

in parliament with little success. But in 1806, Lord Grenville and Fox having come into power, a bill was passed in both Houses to put an end to the British slave trade for foreign supply, and to forbid the importation of slaves into the colonies won by the British arms in the course of the war. On 10th June of the same year Fox brought forward a resolution "that effectual measures should be taken for the abolition of the African slave trade in such a manner and at such a period as should be deemed advisable," which was carried by a large majority. A similar resolution was successful in the House of Lords. A bill was then passed through both Houses forbidding the employment of any new vessel in the trade. Finally, in 1807, a bill was presented by Lord Grenville in the House of Lords providing for the abolition of the trade, was passed by a large majority, was then sent to the Commons (where it was moved by Lord Howick), was there amended and passed, and received the royal assent on 25th March. The bill enacted that no vessel should clear out for slaves from any port within the British dominions after 1st May 1807, and that no slave should be landed in the colonies after 1st March 1808.

In 1807 the African Institution was formed, with the primary objects of keeping a vigilant watch on the slave traders and procuring, if possible, the abolition of the slave trade by the other European nations. It was also to be made an instrument for promoting the instruction of the negro races and diffusing information respecting the agricultural and commercial capabilities of the African continent.

The Act of 1807 was habitually violated, as the traders knew that, if one voyage in three was successful, they were abundantly remunerated for their losses. This state of things, it was plain, must continue as long as the trade was only a contraband commerce, involving merely pecuniary penalties. Accordingly, in 1811, Brougham carried through parliament a bill declaring the traffic to be a felony punishable with transportation. Some years later another Act was passed, making it a capital offence; but this was afterwards repealed. The law of 1811 proved effectual, and brought the slave trade to an end so far as the British dominions were concerned. Mauritius, indeed, continued it for a time. That island, which had been ceded by France in 1810, three years after the abolition, had special facilities for escaping observation in consequence of the proximity of the African coast; but it was soon obliged to conform.

The abolition of the French slave trade was preceded by stormy struggles and by many deplorable excesses. The western part of St Domingo, nominally belonging to Spain, had been occupied by buccaneers, who were recognized and supported by the French Government, and had been ceded to France at the peace of Ryswick in 1697. So vast was the annual importation of enslaved negroes into this colony before 1791 that the ratio of the blacks to the whites was as 16 to 1. In that year there were in French St Domingo 480,000 blacks, 24,000 mulattoes, and only 30,000 whites. The French law for the regulation of slavery in the plantations, known as the *Code Noir* (framed under Louis XIV. in 1685), was humane in its spirit; but we are informed that its provisions were habitually disregarded by the planters, whilst the free mulattoes laboured under serious grievances and were exposed to irritating indignities. A "Société des Amis des Noirs" was formed in Paris in 1788 for the abolition, not only of the slave trade, but of slavery itself. The president was Condorcet, and amongst the members were the Duc de la Rochefoucauld, the Abbé Gregoire, Brissot, Clavière, Pétion, and La Fayette; Mirabeau was an active sympathizer. The great motor of the parallel effort in England was the Christian spirit; in France it was the enthusiasm of humanity which was associated with the revolutionary movement. There were in 1789 a number of mulattoes in Paris, who had come from St Domingo to assert the rights of the people of colour in that colony before the national assembly. The Declaration of the Rights of Man in August 1789 seemed to meet their claims, but in March 1790 the assembly, alarmed by rumours of the discontent and disaffection of the planters in St Domingo,

passed a resolution that it had not been intended to comprehend the internal government of the colonies in the constitution framed for the mother country, and added that the assembly would not cause any innovation to be made, directly or indirectly, in any system of commerce in which the colonies were already concerned, — a declaration which could only be interpreted as sanctioning the continuance of the slave trade. Vincent Ogé, one of the mulatto delegates in Paris, disgusted at the overthrow of the hopes of his race, returned to St Domingo, and on landing in October 1790 addressed a letter to the governor announcing his intention of taking up arms on behalf of the mulattoes if their wrongs were not redressed. He rose accordingly with a few followers, but was soon defeated and forced to take refuge in the Spanish part of the island. He was afterwards surrendered, tried, and sentenced to be broken on the wheel. When the news of this reached Paris, it created a strong feeling against the planters; and on the motion of the Abbé Gregoire it was resolved by the assembly on 15th May 1791 "that the people of colour resident in the French colonies, born of free parents, were entitled to, as of right, and should be allowed, the enjoyment of all the privileges of French citizens, and among others those of being eligible to seats both in the parochial and colonial assemblies." On the 23d August a rebellion of the negroes broke out in the northern province of St Domingo, and soon extended to the western province, where the mulattoes and blacks combined. Many enormities were committed by the insurgents, and were avenged with scarcely inferior barbarity. The French assembly, alarmed by these scenes, and fearing the loss of the colony, repealed on 24th September the decree of the preceding May. This lamentable vacillation put an end to all hope of a reconciliation of parties in the island. Civil commissioners sent out from France quarrelled with the governor and called the revolted negroes to their assistance. The white inhabitants of Cape François were massacred and the city in great part destroyed by fire. The planters now offered their allegiance to Great Britain; and an English force landed in the colony. But it was insufficient to encounter the hostility of the republican troops and the revolted negroes and mulattoes; it suffered dreadfully from disease, and was obliged to evacuate the island in 1798. On the departure of the British the government remained in the hands of Toussaint l'Ouverture, the noblest type ever produced by the African race. Slavery had disappeared; the blacks were employed as hired servants, receiving for their remuneration the third part of the crops they raised; and the population was rapidly rising in civilization and comfort. The whole island was now French, the Spanish portion having been ceded by the treaty of Basel. The wish of Toussaint was that St Domingo should enjoy a practical independence whilst recognizing the sovereignty and exclusive commercial rights of France. Of the violent and treacherous conduct of Bonaparte towards the island and its eminent chief we cannot here give an account; the final issue was that the blacks drove from their soil the forces sent to subdue them, and founded a constitution of their own, which was more than once modified. There can be no doubt that the Government of the Restoration, in seeking to obtain possession of the island, had the intention of re-establishing slavery, and even of reopening the slave trade for the purpose of recruiting the diminished population. But Bonaparte abolished that trade during the Hundred Days, though he also failed to win back the people of St Domingo, or, as it was now called by its original name, Hayti, to obedience. The Bourbons, when again restored, could not reintroduce the slave trade; the notion of conquering the island had to be given up; and its independence was formally recognized in 1825. Thus France lost her most important colonial possession, which had yielded produce to an amount almost as great as that of all the rest of the West Indies; and the negro race obtained its first and hitherto its only independent settlement outside the African continent.

