SOME NEW BOOKS.

The Peace Conference at The Hague.

There is no one better qualified to give us an account of the proceedings and the outcome of *The Peace Conference at The Hague* than Mr. FREDERICK W. HOLLS, whose book upon the subject is published by the Macmillans. The author tells us that the unostentatious, as well as business-like way in which the conference was organized made, in his opinion, a favorable impression, and he says that, for awhile, there seemed to be ground for hope that Continental public opinion would at least suspend judgment. He admits that this hope was destroyed largely through the unfortunate attitude of many important members of the conference toward the press. That secrecy during the progress of the work of a diplomatic gathering was indispensable was conceded by journalists themselves. With their scepticism, however, regarding the ultimate result of the deliberations, even a slight show of a reticent and an uncompromising attitude was sufficient to convince them of the uselessness of further attention. The fact that "disarmament" could not be even discussed was, of course, soon evident, and taking this fact as proof of the "failure" of the Conference, the press, with a few notable exceptions, withdrew its representatives from The Hague, and contented itself thereafter with giving its readers fragmentary and often inaccurate bits of information obtained from irresponsible sources. Consequently, and also because the official records of the Conference have been only lately published, the author thinks it may be justly said that hardly upon any recent event of importance is the reading public less completely informed than upon the work actually accomplished at the Peace Conference and its practical value. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that the events which have taken place, notably in South Africa and in the Far East, since the adjournment of the Conference, should have had the effect of deepening the prevalent misconception regarding its results and their importance. The author of this book, for his own part, does not hesitate to avow the conviction that the Peace Conference accomplished a great and glorious result, not only in the humanizing of warfare and the codification of the laws of war, but, above all, in the promulgation of the Magna Charta of international jurisprudence, the binding together of the civilized powers in a federation for justice, and the establishment of a permanent international court of arbitration. The author's aim is to tell, precisely and exhaustively, what took place, without making the book too technical for the general reader. After pointing out the circumstances under which the Conference took place, we purpose to avail ourselves of the volume before us to show the bearing of the Conference upon international law and policy.

It was at the regular weekly reception of the diplomatic representatives accredited to the Court of St. Petersburg, held at the Foreign Office in that city on Wednesday, Aug. 24, 1898, that each visitor was surprised to receive from Count Mouravieff, the Russian Foreign Minister, a lithographed communication, which read, in part, as follows: "The maintenance of general peace and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations present themselves in the existing condition of the whole world as the ideal toward which the endeavors of all governments should be directed. The intellectual and physical strength of the nations, labor and capital, are for the major part diverted from their natural application and unproductively consumed. Hundreds of millions are devoted to acquiring terrible engines of destruction which, though to-day regarded as the last work of science, are destined to-morrow to lose all value, in consequence of some fresh discovery in the same field. National culture, economic progress and the production of wealth are either paralyzed or checked in their development. Moreover, in proportion as the armaments of each power increase, so do they less and less fulfil the object which the governments have set before themselves. It appears evident that, if this state of things be prolonged, it will inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is desired to avert, the horrors of which make every thinking man shudder in advance. To put an end to these incessant armaments and to seek the means of warding off the calamities which are threatening the whole world, such is the supreme duty which is to-day imposed on all States. Filled with this idea, his Majesty has been pleased to order me to propose to all the governments whose representatives are accredited to the Imperial Court the meeting of a conference which would have to occupy itself with this grave problem."

The proposed conference was held at The Hague. Now let us look at the results. They are set forth in the author's final chapter. He begins by telling us that, in considering the effects of the Peace Conference upon the science of international law and upon the future policy of civilized Powers, the first fact to be borne in mind is that the Conference itself should be regarded not as the outcome of a sudden impulse on the part of the Emperor of Russia, but as the natural and almost inevitable consummation of a movement and tendency in European diplomacy, the beginnings of which date back to the Peace of Westphalia. When the Conference was first called, indeed, its connection with the intellectual, scientific and philosophic aspirations for universal and eternal peace was emphasized by innumerable articles and dissertations displaying a great deal of erudition and research. It seemed difficult for the daily papers to discuss the rescript of the Emperor of Russia without allusions to the "Great Plan" of Henry IV. and Sully, the Essay of William Penn, the work of the Abbé St. Pierre and the well-known pamphlet of Kant on "Eternal Peace." This view of the purpose of the meeting failed to grasp an essential characteristic of the Peace Conference, to wit, its diplomatic nature. The gathering at The Hague was the lineal descendant, not of the innumerable peace congresses held in various quarters of the globe, but of the diplomatic assemblages called for the purpose of solving an urgent problem, and of furnishing guarantees, more or less permanent, of peace between the Powers represented; diplomatic assemblies beginning with the conferences of Münster and Osnabrück in 1648, and including those of Utrecht in 1713, of Paris in 1763, and, above all, the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and that of Berlin in 1878. There is, however, a vital distinction between the gatherings just mentioned and the Peace Conference at The Hague.

The difference is that all of the former were held at the end of a period of warfare, and their first important object was to restore peace between actual belligerents, whereas the Peace Conference was the first diplomatic assembly called to discuss guarantees of peace without reference to any particular war, past, present or prospective. No doubt, all the other gatherings just named had also the object of providing guarantees for as permanent a peace as seemed possible at the time; this was notably true of the Congress of Vienna held at the close of the Napoleonic convulsion. That particular Congress fixed the general outline and the boundaries between European nations in a manner which has scarcely been [illegible] the important exceptions being the problem [illegible] of Alsace-Lorraine to the German were fixed [illegible] the subtraction of Lombardy and under the [illegible] the Hapsburg dominions. The struggle for [illegible] after these general lines the history of [illegible] that of national consolidation following that [illegible] possible institutions. The [illegible] national unity [illegible] of this problem fills by Italy and Germany [illegible] five years immediately Europe was able to [illegible] gathering at Vienna. [illegible] peared to [illegible] a stable eq[illegible] had been gained national relations; the equilib[illegible] greater part of slightly affected by the shifting [illegible] what ap[illegible] German frontier. The more im[illegible] of international well as historic, causes of friction [illegible] being only thus removed, no insuperable obst[illegible] Franco [illegible] federation of the civilized [illegible] late, as defin[illegible] organized for purposes of [illegible] been [illegible] re[illegible] rs [illegible] national justice. The time, in a word, had come to make the expression "International Law" a reality instead of a mere cover for a miscellaneous collection of moral precepts and conventional rules of intercourse.

