchies, those who thus went forth did not return so as to influence any general revolution in the manners of the desert, which deserts would be gradually repeopled from those left behind, and new generations would grow up in the desert under the same unpropitious influences which had so imperatively held down each succeeding generation of their ancestry to one and the same stage of social advancement. And thus unchangeably primitive, too, will have continued the habits and character of life in the monster desert of Northern *Africa*, known as the *Sahara*, the wildest and most widely-extended desert of the earth, being about 1500 miles in length and 980 in medium breadth. Further, the Arabs, before the days of Muhammad, had not, properly, any *national* cohesion among themselves; they had felt and obeyed the physical necessity which seemed to forbid them to erect, upon their own soil, at least, any permanent structure of social

TABLE V.

magnificence, and they had continued as politically uncemented into any permanent union as the sands of their desert; and being thus INTERNALLY not only uncemented into any union, but even hostilely dissevered into *numberless* predatory and mutually-hostile bands, they were, EXTERNALLY, not only regarded as powerless, but might even be looked down upon, from the proud portals of the great empires which overshadowed them, as politically insignificant, or, indeed, wholly contemptible. Such then, from time immemorial, had been the general condition of those who, in the seventh century after Christ, were destined to become terrible to so many nations of the earth under the well-known name of *Saracens*! What properly is the signification of a term which has so long and so familiarly been in use, the learned, I believe, have been very much divided to determine; many affirming it to mean men or people of the *East*, in which sense it was first applied, as it is said, by the nations who dwelt northward and north-westward of the Arabs.

And if such had been ascertained to be the *true* derivation of the term, there would have been this peculiarity attaching to it, namely, that, while at one point they had acquired the appellation of men of the EAST, from another quarter, and at an earlier date, they had gained the designation of men or people of the *West*—for such is the signification of the word *Arab*, first applied by the Chaldeans; whose country was situated north-eastward of those districts from which the Arabs approached Chaldea.

Others, again, derive the epithet *Saracens* from

TABLE V.

a contracted expression signifying *men* of the *saddle*: but amidst all the varying, and widely-discrepant, derivations assigned to this word, perhaps the easiest and most accurate solution will be found in the Arabic *Zah rā*, signifying *desert*, plain, or waste; and, indeed, the same word we find, under a different orthography, applied by geographers to that immense tract of sandy waste in Africa, to which we have just adverted, universally known under the appellation of the *Sahara*, or Great Desert. And we might further add, if any further observation on the subject were needed, that this derivation possesses an additional claim to our credit, since the term *men of the DESERT* would carry with it somewhat of that reproachful or scornful meaning which is not unlikely to have been pointed against those who, from their unsettled and predatory habits, may be supposed to have been teasing and irritating neighbours.

While speaking of etymologies connected with that portion of the globe which we are historically considering, there is one (of commercial origin, I believe) to which one can hardly help adverting—I mean the derivation of the word *Levant*. One hears of the Levant trade, of the Levantine silks, and of vessels sailing to and from the Levant; but if one goes to one's maps, even the accurate and elaborate maps of Mr. John *Arrowsmith* himself, we can nowhere find the Levant—it utterly Levants out of our sight: and when one comes to make some verbal inquiry about the matter, instead of turning

out, at last, to be anywhere in the East Indies, or in China, as one might reasonably suppose it would, it turns out to mean simply the eastern ends of the Mediterranean. It is certainly obvious enough that the *Levant* applies to the LEVANT DU SOLEIL, and might, perhaps, not be wholly inappropriate or inadmissible, with those inhabiting either Greece, the Spanish, the Lower Italian, or some of the French ports, bordering on, or situated in, the Mediterranean, westward of Turkish Asia; but when we look at our own situation at Scarborough, for example, on the north-eastern coast of England, we shall perceive that the Levant to us is Holstein and Jutland, the Baltic, or the mouths of the Eyder and Elbe, rather than the furthestmost shores of the Mediterranean, in Asia-Minor and Syria; and to all the countries *eastward* of Smyrna, the western shores of Asia-Minor would be *not* to the "LEVANT" but to the "COUCHANT" side "du Soleil." So that, to us, the adopted French word *Levant* appears both vague and inappropriate, and in lieu of it there can be no objection to using some more definite geographical expression.

We shall now go directly onwards to that period in which the Arab or Saracen history begins to assume entirely new historical features, and those, too, of so remarkable and striking a character, as must inevitably arrest the attention of every reflecting human being.

The first person who draws our attention in the new era of Arab history, is that historically extra-

TABLE V.

ordinary character whom we know more generally by his epithet than by his proper name—for, in like manner that the Divine Founder of our own religion is hardly ever otherwise spoken of or written of than as *Christos* (or Christ), a Greek word signifying the *Anointed*; or as *Jesus*, another word of Greek derivation, signifying *Saviour*—so the reformer of the faith of the Arabs and the breaker up of their previous idolatrous worship, is most generally, if not exclusively, known by the epithet of Muhammad, signifying “the Glorified.”

Muhammad sprang from the tribe or clan of Koraish, noted, at once, as being the most illustrious in their descent, and as speaking the purest dialect among the Arabs; they were the princes of Mecca, and the hereditary guardians of the Káaba, or sacred temple, of the Arabs, to which, at stated periods, pilgrimages were performed by most of the Arab tribes: the Koraishes ruled, however, as the heads of a republic, like Pericles in Athens, or the Medici in Florence, rather than as absolute sovereigns; and in their hereditary ecclesiastical character they bore an affinity to the tribe of the Levites among the Jews. That branch of the Koraishes (for the family of Koraish was divided into branch clans or tribes) to which Muhammad belonged bore the family name of Hashem.

Hashem, the *great*-grandfather of Muhammad, was remembered as having munificently relieved the distress of Mecca during a season of threatened famine.

And Abdol Motalleb, the son of the generous Hashem (and of course the grandfather of Muhammad), was equally renowned for his successful defence of Mecca, 568, against the Ethiopian invaders, or Abyssinian Christians, who had subjected the greater part of the kingdom of Yemen, or Arabia Felix.

The gallant Abdol Motalleb, the grandfather of Muhammad, had thirteen sons, but the best beloved of these was Abdallah, who was esteemed the most beautiful and most modest of the Arabian youth. Abdallah was married to *Amina*, of the noble race of the Zahrites, and Muhammad, the only offspring of Abdallah and Amina, was born at Mecca about 570, being about five years, as already stated, after the death of the Emperor Justinian, in 565, and two years after the Abyssinians had been repulsed at Mecca, 568, by his grandfather. In his early infancy Muhammad was deprived by death of his grandfather, his father, and his mother: and his numerous and powerful uncles, in the inheritance which they assigned to him, reduced him to the possession of but five camels and an Ethiopian female slave. Thus situated, he, being of independent mind, turning his attention to commerce, twice accompanied those caravans which, under the protection of the Koraish, made regular annual journeys into Syria, thus acquiring much knowledge of, and tact in the treatment of, mankind; and having approved himself a faithful servant to the rich and noble Cadijah, a widow of Mecca, he

TABLE V.

was rewarded with her hand and fortune in marriage; and thus restored to wealth and consequence, he had now leisure for the indulgence of those contemplative habits to which it would appear that he was constitutionally prone, for he had been distinguished by them from his early youth. And the result of his private meditations was—that he at last came forward as the public and declared reformer of the idolatrous religion of his forefathers; preaching to the Arab people, especially in their annual great Congregating at Mecca, with glowing and fervid eloquence, that there is but *one* Eternal and Almighty Ruler of the universe; and that he himself is the prophet, or apostle, of God, sent to declare this truth and overturn the idols of the Káaba.

That a promulgation of sweeping reform, thus eloquent and bold, should arouse the attention of the people will be easily conceived, and no less easy is it to conceive that it would equally excite the rancorous indignation of the *Koraishes*, who, as the hereditary keepers of the idolatrous temple of Mecca, were the first who were likely to be sensibly *touched* by the proposed religious reformation, and were of course not backward in their attempts to SILENCE Muhammad, by pursuing him and his followers with that species of exasperated violence which was well calculated to arouse in his favour the still greater attention, and still warmer sympathy, of the people; for thus much we seem justified in saying in favour of human nature, viz. that the *people* of almost every nation, when guided by *their*

natural impulse, like the free Arabs, are ever ready to stand by and succour the weakest! But Muhammad's branch of Hashem was in itself so powerful, that the rest of the Koraish tribes, although they persecuted as far as they dared, were for many years compelled to temporize. The preaching of Muhammad at Mecca began in the year 609, and it was not until the year 622, or 13 years later than 609, that he no longer found himself able, under the shelter of his own family, to brave the vengeance of the other branches of the tribe of Koraish. On the death of *Abu Taleb*, the most affectionate and respectable of Muhammad's uncles, Abu Sophian, the chief of the branch of Ommia, succeeded to the principality of the republic of Mecca. Abu Sophian, a bigoted votary of the idols, and an implacable foe to the line of Hashem, convened a secret assembly of the other Koraishes, in which it was determined that Muhammad should *perish*; and in order to elude or render hopeless the vengeance of the Hashemites, each family of the conspirators was to plunge a sword into the heart of the Prophet.

