Intellectuals and the Eastern Question: 'Historical-Mindedness' and 'Kin Beyond Sea', c. 1875-1880

William Kelley
St. John's College
University of Oxford

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Trinity Term, 2017

Abstract

The intractable problems posed by the decline of the Ottoman Empire were a defining feature of the nineteenth-century British experience. Events such as the Greek War of Independence (1821-32), the Crimean War (1853-5), and the Bulgarian Agitation (1876-8) were merely prominent denouements in the protracted history of what contemporaries called 'the Eastern Question'. The Eastern Question could be construed in many ways and admitted many answers. But by the 1870s, many Victorians had come to construe the Eastern Question as primarily an historical question.

This thesis explores the ways in which Victorian public intellectuals brought 'historical-mindedness' to bear on the Eastern Question. Nineteenth-century historiography, it is suggested, may often be understood as a variety of contemporary political thought. Part One takes the historian E. A. Freeman, one of the Bulgarian Agitation's leaders, as its subject. Studied in depth, Freeman becomes a window onto how nineteenth-century intellectuals could experience and understand the Eastern Question.

Part Two turns to the remarkable efflorescence of historical writing elicited by the so-called Eastern Crisis of 1875-80, investigating how historical arguments were invoked not merely in history books but also in newspaper reports, politically-freighted travel writing, and above all in periodical articles, over two-hundred of which are studied here.

When Gladstone invoked the authority of 'the historical school of England' to criticise Lord Beaconsfield during this period, he did so advisedly, for historians both lay and professional were remarkably unanimous in their interpretation of events in south-eastern Europe. Drawing on the insights of comparative philology and often sympathetic to Eastern Orthodoxy for reasons of religion, these historians tended to emphasise the Balkan Christians' European identity, situating them within teleological narratives of progress which evoke contemporaneous Whig histories of England.

Long Abstract

The intractable problems posed by the decline of the Ottoman Empire were a defining feature of the nineteenth-century British experience. Events such as the Greek War of Independence (1821-32), the Crimean War (1853-5), and the Bulgarian Agitation (1876-8) were merely prominent denouements in the protracted history of what contemporaries called 'the Eastern Question'. The Eastern Question could be construed in many ways and admitted many answers. To some, it remained a question of Britain's geopolitical and economic interests, as it had been on the eve of the Crimean War. To others, it was a question of solidarity between two empires, British and Turkish. But by the 1870s, many Victorians had come to construe the Eastern Question as primarily an historical question.

In this period, history enjoyed extraordinary prominence in culture, religion and politics. Arguments premised on history exercised considerable power in public life, and all aspects of human culture were studied in historical perspective. Unsurprisingly, historians enjoyed unprecedented prominence, contributing to the debates of the day; and important statements of political thought—above all concerning questions of national identity—were expressed not only in tracts and treatises, but in historiography. It was natural that when Victorians sought to make sense of the Eastern Question many looked to history for answers.

The two complementary parts of this thesis both explore the ways in which Victorian public intellectuals sought to understand the Eastern Question 'in its historical bearings'. **Part One** is concerned with the historian and controversialist E. A. Freeman, whose lifelong engagement with the problems of south-eastern Europe and its history is studied in detail. In **Chapter One**, Freeman becomes a window onto the important place that the Eastern Question could occupy in the biographies of nineteenth-century intellectuals. Events such as the Crimean War and the Greek War of Independence, it is argued, occupied a position in the nineteenth-century imagination comparable to the Revolutions of 1848 or the passage of the First Reform Act in 1832. Freeman's role as an activist is chronicled in detail, including his collaboration with other prominent Victorians including Henry Liddon, William Gladstone and James Bryce, illuminating one of the prosopographical networks at the heart of the Bulgarian Agitation.

Chapter Two studies the intellectual history for Freeman's engagement with the Eastern Question. While his *History of the Norman Conquest* has tended to monopolise the attention of historians of historiography, this essay argues that the Eastern Question occupies a central place in Freeman's historical thought. In works such as his four-volume *History of Sicily*, his *Chief Periods of European History*, his third series of *Historical Essays* and his monographs on the *History and Conquest of the Saracens* and *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, Freeman elaborated a conception of universal history to which the Eastern Question was central. Freeman's thought is set in a number of illuminating intellectual and religious contexts, including his abiding enthusiasm for the Eastern Orthodox Church; his interest in the comparative method and mid-Victorian conceptions of race and nationality; and his response to George Finlay's account of Greek history.

At times, the focus is on Freeman's own contributions to an historical understanding of the Eastern Question, contributions that are important texts in nineteenth-century intellectual history in their own terms. But Chapter Two is equally concerned with the contexts in which Freeman's historical writing on the Eastern Question may usefully be read, some of which are studied in greater depth than is

dictated by their direct relation to Freeman's thought. This widening of focus is intended to lead to a portrayal of how intellectuals could engage with the Eastern Question as an historical question in the nineteenth century, in which larger context Freeman's own engagement with the Eastern Question may be situated. This approach is informed by J. G. A. Pocock's series of studies under the title of *Barbarism and Religion* and, in Pocock's phrase, aspires to offer an 'ecology' rather than an 'etiology' of how Victorian intellectuals thought about the Eastern Question.

The detailed and chronologically extended history offered in Part One is intended to complement **Part Two**'s broad but chronologically more limited study of how Victorian intellectuals sought to understand the Eastern Question 'in its historical bearings' during the Eastern Crisis of 1875-80. During this half-decade, Turkish paramilitaries brutally suppressed a series of nationalist insurrections in the Balkans—most controversially in Bulgaria. Serbia, Montenegro, and finally Russia declared war on the Porte. When prime minister Benjamin Disraeli (created Lord Beaconsfield later that year) sided with Britain's Ottoman allies, outrage and indignation swept the nation: hundreds of public meetings denounced the Turks and the government. The Balkan Christians' claims to nationality, largely unheard of merely a few months' earlier, became a question of national importance, and Gladstone emerged from retirement and returned to active politics, ultimately unseating Beaconsfield in the 1880 election.

In the events of the Eastern Crisis—and above all its centrepiece, the so-called Bulgarian Agitation—British intellectuals played a leading role. Sensational reports in the newspapers were complemented by an effusion of earnest periodical articles, pamphlets and books, as what the *Daily News* called 'intellectual England' engaged with events in south-eastern Europe. The leading lights of scholarship and science harangued crowded town halls and organised protests. Though mass movements and agitations had occurred before, this was something of a departure: indeed, for Richard Shannon, the Bulgarian Agitation marked the beginning of 'the new and historically unprecedented prestige' which public intellectuals were to enjoy in later nineteenth-century politics. That many of these intellectuals drew on history to interpret events in south-eastern Europe makes this episode and the literary efflorescence it elicited an ideal subject for an exploration of nineteenth-century 'historical-mindedness' in action.

When Victorian intellectuals were confronted by the reopening of the Eastern Question in the 1870s, many turned to travel literature for information about south-eastern Europe and its inhabitants. Publication statistics tell the story simply but eloquently: 18 new books of Balkan travel writing appeared in 1875, 116 in 1876, and 129 in 1877. Scholars of this body of literature have tended to draw on the work of Edward Said, arguing that, in their accounts of their Balkan adventures, nineteenth-century travel writers were at work constructing 'an internal Other—a stranger within—against which Western European writers project and exorcize Europe's own identity-related taboos'. Western writers, it has therefore been argued, 'created a fictional Balkan world' in an act of 'cultural'—and even 'textual'—'colonisation'. **Chapter Three** offers a revisionist corrective to this thesis, finding a common theme to nineteenth-century Balkan travel literature not in projected 'taboos', but rather in a shared sense that south-eastern Europe's identity ultimately resided in its history. Moreover, that history was generally thought to indicate that the Balkans—far from being an 'Other within'—were fundamentally European. Time and again, writers emphasised the many ways in which the Balkans had been part of Europe before the Ottoman conquest; and for many, the past seemed to be an indication of the shape of things to come—predictions which were lent added salience by the events of the 1870s.

This decidedly historically-minded body of travel writing, it is suggested, framed how nineteenth-century intellectuals understood the Eastern Question.

Victorian intellectuals also turned to the reports of newspaper foreign correspondents to keep abreast of events in south-eastern Europe, and these are the subject of **Chapter Four**. During the two decades following the Crimean War, new technology had transformed the reporting of foreign affairs in general, and Balkan affairs in particular. Between 1850, when the very first cable had been laid under the English Channel, and 1874, when the quadruplex system made it possible to send four messages down the same wire simultaneously, electrical telegraphy had made considerable advances. The world seemed smaller, and the annihilation of space by time—steamboats on the Danube and railways across central Europe—meant that the Balkan peninsula was significantly more accessible to Western journalists than it had been in 1855. The British public were thus informed about events in the Balkans with a rapidity that would have been inconceivable merely three decades earlier. South-eastern Europe, hitherto largely unknown, became familiar in up-to-date despatches from correspondents working for Reuter's news agency or for newspapers such as the *Daily News*, *The Times* and *Daily Telegraph*; despatches that were then reproduced outside the metropolis in provincial newspapers.

Chapter Four accordingly emphasises how this material context impacted the reporting of events in the Balkans, exploring the conventions of this emerging genre. Of critical importance, it is argued, is the emerge of a new kind of 'scholarly' foreign correspondent in the 1870s, exemplified by the American artist and journalist William Stillman and the British scholar and archaeologist Arthur Evans. Unlike earlier generations of foreign correspondents, Stillman and Evans may be situated within what Noel Annan called the 'intellectual aristocracy' of nineteenth-century Britain. Evans' long career at the heart of British intellectual life is well-known, but Stillman was just as well-connected: he had been on intimate terms with the likes of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow during his years in the United States, and his successful career as an artist ensured that he moved with equal facility in London's intellectual and artistic circles. Like many of their peers, Stillman and Evans shared interests in archaeology, ethnology, botany and mountaineering. Culturally and intellectually, they were thus both well-placed to address 'the cultivated intelligence of England'; and they did so in reports which were richly imbued with historical-mindedness. Indeed, their reports sit as comfortably among the conventions of nineteenth-century travel writing, studied in Chapter Three, as they do among those of the more demotic newspaper correspondents studied in this chapter. It is argued that their reports, like the accounts of travel writers, tended to frame the Eastern Question as an historical question for their readers.

Chapter Five concludes Part Two by offering a close study of the British periodical press: between 1875 and 1880, over two-hundred periodical articles appeared to address the Eastern Question, and many of them are studied here. Again, the material context is important: the repeal of the Stamp Duty in 1855 and the Paper Duty in 1861—the two so-called 'taxes on knowledge'—issued in an enormous growth of popular ephemeral literature. By the late 1860s, rotary web presses had made further improvements to the economics of publishing. New and important periodicals and journals emerged: the *Saturday Review* in 1855, *Macmillan's Magazine* in 1859, the *Fortnightly Review* in 1865, and the *Contemporary Review* in 1866. Just over a decade later, in 1877, the inaugural issue of the *Nineteenth Century* would appear. The periodicals were at the heart of British print culture: in their pages, old and new literature was reframed to address contemporary questions, and books that in

themselves were unlikely to attain an extensive readership might be 'read' for and by a wider audience. A periodical article might intervene simultaneously in a contemporary debate and contribute to an existing tradition embodied in the works it reviewed. Or conversely, periodicals might review the daily or weekly press—publications such as the *Daily News*, *The Times* and *The Spectator*—offering a deeper, more sustained analysis of current affairs for an intellectual audience. Indeed, by the 1870s Carlyle's prophecy that literature was destined 'to become one boundless self-devouring Review' had, in a sense, been fulfilled, and some commentators went so far as to prophesy the imminent obsolescence of the book. In the words of John Morley, editor of the *Fortnightly Review* and prominent Liberal politician, the periodicals came to be entrusted with the 'momentous task of forming national opinion'.

By the superficial metric of circulation their impact was small: the *British Quarterly Review* peaked at a readership of around 2,500 and during the 1870s Morley's own *Fortnightly* consistently attained a similar figure; the *Nineteenth Century* led the field, selling over 10,000 copies per issue. But the readers of the periodicals were of an importance disproportionate to their number, comprising Bagehot's 'mass of influential persons ... who assist at the deliberations of the nation'. The periodicals were read in the universities and the London clubs, the country houses and the country rectories; by the members of town councils and holders of the suffrage in the boroughs and counties; by the Bench and the Bar, by the chiefs of political parties, and by Members of Parliament. In short, as Shattock and Wolff note, the periodicals' readership was by turns 'critical, articulate, influential, and ... homogeneous to a degree scarcely recognizable' today. Periodical articles were thus pitched to a distinctly more cultivated audience than the majority of popular pamphlets or political speeches, making them an invaluable source for the study of nineteenth-century intellectual culture. Digitized and more accessible than ever, the nineteenth-century periodical press nevertheless remains an underexploited resource, and many of the essays studied here are studied for the first time.

In Chapter Five, the particular contexts—political, literary and prosopographical—to which authors were responding and in which they were writing are emphasised, demonstrating that historiography could function as a notably reflexive variety of political thought, its emphases shifting as the situation in south-eastern Europe changed. As events unfolded in the Balkans, each new denouement witnessed a new historiographical response from British historians and public intellectuals in the periodical press. The insurrections in Herzegovina and Bosnia (beginning in July and August 1875), the Bulgarian Atrocities (April and May 1876), the declaration of war between Serbia and Turkey (June 1876), the Constantinople Conference (December 1876-January 1877), the 'Montenegrin moment' of 1877, and the Congress of Berlin (June-July 1878) all raised distinct questions which elicited distinct and carefully elaborated historical answers that exemplify what Felix Gilbert called 'pragmatic history'. In the pages of the periodicals, historical arguments are at their most elaborate and clearly articulated; but the arguments made therein, it will be shown, complemented the historically minded travel writing and newspaper foreign correspondence explored in Chapters Three and Four.

Much of the historical literature with which this thesis is concerned was informed by a series of corresponding polarities: East versus West, Asia versus Europe, Turanian versus Aryan, Islam versus Christianity, stagnation versus progress, barbarism versus civilisation. The Muslim Turks featured in these narratives as alien intruders into European history and the European continent. The Balkan Christians, by contrast, were identified as members of the so-called Aryan family of European nations, innately

endowed with the capacity for progress and civilisation. Until the Ottoman conquest in the fourteenth century, the Balkan Christians' history had been merely one thread in the history of European Christendom; indeed, they had inherited from the Byzantine Empire the role of Christendom's bulwark against Islamic incursions. After their incorporation into the Ottoman Empire, the Balkan Christians had become something of a world-historical lost nation, waiting to resume their role in the great drama of European history and attain the civilisation of which they were capable.

These histories have much in common with what we have learnt to call Whig histories of England—not least a shared concern with continuity. In their pages, the Balkan Christians are portrayed as the heirs of the Eastern Roman Empire, and pains are taken to prove that they have lost neither their national nor racial identity under Ottoman domination. Whereas the story of progress told in so many histories of England typically finds its consummation in the civilisation and institutions of the present, the *telos* of these teleological histories of south-eastern Europe was still in the future; but its consummation was presented as equally inevitable. Indeed, in some accounts the Balkan Christians, their national development artificially retarded by the Ottoman occupation, acquired additional interest as 'survivals' from an earlier stage in the etiological history of civilisation which more familiarly terminated in nineteenth-century England.

Though the association between the authorship of so-called Whig histories of England and Liberal domestic politics is problematic, these histories of south-eastern Europe all reveal an unambiguous commitment to the classically Liberal tenets of national self-determination and the development of representative institutions overseas. Just as strikingly, these histories also emphasised the parallels and connections between the history of England and the history of south-eastern Europe, exemplifying the confident inclusivity encapsulated by Gladstone's expression 'kin beyond sea'. The historiographical response to the Eastern Crisis of 1875-80 is thus a striking instance of what we might think of as Whig history on a global scale.

Intellectuals and the Eastern Question: ‘Historical-Mindedness’ and ‘Kin Beyond Sea’, c. 1875-1880



William Kelley
St. John’s College
University of Oxford

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term, 2017

IN MEMORIAM

J. W. Burrow, Man of Letters

1935-2009

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due to the Arts & Humanities Research Council and St. John's College's Lamb & Flag Scholarship, which jointly funded my studies, and to my family for their unstinting support.

I am grateful to my two supervisors, Simon Skinner and Brian Young, whose complementary counsel has been invaluable. I am similarly obliged to Joshua Bennett, Alexander Echlin and George Woudhuysen for comments and conversations on this and kindred subjects. I have also profited from discussions with David Womersley concerning Gibbon, and J Mordaunt Crook concerning Freeman. My greatest intellectual debt is recorded in the dedication.

Further thanks are due to the librarians and archivists who assisted me in this project: in particular Rob Petre, Archivist of Keble College, and the staffs of the John Rylands Library, Manchester, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Contents

Acknowledgements ……... p. 4

Introduction …….. p. 6

Part One *An Intellectual and the Eastern Question: The Case of E. A. Freeman*

Chapter One *Experiencing the Eastern Question* …….. p. 33

Chapter Two *Writing the History of the Eastern Question* …… p. 61

Part Two *Intellectuals and the Eastern Crisis*

Chapter Three *Framing the Eastern Question: Balkan Travel Literature* …… p. 94

Chapter Four *Reporting the Eastern Question: Foreign Correspondent* …….. p. 125

Chapter Five *Interpreting the Eastern Question: British Periodicals* ……... p. 164

I *The Balkan Slavs* …….. p. 175

II *The Montenegrin Moment* ……... p. 213

III *The Greeks* ……. p. 241

IV *The Ottoman Empire* ……. p. 257

V *The Eastern Question and the British Past* ..…….. p. 276

Conclusion ……. p. 286

Bibliography ……. p. 289

Introduction

> Priests, professors, poets, painters, politicians—all save fools—
> Why leave your desks and easels, church or chapel pulpits, schools?
> What are you to the Eastern Question—what that Question unto you—
> That *you* must have this Conference, and make all this ado?
>
> —*Punch*[1]

The date was 8 December 1876. As Gladstone advanced across the stage, he 'looked down', as one observer recalled, 'upon a tumultuous scene of excited humanity, every hand waving a hat or handkerchief, and every throat cheering lustily as if it never would tire'.[2] Only at length, after three particularly ringing cheers, did the thousand-strong throng that packed the auditorium and galleries of St James's Hall finally fall silent.[3]

Gladstone's address had been eagerly anticipated since the Eastern Question Association's 'National Conference' had convened that morning: as one speaker put it, everyone was 'burning with eagerness … to hear our great leader in this holy war'.[4] Now the elder statesman 'delivered himself', *The Times* recorded, 'with characteristic courage and disregard of conventions', repudiating Lord Beaconsfield's handling of the Eastern Question and denouncing the prospect of war with Russia. In a rousing peroration interrupted only by still more hearty cheering, he asserted the rights of the Ottoman Empire's Balkan Christians to autonomy, if not outright independence. Britain should side, Gladstone insisted, not with the Turkish government, but with its subject populations—with 'long-oppressed and long-suffering humanity'. The traditional

[1] *Punch* 71 (16 Dec. 1876), p. 264.
[2] W. T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia, Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (2 vols., London, 1909), i. 289.
[3] *Report of Proceedings at the National Conference at St James's Hall, London, Dec. 8th 1876* (London, 1876), p. 9.
[4] Ibid., p. 88.

policy of England (a mantle to which Beaconsfield had attempted to lay claim), he declared, 'was not complicity with guilty power but sympathy with suffering weakness'.[5]

A 'National Conference' of this kind was without any recent precedent; indeed, its name self-consciously evoked the anti-slavery and anti-Corn Law conferences three decades earlier.[6] But in some respects the meeting's composition was more remarkable than its ambitions. As *The Times* acknowledged, the conveners of the Conference could claim with some justice to represent 'the intellectual culture of this country'. The delegates, including 'men of letters, men of science [and] professors', were able to 'speak for classes which, although they generally avoid the rougher strifes of the hustings, represent a great force of public opinion'.[7] The Conference, the newspaper had explained,

> shows the deliberate judgement of a most influential class ... a body of men representing the most cultivated as well as the most sober-minded and conscientious sections of the community have associated themselves to protest against an alliance with the Turkish power. If nothing comes of the "National Conference" except the publication of the list of "Conveners" it will still have been successful. The names are those of men distinguished in every department of intellectual exertion, of men eminent by position or by service to the State ... We have never known any association for a political object which has obtained support over so large a part of the scale of English society.[8]

The *Daily News* was inclined to agree:

> Probably so many names distinguished in literature, in art, in philosophy, in theology, in science, and in scholarship of various orders, have never been brought together for any political or social purpose. The cultivated intelligence of England is more than merely represented in this list; it is present there in great force; and in each department the greatest names lead the rest. Intellectual England, that select portion of the nation whose business it is to cultivate the higher faculties of research, of speculation, and of creative art, whether with the pen, the brush, or the chisel, and the

[5] Ibid., quote at p. 199, Gladstone's speech from pp. 93-120.
[6] See H. L. Jephson, *The Platform: Its Rise and Progress* (2 vols., London, 1892).
[7] *The Times* (9 Dec. 1876), p. 9.
[8] *The Times* (8 Dec. 1876), quoted in George Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and the Eastern Question* (2 vols., London, 1886), ii. 131.

