

The signification of the name *Oelod*, in the East Mongolian *Ogöled*, now the most widely spread among the tribes living in China, is likewise very doubtful. Some assert that "Oelod" is nothing but the Chinese transcription of Oirad, as the ordinary Chinese language does not possess the sound *r*. We have, however, to bear in mind that we have a Mongolian root *ogöled*, with the sense "to be inimical," "to bear hatred, ill-will," &c. The main population of the Kalmuks live, or rather drag out, their existence after the usual fashion of nomad tribes in Sungaria, in the eastern part of the Thian-shan, on the south border of the Gobi, on Kokö-nör, and in the province of Kan-suh. All these are under the Chinese Government. In consequence, however, of the extension of the Russian empire in Thian-shan and Alatau, many hordes have come under the Russian sway. According to an approximate account we may reckon in the territory Semirjetshensk (Kuldja) and Semipalatinsk 34,000 Kalmuks, while in the southern part of the government Tomsk, on the Altai, the Kalmuk population amounted formerly to 19,000. Besides these we find a section of Kalmuk population far in the west, on the banks of the Volga (near Astrakhan). From their original seats in Sungaria they turned in their migrations to the north, crossed the steppe of the Kirghiz, and thus gradually reached the Emba and the Or. Between these two rivers and the Ural the Torgod settled in 1616; thence they crossed the Volga in 1650, and took possession of the now so-called steppe of the Kalmuks, being followed in 1673 by the Dörböd, and in 1675 by the Khoshod. In 1771 a considerable number returned to the Chinese empire. At the present time there is a not unimportant population in the so-called steppe of the Kalmuks, which extends between the Caspian and the Volga in the east and the Don in the west, and from the town of Sarepta in the north to the Kuma and the Manytch in the south. According to modern statistical accounts, this population amounts to 75,630. To these we have to add 24,603 more on the borders of the Cossacks of the Don, and lastly 7298 in the bordering provinces of Orenburg and Saratoff. The sum total of the so-called Volga Kalmuks is therefore 107,531.

(3) In the southern part of the Russian province of Irkutsk, in a wide circle round the Baikal Lake, lies the herdsmen proper of the Buriats, which they also call the "Holy Sea"; the country east of the lake is commonly called Transbaikalia. Their country practically extends from the Chinese frontier on the south within almost parallel lines to the north, to the town Kirensk on the Lena, and from the Onon in the east to the Oka, a tributary of the Angara, in the west, and still farther west towards Nijnj-Udinsk. They are most numerous beyond the Baikal Lake, in the valleys along the Uda, the Onon, and the Selenga, and in Nerzhinsk. These Trans-Baikalian Buriats came to these parts only towards the end of the 17th century from the Kalkhas. While Mongols and Kalmuks generally continue to live after the usual fashion of nomads, we find here agricultural pursuits, most likely, however, due mainly to Russian influence. Christianity is also making its way. The sum total of the Buriats amounts at present to about 250,000.

Another tribe separated from the rest of the Mongols is the so-called Hazira (the thousand), and the four Aimak (i.e., tribes), who wander about as herdsmen in Afghanistan, between Herat and Kabul. In external characteristics they are Mongols, and in all probability they are the remains of a tribe from the time of the Mongol dynasty. Their language, which shows, of course, Persian influence, is strictly Mongolian, more particularly West Mongolian or Kalmuk, as has been proved by H. C. von der Gabelentz.

Agreeably with this threefold division of the Mongols we have also a threefold division of their respective languages: (1) East Mongolian or Mongolian proper, (2) West Mongolian or Kalmuk, (3) Buriatic.

The dialects just mentioned are found to be in close relation to each other when we examine their roots, inflexions, and grammatical structure. The difference between them is indeed so slight that whoever understands one of them understands all. Phonetically a characteristic of them all is the "harmony of vowels," which are divided into two chief classes: the hard *a, o, u*; and the soft *e, ö, ü*; between which *i* is in the middle. All vowels of the same word must necessarily belong to the same class, so that the nature of the first or root-vowel determines the nature of the other or inflexion-vowels; now and then a sort of retrogressive harmony takes place, so that a later vowel determines the nature of the former. The consonants preceding the vowels are equally under their influence.