Muhammad, however, having obtained timely intelligence of the danger which threatened him, effected a perilous *flight* to Yatreb, about 200 miles from the rival city of Mecca [Jedda, 74 miles distant, is the sea-port of Mecca]. And this fortunate escape, in 622 after Christ, is commemorated as the general era of the Muhammadan religion, under the name of the HEJIRA, a word signifying **FLIGHT**. At this era of 622, *Chlotaire*

TABLE V.

II. was the sole king of the Franks; *Ethelbert*, the first Anglo-Saxon sovereign who adopted *Christianity*, and who introduced *laws*, was the king of Kent. In Yatreb (which thenceforth was called *Medina*, or *THE city*, meaning *the city of the Prophet*) Muhammad had already so many converts and friends, that, from the period of his escape thither, he not only assumed all the prerogatives of an ecclesiastical pontiff, but the exercise of the regal authority of a temporal sovereign. And such was the rapid success with which he established his authority in this twofold character (to which, by the way, he was, as already stated, even by birth fully entitled to aspire), that he speedily became, partly by the vigour of his arms, and partly by the persuasion of his irresistible eloquence as an enthusiastic preacher, the temporal and spiritual ruler over nearly the *whole of Arabia*. Within ten years from the era of the flight, for he died in 632, he had achieved the total uprooting of a faith which had been revered by the Arabs from time immemorial, and he had besides achieved the no less difficult task of bringing into submission and moulding into a substantial union the whole of the jarring and dissevered wanderers of Arabia. He had collected and given consistency to the scattered elements, the previously-discordant atoms, of Arabia's future glory. And in the meanwhile "*the KURA'N*," or "*the BOOK*," with which they were to go forth to reclaim other nations from erroneous faith, was already in preparation; for his disciples had re-

TABLE V.

corded on palm leaves, and on the blade-bones of mutton, all that they could catch of the substance of his ecclesiastical effusions. But these fragments or pages were thrown, without order or connection, into a sacred repository or chest, until, two years after the death of Muhammad, the sacred volume was collated or arranged, and published by his friend and successor, ABU BIKR; and this work, having subsequently been revised by the Khalif Othman, has ever since maintained a uniform text, the substance of which is contained in an English translation of the Kurán, by Mr. Sale.

The chapters on the omnipotency of the Deity are, I believe, esteemed to be among the most successful examples of Muhammad's eloquence and literary genius.

The *Sunna*, or oral law, is a sacred compilation of about 200 years' later date than the *Kurán*; it is a discriminative collection into one written body, by Al Bochari, of the innumerable sayings and doings of the Prophet Muhammad, which had been preserved by tradition, and gradually so increased in transmission, that it at length became necessary to reduce them to more reasonable compass; for all these traditions were revered by the people more or less as guides for the conduct of life, and hence the necessity for compiling, at last, all those of the traditions which were deemed genuine, or which it was thought prudent to accept as genuine, into one written body or consecrated volume, and then finally to reject or disallow all the rest as apocryphal.

TABLE V.

The Sunna led to the great schism of the *Shiahs* and *Sunnites*.

When the internal submission to Muhammad's power had been fully effected, the next difficult step was, how to inspire his new subjects and followers with sufficient boldness to assail those bordering and mighty empires which had hitherto seemed to wear walls of brass against the impotent arms of the Arabs. But in his quality of general, I speak not of Muhammad as a mere tactician, for a mere tactician, even of the ablest cast, is but a man of wood or straw, when compared with one possessing those higher and nobler (those *Nelson-like*) attributes of the great commander, with which Muhammad appears to have been so eminently gifted, namely, the ability to inspire his troops with an irresistible self-confidence, to infuse into the bosom of all around him his own glowing and enthusiastic valour; to arouse, combine, direct, and turn upon his enemies, like a *sword of fire*, the very *passions* (as well as cooler manual powers) of those whom he desires to carry onwards to victory; for, after all, it is the SPIRIT of the OPERATIVE warrior which gains the triumph.

Terrible is the shout of battle of those amidst whom the spirit of martial and national glory has once been thoroughly breathed; and such a spirit dies not with the leader from whom it has been imbibed, for though his body may have disappeared, his soul will seem to be yet long afterwards alive among his followers.

TABLE V.

So effectually had *Muhammad*, as a warrior, known how to call forth and combine every hidden energy of the Arab's inmost nature, and so irresistibly to propel it against surrounding nations, that although he himself accompanied his troops but on one external or foreign expedition, viz. into Syria (and died in 632, while a second campaign was preparing), he had already so effectually set the car of victory in motion, that it never afterwards stood still until the fairest portions of the earth were stretched in subjection at the Arabs' feet, until the Arabs had erected one of the widest-spreading universal monarchies ever known in the annals of time.

For Muhammad's troops drew not bit in their career of conquest, until the Arab Jerreed had been hurled alike into the heart of France and into the skirts of India; until, in Europe, they had subjected Spain, Sicily, and we may add lower Italy, and stood alike before the gates of Constantinople and the gates of Rome; and until, in short, they had, alike on the banks of the Indus and on the banks of the Rhone and the Loire, proclaimed the simple *unity of God* (and the honour of his militant apostle Muhammad).

Such, indeed, was the enthusiastic and reckless energy with which, after they had once tasted of victory, the Arabs poured themselves forth, that speedily after Muhammad's death we find them not contented with assailing *one* of the mighty monarchies, which had so long looked down upon them

TABLE V.

with disdain, but attacking, and with equal vigour, the other empire also, striking home at once at the Persian as well as the Roman, and entering in the very same year (viz. 637), which was but five years after Muhammad's death, CTESIPHON, the *capital of PERSIA*, and JERUSALEM, the well-known capital of Palestine, that capital which has so often experienced a change in its temporal sovereign and its state religion.

The Arab, in detail, in his track of victory, his road of triumph, we cannot follow; the nature of this publication does not admit of it. But we can readily convey an idea of the rapidity with which these mounted missionaries, these conquerors for heaven, as well as for earth, these gatherers up at one thrust of crowns temporal and crowns eternal (doing BUSINESS this, with a vengeance), not merely overrun, but substantially secured the sovereignty over (a distinction, which in measuring the success of the Arabs it is material to remember) regions of first-rate magnitude and of primary political importance—a rapidity which left the assailed but little time for aying and naying, or arguing the matter with the new creedsmen and new rulers, for the lightning of the Arab's scimitar was often felt gleaming over the heads of the conquered before they had even heard the thunder of the mounted warrior's hoof.

In the ten years of the reign or administration of the Khalif *Omar* (who followed *Abu Bkr*, the immediate successor of Muhammad, and which Abu

TABLE V.

Bikr survived Muhammad *only two years*), the Arabs reduced to his obedience *thirty-six thousand cities* or castles, destroyed four thousand churches or temples of the "unbelievers," and erected fourteen hundred mosques for the exercise of the Muhammadan faith. Between 635 and 651, or within the compass of *sixteen years*, the Arabs had totally and finally reduced into tranquil subjection that wide sovereignty which, first under the name of the *Parthian*, and subsequently of the *New-PERSIAN* Empire, had, during hundreds upon hundreds of years, scoffed at the terror of the *Roman name*, and effectually resisted the whole weight of the *Roman power*. And if the rapid subjection of Persia present a striking memorial of the military genius and energy of the Arabs in the very early period of their career in the *east*, the rapid reduction of mountainous Spain 60 years later has left an equally memorable evincement of their extraordinary martial prowess in the *west*. For Spain, which, in a far more savage and disorderly state, had resisted the Romans during 200 years, was overwhelmed in *about eleven months* by the Arabs, under *TARIK* and *Musa*. Connected with the Arab subjection of Persia, we remark this striking circumstance, viz. that after his defeats, and the sack of *Ctesiphon*, his capital, 637-651, *Yazdijird III.*, the last of the house of *Sassan*, and the last ruler of Persia who professed the RELIGION of **ZOROASTER**, fled to those very *mountains of Farsistán*, from which *CYRUS*, the great founder of the *first*

TABLE V.

Persian monarchy, had descended about *twelve hundred years before*.