The chief obstruction to the attainment of this object was for many years the fear that the definite and accepted formulation of international law implied an impairment of national power, especially for defence. Mr. Holls submits that the conviction was based upon a curious confusion between cause and effect. In his opinion, it was the absence of anything worthy to be called international law which caused universal military service and the highest possible efficiency in warlike preparations to be regarded as indispensable; it was not militarism and all that it implies which prevented the establishment of international law. During the lifetime of Bismarck, the system of universal military service which, under his guidance, had achieved such brilliant successes, seemed unassailable, even so far as scientific discussion was concerned. To question its efficiency in Germany involved almost an accusation of treason, and other Continental countries followed the lead of the German Empire, both in practice and in theory. In the introduction to this volume reference is made to the singular timeliness of the rescript of the Russian Emperor, coming, as it did, after Bismarck's death, and after the end of the Spanish-American War, and at a time when the shadow of a tremendous problem in the Far East was darkening the horizon of commercial nations.

Our author does not deem it necessary, for the purpose of exalting the Peace Conference, to depreciate the value of the science of international law, as previously understood; but he reminds us that every student of that science has been long aware of the fact that in the absence of any conclusive legal or judicial method for the adjustment of international differences the science itself was bound to remain ineffective. It was as if municipal law should contain only rules of action and principles of justice, but should provide no method by which the principles could be vindicated or the rules carried into effect. The keystone to the arch of international jurisprudence would evidently have to be some provision for a peaceable method of procedure, however incomplete or unsatisfactory, looking to the establishment of rights and the imposition of duties.

Herein Mr. Holls finds the true bearing of the work of the Peace Conference upon international law. The provisions of international jurisprudence regarding the sovereignty of States, the inviolability of their Chief Executives and representatives, the rights and duties of aliens and citizens, the provisions regarding national territory and the high seas, and those regarding treaties and contracts, are all bound together by the Hague treaty, under which a violation of rights no longer need lead necessarily to war, but can be litigated and settled, no less efficiently because peaceably. Whatever fault may be found with particular provisions of the treaty, the latter, considered as a whole and as the embodiment of a principle, must remain the nucleus around which, by discussion and adjudication, a more perfect body of international laws may be framed.

The "Parliament of Man, the federation of the world"—for justice and for every universal civilized interest—that, according to Mr. Holls, is the conception which found its best, if not its first, illustration in the Peace Conference at The Hague. The latter exemplified something akin to federal coöperation on the part of Powers exhibiting a disparity of size and strength, measured by the difference between Russia and Luxemburg, or the United States and Servia, and having interests as diverse as those of Switzerland and Siam. They could all act together efficiently and amicably on the one secure basis of equality in international law. This conference represented, in a word, the direct negation and opposite extreme of the idea of a world empire as conceived and attempted by Cæsar and Napoleon. The practical objection has been raised against the endeavors of the conference that, if successful, they would make diplomacy superfluous, or substitute a race of international pettifoggers for the eminent experts in an art which it has taken centuries to perfect. On the contrary, Mr. Holls believes that for all the shrewdness, the tact, patience, social grace and "repose in energy," which hitherto have been the chief characteristics of a successful diplomat, there will be a greater demand than ever. Besides this, there will now be sought the learning, and, above all, the power of expression which can vindicate a country's cause, if necessary, before the judgment seat of a tribunal exemplifying to an infinitely higher degree than was hitherto attainable the ideas of international justice.

Southeastern Europe.

The papers presented in the form of a book entitled *Turkey in Europe* (Edward Arnold), are the outcome of an attempt prosecuted during some years to learn the real condition of Turkey and of some neighboring countries. The specific design of the author, who writes under the pseudonym of ODYSSEUS, is to treat of Turkey in Europe; and although he speaks incidentally of the modern States of Greece, Servia and Bulgaria, his aim is to give an account not so much of them as of the Greeks and Slavs who inhabit the districts which are still included in Turkey. He has added a chapter on the Armenians, who, like the Turks, are an Asiatic people, who, again like the Turks, have invaded Europe. Such large bodies of them live in Constantinople, and so much of the business of European Turkey is in their hands, that the Armenian riots of 1896 raise many interesting inquiries, with reference not merely to Anatolia, but to the whole Turkish Empire. In the earlier part of his book the author offers a brief historical sketch of the countries which we now call Turkey and the Balkan States, from the foundation of Constantinople up to the present century. The chapters next following treat of the origin and characteristics of the invading people, whose presence is the main cause of the peculiarities which to-day distinguish Southeastern Europe. Still other chapters are devoted to an exposition of Mohammedanism and Eastern Christianity. It is pointed out that the chief reason why the Turks have never been assimilated by the Europeans who surround them (as has been the case with the Magyars, Bulgarians, Finns and other peoples who were originally pagan Asiatics) is that when they appeared in Europe they had already adopted the Mohammedan religion and with it a certain amount of Arabian and non-European civilization. On the other hand, the inability of the Byzantine Empire to resist the Turks was due mainly to the dissensions between the Eastern and Western churches, which rendered it impossible for Christendom to unite and oppose Islam. Finally the author undertakes to describe the various Christian peoples who inhabit the Ottoman Empire, and the racial quarrels which prevent them from combining against the Turks.

I.

