harbours. Nine months after planting, the cottons shows its first pod, and then continues to yield with increasing power, and the plant may live. At the same time, and on the same tree, is seen the blossom, the green pod, and the green leaves. The most important consideration in connexion with the cultivation of cotton in these islands is the fact that there would be no scarcity of labour. We are estimated to have 600,000 natives, constituting the population of Fiji, would afford a large supply. Nature supplies every requisite to make its cultivation possible. The Fiji Islands are well supplied with fresh water, and standing all these advantages, Mr. Fritchard maintained that it was only in the security of his protection that cotton could be cultivated in Fiji.

The Foreign Office having received the deed of cession from "Ebenese Thambukom, by the Grace of God Sovereign Chief of Bau and its Dependencies, Vanua-i, the Armies of Fiji and Tui Viti," transferred it to the Colonial Office for the opinion of Sir Edward Lytton. The Colonial Secretary regarded the proposal as one likely to be of material advantage to this country; but he was not quite certain about it, without ascertaining the views of the Board of Admiralty. The naval authorities lost no time in expressing their opinions. Sir Edward Lytton then, in a letter to the same end, "there are several reasons which would make it desirable to obtain the possession of the islands of the Fiji group, and they are decided in favour of any advanced position in the Pacific Ocean. We have valuable possessions on either side of it, and it will be to our interest to have a strong and healthy settlement there, which may be a check to the growth of private would, and which might be of service to us in any emergency. Mr. Fritchard, in a letter to the Committee of the Cotton Supply Association for examination are found to be of qualities most desirable for the manufactures of this country, and the Committee have formed an opinion in all respects favourable to these samples, and believe that such a range of excellent cotton is scarcely now received from any cotton-growing country which supplies this requisite raw material to Great Britain. Resolved, That whilst this Fiji cotton ranges in value from 7½d. to 1s. the large supply received from the United States does not realise nearly half so high an average value at present."

In April, 1859, Sir Edward Lytton, in a letter to the opinion of Lord Malmsbury, whether, supposing on other grounds it is found to be desirable to accept the sovereignty of the islands, their occupation by Great Britain may not lead to embarrassment or complication with foreign powers who have a large share in the commerce. Lord Malmsbury replied that he did not think any such embarrassment would follow the annexation. The Colonial Office has not been consulted as to the opinion from Mr. Fritchard as to the mode in which the Fiji Islands might be governed if their cession should be obtained for the purposes of Great Britain.

So far everything seems to be favourable to the proposed cession. But, in 1860, the Governor of New South Wales threw doubts upon the expediency of completing the arrangements, and the Government determined to send a special agent to the islands to report on the subject. Col. Smythe was selected for this purpose, and he expressed a decided opinion against the proposal. His statement, together with other considerations urged by him, to the effect that the question of the government of the Fiji Islands remained before the Committee, was at once denounced by Mr. Fritchard as "one of the most ridiculous, if not the most absurd, propositions ever submitted to the House of Commons. The statement that any civilized power which may make itself responsible for the government of the Fiji Islands cannot very well afford the immediate expenditure, with the possibility before long of finding itself involved in native wars, and, possibly, in wars with all other civilized nations. It would also appear very absurd to suppose that the welfare of the natives would not be better consulted by leaving their civilization to be effected by causes which are already in operation."

Finally, in September, 1861, Lord Russell sent a despatch to the Colonial Office announcing his concurrence with the report of Newcastle, that it would be inexpedient to accept the sovereignty of the islands.

The correspondence now laid before Parliament contains the valuable scientific Report of Dr. Bertold Seemann. But as our readers have had an opportunity of perusing Dr. Seemann's communications, sent to the Athenaeum from the Fiji Islands more than twelve months ago, and we understand he is now living through the press, we refrain from dealing at present with that in truth the most interesting portion of the official papers.

KILIMANJARO AND ITS SNOWS.

Fernando Po, May 23, 1859.

It is cold weather to answer in July a correspondence in your valuable columns dating from February; but—why not? I find myself then in the position of Mr. Pickford, who was the original of pensive, Dr. Seemann's communications, sent to the Athenaeum from the Fiji Islands more than twelve months ago, and we understand he is now living through the press, we refrain from dealing at present with that in truth the most interesting portion of the official papers.

The celebrated "umbrella story," a fanciful fiction, has been rightly contradicted by Mr. Cooley. Who does not remember the strange feeling shown by the Royal Geographical Society when informed that the brave, but imprudent Mr. Kuroe was compelled, after a fray and a flight, to fill his double-barrel with water, and to preserve his life by the pious draught? Was there a member of our Society so dead to sympathy as to "ridicule" such use of a gun? But if the missionaries imposed only by their enthusiasm the results of the travels and discoveries of the missionaries.