England had not been the first European power to abolish the slave trade; that honour belongs to Denmark; a royal order was issued 16th May 1792 that the traffic should cease in the Danish possessions from the end of 1802. The United States had in 1794 forbidden any participation by American subjects in the slave trade to foreign countries; they now prohibited the importation of slaves from Africa into their own dominion. This Act was passed 2d March 1807; it did not, however, come into force till 1st January 1808. At the congress of Vienna (opened November 1, 1814) the principle was acknowledged that the slave trade should be abolished as soon as possible; but the determination of the limit of time was reserved for separate negotiation between the powers. It had been provided in a treaty between France and Great Britain, May 30, 1814, that no foreigner should

in future introduce slaves into the French colonies, and that the trade should be absolutely interdicted to the French themselves after June 1, 1819. This postponement of abolition was dictated by the wish to introduce a fresh stock of slaves into Hayti, if that island should be recovered. Bonaparte, as we have seen, abolished the French slave trade during his brief restoration, and this abolition was confirmed at the second peace of Paris, November 20, 1815, but it was not effectually carried out by French legislation until March 1818. In January 1815 Portuguese subjects were prohibited from prosecuting the trade north of the equator, and the term after which the traffic should be everywhere unlawful was fixed to end on 21st January 1823, but was afterwards extended to February 1830; England paid £300,000 as a compensation to the Portuguese. A royal decree was issued on 10th December 1836 forbidding the export of slaves from any Portuguese possession. But this decree was often violated. It was agreed that the Spanish slave trade should come to an end in 1820, England paying to Spain an indemnification of £400,000. The Dutch trade was closed in 1814; the Swedish had been abolished in 1813. By the peace of Ghent, December 1814, the United States and England mutually bound themselves to do all in their power to extinguish the traffic. It was at once prohibited in several of the South American states when they acquired independence, as in La Plata, Venezuela, and Chili. In 1831 and 1833 Great Britain entered into an arrangement with France for a mutual right of search within certain seas, to which most of the other powers acceded; and by the Ashburton treaty (1842) with the United States provision was made for the joint maintenance of squadrons on the west coast of Africa. By all these measures the slave trade, so far as it was carried on under the flags of European nations or for the supply of their colonies, ceased to exist.

Meantime another and more radical reform had been in preparation and was already in progress, namely, the abolition of slavery itself in the foreign possessions of the several states of Europe. When the English slave trade had been closed, it was found that the evils of the traffic, as still continued by several other nations, were greatly aggravated. In consequence of the activity of the British cruisers the traders made great efforts to carry as many slaves as possible in every voyage, and practised atrocities to get rid of the slaves when capture was imminent. It was, besides, the interest of the cruisers, who shared the price of the captured slave-ship, rather to allow the slaves to be taken on board than to prevent their being shipped at all. Thrice as great a number of negroes as before, it was said, was exported from Africa, and two-thirds of these were murdered on the high seas. It was found also that the abolition of the British slave trade did not lead to an improved treatment of the negroes in the West Indies. The slaves were overworked now that fresh supplies were stopped, and their numbers rapidly decreased. In 1807 there were in the West Indies 800,000; in 1830 they were reduced to 700,000. It became more and more evident that the root of the evil could be reached only by abolishing slavery altogether. At the same time, by the discussions which had for years gone on throughout English society on the subject of the slave trade, men's consciences had been awakened to question the lawfulness of the whole system of things out of which that trade had taken its rise.

An appeal was made by Wilberforce in 1821 to Thomas Fowell Buxton to undertake the conduct of this new question in parliament. An anti-slavery society was established in 1823, the principal members of which, besides Wilberforce and Buxton, were Zachary Macaulay, Dr Lushington, and Lord Suffield. Buxton moved on 5th May of the same year that the House should take into consideration the state of slavery in the British colonies. The object