The great epochs that mark the history of Constantinople previous to its capture by the Turks may be indicated in a paragraph. The first epoch, that from the foundation of the city by Constantine to the reign of Justinian (A. D. 325-527), is one of contraction. The Empire was invaded by Goths, Vandals and Huns, and, though the two former peoples were successfully removed from the provinces east of the Adriatic, they founded kingdoms in Spain and Africa, while in Italy the German general Odoacer deposed Romulus Augustulus, Emperor of the West, in 476. Henceforward, until the coronation of Charlemagne in 800 introduced a new order of things, there was but one Emperor, who resided at Constantinople, but claimed a theoretical, though more and more shadowy sovereignty over the West. The successes of Justinian (A. D. 527-565) and his generals, Belisarius and Narses, in Italy, North Africa and Spain, and the assertion of the imperial power over the Bishop of Rome, who had begun to make himself felt as a political factor of importance, produced a movement of expansion, and made the sovereignty asserted by the Byzantine Emperor in the West a reality for a brief period. It was, however, the peculiar destiny of the Eastern Empire to secure no rest; throughout its history no sooner was one enemy disposed of than another appeared. The Lombards succeeded the Goths and made considerable conquests in Italy while the Emperors were engaged in fighting the Persians in Asia and the Slavs in Europe; so that, when the next epoch-making Emperor, Heraclius, came to the throne, his Western possessions comprised merely Sicily, the extreme south of Italy and a narrow strip stretching obliquely from Ancona and Ravenna to Rome. The energy and ability of Heraclius enabled him to crush the power of Persia in the East, though he was distracted by simultaneous attacks from the Avars in the West. But his reign (A. D. 610-641) is especially remarkable as forming the best dividing point between ancient history and the Middle Ages. It presents three interesting features. First, the Empire, which was Roman in origin, but has now become definitely Greek. Secondly, paganism has vanished, and the Emperor and his subjects appear as the champions of Christianity. Thirdly, it is in this reign that the great antagonist of Eastern Christendom enters on the scene. In A. D. 628 the Prophet Mohammed summoned both Heraclius and his adversary, Chosroes, King of Persia, to embrace Islam, and, from this time for upward of eight centuries the Byzantine Empire had to struggle against the races which professed the new faith. In the first stage of the struggle, Constantinople twice successfully resisted sieges by the Arabs, first in 673-677, and, secondly, in 717-718; and, though the Moslems made progress in Asia, Leo the Isaurian may be considered to have reasserted the supremacy of Christianity in what is now called the Levant. Meanwhile the separation from the West was becoming more decisive. The struggle against the Arabs left the Emperor no time to resist the Lombards, who in 750 captured Ravenna and the other possessions of the Empire in Italy. The iconoclasm of Leo III. and Constantine V. alienated the religious sentiment of Rome, and the Pope first invoked the help of Pepin, King of the Franks, to protect him against the Lombards, and finally in 800, crowned Charlemagne Roman Emperor. Henceforth, the separation between Rome and Constantinople was complete so far as secular matters are concerned, though the final breach between the Churches did not occur for some time.

On the whole, the ninth and tenth centuries marked a period of prosperity for the Empire, notwithstanding the definite loss of its hold upon the West. As Mr. Brooks Adams has pointed out, Constantinople then attained a unique commercial importance and enjoyed long spells of peace. At the beginning of the ninth century, it is true, a somewhat humiliating arrangement had to be made with Harun-al-rashid, and the Saracens took Crete, and, subsequently, Sicily. The Moslems, however, became divided among themselves; the Buhawids broke up the Caliphate of Bagdad, and the Emperors Romanus and Nicephorus Phocas recovered Crete, Cilicia and North Syria; while in Europe Basil, "the Bulgarian slayer," made the Danube the frontier of the Empire, which it had not been since the reign of Heraclius, and established his rule over the Balkan peninsula. The eleventh century was characterized by two important phenomena, to wit the appearance of the Seljuk Turks, and the final separation of the Eastern and Western churches (A. D. 1054), which left Christendom, split and weakened by internal dissensions, face to face with a reunited Islam. In 1071 Arslan defeated and captured the Emperor Romanus IV. at Nanzikert, and amid the anarchy and chaos which ensued, the Seljuks advanced unopposed in Asia Minor. At last in 1081, Alexius Comnenus forced himself to the front and founded the House of the Comneni, which ruled a hundred years. They were relatively successful in keeping back the Seljuks, but they were harassed by new Western enemies, first the Normans, and then the Venetians. Byzantine commerce declined and Italian influence in the Levant rapidly increased. The most momentous feature of this period, however, was, of course, the Crusades, which, like most acts of intervention by Western Europe in the affairs of the East, were doubtful blessings to those whom they were designed to assist. The first of these expeditions did indeed aid Alexius to recover Western Asia Minor, but the Emperor and the Crusaders subsequently fell out, and, as a consequence of the quarrel, the latter founded the Latin states of Syria. It was reserved for the Fourth Crusade in 1204 to deal the Eastern Empire a deadlier blow than any it had yet received from Saracen or Turk. The House of Comnenus had been succeeded by the feeble Angeli. Military and financial disorganization led to the loss of Bulgaria and Cyprus and to a disastrous Seljuk war. The Emperor Alexius Angelus involved himself in foreign quarrels; Venice and the Italian Republics grew bitterly hostile to Constantinople, and the Pope regarded the Emperor and his church as schismatics. In these circumstances, the Crusaders, instead of fighting the Moslems, attacked and captured Constantinople, where they established Baldwin as Latin Emperor, while the Marquis of Montferrat was made King of Salonica, and the Venetians took many islands and part of the mainland of Greece. For some fifty years the Greek Emperors lived in exile at Nicæa in Asia, and southeastern Europe was in a strange state of confusion, created by a patchwork of Greek, Latin and Slavonic principalities. The Latin Empire was merely a congeries of military adventurers. It reposed on no sound national or political basis, and it made no friends in the East. It was naturally the enemy of everything Greek, and it was unable or unwilling to combine with the Slavs, who as desiring an expansion of territory at the expense of the Greeks, would have been its natural allies. It came to an end in 1261, when Michael Palæologus recaptured Constantinople, where his house reigned until 1453.