Numerous fugitive Persians, or **PARSEES**, bearing with them the thenceforth scattered **FAITH OF ZOROASTER**, are driven *by sea* [to Bombay] and by land **INTO INDIA**; 't is thus that mankind get scattered over the earth.

Recapitulatively we may rehearse in memory, that Muhammad was born 570, being five years after the death of Justinian 565, and two years after the irruption of the Longobards into Upper Italy, 568; that he began preaching at Mecca 609 (being but nine years later than the promulgation of Christianity to our Saxon forefathers in Britain, by Austin and 40 other monks, in 600), Muhammad being then 39 years old; at the era of the Hejira, 622, he was 52 (the same age as Alfred and Shakspeare when they died); and at the period of his death, ten years later, he was 62. Further, that the conquering Arabs, who had entered Ctesiphon and Jerusalem as early as 637, had, by 732, pushed their conquests eastward beyond the Indus to Gujerat, as well as to the Hydaspes and to Kashmi'r; and westward, after conquering all Spain, they had carried their arms to the banks of the Loire in the very heart of the Frankish monarchy.

In contemplating the conquests of the Saracens or Arabs we have a modern exemplification upon a broad scale of that *absorbency of name* which so often accompanies the victorious *tribe* or nation. The inhabitants of the extensive southern and eastern

TABLE V.

shores of the Mediterranean had long been proud to assume and make a parade of the name of *Romans*; and by this appellation they would be most generally known to the nations around them. Next, as being subjected to the Khalifs, they were all included under the general national denomination of *Saracens*; and thirdly, they have ceased to be Saracens, and have now, *nationally*, all become Turks.

The word **KHALIF**, signifying simply SUCCESSOR (*i. e.* successor to the Prophet), was assumed by such as succeeded (at first *electively*) to the exercise of the supreme temporal and spiritual dominion which Muhammad had founded as *the* most sacred and honourable of all earthly titles. And with regard to the earliest *Khalifs* we note this singularity, that, although at the head of an essentially military and so very recently founded an empire, they very seldom indeed were seen in the field with their conquering armies, they being mostly occupied in their ecclesiastical duties or in the administration of civil justice. The laws of the Arabs, as we may here observe, being for the most part founded on the *common principles of the understanding*, readily and durably maintained their influence. While the Khalifs were thus employed, they entrusted to their valiant generals the rapid extension of their empire; and among these generals in the early annals and great battles of the empire, we find *Khaled*, significantly meaning the "*sword of God*," a conspicuous character, who might worthily be compared to the

TABLE V.

ever-energetic and danger-defying General Picton of our own day.

The extreme or ultra simplicity of the Khalifs of *Medina*, of the earliest date, contrasts finely with the extreme splendour of the Khalifs of Damascus and of *Bagdad* in subsequent days. In the articles of capitulation, framed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem, it was stipulated that the Khalif Omar should himself be present when possession was taken of the city, as a security for the more faithful observance of the articles; and Omar's triumphal journey to the captured city is thus described in Gibbon:—"The conqueror of Persia and of Syria was mounted on a red camel, which carried, besides his person, a bag of corn, a bag of dates, a wooden dish, and a leathern bottle of water. Wherever he halted, the company, without distinction, was invited to partake of his homely fare, and the repast was consecrated by the prayer and exhortation of the Commander of the Faithful."

With a similar absence of all attempt at show or parade, we find him, on his arrival before Jerusalem, "pitching his tent of coarse hair, and calmly seating himself on the ground," "and after ratifying the capitulation, he enters the city without fear or precaution, and courteously falls into a discourse with the patriarch on the religious antiquities of the city." This simplicity of the year 637, I repeat, offers a striking contrast to those later and even rapidly-declining days of the empire, in which we read of the splendour of the sacred Cassar, castle,

TABLE V.

or palace, which, in the form of a vast half-moon, reflected itself in the limpid water of the Tigris, flowing beneath its walls, in the capital of BAGDAD.

Days in which we read of the 38,000 pieces of tapestry (12,500 of these being of silk, embroidered with gold) hung up in this palace, and of the 22,000 carpets, or resting cushions, on its floors—of the tree of gold and silver spreading into eighteen large branches, on which, as well as on the lesser boughs, sat a variety of birds of the same precious metals, as were also the leaves of the tree; and which tree, by machinery, affected spontaneous motion, wafting coolness through the apartment by its oscillatory leaves and branches, the several birds warbling the while their natural melodies. From this sacred palace there would, on state occasions, issue forth a hundred lions, with each its keeper.

Barges and boats, with the most superb decorations, would be seen floating on the Tigris; 160,000 men, horse and foot, would be under arms. The numerous state officers and favourites of the Khalif would be seen near him in the most splendid apparel, their belts glittering with gems and gold; and near these again would be placed 7000 state servants or footmen—4000 white and 3000 black. Indeed, the door-keepers alone of the sacred palace are stated to have amounted to 700.

Such, then, was the extreme simplicity with which the first, and such the extreme splendour with which the last of the Saracen dynasties exercised their ecclesiastical and regal sway. Such were the humble

TABLE V.

Peters, and such the superb pontiffs, of the Muham-madan faith.

The era of simplicity was the period of conquest ; the era of splendour was the day of decay.

The earliest and most *national* seat of the Arab Empire was at *Medina*, and there, that which we may call the elective dynasty of the successors to Muhammad, viz. *Abu Bkr*, *Omar*, *Othman*, and *Ali*, were stationed 28 years. 2ndly, after the tumultuary election of *Ali*, and the still more bloody accession of the first HEREDITARY dynasty, viz. the house of Ommia or Moawiyah, the seat of rule was removed to DAMASCUS ; for this house, against which there was much popular excitement in and around Medina, found it prudent to abandon Arabia as the seat of dominion, and adopt a capital in the midst of its warmest supporters, the *Syrians*.

3rdly. When the house of Ommia was overthrown by the house of Abbas, in 749, such was the deadly hatred to the memory and rule of the Omniades, that Damascus was discarded and the city of **BAGDAD** founded, in 762, on the river Tigris, about 15 miles above Ctesiphon, the ruined capital of the New-Persian monarchy ; and *Bagdad* continued to be the seat of empire until its destruction by the Moguls, in 1258, or during about 496 years, the rule of the Abbassides lasting in all, from 749, during 509 years. The three dynasties, too, are distinguished by different *colours* as well as capitals : *green* being appropriated to the *first dynasty*, and further, in particular, to the family of *Ali*, the

TABLE V.

nearest of all in blood (through his marriage with the Prophet's daughter *Fatima*) to Muhammad; *white* to the house of Ommia; *black*, the opposite of the hated white of the Ommiades, to the house of Abbas, as indicated in Table V. by the respective colouring streaks typifying the badges, banners, turbans, and scarfs of the three several dynasties. The accession of the house of Ommia, as the first hereditary dynasty, affords a memorable example of the unforeseen turns in the affairs of human life; for Moawiyah, the grandson of Ommia, was the son of that very Abu Sophian who was at the head of the conspiracy for the destruction of Muhammad.

And thus the fortunate escape of the intended victim led to the chief conspirator's family being raised to the most splendid and powerful temporal throne of its day; and, moreover, the very son of that man who was the most zealous upholder of the idol worship of the Káaba (dreading probably that the downfall of the idols would be accompanied by the downfall of his own family power, profits, and dignity) finds himself, through the triumphant destruction of the Arab idolatry, exercising a considerably more potent ecclesiastical jurisdiction than even the mightiest among the Gregories of Rome.

In the person of Abul *Abbás*, of the family of Hashem, Muhammad's branch of the Koraish line was restored. It was under the *first*, or elective dynasty, that the great conquest of Persia was effected. And under Moawiyah, the first sovereign of the house of *Ommia* (and the first founder of

TABLE V.

an *hereditary* dynasty of Saracen Khalifs), that a *navy* was created, Constantinople first besieged, and with difficulty saved by the *Greek Fire*, *Sicily* successfully invaded, and the Arab conquests carried along the shores of Africa to the Atlantic.

It was under the Khalif WÁLID I., of the house of Ommia, too, that Spain was subjugated by his generals, *TARIK* and *Musa*, who, in their warlike successes and varied fortunes of life, somewhat remind us of the Belisarius and Narses of the Emperor Justinian's reign. As connected with some proud recollections in our own warrior annals, and with our now only remaining stronghold on the continent of Europe, we may re-mention that the intrenchments of *Tarik's* camp, on the European *Pillar of Hercules*, or extreme south-western rock of Europe, formed the first rude outline of the present fortifications of *Gibraltar*, a word which still corruptly commemorates the earliest fortified position of the Arab general *Tarik*, and which properly (as "*Gebel*" or "*Gibl al Tarik*") signifies the "*Rock of Tarik*." Finally, it was during the rule of this house that a very considerable portion of the territory comprised in modern France was subdued, and the remainder with difficulty saved in the hard-fought *battle of Tours*, by CHARLES MARTEL, in which the Arab general-in-chief, *Abd-ur-Rahmán*, perished, 732, just one hundred years after the death of Muhammad, 632.