he and his associates had then in view was gradual abolition by establishing something like a system of serfdom for existing slaves, and passing at the same time a measure emancipating all their children born after a certain day. Canning carried against Buxton and his friends a motion to the effect that the desired ameliorations in the condition and treatment of the slaves should be recommended by the home-Government to the colonial legislatures, and enforced only in case of their resistance, direct action being taken in the single instance of Trinidad, which, being a crown colony, had no legislature of its own. A well-conceived series of measures of reform was accordingly proposed to the colonial authorities. Thereupon a general outcry was raised by the planters at the acquiescence of the Government in the principles of the anti-slavery party. A vain attempt being made in Demerara to conceal from the knowledge of the slaves the arrival of the order in council, they became impressed with the idea that they had been set free, and accordingly refused to work, and, compulsion being resorted to, offered resistance. Martial law was proclaimed; the disturbances were repressed with great severity, and the treatment of the missionary Smith, which was taken up and handled with great ability by Brougham, awakened strong feeling in England against the planters. The question, however, made little progress in parliament for some years, though Buxton, William Smith, Lushington, Brougham, Mackintosh, Butterworth, and Denman, with the aid of Z. Macaulay, James Stephen, and others, continued the struggle, only suspending it during a period allowed to the local legislatures for carrying into effect the measures expected from them. In 1828 the free people of colour in the colonies were placed on a footing of legal equality with their fellow-citizens. In 1830 the public began to be aroused to a serious prosecution of the main issue. It was becoming plain that the planters would take no steps tending to the future liberation of the slaves, and the leaders of the movement determined to urge the entire abolition of slavery at the earliest practicable period. The Government continued to hesitate and to press for mitigations of the existing system. At length in 1833 the ministry of Earl Grey took the question in hand and carried the abolition with little difficulty, the measure passing the House of Commons on 7th August 1833 and receiving the Royal assent 28th of the same month. A sum of 20 millions sterling was voted as compensation to the planters. A system of apprenticeship for seven years was established as a transitional preparation for liberty. The slaves were bound to work for their masters during this period for three-fourths of the day, and were to be liable to corporal punishment if they did not give the due amount of labour. The master was, in return, to supply them with food and clothing. All children under six years of age were to be at once free, and provision was to be made for their religious and moral instruction. Many thought the postponement of emancipation unwise. Immediate liberation was carried out in Antigua, and public tranquillity was so far from being disturbed there that the Christmas of 1833 was the first for twenty years during which martial law was not proclaimed in order to preserve the peace. Notwithstanding protracted and strenuous opposition on the part of the Government, the House of Commons passed a resolution against the continuance of the transitional system. When this was done the local legislatures saw that the slaves would no longer work for the masters; they accordingly cut off two years of the indentured apprenticeship, and gave freedom to the slaves in August 1838 instead of 1840.

The example of Great Britain was gradually followed by the other European states, and some American ones had already taken action of the same kind. The immediate emancipation of the slaves in the French colonies was decreed by the Provisional Government of 1848. In 1858 it was enacted that every slave belonging to a Portuguese subject should be free in twenty years from that date, a system of tutelage being established in the meantime. This law came into operation on 29th April 1878, and the status of slavery was thenceforth illegal throughout the Portuguese possessions. The Dutch emancipated their slaves in 1863. Several of the Spanish American states, on declaring their independence, had adopted measures for the discontinuance of slavery within their limits. It was abolished by a decree of the Mexican republic on 15th September 1829. The Government of Buenos Ayres enacted that all children born to slaves after 31st January 1813 should be free; and in Colombia it was provided that those born after 16th July 1821 should be liberated on attaining their eighteenth year.

Three of the most important slave systems still remained in which no steps towards emancipation had been taken—those of the Southern United States, of Cuba, and of Brazil.

Slavery was far from being approved in principle by the most eminent of the fathers of the American Union. Washington in his will provided for the emancipation of his own slaves; he said to Jefferson that it was "among

his first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery in his country might be abolished by law," and again he wrote that to this subject his own suffrage should never be wanting. John Adams declared his abhorrence of the practice of slaveholding, and said that "every measure of prudence ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States." Franklin's opinions we have already indicated; and Madison, Hamilton, and Patrick Henry all reprobated the principle of the system. Jefferson declared that in the presence of the institution "he trembled for his country when he remembered that God was just." The last-named statesman, at the first continental congress after the evacuation of the British forces, proposed a draft ordinance (1st March 1784) for the government of the territory—including the present Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi—ceded already or to be ceded by individual States to the United States; and it was an article of this ordinance that "after the year 1800 there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crime." This proviso, however, was lost. At the convention of Philadelphia in 1787, where the constitution was settled, the sentiments of the framers were against slavery; but South Carolina and Georgia insisted on its recognition as a condition of their joining the Union, and even an engagement for the mutual rendition of fugitive slaves was embodied in the federal pact. The words "slave" and "slavery" were, however, excluded from the constitution, "because," as Madison says, "they did not choose to admit the right of property in man" in direct terms; and it was at the same time provided that Congress might interdict the foreign slave trade after the expiration of twenty years. It must not be forgotten that either before or soon after the formation of the Union the Northern States—beginning with Vermont in 1777, and ending with New Jersey in 1804—either abolished slavery or adopted measures to effect its gradual abolition within their boundaries. But the principal operation of (at least) the latter change was simply to transfer Northern slaves to Southern markets.

We cannot follow in detail the several steps by which the slave power for a long time persistently increased its influence in the Union. The acquisition of Louisiana—including the State so named, Arkansas, Missouri, and Kansas—(1803), though not made in its interest, the Missouri compromise (1820), the annexation of Texas (1845), the Fugitive Slave Law (1850), the Kansas-Nebraska bill (1854), the Dred Scott decision (1856), the attempts to acquire Cuba (1854) and to reopen the foreign slave trade (1859-60), were the principal steps—only some of them successful—in its career of aggression. They roused a determined spirit of opposition, founded on deep-seated convictions. The pioneer of the more recent abolitionist movement was Benjamin Lundy (1789-1839). He was followed by William Lloyd Garrison (1805-1879), Elijah P. Lovejoy (1802-1837)—a martyr, if ever there was one—Wendell Phillips, Charles Sumner, John Brown (b. 1800, hanged 1859), all of whom were in their several ways leading apostles or promoters of the cause. The best intellect of America outside the region of practical politics has been on the anti-slavery side. William E. Channing, R. W. Emerson, the poets Bryant, Longfellow, pre-eminently Whittier, and more recently Whitman, have spoken on this theme with no uncertain sound. The South, and its partisans in the North, made desperate efforts to prevent the free expression of opinion respecting the institution, and even the Christian churches in the slave States used their influence in favour of the maintenance of slavery. But in spite of every such effort opinion steadily grew. Public sentiment in the North was

deeply stirred by the *Uncle Tom's Cabin* of Mrs Harriet Beecher Stowe (1852), which, as Senior said, under the disguise of a novel was really a pamphlet against the Fugitive Slave Law. It gradually became apparent that the question could not be settled without an armed conflict. The designation of Abraham Lincoln as president in November 1860 was the signal for the rising of the South. The North at first took arms simply to maintain the Union; but the far-sighted politicians from the first, and soon the whole nation, saw that the real issue was the continued existence or the total abolition of slavery. See UNITED STATES.