Meanwhile, the Latin conquest had permanently reduced the Empire. During the half century that Baldwin and his successors held Constantinople, Slavonic kingdoms had been firmly established in the Balkan Peninsula, Albania had become the Despotate of Epirus, the greater part of Greece had been divided among Latin States, and most of the Ægean Islands had passed into the hands of Venice. In Asia, the Seljuks advanced again and a crew of European adventurers called the "Grand Company," whom the Emperor Andronicus II. hired to defend him, proved as great a curse as the Turks themselves. Bad as things were, they were to become worse. In the first half of the fourteenth century appeared the Ottoman Turks, who rapidly swallowed up what scraps of the Empire remained in Asia, and were unwisely invited over to Europe by the Regent John Cantacuzene to assist him against the Servians. Their conquests were as rapid on the western side of the strait as they had been on the other. In the middle of the fourteenth century the Greek Emperor had nothing left outside of his capital except Salonica and a portion of the Peloponnesus, and became a vassal of the Sultan. The westward movement of Timur from central Asia and the overthrow of Sultan Bayazid by him gave the Greek Empire a little breathing space, and Manuel Palæologus recovered parts of the European coast. Had Christendom been able to form any coalition against the Turks at the moment when they were attacked by Timur, the case of the Empire would not have been desperate; but the opportunity was allowed to slip. Mohammed I. again united the Turkish power; Salonica was captured in 1430, and Constantinople fell in 1453.

II.

Who were the Bulgarians? Originally, they were an Asiatic people akin to the Finns, Huns, Avars and Pechenegs, forming part of what is often called the Finno-Ugric stock. Starting apparently from the same regions as the Huns, they first settled on the Volga, where a kingdom known as the Greater or Black Bulgaria continued until the fifteenth century, but part of them early passed further West and came in contact with the Slavs. Nothing is known of their original language and religion, but their dress, manners and institutions distinguished them sharply from their Slavonic neighbors; for, while the latter were governed by many chiefs to whom they paid but scant obedience, the Bulgarian Khan was an absolute monarch, isolated from his subjects by a rigorous system of Oriental etiquette, and obliged even to eat alone. The Bulgarians also possessed slaves and a well-disciplined army, and probably had most of the characteristics which rendered the Turks so formidable a power. Their most remarkable trait was their receptivity. They adopted the language, and, to a certain extent, the manners of the Slavs, and a considerable mixture of blood took place, modifying the original physical type. It is not known at what period the Bulgarians became completely Slavized, but it was clearly before their conversion to Christianity (A. D. 864), as St. Cyril and St. Methodius were able to preach to them in a Slavonic language.

Our author can find nothing to prove that they had not already come under the influence of the Slavs at the time when they dwelt north of the Danube, and had not as yet invaded the Empire.

It is in the reign of Constantine IV. (A. D. 668-685) that we first hear of the Bulgarians as an independent power, though they are mentioned as accompanying the invasions of the Slavs as early as the reign of Anastasius (A. D. 491-518). In the third quarter of the seventh century, they settled in the district of Ondico (Bujak), and subsequently in 679 subdued what were called "the Seven Slavonic Tribes" of Moesia and occupied that province. The boundaries of their kingdom were approximately those of the modern principality of Bulgaria and the capital, Peristhlava or Preslav, was near Varna. Constantine IV., exhausted by his efforts against the Arabs, submitted tamely to the establishment of the new State within his dominions, and his son, Justinian Rhinotmetis, at one period courted the aid of the Bulgarian chieftain. By the beginning of the ninth century the Bulgarians had grown so powerful that they threatened Constantinople itself. Their King, Krumn, appeared before the gates of the Imperial city and might, perhaps, have taken it, had not the Greek Army, alive to the critical situation, deposed the incompetent Michael I., and proclaimed Leo the Armenian as Emperor. Adopting a method which was beginning to become characteristic of Byzantine politics, Leo I. endeavored to assassinate Krumn at a conference; but, when this plan failed, proved that he was a soldier as well as a diplomatist by inflicting on the Bulgarians a defeat so crushing that we hear little more of them for fifty years. These conflicts with the Empire naturally brought the Bulgarians into contact with Christianity. Ultimately their King, Boris, was baptized, and after some hesitation between the rival claims of Rome and Byzantium he ended by acknowledging the spiritual authority of the latter. As soon as the Bulgarians had accepted Christianity, their advance was rapid and conspicuous. Simeon, the son of Boris (A. D. 892-927) founded the first Bulgarian Empire, which extended from Mesembria on the Black Sea to the Adriatic and included the greater part of modern Macedonia, Albania, Servia, Dalmatia, and Greece, leaving to the Byzantine Empire little besides Constantinople, Salonica and Adrianople, with the territory immediately surrounding them. To mark clearly the position which he claimed, Simeon assumed the title of Czar or Tsar, which was thus used in Bulgaria when the Russian nation hardly existed. It is doubtless an abbreviated form of Cæsar and indicated that he who bore it thought himself the equal of the Byzantine monarch.