But the most *splendid* sovereigns of the Saracens were of the race of *Abbas*, as well as, ultimately,

TABLE V.

the most *unhappy*; for this race, which created the golden era of the Saracen Empire, also witnessed its decline and fall. And especially to this dynasty, for their emulative and munificent patronage of learning, posterity owes a debt of gratitude to which neither of the other dynasties can put forth any claim. Al Mansúr, of this house, had the merit of introducing a taste *for*, and Al Má-mún of carrying to the highest pitch the protection *of*, science and learning. But not less renowned than these two already-named sovereigns of the house of Abbas, is the famous HARÚN-ur-Raschíd (the father of Al Mámún), who is well known in European history as having negotiated, and, as already mentioned in another portion of this work, exchanged presents (among which, from Harún, was a *clepsydra*, or water-clock, one of the earliest time-measurers seen in modern Europe,) with CHARLEMAGNE, and whose memory is moreover graced with an everlastingly popular celebrity as the perpetual hero of the 1001 Nights' Arabian Tales.

Under the Ommiades was the era of arms; under the Abbassides was the era of arts and literature. The house of Abbas it was that trimmed the lamp which, during the extinct light of Europe, the Arab schools kept burning.

The first or *elective* dynasty (at Medina) existed only 28 years, dating from the death of Muhammad, 632, to the year 660; the *Ommiades* (at Damascus) ruled from 660 to 749, or during a period of 89 years; and the *Abbassides*, during 509 years, from

TABLE V.

749 (at Bagdad from 762), as long as the Asian Khalifs continued to exercise any sovereignty, or to spin out a fallen, and, during many centuries, merely nominal regnal existence, viz. to 1258, when the SPIRITUAL *Khalifat* was removed into Egypt.

Glancing across our first Table of Modern Time for general synchronistic recollections, we shall perceive and note, as strongholds for our Arab memory, 1st, that there is but a difference of 4 years between the accession of the first sovereign of the Carolingian dynasty over the Franks, and the accession of the Saracenic house of *Abbás*; for the first of the house of *Abbás*, *Abul Abbás*, accedes 749, and reigns to 753; while the first Carolingian, *Pepin the Short*, the little Napoleon of his day, accedes 752, the year before *Abul Abbás*'s death, and reigns to 768.

2ndly, That CHARLEMAGNE, the son and successor of *Pepin the Short*, accedes 768, and dies 814—1001 *years* before the battle of Waterloo, 1815; thus ruling 46 years, while his celebrated cotemporary, HARÚN-UR-RASCHÍD, the fifth Khalif of the house of *Abbás*, acceding 786, and dying in 808, reigns but 22 years; his reign being of 24 years shorter duration than Charlemagne's.

3rdly, That in the year 800, Charlemagne has the long-dormant title of the *Roman Emperor* (in the West) revived in his favour; that EGBERT, in the same year, 800, ascends the throne of Wessex; and that Harún-ur-Raschíd, who does not die until 808, is, in the year 800, reigning in all his glory;

TABLE V.

finally, that at this period the pope, in Italy, is becoming a confirmed temporal sovereign. We can thus repose the memory, for safety, in recalling the most flourishing era of the Saracens on no less than four great points of European history, viz. Egbert's acquiring a crown, Charlemagne a new title, the Pope a good substantial footing of land, and Venice assuming the name which it still bears. We further repeat, that the struggles and weakening divisions, both in the Frankish and Saracenic monarchies, with which Table V. closes, will identify themselves in time with Alfred's severe struggles against the Danes, out of which, however, *he* at length successfully emerges.

From the Franks it was that the Arabs sustained their first terrible European shock of war, at Tours, on the banks of the Loire, 732; and with the Franks it was (in the age of Charlemagne and Harún-ur-Raschíd) that they first joined hands in friendship. And *hence* it probably is, that, with the Saracens to this day, all Europeans, whether English, French, Germans, Italians, Danes, or Dutchmen, are known only under the indiscriminate appellation of *Franks*. We, too, equally, in the Crusades, gave the misnomer of *Saracens!* to our adversaries, the *Turks*, both belligerents in the Crusades thus curiously miscalling each other.

Among the new features and historical recollections which the Saracen conquests in Europe have most strongly impressed (and which at the same time most readily recur to the memory) are the quoting

TABLE V.

of *proverbs*, the invention of *romances*, the introduction of *tournaments*, and, if not too humble to claim a mention, the practice of *fortune-telling*. But as of graver importance we may mention the introduction of the *Arabic figures*, or cyphers, much valuable instruction and information in geography and astronomy, in chemistry and medicine; and, although the Arabs brought with them that direful disease, the small-pox, which had been introduced among *them* from AFRICA, they also were the first who studied how properly to treat it. The Arabs were, besides, the authors of many improvements in arts and manufactures.

Long *before* the time of Charlemagne they had instructed the Franks in the art of weaving, and had introduced into Europe many eastern vegetables; and they, throughout their whole empire, had established communications by means of letter *posts* 700 years earlier than posts were established in France. The various words, as *Al manack*, *Al Gebra* (from *Geber* the astronomer), *Al cohool*, *Al chymy*, *Azimuth*, *Zenith*, *Nadir*, and many others, especially as terms in *chemistry* (which is itself derived from the Arabic word *kema*), still in use with Europeans, constitute a sort of permanent homage which our literature and science render to the superior knowledge of the Arabs at the era of the celebrated schools of *Bagdad*, *Bassora*, *Cufa*, and *Alexandria*, and the no less *celebrated schools of Spain*, which flourished coevally with the most melancholy ages of European darkness.

TABLE V.

There is even much reason to believe, that from the Saracens the Italians derived their earliest knowledge of the COMPASS, which was, however, doubtless, greatly improved by the Italians, and especially by *Flavius Gioja*, of Amalfi, in the commencement of the 14th century. The Arabs, like the earlier Greeks and Romans, attained, at one and the same time, to the meridian glory of their literature and the meridian splendour of their empire. And the rapidity with which the Arabs swung themselves mentally up to a high station in science and literature is scarcely less remarkable than the rapidity with which they effected their manual conquests of the sword.

On this subject I cannot forbear to quote a fine parallel which has been drawn by the German historian John von Müller:—

“Should I attempt,” says he, “to compare the simple manners of Charles the Great with the splendour of the Sultan of a thousand and one nights; the steadfastness of the Frankish warrior with the fire of the Arab; the tedious progress by which we emerged from barbarism with the sudden apparition of a new faith, a universal empire, a refined civilization, among the hordes of the desert; it would be to draw a parallel between the understanding and the imagination. We behold, on one side, the lofty flight of souls which are elevated by a phantom above the apparent bounds of possibility; we see the fire which animated them gradually diminish, from time to time break forth again,

TABLE V.

but finally lose itself in its primitive obscurity: on the other side, we observe the slower development of reason, steadfast in its exertions, assailed by a thousand errors and passions, strengthening itself by imperceptible degrees, and at length evolving a blaze of light, which imparts, at the same time, the power of effecting greater things, and of calculating the utmost possible attainments of the human faculties."

In architecture it will, of course, be remembered, that the Arabs were the founders of that style which we *mis-term Gothic*, because our ancestors became acquainted with it in the *Visi-Gothic* portion of Spain, but which is in reality *Saracenic*. "It gives," says v. Müller, "that expression of boldness and extravagance which seems peculiar to the Oriental people. Nature is never vast enough for them. The Grecian beauty is too tame for their imagination, which demands something gigantic, mysterious, and emblematical."

On the egregious mal-adaptation of this style to the ecclesiastical edifices of our own island and climate, Smollett makes the following pungent observations:—"Those British architects who adopted this style do not seem to have considered the propriety of their adoption. The climate of the country possessed by the Moors*, or Saracens, both in Africa and Spain, was so exceedingly hot and dry

* [A misnomer not unfrequently to be met with, which has arisen from the Saracens having entered Spain from *Mauritania*, or the country of the *Moors*.]

TABLE V.

that those who built places of worship for the multitude, employed their talents in contriving edifices that should be cool; and for this purpose, nothing could be better adapted than those buildings—vast, narrow, dark, and lofty, impervious to the sunbeams, and having little communication with the scorched external atmosphere; but ever affording a refreshing coolness, like subterranean cellars in the heat of summer, or natural caverns in the bowels of huge mountains.