The war was closed by the surrender at Appomattox (9th April 1865), but already in 1862 slavery in the Territories had been abolished by Congress; on 22d of September of the same year Lincoln had issued his proclamation of freedom to the slaves; and in 1864 a constitutional amendment had been passed abolishing and forever prohibiting slavery throughout the United States.

The Spanish slave code, promulgated in 1789, is admitted on all hands to have been very humane in its character; and, in consequence of this, after Trinidad had become an English possession, the anti-slavery party resisted—and successfully—the attempt of the planters (1811) to have the Spanish law in that island replaced by the British. But, notwithstanding this mildness of the code, so habitually and glaringly were its provisions violated in the colonies of Spain, that Dr R. R. Madden, who had personal knowledge of the affairs of Cuba, declared in 1840 that "slavery in Cuba was more destructive to human life, more pernicious to society, degrading to the slave and debasing to the master, more fatal to health and happiness, than in any other slaveholding country on the face of the habitable globe." "It is in Cuba at this day," wrote Cairnes in 1862, "... that we see in the servile class the coarsest fare, the most exhausting and unremitting toil, and even the absolute destruction of a portion of its numbers every year by the slow torture of overwork and insufficient sleep and rest." The slave population of the island was estimated in 1792 at 84,500; in 1817 at 179,000; in 1827 at 286,000; and in 1848 at 436,000. An Act was passed by the Spanish legislature in 1870, providing that every slave who had then passed, or should thereafter pass, the age of sixty should be at once free, and that all yet unborn children of slaves should also be free. The latter, however, were to be maintained at the expense of the proprietors up to their eighteenth year, and during that time to be kept as apprentices, to such work as was suitable for their age. This is known as the Moret Law, having been carried through the house of representatives by Señor Moret y Prendergast, then minister for the colonies. By the census of 1867 there was in Cuba a total population of 1,370,211 persons, of whom 764,750 were whites and 605,461 black or coloured; and of the latter number 225,938 were free and 379,523 were slaves. In 1873 the Cubans roughly estimated the population at 1,500,000,—of whom 500,000, or one-third, were slaves. Mr Crowe, consul-general in the island, has lately (1885) stated that "the institution is rapidly dying,—that in a year, or at most two, slavery, even in its present mild form, will be extinct."

There was a convention between Great Britain and Brazil in 1826 for the abolition of the slave trade, but it was habitually violated in spite of the English cruisers. In 1830 the traffic was declared piracy by the emperor of Brazil. England asserted by the Aberdeen Act (1845) the right of seizing suspected craft in Brazilian waters. Yet by the connivance of the local administrative authorities 54,000 Africans continued to be annually imported. In 1850 the trade is said to have been decisively put down. The planters and mine proprietors cried out against this as a national calamity. The closing of the traffic made the labour of the slaves more severe, and led to the employment on the plantations of many who before had been engaged in domestic work; but the slavery of Brazil has always been lighter than that of the United States. On 23d September 1871 the Brazilian chambers decreed that slavery should be abolished throughout the empire. Though existing slaves were to remain slaves still, with the exception of those possessed by the Government, who were liberated by the Act, facilities for emancipation were given; and it was provided that all children born of female slaves after the day on which the law passed should be free. They were, however, bound to serve the owners of their mothers for a term of 21 years. A clause was inserted to the effect that a certain sum should be annually set aside from dues to aid each province in emancipating slaves by purchase. Seven years before the passing of this Act the emperor, whose influence has always been exerted in favour of freedom, had liberated his private slaves, and many Brazilians after 1871 followed his example. According to the census of 1835 there were then in

Brazil 2,106,000 slaves. It was estimated that at the beginning of 1875 there were not more than 1,476,567. But in 1884 they are spoken of as 3,000,000 in number. A gradual separation has been for some time taking place between the parts of the country in which slave labour is used and the free-labour regions. Slavery is being concentrated in the districts between Maranhão and São Paulo. In 1880 the deputy Joachim Nabuco, leader of the anti-slavery movement, obtained leave to introduce a bill for a more rapid liberation of slaves than was attainable under the law of 1871, and for the final extinction of slavery in Brazil by 1st January 1890. The Government, however, refused to sanction the further progress of the bill: but the question has since become again of present political interest, being the principal subject of discussion in the parliament which opened 1st March 1885. A bill has been passed, known as the Saraiva Law, on which we cannot yet form a definitive judgment, but which is understood to have disappointed the expectations of the abolitionists. It is said to provide exorbitant compensation for the slave-owners; and, although slaves over 60 years of age are to obtain their freedom, it appears that all slaves, on being set free, as well as the indentured children of slaves, are to remain three years longer with their masters at very low wages, the planters thus practically receiving an additional indemnity.

In the colonies of more than one European country, after the prohibition of the slave trade, attempts were made to replace it by a system of importing labourers of the inferior races under contracts for a somewhat lengthened term: and this was in several instances found to degenerate into a sort of legalized slave traffic. About 1867 we began to hear of a system of this kind which was in operation between the South Sea Islands and New Caledonia and the white settlements in Fiji. It seems to have begun in really voluntary agreements; but for these the unscrupulous greed of the traders soon substituted methods of fraud and violence. The natives were decoyed into the labour ships under false pretences, and then detained by force; or they were seized on shore or in their canoes and carried on board. The nature of the engagements to go and work on the plantations was not fully explained to them, and they were hired for periods exceeding the legal term. The area of this trade was ere long further extended. In 1884 attention was drawn in a special degree to the Queensland traffic in Pacific Islanders by the "Hopeful" trials, and a Government commission was appointed to inquire into the methods followed by labour ships in recruiting the natives of New Guinea, the Louisiade Archipelago, and the D'Entrecasteaux group of islands. The result of the investigations, during which nearly five hundred witnesses were examined, was the disclosure of a system which in treachery and atrocity was little inferior to the old African slave trade. These shameful deeds have made the islanders regard it as a duty to avenge their wrongs on any white men they can entice upon their shores. The noble-hearted bishop of Melanesia, John Coleridge Patteson, fell a victim to this retaliation on the island of Nukapu 20th September 1871. The tendency of the whole system is to create a war of races. It may be questioned whether this trade in labour can be safely continued at all; if so, it must be under a constant and vigorous system of surveillance and regulation.