The Mongolian characters, which in a slightly altered form are also in use among the Manchus, are written perpendicularly from above downward, and the lines follow from left to right, the alphabet having signs for seven vowels *a, e, i, o, u, ö, ü*, and diphthongs derived from them *ao, ai, ei, ii, oi, ui, öi, üi*, and for seventeen consonants *n, b, kh, gh, k, g, m, l, r* (never initial), *t, d, y, s (ds), ts, ss, sh, w*. All these are modified in shape according to their position, in the beginning, middle, or end of a word, and also by certain orthographic rules. In Mongolian and Manchu writing the syllable (i.e., the consonant together with the vowel) is considered as a unit,

<sup>1</sup> See his essay, "Ueber die Sprache der Haziras und Aimaks," in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. xx. pp. 326-335.

in other words, a syllabarium rather than an alphabet. The existing characters are lineal descendants of the original Ugurian forms, which were themselves derived from the Syriac, having been brought to the Ugurs by Nestorian missionaries. An Indian and Tibetan influence may also be noticed, while the arrangement of the characters in perpendicular lines is common to the Chinese. The writing was brought into its present shape by the learned Lamas Sa-skya Pandita, Phags-pa Lama, and 'Tshoitshi Odsér in the 13th century, but is exceedingly imperfect. To express the frequently-occurring letters borrowed from Sanskrit and Tibetan, which are wanting in the Mongol alphabet, a special alphabet called Kalik is employed. Every one who has tried to read Mongolian knows how many difficulties have to be overcome, arising from the ambiguity of certain letters, or from the fact that the same sign is to be pronounced differently according to its position in the word. Thus, there are no means for distinguishing the *o* and *u*, *ö* and *ü*, the consonants *g* and *k*, *t* and *d*, *y* and *s (ds)*. *A* and *e, o (u)* and *ö (ü)*, *a (e)* and *n, g* and *kh, t (d)* and *on*, are liable to be mistaken for each other. Other changes will be noticed and avoided by advanced students. It is a great defect that such common words as *ada* (a fury) and *ende* (here), *ende* (here) and *nada* (me), *aldan* (fathom) and *aldan* (gold), *ordu* (court-residence) and *urtu* (long), *onokhu* (to seize) and *umukhu* (to ride), *tere* (this) and *dere* (pillow), *gebe* (said) and *kobe* (made), *gem* (evil) and *kem* (measure), *ger* (house) and *ker* (how), *naran* (sun) and *nere* (name), *yagon* (what) and *dsagon* (hundred), should be written exactly alike. This list might be largely increased. These defects apply equally to the Mongolian and Buriatic alphabets.

In 1648 the Sapa Pandita composed a new alphabet (the Kalmuk), in which these ambiguities are avoided, though the graphic differences between the two alphabets are only slight. The Kalmuk alphabet avoids the angular and clumsy shapes of the Mongolian, and has, on the contrary, a rounded and pleasing shape. The Kalmuk alphabet has also this great advantage, that every sound has its distinct graphic character; a mistake between two characters can scarcely occur. The Kalmuk words once mastered, they can be easily recognized in their Mongolian shape. The dialectical differences are also very slight.