Secondly, Capt. Burton—allow me to speak of him in theplural, for he was the leader of the Kishima-ajofo, for the best reason,—he never tried. He was ordered to explore the "Sea Unyamwezi," to see if it contained the source of his poor powers he obeyed orders. His trip to Fouta was the result of a separate mission, an escape from the Hambury gentry of Zanzibar. When the lowlands were being swept by hordes of returning Europeans, the Breton, a member of the Beloch soldiery of Elise Highness the Sajjyih within sight of the ramparts of Momba. Capt. Burton could not have cut his way through them without a large escort, or rather a little army. This, as he said, would have cost him 5,000l., whilst 1,000l. was the total sum allotted to him for explorational purposes from public funds. He did not know, perhaps happily, at the time, that the Indian Government, on the day on which the last British war ended in early life, would allow him and his companion to be the worse by some 1,400l. in the due course of events. It was only in reflecting that his "tentative journey" to Fouta was probably the means of saving Mr. and Mrs. Capt. Spence and Burton, hearing that the Wanzes had gone on a Business, hurried up to the Mission house, some miles distant, and assisted upon the tenants retiring to a place of protection, the "humble office," the position of the "Crown of Glory"; but the two Englishmen, who could not object to his "taking the shilling" in the "nobly army," informed him that his wife, an Englishwoman, could not be permitted to land. Mr. Rehbman listened to reason. A few days afterwards a command of the Wanzes swept over the Shima hills, massacred the Wanzes population, and, as I have said, spared the English back into their fortress.

From the Wise Man of Gotha, I turn to Mr. Cooley, who for this time only appears in the humble rôle of my defender and, Heaven preserve me from such defaulders! Mr. Cooley, commenting upon a passage in one of my reports (Journal of a C. S. cron. p. 200), says: "Mr. Cooley is no doubt a very learned man, and unquestionably means that they (i.e. native travellers who had, I said, described the much-beloved Egyptian Olympus soberly) completely destroyed the existence of snow. But it is evident that Capt. Burton was restrained from close inquiry and freedom of speech on this subject by the influence of the Royal Geographical Society, where with little geography there is much partisanship."

Mr. Rehbman, in a letter to Mr. Cooley to Blackwood's Magazine (March, 1868, page 579), where, after detailing sundry mythical tales touching Kilimanjaro, he refers to the "physical geographer," who the Mombwa missionaries travelled to Kilimanjaro "armed with nothing but an umbrella," remarks—"one of his (Capt. Burton's) greatest mistakes, finished off by him in his most dazzling appearance, when he was forced to cut his way from the coast the word, and he brought it back uncorrected and unchanged,—leaving it to be supplied, but not venturing to correct(!), thus the puerile linguistic whimsies of the missionaries were confirmed in the interior. I do not hesitate to state my conviction that the great empire with the head of the long hair, and I, Mr. Cooley, upon my humble powers of opinion or expection by the Royal Geographical Society, or by any other Society yet invented.

In the same letter, Mr. Cooley, who kindly extenuates many of my "mistakes" by ascribing them to the "misinformation and wrong bias" given to me "by way of instructions," further remarks—"one of his (Capt. Burton's) greatest mistakes, finished off by him in his most dazzling appearance, when he was forced to cut his way from the coast the word, and he brought it back uncorrected and unchanged,—leaving it to be supplied, but not venturing to correct(!), thus the puerile linguistic whimsies of the missionaries were confirmed in the interior. I do not hesitate to state my conviction that the great empire with the head of the long hair, and I, Mr. Cooley, upon my humble powers of opinion or expection by the Royal Geographical Society, or by any other Society yet invented.

Quaestus tandem!—Mr. Editor, I spent six months in Unyamwezi. I collected a vocabulary of that language, compared with hundreds of Wanyamwezi natives, all of whom called their country Unyamwezi, their individualities Mnyamwezi (the orign of the corrupted forms which Mr. Cooley, upon most insufficient evidence, calls the only authentic name), is of territorial and territorial origin, and has nothing to do with the origin of the tribe. Quaestus tandem!—Mr. Editor, I spent six months in Unyamwezi. I collected a vocabulary of that language, compared with hundreds of Wanyamwezi natives, all of whom called their country Unyamwezi, their individualities Mnyamwezi (the orign of the corrupted forms which Mr. Cooley, upon most insufficient evidence, calls the only authentic name), is of territorial and territorial origin, and has nothing to do with the origin of the tribe.
mandant! May we not reply to this distinguished encomium,
A.A. L. C. S. C. -
Impey, hum!' I think it complex & elegant:

‘To conclude this lengthy communication. At the same time, the argument of the case would be, if a cone 17,000 feet high would be seen from the author's observatory, that until my hand had touched that snow, a position of the stars was not to be ventured upon. I now believe that the author has mentioned the names of the townships in the north of Scotland.'