Simeon also did his best to introduce Byzantine civilization among his people. The civil and ecclesiastical institutions of the new State were carefully modelled upon those of the Empire, and numerous translations from Greek ecclesiastical works attest the existence of a certain degree of religious culture. The first Bulgarian Empire, however, was shortlived. Simeon's successor was not strong enough to keep the fabric together. The warlike Emperor Nicephorus Phocas invited the Russians, who now appear for the first time in the Eastern question, to assist him in invading Bulgaria. Internal dissensions broke out in that country, and a noble called Shishman founded a dynasty of his own in the Western provinces. John Zimesces the assassin and successor of Nicephorus, found, as many other rulers of Constantinople have found, that the Russans were awkward neighbors; but, by his prompt and decisive action, he drove them out of Bulgaria and back from the banks of the Danube. He also entirely destroyed the Eastern Bulgarian Empire. The Western part, nevertheless, remained independent under Samuel, the son of Shishman (A. D. 993-1014), whose capital was at Ochrida, and whose dominions extended from the Danube at least as far south as Janina. This State was finally conquered in 1018 by the Byzantine Emperor, Basil II., generally called Bulgaroktonos, or "The Bulgarian Slayer," who after a desperate struggle of thirty-four years, annihilated Bulgaria and brought the whole of the Balkan Peninsula under the direct rule of Constantinople. According to a tradition, he took on one occasion 15,000 Bulgarian prisoners and blinded all except 150, whose sight was spared that they might lead the eyeless host back to their masters. When Samuel saw them he died of grief.

It was a hundred and fifty years before Bulgaria recovered from this blow, and emerged again as an independent power. The new State was founded by the dynasty of the Asens, and is often spoken of as the Vlacho-Bulgarian Empire. The name Vlach is applied not only to the inhabitants of Roumania, but to the tribes scattered over Macedonia and Thessaly—particularly in the Pindus Range—who speak a Latin language. Our author thinks that their present distribution can only be explained by the supposition, not that they have migrated from Roumania, but that they are the descendants of the Latin-speaking population which occupied the peninsula before the Slav invasions. This does not mean that they are, necessarily, of Latin race; but it seems probable that in the period preceding the Slav invasions, Latin was the language of the Balkan Peninsula, except on the Ægean coast. The Slav invaders overran the valleys, and the Latin-speaking tribes took refuge in the hills. At any rate, the Vlachs are at present scattered in a manner which accords with this theory, and almost always inhabit mountains, while the plains around are occupied by other races. This geographical distribution explains the double character of the second Bulgarian Empire, for in the same district there might be a double population—the Vlachs of the hills and the Slavo-Bulgarians of the plains. At this period the Vlach element seems to have been particularly important, for Thessaly was known as the Great Wallachia, although the centre of the Vlacho-Bulgarian Empire was not in Thessaly or South Macedonia, but at Tirnovo. Though it is pronounced probable that the founders of this new State were Vlachs rather than Bulgarians, the Bulgarian element was preponderant among their subjects, and the empire of Asen II. seems to have as good a right to the title of Bulgarian as had the empire of Simeon. The earlier princes of the dynasty contracted alliances, both political and matrimonial, with the Kumans, a tribe allied to the Turks, who, together with the Pechenegs (or Patzinaks) appeared on the Danube in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and made incursions into Bulgaria, which, in some cases, resulted in permanent settlements.

The outbreak which originated the second Bulgarian Empire was occasioned, it appears, by the exactions of the Emperor Isaac Angelus, who collected taxes with extraordinary rigor in order to meet the expenses of his court. Two brothers, Asen and Peter, having in vain demanded redress, proclaimed a revolt and announced that St. Demetrius had left his shrine in Salonica, and as a sign of special favor had taken up his abode in Tirnova, where they established the capital of their new State. The superstitions and grievances of the peasantry assured them a favorable hearing. The Bulgarians rose against Isaac Angelus and successfully resisted his attempt to subdue them. The national tendency to dissension asserted itself, however. Asen and Peter were both assassinated and were succeeded by their younger brother, Joannitza, or Kaloyan (Good John), whose natural abilities and exceptionally favorable opportunities enabled him to put the Bulgarian State on a firmer footing. He was shrewd enough to derive considerable advantage from the breach between Eastern and Western Christianity, which was rapidly widening, and he carried on a curious correspondence with Pope Innocent III., which ended in the despatch of a Papal Legate to Tirnova, who crowned Kaloyan as *Dominus Blacorum et Bulgarorum*. As soon as he heard of the capture of Constantinople (1204) Kaloyan offered his arms and assistance to the Latin Empire. His overtures were met with a rude and unwise rebuff, and he was even told to give up to the Latins the territory which he had taken from the Greek Empire. Thereupon he made an alliance with the Greeks and defeated the Latins at Adrianople. The Latin Emperor Baldwin himself was taken prisoner and perished mysteriously in captivity. When he had avenged the insults of the Latins, Kaloyan turned against the Greeks. At the head of his barbarous Kumans he massacred the Greek inhabitants of Thrace and Macedonia and finally besieged Salonica. Here his eventful career came to an end. He died in his camp, assassinated by a member of his family, in 1207, and his dominions lapsed temporarily into chaos. Bulgaria seemed about to disappear from the map when Kalovan's son, Asen, who had fled to the North, returned with a band of Russians and seized the throne.

The reign of Asen II. (1218-1240) was the most prosperous period of the second Bulgarian Empire, and, perhaps, of all Bulgarian history. The weakness of both the Latin and Greek empires rendered him the strongest potentate in Eastern Europe. Like his father, he wished to be on good terms with the Latin Empire, and was a candidate for the post of Regent during the minority of Baldwin II. He was not elected, and angry at what he considered a slight, he formed an alliance with the Greeks. His Empire comprised the modern Bulgaria and Servia (including Belgrade), Macedonia and Albania, and according to his own boast, he left the Latins nothing but Constantinople and the cities around it. If we keep in view how troubled were the times, and how blood-stained the annals of his predecessors, his reign will seem to have been marked by extraordinary peace and material prosperity. He was an ardent patron of architecture and the Church. He filled his capital, Tirnovo, with magnificent buildings, which made it second only to Constantinople in beauty and splendor, and he also built and endowed a large number of monasteries in different parts of his dominions. His Empire, however, was not more stable than that which had preceded it, and broke up immediately after his death in 1241. Our author deems it unprofitable to follow in detail the complicated intrigues and insurrections which composed the remainder of the mediæval history of Bulgaria. Rent by internal dissensions, the unhappy country was attacked by Tartars from the north, and overshadowed by the growing power of Servia to the west.