The Kalmuk, therefore, is the key of the Mongolian, and should form the groundwork of Mongolian studies. The Kalmuk and East Mongolian dialects do not differ much, at least in the spoken language; but the Kalmuks write according to their pronunciation, while the Mongols do not. For example, *sön* (*dsön*), "hundred," is pronounced alike by the Kalmuks and the East Mongolians; but according to Mongolian orthography the word appears in the form *dsagon*. The dialectic difference between the two dialects very frequently lies only in a different pronunciation of some letters. Thus East Mongolian *ds* is in Kalmuk soft *s*, &c. The chief difference between the two dialects lies in the fact that in Kalmuk the soft guttural *g* between two vowels is omitted, while, through the joining of the two vowels, a long vowel is produced. In the pronunciation of common East Mongolian the *g* is likewise omitted, but it is written, while in Kalmuk, as just now mentioned, the guttural can only be traced through the lengthening of the syllable. Thus we find: Mongol *kagan*, "prince," Kalmuk *khän*; *M. dagon*, "voice, sound," *K. dön, dän*; *M. dologan*, "seven," *K. dölön*; *M. agola*, "mountain," *K. üla, ula*; *M. nagor*, "lake," *K. nör, nár*; *M. ulagan*, "red," *K. ulän*; *M. yagon*, "what," *K. yön (yün)*; *M. dabagan*, "mountain-ridge," *K. dabän*; *M. ssaganan*, "thought," *K. sanän*; *M. baragon*, "on the right," *K. barön, barün*; *M. shubagon*, "bird," *K. showön*; *M. chilagon*, "stone," *K. chilon (chulan)*; *M. jirgagan*, "six," *K. surgän*; *M. degere*, "high, above," *K. dère*; *M. ugukhu*, "to drink," *K. ükhu*; *M. togodshi*, "history," *K. tödshi, tadshi*; *M. egüden*, "door," *K. öden*; *M. dsegün*, "left," *K. sön*; *M. ögede*, "in the height," *K. öös*; *M. ögeled*, "the Kalmuks," *K. ölod*; *M. üileged*, "if one has done," *K. üiled*; *M. köbegün*, "son," *K. köwön*; *M. gegün*, "mare," *K. güen*; *M. kegür*, "corpse," *K. kür*; *M. kharigad*, "returned," *K. kharöd*, &c.

The Buriatic, in these peculiarities, is almost always found with East Mongolian, with which it is in every respect closely allied. In the pronunciation of some letters the transition of East Mongolian *tsa*, *tsé* into Buriatic *ss* is noticeable; for instance: Mong. *tsessek*, "flower," Buriatic *ssessek*; *M. tsak*, "time," *B. ssak*; *M. tsagan*, "white," *B. ssagan*; *M. tsötsen*, "prudent," *B. ssesen*. *Ss* is sometimes pronounced like (the German) *ch*: East M. *ssain*, "good," *B. chain*; *M. ssedkil*, "heart," *B. chedkil*. *K* in the beginning or middle of a word is always aspirated.

The noun is declined by the help of appended particles, some of which are independent post-positions, viz., *Gen. yin, u, un*; *Dat. dur, a*; *Acc. yi, i*; *Abstr. esse*; *Instrum. ber, yer*; Associative, *luga, läge*. The dative and accusative have also special forms which have at the same time a possessive sense, viz., *Dat. dagan, degen*; *Accus. ben, yen*. The plural is expressed by affixes (*nar, ner, od, ss, d*), or frequently by words of plurality, "all," "many," e.g., *kümüen nogöd* (man, many = men). The oblique cases have the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. C. von der Gabelentz, in the *Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde d. Morgenlandes* Göttingen, 1833, vol. II. pp. 1-21, "Versuch über eine alte mongolische Inschrift."

same endings in singular and plural. Gender is not indicated. The adjective is uninflected both as attribute and as predicate; there is no comparative form, this idea being expressed by the construction or by the use of certain particles. The personal pronouns are *bi, i*; *ichi*, thou; *vida*, we; *ta, ye*; their genitives serve as possessives. The demonstratives are *ene, tere* (this, that), plural *ede, tede*; interrogative *ken, who?* The relative is lacking, and its place is supplied by circumlocutions. The numerals are: *1, nigen*; *2, khoyar*; *3, gurban*; *4, dörben*; *5, tabun*; *6, jirgagan*; *7, dologan*; *8, naiman*; *9, yisun*; *10, arban*; *100, dsagon*; *1000, minggan*. The ordinals are formed by appending *tugar, tüger*. The theme of the verb is seen in the imperative, as *bari, gras*. The conjugation is rich in forms for tense and mood, but person and number are with few exceptions unexpressed. The present is formed from the theme by adding *mui (barimus)*, the preterite by *bai or luga (baribai, bariluga)*, the future by *ssugai or ssu (barissugai, barissu)*. The preterite has also in the third person the terminations *dsugut* and *run*; the future has in the third person *yu*, and in the first *ya*. The conditional ends in *bassu (baribassu)*, the precative in *tugai, tügei*, the potential in *sa (barimuisa)*, the imperative plural in *ktun*, the gerund in the present in *n, dsu (barin, baridsu) or tala*, "while, till" (*baritala*, "inter capiendum"), in the preterite it is formed in *gad (barigad)*; the present part. has *ktchü (barikchü)*, the past part. *ksan (barikssan)*; the supine ends in *ra*, the infinitive in *khü (barikhu)*, or when used substantively *barikhu*. There is but one perfectly regular conjugation, and derivative forms, derived from the theme by infixes, are conjugated on the same scheme. Thus the passive has infix *ta* or *kda (baritakhu, ta)*, to be grasped), the causative *gü (barigukhu, ta)*, to cause to grasp), the co-operative or sociative *üsa* or *üda (barillakhu, ta)*, to grasp together).