> men most eminent in the several Churches as religious teachers, are there ... After an interval of weeks, the deliberate judgement of the most cultivated and trained classes is recorded in the same sense [as the Agitation meetings].[9]

'The list of conveners', another newspaper elaborated,

> teaches even the dullest among us the wealth of intellect, the luxuriance of genius, which in this free country can be concentrated upon a political object. Too often men have regarded politics as a thing for politicians. The roll of conveners shows that our country commands the assistance of all her most gifted children in times of difficulty and of danger. It is almost like a new revelation to find that in endeavouring to guide the policy of England we are receiving the assistance of the most noted poets, philosophers, divines, and historians of our age.[10]

The Conference's speakers included Anthony Trollope, the bishop of Oxford John Mackarness, James Bryce, E. A. Freeman, George Otto Trevelyan, Henry Allon, Henry Fawcett and Henry Liddon alongside Gladstone. Among the many distinguished figures seated in the orchestra were John Ruskin, William Morris, J. R. Green, William Lecky, Lord Acton, Edward Burne-Jones and Mark Pattison—'gentlemen of a high literary reputation'.[11] As the duke of Westminster facetiously observed in his opening speech, this convention might without exaggeration be described as 'not altogether unintellectual or unintelligent'.[12] And in addition to this 'imposing array, including some of the most illustrious names in England',[13] letters of support from Thomas Carlyle, Edward Pusey, Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer and Robert Browning were read out.[14] As E. A. Freeman was eager to emphasise, there was 'hardly a form of

[9] *Daily News* (5 Dec. 1876), quoted in ibid., ii. 130. The *Daily News* was commenting on the publication of the list of the Conference's conveners, not of course on the conference itself.
[10] 'A Specimen of the Liberal Press', possibly the *Northern Echo*, quoted in Stead, *M.P. for Russia*, i. 281.
[11] *Proceedings*, p. 8.
[12] *Proceedings,* p. 3.
[13] Stead, *M.P. for Russia*, i. 280.
[14] *Proceedings*, pp. i-xv.

intellectual eminence that was not represented' in the list of 'men of mark in every branch of leaned and scientific pursuit' who had lined up to endorse the Conference.[15]

It was rare, John Morley observed, 'to see *Mind* in such force'.[16] Indeed, for Richard Shannon, the episode's most influential historian, this was quite simply 'the most brilliant array of intellectual figures ever brought together to intervene in a question of politics in England'.[17] But in its high intellectual tone, the St James's Hall Conference was merely representative of a movement that had begun seven months earlier. In June 1876, lurid reports had begun to appear in the British press: Turkish paramilitaries, suppressing a nationalist insurrection in Bulgaria, had massacred thousands of men, women and children. In the House of Commons, the prime minister Benjamin Disraeli (created Lord Beaconsfield later that year) responded glibly and showed no signs of deviating from the pro-Ottoman position which had characterised British foreign policy since the 1830s. Outrage and indignation swept the nation.[18] Spurred on by the press, and in particular Frank Hill's *Daily News* and John Thaddeus Delane's *The Times*, hundreds of public meetings passed resolutions denouncing the Turks and the government during the Parliamentary recess between July and September. The Balkan Christians' claims to nationality, largely unheard of merely a few months' earlier, became a question of national importance. Gladstone emerged from a retirement he claimed he had intended to devote to scholarship and returned to active politics, ultimately unseating Beaconsfield in the 1880 election. As the Grand

[15] Edward Freeman, 'The Relation of the English People to the [Russo-Turkish] War', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Aug. 1877), pp. 481-510 at p. 510.
[16] F. W. Hirst, *Early Life and Letters of John Morley* (2 vols., London, 1927), vol. i, p. 35.
[17] Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (2nd ed., Hamden, Conn., 1975), p. 26.
[18] Richard Millman, *Britain and the Eastern Question 1875-78* (Oxford, 1979); R. W. Seton Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question* (London, 1935).

Old Man reflected two decades later, from 1876 until 'the final consummation in 1879-80' he had 'made the Eastern Question the main business of my life'.[19]

As Colin Matthew recognised, this episode constituted 'one of the great set-pieces' of Victorian history.[20] And far from being confined to the popular press and what *The Times* called 'the impulsive classes',[21] in the Bulgarian Agitation—as the movement came to be known—Britain's public intellectuals took a leading role. Sensational reports in the newspapers were complemented by an effusion of earnest periodical articles, pamphlets and books, as 'Mind' engaged with events in south-eastern Europe. Fitzjames Stephen captured the diversity of the Agitation's *dramatis personae*, reflected so tellingly by the Eastern Question Association's National Conference, when he complained to Lord Lytton that 'Bishops, Lords, Professors, all sorts and conditions of men are swarming about the country as to the atrocities'.[22] The leading lights of scholarship and science harangued crowded town halls and organised protests. Though mass movements and agitations had occurred before, this was something of a departure: indeed, for Shannon, the Bulgarian Agitation marked the beginning of 'the new and historically unprecedented prestige' which public intellectuals were to enjoy in later nineteenth-century politics.[23]

Of course, to speak of 'public intellectuals' is to commit the sin of anachronism. Contemporaries used a different idiom: Morley's idealist '*Mind*'; E. A. Freeman's 'men of mark in every branch of leaned and scientific pursuit'; the *Daily News*' 'Intellectual England'. But autochthonous categories such as those are at once too varied and too

[19] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903), iii. 550.
[20] H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1875-1898* (Oxford, 1995), p. 15.
[21] *The Times* (9 Dec. 1876), p. 9.
[22] Fitzjames Stephen to Lytton, 6 Sept. 1876, quoted in Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 87.
[23] Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 202. Of course, few events are truly unprecedented: see Alexander Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1978).

imprecise, so although they are retained wherever possible, this thesis follows Stefan Collini in defining public intellectuals as individuals 'who deploy an acknowledged intellectual position or achievement in addressing a broader, non-specialist public'. Public intellectuals, Collini adds, 'must also be recognised as having acquired a certain standing in society which is taken to license them … to address a wider public than that at which their occupational activity is aimed'.[24] Academic specialists addressing fellow-specialists, in other words, are disqualified.

It is important here to observe that an 'acknowledged intellectual position or achievement' in the 1870s could be both attained and maintained outside the academy. Many of the figures who drew on history to interpret the Eastern Question in Britain's periodical press were private scholars, politicians or diplomats, but that did not compromise their credibility—what Collini calls their '"cultural authority"'—as men of learning and salient experience. The public intellectuals of late Victorian Britain were therefore members of a diverse constituency which is difficult to identify with any particular institution. Instead, this thesis contends that we shall 'know them by their fruits'; and above all by their contributions to Britain's sophisticated periodical literature—that quintessential 'organ of the mid-Victorian clerisy'.[25] As we shall see, between 1875 and 1878, six influential periodicals—the *Quarterly Review*, the *British Quarterly Review*, the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Contemporary Review*, *Macmillan's Magazine* and the *Nineteenth Century*—devoted between them over two-hundred essays to the Eastern Question. Such copious coverage, this thesis contends, indicates that Eastern Question was a subject that commanded considerable interest among Britain's public intellectuals.

[24] Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 46-8.
[25] Christopher Kent, 'Higher Journalism and the Mid-Victorian Clerisy', *Victorian Studies*, 13 (Dec. 1969), pp. 181-98 at p. 181.

Nor is such interest surprising. By the time of the St James's Hall Conference, the Eastern Question had been a defining feature of the experience of two generations. Its decisive denouements—the Crimean War and the Greek War of Independence—had been of comparable cultural significance to the Revolutions of 1848 and the passage of the First Reform Act in 1832. And like those events, the Eastern Question could be construed in many ways.[26] To some, it remained primarily a question of Britain's economic and imperial interests. To others, it was a matter of solidarity between empires, British and Turkish. To many contemporaries, therefore, the Bulgarian Agitation was simply incomprehensible. For Fitzjames Stephen, the Agitation was 'an outbreak of pseudo-Christian John Bullism', and he felt little enthusiasm for either the Balkan Christians or the Turks:

> I never have believed, since I knew anything about it, that the Turks were capable of governing otherwise than as barbarians—but to say the truth, I never could bring myself to care two straws whether the Bulgarians, Servians, Montenegrins & others were barbarously treated or not ... As to the 'unspeakable atrocities' one does not expect a savage not to use his scalping knife, & the ill treatment of people a long way off of whom one knows little, does not naturally move one. I rather despise an animal facility of being so moved.[27]

Disraeli shared Stephen's distaste: for him the Eastern Question was fundamentally political, a question of 'the distribution of power in the world' involving 'the existence of Empires'. Responding to a question from the Duke of Argyll in the House of Lords, he betrayed his bewilderment: 'Am I to understand from the noble Duke that in his mind the only element of this great Eastern Question is the condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte?'[28] In private, Disraeli was to dismiss sympathy for the national

[26] For an overview, albeit *sui temporis*, of the varieties of opinion concerning the Eastern Question in 1876, see Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield*.
[27] Fitzjames Stephen to Lytton, 13 Aug. 1876, in Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 205.
[28] Hansard, CCXXXII, 8 Feb. 1877, 51.

aspirations of the Ottoman Empire's Christian communities as nothing more than 'sentimental eccentricity'.[29]

Such perspectives, ably analysed in Miloš Kovi ć's recent study of *Disraeli and the Eastern Question*, had characterised how Victorians approached the Eastern Question at the time of the Crimean War. In the 1850s, little had been known of the Serbs and less of the Bulgarians. But for the intellectuals who participated in the Bulgarian Agitation and who assembled in such numbers in St James's Hall, the fate of south-eastern Europe's Christians had come to define the Eastern Question.[30] As news of atrocities in the Balkans reached England, activists established a 'League in Aid of the Christians in Turkey', and the great and the good collected money for the relief of refugees in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Serbia. Most of the mass meetings of July-September 1876 passed motions urging autonomy for what Gladstone called 'the subject-populations of Turkey'.[31] The daily and periodical press rhapsodised over the sober virtues of the oppressed Bulgarians, and even tiny Montenegro—'good, gallant, glorious Montenegro'[32]—became the subject of a sonnet by Tennyson and a slew of periodical articles when its government declared war on the Turks in 1877.[33] Questions of national identity in south-eastern Europe accordingly assumed new and pressing importance.

To many Victorians, the past seemed the best guide to the present's problems, and Britain's sophisticated print culture witnessed an efflorescence of periodical essays, pamphlets, books, and journalism that set the Eastern Question 'in its historical

[29] Miloš Kovi ć, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question* (Oxford, 2010), p. 198. Kovi ć's admirable book explores Disraeli's life-long engagement with the Eastern Question.
[30] See Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 37.
[31] Hansard, CCXLII, 30 July 1878, 672.
[32] Gladstone to Olga Novikoff, 20 Jan 1878, quoted in Stead, *M.P. for Russia*, ii. 436.
[33] See below, pp. 212-41.

bearings'.[34] As the historian James Bryce put it, the Eastern Question could only be adequately understood by 'reference rather to the course of … history generally … than to the events of these last few weeks or months'.[35] 'On the mirror of the past is drawn the image of the future', agreed Gladstone.[36] Some commentators insisted on the priority of an historical perspective—believing, like Henry Liddon, that 'the past of the Slavonic peoples of Turkey' was 'the only sound basis of any forecast of their future'.[37] Others simply assumed it: anyone contemplating the 'present aspect' of south-eastern Europe, Freeman declared, 'will *naturally* come to contemplate its past history'.[38] Thus what George Carslake Thompson would call the 'Historic Instinct' came to play a crucial role in the Eastern Crisis of the 1870s.[39]

There was a precedent for just such an historical turn in the Greek Revolution, when the racial relationship between the modern and ancient Greeks had become a subject of heated controversy. Most notably, Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer's contention that 'not a single drop of undiluted Hellenic blood flows in the veins of the Christian population of present-day Greece', elaborated in his *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea* (1830), had struck at the sentimental foundations of Romantic Philhellenism.[40] 'Fallmerayer's ideas', William St Clair observes, 'were looked upon as a deadly heresy, and the supposed identity of the Ancient and Modern Greeks became a question of intense political feeling', and historians had divided between Fallmerayer's supporters

[34] Edward Freeman, *The Eastern Question in its Historical Bearings* (Manchester, 1876).
[35] James Bryce, 'Russia and Turkey', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (Dec. 1876), pp. 793-808 at p. 793.
[36] W. E. Gladstone, 'Preface' in Paulina Irby and Georgina Muir Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (2 vols., 5th ed., London, 1877), i. xi-ii.
[37] 'Canon Liddon on the Slavs', *The Times* (8 Dec. 1876), p. 6.
[38] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 231-2. Emphasis added.
[39] Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield*, i. 75.
[40] 'Denn auch nicht ein Tropfen ächten und ungemischten Hellenenblutes fließet in den Adern der christlichen Bevölkerung des heutigen Griechenlands': Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer, *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea* (Stuttgart, 1830), pp. iii-iv.

and his critics.[41] But the proliferation of historical writing in the later 1870s, informed by the half-century of intervening scholarship, attained a much greater degree of argumentative depth and conceptual sophistication. Its authors, moreover, were notably more unanimous in their interpretation of what they believed to be the lessons of history than the scholars who debated the Fallmerayer thesis had been.

In part, that was because those intervening years had witnessed the tentative beginnings of Anglophone historiography's transformation into a 'professional' discipline. While the enduring tradition of amateur historical scholarship, exemplified by Macaulay, was more than alive and well, many of the historians who participated in the Bulgarian Agitation were committed to the idea of what Stubbs called 'an Historical School', composed of a 'great republic of workers', which would speak with a common voice as a corporate body.[42] That 'historical school' took a correspondingly consistent stance on the Eastern Question. When Edward Freeman listed the 'historical students' who sympathised with the Bulgarian Agitation, he could name Stubbs, James Bryce, Goldwin Smith, J. R. Green, G. W. Cox, William Bright, Thomas Carlyle and, albeit

[41] William St Clair, *That Greece Might Still be Free* (Oxford, 1972), p. 351. See also Stathis Gourgouris, *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece* (Stanford, 1996), pp. 140-54; Rodanthi Tzanelli, *Nation-Building and Identity in Europe* (London, 2008), pp. 60-61; Katerina Zacharia (ed.), *Hellenisms: Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity* (Aldershot, 2008).

[42] W. H. Hutton, *Letters of William Stubbs* (London, 1904), p. 63. On the 'professionalization' of history and its limitations, see Doris S. Goldstein, 'The Professionalization of History in Britain in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,' *Storia della Storiografia*, 3 (1983), pp. 3-27; Doris S. Goldstein, 'The Origins and Early Years of the *English Historical Review*', *English Historical Review*, 51 (Jan. 1986), pp. 6-19; Rosemary Jann, 'From Amateur to Professional: the Case of the Oxbridge Historians,' *Journal of British Studies*, 22 (Spring 1983), pp. 122-147; Alon Kadish, 'Scholarly Exclusiveness and the Foundation of the *English Historical Review*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 61 (1988), pp. 183–98; Philippa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838–1886* (Cambridge, 1986); Peter Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education: The Study of Modern History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Manchester, 1840–1914* (Manchester, 1986); Michael Bentley, 'The Evolution and Dissemination of Historical Knowledge', in Martin Daunton (ed.), *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 173–97; Gabriele Lingelbach, 'The Institutionalization and Professionalization of History in Europe and the United States' in Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók (eds.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume Four, 1800-1945* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 78-96.

largely at Carlyle's insistence, J. A. Froude.[43] He might have added Lord Acton, Thorold Rogers and William Lecky to the list. Among them, we recognise five regius professors of history—Freeman himself being a sixth—and the founders of the *English Historical Review*. It was thus without exaggeration that Gladstone claimed to speak with the authority of 'the gentlemen who represent the historical school of England' when he castigated the Turks and their British supporters: 'every historian in the country', he assured his audience, 'is strongly on our side'.[44]

As the controversy that attended Charles Kingsley's appointment as the University of Cambridge's regius professor of history demonstrated, Stubbs' 'Historical School' was increasingly asserting its monopoly over questions of historical accuracy and scholarly competence. Recognition by one's peers mattered more than any particular credential or institutional affiliation. Freeman's indictment of Kingsley—'of all men living … the least qualified to undertake the work of an historian or an historical Professor'—is notorious, but around this time other 'irregular intruders on the province of history' were roughly handled in the press too.[45] During the Bulgarian Agitation, historical arguments were scrutinized carefully, and those who misread the lessons of the past were duly chastised. Lord Derby, the foreign secretary, was ridiculed as 'the man who himself fancies that Bosnia is a Greek land' and upbraided in the *Contemporary Review* for his ignorance in an article which pledged to remind him 'of a bit of history which he seems to have forgotten'.[46] At his home in Somerset, Freeman kept a copy of Reginald Bosworth Smith's *Mohammed and*

[43] Freeman to Gladstone, 21 Sept. 1877, quoted in Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 221.
[44] *The Times* (1 June 1877), p. 10.
[45] [Edward Freeman], 'Mr. Kingsley's Roman and Teuton', *Saturday Review*, 17 (9 April 1864), pp. 446-8; [Edward Freeman], 'Damaged History for Popular Consumption', *Saturday Review*, 11 (22 June 1861), pp. 635-7. For attributions, see M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868* (New York, 1941), pp. 342ff.
[46] Edward Freeman, 'Neutrality—Real or Pretended?', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Oct. 1877), pp. 877-93 at p. 888.

Mohammedanism 'on the table as a standing joke to show everybody'.[47] Tory organs such as the *Quarterly Review* seldom dared to address the Eastern Question in historical perspective—in stark contrast with the Liberal-leaning press.[48] Conservatives were thus largely denied the resources of the past; whereas Gladstone could appeal to 'the lessons of history' with impunity, assured of the sanction of England's 'new historical school'.[49]

That the Balkan Christians' advocates should have enjoyed a monopoly on historical argument was possible because English historians were indeed remarkably unanimous in how they understood the Eastern Question. As we shall see, much of the historical literature concerned with south-eastern Europe that emerged in the later 1870s was informed by a series of corresponding polarities: East versus West, Asia versus Europe, Turanian versus Aryan, Islam versus Christianity, stagnation versus progress, barbarism versus civilisation. The Muslim Turks featured in these narratives as alien intruders into European history and the European continent. The Balkan Christians, by contrast, were identified as members of the Aryan family of European nations, innately endowed with the capacity for progress and civilisation. Until the Ottoman conquest in the fourteenth century, the Balkan Christians' history had been merely one thread in the history of European Christendom; indeed, they had inherited from the Byzantine Empire the role of Christendom's bulwark against Islamic incursions. After their incorporation into the Ottoman Empire, the Balkan Christians had become something of a world-historical lost nation, waiting to resume their role in the great drama of European history and attain the civilisation of which they were capable. The events of the 1870s suggested to many that outcome was imminent.

---

[47] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Dec. 1878.
[48] See Chapter 5 below for an extensive discussion.
[49] Morley, *Gladstone*, ii. 561.

These histories have much in common with what we have learnt to call Whig histories of England, not least a shared concern with continuity.[50] In their pages, the Balkan Christians are portrayed as the heirs of the Eastern Roman Empire, and pains are taken to prove that they had lost neither their national nor racial identity under Ottoman domination. Whereas the story of progress told in so many histories of England typically finds its consummation in the civilisation and institutions of the present, the *telos* of these teleological histories of south-eastern Europe was still in the future; but its consummation was presented as equally inevitable. Indeed, in some accounts the Balkan Christians, their national development artificially retarded by the Ottoman occupation, acquired additional interest as 'survivals' from an earlier stage in the etiological history of civilisation which more familiarly terminated in nineteenth-century England. Though the association between the authorship of so-called Whig histories of England and Liberal domestic politics is problematic,[51] these histories of south-eastern Europe tend to reveal a less ambiguous commitment to the classically Liberal tenets of national self-determination and the development of representative institutions overseas. Just as strikingly, these histories also emphasised the parallels and connections between the history of England and the history of south-eastern Europe, exemplifying the confident inclusivity encapsulated by Gladstone's expression 'kin beyond sea'. The historiographical response to the Bulgarian atrocities of 1876, in other words, is a striking instance of what we might think of as Whig history on a global scale.[52]

[50] For an extended and critical discussion of Whig history, see John Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past* (Cambridge, 1981).
[51] In particular see James Kirby, *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, c. 1870-1920* (Oxford, 2016).
[52] For a discussion of the problems and possibilities afforded by a global approach to intellectual history, see Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (eds.), *Global Intellectual History* (New York, 2013). The contentions of this paragraph are revisited below.