We have seen that the last vestiges of the monstrous anomaly of modern colonial slavery are disappearing from all civilized states and their foreign possessions. It now remains to consider the slavery of primitive origin which has existed within recent times, or continues to exist, outside of the Western world.

In Russia a country which had not the same historical antecedents with the Western nations, properly so called, and which is in fact more correctly classed as Eastern, whilst slavery had disappeared, serfdom was in force down to our own days. The rural population of that country, at the earliest period accessible to our inquiries, consisted of (1) slaves, (2) free agricultural labourers, and (3) peasants proper, who were small farmers or cottiers and members of a commune. The sources of slavery were there, as elsewhere, capture in war, voluntary sale by poor freemen of themselves, sale of insolvent debtors, and the action of the law in certain criminal cases. In the 18th century we find the distinction between the three classes named above effaced, and all of them merged in the class of serfs, who were the property either of the landed proprietors or of the state. They were not even *adscripti glebæ*, though forbidden to migrate; an imperial ukase of 1721 says, "the proprietors sell their peasants and domestic servants, not even in families, but one by one, like cattle." This practice, at first tacitly sanctioned by the Government, which received dues on the sales, was at length formally recognized by several imperial ukases. Peter the Great imposed a poll-tax on all the members of the rural population, making the proprietors responsible for the tax charged on their serfs; and the "free wandering people" who were not willing to enter the army were required to settle on the land either as members of a commune or as serfs of some proprietor. The system of serfdom attained its fullest development in the reign of Catherine II. The serfs were bought, sold, and given

in presents, sometimes with the land, sometimes without it, sometimes in families and sometimes individually, sale by public auction being alone forbidden, as "unbecoming in a European state." The proprietors could transport without trial their unruly serfs to Siberia or send them to the mines for life, and those who presented complaints against their masters were punished with the knout and condemned to the mines. The first symptoms of a reaction appear in the reign of Paul (1796-1801). He issued an ukase that the serfs should not be forced to work for their masters more than three days in each week. There were several feeble attempts at further reform, and even abortive projects of emancipation, from the commencement of the present century. But no decisive measures were taken before the accession of Alexander II. (1855). That emperor, after the Crimean War, created a secret committee composed of the great officers of state, called the chief committee for peasant affairs, to study the subject of self-emancipation. Of this body the grand-duke Constantine was an energetic member. To accelerate the proceedings of the committee advantage was taken of the following incident. In the Lithuanian provinces the relations of the masters and serfs were regulated in the time of Nicholas by what were called inventories. The nobles, dissatisfied with these, now sought to have them revised. The Government interpreted the application as implying a wish for the abolition of serfdom, and issued a rescript authorizing the formation of committees to prepare definite proposals for a gradual emancipation. A circular was soon after sent to the governors and marshals of the nobility all over Russia proper, informing them of this desire of the Lithuanian nobles, and setting out the fundamental principles which should be observed "if the nobles of the provinces should express a similar desire." Public opinion strongly favoured the projected reform; and even the masters who were opposed to it saw that, if the operation became necessary, it would be more safely for their interests intrusted to the nobles than to the bureaucracy. Accordingly during the year 1858 a committee was created in nearly every province in which serfdom existed. From the schemes prepared by these committees, a general plan had to be elaborated, and the Government appointed a special imperial commission for this purpose. The plan was formed, and, in spite of some opposition from the nobles, which was suppressed, it became law, and serfdom was abolished (19th February = 3d March 1861). Its nature and results have been indicated in *Russia*, vol. xxi. p. 82. The total number of serfs belonging to proprietors at the time of the emancipation was 21,625,609, of whom 20,158,231 were peasant serfs and 1,467,378 domestic serfs. This number does not include the state serfs, who formed about one-half of the rural population. Their position had been better, as a rule, than that of the serfs on private estates; it might indeed, Mr Wallace says, be regarded as "an intermediate position between serfage and freedom." Amongst them were the serfs on the lands formerly belonging to the church, which had been secularized and transformed into state domains by Catherine II. There were also serfs on the apanages affected to the use of the imperial family; these amounted to nearly three and a half millions. Thus by the law of 1861 more than forty millions of serfs were emancipated.

The slavery of the Mohammedan East is usually not the slavery of the field but of the household. The slave is a member of the family, and is treated with tenderness and affection. The Koran breathes a considerate and kindly spirit towards the class, and encourages manumission. The child of a slave girl by her master is born free, and the mother is usually raised to be a free wife. But behind this slavery, however mild in itself, stands the slave trade, with its systematic man-hunting, which has been, and still is, the curse of Africa. The traffic in slaves has been repeatedly declared by the Ottoman Porte to be illegal throughout its dominions, and there have been several conventions between Great Britain and the Khedive for its suppression in Egypt; but it is still largely carried on both in the latter country and in Turkey, owing to the laxity and too often the complicity of the Government officials.