There are no prepositions, only post-positions. Adverbs are either simple particles (affirmative, negative, interrogative, modal, &c.), or are formed by suffixes from other parts of speech. There are very few conjunctions; the relations of clauses and sentences are mainly indicated by the verbal forms (part., sup., conditional, but mainly by the gerund).

The order of words and sentences in construction is pretty much the opposite of that which we follow. In a simple sentence the indication of time and place, whether given by an adverb or a substantive with a post-position, always comes first; then comes the subject, always preceded by its adjective or genitive, then the object and other cases depending on the verb, last of all the verb itself preceded by any adverb that belong to it. So in the structure of a period all causal, hypothetical, concessive clauses, which can be conceived as preceding the main predication in point of time, or even as contemporary with it, or as in any way modifying it, must come first; the finite verb appears only at the end of the main predication or apodosis. The periods are longer than in other languages; a single one may fill several pages.

Grammars and dictionaries may be divided according to the three dialects. For East Mongolian, I. J. Schmidt gave the first grammar (Petersb., 1831), and a Mongolian-German-Russian dictionary (Petersb., 1835). Next Jos. Kowalewski published in Russian a Mongolian grammar (Kasan, 1836), a chrestomathy (2 vols., Kasan, 1836, 1837), and his great *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français* (3 vols., Kasan, 1844, 1846, 1849). We name also R. Yulle, *Short Mongolian Grammar* (in Mongolian), xilographed at the mission press near Seelenginsk beyond Lake Balkal (1838). A. Bobrowsnikow's Russian Grammar of the Mongolian-Kalmuk Language (Kasan, 1849) is also very good. An abridgment of Schmidt's work is C. Poini, *Elementi della grammatica mongolica* (Florence, 1878). A. Popow's *Mongolian Chrestomathy* appeared in 2 vols. at Kasan (1836). For the Kalmuk we have grammars by Popow (Kasan, 1847), Bobrowsnikow as above, and H. A. Zwick (s. v. a.), autographed at Donaueschingen (1851). Zwick's autographed Kalmuk and German dictionary with a printed German index appeared (s. v. a.) in 1852; B. Julg's edition of the tales of Siddhi-kür (Leips., 1866) gives a complete glossary to these stories. There are small Russian and Kalmuk vocabularies by P. Smirnow (Kasan, 1857) and C. Golstunsky (Petersb., 1860).

**MONGOOS, or MUNGOOS. See ICHNEUMON.**

MONITION, in the practice of the English ecclesiastical courts, is an order requiring or admonishing the person complained of to do something specified in the monition, "under pain of the law and penalty thereof." It is the lightest form of ecclesiastical censure, but disobedience to it, after it has been duly and regularly served, entails the penalties of contempt of court. See Phillimore, *Ecclesiastical Law* (London, 1873).

MONK, GEORGE (1608-1669), duke of Albemarle, the second son of Sir Thomas Monk, a gentleman of good family but in embarrassed circumstances, was born at Potheridge, near Torrington in Devonshire, on 6th December 1608. An exploit which brought him within the reach of the law compelled him to begin his career as a soldier of fortune at the age of seventeen. He acted under Sir R. Grenville as a volunteer in the expedition to

for the Buriatic we have Castrén, *Versuch einer Burjätischen Sprachlehre*, edited by Schiefner (1837), and A. Orlov's Russian grammar of the Mongol-Buriatic colloquial language (Kasan, 1878).