The two Slavonic States came into collision at the battle of Velbuzhd. The Bulgarians were utterly defeated, and thenceforth may be for some time considered as the vassals of Servia, until the decline of the latter State reëstablished equality. It is an inglorious feature of this period that the Bulgarians were allies of the Turks, and assisted them against the Greek Empire. Corps were formed called Voinik composed of Christians, who, in consideration of their taxes being remitted, served under the Ottoman standard against their coreligionists. The last Bulgarian Czar became the vassal of Sultan Murad, and gave him his daughter in marriage. In spite of such concessions, Bulgaria was doomed. The power of the Southern Slavs was annihilated in 1389 at the battle of Kossovo, and four years later the Ottomans burned Tirnovo and destroyed the last vestige of Bulgarian independence.

III.

It has seemed to us that the author's outline of Bulgaria's mediæval history deserves particular attention because it is relatively unfamiliar to American and English readers. The annals of Servia are comparatively well known. We pass to the chapters in which the earlier records of the Turks are summarized. We should first call to mind that at the present day large parts of Asia north of the Hoang-ho, of Thibet and of the Hindu-Kush, that is to say the regions vaguely described as Mongolia, Turkestan and Siberia, are inhabited by people who may be conveniently treated as forming a linguistic unit. Their languages may be divided into four families, the Manchu, the Mongol, the Turkish and, fourthly, a more miscellaneous group comprising Finnish, Magyar and a number of less known tongues. The resemblances between these four families lie in the structure rather than in the vocabulary; but all the languages are sharply distinguished from those of the Chinese or Aryans by whom the speakers are surrounded. It seems clear that at the present day there is no racial unity corresponding to this linguistic unit, and it is not clear that there ever was. Many Finns are physically undistinguishable from Swedes. The original Huns are always spoken of as a peculiarly hideous race, but the Magyars are among the best-looking people in Europe, and show no trace of the physical type commonly called Mongol or Tartar. Very many Osmanlis exhibit a Caucasian type for which there are obvious reasons. Since their arrival in Anatolia and Europe the Osmanlis have continually intermarried with the Kurds, Greeks, Slavs and Albanians, and the practice of contracting unions with foreign slave girls has still further mixed their blood, especially in the richer families. Even before they appeared in Anatolia, they had been long in contact with the Persians or other Iranian races. The earliest known inhabitants of the modern Bokhara, Ferghana and the adjoining districts were apparently Iranians, and we can hardly doubt that the westward-bound Turks took with them a considerable admixture of Iranian blood.

The idea which underlay the formation of the corps of Janissaries—that of creating a military organization the members of which had severed all their natural ties of language, country and family, and were united only by discipline to their chiefs, and by a secondary acquired language—was evidently a characteristic product of the Turkish mind. Our author suggests that probably similar things had been done in central Asia. In that region military powers of one kind or another were forever rising and falling; confederations would take the name of their most important tribes; the vanquished would lose their appellation and be merged in the victors. The name Osmanli is an example of what may have happened in many obscurer cases. It is now applied loosely to any Moslem in the Turkish dominions, and those who use it most strictly would never hesitate to give it to all Turkish-speaking Moslems. Many of the latter, however, must be the descendants of the Seljuks, while others are descendants of Christians, whereas the original Osmanlis were merely the tribe of dependents of Osman, and, for a long period, were not only distinct from the Seljuks, but at war with them. At the present day, the name Turk generally denotes a Moslem speaking a Turkish language, while Mongol designates a Buddhist speaking a Mongol tongue. In earlier centuries it is not so easy to draw the distinction. Timur has been called both a Mongol and a Turk. Jenghiz Khan was apparently a Mongol, but his son was called Jagatai, which word in Turkish is the recognized expression for the Eastern dialects of the Turkish language.

If these people—Turks, Mongols, Magyars, Manchus and other so-called Turanians—be considered as a whole, the part which they have played in history must be recognized as a large but a strange one. Their contributions to art, literature, science and religion are practically nil. Their destiny has been, not to instruct, to charm or to improve, hardly even to govern, but simply to conquer. Their literary sterility has deprived them of the fame which the scale if not the grandeur of their exploits deserves. When one tries to piece together their obscure and fragmentary records, it is but a catalogue of terrible names that looms upon the memory: Attila, "the Scourge of God," Huns, Avars and Turks, the Ghaznevids, the Mameluks, the Golden Horde, Jenghiz Khan, Tamerlane, the Great Mogul, Mohammed the Conqueror. They have ruled from the north of Africa to the shores of the Pacific; they have sent expeditions against Vienna and against Japan; they have reigned in Russia, in Persia, in China and in India; and, although their empires have been mostly ephemeral, a Turk still sits upon the throne of Constantinople, and a Manchu on that of Pekin.