“ But nothing could be more preposterous than to imitate such a mode of architecture in a country like England, where the climate is cold and the air eternally loaded with vapours; and where, of consequence, the builder’s intention should be to keep the people warm and dry.”

And we have here (as it may not be amiss to observe) a pretty safe clue to the *time* in which our edifices of this order were introduced; or, at all events, we have a pretty decided evidence that it is quite extravagant to ascribe them to such early date as some have wildly been disposed to affix to them. In the first place, we ought to recollect that Christianity was not attempted to be preached or introduced among the *Saxons* of Britain before about the year 600 after Christ—and next, that the Saracens did not *conquer Spain* before the year 711—and that, therefore, this style could not have been learnt, if we assume even the very earliest possible, or probable, day, sooner than about the middle, or towards the latter end, of the

TABLE V.

8th century, by any other European nation from Spain; and it would, most likely, only gradually and slowly find its way to our shores, from that part of *southern* France which was so long occupied by the Saracens having their seat of rule at Narbonne.

If Smollett, as we have already quoted, be thus disposed to find fault with the want of architectural discretion in our earlier ancestry, *we* are certainly not disposed to be very favourably impressed with the *historical* discretion of our *later* ancestry—for it would seem an extraordinary piece of contradiction to have rejected the rebuilding of St. Paul's, in London, on the beautiful Greek model proposed by Sir Christophen Wren, solely on the score of its being tinctured with a *Pagan* origin—while, at the same time, all the other cathedrals of our country are more or less identified, in their model, with the architecture of those very *Muhammadian* Saracens who were long the most fierce and formidable adversaries of the Christian world; for the Saracens looked upon the Christians—who were the strenuous upholders, *in Asia*, of image and picture worship—as not one jot less impiously idolatrous than the worshippers of pagods in India—nay, not being able to comprehend the sublime mystery of the Trinity in Unity, they conceived that, besides pictures, and statues, and saints, and the Christian *goddess*, as they esteemed the Virgin Mary, the Christians worshipped a *plurality* of SUPREME deities; thus they looked upon every principle of the Christian faith as offensive in the highest degree to the *sole* Creator

TABLE V.

and SOLE Supreme Ruler of the Universe. Our prejudices against the Jews being thus completely outdone by the Saracenic, and, later, Muhammadan-Turkish scorn of the unclean "*Christian Dogs*."

To discover a purely *Christian* architecture would be almost as curious as to discover a set of purely "*Christian names*;" our *Christian* names being, self-contradictingly, mostly *Jewish* ones, as "*Rachel*," Hebrew for a "*sheep*;" "*Rebecca*," Hebrew for "*fat and full*;" "*Sarah*," signifying "*dame*," or "*mistress*;" "*Hagar*," "*a stranger*;" "*Mary*," "*bitter*;" "*Dinah*," "*judgment*;" "*Hannah*," "*gracious*;" "*Judith*," "*praising*;" "*Susannah*," "*a lily*;" "*Elizabeth*," "*God hath sworn*," and "*Leah*," "*painful*;" with the equally familiar and choice *Christian* male names of Enoch, Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Benjamin, Aaron, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Jesse, Jonathan, David, Hezekiah, Josiah, Daniel, Jeremiah, Nathaniel, Simon, John, Matthew, Michael, Matthias, and numerous others, all unmistakably of Hebrew or *Jewish* origin.

And these Hebrew names being all *epithetical*, like "*the big buck*," "*the little wolf*," "*the watching fox*," "*the foremost in battle*," "*the bad hawk*," "*the little otter*," "*the black wolf*," "*the playing fox*," "*bear's oil*," and other similar *aboriginal* and *epithetical* names of America in the present day, are seldom *appropriate* to the character or personal attributes of those on whom they are adoptively and baptismally conferred: for instance,

TABLE V.

"Sarah" might oftener be a "maid" than a "mistress;" "Mary," "bitter," might sometimes be very "sweet;" "Susannah," "a lily," might not always be very fair; "Rebecca," "fat and full," might be rather "lean;" and "Leah," "painful," might be very "pleasant:" "Job," too, instead of being "patient," as the name imports, might be a most "irritable" man.

Before quitting the subject of architecture, one cannot help remarking that it really *is* somewhat singular that no modern European nation should ever successfully have attempted to introduce an architectural style of its own, but that the utmost perfection down to this day to which any architect in Europe has aspired, is to be ever the slavish imitator, by rule and line, of the Greek, or Roman, or Saracenic model.

It has sometimes been said of individuals among the dead, that if they could revisit their domestic circles, how surprised they would be at the changes which had there taken place. And we may certainly, with greater force and less invidiously, apply the same remark to departed nations. If the Romans, who celebrated the millennial duration of Rome in the year 248 after Christ, and who would then feel triumphantly assured that the Roman power could never be shaken or overturned; if *they* could have looked up in the year 476, or but about two centuries and a quarter later than 248;—nay, if those *rulers of the West*, who flourished in the 4th cen-

tury, could have looked up in the 5th, they would have found the whole Roman power of the West finally swept from the earth, and not even a fragment of their so oft victorious eagle-standard anywhere raised as a rallying point throughout the whole extent of their former western rule. And, in like manner, how would the Romans of the East (who had a codicil of existence after the *main* parchment and great seal of the Roman power had been rent and broken, and who having, through Belisarius and Narses, recovered so much power and reconquered such ample dominion, that, from Justinian's reign, the Roman authority seemed again to be firmly and gigantically upreared), how would *they* have been astounded to have arisen one century later than Justinian's rule, and then beheld the despised stragglers of the desert quietly and carelessly seated in supreme political and pontifical rule over not only nearly the whole of the previous Asian and African dominions of Justinian, but over the whole of the Persian monarchy besides!

Nay, how would not the mind have been turned inwardly upon itself, if those who were principal actors in the infuriated, and often bloody, religious contests in matters of mere form or opinion, among the Christians, which are so strongly identified with the shores of the Mediterranean, could have returned—during those periods of the Saracenic occupation in which *Christianity along the shores of Africa had become wholly extinguished*, and in which along the whole remaining stretch of the Mediter-

TABLE V.

anean coast up to the very walls of Constantinople, the professors of Christianity, of whatever creed or denomination, were now reduced to the utterance only of a still, small, and humble voice—to have beheld the professors of *a totally new faith*, on the very same African and Syrian shores, *already embroiled and divided among themselves into equally violent and interminably hostile religious sects or parties!* While we, in the north-west of Europe, can be said to have changed our religion of State but once, that is, from Paganism, in some of its various forms and modifications, to Christianity, the State religions of most of the nations of those regions of the East which we are considering have been radically changed no less than *three*, and in some cases four, times. In Jerusalem, for example, during the Jewish predominancy, the State religion was the religion of Moses; during the Roman occupation, *Paganism* was the religion of the State; again, under the Moslems, Muhammadanism; and, during the Christian occupation by the Crusaders, *Christianity*.

Geographically, the sweeping changes that had taken place in the course of 400 years (and how short are these in the boundless expanse of time) might best be read in the progressional maps of political geography, which I have already announced my intention of publishing. These changes are stated hereunder, viz.: in the year 400 after Christ the world, in its universal colouring of red, is seen yet to belong to the *Cæsars* (or *Kaisers*); in

TABLE V.

the year 500 the western half of their dominion is expunged, and replaced by a motley assemblage of new nations: in 600 the universal sovereignty of the Romans seems again to be erected; for the Vandals of Northern Africa have been overwhelmed or expelled, and the islands of the Mediterranean, as well as nearly the whole of Italy, again own the Roman rule.

But lastly, looking at the world in the year 800, we find that the sceptre of universal sway has already *long* been transferred from the feeble hand of the Cæsar to the vigorous arm of the Saracen.

And CHRONOLOGICALLY, if we retrace our steps, we shall find that the whole of the most interesting and brilliant portion of the history of the Saracen Empire is comprised within about 220 years, viz. from 622 down to Al Mutasem, 841, in the *first* period or great compartment of *modern time*; the flourishing period of this modern empire thus occupying about the same amount of years as the ancient Persian monarchy and the contemporaneously flourishing republics of Greece, viz. 222 years, from the 555s to the 333s. At the head of Table V., which dates from 476 after Christ, and even down to the year 622, we find that the Arabs or Saracens are but mere shepherdizing, camel-driving, or wildly roving and marauding stragglers on a wide sandy waste; that, united into one stream, or rather torrent, and impelled outwards by Muhammad, they speedily gather into their bed other streams of population, and swell, before arriving at the central

TABLE V.

period of that Table, into majestic grandeur; and onwards they roll in one grand and still accumulating breadth of waters, until, towards the close of the fifth Table, we perceive, by a *delta* of sectional columns, that the pride and the power of their empire have passed away. For great empires, like the Nile and the Ganges, and other great rivers, commencing by hardly cognizable streamlets, mostly, before they are lost in the ocean, waste their weight, force, and magnificence by breaking into a *delta* of branches, which leaves as utterly undistinguishable as was its original source, its final parental channel.