*Literature*.—A clear distinction must be drawn between the higher and nobler written or book-language and the common or conversational language of everyday life. The difference between the two is very considerable, and may be fairly compared to that between the Modern High German book-language and the different dialects. All grammars and dictionaries as yet published treat only of the book-language; and with a few exceptions, the published literary documents are written in this higher style. The exceptions are the *Gesser-Khan*, and the *Siddhi-kür* and *Djanariad* (the last two published by Golstunsky). The popular or conversational language has only quite lately been fixed in writing by A. Pozdnnyev in his Russian work, *Specimens of the Popular Literature of the Mongolian Tribes*, part I., "Popular Songs" (Petersb., 1880), which contains rich material for the study of the popular literature.

The literature known at present consists mostly of translations from the Tibetan, the holy language of Buddhism, which is still the language of the learned. The Tibetan Buddhist literature is itself translated from the Sanskrit; hence, now and then, through Mongols and Kalmuks we get acquainted with Indian works the originals of which are not known in Sanskrit. Such is the case, for instance, with the tales or Siddhi-kür. Many books have also been translated from the Chinese. Most of the writings are of a religious, historical, philosophical, medical, astronomical, or astrological character. Favourite subjects are folk-lore and fairy tales. Among the religious books, perhaps the most important is that containing the legends entitled *ülger ün dalai*, "ocean of comparisons" (edited by the late L. Jacob Schmidt under the title, *Der Weiße und der Thier*, in Tibetan and German, Petersb., 1843). To this may be added the *bodhü mir*, or "the holy path," the *altan cseri*, "gleaming of gold," the *mani gambo*, and *yertünkü yin töl*, "mirror of the world." What was known of poetical literature before Pozdnnyev is scarcely worth mentioning. In recent years of the historical and narrative literature we find, wherever the narrative takes a higher flight, an admixture of poetical diction. The poetry appears in a certain parallelism of the phrases, with a return either of the same endings (rhyme) or of the same words (refrain). Frequently we find, besides the rhyme or refrain, alliteration. The essay of H. C. von der Gabelentz in *Z. f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. I., pp. 20-37, "Einiges über Mongolische Poesie," has been superseded by the work of Pozdnnyev.

Among historical works a high place is due to that composed by the tributary prince, Ssanang Ssetsen, in the middle of the 17th century (*Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen und ihres Fürstenthums*, Mong. and Germ., by I. J. Schmidt, Petersb., 1829), and to the *Altan tobchi*, i.e., "Golden knob" or "precious contents" (text and Russian translation by the Lama Galsang Gombojew, Petersb., 1858). Of folk-lore and fairy tales, we have the legend of the hero *Gesser-Khan* (text ed. by I. J. Schmidt, Petersb., 1836, and German version, 1839; comp. Schott, *Ueber die Gesser-Khan*, Berl., 1851, and B. Julg in the *Transactions of the Würzburger Philol. Versam.*, vol. I., 1868, pp. 48 sqq., Leips., 1869); and the tales about *Ardschi Bardschi* (Russian version by Galsang Gombojew, Petersb., 1858; text and German trans. by B. Julg, Innsbr., 1867, 1868). A favourite book is the tales of Siddhi-kür based on the Sanskrit *Vedla panchavinioti* (Russian trans. by Galsang Gombojew, Petersb., 1855; mine of the tales in Mongolian and German by B. Julg, Innsbr., 1868). The fuller collection of these tales in Kalmuk first became known by the German trans. of B. Bergmann in vol. I. of his *Nomadische Streifereien unter d. Kalmüken* (4 vols., Riga, 1804-1805); an autographed edition in the vulgar dialect was published by C. Golstunsky (Petersb., 1864; text and German trans. with glossary by B. Julg, Leips., 1866). A poetic heroic story is the *Djanariad*, extracts from which were given by Bergmann (*op. cit.*, iv. 181 sqq.); a complete Russian version by A. Bobrowsnikow (Petersb., 1864); a German version by F. v. Erdmann in *Z.D.M.G.*, 1857 (Kalmuk trans. by Golstunsky, Petersb., 1864). A similar poem is the history of Ubashi Khuntaidshi and his war with the Oirad, Kalmuk text and Russian trans. by G. Gombojew in his *Altan tobchi* as above, and text alone autographed by Golstunsky (Petersb., 1864). Some books of religion for the Christian Buriats (transcribed in Russian characters) represent the Buriatic dialect. The Russian and English Bible Societies have given us a translation of the whole Bible. I. J. Schmidt translated the Gospels and the Acts into Mongolian and Kalmuk for the Russian Bible Society (8 vols., Petersb., 1810-1821)—a masterly work. The English missionaries, E. Stallybrass and W. Swan, and afterwards R. Yulle, translated the whole Old Testament into Mongolian (1836-1840). This work was printed at a mission press near the great cost for the purpose near Seelenginsk beyond Lake Balkal in Siberia. In 1846 the New Testament by the same hands appeared at London.