Of course, the thought of the nineteenth century was imbued to an extraordinary degree with a sense of the importance of historical perspective. It was a commonplace that knowledge of the past was necessary to understand the present, and historiography was frequently freighted with political implications.[53] As Duncan Bell notes, 'historical-mindedness, as it was often called, structured political argument, rendering some lines of reasoning more intelligible, more perspicacious, and more plausible, than others'.[54] And, as Peter Mandler observes, British historians consequently 'spoke on all sorts of national issues'—from both within the academy and outside its confines.[55] But the Eastern Crisis of the 1870s was nonetheless subjected to unusually sustained historical scrutiny. Though Viscount Gladstone claimed that from '1875 to 1880 no Foreign Minister … plunged more deeply into history than Mr. Gladstone',[56] Gladstone's historically-minded approach to the Eastern Question was very far from being unique. As Freeman observed, 'the events of our own day have brought certain branches of historical inquiry into a prominence which they never had before'. What was more, he added, those branches of historical inquiry had been brought 'into the closest possible connexion with the great political changes of our time'.[57] The Eastern Question, in other words, had imbued south-eastern Europe's history with unprecedented political interest.

In his seminal study of nineteenth-century histories of England, John Burrow drew attention to 'a self-conscious and influential school of [nineteenth-century] English

[53] For a discussion, see John Burrow, 'All That Glitters: Political Science and the Lessons of History' in Stefan Collini, Donald Winch and John Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 183-205.
[54] Duncan Bell, *Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire* (Princeton, 2016), p. 12.
[55] Peter Mandler, *History and National Life* (London, 2002), p. 45. On the wider functions of history in politics and culture, see Olive Anderson, 'The Political Uses of History in mid-Nineteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 36 (1967), pp. 87–105; Billie Melman, *The Culture of History* (Oxford, 2006).
[56] Viscount Gladstone, *After Thirty Years* (London, 1928), p. 103.
[57] Edward Freeman, 'The Southern Slaves', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (July 1877), pp. 137-84 at p. 139.

political thinking' which held that 'political wisdom, and the identity of a society, and hence in some measure the appropriate conduct of its affairs, are found essentially in its history.'[58] That view, he observed, found its natural elaboration not in treatises of political thought, but in historiography; and it would be difficult to find a better illustration of Burrow's thesis than the Bulgarian Agitation. As events unfolded in the Balkans, each new denouement witnessed a new historiographical response from British historians and public intellectuals. The insurrections in Herzegovina and Bosnia (beginning in July and August 1875), the Bulgarian Atrocities (April and May 1876), the declaration of war between Serbia and Turkey (June 1876), the Constantinople Conference (December 1876-January 1877), the 'Montenegrin moment' of 1877, and the Congress of Berlin (June-July 1878) all raised distinct questions which elicited distinct and carefully elaborated historical answers that exemplify what Felix Gilbert called 'pragmatic history'.[59] This episode in the history of historiography as political thought is the subject of this thesis.

This historiographical turn in British public discourse has gone almost entirely unnoticed. Diplomatic and political historians have monopolised the Eastern Question, and their sub-disciplinary priorities have left little room for any sustained encounter with its intellectual history.[60] Though Conservative attitudes to the Eastern Question have found, as we have seen, a recent student in Miloš Ković, Richard Shannon's 1963 study of *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* remains the only extended intellectual

[58] Burrow, *Liberal Descent,* p. 2.
[59] Felix Gilbert, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Florence* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1965). Other historians of Renaissance Italy have been sensitive to the political valences of historiography: J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1975); Gary Ianziti, *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past* (London, 2012).
[60] Most importantly, J. A. R. Marriott, *The Eastern Question: An Historical Study in European Diplomacy* (Oxford, 1918); R. W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question* (London, 1935), M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations* (London, 1966); Richard Millman, *Britain and the Eastern Question, 1875-8* (Oxford, 1979).

analysis of their Liberal and anti-Turk counterparts since George Carslake Thompson's two volumes on *Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield* were published in 1886. Carslake Thompson identified what he called the 'Historic Instinct' as an important factor in the Agitation; and Shannon also noted the peculiar prominence of historians within the Agitation's ranks. But *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* nonetheless concluded that:

> An analysis of the structure of the 'secular' aspect of the response to the atrocities agitation is not assisted and guided by such relatively clear demarcations as define the religious denominations. The fault lines along which the shock of the agitation ran in the non-religious areas are correspondingly less easy to interpret. There is no simple, coherent pattern in terms of schools of thought, very little preservation of group identity amid the fragmentation of the intellectual reaction.[61]

While Shannon's attempt to distinguish between the '"secular"' and the 'religious' might be considered an arid exercise by today's historians of nineteenth-century culture and intellect, equally striking is his apparent lack of interest in British intellectuals' deep engagement with the Eastern Question 'in its historical bearings'; a phenomenon to which, as we have seen, contemporaries were undeniably alive. Of course, the fact that Shannon's citations from the periodical press are almost entirely confined to essays excerpted in Carslake Thompson's earlier work may have limited his interpretative range, as it was in the periodical press that historically-minded approaches to the Eastern Question were elaborated in the greatest detail. But whatever the reasons for his cursory handling of the Bulgarian Agitation's historiographical dimensions, Shannon's influence has been considerable: subsequent historians such as Richard Millman, K. Theodore Koppen and Jonathan Parry have tended to depend upon

[61] Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 203.

Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation, and thus its author's omissions of have been perpetuated.[62]

Intellectual historians have otherwise tended to ignore the Eastern Question, despite its considerable important place in the lives of educated Victorians. There are notable exceptions, of course. Both Shannon and Colin Matthew have explored how the Bulgarian Agitation drew Gladstone back into active political life, out of a retirement he had hoped to devote to scholarship.[63] Stéphanie Prévost has shown that the Bulgarian Agitation was decisive for the newspaper editor W. T. Stead, whose concept of 'government by journalism' was shaped by the experience of 1876.[64] The present author has examined the important place the Eastern Question occupied in E. A. Freeman's historical thought.[65] And biographers often advert to its importance: Fiona MacCarthy, for example, characterised 1876 as the moment when William Morris first 'tasted blood' politically,[66] and H. A. L. Fisher once described how 'the tide of passionate feelings on the Near Eastern Question which brought Gladstone back into office' swept James Bryce 'forward into an active political life'.[67] None of this, however, amounts to the sustained and systematic study of British intellectuals' engagement with the Eastern Question that the subject's importance merits.

Nor have historians of historiography devoted much attention to an episode which elicited a great deal of historical writing, and which monopolised many prominent

---

[62] Millman, *Britain and the Eastern Question*; K. Theodore Koppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation 1846-86* (Oxford, 1998); Jonathan Parry, *The Politics of Patriotism: English Liberalism, National Identity and Europe, 1830-1886* (Cambridge, 2006).

[63] Matthew, *Gladstone 1875-1898,* pp. 1-60; H. C. G. Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East' in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 15 (1978), pp. 417-42; Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*.

[64] Stéphanie Prévost, 'W. T. Stead and the Eastern Question', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 16 (2013), pp. 1-28.

[65] William Kelley, 'Past Politics and Present History: Edward Freeman and the Eastern Question', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 119-35.

[66] Fiona MacCarthy, *William Morris* (London, 1994), pp. 378-86, quote at p. 386.

[67] H. A. L. Fisher, *James Bryce, Viscount Bryce of Dechmont* (2 vols., London, 1927), i. 167.

historians' attention. In part, this may be because the historians of nineteenth-century historical writing have tended to focus their attention on etiological accounts of English history since the publication of Herbert Butterfield's seminal *The Whig Interpretation of History* in 1931. Historians of historiography have often identified in Victorian historical writing what Michael Bentley characterises as

> a distinctive and remarkably time-specific tendency which focussed on British experience at the expense of the world outside, one that concentrated on types of constitutional history rather than on social, cultural or intellectual studies, and that often imbued that study with a linear logic leading from past to present, so that history became a matter of identifying broad processes working themselves out over hundreds of years and connecting the present of Victorian Westminster with a past running back through the Glorious Revolution, Magna Carta, the Witenagemot and eventually towards the forests of Saxony.[68]

In their focus on nineteenth-century histories of England and its institutions, however, historians of historiography have arguably neglected historical writing that was very alive indeed to 'the world outside'. While that neglect has been mitigated in recent years, principally thanks to a new and stimulating interest in imperial historiography, nineteenth-century historical writing concerned with the Balkans and the Ottoman Empire continues to languish at the margins.[69]

The problem may be that when nineteenth-century historians turned to the history of south-eastern Europe, they did so not as celebrants but as critics of empire; whereas the growing body of scholarship concerned with historians as 'imperial ideologists' and historiography as a species of 'imperial discourse' leaves little room for anti-imperial

[68] Michel Bentley, 'Approaches to Modernity: Western Historiography Since the Enlightenment', in his (ed.), *Companion to Historiography* (London, 1997), pp. 436-7. For similar assessments, see *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, vol. 4*, pp. 204, 209; Peter Ghosh, 'Whig Interpretation of History', in Kelly Boyd (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing* (2 vols., London, 1999).

[69] Cf. Richard J. Evans, *Cosmopolitan Islanders: British historians and the European Continent* (Cambridge, 2005), which offers a cursory survey of British historical writing concerned with continental Europe, from Bede to the present.

historical writing—writing which may qualify some of its central contentions.[70] While Casper Sylvest's recent work on Liberal internationalism and the uses of history might be accounted an exception, Sylvest is largely concerned to explicate 'how history was put to use in internationalist ideology', a project simultaneously more functionalist and more conceptual than the history which is attempted here.[71] Moreover, students of historiography have yet properly to exploit the considerable resources of the periodical press, more accessible than ever before thanks to digitization. Topical historical essays in the periodicals have in many cases eluded historians; others have won their attention only in altered form: in volumes of subsequently-collected essays where they were frequently stripped of their original political freighting and contextual valences. A great deal of important testimony to the enmeshment of political thought and historical writing consequently remains unrecovered.

The two complementary parts of this thesis both explore the ways in which Victorian public intellectuals sought to understand the Eastern Question 'in its historical bearings'. **Part One** is concerned with the historian and controversialist E. A. Freeman, whose lifelong engagement with the problems of south-eastern Europe and its history is studied in detail. In **Chapter One**, Freeman becomes a window onto the important place that the Eastern Question could occupy in the biographies of nineteenth-century intellectuals. Events such as the Crimean War and the Greek War of Independence, it is argued, occupied a position in the nineteenth-century imagination comparable to the Revolutions of 1848 or the passage of the First Reform Act in 1832. Freeman's role as an activist is chronicled in detail, including his collaboration with

[70] Bell, *Reordering the World*, pp. 7-8. See also Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain* (Cambridge, 2013).
[71] Casper Sylvest, 'Liberal Internationalism and the Uses of History' in his *British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930: Making Progress?* (Manchester, 2009), pp. 148-84 at p. 84.

other prominent Victorians including Henry Liddon, William Gladstone and James Bryce.

Chapter Two studies the intellectual history for Freeman's engagement with the Eastern Question. While his *History of the Norman Conquest* has tended to monopolise the attention of historians of historiography, this essay argues that the Eastern Question occupies a central place in Freeman's historical thought. In works such as his four-volume *History of Sicily*, his *Chief periods of European History*, his third series of *Historical Essays* and his monographs on the *History and Conquest of the Saracens* and *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, Freeman elaborated a conception of universal history to which the Eastern Question was central. Freeman's thought is set in a number of illuminating intellectual and religious contexts, including his abiding enthusiasm for the Eastern Orthodox Church; his interest in the comparative method and mid-Victorian conceptions of race and nationality; and his response to George Finlay's account of Greek history.

At times, the focus is on Freeman's own contributions to an historical understanding of the Eastern Question, contributions that are important texts in nineteenth-century intellectual history in their own terms. But Chapter Two is equally concerned with the contexts in which Freeman's historical writing on the Eastern Question may usefully be read, some of which are studied in greater depth than is dictated by their direct relation to Freeman's thought. This widening of focus is intended to lead to a portrayal of how intellectuals could engage with the Eastern Question as an historical question in the nineteenth century, in which larger context Freeman's own engagement with the Eastern Question may be situated. This approach is informed by J. G. A. Pocock's series of studies under the title of *Barbarism and*

Religion and, in Pocock's phrase, aspires to offer an 'ecology' rather than an 'etiology' of how Victorian intellectuals thought about the Eastern Question.[72]

This approach requires some justification, as an illustrative case study is far from the only way in which Victorian intellectuals' engagement with the Eastern Question might have been approached. One epistemological consideration is that the thematic exposition of contexts fails to convey, as John Burrow observed, 'a sense of the complex ways in which individuals respond to, assimilate and reshape the materials of their intellectual milieux',[73] and thus finds its natural complement in the detailed study of particular texts and authors. Burrow's *Liberal Descent* exemplifies the ways in which exploring an intellectual moment through the eyes of a particular individual preserves autochthonous concepts and mitigates intellectual histories' tendency to reify and homogenise. As Peter Ghosh observes, 'historical reality must be grouped and ordered conceptually to render it comprehensible; but that grouping has to a significant extent been performed by the historical actors themselves, by the concepts they created'.[74] The first part of this thesis thus complements the necessarily more thematic and synchronic chapters that follow it.

The detailed and chronologically extended history offered in Part One is intended to complement **Part Two**'s broad but chronologically more limited study of how Victorian intellectuals sought to understand the Eastern Question in its 'historical bearings' during the Eastern Crisis of 1875-80. When Victorian intellectuals were confronted by the reopening of the Eastern Question in the 1870s, they could turn to a distinct tradition of Anglophone Balkan travel writing, richly imbued with historiography, when they sought to make sense of south-eastern Europe. Thanks to

[72] J. G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon* (Cambridge, 2001), i. 10.
[73] Burrow, *Liberal Descent*, p. 5.
[74] Peter Ghosh, *An Historian Reads Max Weber* (Wiesbaden, 2008), p. 1.

volumes of travel literature written by western diplomats, consuls, soldiers, engineers, travellers, missionaries and scholars, the crowd that filled St James's Hall on 9 December 1876 was better informed about south-eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire than even Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet had been in 1853. As we shall see, publication statistics tell the story simply but eloquently: 18 new books of Balkan travel writing appeared in 1875, 116 in 1876, and 129 in 1877.[75]

Scholars of this body of literature have tended to draw on the work of Edward Said, arguing that, in their accounts of their Balkan adventures, nineteenth-century travel writers were at work constructing 'an internal Other—a stranger within—against which Western European writers project and exorcize Europe's own identity-related taboos'. Western writers, it has been argued, 'created a fictional Balkan world' in an act of 'cultural'—and even 'textual'—'colonisation'.[76] **Chapter Three** offers a revisionist corrective to this thesis, finding a common theme to nineteenth-century Balkan travel literature not in projected 'taboos', but rather in a shared sense that south-eastern Europe's identity ultimately resided in its history. Moreover, that history was generally thought to indicate that the Balkans—far from being an 'Other within'—were fundamentally European. Time and again, writers emphasised the many ways in which the Balkans had been part of Europe before the Ottoman conquest; and for many, the past seemed to be an indication of the shape of things to come—predictions which were lent added salience by the events of the 1870s. This decidedly historically-minded body

[75] See Chapter 2 below.

[76] Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford, 1997), p. 188; Vesna Goldsworthy, 'The Balkans in Nineteenth-Century British Travel Writing' in Tim Youngs (ed.), *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2006), pp 19-36 at p. 29; Vesna Goldsworthy, *Inventing Ruritania: the Imperialism of the Imagination* (New Haven CT, 1998), pp. x, 3. See also Andrew Hammond, *British and American Representations of the Balkans* (Cardiff, 2007); Reinhold Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama: British Travellers in Nineteenth-Century Turkey* (Amsterdam, 1999); Tim Youngs, *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2006); Michelle Tusan, *Smyrna's Ashes: Humanitarianism, Genocide, and the Birth of the Near East* (Berkeley, 2012), pp. 3, 6-8, 13 and *passim*. For a more extended discussion, see Chapter 3 below.

of travel writing, it is suggested, framed how nineteenth-century intellectuals understood the Eastern Question.

Victorian intellectuals also turned to the reports of newspaper foreign correspondents to keep abreast of events in south-eastern Europe, and these are the subject of **Chapter Four**. During the two decades following the Crimean War, new technology had transformed the reporting of foreign affairs in general, and Balkan affairs in particular. Between 1850, when the very first cable had been laid under the English Channel, and 1874, when the quadruplex system made it possible to send four messages down the same wire simultaneously, electrical telegraphy had made considerable advances. The world seemed smaller, and the annihilation of space by time—steamboats on the Danube and railways across central Europe—meant that the Balkan peninsula was significantly more accessible to Western journalists than it had been in 1855. The British public were thus informed about events in the Balkans with a rapidity that would have been inconceivable merely three decades earlier. South-eastern Europe, hitherto largely unknown, became familiar in up-to-date despatches from correspondents working for Reuter's news agency or for newspapers such as the *Daily News*, *The Times* and *Daily Telegraph*; despatches that were then reproduced outside the metropolis in provincial newspapers.[77]

Chapter Four accordingly emphasises how this material context impacted the reporting of events in the Balkans, exploring the conventions of this emerging genre. Of critical importance, it is argued, is the emergence of a new kind of 'scholarly' foreign correspondent in the 1870s, exemplified by the American artist and journalist William Stillman and the British scholar and archaeologist Arthur Evans. Unlike earlier generations of foreign correspondents, Stillman and Evans may be situated within what

[77] See Chapter 4 below.

Noel Annan called the 'intellectual aristocracy' of nineteenth-century Britain.[78] Evans' long career at the heart of British intellectual life is well-known, but Stillman was just as well-connected: he had been on intimate terms with the likes of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow during his years in the United States, and his successful career as an artist ensured that he moved with equal facility in London's intellectual and artistic circles. Like many of their peers, Stillman and Evans shared interests in archaeology, ethnology, botany and mountaineering. Culturally and intellectually, they were thus both well-placed to address 'the cultivated intelligence of England'; and they did so in reports which were richly imbued with historical-mindedness. Indeed, their reports sit as comfortably among the conventions of nineteenth-century travel writing, studied in Chapter Three, as they do among those of the more demotic newspaper correspondents studied in this chapter. It is argued that their reports, like the accounts of travel writers, tended to frame the Eastern Question as an historical question for their readers.

Chapter Five concludes Part Two by offering a close study of the British periodical press: between 1875 and 1880, over two-hundred periodical articles appeared to address the Eastern Question, and many of them are studied here. Again, the material context is important: the repeal of the Stamp Duty in 1855 and the Paper Duty in 1861—the two so-called 'taxes on knowledge'—issued in an enormous growth of popular ephemeral literature. By the late 1860s, rotary web presses had made further improvements to the economics of publishing. New and important periodicals and journals emerged: the *Saturday Review* in 1855, *Macmillan's Magazine* in 1859, the *Fortnightly Review* in 1865, and the *Contemporary Review* in 1866. Just over a decade

[78] See Noel Annan, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy', in J. H. Plumb (ed.), *Studies in Social History* (London, 1955), pp. 241-87 and more recently William Whyte, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy Revisited', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 10 (2005), pp. 15-45.

later, in 1877, the inaugural issue of the *Nineteenth Century* would appear. The periodicals were at the heart of British print culture: in their pages, old and new literature was reframed to address contemporary questions, and books that in themselves were unlikely to attain an extensive readership might be 'read' for and by a wider audience. A periodical article might intervene simultaneously in a contemporary debate and contribute to an existing tradition embodied in the works it reviewed. Or conversely, periodicals might review the daily or weekly press—publications such as the *Daily News*, *The Times* and *The Spectator*—offering a deeper, more sustained analysis of current affairs for an intellectual audience. Indeed, by the 1870s Carlyle's prophecy that literature was destined 'to become one boundless self-devouring Review' had, in a sense, been fulfilled, and some commentators went so far as to prophesy the imminent obsolescence of the book.[79]

In Chapter Five, the particular contexts—political, literary and prosopographical—to which authors were responding and in which they were writing are emphasised, demonstrating that historiography could function as a notably reflexive variety of political thought, its emphases shifting as the situation in south-eastern Europe changed. As events unfolded in the Balkans, each new denouement witnessed a new historiographical response from British historians and public intellectuals in the periodical press. The insurrections in Herzegovina and Bosnia (beginning in July and August 1875), the Bulgarian Atrocities (April and May 1876), the declaration of war between Serbia and Turkey (June 1876), the Constantinople Conference (December 1876-January 1877), the 'Montenegrin moment' of 1877, and the Congress of Berlin (June-July 1878) all raised distinct questions which elicited distinct and carefully elaborated historical answers. In the pages of the periodicals, historical arguments were

[79] Thomas Carlyle, 'Characteristics', *Edinburgh Review*, 54 (Dec. 1831), pp. 351-83.

at their most elaborate and clearly articulated; but the arguments made therein, it will be shown, complemented the historically minded travel writing and newspaper foreign correspondence explored in Chapters Three and Four.

