

harbours. Nine months after planting, the cotton-tree shows its first pod, and then continues to yield without intermission for 10, 12 or 15 years, as the plant may live. At the same time, and on the same tree, is seen the blossom, the green pod and the ripe cotton. An important consideration in connexion with the cultivation of cotton in these islands is the fact that there would be no scarcity of labour, for the 200,000 natives, estimated as the population of Fiji, would afford a large supply. Nature contributes every requisite to make its cultivation easy and its growth rapid. But, notwithstanding all these advantages, Mr. Fritchard maintained that it was only in the security of British protection that cotton could be cultivated in Fiji.

The Foreign Office having received the deed of cession from "Ebenezer Thakombau, by the Grace of God Sovereign Chief of Bau and its Dependencies, Vunivalu of 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 unwilling to come to any decision about it without ascertaining the views of the Board of Admiralty. The naval authorities lost no time in informing Sir Edward Lytton that, in their judgment, "there are several reasons which would make it desirable to obtain possession of the islands." They were much struck by our entire want of any advanced position in the Pacific Ocean. We have valuable possessions on either side, as at Vancouver and Sydney, but not an islet or a rock in the 7,000 miles of ocean that separate them. The Panama and Sydney mail communication is likely to be established, yet we have no island on which to place a coaling station and where we could insure fresh supplies: and it may hereafter be found very inconvenient that England should be shut out from any station in these waters, and that an enemy should have possession of Tonga-tabu, where there is a good harbour, within a few hundred miles of the track of our homeward-bound gold ships from Sydney and Melbourne. In one respect the Report of the Admiralty would not be inconsistent with the economical notions of the present day: they remark that neither forts nor batteries would be necessary to hold the ground.

Not satisfied with getting the opinions of the Colonial Office and of the Admiralty, Lord Malmesbury sent some samples of cotton to the Cotton Supply Association of Manchester, and speedily obtained the following resolutions from that active body:—"Resolved, That the samples of Fiji cotton which have been submitted by the Foreign Office 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 great supply received from the United States does not realize nearly half so high an average value at present."

In April, 1859, Sir Edward Lytton requested the opinion of Lord Malmesbury, 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 rights or claims in that part of the Pacific. Lord Malmesbury replied that he did not think any such embarrassment would follow the annexation, and he sent to the Colonial Office a despatch from Mr. Pritchard as to the mode in which the Fiji Islands might be governed if their cession should be accepted by Her Majesty's Government.

So far everything seemed favourable to the proposed cession. But, in 1860, the Governor of New South Wales threw great 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 statements, together with other considerations suggested by the native war in which England was menaced in New Zealand, appeared to the Duke of Newcastle to establish conclusively the impolicy of appropriating the islands. The Duke was of opinion "that any civilized power who may make itself responsible for the government of the Fiji Islands must also be willing to incur a large and immediate expenditure, with the possibility before long of finding itself involved in native wars, and, possibly, disputes with other civilized countries. It would also appear very uncertain whether 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 Duke 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. Berthold Seemann. But as our readers have had an opportunity of perusing Dr. Seemann's communications, sent to the *Athenæum* from the Fiji Islands more than twelve months ago, and as we understand he has a work on the subject now going through the press, we refrain from dealing at present with that which is in truth the most interesting portion of the official papers.

KILIMANJARO AND ITS SNOWS.

Fernando Po, May 23, 1862.

It is cold writing to answer in July a correspondence in your valuable columns dating from February; but—*que faire?* I find myself then in the position of Mr. Pickwick, mercilessly bethumped by the Editors of the 'Eatanwill Gazette' of Gotha, and the 'Independent' of the Royal Geographical Society, who, in settling a fierce private feud, discharge all their bravery upon me.

The "Physical Geographer to the Queen"—such, I believe, was the grandiose title which Herr Petermann, probably with the usual Teutonic object (pay and pension), took to himself—asserts with an affront to fact hitherto unshown by "physical geographer," that the Mombas Missionaries travelled to Kilima-njaro "armed with nothing but an umbrella"; that "Capt. Burton, after being unable to perform the journey Mr. Rebmann had performed" (excuse the English, it comes from Gotha) "three times before him, did his best to ridicule the missionaries"; and that "there is nothing more amusing than to peruse these would-be clever comments of Capt. Burton, Mr. Cooley and others, on the Snowy Mountains and other results of the travels and discoveries of the missionaries."