But even in its delta, the Arab Empire, although it ceased to hold a united paramountship of power in three quarters of the globe, offers signs of its previous vastitude and strength; for in its very wreck, in the tenth century, we behold in the **"TRIPLE DIVISION OF THE KHALIFAT"** three separate sovereign States in the three several quarters of the old world; viz. one in *Asia*, under the House of Abbás (black the badge), to 1258; one in *Africa*, under the Fatimites (green the badge), to 1171, ruling from the Atlantic to the Red Sea; and one in *Europe*, under the Ommiades (white the badge), to 1038.

And even after the Ommiades became extinct, in 1038, the Arabs continued to hold the ascendancy, both in religion and political power, in the peninsula of Europe, until the *battle of Tolosa*, in which the united Christian States were at length victorious. The date of this battle, which changed the political

and religious destiny of Spain and Portugal, is easy of affixment in memory, having occurred in 12 12, or the year of the *two twelves*, three years only before Magna Charta, 1215, and 501 years after the conquest of the peninsula by *Tarik* and *Musa*, in 711; and down even to 1492, the year of the discovery of America, it will readily be recollected that the Arabs exercised regal power in GRANADA, from that *Al Hamra* palace which was the last seat of their European rule, and from the remains of which the highly talented Mr. *Owen Jones* has furnished us with so many tasteful illustrations of its former decorative splendour. Thus, *in all*, the Arabs exercised sovereign power, upon a larger or smaller scale, in Spain, from 711 to 1492, or during 781 years. The taking of Granada, by *Gonzalo*, "the great captain" of the age, was witnessed by *Columbus* before he embarked in the most daring voyage that ever was undertaken by man.

But it is not the Saracen sway alone that we behold thus narrowed or divided at the close of the first compartment of modern time; for contemporaneously the empire of the fighting Franks—the coevous conquerors with the Arabs in this first period of modern time—also divides into various new kingdoms, as *Germany*, *France*, the *Burgundies*, and northern Italy. And this Frankish monarchy, it will be remembered, alone it was which in 732 prevented the Arabs from bestriding with their power every acre in Europe that had ever acknowledged the old Roman rule; for if the broad

TABLE V.

green column of the Frankish monarchy had not already been organized, what resistance could the other feeble columns of that period, split and resplit as they were again within themselves, have opposed to a power which in its very infancy had already swept away the monarchy of the Persians, and crushed the eastern empire of the Romans, the capital alone, *saved by the Greek fire*, 676, remaining unsundered?

The Arabs, as we have already had occasion to observe, had, during the rule of the House of Ommia, victoriously borne the Crescent into the very heart of France. In the south of France they so long occupied so considerable a tract, having *Narbonne* as the immediate seat of government, that, from the mouth of the Garonne to the mouths of the Rhone, the inhabitants had assumed the manners and adopted the religion of Arabia; and the possession of this tract rendered the Khalif of Damascus at once the sovereign of Samarkand (with the Eden around it), and the lord of the vineyards of Gascony and of the city of Bourdeaux. Nay, at one period, the Arab conquests were pushed *eastward beyond* the Rhone; and northward, from the Atlantic and Mediterranean, they swept down all resistance up to *Sens*, on the Yonne, and *Tours*, on the Loire, and stood at the same time before *Lyons* and *Besançon*; and it was the hard-fought victory of Tours—this triumph at last of the heavy *hammering* Frankish mace over the rapid Arab Jerreed, in 732 (110 years after the Hejira, 622, and *exactly*

100 years after Muhammad's death, in 632)—alone that prevented the Arabs from subjecting the rest of France. In the words of Gibbon, "a victorious line of march had been prolonged above a thousand miles, from the rock of Gibraltar to the banks of the Loire; the repetition of an equal space would have carried the Saracens to the confines of Poland and the Highlands of Scotland." "The Rhine is," says he, "not more impassable than the Nile or Euphrates, and the Arabian fleet might have sailed without a naval combat into the mouth OF THE THAMES." And, we may add, that, once in the Thames, they must very speedily have seated themselves down upon London Stone; and we should thus most probably have seen, at this day, a good many more Saracens' Heads than one on the London Snow Hill. Next in their sweep homewards, northward of the Mediterranean, there was no power either in Italy or beyond the Adriatic that was capable of arresting their progress, the Roman power having long been so effectually broken that Constantinople was itself, as already stated, besieged by the Arabs in 676, being exactly 44 years after Muhammad's demise, 632. The reason why the Arabs never, after the defeat of Tours, 732, renewed their attempt (on a competent scale) for reducing the whole of Europe to subjection will be sufficiently obvious when we recollect that, within 17 years after that defeat, the great revolution which precipitated the Omniades from the seat of power and elevated the House of *Abbás*, in 749, was the occasion of Spain

TABLE V.

being erected into an *independent* Arab sovereignty or khalifat from 755, and that the insurgent ruler of this province naturally bent his thoughts and his arms to the repulse of the legions of the Abbassides rather than to the extension of the Arab sway beyond the Pyrenees; and thus the rock of Gibraltar became thenceforth rather the embattled block house *against*, than the regular landing place *for*, further reinforcements for the Arab armies of Spain. Such, then, as we have described them to have been, were the splendid conquests which the Arabs actually achieved, and such the imminent peril which overhung the rest of Europe; for *Christianity* in Europe, thus wonderfully saved, stood wondrously imperilled.

Measuring the Arab Empire simply from the Pyrenees as its north-western boundary, we find it covers a continuous tract, over which, to reach its eastern extremity on the confines of Tatar and India, required a journey of 200 days, or about 7 calendar months, or along a continuous expanse of 5250 English statute miles *line* measure; and if to this we add, say the allowance of *one-fourth* for *road* measure (for the usual allowance between road and line measure with geographers is, as Mr. John Arrowsmith informs me, from one-fifth to one-fourth, according to circumstances, upon the whole distance), we shall behold before us a route of 6562 English statute miles, along the whole extent of which the Muhammadan faith had produced a

TABLE V.

general resemblance of manners and opinions; and along the whole extent of which, excepting in the transit across the subject province of *Persia*, the *Arabian* language had been adopted as the national tongue. And thus the earliest Oriental empire of *modern* time, far outstripping the antecedent empires of Cyrus and Alexander, might fairly compete in its diversified territorial magnitude with the widest extent of Roman rule in its proudest period of united grandeur.

And if thus wonderful were the successes of the Arab arms, still more widely branched and far more permanently fixed have been the triumphs of the Arab faith; for even at this day, about a *thousand years* since the political empire of the Arabs was dissolved, the religion of Muhammad remains, nay, triumphantly prevails, from the Atlantic into the heart of India, and again southward into the centre of Africa.

For the Arabs, who with one arm had uprooted the New-Persian Empire, and with the other wrested dominion out of the hands of the Romans, had at one point threatened to weigh down Christianity, while at another they attempted to subvert the firmly-organized and strongly-cemented religion of the Brahmans in India; and the Arab faith did, in effect, intermediately, almost wholly sweep away or scatter into fragments for ever the *religion of Zerdusht*, or *Zoroaster*. It has indeed been roundly calculated, that Muhammadanism was at one period

TABLE V.

professed by about ONE-HALF of the total population of that portion of the globe which is geographically designated *the Old World*.

One more chronological remark only I have to offer before we quit this intertextive compartment of historic time, namely, that the same 888 which serve so conveniently as a stronghold to the memory for the eras at once of the breaking up or final *division* of the Arab and Frankish empires AFTER Christ, will (although so widely sundered in time) instantaneously bear the memory back to the three eights BEFORE Christ, when another great monarchy of its day, namely, the first Assyrian, was, on the fall of Sardanapalus, also broken up; and conjoining the two periods of 888 *before* and 888 *after* Christ, we shall perceive a lapse of 1776 years between the ruin or fall of the *first* widely-extended monarchy of the earliest compartment of *antiquity*, and the fall or rapid decline of the *earliest* vast monarchy, viz. the Saracenic, of the *first* Table of *modern* time; both these empires being also *geographically* identified in their origin with nearly the same character of contiguous territorial surface.