Part One
An Intellectual and the Eastern Question:
the Case of E. A. Freeman

Chapter One

Experiencing the Eastern Question

For the intellectuals who gathered in the St. James's Hall in December 1876, the 'eternal Eastern Question' was a familiar subject.[1] As Disraeli admitted, the problems posed by the Ottoman Empire's decline had 'haunted Europe for a century',[2] constituting a central theme in the lives of many nineteenth-century intellectuals. Some of the assembled luminaries in the St. James's Hall in 1876 had come of age during the Greek War of Independence and experienced the heady Romantic Philhellenism of the 1820s. They had been born in time, as G. M. Young put it, 'to feel the light had gone out of the world when Byron died'.[3] The Liberal politician Lord Waveney, for example, could still remember 'as a Harrow boy, cheering to the echo when we heard of [the Battle of] Navarino'—where the combined fleets of Britain, France and Russia had destroyed the Ottoman Navy in 1827, saving the fledgling Greek state from destruction—'and knew that once again tyranny was crippled on the seas'. Equally vividly, he recalled 'the thrill of horror that ran through the veins of Englishmen' when they learnt that the Turks had massacred the Greek inhabitants of Chios.[4]

---

[1] The phrase was Lord Derby's, coined in an 1876 debate concerning the Suez Canal, but the expression was widely adopted, notably by Freeman.
[2] Quoted in Miloš Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question* (Oxford, 2010), p. 93.
[3] G. M. Young, *Victorian England, Portrait of an Age* (London, 1936), p. 1. Young is likely alluding to Tennyson's recollection that, when he learnt of Byron's death, 'the whole world seemed to be darkened for me'.
[4] *Report of Proceedings at the National Conference at St James's Hall, London, December 8th 1876* (London, 1876), pp. 68-9.

Like Waveney, Gladstone was recapitulating formative experiences when he concluded his address at St James's Hall with a discussion of 'the policy of Mr Canning in the case of Greece'.[5] As a schoolboy he had performed in an Eton masquerade

> in all the glories of the costume of a Greek patriot, for he was a faithful Canningite; the heroic struggle against the Turk was at its fiercest, and it was the year when Byron died at Missolonghi.[6]

Gladstone's father John had sponsored George Canning's candidacy to represent Liverpool in the House of Commons in the election of 1812, and Canning had been a regular guest at the Gladstone family residence. So Canning's unexpected and premature demise had been an 'almost personal' blow, and the young William had composed eulogistic verses on the statesman's tomb during 'an eager pilgrimage' to Westminster Abbey in 1827.[7] Above all, Canning's support for free and independent Greece made an indelible impression upon the future Liberal premier as 'perhaps the boldest and wisest [foreign] policy which has been exhibited by a British Minister during the present century'.[8]

For younger Victorians, Philhellenism continued to be an abiding cultural and intellectual presence in one form or another.[9] Byron's persistently popular poetry, the Turkophile pamphleteering of David Urquhart (a disillusioned philhellene),[10] and the plangent pages of George Finlay's *History of Greece* exemplify the range and diversity

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 116-19.
[6] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903), i. 30.
[7] Ibid., i. 38.
[8] W. E. Gladstone, 'The Hellenic Factor in the Eastern Problem', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Dec. 1876), pp. 1-27 at p. 13.
[9] The best account is still St Clair, *That Greece Might Still be Free*. On the subject of the importance of Classical and modern Greece in nineteenth-century Britain, see Richard Jenkyns, *The Victorians and Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1980); G. W. Clarke (ed.), *Rediscovering Hellenism: the Hellenic Inheritance and the English Imagination* (Cambridge, 1981); Fani-Maria Tsigakou, *The Rediscovery of Greece: Travellers and Painters of the Romantic Era* (London, 1981); Frank Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (London and New Haven, 1981).
[10] See M. Lamb, 'The Making of a Russophobe: David Urquhart—the Formative Years, 1825–1835', *International History Review*, 3 (1981), pp. 330–57 and M. Lamb, 'Writing up the Eastern Question in 1835–6', *International History Review*, 15 (1993), pp. 239–68.

of the copious literary legacy which the Philhellenes bequeathed to their successor-generation.

The Crimean War had left an equally enduring impression, as Stefanie Markovits has shown.[11] The war, chronicled with unprecedented fidelity in the domestic press thanks to the electric telegraph and photography, had redrawn the frontiers of Europe at a cost of 800,000 casualties. To many, the Crimean War and the Treaty of Paris made Britain not only complicit in Turkish atrocities in the Balkans two decades later, but morally responsible for preventing their recurrence. Gladstone, who had sat as Chancellor of the Exchequer in Aberdeen's cabinet, felt that responsibility particularly acutely, acknowledging that he had been 'officially connected with this great question in its historical character'.[12] His sentiments were shared by the Duke of Argyll, who had sat in Aberdeen's cabinet as Lord Privy Seal, and who also took a prominent part in the Bulgarian Agitation.[13] Speaker after speaker at the St James's Hall Conference returned to this theme: the duke of Westminster, Anthony Trollope, Henry Richard MP, James Bryce, Henry Allon, Searjeant Simon MP, Henry Liddon, and Gladstone.[14]

Above all, the Ottoman Empire's British critics agreed that it was essential to avoid repeating the mistakes of the Crimean War. They feared lest Britain be drawn into war with Russia once more. Anthony Trollope urged his audience to cast their minds back to 1853: 'You who are old enough, as most of you are, to remember the Crimean War will remember the feeling by which England was induced somewhat slowly to assent to that war.' The conflict that ensued had been an experiment, Trollope observed, 'that England will not very readily repeat'.[15] For as an author in *Macmillan's Magazine* put

[11] Stefanie Markovits, *The Crimean War in the British Imagination* (Cambridge, 2013).
[12] Quoted in H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1875-1898* (Oxford, 1995), p. 14.
[13] See Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield*, i. 392.
[14] *Proceedings*, pp. 8, 20, 27, 43, 47, 48, 62, 112.
[15] Ibid., p. 21.

it, the aftermath of the Crimean War had exposed Turkey as 'a land of illusions'.[16] Indeed, for Gladstone's son, writing thirty years after his father's death, the events of the Bulgarian Agitation were 'directly linked', in the final analysis, 'with the great error' of the Crimean War: 'Mr. Gladstone had learnt the lesson of the Crimean War'—whereas Disraeli, he contended, had not.[17]

So by the time of the Bulgarian Agitation, the Eastern Question had been a defining experience in the lives of two generations of British intellectuals, and the weight of memory alone inclined them to interpret the events of the present in the light of the past. Events such as the Crimean War and the Greek War of Independence occupied a position in the nineteenth-century imagination comparable to the Revolutions of 1848 or the passage of the First Reform Act in 1832; and the Bulgarian Agitation was not an isolated episode, but merely the most recent climacteric in a long, troubled and painfully familiar history. For many Victorians, the Agitation was the culmination of a correspondingly lengthy intellectual engagement with the Eastern Question, deeply enmeshed with their thinking about subjects such as race, religion, nationality and history.

If E. A. Freeman's lifelong preoccupation with the Eastern Question was particularly acute, in other words, it was not unusual, and in this chapter Freeman becomes a window onto the importance that the Eastern Question could assume in the lives of nineteenth-century intellectuals. As we have seen, this is a subject that has received only cursory attention, and Freeman's interest in the Eastern Question, like his contemporaries', has been largely neglected by intellectual historians. Even Stuart Jones' stimulating recent study of Freeman's career as a public intellectual devotes

[16] Robert Land, 'Reform in Turkey', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 39 (Nov. 1878), pp. 82-90 at p. 82.
[17] Viscount Gladstone, *After Thirty Years* (London, 1928), pp. 118, 128.

more analysis to his debate with Anthony Trollope over the ethics of field sports than to his participation in the Bulgarian Agitation.[18] This chapter, however, draws on published and unpublished sources (including the extensive collection of Freeman papers at the John Rylands Library, Freeman's correspondence with James Bryce in the Bodleian Library, and Freeman's correspondence with Henry Liddon in the Keble College archive) to recover the full extent Freeman's long engagement with the Eastern Question, and to delineate some of the prosopographical connections which linked Freeman to other intellectuals who shared his preoccupation with the problems of south-eastern Europe.

For Freeman, that preoccupation began at a very early age. Unlike Lord Waveney, he did not actually remember hearing the news of the Battle of Navarino in 1827: he was only four years old at the time. It was instead to the sight of 'a Panorama of the battle which was carried about the country' several years later that he dated the beginning of his interest in the problems of south-eastern Europe. As a child, he recalled, the mention of Navarino 'always came to my childish ears as something honourable', and since those early days, he insisted, 'Greece, her rights and wrongs—to grow in after-days into the rights and wrongs of all south-eastern Europe—have never been out of my thoughts'.[19] While autobiographical teleologies are notoriously unreliable, Freeman's precocious public engagement with the Eastern Question, beginning in his twenties, seems to bear out the claim.

By the 1850s, of course, British enthusiasm for the young Greek state was waning. A corrupt and centralising administration, misgoverning lawless provinces, had

[18] H. S. Jones, 'Historical-Mindedness and the World at Large: Edward Freeman as Public Intellectual', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 293-310.
[19] Edward Freeman, 'A Review of My Opinions', *The Forum* 13 (April 1892), pp. 145-60 at p. 148.

forfeited support, defaulted on loans and done much to falsify optimistically philhellene prophecies of a Greek national renaissance. The outbreak of the Crimean War was a further blow, bringing Greek irredentism into conflict with Britain's new and popular allies in Constantinople: while the Greeks' lustre was dimming, 'Johnny Turk' was newly in the ascendant. But Freeman was from the beginning an ardent advocate of the Greeks: ballad poetry was one medium, soon abandoned;[20] classical and Byzantine Greek history another.[21] Throughout the decade, indeed, he published more than twelve lengthy essays on Greek history in the *North British Review*, the *Edinburgh Review*, the *National Review*, and the anthology of *Oxford Essays* published by John Parker, as well as shorter pieces in the *Saturday Review*.[22] In these pieces, Freeman avowed—flying in the face of popular opinion—what he called 'that general philanthropy which, when Greeks are concerned, is not ashamed of the name of philhellenism'.[23] He laboured to defend the new Greek state against its western critics who should, he argued, make allowances for 'the debasement inseparable from the loss of political liberty for two thousand years', just as they should acknowledge Greek success in commerce and literature.[24] That argument was already a trope of philhellene *apologia*, but Freeman's

[20] E.g. Edward Freeman, 'The Last Eucharist in St. Sophia' and 'The Last Caesar and His People', in H. Thompson (ed.), *Original Ballads by Living Authors* (London, 1850), pp. 74-7; Edward Freeman and G. W. Cox, *Poems Legendary and Historical* (London, 1850), pp. 3-20, 39-49, 50-62.
[21] See Paul Stephenson, 'Edward Freeman (1823-1892), a Neglected Commentator on Byzantium and Modern Greece', *The Historical Review*, 4 (2008), pp. 119-56.
[22] Edward Freeman, 'Greece During the Macedonian Period', *North British Review*, 21 (Aug. 1854), pp. 425-50; 'Finlay on the Byzantine Empire', *North British Review*, 22 (Feb. 1855), pp. 343-75; 'The Greek People and the Greek Kingdom', *Edinburgh Review*, 103 (April 1856), pp. 386-422; 'Grote's History of Greece', *North British Review*, 25 (May 1856), pp. 141-72; 'Creasy's History of the Ottoman Turks', *Saturday Review*, 2 (17 May 1856), pp. 60-2; 'Creasy's History of the Ottoman Turks', *Saturday Review*, 2 (24 May 1856), pp. 88-9; 'Greece under the Ottoman Turks', *Saturday Review*, 2 (28 June 1856), pp. 206-7; 'Ancient Greece and Medieval Italy', *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University* (4 vols., London, 1855-8), iii. 129-67; 'Alexander the Great', *Edinburgh Review* 105 (April 1857), pp. 305-41; 'Colonel Mure and the Attic Historians', *National Review*, 6 (Jan. 1858), pp. 69-91; 'Trikoupe's History of the Greek Revolution', *Saturday Review*, 5 (20 Feb. 1858), pp. 192-3; 'The Eastern Church', *Edinburgh Review*, 107 (April 1858), pp. 322-57; 'Mr. Gladstone's Homer and the Homeric Age', *National Review*, 7 (July 1858), pp. 40-74. For Freeman's contributions to the *Saturday Review*, see Bevington, *The Saturday Review*, pp. 342ff.
[23] Edward Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series* (London, 1879), p. 376.
[24] Ibid., pp. 391, 420.

essays on Greek history distinguished him among his contemporaries as one of its most erudite and unfaltering exponents.

It was in the 1850s, too, that Freeman's studies in Greek history led him to begin corresponding with two men who would contribute to his understanding of the Eastern Question in different but important ways. Introducing himself to Spyridon Trikoupes, the Greek statesman and historian, in June 1855, Freeman identified himself, alluding to the state of public opinion during the Crimean War, as 'one of those, who still, now that English sympathies seem all but exclusively given to infidels and barbarians [*i.e.* the Ottoman Empire], do not shrink from the once popular title of Philhellenes'.[25] Freeman kept up a friendly correspondence with Trikoupes, exchanging books and articles, until the latter's death in 1873. The other correspondent was George Finlay, the Scottish expatriate and historian of Greece,[26] who replied by return of post to Freeman's friendly overtures, writing to thank him for his 'good opinion of my works on Greek history which seem in general to excite little interest in England' and declaring his sympathy for Freeman's declared objective: the 'vindication of the Greek nation from misrepresentation'.[27] Freeman would never meet Finlay in person, but they, too, exchanged regular letters until Finlay's death in 1875. Both Trikoupes and Finlay furnished Freeman with an insider's perspective on contemporary Greek politics and institutions which he employed in his periodical and newspaper writing.[28]

In addition to his essays in the periodicals, Freeman also contributed to a series of *Tracts for the Present Crisis* edited by Sir Arthur Elton, intended 'to propagate accurate

[25] Freeman to Spyridon Trikoupes, 13 June 1855, in W. R. W. Stephens (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (2 vols., London, 1895), i. 186.
[26] Finlay's seven-volume *History of Greece* appeared between 1843 and 1861. For Finlay's intellectual influence on Freeman, see below pp. 76-9.
[27] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/56, Finlay to Freeman, 27 June 1855.
[28] There are 56 letters from Finlay among the Freeman papers in the John Rylands University Library (hereafter JRL), EAF/1/2/55-111. Some of Freeman's correspondence with Trikoupes is reproduced in Stephens, *Life and Letters*.

knowledge respecting the past history and present condition of south-eastern Europe, and to prove the iniquity of carrying on the war with Russia in support of the Turks'—an objective shared by a slew of contemporaneous publications, including Friedrich Max Müller's *The Languages of the Seat of War in the East* (1854). Freeman's tracts appeared as the war entered its terminal year, and Elton's series was popular enough to run to a second edition.[29] Already keen to advertise his endeavours amongst their Greek beneficiaries, he sent a copy of the series to Trikoupes, adding that 'I shall be very much obliged if you can get [my contributions] at all known among the people most interested; as I am anxious your nation should know that it has one or two friends left in England'.[30] Simultaneously Freeman denounced the Turks in the *Evening Star*,[31] and the same object was prominent in his mind when he lectured the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution on the history of the Saracens. Past history was already enmeshed in present politics, for he had, he told Finlay, 'inoculated' his audience 'with strong Byzantine tendencies'; and he boasted to Trikoupes before his departure that he would 'contrive to introduce some side blows for you and against the Turks'.[32] Publishing the lectures as *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*, Freeman delighted Finlay with the dedication: 'the highest reward ... which I have yet received'.[33]

The conclusion of the Crimean War did nothing to simplify the complexities of south-eastern Europe, and Freeman continued to engage with eastern issues. Towards the end of the decade, the Ionian Islands attained fleeting celebrity, as their inhabitants sought to secede from British rule, demanding annexation by the Greek state. In

[29] A. H. Elton (ed.), *Tracts for the Present Crisis* (1st ed., Bristol, 1855), nos. 1-36.
[30] Freeman to Trikoupes, 5 March 1856, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 228.
[31] Ibid., i. 207-8.
[32] Freeman to Trikoupes, 18 Nov 1855, in ibid., i. 227; Freeman to Finlay, 26 Dec. 1855, ibid.
[33] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/59, Finlay to Freeman, 29 April 1856.

November 1858, William Gladstone was dispatched as Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Isles in an attempt to resolve the situation; an errand that proved difficult and largely thankless. Like Freeman, Gladstone regarded the Ionian Islands as merely one part of the broader Eastern Question, believing that 'this small question is the narrow corner of a very great question, one no less, in all likelihood, than the reconstruction of all political society in south-Eastern Europe'.[34] And like Freeman, Gladstone was also acutely sensitive to the historical associations of classical land: Morley suggests that it was the appeal of 'the wanderings of Ulysses and the geography of Homer' that led him to accept the ministry's commission.[35] Soon Gladstone found himself at Corfu,

> the famous island of which he had read such memorable things in Thucydides and Xenophon, the harbour where the Athenians had fitted out the expedition to Syracuse ... where the young Octavian had rallied his fleet before the battle of Actium ... whence Don John had sallied forth for the victory of Lepanto.[36]

After a tour around the islands and a visit to Athens, a jaunt to Albania followed. Gladstone was treated to his first sight of the Ottoman Empire—and, at his request, a special performance of the Muslim call to prayer. 'The sight of the green-turbaned imam crying the azan for a Frank was most singular', observed his amused secretary, noting that though 'Gladstone is as unoriental as any man well can be', he still entered into the spirit of the occasion, reciting poetry after dinner. Gladstone's verdict in his diary, however, differed starkly from the young Benjamin Disraeli's admiring descriptions of Albania and the Ottoman Empire: 'the whole impression is saddening', he concluded: 'it is all indolence, decay, stagnation; the image of God seems as if it were nowhere'.[37]

---

[34] H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1809-1874* (Oxford, 1986), p. 163.
[35] Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, i. 596.
[36] Ibid., i. 602.
[37] Ibid., i. 607-8. Cf. Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question*, pp. 20-5.

Freeman admired Gladstone's efforts in the Ionian Islands: 'there was something heroic', he told Finlay, 'in going out on an errand which all the small folk, crawlers, club-loungers, Saturday Reviewers, and all that gang, were safe to make game of',[38] and in early 1859 he duly contributed a series of leading articles to the *Guardian* on the subject of the Ionian Islands, arguing for their right to be Greek.[39] Freeman had as yet never travelled abroad, and Finlay sometimes struggled to curb his naiveté: 'I find that you see Greece & the Greeks through an atmosphere which renders the objects more picturesque than they are in nature', he chided.[40] Finlay's letters often assume a cynical and disillusioned tone, which their author attributes to the experience of an old man 'wearied with hearing those talking about gathering the fruit who will not water the tree [of liberty] & yet steal the leaves to feed their goat', but which Freeman was inclined to explain away.[41]

But the two men's divergent temperaments were reconciled whenever questions of importance arose, such as the Greek Revolution of 1862 a few years later. 'You have an inimitable style,' Finlay told Freeman, 'and nobody knows both ancient and modern Greece so well. You alone are the man that can stave off both pedants and politicians. I beg you … to turn your attention to the subject.' Finlay went on to suggest, half in jest, that the Greeks elect Gladstone king: 'he has all the qualities & some of the defects they want'.[42] Freeman duly forwarded Finlay's letter to F. H. Dickinson, an English clergyman, who thought Gladstone would indeed make a good candidate for the Greek

[38] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 243.
[39] See Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 207. Note that this is not the *Manchester Guardian*, but the High Church journal of the same name.
[40] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/100, Finlay to Freeman, 29 June 1865.
[41] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF1/2/73, Finlay to Freeman, 26 Dec. 1869. See Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 231-277.
[42] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/80, Finlay to Freeman, 31 Oct. 1862; JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF1/2/73, Finlay to Freeman, 26 Dec. 1869.

throne; so Freeman suggested it to Trikoupes.[43] The idea, of course, was abortive, but Freeman went on, as we shall see, to make a comprehensive statement of his vision for not a monarchical but a federal Greece: the first volume of his *History of Federal Government*, dedicated to none other than Trikoupes, is in its way just as suggestive of counterfactuals as the notion of Gladstone reigning over a Hellenic kingdom.[44]

The 1860s and early 1870s found Freeman's attention divided. As he put it in 1875, given the contemporaneous drama of the reunion of Italy and Germany, the American Civil War, and the Franco-Prussian War, it was understandable if even 'the best friends of the Greek, the Slave [*sic*], and the Bulgarian might sometimes forget them for a season'.[45] These years also witnessed the publication of the first volumes of Freeman's *History of the Norman Conquest of England* (5 vols., 1867-1879), an *Old English History for Children* (1869), and his *History of the Cathedral Church at Wells* (1870). Simultaneously, Freeman advanced his candidacy for the regius chair in modern history at Oxford;[46] involved himself in academic politics in Oxford and at Owens College, Manchester; and fought a heated debate on the morality of field sports.[47] Travels in England and France for research were a further disruption. And of course, all the while he contributed with his usual copiousness to the *Saturday Review*, *Macmillan's Magazine*, the *British Quarterly Review*, the *National Review*, and other periodical publications and newspapers.[48]

---

[43] F. H. Dickinson to Freeman, 10 Nov. 1862, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 282-3; Freeman to Trikoupes, 18 Feb. 1863, ibid., i. 285.
[44] Freeman, *History of Federal Government*, pp. v, 710ff.
[45] Edward Freeman, 'The True Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 24 (Dec. 1875), pp. 747-69 at p. 751.
[46] The *History of the Norman Conquest* was intended to demonstrate his credentials, and Freeman chose the subject in part 'because there will be little more to do than to write down what is already in my head'. See Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 335.
[47] Ibid., i. 360-74.
[48] See Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 484-9 for a bibliography of some of Freeman's periodical publications, excluding the *Saturday Review*—for which, see M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868* (New York, 1941), pp. 342ff.