In the days of the colonial slave trade its African centre was the region about the mouths of the rivers Calabar and Bonny, whither the captive negroes were brought from great distances in the interior. As many slaves, Clarkson tells us, came annually from this part of the coast as from all the rest of Africa besides. At present, it is commonly said,—though Cameron in 1875 was otherwise informed,—no slaves are exported from the western side of the continent. The principal centres from which the supply is now furnished to Egypt, Turkey, Arabia, and Persia are three in number. (1) The Soudan, south of the Great Sahara, appears to be one vast hunting-ground. Captives are brought thence to the slave market of Kuka in Bornu, where, after being bought by dealers, they are, to the number of about 10,000 annually, marched over arid desert tracks under a burning sun to Murzuk in Fezzan, from which place they are distributed to the northern and eastern Mediterranean coasts. Their sufferings on the route are dreadful; many succumb and are abandoned. Rohlfs informs us that "any one who did not know the way" by which the caravans pass "would only have to follow the bones which lie right and left of

the track." Negroes are also brought to Morocco from the Western Soudan and from Timbuktu. The centre of the traffic in Morocco is Sidi Hamed ibn Musa, seven days' journey south of Mogador, where a great yearly fair is held. The slaves are forwarded thence in gangs to different towns, especially to Morocco city, Fez, and Mequinez. About 4000 are thus annually imported, and an *ad valorem* duty is levied by the sultan, which produces about £4800 of annual revenue. The total number of negro slaves in Morocco appears to be about 50,000. (2) The basin of the Nile, extending to the great lakes, is another region infested by the slave trade; the slaves are either smuggled into Egypt or sent by the Red Sea to Turkey. The khedive Ismail in 1869 appointed Sir Samuel Baker to the command of a large force with which he was "to strike a direct blow at the slave trade in its distant nest." The instructions in the firman issued to him were as follows:—"To subdue to our authority the countries situated to the south of Gondokoro, to suppress the slave trade, to introduce a system of regular commerce, to open to navigation the great lakes of the equator, and to establish a chain of military stations and commercial depôts throughout Central Africa." The work energetically commenced by him was continued by Colonel C. G. Gordon (1874 to 1879), but since the revolt of the Soudan, it is to be feared, no trace of his or of Baker's work remains in the scene of their labours. The most effectual direct methods of dealing with the slave trade in the present territories of Egypt seem to be those suggested by the Anti-Slavery Society to Mr Gladstone's Government in 1861—extended consular supervision, and a compulsory registration of all existing slaves. (3) There has long been a slave trade from the Portuguese possessions on the East African coast. The stream of supply came mainly from the southern Nyassa districts by three or four routes to Ibo, Mozambique, Angoche, and Kilimane. Madagascar and the Comoro Islands obtained most of their slaves from the Mozambique coast. It was believed in 1862 that about 19,000 passed every year from the Nyassa regions to Zanzibar, whence large supplies were drawn for the markets of Arabia and Persia up to 1873. The mission of Sir Bartle Frere to the sultan of Zanzibar in 1873 brought about a treaty for the suppression of the slave trade, but it is to be feared that the cessation of the traffic from that port has not extinguished the traffic but has in part only given it a different direction, through Somali markets. In Madagascar, which had been supplied from the Mozambique coast, the import and sale of slaves were prohibited within the Hova dominions by Queen Ranavalona II. in June 1877. The rulers of the Comoro Islands, Mohilea and Anjuan (or Johanna), have signed treaties for the abolition of the status of slavery in their dominions after 1890, the fulfilment of which, however, it will probably be difficult to enforce. The stations established by the English universities in the valley of the Rovuma and by the Established and Free Churches of Scotland on Lake Nyassa doubtless contributed much to the diminution of the traffic in those parts. It is said that, whereas no less than 10,000 slaves formerly passed the southern end of the Nyassa every year, in 1876 not more than 33 were known to have been conveyed by that route. Lieutenant O'Neill, British consul at Mozambique, writing in 1880, fixed at about 3000 the number then annually exported from the coast between the rivers Rovuma and Zambesi. But since that date the traffic seems to have received a fresh impetus from an increased demand for ivory, the slave and ivory trades being "hand and glove." The Portuguese appear to be the most determined upholders of the evil system, and in consequence are everywhere detested by the natives.

There are other minor branches of the trade elsewhere in Africa. Thus from Harar in Somali-land caravans are sent to Berbera on the coast, where there is a great annual fair. The slaves are collected from the inland Galla countries, from Gurágue, and from Abyssinia.

Clarkson first, and Buxton afterwards, whilst they urged all other means for the suppression or discouragement of the slave trade and slavery, saw clearly that the only thoroughly effectual method would be the development of legitimate commerce in Africa itself. When Buxton published in 1840 his book entitled *The Slave Trade and its Remedy*, this was the remedy he contemplated. The unfortunate Niger expedition of 1841 was directed to similar ends; and it has been more and more felt by all who were interested in the subject that here lies the radical solution of the great problem. It was for some time thought that from Sierra Leone as a centre industry and civilization might be diffused amongst the nations of the continent; and in 1822 the colony (which in 1847 became the independent republic) of Liberia had been founded by Americans with a similar object; but in neither case have these expectations been fulfilled. A new, and it would seem really hopeful, effort for the same great end has recently been undertaken.

Leopold II., king of the Belgians, invited in September 1876 representative geographers to a conference in his palace, to discuss the question of the exploration and civilization of Africa through the development of commerce and the abolition of the slave trade.

Six European nations were represented, and an International African Association was formed. The central committee organized seven successive expeditions from the east coast to Lake Tanganyika. The exploration of the Congo by Stanley turned attention to the west coast, and he went out to the Congo in 1879 as commander-in-chief of the association, to open up that river. The association obtained, by treaties with the native chiefs, the cession of certain territories. The recognition of its flag and its territorial rights by the European Powers has transformed the association into the Congo Free State. A conference was held at Berlin on 15th November 1884, attended by plenipotentiaries from all the European states, to regulate the position of the new state, and one of its declarations was that "these regions shall not be used as markets or routes of transit for the trade in slaves, no matter of what race; each of these powers binds itself to use all the means at its disposal to put an end to this trade and to punish those engaged in it." The territory of the new-state was fixed so as to comprise 1,065,200 square miles, with an estimated population of 42,608,000 souls. Stations have been built at points extending for nearly 1500 miles into the centre of Africa.