I am ready at any time, when not otherwise warned, to bring home a sample of its use; and I cannot confine myself to a greater pleasure than indicating Her Majesty's Government to send me to fetch, at a moment's notice, as Mr. Cooley would argue—but a bottle of Kilmarasian wine.

RICHARD F. BURTON.

BIBLE HISTORY AND THE RAINFOREST CANYON

1 Hill Street, Berkeley Square, July 15, 1866.

Before seeing Dr. Hincks's letter of June 29, which was published on the 16th, I had prepared a Comparative Table of the four copies of the recently discovered Assyrian Canon, in the British Museum; and, in consequence of the discovery of Tidiglath-Pileser, Sargon and Sennacherib; and I had intended to publish this table without further consideration, in order to show that the Assyrians might exercise their own ingenuity in reconciling the apparent discrepancies of the several lists, and I offer my tables for look out at the next number, for the sake of the synchronisms, for which the lists afford materials, between Jewish and Assyrian history. Dr. Hincks's letter obliges me to give a somewhat greater extension to this plan, for I am not impossible for me to avoid noticing, in the first place, the general drawback of the translation of the prayer, where I have found in Assyrian discovery which pervades its communication. It is equally impossible to avoid the offensive strictures which has been thrown out against the authorities of the British Museum. Such topics seem to me to be entirely out of place in a chronological controversy, and can only be explained, I would suggest, by the excessive mortification which the Doctor feels as having allowed the now celebrated "Canons" to slip through his fingers, notwithstanding that he has, as an active of the principal fragments in 1854, during his employment at the British Museum, in the very point of his researches into the Assyrian antiquities, and notwithstanding that he has written a few pages of early period, and to the character of the character, and to a certain extent, has contributed the value of the mutilated tablets.

Now, the decision of the doctor is of the greatest importance, Hincks and myself can hardly possess any interest for the public, and I shall not therefore follow his utterances any more closely. If anybody should be curious to learn the particulars which have been represented in the Biblical illustration, I would merely refer him to my letter published in the Athenæum of August 20, 1851, in which I found a distinct announcement of my discovery of the copy of Sargon, by Sargon, in his list year, and of the siege of Jerusalem, by Sennacherib, in his "History of the World," where, in fact, all those identifications of tablets of various years, the dates of which have since led to such important results with Dr. Hincks's letter, were to be laid down for the first time with anything of certainty or historical interest, and in favour of the conjecture; and it was not only, I maintain, by my reading of the narratives of Ormuz and Hormuz, of which, by the head of today, and the Geld thus laid open to further research. We have indeed claims to have discovered the notice of Jeshua son of Onni, on the Nimrud Obelisk, in the letter of 1851, he should remember that I had published the reading of the name of Jeshua early in 1850 (R. A. Soc. Journ. Vol. xxi. Part ii. p. 447), and that the writer of this letter to the Athenæum of August 1851 already quoted and, that I had further made the independent discovery of the name of Jeshua the son of Hemaa to the Biblical Jeho, King of Samaria, as nearly as possible simultaneously with the announcement (see Athenæum, No. 1274, p. 387).

Having said so much in repudiation of Dr. Hincks's discovery, I now proceed to consider briefly the important points of his letter, which contains, as I think, some very interesting historical and some very erroneous statements in regard to the "Canons."

Firstly, with respect to the actual tablets, it is impossible to determine with any certainty, from the information presented in Dr. Hincks's letter, whether the fragment which he examined in 1853, and of which he published a notice in his report to the Trustees of the British Museum, was, or was not, identical with any of the fragments of which I have lately given an account. "A list of the annual Superintendents, with the years of the reign to which they belong," would, it is true, supply sufficiently well a fragment of a Canons; but I can only suggest an oath to the more extended description of a "Gigantic Script," recording some connection in connexion with each year of the reign of successive kings; still less am I prepared to believe that the same arrangement, or even derangement, of the fragments, such as they have been given to me since I first examined them, the letter to the the A. S. J. of 1854, published on Dr. Hincks's authority—for the French version does not claim, as far as I understand his letter to the Minister of Public Instruction, to have ascertained the dates by his own personal inspection of the tables—that Tidiglath-Pileser ascended the throne in the 26th year of his reign, and that his own reign extended to 42 years. I am satisfied, and I am willing to state my whole reputation on the issue. It is not chronological data which exist on any tablet in the British Museum, including of course the copies of the Canon, the collection of the columns on the reverse is inviolate; that is, the series, whether of names or words or phrases, commences at the upper left-hand corner of the obverse, and terminates at the lower left-hand corner of the reverse, the order being on the one side from left to right, and on the other from right to left. Perhaps also Mr. Oppert's publication of a third Tidiglath-Pileser after Eshur-Haddad, which seems to me almost similar to the former order of collection, though in that case I must be presumed that he also examined the same documents as Dr. Hincks, and to equally little purpose.