Freeman did not lose his interest in the Eastern Question, however, declaiming against the 'monstrous' respect being paid to Sultan Abdülaziz, who visited England in 1867 to be dubbed a knight of the Garter in what Freeman thought 'a grotesque insult to all decency'.[49] And the Eastern Question was important to the Liberal platform upon which he stood unsuccessfully in the general election of 1868 as the candidate for Mid-Somerset. As *La Grèce*, a Francophone Athenian newspaper, observed,

> The historian of Federal Government and of the Norman Conquest was known and loved in Greece before his name had acquired the fame which he so justly merited … It is owing to Mr. Freeman that the claims of the Christians in the East have found a voice in the English Press … Should [he] obtain a seat in the British Parliament, the little phalanx of the friends of Greece in the House of Commons will have in him a powerful auxiliary, and the Greeks, the Servians, the Roumanians, and Bulgarians will have one more defender who will do justice to their cause and make a stand against the London champions of Mahometan despotism.[50]

Freeman's philhellenism, then, had not gone unnoticed. But even he was become a little disillusioned with the Greek state for which he had formerly been such a passionate partisan. 'What a state of things you do describe', he complained to Finlay: 'I stuck to the Greeks as long as I could, but they really have got beyond me. But I can't turn Turk—never, nowhere, nohow, not at all.'[51] His sympathies, he reasoned, must migrate to the Romanians and Bulgarians.

In truth, this was an episode of momentary pique. Writing to Trikoupes' son in 1875, thanking him for the award of the Greek Order of the Saviour, Freeman gushed with all his old warmth:

> If anything could increase my … goodwill towards Greece and her people, it would be to feel myself bound to them by so close a tie. It is something that the highest honour which I have ever received from any quarter should come from Greece.[52]

---

[49] Edward Freeman, 'The Grand Turk in England', *Daily News* (27 June 1867), clipped in JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/5/1/1, fol. 94.
[50] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 351-2.
[51] Freeman to Finlay, 12 Jan. 1871, in ibid., ii. 41.
[52] Freeman to Charilaos Trikoupes, 19 July 1875, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 92. Cf. 'Opinions', pp. 148-9.

But there is a sense, as we shall see, in which Freeman's threat to transfer his affections to the Slavs was prophetic, for in retrospect, Freeman's engagement with the history and current affairs of Greece came to seem a mere prelude to the frenetic activity on behalf of the Eastern Christians in general that began in October 1875, and reached a peak of intensity in the two years that followed. The events of this period marked, as he saw it, 'the beginning of an æra in the history of the world'.[53] And in these years Freeman was not merely 'one more defender' of the Greeks and the Slavs. He was more than a 'powerful auxiliary'. In the extra-parliamentary politics of what would come to be known as the Bulgarian Agitation, he took a leading role.

Characteristically, past history led Freeman into present politics, for it was 'a visit to the eastern coasts of the Hadriatic, planned long ago with objects bearing wholly on the history of past times',[54] and finally undertaken in October 1875, that was instrumental in extending his sympathies from the Greeks in particular to all the Christian peoples of south-eastern Europe.[55] Freeman had travelled with John Morley, editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, and J. F. F. Horner, a Somerset friend who had been educated at Eton and Oxford.[56] As they heard early reports of the revolt in Herzegovina, Freeman teased his daughter that he had stopped 'to breakfast on *raki*, wine and water, bread, onions, and the liver of some creature, may be a Turk'.[57] Soon, as he put it in Morley's magazine shortly after his return, he 'was able to hear much of the matter from men

[53] Edward Freeman, 'Present Aspects of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (Oct. 1876), pp. 409-23 at p. 409.
[54] Ibid., p. 409. Cf. Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (2nd ed., Hamden Conn., 1975), pp. 36-8.
[55] See Freeman, 'Opinions', p. 158.
[56] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 35, 97, 126-7. For Horner, see E. R. Kelly, *Somersetshire* (London, 1875), p. 181: Horner is styled 'lord of the manor' of the village of Cloford, Somerset.
[57] Freeman to Miss Freeman, 9 Oct 1875, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 99.

familiar with the seat of war, and myself to get a glimpse ... alike of enslaved Herzegovina and of unconquered Montenegro'[58]—what, in a letter home, he called 'the difference between Christendom and paynimrie'.[59] He was disgusted by 'a convoy of about 400 Turkish soldiers, such ugly, ragged dogs', and distressed to see Ragusa, 'full of refugees ... poor, half-starved creatures'.[60] The Turkish regime, he concluded—in language calculated to provoke his opponents—was quite simply 'the foulest fabric of tyranny on earth'.[61]

Back at home in Somerset, Freeman was already soliciting donations for the displaced Christians from his friends and correspondents. He made light of his endeavours in a letter to Margaret Macarthur,[62] joking that, if her father would 'leave off murthering [*sic*] of birds, and send me the guns, powder, &c. I will send them to those that will use them to shoot Turks, a far more useful and righteous form of sport.'[63] In fact, however, Freeman restricted his contributions to humanitarian aid, writing in early January 1876 to tell his friend the geologist and palaeontologist Sir William Boyd Dawkins, lecturer at Owens College, that he had 'gathered about £100 and sent most of it … in money and blankets'. Dawkins was told to 'stir up the rich people at Manchester'.[64] In the December issue of Morley's *Fortnightly Review*, Freeman's latest article on the Eastern Question concluded with an imprecation to his readers to 'stretch forth a kindly hand'.[65] In April he wrote to thank an old friend from his days at Trinity

[58] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', p. 747.
[59] Freeman to Florence Freeman, 17 Oct. 1875, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 126-8. By 'paynimrie', Freeman meant the lands inhabited by pagans, i.e. the Turks.
[60] Idem.
[61] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', p. 747.
[62] Margaret Macarthur contributed the volume on the *History of Scotland* (London, 1873) to a series of short histories edited by Freeman for Macmillan. For a sensationalist account, see Susan Walton, 'Charlotte M. Yonge and the "historic harem" of Edward Augustus Freeman', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 11 (2006), pp. 226-55.
[63] Freeman to Margaret Macarthur, 18 Dec 1875, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 128.
[64] Freeman to Dawkins, 2 Jan 1876, in ibid., ii. 130.
[65] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', p. 769.

College, Oxford, 'for your gift to the Refugees' and to encourage him to 'stir up all men'.[66]

The cause had by now taken on a quasi-religious significance for Freeman. In the same letter, he recorded that he had sung his 'psalms lustily and with good courage, as there was my special Insurgent psalm, last but one'. His insurgent psalm was psalm 149—with its exhortations to 'execute vengeance on the heathen', of obvious salience to the Eastern Question. Next year, in the pages of the *Contemporary Review*, Freeman himself identified this very characteristic as he reflected on the early days of the movement:

> Men came together as if to deliver their souls, as if their hearts could not rest within them till their tongues had spoken ... It seemed as if the common earth and the common human nature had received a defilement, which it needed some rite of lustration to wipe off from the consciences of all mankind.[67]

His Oxford friend the Reverend George Cox, Broad-Church historian and poet, was one of many who agreed: 'One cannot help holding up hands and crying, "How long, O Lord, how long"'.[68] In the ensuing months, Freeman for one would work strenuously to clear his conscience. On 9 May 1876 *The Times* carried a letter from Freeman imploring 'all lovers of humanity and freedom' to send him donations for the Herzegovinian refugees.[69] Other papers carried similar letters.[70] The next day, he wrote to his friend the Anglo-Catholic theologian Henry Liddon: 'I sent my letter to Jupiter [*i.e. The Times*]',[71] he admitted, 'not thinking he would put it in … but there it is, and it is bringing me in a good bit of golden shower'.[72] Two days later that shower had

---

[66] Freeman to Rev. Canon Meyrick, 30 April 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 136.
[67] Edward Freeman, 'The English People in Relation to the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Feb. 1877), pp. 489-515 at p. 490.
[68] George Cox to Olga Novikoff, 2 Nov. 1876, quoted in W. T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia, Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (2 vols., London, 1909), i. 265.
[69] Edward Freeman, 'The Herzegovinian Refugees', *The Times* (9 May 1876), p. 7.
[70] See the allusion to 'my last letters to daily papers' in Freeman to Bryce, 12 May 1876 in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 137.
[71] Freeman often referred to the *Times* as 'Jupiter', a habit he took from Anthony Trollope.
[72] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 10 May 1876.

become an inundation, as he reported to Bryce: 'I have got altogether about £680, and it was still dropping in when I left home'.[73]

Freeman was thus at the very heart of what Richard Shannon called the Herzegovinian 'proto-agitation' that began towards to end of 1875, and which laid the foundations for the Bulgarian Agitation a few months later.[74] William Stillman, for example, a prominent foreign correspondent whose despatches did much to stir up British indignation, attributed 'much of the weight given to the *Times* reports' of the Bulgarian atrocities to the preparatory work done by Morley and Freeman.[75] And as Shannon noted, many of the Bulgarian Agitation's principal *dramatis personae* had played a prominent role in its predecessor movement—including Freeman's regular correspondents James Bryce, Henry Liddon, Humphry Sandwith, Malcolm MacColl, Goldwin Smith, John Morley and James Fraser, bishop of Manchester.[76]

Like so many of his friends, Freeman only amplified his efforts when news of Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria reached Britain. As war correspondent Januarius MacGahan's lurid reports in the *Daily News* and William Stillman's more measured columns in *The Times* made their impression, horror and indignation swept the nation.[77] Public meetings denounced the Turks. By July, Freeman was lecturing on the Eastern Question in Bath, where he proposed and carried a resolution to recall the British fleet, sent to Besika Bay to ward off Russian intervention in Bulgaria.[78] The next week found him at Willis's Rooms in London, haranguing a public meeting arranged by James Farley, banker and commentator on Eastern matters, and presided over by Lord Shaftesbury. The audience included twenty-five MPs. In a lengthy speech, Freeman

[73] Freeman to Bryce, 12 May 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 137.
[74] Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, pp. 37-8.
[75] W. J. Stillman, *The Autobiography of a Journalist* (2 vols., London, 1901), ii. 156.
[76] Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 38.
[77] See below, pp. 130-5.
[78] *The Times* (24 July 1876), p. 9

proposed a motion that there would be no solution to the Eastern Question until the Christians of south-eastern Europe were granted full autonomy. He hoped, he said, 'to teach the Foreign Office … a few things they cannot understand'.[79] The motion was carried unanimously. As a reward for his efforts, by July a letter in the *Guardian*—likely by the pen of Gladstone's confidant and, in Colin Matthew's phrase, 'in-house journalist', Malcolm Macoll[80]—was suggesting that Freeman lead a Christian Defence League.[81] Freeman complemented public speeches with periodical articles in the *Fortnightly Review*, *Contemporary Review*, *British Quarterly Review*, and *Macmillan's Magazine*, all of them laden with historical argument and allusion.[82] At the same time, he reissued a new edition of his *History and Conquests of the Saracens*. And throughout the year, he would endeavour to digest and popularise his views in shorter pieces in the press, both in the Liberal *Daily News* and in *The Times*.[83]

In August, Liddon, a private activist on behalf of the eastern Christians, unleashed a public broadside: 'I wish you would preach about all this', Freeman had written in May, and now, at last, Liddon did.[84] In a sermon at St Paul's, Liddon, one of the most celebrated preachers of the day, demanded a 'moral, Christian, humane' Eastern policy,

---

[79] *The Times* (8 July 1876), p. 10.
[80] H. C. G. Matthew, 'MacColl, Malcolm (1831–1907)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004); see Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Jan. 1879.
[81] *Manchester Guardian* (5 July 1876), p. 887. For this attribution, see Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 48.
[82] 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88; 'The Illyrian Emperors and Their Lands', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (July 1876), pp. 1-35; 'The Turks in Europe', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (Oct. 1876), pp. 441-71; 'Present Aspects of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (Oct. 1876), pp. 409-23; 'The Law of Honour', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (Dec. 1876), pp. 731-51.
[83] 'Lord Derby and the Eastern Christians', *Daily News* (20 July 1876); 'The Turks in Europe', *Daily News* (15 Aug. 1876); 'The Turks in Europe', *Daily News* (24 Aug. 1876); 'Turkish Atrocities', *The Times* (28 Aug 1876); 'Points for Public Meetings', *Daily News* (5 Sept. 1876); 'Dr. H. Sandwith on the Turkish Atrocities', *Daily News* (13 Sept 1876); 'Lord Derby's Apology', *Daily News* (15 Sept. 1876); 'Turkish Atrocities: Who Caused Them?', *Daily News* (16 Sept. 1876); 'The Eastern Question', *Daily News* (2 Oct. 1876); 'Practical and Sentimental Politics', *Daily News* (13 Oct. 1876); 'Dr. Sandwith's Work in Servia', *Daily News* (24 Oct. 1876); 'Practical Politics', *The Times* (8 Nov. 1876); 'The Eastern Question', *Daily News* (16 Nov. 1876); 'The Russian Proposals', *The Times* (28 Nov. 1876); 'The Refugees in Dalmatia and Montenegro', *The Times* (6 Dec. 1876); 'Sir Stafford Northcote and Mr. Freeman', *The Times* (16 Dec. 1876); 'Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Freeman', *The Times* (22 Dec. 1876).
[84] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 10 May 1876.

denouncing the 'light-hearted incredulity', the 'heartless epigrams', of Lord Beaconsfield. Only public demonstrations of dissent, he argued, could absolve the individual of responsibility for the misdeeds of the government. *The Rock* called it an 'inflammatory harangue', and it made a great impression.[85] Indeed, the resonances of a denunciation of a Conservative prime minister in St Paul's were unmistakable. Liddon's sermon was applauded by W. T. Stead, editor of the *Northern Echo* and coordinator of the agitation in the north and the midlands. More public meetings ensued. As Freeman told Bryce, just then travelling in the Caucasus, 'I really believe that the nation is at last stirring. Meetings to denounce the Turk and Jew [*i.e.* Disraeli] are getting common … There has been a grand meeting at Darlington, and I was asked to one at Liverpool last night'.[86]

By this time, as Richard Shannon observed, Freeman was 'by far the most widely known figure among the agitation leaders'. He was writing as many as eighteen letters a day, to correspondents including William Stillman, Ragusa correspondent for *The Times*; Olga Novikoff, a Russian activist in London; Richard Burton, the famous explorer, orientalist, and at that time British Consul at Trieste; Baron Gondola, the Mayor of Dubrovnic; Adeline Irby, the English Slavophile; and Humphrey Sandwith, a retired army doctor and an expert on the Eastern Question. In a list of dedicatees, for example, in an ironic Tory pamphlet, *Revelations from the Seat of War* (1877), Freeman was second only to Gladstone himself in precedence.[87] And Freeman, under none of Gladstone's constraints, was far less equivocal. In the *Guardian* at the end of August he denounced the leaders of the government as the 'sworn allies of Antichrist'.[88] He

[85] Quoted in Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 61.
[86] Freeman to Bryce, 27 Aug. 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 141. The Darlington meeting was organised by Stead.
[87] Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 81.
[88] *The Guardian* (30 Aug. 1876), p. 1136.

continued to harangue public meetings, which were reported in the local press.[89] The very day that Liddon wrote to congratulate him on 'the present condition of public opinion',[90] his friend, the historian J. R. Green, wrote to tell him that 'your Welsh address … has served as accompaniment to my luncheon'.[91] By the end of September, Freeman was boasting to Bryce that he could only attend one tenth of the events to which he was invited. At Cardiff, he claimed, he was welcomed as 'an angel of light'.[92] No matter if Tory Oxford was less susceptible.[93] Only now did Gladstone become more committed to the agitation, publishing his pamphlet *Bulgarian Horrors*. Given how much Freeman had already contributed to the debate, it was with good reason that he could claim that 'Gladstone has come over to us, not we to him'.[94]

All this activity was becoming rather overwhelming. As Freeman told his protégée Charlotte M. Yonge, 'I certainly find that the preaching of a crusade is a great hindrance to looking over proofs … I am torn in pieces by blessed calls to different stages of the warfare with Turk and Jew'.[95] He was still sending money to the Balkans; by 26 September, the amount had already reached £2,002 12s. 6d.,[96] and on 15 October he told Liddon he had 'one more lot to send'. He had also, he remarked, 'just written another thunderer … You must help me'.[97] Eight days later, he was in Glastonbury, staying with John Bright's daughter and 'writing with strange pens, having come over

[89] E.g. *South Wales Daily News* (9 Sept. 1876); *Bath Chronicle* (20 July 1876); *Wells Journal* (10 Feb. 1876); *Manchester Guardian* (23 Nov. 1876).
[90] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Liddon to Freeman, 30 Aug. 1876.
[91] Green to Freeman, 30 Aug. 1876, in Leslie Stephen (ed.), *Letters of John Richard Green* (London, 1901), p. 437.
[92] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 125f, Freeman to Bryce, 22 Oct. 1876.
[93] Freeman to Gladstone, 14 Sept. 1876, quoted in Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 136.
[94] Freeman to anon., 12 Nov. 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 142.
[95] Freeman to Charlotte M. Yonge, 2 Oct. 1876, in ibid., ii. 138.
[96] Edward Freeman, 'The Servian Sick and Wounded', *The Times* (26 Sept. 1876), p. 3. Adjusting by (British) purchasing power, equivalent to £147,000 in today's money. This is a conservative estimate, and the value of the pound in the Balkans would obviously have been considerable.
[97] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 15 Oct. 1876.

here to make a speech'.[98] He resolved, too, that he must 'try and stir Bryce up; but he is [a] Scot & lawyer & therefore cautious'.[99] But some, at least, thought the thunder and the speeches were striking home: in November the *Gazette* declared that 'Mr. Freeman's letters … have become a power in the land … he has an extraordinary power of hammering away at an idea'.[100]

Freeman did not rest on his laurels—though he did carefully preserve press cuttings, laudatory and critical, in his scrapbooks—for November brought a new opportunity. The Constantinople Conference of the Great Powers had been announced, with Lord Salisbury the British delegate. Freeman began plotting with Liddon at once:

> I have been talking with Lord Bath and Dickinson about our matters, and specially about Lord Salisbury going out to [Constantinople]. Lord Bath thought it was no good for him to say anything, but that a word applied from you to Lord Salisbury would be useful …
>
> You know as well as any one the general points to insist on; but put sharply before him the need of giving the great mass of Slavonic land, Bosnia, Herzegovina, & the rest—as *well* as Montenegro—*a mouth* [i.e. access to the sea] …
>
> Don't tell Lord Salisbury what Lord Bath said.[101]

Liddon duly obliged, writing, in an astute touch, not to Lord but to Lady Salisbury by the next post: 'May I beg you, if you can & when you can do so, to entreat Lord Salisbury to keep one or two (out of many) points in mind?'[102] To strengthen his hand, Freeman wrote to Richard Burton at Trieste, 'my strange ally',[103] asking him to lobby Lord Salisbury on his journey:

> Could you not bring some of the important points of the case privately before Lord Salisbury, now he is to be plenipotentiary? He is not like the two men of Belial [*i.e.* Derby and Disraeli], and your knowledge of the East would get you a hearing with him. I am sure you might do good in this way.[104]

---

[98] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 23 Oct. 1876.
[99] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 1 Nov. 1876.
[100] *The Gazette* (11 Nov. 1876). Clipped in Freeman's scrapbook, JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/5/1/4, p. 14.
[101] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 9 Nov. 1876.
[102] Liddon to Lady Salisbury, 10 Nov. 1876, quoted in Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation* p. 254.
[103] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 12 Nov. 1876.
[104] Freeman to Captain Richard Burton, 10 Nov. 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 142.