The richest collections of Mongolian and Kalmuk printed books and MSS. are in the Asiatic museum of the Petersburg Academy, and in the libraries of Kasan and Irkutsk; there is also a good collection in the royal library at Dresden. Consult in general, besides the already-cited works of Bergmann and Pozdnnyev, P. S. Fallas, *Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten u. d. Mongolischen Völkerstämme* (3 vols., Petersb., 1776-1801); I. J. Schmidt, *Forschungen im Gebiete der Alterth. . . . Bildungsgeschichte der Völker Mittelasiens*, vor. d. *Mongolen und Tibeter* (Petersb. and Leips., 1824); B. Julg, "On the Present State of Mongolian Researches," *Journ. R. As. Soc.*, xiv. (1882), pp. 42-65. (B. J.)

Cádiz, and the next year did notable service at the Isle of Rhé.

In 1629 Monk went to the Low Countries, the training ground for military men, where in Oxford's and in Goring's regiments he obtained a high reputation for courage and for a thorough knowledge of his trade. In 1638 he threw up his commission in consequence of a quarrel with the Dutch civil authorities, came to England, and obtained the lieutenant-colonelcy of Newport's regiment during the operations on the Scottish border. Here he showed his skill and coolness in the dispositions by which he saved the English artillery at Newburn, though himself destitute of ammunition; and in the councils of war he confidently voted with Strafford for fighting, and against retreat or composition. One of Monk's biographers relates that he now thought of joining the adventurers who proposed to colonize Madagascar. The Irish rebellion, however, offered



more congenial employment, and in February 1641 he landed at Dublin as colonel of Lord Leicester's regiment. Here he greatly increased his reputation. Under the most difficult circumstances he was ever cool, patient, vigorous. A rigid disciplinarian, he was always attentive to the wants of his men, and completely won their confidence and affection. All the qualities for which he was noted through life, the calculating selfishness which kept him ever on the winning side and by which he accomplished his great historic success, the imperturbable temper and impenetrable secrecy, were fully displayed in this employment. He had but one interest, that of George Monk; and to secure that interest he laboured, while retaining his freedom from party ties, to make himself indispensable as a soldier. The governorship of Dublin was vacant, and Monk was appointed by Leicester. But Charles I. overruled the appointment in favour of Lord Lambert, and Monk, with great shrewdness, gave up his claims. Ormond, however, who viewed him with suspicion as one of the two officers who refused the oath to support the royal cause in England, sent him under guard to Bristol. He now deemed it safest to affect Royalist views. His value caused him to be received at once into Charles's confidence; he was appointed major-general of the Irish brigade, and served under Byron at the siege of Nantwich. Here he was taken prisoner by Fairfax, on 25th January 1644, in one of the most skilful operations of the war. After a short captivity in Hull he was placed in the Tower, where he remained for three years (during which his father died), beguiling his imprisonment by writing his *Observations on Military and Political Affairs*.