The earliest information respecting these races comes chiefly from Chinese sources, which describe under the general name of Hiung-Nu, the tribes to the north of the Hoang-Ho against whose incursions the great wall was built. Of their early westward movements we have no indications except the appearance of various hordes in the West; but it is clear that in the fourth century of our era a movement toward the Urals and the Volga took place. This migration is marked by the still existing settlements of Samoyedes and Ostiaks on the Asiatic side of the Northern Urals, by the Finns, Laps and other races in North Russia, and by the Mordvinians and Cheremissians on the Volga. Subsequent movements, of whose causes we are equally ignorant drove the more important part of these tribes—the Huns, the Bulgarians and the Avars—southwest from the Ural and Volga against the frontiers of the Roman Empire. The name Turk appears in Chinese as Tu-kiu, and in Greek as Tourkoi as early as the fifth and sixth centuries of our era; in the last ten years monuments have been discovered on the Yenisei and Orkhon rivers, which throw a light on the pre-Islamic civilization of the Turkish people. The most important of these is an inscribed memorial found near the latter river, and erected in 733 A. D., to one Kul-Tegin by his brother Bilgo Khagan. The Turks seem at that time to have had two occupations, pasturage and warfare, the latter either on their own account, or as mercenaries of the Chinese. They were excellent horsemen, and the spirit of military adventure was favored by their peculiar institutions, in pursuance of which the youngest son usually inherited his father's property, while the elder brothers went out into the world to seek their fortunes. Among them were already noticeable the special instincts of discipline and order which characterized the followers of Jenghiz Khan, Timur and the Osmanlis, which, unhappily, has nothing to do with good government, but merely makes every man render unquestioning obedience to his military or official superior. They possessed an alphabet which has a superficial resemblance to runes, due to the fact that it is composed exclusively of vertical and oblique strokes, without any horizontal lines. They had, however, no written law or sacred books. Their religion seems to have consisted of the worship of the sky and of the five elements, earth, water, fire, wood and metal, or iron. The old name Tangri, or Heaven, is still used in Osmanli Turkish for God, but the ancient religion seems to have had little lasting effect on the national character. Its most important characteristics were negative: there was no trace of any organized priesthood, or other institutions tending to settle and control the traditional soldiers of fortune. In due time, however, the Turks came into contact with both Christianity and Buddhism. The former was introduced into Central Asia by Nestorian missionaries through Khorassan, and in the fourth and sixth centuries we hear of Bishops of Merv, Herat and Samarcand. Buddhism was, apparently, imported rather later, in the sixth century.

From the third until the end of the sixth century A. D., the Turks played a considerable part in the affairs of China, which is passed over in the book before us. It is more to our author's purpose to notice that they came into collision with the dynasty of the Sassanids in Persia (215-639 B. C.), and pressed persistently westward toward the southern extremity of the Caspian, waging a continual war, which is described by Persian writers as the contest of Iran and Turan. As the Greek Empire was also at war with Persia, the Turks seem to have thought that they might make an alliance with Byzantium against the common enemy. In 562 the Turkish Khan sent an embassy to the Greek Emperor. He proposed to act as an intermediary for the silk trade between China and Byzantium, but his overtures were refused. From the time when a section of the Turks entered the service of the Abbasid Caliphs, and in their name exercised temporal power, all educated persons are conversant with the principal events of Turkish history. We need not review them, therefore, but turn to a chapter in which our author endeavors to define the practical effect of the chief doctrines of Islam on the life of the nation which professes them.

IV.

The outcome of his brief examination of the subject seems to be that the effect is in the main cramping, stifling and sterilizing. At the same time, it is pointed out that Islam has another and vivifying side. Probably no system has done more to encourage individual liberty and responsibility, despite its formality, despite its despotism, despite the fatalism which it teaches. It is the most unsacerdotal religion in the world: it recognizes no sort of priest, and calls on every man to save and justify himself before the Almighty. The most solemn ceremony performed by the Caliph as head of the faith does not differ in kind from the daily prayers of the most illiterate peasant. The sense of individual importance has its exemplar in the Turkish soldier, who is the incarnation alike of Islam and of the Turkish race. According to military experts, he has not only the passive obedience of the Slav, but a readiness in finding expedients, and an individual initiative which are rare in the armies of other countires. Islam has strengthened and hallowed the sense of discipline, the unquestioning submission to authority which have always characterized the Turk; but, on the other hand, by inculcating in every man a feeling of his dignity and a consciousness of his responsibility, it encourages and enlivens individual effort in the few spheres wherein those who profess Islam are able to show energy. The Sultan may be a Roman Emperor; but every Turk is a Roman citizen, with a profound self-respect and a sense not only of his duties but of what is due to him.

Our author also credits Islam with the temperance which it preaches. No doubt the upper classes in Constantinople drink considerably, and drink with the deliberate intention of intoxicating themselves. If we put aside, however, this section of society, which justly may be described as contaminated by European influences, it may be safely said that the great majority of the Turkish nation, soldiers, peasants, merchants and the learned professions never touch alcohol. Against the moral value of this abstinence may be set the position assigned to women; nevertheless, any just criticism of Mohammed's legislation on this subject and its results must not lose sight of two points. First, Mohammed did not invent the seclusion and subjection of women. He accepted with some improvements the current Arabian ideas on the subject. The system of the harem is in its origin not Moslem, but simply Oriental. The only reproach that can be made against the Prophet on this score is that by too definite legislation he rendered subsequent development and reform impossible. Secondly, those who talk of the degradation of Mohammedan women would do well to remember that in Mohammedan countries prostitution and illegitimacy are almost unknown. It is true that only the length of his purse and the temper of his lawful wives—both of these restraints are very effective—limit the unions which a Moslem may contract with slaves, but the offspring of such unions are legitimate children, and inherit, share and share alike, with the children born in wedlock. A Moslem woman is never free, but, on the other hand, it is almost impossible to imagine any circumstances in which she would be cast on the world without a protector. A certain solidarity characterizes not only family relations, but all Moslem society. There are no paupers; giving alms is not a mere theoretical obligation, but an essential religious duty really discharged. It may be replied that there are many beggars. There are, and the spectacle is unpleasant; but from the beggar's point of view, could they, asks our author, have a better life, their misfortunes being borne in mind? If one has twisted limbs or any incurable malady, including laziness, is it not more healthy, interesting and lucrative to sit begging at street corners than to be the inmate of a charitable institution? One thing is certain, Moslem beggars never starve. Neither is Islam wanting in more intellectual excellencies. If it could be stripped of its bibliolatry, and if the fatal connection between religious and secular law could be severed, the manly simplicity of its cardinal doctrines, its calm acceptance of the existing order of the world, rising superior to explanations based on emotion and sentiment, and its dignified resignation to the will of God must command our approval and sympathy. Those who have devoted adequate and impartial attention to the life and work of the Prophet mostly admit that a feeling of admiration and respect dominates their most critical estimates of him and will not refuse to join in the modest benediction which generally accompanies his name, "God bless him and grant him peace!"