Meanwhile, outraged by Disraeli's Guildhall speech threatening war with Russia, Freeman set off on stump again. After a 'fling at Turks & Jews' at Bristol on 13 November, he moved to Manchester, then Exeter, 'bearing testimony' all the way. And he had now, he added, sent over £5,000 to the Balkans.[105]

By now, some were beginning to tire of Freeman's capacity for what he liked to call 'pegging away'.[106] Some of his critics, of course, were his political opponents. 'I have been both praised and abused as I never was before', he complained to Bryce: 'the local Tory press seems to have no thought but to revile me'.[107] Two days before Christmas, 'I had more anonymous letters of abuse … than I ever had in one day before'.[108] But he had also begun to alienate friends. In November, Liddon had learnt from his brother that Freeman had 'hit about him' at a social gathering, casting the Bulgarian question as 'a party one' and stopping all conversation, stirring up 'much active hostility without ingratiating himself with his own political friends'.[109] Frank Hill of the *Daily News* temporarily stopped publishing Freeman's letters, and Freeman enlisted Bryce to try to repair the damage: 'you know the man, can you find out what it all means?', he asked.[110]

When the Eastern Question Association sought to bring together all the public intellectuals interested in Eastern matters, Bryce had to intervene again, for Freeman tried to invite Mikhail Chernyayev, the pan-Slav Russian general who had commanded the defeated Serbian army in 1876, to the Association's National Conference in St

[105] Freeman to Bryce, 13 & 23 Nov. 1876, in ibid., ii. 143; Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 129f.
[106] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 278.
[107] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 127f, Freeman to Bryce, 13 Nov. 1876.
[108] Freeman to Edith Thompson, 24 Dec. 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 144.
[109] Keble College, Liddon Papers, E. Liddon to H. P. Liddon, 18 Nov. 1876.
[110] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 126, Freeman to Bryce, 22 Oct. 1876.

James's Hall.[111] Perhaps tempers were beginning to fray because, the Agitation's popularity notwithstanding, the government showed no signs of altering its policy, and Gladstone still refused to take an active lead. 'I am still loyal to the great man at Hawarden', Green assured Freeman, 'but why does he set us little flock to speak and himself so resolutely hold his peace?'[112] At the Eastern Question Association's conference in St. James's Hall, Freeman could boast that 'my reception was next to Gladstone's', and W. T. Stead praised him for his 'very effective and scholarly speech'.[113] But he was still no substitute for the Grand Old Man.

Freeman and Gladstone, however, were in regular contact. The two met, along with Lord Bath, Stillman and Liddon, for a weekend at Longleat, Lord Bath's Elizabethan seat, in January 1877.[114] 'We shall doubtless do a little plotting', Freeman had predicted to Bryce, and sure enough the party talked 'incessantly' about the Eastern Question.[115] Gladstone later visited Freeman for lunch at his home, Somerleaze, as the *Wells Journal* reverently recorded: 'I gathered some people together and had a little speech-making', he told Olga Novikoff.[116] Green alluded to the meeting in a letter next month: 'Bismillah! you are a great man: multitudes rise to greet thee and Ex-Premiers visit thee!' Freeman was also visited by his regular correspondent, Malcolm MacColl, who was strongly connected with Gladstone.[117] In September, Gladstone asked about historians who supported the agitation, and Freeman was able to confirm that 'I have all along had the pleasure of finding that nearly everybody whose opinion I had learned

[111] Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 262; Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 6 Feb. 1877.
[112] Green to Freeman, 1 Dec. 1876, in Stephen, *Letters*, p. 441.
[113] Freeman to Edith Thompson, 24 Dec. 1876, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 144; Stead, *M. P. for Russia*, i. 288.
[114] Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 297.
[115] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 131f, Freeman to Bryce, 15 Jan. 1877f.
[116] *Wells Journal* (25 Jan. 1877), clipped by Freeman in JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/5/1/2, fol. 20; Freeman to Olga Novikoff, 7 Feb. 1877, quoted in Stead, *M. P. for Russia*, i. 331.
[117] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Jan 1879.

to value about other matters is with me about this', before listing as his allies, as we have seen, Stubbs, Bryce, Goldwin Smith, J. R. Green, G. W. Cox, W. Bright, Carlyle and Froude.[118]

Freeman also had new correspondents to occupy his attentions. Towards the end of the month, he received a letter from Monsieur Duby, Nicolas I of Montenegro's Swiss secretary, thanking him for sending 'the reports of your several speeches and addresses on the Eastern Question'.[119] Nicholas had 'been much struck by the force and lucidity of your advocacy of the Christian claims', and wished to express his gratitude for the support 'of such influential, able and spirited friends'. He begged Freeman to 'believe that the Christians in the Principality are quite aware of the importance to them of the assistance given by your own and your friends' exertions', and of the need to win over 'the immense influence that belongs to England'—they were courting 'Dear good friend Stillman' just as assiduously.[120] Freeman was clearly touched, because by 26 March 1877, Nicholas' secretary was writing to accept the dedication of Freeman's new 'little book', *The Ottoman Power in Europe*—a companion piece to the recently re-issued *History and Conquests of the Saracens*—and thanking Freeman for a copy of 'your new pamphlet on "Races"'.[121]

All three pieces were intended as interventions in the Eastern Question, and exemplify the way in which Freeman tried to use historiography to inform and shape the contemporary debate. Indeed, his history of *The Ottoman Power in Europe* was even more politically weighted than his lectures on the Saracens. It made quite a stir, as Green recalled in a typically jocular letter to Alice Stopford, his future wife:

> Freeman has bequeathed to his country as he fled from her shores a book on the Ottoman Turks which makes a fearful Bulgarian Massacre of my

[118] Freeman to Gladstone, 21 Sept. 1877, quoted in Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 221.
[119] For Duby's nationality, see Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 160.
[120] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/46, Duby to Freeman, [25?] Jan. 1877.
[121] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/47, Duby to EAF, 26 March 1877.

> Lord Beaconsfield, my Lord Derby, and Hobart Pasha.[122] It is the most rattling bit of invective I have read for a good while. Did I tell you than an old admiral, a friend of Hobart's, challenged Freeman to single combat on the sands of Boulogne by way of avenging the Pasha's wrongs? If Hobart resigns his Turkish commission and comes home, I shall expect to hear of murder done at Somerleaze![123]

Nicholas I appreciated the importance of works like these, for next month another letter offered Freeman the Montenegrin Order of Daniel I—in addition to his Serbian and Greek titles, 'which', he joked to Edith Thompson, 'will make me three Commanders; so I shall expect to be addressed in the plural'.[124] Along with books and pamphlets, Freeman was also sending British newspapers to the Balkans: '*Do* you read the *Northern Echo*', he asked Liddon, 'the best paper in Europe? I send it often to Russia and Montenegro. All the colliers read it, also Bright and Gladstone'.[125] The *Echo* was W. T. Stead's paper, and instrumental in fomenting the agitation in its heartlands in the Nonconformist midlands and north.

Freeman had already visited Montenegro; now, at last, in May and June he visited Greece and the Ionian Islands where he was fêted as a celebrity. 'We had a wonderful time of it', he told his friend Edith Thompson:

> The speciality of Zakynthos is to cover you with flowers, that of Ithákê to fire cannon ... But I am not sure the finest thing was not when we left at Corfu, when they came all round the steamer with boats and a band, and I made them speeches … At Zakynthos, when I made my speech after dinner, certain men rushed in thro' the window and kissed, not my hands indeed, but my mouth … They don't do that in Mid-Somerset.

Speechifying itself was easy enough, Freeman went on to explain: he had simply taken Demosthenes as his model, falling back on his ancient Greek—much like Gladstone as

[122] Augustus Charles Hobart-Hampden was an Ottoman Admiral and British naval captain who commanded the blockade of Crete, for which he was awarded the title of Pasha.
[123] Green to Miss Stopford, 6 May 1877, in Stephen, *Letters*, p. 459. Somerleaze was Freeman's Somersetshire residence.
[124] Freeman to Edith Thompson, 23 April 1877, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 150.
[125] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 18 April 1877.

Lord Commissioner of the Ionian Islands two decades earlier.[126] In fact, the real challenge, he confessed, had been 'to talk common chatter', for which familiarity with Athens' golden age was no preparation.

By July, Freeman was back in Somerset and again contributing to the *Daily News*, warning Liddon that he had 'more thunder ready for next *Contemporary*. We must roar, roar, roar'.[127] In the course of 1877, Freeman, in fact, contributed several more weighty articles to the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Contemporary Review*, the *British Quarterly Review*, and the *Saturday Review*.[128] By this stage, he had developed a nuanced conception of the history of south-eastern Europe and its contemporary implications, and some of these pieces, as we shall see, might be numbered amongst his most mature works of historical scholarship.

In many ways, however, it was too late. The Constantinople Conference had reached an impasse and adjourned in January 1877. By November, Freeman was again inveighing bemusedly against 'that stupid Daily News—I sent in a letter ... and they have not put it in'. Goldwin Smith tried to humour him, pointing out that the paper was published on 'commercial principles'.[129] Early next year, Freeman had not stopped 'pegging away' at the Eastern Question; and he was also zealously hounding the historian J. A. Froude for alleged inaccuracies.[130] Green wrote tactfully to express his hope that 'your health is better with new air and new rest. Were I you, I would simply

[126] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 152-4; Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, i. 597.
[127] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 15 July 1877.
[128] 'The Geographical Aspect of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (Jan. 1877), pp. 73-87; 'The English People in Relation to the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Feb. 1877), pp. 489-515; 'The Jews in Europe', *Saturday Review* (10 Feb. 1877); 'The Southern Slaves', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (July 1877), pp. 137-84; 'The Relation of the English People to the [Russo-Turkish] War', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Aug. 1877), pp. 481-510; 'Neutrality [on the Eastern Question]—Real or Pretended?' *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Oct. 1877), pp. 877-93.
[129] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 30 Nov. 1877.
[130] See most recently Ian Hesketh, '"Diagnosing Froude's Disease": Boundary Work and the Discipline of History in Late Victorian Britain', *History and Theory*, 47 (2008), pp. 373-95.

rest and leave Turks and Froudes to go the way of Turks and Froudes'.[131] Even Russia's conduct of the war was destined to disappoint him: 'how can men turn round in sight of St. Sophia?', he exclaimed with frustration.[132] Freeman was anything but insincere. In June he resolved to 'cut the *Saturday Review*' over its criticisms of the Bulgarian Agitation, entailing 'a sacrifice of from £400 to £500 a year'.[133] As Stuart Jones observes, Freeman was not, in fact, a man of substantial private income: his standard of living depended crucially on the profits of journalism, and his annual income from his inheritance was scarcely more than the sum he forfeited by dropping the *Saturday Review*.[134] Small wonder that he complained to J. R. Green in September that he was 'so cleaned out of money' that he was feeling the loss of his lucrative emoluments from the *Saturday*.[135] Moreover, as one of the original 'Saturday revilers' who had helped to set the house style and likely contributed over 1,000 articles to the publication, his was an emotional sacrifice too.[136] Soon the *Pall Mall Gazette* was also the subject of a boycott.[137] With the *Daily News*, too, no longer publishing his letters, Freeman found himself 'pouring out my soul in the *Manchester Examiner* … the air there is freer'.[138]

Nor were the periodicals the only victims of Freeman's frustration; the Church of England was also found wanting. Led by Archbishop Tait, the Anglican clergy had largely refused to break what they argued was a patriotic and Erastian silence over the Eastern Question:

---

[131] Green to Freeman, 22 Jan 1878, in Stephen, *Letters*, p. 472.
[132] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 29 March 1878.
[133] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 22 June 1878.
[134] H. S. Jones, 'Historical-Mindedness and the World at Large: Edward Freeman as Public Intellectual', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 293-310 at pp. 296-7. Cf. the claim that 'Freeman enjoyed a considerable private income' in John Cannon *et al.* (eds.), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Historians* (Oxford, 1988), p. 139.
[135] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF 1/8/79, Freeman to Green, 22 Sept. 1878.
[136] Leslie Stephen, *Some Early Impressions* (London, 1924), p. 114; Jones, 'Freeman as Public Intellectual', p. 297.
[137] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Jan. 1879: 'since I cut Sat. Rev. & P.M.G. I am £700 a year poorer than I was'.
[138] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 7 July 1878.

> The Nonconformists, all blessings on them, do speak out, & our own people don't. And that sends me Disestablishmentwards 1001 times faster than all the rubbish of Fred[erick] Harrison and such like, which sends me the other way.[139]

'I would purchase Christian St. Sophia at the price of disendowed Canterbury', he told Bryce.[140] This disaffection with the Anglican establishment shows how far Freeman had come from his days as a High Church undergraduate at Trinity; but it also shows just how much the Eastern Question mattered to him.[141] It was not the ministers of the Church of England who articulated an authentically Christian perspective, but rather 'lay prophets' such as Goldwin Smith and Gladstone, Freeman had come to believe.[142]

More and more, he would choose 'to circulate myself in two lands at once', publishing in the *Princeton Review*.[143] The Unites States of America, he remarked to a sceptical Edith Thompson, 'is a fairly big bushel to be hidden in'.[144] 'Times are not so stirring—for me at least—as they were', he complained to Liddon. Paranoia set in: 'there is a great deal going on … which the Jews of London and Vienna … conspire to keep the British public from knowing.'[145] In truth, the opportunity offered by the Bulgarian Agitation had now passed. Freeman's contributions to the debate henceforth became increasingly sporadic. Gladstone's second premiership, from 1880 to 1885, naturally issued in a more congenial Eastern policy.[146] By the mid-1880s, the decrepitude of the Ottoman Empire led Freeman to believe that by now 'the House of

---

[139] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Dec. 1878. Cf. Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 168, Freeman to Bryce, 5 June 1878: 'These dumb dogs of parsons ... Jew-ridden & society-ridden, are sending me faster towards Disestablishment than F. Harrison, with all his fallacies, blunders, and impudence, can keep me away from it.'
[140] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, 153ff, Freeman to Bryce, 21 Dec. 1877.
[141] See Michael Ledger-Lomas, 'An Erastian Descent: History and Establishment in the Thought of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley and Edward Freeman', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 65-81 at p. 70.
[142] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 168, Freeman to Bryce, 5 June 1878.
[143] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 6 Feb. 1877.
[144] Freeman to Edith Thompson, 7 Dec. 1878, in Stephen, *Life and Letters*, ii. 169.
[145] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Dec. 1882.
[146] See Edward Freeman, 'The Election and the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 37 (June 1880), pp. 956-76.

Austria was the enemy'.[147] But his death in Alicante on 16 March 1892 terminated his engagement with the Eastern Question, depriving him of the chance to contribute to the uproar caused over the Armenian massacres later in the decade that so exercised his friend James Bryce.

The Eastern Question thus furnishes E. A. Freeman's biography with one of its central themes. But if the preceding pages have shown how important a place the Eastern Question occupied in Freeman's biography, they testify equally strongly to his important place at the intellectual and prosopographical heart of the Victorians' enduring engagement with the Eastern Question. Freeman's thought is correspondingly illuminating, and it is therefore forms the basis for a broader portrayal of how Victorian intellectuals could engage with the Eastern Question as an historical question in the chapter that follows.

[147] Edward Freeman, 'The Austrian Power', *Fraser's Magazine*, 102 (July 1880), pp. 29-47.

Chapter Two

Writing the History of the Eastern Question

Nothing if not copious, E. A. Freeman's bibliography bears voluminous testimony to his enduring preoccupation with the history and politics of what he sometimes called the 'Byzantine peninsula'.[1] Indeed, the Eastern Question, he once declared, amounted to his 'chief secondary object of study'.[2] Yet Freeman's deeply historical engagement with the Eastern Question has seldom attracted the attention of historians of historiography, overshadowed by his history of the Norman Conquest and his interpretation of English history.[3] Historians that have engaged with Freeman's thinking about race and empire—such as Christopher Parker and Arnaldo Momigliano, and more recently Theodore Koditschek, Vicky Morrisroe and Duncan Bell—have largely failed to moor their analyses sufficiently firmly in the context which shaped that thinking, interpreting pronouncements that had often been engendered by specific events in south-eastern Europe as abstract statements of general principle.[4] This

[1] Edward Freeman, *A History of Federal Government* (London, 1863), p. 712.
[2] Edward Freeman, *The Ottoman Power in Europe* (London, 1877), p. xxi.
[3] The best study of Freeman remains John Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past* (Cambridge, 1981). See also Michael Bentley, *Modernizing England's Past: English Historiography in the Age of Modernism, 1870–1970* (Cambridge, 2006); Judith Green, 'E. A. Freeman and his *History of the Norman Conquest*', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 237-54.
[4] Christopher Parker, 'The Failure of Liberal Racialism: the Racial Ideas of E. A. Freeman', *Historical Journal*, 24 (December 1981), pp. 825-46; Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Two Types of Universal History: the Cases of E. A. Freeman and Max Weber', *Journal of Modern History*, 58 (March 1986), pp. 325-46; Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain* (Cambridge, 2013); Vicky Morrisroe, '"Sanguinary Amusement': Edward Freeman, the Comparative Method and Victorian Theories of Race', *Modern Intellectual History*, 10 (April 2013), pp. 27-56; Duncan Bell, 'Alter Orbis: E. A. Freeman on Empire and Racial Destiny', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 217-36.

chapter, expanding upon work published in the *Proceedings of the British Academy*,[5] contends that Freeman's engagement with the Eastern Question is an essential heuristic for any Freeman scholar, demonstrating that what he called his 'secondary' studies were fundamentally enmeshed with what he regarded as the 'main subject' of his life's work: the history of 'the Greek, the Roman, and the Teuton'.[6]

For Freeman, that main subject formed a single story, and he readily acknowledged that he had learnt from Thomas Arnold 'the truth which ought to be the centre and life of all our historic studies, the truth of the Unity of History'.[7] The story, in Arnold's words, was in essence a simple one:

> For the last eighteen hundred years, Greece has fed the human intellect; Rome, taught by Greece and improving upon her teacher, has been the source of law and government and social civilization; and what neither Greece nor Rome could furnish, the perfection of moral and spiritual truth, has been given by Christianity. The changes which have been wrought have arisen out of the reception of these elements by new races; races endowed with such force of character that what was old in itself, when exhibited in them, seemed to become something new.[8]

In this conception, the history of 'the Greek, the Roman, and the Teuton' becomes a sort of world-historical relay race, as each exhausted contestant passes on the baton of civilization to his successor. The Roman subjugation of Greece and the Teutonic invasions of the Roman Empire were reinterpreted as evidence of continuity, not rupture. That relay race had shaped the language, institutions and religion of Europe.

To furnish further proof that all the runners were on the same team, Freeman drew on another of his great enthusiasms, the so-called comparative method. In the mid-nineteenth century the Prussian diplomat Baron Christian Bunsen and his protégé Friedrich Max Müller (who become a naturalised British citizen in 1855) had done

---

[5] William Kelley, 'Past Politics and Present History: Edward Freeman and the Eastern Question', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 119-35.
[6] Edward Freeman, *Comparative Politics* (3rd ed., London, 1873), p. 38.
[7] Edward Freeman, *The Methods of Historical Study* (London, 1886), pp. 5-6.
[8] Thomas Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History* (2nd ed., London, 1843), pp. 28-9.

much to popularise the study of comparative philology in Britain, introducing an Anglophone audience to the researches of German scholars including Friedrich Schlegel, Jacob Grimm and Franz Bopp, who had argued that similarities between many of the world's languages—and in particular most of those spoken in contemporary Europe—pointed to common ancestry. Most of the inhabitants of modern Europe, they contended, were descended from Aryan ancestors who had migrated across the world from their home in the mountains of northern India in prehistoric times. In early 1851, Max Müller had been appointed deputy Taylorian professor of modern European languages at Oxford, giving a first course of lectures on the history and origin of modern languages which drew on the insights of the comparative method. Such ideas were soon presented to a wider audience in Bunsen's *Outlines of the Philosophy of World History* (1854)—which included extensive contributions by Max Müller—and Max Müller's own influential essay on 'Comparative Mythology' in John Parker's *Oxford Essays* two years later.[9] Scholars in other fields soon sought to apply the premises and approaches of comparative philology to their own disciplines.[10]

Freeman was an early partisan of the comparative method. In a series of lectures to the Royal Institution, published as *Comparative Politics* (1873), he attempted 'to claim for political institutions a right to a scientific treatment of exactly the same kind as that which has been so successfully applied to language, to mythology, and to the progress of culture'. Just as similarities between European languages indicated a common source, so the 'large common stock of institutions' shared by 'Greeks, Italians and Teutons' could not, Freeman believed, 'be otherwise accounted for than by the

[9] Friedrich Max Müller, 'Comparative Mythology' in *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), ii. 1-87.
[10] For an extended study of the comparative method, see Stefan Collini, Donald Winch and John Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 207-46.

supposition of their common primitive origin'.[11] That heuristic revealed a vast array of hitherto unimaginable affinities between periods, peoples and places. As he had declared in his Rede Lecture on 'The unity of history' a year earlier, 'times and tongues and nations which before seemed parted poles asunder, now find each one its own place … as members of one common primæval brotherhood'. Their history was 'one long series of cause and effect'.[12] Greeks, Romans and Teutons were thus all members of the same 'great family' of Aryan nations, 'called on' (and here we hear echoes of Arnold's providentialism) successively to 'develop the common institutions of the great family within its own borders … and … to defend those borders and those institutions against the inroads of the barbarian from without'.[13] Freeman devoted considerable labour to the history of the 'common institutions' of the Aryan family of nations, and the free political life which they fostered; they are the subject of his *History of Federal Government* (1863) as well as *Comparative Politics*. But he was equally preoccupied with what he saw as the Aryan nations' perpetual conflict with 'the barbarian from without'.