The celebrated "umbrella story," a farcical fiction, has been rightly contradicted by Mr. Cooley. Who does not remember the strong feeling shown by the Royal Geographical Society when informed that the brave, but unfortunate, Dr. Krapf was compelled, after a fray and a flight, to fill his double-barrel with water, and to preserve his life by the nauseous draught? Was there a member of our Society so dead to sympathy as to "ridicule" such use of a gun? But if the missionaries travelled only with their "regen-schirms," they also accompanied large parties of natives armed to the teeth, and possibly, like the Guards at Fontenoy, they may have levelled the muskets with their umbrellas.

Secondly, Capt. Burton—allow me to speak of him in the third person—did not fail to reach Kilima-njaro, for the best reason,—he never tried. He was ordered to explore the "Sea Unyamwezi," and to the best of his poor powers he obeyed orders. His trip to Fuga was a mere study, perhaps also an escape from the Hamburg gentry of Zanzibar. At that time the lowlands were being swept by hordes of marauding Wamasai, who speared the Beloch soldiery of His Highness the Sayyid within sight of the ramparts of Mombas. 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 5,000*l.*, whilst 1,000*l.* 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, among whom he had the misfortune to fall in early life, would allow him and his companion to be the worse by some 1,400*l.* in the affair. Still he had, and has, some satisfaction in reflecting that his "tentative journey" to Fuga was probably the means of saving Mr. and Mrs. Rebmann's lives. Capts. Speke and Burton, hearing that the Wamasai were close upon Mombas, hurried up to the Mission house, some miles distant, and insisted upon the tenants retiring to a place of safety. Mr. Rebmann showed an ambitious disposition for the "Crown of Glory"; but the two Englishmen, who could not object to his "taking the shilling" in the "noble army," informed him that his wife, an Englishwoman, could not be permitted to list. Mr. Rebmann listened to reason. A few days afterwards a command of the Wamasai swept over the Shimba hills, massacred the Wanyika population, and, as I have said, speared the Beloch back into their fortress.

From the Wise Man of Gotha, I turn to Mr. Cooley, who for this time only appears in the amiable rôle of my defender,—and, Heaven preserve me from such defenders!

Mr. Cooley, commenting upon a passage in one of my reports (*Journal R. G. S.* xxviii. p. 200), remarks with a curious want of delicacy—"This unquestionably means that they" (*i. e.* native travellers who had, I said, described the much-vexed Ethiopic Olympus soberly and correctly) "denied 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 partizanship."

Leaving the Royal Geographical Society, whose shoulders are full broad enough to settle its own quarrel with one whom they have made hostile by their benefits, I refer Mr. Cooley to *Blackwood's Magazine* (March, 1858, page 279), where, after detailing sundry mythical tales touching Kilima-njaro, I conclude with, "Amongst this Herodotian tissue of fact and fable ran one fine thread of truth: *all testified to the intense cold.*" Those who know me can answer for the amount of influence exercised upon my humble powers of opinion or expression 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) grandest mistakes, finished off by him in his most dashing manner, he owes entirely to Dr. Krapf. He carried from the coast the word, and he brought it back uncorrected and unchanged,—leaving it to be implied, but not venturing to assert (!), that 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 name of Unyamwezi never existed, and that Monomuzi, or Muefie muezi (the only authentic name), is of terrestrial and territorial origin, and has nothing to do with the moon."

Quousque tandem?—Mr. Editor, I spent six months in Unyamwezi. I collected a vocabulary of the Kinyamwezi. I conversed with hundreds of Wanyamwezi natives, all of whom called their country Unyamwezi, their individualities Mnyamwezi (the origin of the corrupted forms which Mr. Cooley, upon most insufficient evidence, calls the only authentic names), and their nation Wanyamwezi. I also learned that Mwezi there means the moon. I thought it possible that Ptolemy and his followers might, after the usual Greek fashion, have heard the name, and translated it by "Mountains of the Moon"; and in writing of the "Land of the Moon," I showed that it was my purpose to produce an intelligible English name for a local habitation which, dubbed Unyamwezi, would only irritate the stomach of a British public. I cannot but be surprised that a geographer like Mr. Cooley should hold on so obstinately to an old and childish blunder which he ought long to have discarded. He applies to the world of Whitehall Place the well-worn words, "Quam parvâ scientiâ regitur

mundus!" May we not reply to that distinguished microcosm,

Animum rege qui nisi pareat
Imperat, hunc frenis hunc tu compes à catenâ!