Our author thinks that any estimate of the influence of Islam in Turkey would be misleading without reference to an important phenomenon, to wit: the dervishes. The Persian word dervish appears to have meant originally a begging monk, though not necessarily or usually a celibate, but it is now often loosely applied to the members of any religious confraternity. Thus the followers of the Mahdi and of the Sheikh Senusi are often styled dervishes, although their peculiar tenets seem to consist chiefly in an attempt to return to the primitive conditions of the Moslem state, and they have nothing in common with the traits and tenets of the Turkish dervishes. Of the latter there are several orders, the most important being the Vektashis, the Mevlevis and the Rufais, the two last named being commonly known to Europeans as dancing and howling dervishes; they all possess certain common peculiarities. The specific ritual, or method of imparting mystical doctrines practised by any order is called its *tariq*, or road, and the members are said to follow such and such a road. In Turkey, side by side with the rigorous orthodoxy of the Mollahs, the dervishes supply the element of mystery, ceremony and excitement which the populace love, and which Mohammed probably would have disliked. They appeal to the highest and lowest forms of religious sentiment. Educated minds find pleasure in the pantheistic speculations of the Persian poem called the Mesnevi, while wonder-working saints, holy tombs, singing, dancing and quasi-magical ceremonies please the vulgar. The dervishes are far from believing with Mohammed and his orthodox followers that God has revealed the truth in "a plain book." For them the religious man is not so much a believer as a seeker after truth, and his life is a journey through several stages, of which the last is absorption into the Deity. Their religious terminology is full of such expressions as "the knowledge and love of God," which, however, bears a more mystical and less personal meaning than we attach to it. Our author expresses the opinion that Mohammed would not have liked the phrase, and and would certainly have explained it as signifying "fear God and read the Scriptures."

We are told that dervishes observe the Mohammedan forms of prayer, the fast of Ramazan and other ceremonies; that they have also their own characteristic form of worship called Zikr, consisting of the repetition, sometimes continued for several hours, of some religious formula, such as "There is no God but God," or the ninety-and-nine names of the Deity. The formulæ used are almost all of unimpeachable orthodoxy; but the spirit of the performance is widely different from that of the Namaz, or orthodox mode of public worship, as its object is to distract the devotee's mind from earthly things, and, finally, to throw him into the state of trance or ecstasy called *hal*. The repetition of such formulæ can no doubt be defended from the Sunna, or book of traditions relating to the Prophet; but it is evident that the whole doctrine and practice of the dervishes contain a large pre-Mohammedan element which is, perhaps, Indian in origin. The connection with Persia is unmistakable. Some of the Sheikhs most revered by the dervishes came from Persian-speaking countries, and wrote in Persian; they are on good terms with the Shiahs, and share their peculiar respect for the Caliph Ali. It is well known that this personage is the chief subject of contention between the Sunnite and Shiite sections of the Moslem world. The Sunnites consider that Ali was simply the fourth Caliph, neither greater nor less than his three predecessors. The Shiites maintain that he alone was the rightful successor of Mohammed; they reject the Sunnite Caliphs, and especially execrate the memory of the first three who kept Ali out of his rights, and of those who were responsible for the murder of his sons Hassan and Hussein. Somehow or other Ali has become associated with mystical and heretical doctrines; his admirers are suspected of considering him not only the equal of the Prophet, but an incarnation of the Deity. Hence among rigorous Sunnites he occupies a somewhat equivocal position, similar to that of the Virgin Mary among Protestants.

We observe, finally, that it is difficult to explain the position of dervishes in the Turkish world. They cannot be said to be unorthodox, for nearly every religious man is a lay member of one or other of their orders. They profess an unostentatious respect for the externals of Islam, and they have a great influence among the people. On the other hand, their esoteric doctrines, as expounded in such a work as the Persian poem before mentioned, the Mesnevi, cannot be reconciled with the natural meaning of the Koran, and there is a deep-seated animosity between dervishes and the officials of the established Mohammedan Church, such as Mollahs and Softas. The Mollahs are beneficed clergy in receipt of some small salary attached to mosques and other pious foundations; the Softas are theological students. There are many thousands of the latter in such religious centres as Constantinople and Cairo, but the reason why most of them have adopted the learned profession is not by any means a passion for theology, but a desire to escape military service, which can only be done by professing one's self a student of religion. If once accepted in a *Medresse*, or school, they are practically provided for during their lives, and can lead an existence of almost absolute idleness. Their chief occupation consists in learning by heart treatises on Moslem law which they make no attempt to understand; they are often unable to read or write. These large bodies of fanatical and ignorant men mostly between the ages of 20 and 40, without regular employment, are a constant source of danger, and are sometimes broken up by the Government. It would, apparently, be an illusion to imagine that the average Turkish dervish is less ignorant and superstitious than the average Softa, but, according to our author, he is far more gentle and less fanatical; the writers whom he studies, are, if more extravagant, less cramping, and the further he travels on the road to pantheism the more tolerant does he become. To pantheism, however, is closely allied the dangerous doctrine that, as both good and evil come from God, there is no difference between them. It is obvious that such a tenet can be safely held only by the few who have really mastered their passions and extinguished their desires. Our author apprehends that many dervishes find it easier to understand that the prohibition of such things as alcohol does not apply to the elect, than to attain to the corresponding stage of self-control.

M. W. H.

Why He Came on That Day.

"I was greatly surprised on Thanksgiving Day," said Mr. Goslington, "to hear coming along my street the wagon of the modern travelling knife sharpener, a workshop on wheels, betokened by the sounding of its familiar gong. It seemed surprising that on this commonly observed holiday anybody at all should be abroad at work, but mark how ignorant or short-sighted this showed me to be, for this was the day of all others for the knife sharpener to come around to sharpen up the last of the knives that would be used in carving the joyous turkey."