Of course, Freeman never lost his focus on the history of the west. In both his short *History and Conquests of the Saracens* (1856) and its still more polemical 'companion',[14] *The Ottoman Power in Europe* (1877), Freeman freely avowed the perspective of 'one who looks at Eastern history with Western eyes, and is therefore naturally inclined to give most attention to those parts of his subject which, in the way either of connexion or contrast, possess some bearing upon the history of the West'.[15]

---

[11] Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, pp. iii-iv.
[12] Ibid., pp. 302, 304. Freeman's interest in the comparative method is discussed in Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, and more recently in Morrisroe, '"Sanguinary Amusement"', pp. 29-40.
[13] Edward Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History* (London, 1886), p. 6.
[14] Freeman, *Ottoman Power*, p. vii.
[15] Edward Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens* (Oxford, 1856), p. v. See also *Ottoman Power*, p. vii: 'in both [*Ottoman Power* and *Saracens*] I deal with Eastern and Mahometan affairs mainly in their reference to Western and Christian affairs'; and [Edward Freeman], 'Mahomet', *British Quarterly Review*, 55 (Jan. 1872), pp. 100-36 at p. 135 where Freeman admits to looking at religions of

The most obvious of those contrasts were racial: while the peoples of Europe, as we have seen, 'belong to one common Aryan stock',[16] their enemies in the East had been successively Semitic and Turanian, and as such belonged 'to a different branch of the human family'.[17] He was prepared to allow the Semitic Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Hebrews and Saracens some merits; the Semitic nations, he believed, 'have reached a higher stage of civilisation and civil polity than any of the nations that lie beyond the Aryan and Semitic range'.[18] But he reserved a special antipathy for the Turanian Ottoman Turks. Turanians, Freeman admitted, were 'negatively defined' as aliens who 'lie outside the European and Aryan world, the world of Rome and of the Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic disciples of Rome', and who 'lie equally outside the Semitic world, the world of the Phoenician, the Hebrew, and the Arab'.[19]

Race, however, was not immutable: the Turanian Bulgarians, for example, had been 'Christianized, Europeanized, [and] assimilated by an European and Christian nation'.[20] Their racial character had been lost in the mass of their Slav subjects, with whom they came to share a language, culture and history. They had become Slavs, in other words, by what Freeman elsewhere called a 'legal fiction'.[21] Freeman's definition of race, indeed, owed more to philology and history than to physiology. He acknowledged that the process 'of adoption, naturalization, assimilation' that had made the Bulgarians Slavs 'has gone on everywhere'. It followed that 'no nation can boast of absolute purity of blood ... no existing nation is, in the physiologist's sense of purity,

---

the East 'mainly in their relation to the European and Christian world'. Vicky Morrisroe, 'Eastern History with Western eyes: Edward Freeman, Islam and Orientalism', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 16 (2011), pp. 24-45 offers a reading of these texts influenced by the work of Edward Said.

[16] Freeman, *Ottoman Power,* p. 6.

[17] Freeman, *Saracens*, p. 41.

[18] Freeman, *Saracens*, p. 42.

[19] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series* (London, 1879), pp. 393-4.

[20] Ibid., pp. 396, 418.

[21] Ibid., pp. 194-5.

purely Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, or anything else'. For the purposes of the historian, Freeman argued, race was

> a relation in which the community of blood is the leading idea, and in which, where natural community of blood does not exist, its place is supplied by something which by a legal fiction is looked upon as its equivalent.[22]

Here, as we shall see, Freeman drew on the third lecture of Sir Henry Maine's *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions*, where Maine had sought to show that the idea of kinship, though not necessarily its reality, was the foundation of 'the earliest tie which knitted men together in communities'.[23] By the 'legal fiction' of adoption or assimilation, strangers could partake of that tie; and in the West assimilation had been the rule.

In the East, however, assimilation had been the exception. For Freeman, the distinguishing feature of the history of Eastern Europe, Europe's 'border-land',[24] was the 'abiding presence' of 'nations wholly alien to the Aryan stock'.[25] There, an Aryan majority was ruled by a Turanian elite. To explain why the Aryan Slavs had failed to assimilate the Turanian Turks where they had succeeded in assimilating the Turanian Bulgarians, Freeman looked to religion. The Bulgarian had been 'a mere heathen savage', fit to 'become a pupil', differences of 'race and speech' notwithstanding. The Turk, on the other hand, was 'burthened with the half-truth of Islam, with the half-civilization of the East', and for that reason could not 'become a real pupil of Christian civilization'.[26]

---

[22] Ibid., p. 198.
[23] Sir Henry Maine, *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions,* (3rd ed., London, 1880), p. 64. See John Burrow, 'Henry Maine and mid-Victorian Ideas of Progress' in Alan Diamond (ed.), *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 55-69.
[24] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 22, 232.
[25] Ibid., p. 392.
[26] Ibid., p. 396.

Ironically, it was Freeman's appreciation for Islam's character as a reforming religion that led him to this conclusion: surveying Oriental scholarship, he dismissed alike Aloys Sprenger's theory of Mahomet's 'hysteric madness' and William Muir's suggestion that Islam bore the traces of 'Satanic influence'.[27] On the contrary, Freeman echoed medieval theologians in thinking that the reason why Islam had exercised 'so blighting an influence on every land where it has been preached' was that

> it is an imperfect system standing in the way of one more perfect. Islam has just enough of good to hinder the reception of a greater good. When Islam is preached to a tribe of savage heathen, its acceptance is in itself an unmixed blessing. But it is a blessing which cuts off all hope of the reception of a greater blessing; the heathen, in his utter darkness, is far more likely to accept the faith of Christ than the Mahometan in his state of half enlightenment.[28]

In Eastern Europe, then, 'the distinction of religion kept on for ever the distinction between conquerors and conquered'.[29] Islam, in short, had made assimilation impossible, and racial contrasts between East and West were made still 'keener by the most sharply drawn of all differences between creed and creed'.[30]

The contrasting example of the East threw the unique character of Europe's history into deeper relief, and in both monographs Freeman juxtaposed the 'progressive, legal, monogamous, and Christian' West, and the 'stationary, arbitrary, polygamous, and Mahometan' East.[31] If European history was 'one unbroken drama',[32] then the East presented its antithesis. Indeed, with the characterization 'stationary', Freeman came close to claiming that the East simply had no history: 'instead of the gradual development of political systems, we find only the personal substitution of ruler instead

---

[27] Freeman, 'Mahomet', pp. 118, 120. For Muir, Sprenger, and their Orientalist context, see Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing* (London, 2007).
[28] Freeman, 'Mahomet', p. 132.
[29] Freeman, *Ottoman Power*, p. 71.
[30] Edward Freeman, *The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times* (4 vols., London, Macmillan, 1891-4), i. 31.
[31] Freeman, *Saracens*, 4; Freeman, *Ottoman Power*, pp. 5-21.
[32] Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, p. 306.

of ruler, of dynasty instead of dynasty, of nation instead of nation'. Whereas analogies between different periods of Western history 'afford even more instruction in the points of difference than in those of similarity', in the East 'analogy rises well nigh to identity'. Small wonder that Freeman found Eastern history monotonous.[33]

But the East and West offered more than an illuminating contrast. Freeman took their conflict as the great theme of universal history: it was, he argued, the 'one aspect in which all … periods form one whole'.[34] That conflict, for Freeman, was 'the "Eternal Eastern Question", the undying question between the civilization in the West and the barbarism of the East',[35] and it structured his account of 'the main outlines of European history' in the *Chief Periods of European History* (1886).[36] Here, the history of Europe was written as a series of conflicts between the successive 'champions'[37] of the East (Carthaginians, Persians, Saracens and Turks) and the Aryan West (Greeks, Romans and Teutons). The Eastern Question united disparate periods and places: that 'the day of Zama ... must be set down by the still abiding world of Europe as a great salvation, a crowning mercy, alongside of the work of Ætius and Theodoric and the work of the elder Charles' is Freeman's way of comparing the defeat of the Carthaginians in 202 BC, the defeat of the Huns in 451, and the defeat of the Turks outside Vienna in 1683.[38] This was essentially a Herodotean story, and it is no coincidence that Freeman singled

[33] Freeman, *Saracens*, p. 4. Cf. *Chief Periods*, p. 10: 'I am speaking now of history in the narrower sense, of the continuous political history of man. With the strangers who lay without this great brotherhood … we have to deal only when they come across men of our own household.'
[34] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 4.
[35] Ibid., p. 5. The 'Eternal Eastern Question' was a phrase coined by Lord Derby, hence Freeman's quotation marks (see Ch. 1, n. 1 above). Like many others, Freeman adopted the expression, in part ironically since he entertained a low opinion of Derby's intelligence.
[36] Ibid., p. ii.
[37] E.g. Freeman, *Chief Periods*, pp. 5, 63.
[38] Ibid., p. 53.

out Herodotus, 'who better knew the meaning of the world's history than the diplomatists of modern days' for special praise.[39]

Freeman's last book, his unfinished multi-volume *History of Sicily* (1891-4), was cast as 'a contribution to Universal History' and, here too, that history was framed by the Eastern Question. Freeman begins with the declaration that 'the eternal Eastern Question ... may be taken as the truest motto of Sicilian history'.[40] Only by appreciating their role in the history of the Eastern Question could the 'full historic significance' of events and individuals be fully understood.[41] In other words, the Eastern Question was not merely a theme but an heuristic: an interpretative key, like the comparative method, that could unlock the real meaning of the past.[42] Needless to say, it was an heuristic that could sometimes issue in prolepsis, as when Freeman, following an idea of Arnold's, claimed that 'the Greek kept the greater part of Sicily for Europe until the Roman was able to secure the whole'.[43] Whether the Greeks who fought Carthage in the fourth century BC appreciated that their struggle was merely the world-historical overture to the Punic Wars is doubtful, but to Freeman that would have been beside the point.

As we have seen, the Eastern Question also suggested the sort of structuring analogies to which Freeman was so partial, and that tendency reaches its culmination in the *History of Sicily*. When Freeman writes, for example, that we cannot appreciate the importance 'of Roger and William the Good without going back to Pyrrhos and Timoleôn',[44] he is linking the Norman conquest of Saracen Sicily with the warfare between Greeks and Carthaginians for control of the island over a millennium earlier:

[39] Ibid., pp. 18, 5. Cf. Freeman, *Sicily*, i. vi; and 'Mahomet', 102: 'The rivalry of East and West ... was, in the eyes of Herodotus, the subject of the drama of human history'.
[40] Freeman, *Sicily*, i. viii.
[41] Ibid., i. 44.
[42] Cf. Freeman, *Methods of Historical Study*, p. 23.
[43] Ibid., i. 8.
[44] Ibid., i, 44.

both, for Freeman, were instances of 'the strife between Aryan and Semitic man'.[45] Analogies of this kind give a cyclical character to the *History of Sicily*, recalling the hermeneutics of type and antitype:

> Sparta and Epeiros sent forth a line of princes, who come half as deliverers, half as conquerors ... They too have their cycle. They are repeated in a later series of conquerors and deliverers ... Belisarius, George Maniakês, Roger of Hauteville, Peter and Frederick of Aragon … answer to the series from Archidamos to Pyrrhos … And, last of all, the unsullied glory of Timoleôn shines forth again in the unsullied glory of Garibaldi.[46]

In passages like these, the Eastern Question is used to link events over the course of three millennia, and it is clear that Freeman did not exaggerate when he expressed his belief that Sicily's 'calling' as the 'battle-field of East and West' was the 'highest aspect' of her history.[47] Indeed, when his collaborator and son-in-law Arthur Evans composed the epitaph to the posthumously published concluding volume of the *History of Sicily*, it was to Freeman's absorption with the 'Eternal strife' and the clash of 'East and West, Thraldom and Freedom' that he fittingly adverted.[48]

Evans' juxtaposition of 'East and West' with 'Thraldom and Freedom' was moreover an allusion to how enmeshed Freeman's conception of the Eastern Question was with his emphatically Liberal politics. Looking back, Freeman would locate the first stirrings of incipient Liberalism in his childhood. One of his earliest enthusiasms, aged eleven, was for 'the affairs of Spain and Portugal', and he composed a poem, dated 10 September 1834, to commemorate a victory of the Carlist forces: he must have been, he later reflected, 'something of a Home Ruler already.'[49] Around the same time, he

[45] Ibid., i, 31.
[46] Ibid., i, 24-5.
[47] Ibid., i, 11.
[48] Ibid., iv, p. vii.
[49] W. R. W. Stephens (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (2 vols., London, 1895), ii. 11; Edward Freeman, 'A Review of My Opinions', *The Forum* 13 (April 1892), pp. 145-60 at p. 146.

acquired a copy of Wilkinson's historical atlas, a publication that he came to believe 'affected me for life':

> The old map showed Germany and Hungary with a marked boundary between them. In the new map all Hungary and a great piece of Germany—as also a great piece of Italy—had gone to make up what seemed to me a new thing called 'Austria.' This I did not like.[50]

In Freeman's telling, his juvenile attachment to the integrity of national boundaries, learnt from Wilkinson's atlas, was only amplified by the influence of Thomas Attwood, founder of the Birmingham Political Union and a passionate advocate of Polish independence, who was Freeman's uncle by marriage, and his enthusiasm proved infectious.[51]

Autobiographical teleologies, of course, are notoriously unreliable. It seems almost too good to be true that Freeman should have cultivated his nascent liberalism with the aid of an historical atlas and a history of Poland; and as he admitted, his support for the Poles waned as he grew older. Yet in many respects, Freeman's later enthusiasms are of a piece with his childhood memories. His Liberalism was always, as John Burrow observed, 'the Byronic and Mazzinian creed and rhetoric of the 1830s and 1840s'.[52] He and his allies, Freeman later complained, 'spoke on behalf of the Greek and the Slave, only as both we and others were wont to speak on behalf of the Pole, the Lombard, and the Hungarian'.[53] He resented that few of his contemporaries were so consistent. To Finlay he denounced 'wiseacres who lay down one rule for Magyars and Lombards, and another for Greeks and Bulgarians'.[54] Freeman agreed with his friend Wilhelm Ihne, the German historian and philologist, who thought that

[50] Freeman, 'Opinions', p. 147.
[51] Ibid., 149.
[52] Burrow, *Liberal Descent*, p. 156.
[53] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', p. 748.
[54] Freeman to Finlay, 25 Jan 1858 in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 236.

'the re-organisation of Europe on a national basis' was 'the work of our age'.[55] Garibaldi had an honoured place in a photograph album reserved for anyone 'who kills a tyrant or otherwise delivers any place'.[56]

By contrast, imperialism was Freeman's bête noire. In 1857 he had castigated the Anglo-Persian War and the Second Opium War as 'mere murder and brigandage',[57] and in 1880 he declared his hatred of the British Army: 'accomplices with the Jew [*i.e.* Lord Beaconsfield] in the murther [*sic*] of the Zulus'. Indeed, his loathing for the British soldiers who boasted of conquering the free Zulus was, he declared, 'in exact proportion to my admiration for the men who fought at Senlac', in defence of English freedom.[58] When the time came, his Liberal, anti-imperial principles would place him firmly on what he called the 'Dutch' side in the wars of German unification. Reflecting on the merits of 'Isaiah's hymn of triumph over the doomed tyrant of Babel', he immediately drew a contemporary parallel. 'Surely', he wrote, 'that glorious hymn never sounded in men's ears with a more thrilling voice than in September 1870'.[59] The same principles made Freeman sympathetic to the cause of Home Rule in Ireland. 'I cry out', he admitted, 'for free Bulgaria, and free everything else … and I cannot help seeing that geographical reasons alone will always hinder Ireland from being joined to Great Britain'.[60] Freeman would draw out the parallel between Ireland and the Balkans more fully in letters to *The Times* in the years immediately preceding his death.[61]

Freeman's Liberalism derived ultimately from moral conviction, and he was proud to acknowledge his debt in this regard to Thomas Arnold, 'that great teacher of historic

[55] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/7, Ihne to Freeman, 3 Oct. 1876.
[56] Freeman to Finlay, 7 Oct. 1863, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 288-90.
[57] Freeman to Finlay, 10 May 1857, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 234.
[58] Freeman to W. R. W. Stephens, 8 March 1880, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 198-9.
[59] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 2nd Series* (London, 1873), p. 74.
[60] Freeman to anon., 8 Feb. 1880, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 194-5.
[61] Freeman, 'Croatia And Ireland', *The Times* (17 Sept 1887), p. 12; 'Analogies of Home Rule', *The Times* (1 Nov. 1888), p. 8.

truth, that greater teacher of moral right'. It had been Arnold's 'higher calling', he thought, to show that 'history is a moral lesson'.[62] For Arnold and so many of the so-called Liberal Anglican historians, history was to nations what biography was to individuals.[63] From this anthropomorphic conception of the nation—the so-called genetic analogy—it followed that nations should be guided by the same moral principles as individuals; 'public crimes', indeed, were even more opprobrious than individual crimes, Freeman thought, because they had the potential to be greater in scale: 'the betrayers and murderers of nations are more truly, more deeply, guilty than the betrayers and murderers of particular men'.[64] This argument was a recurring theme in Freeman's articles and letters to newspapers. The Turks were sinning by oppressing the Eastern Christians; and the British people were collectively complicit in that crime. Freeman's call for national 'rites of lustration', then, was more than rhetorical hyperbole: from his Arnoldian belief in the moral 'inner life' of nations, it followed that 'to soften down one's language … is in some sort partaking of the evil which we shrink from honestly denouncing as evil'.[65] Those who advanced the cause of the Bulgarians, he thought, were simply those who 'believe in right and wrong, which your ranting and roaring Tory and your cut and dried Whigs do not'.[66] The Eastern Question was thus above all a moral question—and Freeman was prepared to concede to Edith Thompson that he could be 'a pretty keen controversialist when I have any common ground of moral sentiment … to start from'.[67] The same sensibility, it might be noted, underlay

[62] Freeman, *Methods of Historical Study*, pp. 6-7.
[63] Arnold, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 4 & *passim*. See Duncan Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge, 1952); James Kirby, *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870-1920* (Oxford, 2016), p. 34.
[64] 'National Morality', *Princeton Review* (July 1878), pp. 641-74 at p. 671.
[65] 'National Morality', p. 671.
[66] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 1 Nov. 1876.
[67] Freeman to Edith Thompson, 26 March 1880, in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 199.

his opposition to vivisection—'a question which is distinctly a moral one'—and foxhunting.[68]

Freeman's Arnoldian conviction that history was a moral lesson underpinned his conception of universal history; what he called the 'unity of history'.[69] 'The same eternal laws of right and wrong', he believed,

> are to be applied in forming our estimate of the actors in [both the past and the present]. The championship of right and the championship of wrong bear exactly the same character in any age. A Montfort and a Gladstone, a Flambard and a Beaconsfield, must stand or fall together.[70]

The Eastern Question, so prominent among Freeman's enthusiasms, was in fact merely one instance of a still more fundamental conflict between right and wrong. Indeed, it was his acute sense of history's morality that underpinned Freeman's sense of the Eastern Question's significance. That the West represented right and the East represented wrong was the premise for analogies connecting disparate people and periods. In Freeman's Liberal pantheon, his photograph album of contemporary freedom-fighters had its equivalent in earlier day: as we have seen, 'the King who died upon the hill of Senlac', he believed, 'finds his only worthy peer in the Emperor who died before the gate of Saint Rômanos'.[71] The subject nations of south-eastern Europe similarly found their analogues in the conquered Saxons, and in the victims of Spartan dominion in fifth-century Greece. In 1849, contributing to a debate over the proper direction of historical studies at Oxford, Freeman had explicitly endorsed historical comparisons of this kind:

> If a question be set concerning … the relations between the conquering Dorians and the conquered Achaeans, let it be understood that *no information illustrating the relations of conqueror and conquered in all ages will be considered out of place* in the answer.[72]

---

[68] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 276.
[69] Elaborated most clearly in Edward Freeman, *The Unity of History* (London, 1872).
[70] Freeman, *Ottoman Power*, p. viii.
[71] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ii. 44. See above, p. 72.
[72] Stephens, *Life and Letters,* i. 124, emphasis added.

He would subsequently make the parallel between the 'Englishman in the first days of the Norman Conquest' and Bulgarians under Turkish rule.[73] Freeman's two most sustained works of historical writing—the *History of the Norman Conquest* and the *History of Sicily*—were thus united by a common theme.

Like the *History of the Norman Conquest*, Freeman's *History of Sicily* was also concerned with an episode of what he called 'past history', albeit history freighted with consequences for the present. As far as Sicily was concerned, the 'Eternal Question' had 'met with its solution by the sword of the Norman', and the island had been henceforth 'ever Aryan, European, Christian'.[74] In south-eastern Europe, however, no such solution had been found, and Freeman was, as we have seen, actively engaged with the politics of the Eastern Question in these lands during his own lifetime. As his biographer W. R. W. Stephens observed, 'the speeches which he made, the articles and letters which he wrote during the next five or six years on the Eastern Question, would fill a large volume'.[75] As we have seen, that was arguably an underestimate. But as Stephens also noted, Freeman's 'enthusiasm and his antipathy [for the Turks] were … the outcome … of convictions based upon a long and careful study alike of ancient history and of recent events'.[76] Freeman's engagement with the Eastern Question in the Balkans, in other words, was deeply enmeshed in his understanding of its history.