There are, it cannot be denied, real dangers connected with this great enterprise for the civilization of Africa. Disputes may arise between the powers having interests in the territories of the new state, and, still worse, the natives may be led to take sides in such disputes. That the African population should be sometimes oppressed, or have justice denied them, by European traders or officials is by no means unlikely in the present state of opinion with respect to our duties towards the retarded races. Difficulties, too, may be created by the rivalries and mutual jealousies of the missionaries of the several Western communions. But, whilst foreseeing these possibilities and urging the necessity of guarding, as far as possible, against the evils referred to, we ought not to view in a grudging or suspicious spirit an enterprise which is begun with pure intentions, and will probably do much to right the wrongs and improve the position of a deeply-injured portion of our race. The establishment of the state will be no reason for the cessation of any effort which Western Governments can make, by the exercise of influence and by remonstrance, to induce Turkey and Egypt to fulfil their engagements respecting the slave trade. The rulers of those states are well disposed to appropriate the results of more advanced civilization; and we need not despair of the disappearance in Mohammedan communities of slave-holding and its ally polygamy, since those practices are not enjoined, but only tolerated, by a religious code which social progress will inevitably lead its adherents to modify, by interpretation.

*Bibliography.*—On the several branches of the subject of slavery and serfdom fuller information may be obtained from the following works, which have been amongst those used in the preparation of the preceding sketch.

On Ancient Slavery: H. Wallon, *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*, 3 vols., 1847, 2d ed. 1879; A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens*, Eng. transl. by G. Cornwall Lewis, 1838, 2d ed. 1842; William Blair, *Inquiry into the State of Slavery among the Romans, from the Earliest Period to the Establishment of the Lombards in Italy*, 1833; Dureau de la Malle, *Economie Politique des Romains*, 2 vols., 1840; M. Troplong, *De l'Influence du Christianisme sur le Droit Civil des Romains*, 2d ed. 1855. On Medieval Slavery and Serfdom: G. Humbert, article "Colonat" in the *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines* of Daremberg and Saglio (now in course of publication); J. Yanoski, *De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage Ancien au Moyen Âge et de sa Transformation en Servitude de la Glèbe* (Wallon and Yanoski had jointly composed a memoir to compete for a prize offered by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in 1837; Wallon's portion of the memoir became the foundation of his *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité* above mentioned; Yanoski's part, the expansion of which was prevented by his early death, was posthumously published in 1860; it is no more than a slight sketch); Benjamin Guérard, *Prolegomenes au Polyptique d'Irminon*, 1844; Fustel de Coulanges, *Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'ancienne France* (only the first part has been published, 2d ed. 1877), and *Recherches sur quelques Problèmes d'Histoire*, 1885 (the latter work contains the best extant discussion of the whole subject of the colonatus, founded throughout on the original texts); Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*, 3 vols., 1874-78. On the Colonial Slave Trade and Slavery: Washington Irving, *Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, 1828, several times reprinted; Arthur Helps, *Life of Las Casas*, 1868; Bryan Edwards, *History, Civil and Commercial, of the British West Indies*, 1793, 5th ed. in 5 vols., 1819; Thomas Clarkson, *History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade by the British Parliament*, 2 vols., 1808; T. Fowell Buxton, *African Slave Trade*, 2d ed. 1838, and *The Remedy, a Sequel*, 1840; *Memoirs of Sir T. F. Buxton*, edited by his son Charles Buxton, 3d ed. 1849. On North American Slavery: G. M. Stroud, *Laws relating to Slavery in America*, 2d ed. 1856; H. Greeley, *The American Conflict*, 1865; and John E. Cairnes, *The Slave Power, its Character, Career, and Probable Destiny*, 1862, 2d ed. 1863. On Brazilian Slavery and Kidder, *Brazil and the Brazilians*, 9th ed. 1873. On Russian Serfdom: L. Mackenzie Wallace, *Russia*, 1877. For the existing state of the African slave trade, and of Egyptian and Turkish slavery, the *Imaillia* of Sir S. Baker, the writings of Livingstone, and the biographies of Gordon may be consulted besides the many documents on these subjects published by the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. There are two volumes by A. Tourmagne, entitled respectively *Histoire de l'Esclavage Ancien et Moderne*, 1880, and *Histoire du Seravage Ancien et Moderne*, 1879, which bring together many facts relating to slavery and serfdom; but they are somewhat loose and uncritical; the author, too, repeats himself much, and dwells on many topics scarcely if at all connected with his main themes. The largest and most philosophical views on slavery generally will be found in Hume's *Essay* "On the Populousness of Antient Nations," and in Comte's *Philosophie Positive*, vol. v., and *Politique Positive*, vol. iii. For its economic effects, when it is regarded as an organization of labour, reference may be had to Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, book iii. chap. 2, J. S. Mill's *Political Economy*, book ii. chap. 5, and J. E. Cairnes's *Slave Power*, chap. 2. (J. K. I.)

SLAVONIA. — See CROATIA AND SLAVONIA.

## S L A V S

ACCORDING to the tables published by Boudilovich in connexion with the admirable ethnological map of Mirkovich (St Petersburg, 1875), the Slavs may be grouped geographically as follows:—

I. SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION.—1. *Russians*.—(a) The Great Russians (*Velikoruskie*), who occupy the governments round Moscow and extend as far north as Novgorod and Vologda, south to Kieff and Voronezh, east to Penza, Simbirsk, and Vyatka, and west to the Baltic provinces and Poland; they number about 40,000,000. (b) The Little Russians (*Malorossiane*), who include the Rousians or Rousniaks in Galicia and the Boiki and Gouzouli in Bukovina; they number 16,370,000. Drawing a straight line from Sandec near Cracow to the Asiatic frontier of Russia, we shall find their language the dominant tongue of Galicia and all the southern parts of Russia till we come to the Caucasus. It is also spoken in a strip of territory in the north of Hungary. (c) The White Russians, inhabiting the western governments; they number 4,000,000.