We must not, however, in thus classing chronologically and locally in our recollection these two, ancient and modern, empires together, fail to recollect the prodigious contrast in the ultimate extent of their territorial surface; for though the Assyrian might in his day assume to all around him the style of a universal sovereign, he was but a pigmy when placed by the side of the Saracen. The conquest of the whole

territory of the Assyrian would have been but the work of a few weeks, or of a few days, to the Arab arms; nay, such a sword as Khaled's would, at a single swoop, have laid such an empire as the Assyrian in the dust for ever. Having thus run over the *rise* and *grandeur*, and taken a sort of precognition of the *fall*, of the mighty empire of the Saracens, we propose, in some portion of the next section of our work, to take a survey of its dissolution, which survey will naturally introduce to our early subsequent notice the empire of the *Turks*; for the gradual fall of the Saracenic empire is closely interwoven with the gradual ascent of the Turkish.

The following extracts will furnish specimens of the style in which the Kurán is composed.

“It is He who sendeth down from heaven rain-water, whereof ye have to drink, and from which plants, whereof ye feed your cattle, receive their nourishment. And by means thereof causeth corn, and olives, and palm-trees, and grapes, and all kinds of fruits to spring forth for you. Surely herein is a sign of the divine power and wisdom unto people who consider. And He hath subjected the night and day to your service; and the sun, and the moon, and the stars, which are compelled to serve by his command. Verily herein are signs unto people of understanding. And He hath also given you dominion over whatever He hath created for you in the earth, distinguished by its different colour. Surely herein is a sign unto people who reflect. It

TABLE V.

is He who hath subjected the sea unto you, that ye might eat fish thereout, and take from thence ornaments for you to wear; and thou seest the ships ploughing the waves thereof, that ye may seek to enrich yourselves of his abundance by commerce; and that ye might give thanks. And He hath thrown upon the earth mountains firmly rooted, lest it should move with you, and also rivers and paths that ye might be directed; and He hath likewise ordained marks whereby men may know their way; and they are directed by the stars. Shall God, therefore, who createth, be as he who createth not? Do ye not therefore consider? If ye attempt to reckon up the favours of God, ye shall not be able to compute their number. God is surely gracious and merciful; and God knoweth that which ye conceal, and that which ye publish. But the idols which ye invoke, besides God, create nothing, but are themselves created. They are dead, and not living; neither do they understand when they shall be raised. Your God is one God."

* * * * *

"Dost thou not perceive that all creatures both in heaven and earth praise God; and the birds also, extending their wings? Every one knoweth his prayer and his praise; and God knoweth that which they do. Unto God belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth; and unto God shall be the return at the last day. Dost thou not see that God gently driveth forward the clouds, and gathereth them together, and then layeth them on heaps?

TABLE V.

Thou also seest the rain which falleth from the midst thereof; and God sendeth down from heaven as it were mountains, wherein there is hail; He striketh therewith whom He pleaseth, and turneth the same away from whom He pleaseth; the brightness of his lightning wanteth but little of taking away the sight. God shifteth the night and the day; verily herein is an instruction unto those who have sight."

* * * * *

"Whatever is in heaven and earth singeth praise unto God; and He is mighty and wise. His is the kingdom of heaven and earth; He giveth life, and He putteth to death; and He is almighty. He is the first and the last; the manifest and the hidden: and He knoweth all things. It is He who created the heavens and the earth in six days; and then ascended his throne. He knoweth that which entereth into the earth, and that which issueth out of the same; and that which descendeth from heaven, and that which ascendeth thereto: and He is with you, wheresoever ye be: for God seeth that which ye do. His is the kingdom of heaven and earth; and unto God shall all things return. He causeth the night to succeed the day, and He causeth the day to succeed the night; and He knoweth the innermost part of men's breasts."

As we are now drawing near the close of the two sections of the FIRST BOOK or part of the PRECEPTIVE and ILLUSTRATIVE COMPANION to my tabularized presentment of universal historical, and literary

TABLE V.

and artistical time, in 25 royal folio sheets, let us test the OCULAR SYSTEM, which I have been endeavouring to elucidate and recommend, by the ordinary rules of practical life. On entering the magnificent Crystal Palace of 1851, did any individual or any family stand gazing at or minutely examining, for the whole day, the first stall they arrived at? *Assuredly not*; the natural impulse of all was, first to take a range over the whole edifice, to mark its structure and classified distributive arrangement, and to catch a hasty first-sight glimpse at all the most striking phenomena of the whole organized world of industrial glory—only occasionally arresting their progress to contemplate some few objects of more than ordinary interest; but largely noting, in the route, various other objects for their future more attentive and more leisurely survey and examination.

And thus, too, it is that, when we first enter the gorgeous temple of universal historic time, we would endeavour rapidly to gain a first-sight glance at the *whole* classified range of great events, and their corresponding dates, and the distributive progression, and fluctuating changes, of empire; marking for future more leisurely and amplified reading all those bold features of the past which the most vividly strike us; and only occasionally arresting ourselves, in our first-sight progress, by phenomena too remarkable or attractive for us to pass onwards without, at least, bestowing upon them some momentary, or cursory, attention and inquiry.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

I find that in treating, in the first section of this work, of "Man in barbarism," I have neglected to advert to one very remarkable trait of aboriginal life in North America, interestingly described by Mr. Catlin, viz. the wholly untaught and perfectly inbred daring and adroitness of the natives in wild horsemanship. Even the veriest urchins, as soon nearly as they can run, laughing at all *riding-school* pretensions, outdo in daring and skill the boldest riders of Europe; creeping stealthily through the high grass, they suddenly dart, or climb, themselves up by the mane, or otherwise, to the affrighted wild horse's bare back, to which, through brake and briar, brushwood and forest, like little unbound Mazeppas, they firmly and fearlessly cling, until they choose to end their frolic by dextrously throwing themselves laughingly off amidst the high grass, or until the half-frantic horse falls down through terror and exhaustion. Connected with this wondrous fact, this expert daring, this heroism of horsemanship, is the still more remarkable peculiarity of the magic treatment, by the wild natives, of the wild horse. They do not "break" the wild horse with the double-bitted and tightened *gag*, with the spur, and the *specially-constructed* LASH, but by simply *breathing into the nostrils* of the poor affrighted animal, generally, it may be supposed, when in a state of great terror or exhaustion, which changes him at

TABLE V.

once from wildness to the gentlest tractability, making him thenceforth perfectly subservient to all the required uses of the native. A fact, which in Europe, through millenniums of years, has escaped the keenest observation alike of our ablest natural historians, of our most practised horse-trainers and breakers, and, above all, of the most wily and knowing of our European horse-dealers, whose *mis*-applied remedy for terror or restiffness probably would be to pour water into the poor animal's ear. Thus useful may be made the *practical* study of the habits (or idiosyncrasy) of animal life!

Severity, which is supposed to cost the least trouble (and a mighty element this trouble-avoidance is in influencing the affairs of man), is but too often, with us, the training which the *teacher* administers, when soothing, and kind, and gentle treatment is what the *learner* requires.

The force and skill, too, with which, when on horseback at full speed, the aboriginal American can shoot an arrow quite through the body of a buffalo, would, if not so undeniably known to be a fact, appear perfectly incredible.

In readverting to "Man in barbarism," and to Mr. Catlin, as the able illustrator of the history and habits of savage life, I cannot refrain from observing, that, had the British Government been at all alive to the interests of historic science, to the national requirement of adopting some more efficient principle than has hitherto been in operation for the advancement of a nationally-advantageous

TABLE V.

prosecution of historic study, they would not, and could not, have missed the golden opportunity of purchasing, and thus securing to the British people, Mr. Catlin's North-American collection, to form one of the entrance compartments to the great study of history, filled with such palpabilities of illustration, as would be best calculated to awaken reflection in the public mind, on those industrial energies and those great mental appliances which have gradually so wonderfully separated cultured and civilized, from ultra-savage life. Such reflections naturally tending, as the next step, to draw the mind onwards to inquiry into man's history in its more advanced stages.

That such an opportunity, I repeat, should nationally have been altogether neglected, an opportunity which may never more return, must naturally be a source of lasting regret to every real lover of the advancement of the systematic study of history.

But in a country where, without any inflicted punishment, any expressed reprobation, or even any arraignment of inquiry, so gross and so monstrous a violation of all the great moralities of history as was exercised at Winchester in 1788 is permitted, it could hardly be expected that any of the Governments or Administrations that have existed since 1842, about which period, as far as I can recollect, Mr. Catlin arrived in this country, should have had either a just sense of the value of forming, or the rudimental capability to form, the beginning of any systematic organization for conducting the popular

TABLE V.

mind into the great and beneficial, the expansive and philosophic, field of historical contemplation.