To conclude this lengthy communication. At the time of my first trip from Zanzibar eastwards, my knowledge of the country did not permit me to trancher so important a question as to Kilima-njaro being topped with snow or with dolomite. I simply reported what came to my ears, inclining rather towards the snow. At the same time, the arguments *contra*—e. g., that a cone 17,000 feet high would be seen from the sea—appeared so strong, that until my hand had touched that snow, a positive assertion was not to be ventured upon. I now believe that Baron Van der Decken and Mr. Thornton have seen the sore subject of dispute. I am ready at any time, when not otherwise wanted, to bring home a sample of it; and you could not confer upon me a higher favour than by inducing Her Majesty's Government to send me to fetch, not a bottle of smoke—as Mr. Cooley would argue—but a bottle of Kilimanjarian snow.

RICHARD F. BURTON.

BIBLE HISTORY AND THE RAWLINSON CANON.

1, Hill Street, Berkeley Square, July 15, 1862.

BEFORE seeing Dr. Hincks's letter of June 28, which was published in the *Athenæum* of July 5, I had prepared a Comparative Table of the four copies of the recently-discovered Assyrian Canon, in so far as those copies refer to the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser, Sargon and Sennacherib; and I had intended to publish this table without further comment or explanation, in order that chronologists might exercise their own ingenuity in reconciling the apparent discrepancies of the several lists, and might also work out at their leisure the synchronisms, for which the lists afforded materials, between Jewish and Assyrian history. Dr. Hincks's letter obliges me to give a somewhat greater extension to this plan. It is impossible for me to avoid noticing, in the first place, the general tone of depreciation of the share I have had personally in Assyrian discovery which pervades his communication. It is equally impossible to overlook the offensive insinuations which he has 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 at having allowed the now celebrated "Canon" to slip through his fingers, notwithstanding that he examined, as he says, one of the principal fragments in 1854, during his employment at the British Museum as reporter on Assyrian antiquities, and notwithstanding that he recognized at that early period the character, and to a certain extent even appreciated the value, of the mutilated tablet. Now, the personal question between Dr. Hincks and myself can hardly possess any interest for the public, and I shall not therefore follow his steps in obtruding it unnecessarily on their notice. If any one should be curious to learn the particular share which we have respectively had in rendering the Assyrian inscriptions available for Biblical illustration, I would merely refer him to my letter published in the *Athenæum* of August 23, 1851, where he will find a distinct announcement of my discovery of the capture of Samaria, by Sargon, in his 1st year, and of the siege of Jerusalem, by Sennacherib in his 3rd expedition, and where, in fact, all those identifications of name and synchronisms of date which have since led to such important results will be observed to be laid down for the first time with anything like certainty or precision. It is true that the names of Sargon and Sennacherib had been previously guessed at, but there was the least possible proof, either etymological or historical, in favour of the conjecture; and it was only, I maintain, by my reading of the names of Omri and Samaria, of Hezekiah and Jerusalem, of Merodach-Baladan and many others, that the period to which the inscriptions of Nineveh referred was positively established and the field thus laid open to further research. When Dr. Hincks indeed claims to have discovered the notice of Jehu the son of Omri, on the Nimrud Obelisk, in the lat-

ter part of 1851, he should remember that I had published the reading of the name of *Jahua* early in 1850 (*R. A. S. Journ.* Vol. xii. Part 2, p. 447), and the reading of the name of *Humri* in my letter to the *Athenæum* of August 1851 already quoted, and that I had further made the independent discovery of the application of this title of *Jahua* the son of *Humri* to the Biblical Jehu, King of Samaria, as nearly as possible simultaneously with Dr. Hincks's announcement (see *Athenæum*, No. 1274, p. 357).

Having said so much in repudiation of Dr. Hincks's pretensions to exclusive discovery, I now proceed to consider briefly the more important part of his letter, which contains, as I think, some very indifferent criticism and some very erroneous statements in regard to the "Canon."