I will now succinctly state what I know of the fragments of tables composing the four versions of the Canon, with especial reference to Dr. Hincks's immense number of unfair dealing against either myself or the authorities of the British Museum, in which 1 tablet consists at present of 8 fragments, 4 belonging to the reverse and 4 to the obverse. 3 of the fragments of the reverse were brought home by Mr. Layard in 1851, and 1 others have been put together and examined by Dr. Hincks in his list of fragments in the British Museum, press, 1866, which I have added to them a fragment, which I had brought home with me in 1855. The four fragments of the reverse, during the present year from the heaps of crumbling rubbish which form the debris of the collection, and fitted them on the tablet, have been seen before by any students, and were so incrustated with earth as to be quite illegible till cleaned. No. 2 tablet is a fragment, containing about 80 names, more or less, of which I had some possession for two years by Dr. Hincks, and it is the tablet which I originally described to the Royal Asiatic Society as containing the "obscure name of a deity," sent it home in charge of Mr. Holdred in 1854, and it has possibly been examined both by Mr. Oppert and by me, and has been now available for public inspection. When I commenced work on No. 1, a few months back, I received this tablet in charge, and could not altogether depend on the correctness of my Ephesian copy of the inscription, but it was not to long, I opened it up and carried it on my search for it, and at length it was discovered by Mr. Cox, assistant in the Antiquity Department of the British Museum. All the fragments of other fragments that had been haphazardly composed, after the shifting of the contents of the various pressers. No other fragment of this tablet has ever been discovered. It dates 124 years after the reign of Sennacherib, whilst the other copies descend as low as the reign of the son of Rees-Haddad.

Of the previous history of Tablet No. 3 I know nothing. I found it during the present year, broken into a dozen small fragments, on the shelf of one of the pressers of my working room at the Museum; I have no recollection whatever of having placed it there, nor of having ever seen it before. It is in a very crumbling state, and the writing is executed much more carefully than on the other tablets.

Tablet No. 4 is a mere fragment of fine clay, consisting of four leaves of 12 lines each, lighted on this year among the contents of a case sent me by Mr. Oppert for the first time, although it had been sent home. This, of course, is one of the other fragments of the same tablet has yet been found.

There is one other fragment which appears to belong to the "Canons," but I cannot fit it on to my satisfaction, and I am inclined to think that it belongs to the very beginning or the very end of the "Canons."

As I have employed at least 20 days during the present year in the mere mechanical drudgery of turning over crumbling fragments at the Museum, and in ploughing over the shameful ignorance of historical or chronological tablets, it is not possible that any large or important portion of any of the records of the "Canons" has escaped my search. Still, as the fragments exceed 100,000 in number, and are for the most part thickly incrustated with dirt, I feel that I must have exhausted the collection. Indeed, I rarely come away from a day's exploration without having found something new to interest me; and I thus live in hope that the discovery of more fragments may yet enable me to complete the series of names, and to solve the difficulty of the disarranged lists.

I must allude in the charge which Dr. Hincks brings against me, and at which I am naturally somewhat indignant, that he charges me with the deprivation of the authority, or at any rate, that my statements and calculations, "if accepted without qualification by the learned world," will have that effect. Now I do not suppose a moment that the authenticity of the historical records of the Hebrew Old Testament is in any danger, or can be in any danger, from a collision with the contemporary evidence of other nations; but at the same time, as the alarm, however exaggerated, has been sounded, I feel that I go further into the question I ought distinctly to repudiate anything like an infidel tendency, and I must apply the test of the "Canons," to show how the recorded Assyrian Chronicle may be reconciled with the true dates of the Scriptural record.

The tablet of the Assyro-Chaldaic Canon, derived from it as it is from independent sources, presents, I confess, the highest respect. Indeed, although Dr. Hincks knows the application to such a document of the term "assertion" of a Scriptural inscription of it does appear to me to be perfectly correct, inasmuch as the monumen of the late Dr. Layard, and that which we have now, were both collected in the same place, and from the same period, and from the same period, and from the same period.