In casually adverting, pp. 14, 15 of this work, to the cumulative monster-masses of undigested legislation which we have upreared in this realm, throwing into the shade the combined legislative diligence of all other nations of the earth, I might have further instanced that the Acts of Parliament in force, relating to the Excise Department alone, amounted some years ago to from 1500 to 1600! Surely these would admit of a little hydraulic condensation.

Then, again, such is the crude precipitancy with which we hasten on in our career of law-enacting for such an empire as Britain, that in "a Marriage Act *Amendment Act*" (during the regency or reign of George IV.), which rendered the illegally officiating clergyman liable to *seven*, or more, *years' transportation*, it was gravely provided in a subsequent clause, that *one-half* of this penalty should go *to the informer* (and serve him right too), and the other half to the Crown!

In arriving at the conclusion of the Second Section of this work, I may observe that I have endeavoured so to conduct the mind of the reader, whether student or adult, over the diversified surface of historical time, as to show that so wonderful is creation as exhibited in the various character, the attributes, the impulses, habits, and multiform condition of man, that to behold but one day's working of the machinery of human life over the whole surface of

TABLE V.

the globe, would supply matter of reflection for the most lengthened after-life. Nay, the action and results of ambition alone, in all their wondrous varieties, might form a subject of perpetual historical study to every reflecting mind; and yet how often the *latest* study of mankind is man.

Our rapid discursive ranges from Zone to Zone, from Pole to Pole, will have rendered it sufficiently manifest, that a leading object of the present work has been to encourage the mind, in the reading of history, to a perpetual exercise of that GENERALIZATION, interwoven with CORROBORATION, which shall ever make one recollection combinatively and corroboratively call up another: and we have, too, sought to show that, sometimes, even the seemingly most widely-sundered points may combinatively act as potent levers to memory.

We have moreover endeavoured to place to view, that some of the boldest elements of historic recollection are directly and corroboratively connected with two of the most remarkable and expansive features of the earth's surface, viz. the desert and the ocean—the seas of sand, and realms of water.

In fine, throughout this work and its detached supplementary “TABULAR TEACHER” the primary object has been illustratively to demonstrate, that the NATURAL *mnemonics* of history rest upon **GENERALIZATION, CORROBORATION, and TABULARIZATION**; all necessarily involved in that “OCULAR MECHANISM OF HISTORIC MEMORY,”

TABLE V.

or that

OCULARIZATION

of the whole surface of time, which I have so laboriously introduced to the notice of the British public, and toward the more general adoption, and more effective use of which, *as a system* alike for purposes of reference and study, the present publication of the "PHENOMENA OF HISTORY," and the thereunto appended "TABULAR TEACHER," were expressly undertaken.

END OF BOOK I. SECT. II.

Post 8vo, price 4s. 6d. boards, with a fine Profile of
"the illustrious" GOETHE.

LETTERS FROM WETZLAR,

DEVELOPING

THE AUTHENTIC PARTICULARS

ON WHICH THE

"SORROWS OF WERTER"

ARE FOUNDED.

BY

MAJOR BELL.

"The information which the present work affords was obtained by Major Bell during a residence of several months on the spot; and he communicates it in a style equally pleasing and unassuming."—*New Monthly Magazine, New Series, No. 9.*

"The celebrity which the author of the 'Sorrows' has since obtained, and the great popularity of this book, make an account of it a 'curious leaf in the history of literature.'"—*New Edinburgh Review, October, 1821.*

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR; AND SOLD BY
ROBERT BALDWIN, 47, PATERNOSTER ROW.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following is a literal copy of the *descriptive announcement*, officially transmitted to the Executive Committee of the Crystal Palace Exhibition of May, 1, 1851, of the COLOURED ROYAL FOLIO TABULAR WORK, frequently referred to in the "First-Sight Phenomena of Historic Time," as well as in the "Tabular Teacher of the Theory and Thrift of Combinative and Corroborative Historic Memory."

GREAT EXHIBITION OF THE WORKS OF INDUSTRY OF ALL NATIONS, MAY 1, 1851.

CLASS 17, No. 203; but exhibited, for the greater convenience of wall space, in the Mining Section of the South-Western Avenue of the Crystal Palace. Class I.

Vividly Illustrated and Impressed by an Original Principle of Colouring,

TWENTY-FIVE ROY. FOLIO CHARTS OF UNIVERSAL
HISTORY, UNIVERSAL LITERATURE, AND THE SEVERAL
SCHOOLS OF PAINTING,

presenting, in separate series, the correlative and progressive structure of the whole Tabular Surface of

Historical and Biographic Time, are exhibited by MAJOR JAMES BELL, in Seven Rolls (as well as in their more generally-used *Book-Form*), covering a wall-space of about 16 ft. by 14 ft., under the following general heading, in white lettering upon an ultramarine blue ground, viz.—

"MAJOR BELL'S OCULAR MECHANISM OF HISTORIC MEMORY,

" giving to Historical, Literary, and Artistic TIME, by
 " Tabular Presentment, a VISIBLE SURFACE; an emphatic change of 'Form and Pressure,' in its consecutive Grand Eras; an OCULAR CLASSIFICATION, of Synchronistic Structure, continuously extending over a surface of nearly 4000 years; and giving to the *World of Nations!*—of Events!—of Individual Renown! in every sphere of celebrity; in collateral Columns, and in Coeval Strata; their Correlative, Chronological Affixment, their Ethnographic Station, on the Rolls of the Universal Historic, Literary, and Artistic Memorials of Man!"

This work, which addresses itself to the practical attention of the inquiring, and, especially, of the Parental public, as well from the great Educational Advantages which it offers, as from the vast amount of Mental and Mechanical Labour that has been bestowed upon its Systematised Construction, embodies, in its consecutively marked Grand Eras—in its Original and Specific Principle of Colouring—in its graduated Varieties of Type—its numerous Mnemonical Appliances, and in the rigid SYNCHRONISTIC Unity of its Collaturally-spread Columns of Nations—the earliest

attempt, in the British dominions, to reduce the great Study of History from a Chaos of Complexity to the Regularity of a System.

Blank Outline Tables, showing, in themselves, the ever-fluctuating *Form* of the Surface of Progressional Time, and designed for filling up in *Tablette* practice, it may be added, is part of the System of Major Bell's "Ocular Mechanism of Historic and Biographic Memory."

In reference to this laborious work, and the concomitant attempt to improve the Practice, by Systematising the Principle, of Historic Teaching, we extract the following notice from the "*Oxford Journal*" of the 3rd November, 1849, viz:—

"A work entitled 'A View of Universal History, Universal Literature, and the Several Schools of Painting,' by Major James Bell, dedicated by special command to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and which has reached its fifth edition, has been brought before our notice by the talented author, who, it will be recollected, took a prominent part in the proceedings of the Alfred Jubilee, at Wantage. The work in question is certainly a national one, and so comprehensive in its character, that the history of every country on the face of the habitable globe, from the earliest period of time, is seen at one view. It has become a Text Book at the public schools, and as a work of reference, for all who feel any interest in Ancient or Modern History, it is without a parallel. The late *Head Master of the Richmond Grammar School*, Yorkshire, the *Rev. James Tate*, subsequently *Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's*, spontaneously gave

“the following well-known *Autographic* Testimonial
“respecting this publication, ‘after two years’ daily use
“‘of it with his senior pupils,’ viz.:—

“‘*It is a work on Universal History, ancient and*
“‘*modern, of the greatest usefulness possible, nor can*
“‘*any library be complete without it. I only lament,*
“‘*for the sake of Major Bell, that such a Book, at such*
“‘*a Price, can never repay him for the pains which he*
“‘*has bestowed on its publication; its value to Historical*
“‘*Literature is inestimable.*’

“The work is printed in a Tabular Form, and by the
“aid of colouring is rendered still more intelligible and
“easy of access on any point of History in any country;
“it is got up in every department with great accuracy,
“and is of itself an imperishable monument of the
“labour, industry, and ability of an individual who has
“devoted a life-time to promote and facilitate the Study
“of History, in a manner never before attempted, or
“with such signal success.”

FIFTH EDITION.

Price, Coloured, in the Roy. Fol. *Book-Form*, handsomely and strongly half-bound, 2l. 10s.—to Subscribers, 45s.

Price, *Chart-Wise*, on rollers, for suspension in School Rooms or Studies, mounted on calico, coloured and varnished, 5l. 5s.

Address, Major Bell, care of Messrs. A. M'Farlane and Sons, Book-Binders, No. 10, Old Bailey, London.

Woodfall and Kinder, Printers, Angel Court, Skinner Street, London.