Firstly, with respect to the actual tablets, it is impossible to determine with any certainty, from the inconsistent allusions 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 king's reign to which they belonged," would, it is true, apply sufficiently well to a fragment of the Canon; but I can hardly reconcile this notice with the more extended description of a "Chronological tablet, recording something in connexion with each year of the reign of successive kings," still less am I able to verify from any possible arrangement, or even derangement, of the fragments, such as they have been ever since I first examined them, the extraordinary calculation, which Mr. Oppert published on Dr. Hincks's authority—for the French *savant* does not claim, as far as I understand his report to the Minister of Public Instruction, to have ascertained the dates by his own personal inspection of the tablet—that Tiglath-Pileser ascended the throne in the 20th year of his predecessor's reign, and that his own reign extended to 42 years. I am satisfied,—and I am willing to stake my whole reputation on the issue,—that no such chronological data exist on any tablet in the British Museum; and I can only suspect that Dr. Hincks's misapprehension may have arisen from his having examined certain fragments of a copy of the Canon—but which I am quite unable to say—under the erroneous impression that the order of the names was uniformly from left to right, whereas in reality on all the tablets in the British Museum, including of course the copies of the Canon, the collocation of the columns on the reverse is inverted; 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 introduction of a third Tiglath-Pileser after Esar-Haddon may have been owing to a similar mistake as to the order of collocation, though in that case it must be presumed that he also examined the same fragments as Dr. Hincks, and to equally little purpose.

I will now succinctly state what I know of the fragments of tablets composing the four versions of the Canon, with especial reference to Dr. Hincks's innuendo of unfair dealing against either myself or the authorities of the Museum. No. 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 these may possibly have been put together and examined by Dr. Hincks in 1853. I found them in one of the Museum presses, when I commenced work in 1856, and added to them a fourth fragment, which I had brought home with me in 1855. The four fragments of the obverse I picked out during the present year from the heaps of crumbling rubbish which form the debris of the collection, and fitted them on to the others. They had never been seen before by any students, and were so incrustated with dirt as to be quite illegible till cleaned. No. 2 tablet is a single fragment, containing about 80 names, more or less legible. This I had in my possession for two years at Baghdad, and it is the

tablet which I originally described to the Royal Asiatic Society as containing dynastic lists. I sent it home in charge of Mr. Hedder in 1854, and it may possibly have been examined both by Mr. Oppert and by Dr. Hincks in 1855, as it was then available for public inspection. When I recommenced work on No. 1, a few months back, I required this tablet for comparison, as I could not altogether depend on the correctness of my Baghdad copy of the inscription, but it was not to be found. I spent many fruitless days in searching for it, and at length it was discovered by Mr. Cox, assistant in the Antiquity Department of the Museum, buried under a multitude of other fragments that had been heaped upon it in the process of shifting the contents of the various presses. No other fragment of this tablet has ever been discovered. It dates apparently from the reign of Sennacherib, whilst the other copies descend as low as the reign of the son of Esar-Haddon.

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 presses of my working-room at the Museum; but 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 less carefully than on the other tablets.

Tablet No. 4 is a mere fragment of fine clay, containing 25 names, which I lighted on this year among the contents of a case that was now opened for the first time, although it had been sent home from Nineveh in 1854. No other fragment of the same tablet has been yet found.

There is one other fragment which appears to belong to No. 1; but I cannot fit it on to my satisfaction, and I am, in fact, still in doubt whether it belongs to the very beginning or the very end of the series.

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, with a view of ascertaining if they belong to historical or chronological tablets, it is not probable that any large or important portion of any of the four copies of the Canon can have escaped my search. Still, as the fragments exceed 100,000 in number, and are for the most part thickly incrustated with dirt, I cannot pretend to have exhausted the collection. Indeed, I rarely come away from a day's exploration without having found something new of interest; and I thus live in hope that the recovery of minute fragments may yet enable me to complete the series of names, and to solve the difficulty of the discrepant lists.

The next point to which I must allude is the charge which Dr. Hincks brings against me, and at which I am naturally somewhat indignant, that I harbour a covert design to subvert the authority of Scripture, or at any rate, that my statements and calculations, "if accepted without qualification by any large portion of the learned world," will have that effect. Now I do not myself for a moment believe that the authenticity of the historical books of the Hebrew Old Testament is in any danger, or can be in any danger, from a collation with the contemporary evidence of other nations; but at the same time, as the alarm, however needlessly, has been sounded, I feel that before I go further into the question I ought distinctly to repudiate anything like an Infidel tendency, and that I ought moreover to endeavour to show how the reformed Assyrian Chronology may be reconciled with the true dates of the Scriptural record. For the authority of the Assyrian Canon, derived as it is from four independent sources, I have, I confess, the highest respect. Indeed, although Dr. Hincks sneers at the application to such a document of the term "contemporary," that description of it does appear to me to be perfectly correct, inasmuch as the succession of the High Priests (or Eponymes, as Dr. Hincks calls them) was undoubtedly recorded after each king's reign, and the general lists, as we now have them, were mere collections or compilations of such contemporary records. We must also remember that the most abundant materials existed at Nineveh for verifying the lists, in the series of documents, public and private, which were in the hands of everyone,