2. *Bulgarians*, including those in Russia, Austria, Roumania, Bulgaria, eastern Roumelia, and those under Turkish government in Macedonia; their total number is 5,123,592.

3. *Servo-Croats*, including those of Servia, Montenegro, the southern part of Hungary, and a few in the south of Russia; they are returned as numbering 5,940,539. Here also may be placed the Slovenes, including those in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, amounting to 1,287,000.

II. WESTERN DIVISION.—1. *Poles*, divided between Russia, Austria, and Prussia; they number 9,492,162; under this head may be included the Kashoubs near Dantzic, numbering 111,416.

2. *Chechs*<sup>1</sup> and *Moravians*, 4,815,154 in number; here also may be included the Slovaks, numbering 2,223,820.

3. *Lusatian Wends* or *Sorbs*, Upper and Lower, partly in Saxony and partly in Prussia. The *Upper Wends* number 98,000, the *Lower* 40,000.

Total number of Slavs in both divisions 89,499,683.

Originally the Slavs were spread over a great part of northern Germany, extending as far as Utrecht, which was anciently called Wiltaburg and was a city of the Wilzen. Thus Slavonic was certainly spoken in Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, Saxony, west Bohemia, Lower Austria, the greater part of Upper Austria, north Styria and north Carinthia, a large part of what is now Hungary, and in the localities now occupied by Kiel, Lübeck, Magdeburg, Halle, Leipsic (= Lipsk, the city of lime-trees), Baireuth, Linz, Salzburg, Gratz (= Gradetz, Gorodetz), and Vienna. The names of the old Slavonic tribes originally settled in these parts of Germany are given in Schafarik's *Slavische Alterthümer*, to which work the reader desiring further information must be referred. They are mentioned frequently in such writers as Helmold, Dietmar, Arnold, Wittekind, and others. We hear of a commercial city of importance, which some writers have rather fantastically termed the Slavonic Amsterdam, called Wolin, on an island of the same name, which was known as Winetha to the Germans and as Julin to the Danes. Schafarik even wished to see the Slavonic tribe of the Wilzen in English Wiltshire. This, however, cannot be accepted; the original name is Wilsætas and that of the town Wiltun, the town on the river Wily. It has long been a generally received opinion that the modern Greeks have a large Slavonic admixture. This opinion was boldly asserted some years ago by Fallmerayer and has not been upset even by the labours of M. Sathas. He dwells much upon the form Σθλαβηνοσ as distinct from Σκλαβηνοσ; but this corruption seems to be owing to some such false analogy as εσθλός. Miklosich, in his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen* (1886), considers the two forms to be identical. In like fashion Procopius connects Serbi with Σπόροι and Constantine Porphyrogenitus turns Svatopluk into Σφενδδπλοκος. Mediaeval Greece, especially the Peloponnesus, abounded with Slavonic

names, which are now being replaced by others drawn from classical sources. Kollar and Wolanski wished to find a Slavonic population in Italy; but their opinions are considered the wild dreams of unscientific patriots, though these views found their way into such works as the *Varronianus* of Dr Donaldson. Equally unfounded appears to be the belief that a Slavonic element may be traced in Spain and Asia Minor. If the Slavs have lost in the west of Europe, they have gained in the east considerably, as Russia has encroached upon the Ugro-Finnish tribes of the northern and eastern portions of its empire, and many of these races are now in various stages of Russification.

As to the original home of the Slavonic race there are three leading opinions:—(1) the Slavs settled in Europe at a period contemporaneous with or shortly after the arrival of the Teutonic and other Indo-European families; (2) they first made their appearance in Europe with the Huns, Avars, and other Asiatic barbarians in the 3d century after Christ; (3) they originated in Europe, as did the so-called Indo-European race altogether. This last view has been maintained by Penka<sup>2</sup> and Schrader<sup>3</sup> (see below).

The first of these views has been supported by Schafarik. He considers that the Slavs left Asia in very early times for the following reasons:—(a) the fact that the Slavonic languages are more closely connected with European tongues than with those of Asia, even granting the many affinities of Slavonic with Zend or (as has been recently shown by Hübschmann) with Armenian; (b) the similarity of the manners and customs of the Slavs to those of the Celts, Germans, and other European populations; (c) the occurrence of many mountains, rivers, and towns having Slavonic names which are mentioned long before the Slavs themselves are found in history; (d) the fact that the Slavs are always spoken of by the earlier writers in terms which show that these writers considered them to be an ancient European nation, and were struck with the large area over which their populations extended. Moreover, the arrival at a comparatively late period of such large hordes would have made a great impression upon the surrounding nations at the time, and this would certainly have found an echo in their historians and chroniclers.

Schafarik believes that the Slavs or Wends (as they were called by their Teutonic neighbours) were settled at a very early period on the southern coast of the Baltic. The word "Wend" he connects with a Slavonic (*voda*) and Lithuanian (*wandū*) root meaning "water"; thus it would signify the people dwelling about the water. He appears to include under the Slavs all people bearing the name Wends, notably the Veneti on the Adriatic. Other writers, however, consider that the word was applied generally to any maritime people; and this view appears probable. The name also occurs in Switzerland. The Wends then, according to Schafarik, were the earliest inhabitants of the Baltic coast; but they were expelled by the Goths in the 4th century B.C. Nestor makes other tribes of Slavs to have been established at an early period on the Danube and to have been driven thence by the Vlachs, a people whom scholars are inclined to identify with the Latin colonists from whom in a great measure the modern Roumans are descended. We find other tribes settled in the neighbourhood of the Carpathians. The first historian who relates anything about the Slavs is probably Herodotus, whose account of the north of Europe is very vague. Among the Scythian tribes mentioned by him two have been

<sup>1</sup> This spelling has been adopted as best calculated to show the pronunciation of the name Czech, in the same way as the French write the word *Tchéque*.

<sup>2</sup> *Origines Ariacæ*, Vienna, 1883.

<sup>3</sup> *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, 1885.