So long as the war lasted Monk could not be released. Charles, however, became a prisoner; the troubles in Ireland made the parliament anxious to secure Monk's services, and he was told that if he would take the Covenant he might have an important command. With some show of hesitation the terms were accepted, and, after a service of two months in Lord Lisle's abortive expedition, Monk was placed in command of the British forces in the north of Ireland. Compelled in 1649 to conclude a pacification with the rebel O'Neill, he returned to England after the king's execution. In the same year he succeeded, by his elder brother's death, to the family estate. His idleness lasted but a short while. Cromwell gave him a regiment and the command of the ordnance in the Scotch war of 1650, and after the battle of Dunbar, in which he led the attack, he was left with 6000 men to subdue the country, which, after taking Edinburgh, Tantallon, and Stirling castles, he did most completely in a few weeks. In 1651 he was seized with fever, but recovered at Bath, and in the same year was appointed on the commission for promoting the Union. In 1653, with Admiral Dean, he commanded the British fleet against the Dutch, and on 2d and 3d June and 29th July fought two of the most sanguinary naval battles on record, in which both his colleague and Van Tromp were slain. A peace on very humiliating terms to the Dutch was concluded, but policy shortly led Cromwell to allow milder conditions,—a concession against which Monk strongly remonstrated. On his return he married his mistress, Anne Clarges, a woman of the lowest extraction, "ever a plain homely dowdy," says Pepys, who, like other writers who mention her, is usually still less complimentary. Monk was now sent to quell the revolt headed by Middleton in Scotland, and, when this service was over, settled down to a steady government of the country for the next five years. For fanaticism in any shape he had no sympathy, and he set himself to diminish the influence of the Presbyterian clergy—Cromwell's chief opponents,—taking from them the power of excommunication and their general assemblies, but allowing them to

retain their presbyteries. Equal repression was exercised against the nobility and gentry. The timely discovery of a plot fomented by Overton for killing Monk on New Year's Day gave him an excuse for thoroughly purging his army of all Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, and other dangerous enthusiasts. It is doubtful whether at this time Monk had proposed to himself the restoration of the king. He probably had it always in his mind as a possibility, but he would run no risks. His very reticence, however, caused alarm on one side and hope on the other. In 1655 he received a letter from Charles II., a copy of which he at once sent to Cromwell, whom, however, we find writing to him in 1657 in the following terms: "There be that tell me that there is a certain cunning fellow in Scotland called George Monk, who is said to lye in wait there to introduce Charles Stuart; I pray you, use your diligence to apprehend him, and send him up to me."

During the confusion which followed Cromwell's death Monk remained silent and watchful at Edinburgh, careful only to secure his hold on his troops. In July 1659 direct and tempting proposals were again made to him by the king. His brother Nicholas, a clergyman, was employed by Sir J. Grenvil to bring to him the substance of Charles's letter. No bribe, however, could induce him to act one moment before the right time. He bade his brother go back to his books, and refused to entertain any proposal. But when Booth rose in Cheshire for the king, so tempting did the opportunity seem that he was on the point of joining forces with him; and a letter was written to the Rump parliament threatening force if it did not at once fill up its numbers. His habitual caution, however, induced him to wait until the next post from England, and the next post brought news of Booth's defeat. On 17th October he heard of Lambert's *coup d'état*. From that moment his plan of action seems to have been settled. In most vehement language he discarded the idea of restoring Charles, and, with admirable perception of the state of English feeling, took for his principles that in all cases the army must obey the civil government, and that the civil government must be parliamentary. At present the Rump was crushed by the military party; the first thing, therefore, to be done was to free it. His army underwent a second purging of disaffection, and he then issued a declaration embodying the principles mentioned above, and wrote to Lenthall the speaker, and to the military party to the same effect. In a treaty with the Committee of Safety his commissioners, who were to treat only on the basis of the restoration of parliament, were outwitted. Monk at once refused to accept the terms proposed, and marched to Berwick, having received an offer from Fairfax of assistance if he would promise that the secluded members should be restored. Meanwhile Lambert had marched northwards to oppose his advance.

Monk's action gave fresh heart to the adherents of the parliament. The old council of state met, and named him general of all the forces; the fleet and the Irish army, hitherto hostile, came round to his side, and so did Whetham at Portsmouth. Monk now, in the depth of winter, crossed the Tweed at Coldstream and marched by Morpeth to Newcastle, receiving letters on his way from the lord mayor and corporation of London urging him to declare for a free parliament. On his approach Lambert's army fell away from their general, and no obstacle remained on the path to London. At York, when urged by Fairfax, he refused to declare for the king, and is said to have caned an officer who affirmed that such was his design. The parliament now ordered him to come to London. Fleetwood's army which occupied the city was, however, a great obstacle; and it was not until the parlia-