That history was a subject to which Freeman devoted considerable attention in the pages of *The Ottoman Power in Europe*, *The Chief Periods of European History*, and a slew of periodical articles, many subsequently collected in his third series of *Historical Essays*. The story began, of course, when the Greek 'appears on the stage of

---

[73] Edward Freeman, 'Race and Language', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (March 1877), pp. 711-41 at p. 180.
[74] Ibid., p. 34.
[75] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 103.
[76] Ibid.

the world as the first champion of the great cause' in 'the earlier stages of the strife which is still waging'.[77] But it was for the Greek's successor, the Eastern Empire, that Freeman reserved special sympathy, and it was with the history of the Empire that he most frequently sought to contextualise the contemporary politics of the Eastern Question.[78] The Byzantine state had been a bulwark against the East for 'a thousand years of eventful history',[79] cherishing 'the flame of civilisation and literature when it was well-nigh extinct throughout Western Europe', and preserving the inheritance of Greece and Rome 'till the nations of the West were once more prepared to receive the gift and despise the giver'.[80] Moreover, far from being a 'dying state … weak, contemptible—in the favourite slang, "effete"—from the very beginning',[81] the Empire had 'endured the first onslaught of the victorious Saracens … and made the successor of the Prophet tremble before the arms of the triumphant Caesar'.[82] Indeed, the Eastern Empire had been 'foremost in the strife' until 1453, and for Freeman the 'Eternal Question' was 'the very substance of her whole history'.[83]

In his enthusiastic rehabilitation of the Eastern Empire, Freeman followed in the footsteps of his friend and correspondent George Finlay, whose seven-volume *History of Greece* was in many ways the most remarkable intellectual achievement of nineteenth-century Philhellenism. Educated in the law at Glasgow and Göttingen, Finlay had fought in the Greek War of Independence alongside Frank Abney Hastings before making Greece his home. He was a reluctant author who turned to writing the history of Greece only when his ambitions to contribute to the 'active life' of the new

[77] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 11f.
[78] For Freeman's contributions to Byzantine historiography, see Paul Stephenson, 'Edward Freeman (1823-1892), a Neglected Commentator on Byzantium and Modern Greece', *The Historical Review*, 4 (2008), pp. 119-56.
[79] Freeman 'The Illyrian Emperors and Their Land', p. 5; Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 232.
[80] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series,* p. 232.
[81] Ibid., p. 233.
[82] Ibid., p. 234
[83] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 160.

Greek state, as a gentleman farmer in the Morea, were frustrated. As he explained to Freeman, history was his 'medicine for reaching the period of political discussion' that Greece under Bavarian had never attained.[84] Finlay's work never won a mass audience. Indeed, his 'vague presentiment', articulated to Freeman with characteristic plangency, 'that a want of literary skill & a too long residence abroad will prevent my work having buoyancy enough to float down the streams of time' has largely come to pass. With the exception of a suggestive essay by the late J. M. Hussey, Finlay's intellectual biography has never been written, nor has any attempt been made to measure the extent of his influence.[85] Yet he was celebrated by his contemporaries: for John Morley, Finlay 'had more of the spirit of true history than most historians then alive', and Freeman once called the *History* 'the greatest work which British historical literature has produced since the days of Gibbon', freely acknowledging Finlay's central contribution to 'my historical system'.[86]

The first five of Finlay's seven volumes were written in dialogue with Edward Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*. To Gibbon, 'the subjects of the Byzantine Empire, who assume and dishonour the names both of Greeks and Romans, present a dead uniformity of abject vices, which are neither softened by the weakness of humanity, nor animated by the vigour of memorable crimes'.[87] But Finlay rescued the Eastern Roman Empire from what his editor called Gibbon's 'depreciatory view',[88] weighting the undoubted 'defects and vices of the political system' against 'the splendid achievements of the

[84] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF 1/2/59, Finlay to Freeman, 29 April 1856.
[85] See, however, J. M. Hussey's insightful essay, 'George Finlay in Perspective: A Centenary Reappraisal', *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 70 (1975), pp. 135-44, and the introductions to J. M. Hussey (ed.), *The Journals and Letters of George Finlay* (2 vols., Camberley, 1995) and J. M. Hussey, *The Finlay Papers: A Catalogue* (London, 1973).
[86] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903), i. 605; Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 241-2; Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 237.
[87] Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. David Womersley (3 vols., London, 1994), iii. 24.
[88] George Finlay, *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time*, ed. H. F. Tozer (7 vols., Oxford, 1877), i. vii.

emperors, and the great merits of the judicial and ecclesiastical establishments'. Above all, he told the story of the continuity—against the odds and under foreign domination—of Greek national identity:

> Though the local institutions of the Greeks proved less powerful than the central despotism of their conquerors, they possessed greater vitality. Their nationality continued to exist even after their conquest ... neither the Roman Caesars, nor the Byzantine emperors, any more than the Frank princes and Turkish sultans, were able to interrupt the continual transmission of a political inheritance by each generation of the Greek race to its successors.[89]

Finlay's account of the continuity of Greek national life thus marked a decisive departure in British historiography. It also, in a sense, answered Fallmerayer's critique of Philhellenism; for if the Greeks had never forfeited their national identity—the Slavonic migrations of the sixth century that had so diluted their 'Hellenic blood' notwithstanding—then they were still the rightful heirs of classical antiquity and legitimate beneficiaries of the Philhellenism it inspired. It was a thesis which Freeman wholeheartedly embraced, validating as it did his Arnoldian sense of 'the unity of history'.[90] Though the Greek nation had, like other nations, England included, 'been affected ... by the law of adoption … all that gives it historic life and national being,' he insisted, 'is, and always has been, Greek'.[91]

Freeman's receptiveness to Finlay's rehabilitation of the Eastern Roman Empire was only amplified by his enduring enthusiasm for the Eastern Church; an enthusiasm that had its roots in the Oxford Tractarianism of the 1840s. 'The Last Mass at St Sophia', a poem he composed in December 1844, is characteristically Tractarian, with its reverently detailed evocations of the Eastern liturgy, and its self-consciously

---

[89] Ibid, i. xvii.
[90] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF 1/2/59, Finlay to Freeman, 29 April 1856; Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 237, 240-1.
[91] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 334.

mediaeval vocabulary: the Ottomans are described, for example, as a 'paynim crew'.[92] As James Kirby has argued so persuasively, when Freeman 'had rejected Rome for good' in around 1848, he 'became increasingly fascinated with Eastern Orthodoxy'.[93] Admiring references to 'that grand Eastern liturgy that you might say in St Sophia' began to litter his correspondence.[94] While he disclaimed 'any strictly theological point of view' in an extensive appreciation of 'The Eastern Church' in the pages of the *Edinburgh Review*, Freeman nevertheless followed the Tractarians in identifying the Orthodox faith as 'the greatest existing witness to the principle that national independence and religious intercommunion are in no way inconsistent': the churches of the East were 'strictly national, admitting no foreign jurisdiction, and yet retain the fullest intercommunion with the equally independent Churches of other nations', he explained.[95] The historian of federal government, in other words, was also an advocate of a federal church, and to Freeman this system was 'surely the highest ecclesiastical ideal on earth'. An Anglican, he wrote, 'feels an irresistible attraction to the ancient churches of the East',[96] and he celebrated the renewal of interest in forging links between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy. It was an affinity that provides an important context for his long engagement with the Eastern Question.

Freeman's interest in the Eastern Church was shared by many of his friends and contemporaries, and in particular those who bore the stamp of Tractarianism. As High Commissioner for the Ionian Isles, Gladstone had been widely criticised for venerating

---

[92] JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF 3/3/2.
[93] James Kirby, 'From Tractarian to Democrat: The Intellectual Formation of Edward Freeman', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 31-45 at p. 41. For Freeman's attitude to Roman Catholicism, see Colm Ó Siochrú, '"Edward Semper Augustus": Edward Freeman on Rome, the Papacy, and the Unity of History', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 47-63.
[94] E.g. Freeman to F.H. Dickinson, 4 Dec. 1881 in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 242; Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 8 Dec. 1882. Freeman dealt with this subject at length in Freeman, 'The Eastern Church'.
[95] Freeman, 'The Eastern Church', pp. 338, 326-7.
[96] Ibid., pp. 338, 357.

the ring of a Greek archbishop on Corfu; an incident which savoured to many, as Morley observed, of 'the fearsome flavour of the Puseyite'.[97] Like Freeman, Gladstone freely admitted that 'as a member of a western church not in the Latin Communion' he felt 'a special interest in the Church of the East', taking a keen and active interest in ecumenical initiatives for reunion.[98] Indeed, as David Bebbington observes, it was Gladstone's affinity for Orthodoxy, already keenly developed by the 1840s, that would 'undergird his protests on behalf of the suffering Christians of the East'.[99] The same was true of Freeman's ally Henry Liddon, another Oxonian Anglo-Catholic who shared his admiration for the antiquity of Eastern Orthodoxy. Visiting Saint Petersburg, Liddon wrote to William Bright, Oxford's regius professor of ecclesiastical history, to describe a service he had attended in St Isaac's Cathedral, rhapsodising that 'there was an aroma of the fourth century about the whole which was quite marvellous'. On the same visit, Liddon also assured Metropolitan Philaret that 'many English Christians longed to see the time when Sancta Sophia at Constantinople would be again in the hands of the Œcumenical Patriarch'.[100] There are also obvious parallels, too, with Freeman's friend William Stubbs, who succeeded to his fellowship in that seat of Tractarianism, Trinity College, Oxford, and who was, like Liddon, an active member of the Eastern Church Association, contributing its inaugural occasional paper on the apostolic succession of the Church of England.[101]

---

[97] Morley, *Gladstone*, i. 609. Cf. Viscount and Viscountess Strangford, *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic* (London, 1864), p. 79.

[98] Gladstone to Tosti, 20 Aug. 1860, quoted in H. C. G. Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East' in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 15 (1978), pp. 417-42 at p. 426.

[99] David Bebbington, *The Mind of Gladstone: Religion, Homer, and Politics* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 127-8. As Bebbington also observes, for Gladstone the Eastern Church had the additional advantage of representing 'in a sense, the continuity of the civilization that stemmed from Homer'.

[100] Liddon to Reverend W. Bright, 29 July 1867 in J. O. Johnston (ed.), *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (London, 1904), pp. 102-5.

[101] See William Stubbs, 'The Apostolic Succession of the Church of England', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 1 (London, Eastern Church Association, 1866). The literature on the relationship between Anglicanism and Eastern Orthodoxy is explored in a number of works, including J. F. Coakley, *The Church of the East and the Church of England* (Oxford, 1992); E. G. W. Bill (ed.),

Beaconsfield, who took the position—informed, it seems, by his youthful familiarity with the *Decline and Fall*—that the Eastern Orthodox Church had 'every error of the Roman added to its own intrinsic barbarism', was sensitive to this phenomenon. Gladstone, he suspected, recognized Eastern Orthodoxy 'as the infallible Church'. And when the Earl of Carnarvon declared at a Cabinet meeting that his most pressing concern was to improve the position of the Balkan Christians, the Prime Minister complained that the Secretary of State for the Colonies was under the influence of Liddon, Lord Bath, and 'a strange sacerdotal crew, who announce, that the real Eastern Question is the "Mutual Communion of the two Churches English & Greek!"' Beaconsfield had previously informed the Queen that Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State for India, was similarly 'thinking more of raising the Cross on the cupola of St Sophia than the power of England'.[102] In a sense, these denunciations were accurate enough. As Richard Shannon noted, Anglo-Catholics were a prominent constituency within the Bulgarian Agitation, and many were warmly disposed towards Eastern Orthodoxy.[103]

By 1876, indeed, sympathetic Anglican interest in the Eastern Church already had a long history. The prelates of the English Reformation respected Greek theological scholarship and admired the Greek Church Fathers; the Prayer Book of 1549 contains borrowings from the Greek Liturgy. By 1617, George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, had invited the Patriarch of Alexandria to send four young Greeks to study theology in England; and, by the agencies of his friend Thomas Roe, appointed ambassador to Constantinople in 1622, Abbot also began to acquire Greek manuscripts.

Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity (London, 1967), Ruth Rouse, Stephen Neill et al., *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva, 1993)*;* Mark D. Chapman, *The Fantasy of Reunion: Anglicans, Catholics, and Ecumenism, 1833-1882* (Oxford, 2014).

[102] Quoted in Miloš Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 197, 200.

[103] Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (2nd ed., Hamden Conn., 1975), p. 172.

Ten years later, Charles I was presented with the Codex Alexandrinus as a token of the Patriarch's affection.[104] While Abbot's Puritan inclinations won him the enmity of Archbishop Laud, the Laudian Church perpetuated contact with the Greek clergy and continued collecting Greek manuscripts—which it was one of Laud's longstanding ambitions to disseminate by establishing a Greek printing press at Oxford.[105] Both Abbott and Laud, in fact, saw the doctrine of the Greek Church as proof that Roman Catholic interpretations of tradition were inconsistent with the heritage of the broader Christian community, and were interested in reunion, as Scott Mandelbrote notes, 'as a means of asserting the antiquity of their own communion'.[106]

Under the Commonwealth, Dr Isaac Basire travelled the Levant as an 'Apostle'—in John Evelyn's phrase—of Anglicanism, proclaiming his 'desire to dispose and incline the Greek Church to a communion with the Church of England'. A year after the Restoration, Basire reiterated that case for a domestic audience in his *Ancient Liberty of the Britannick Church* (1661), and other High Churchmen agreed: Thomas Smith, for example, appointed Chaplain in Constantinople in 1668, believed that intercommunion between Anglicanism and Eastern Orthodoxy was both desirable and possible, a position he developed in his *An Account of the Greek Church* (1680). Similarly, in 1679, Sir Paul Ricault, former secretary of the Constantinople Embassy and sometime consul at Smyrna, published at Charles II's request a work on the Greek

[104] Steven Runciman, 'The Church of England and the Orthodox Churches in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in Bill, *Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity*, pp. 1-18; Scott Mandelbrote, 'English Scholarship and the Greek Text of the Old Testament, 1620-1720: The Impact of the Codex Alexandrinus' in Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene (eds.), *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Surrey, 2006), pp. 74-93.
[105] Nicholas Tyacke, *Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), p. 203. See also R. W. Hunt, R. Barbour and J. J. G. Alexander, *Greek Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 8-9.
[106] Mandelbrote, 'English Scholarship and the Greek Text of the Old Testament', p. 79. See also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995).

Church that expressed his aspirations for reunion, entitled *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*.[107]

Under Charles II, interest in the Eastern Church was founded on much the same bases as it had been under Laud and Abbot earlier in the century. But in the aftermath of the Revolution of 1688, many Non-Jurors looked to the East with greater urgency as they sought an alternative to Popery on the one hand, and on the other an Anglican establishment which they had repudiated. Sometime in 1716, the Scottish Non-Juror Primus, Archibald Campbell, met Arsenius, Metropolitan of the Thebiad, and found him sympathetic to the idea of union. So he and his Non-Juror colleagues, headed by Jeremy Collier (who had been consecrated a Non-Juror bishop in 1718) and Thomas Brett prepared a document in Greek to be sent to the Eastern patriarchs detailing twelve proposals, twelve points of agreement, and five of disagreement. The Non-Jurors, they explained, wished to place themselves under the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and demanded that what they called the 'ancient English liturgy' be approved.[108]

As in so many respects, the Oxford Movement's interest in the Eastern Church thus represented a self-conscious revival of earlier Anglican enthusiasms. As Henry Liddon put it, 'when the Oxford movement of 1833 revived or reasserted the best traditions of the Reformed English Church, it naturally quickened old and profoundly religious yearnings for a restoration of visible unity between the separated sections of the great Christian Body'.[109] In particular, Tractarians drew on the 'branch theory' adumbrated by the Elizabethan divine Richard Hooker in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, a text republished by John Keble in 1836. Hooker had contended that,

---

[107] Runciman, 'The Church of England and the Orthodox Churches in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', pp. 8-10.
[108] Ibid., p. 15; Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 310; F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Anglican Church Principles* (New York, 1924), p. 159.
[109] Henry Liddon (ed.), *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference Held at Bonn* (London, 1875), p. xi.

> As the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names, so the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself.[110]

It was in Hooker's branch theory, indeed, that the very term 'Anglo-Catholic' was premised. Of course, enthusiastic ecumenicism did not necessarily follow, and the Oxford Movement accommodated a variety of positions on the contentious subject of intercommunion and reunion. William Ward, for example, asserted that the Church of England was indeed at Schism, and could not in conscience be otherwise if she believed the Roman Church to be corrupt; whereas William Palmer positively denied 'that we ever separated ourselves from the communion of the eastern or the western churches or that we refuse them communion at the present day'.[111] For many Tractarians, Ward included, ecumenicism was fundamentally concerned with the Roman Church; that, after all, was the subject of Pusey's *Eirenicon*. Like Palmer, however, some Tractarians were also keenly interested in the eastern churches, though this phenomenon has found comparatively few historians; perhaps because, as Colin Matthew observed, unlike Anglican relations with Rome, 'relations with Orthodoxy involved no immediate social or civil crisis and were entirely confined to a self-conscious élite'.[112]

In the early 1840s, a number of Tractarians and High Churchmen had been drawn into the controversy over the Jerusalem Bishopric. In 1842, for example, Pusey had criticized any attempt to 'convert' Orthodox Christians lest doing so should

---

[110] Richard Hooker*, Ecclesiastical Polity*, iii, 1.14.

[111] William Palmer, *The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy of the British Churches Vindicated Against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman in the* Dublin Review (London, 1840), p. 188; W. G. Ward*, The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered in Comparison with Existing Practice* (London, 1844), pp. 120-2. See Chapman, *Fantasy of Reunion*, pp. 10-26.

[112] Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East', p. 425. See however Chapman, *The Fantasy of Reunion*; Tatiana Soloviova, 'Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue in the 19th Century and Gladstone's Interest in the Reunion of Christendom', in Peter Francis (ed.), *The Gladstone Umbrella* (Hawarden, 2001), pp. 50–72; Geoffrey Rowell, 'Eastern Horizons: Anglicans and the Oriental Orthodox Churches', in Nigel Aston (ed.), *Religious Change in Europe, 1650–1914* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 381–97; Leon Litvack, *J. M. Neale and the Quest for Sobornost* (Oxford, 1994); P. E. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church* (Oxford 1929), pp. 23-60.

'immeasurably delay the prospect of union with that communion', and Archbishop Howley had guardedly agreed.[113] And around the same time, the Eastern Church began to capture the attentions of a number of more enthusiastic students. One of the most prominent was William Palmer, who had begun to take a keen interest in the Chaldean church in the 1830s, and played an important role in organizing George Percy Badger's Assyrian Mission of 1842.[114] In 1840, Palmer embarked upon the first of several visits to Russia; undertaken to study the theology of the Eastern Church, with a view to ultimately taking communion, and to lobby the Russian clergy in the cause of reunion. Upon his return, a number of publications ensued, including his anonymous *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic church of the East* (1846).[115] It was also in the 1840s that another ardent student of the Eastern Church, J. M. Neale, began work on his three-volume *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, its first volume appearing in 1847. Neale would go on to publish a number of novels with eastern settings, as well as theological works and a collection of *Hymns of the Eastern Church* (1862).[116]

To many contemporary commentators, Palmer and Neale's enthusiasm appeared eccentric, even ludicrous. As Freeman put it, 'the weak and foolish side of their character always prominently presents itself, while its more respectable elements seldom penetrate beyond the limits of their own party'.[117] But by April 1864 there was sufficient Anglo-Catholic interest in Eastern Orthodoxy to establish the Eastern Church Association, its founder-members including Henry Liddon, T. T. Carter (the warden of

[113] E. B. Pusey, *A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on Some Circumstances Connected with the Present Crisis in the English Church* (Oxford, 1842), pp. 111-136 at p. 117.
[114] Coakley, *The Church of the East*, p. 21 and *passim*.
[115] Henry Brandreth, 'The Church of England and the Orthodox Churches in the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries', in Bill, *Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity*, pp. 19-39 at p. 28.
[116] See Susan Drain, 'Neale, John Mason (1818–1866)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[117] Freeman, 'Eastern Church', p. 325.

the House of Mercy where Gladstone sent redeemed prostitutes), George Williams (editor, *inter alia*, of a collection of correspondence between eighteenth-century Non-Jurors and the Eastern clergy on the subject of reunion), Christopher Wordsworth (the High Church bishop of Lincoln) and Neale.[118] The Association's premise was that the Orthodox Church represented 'a genuine branch of the true Vine'. Moreover, its members could 'entirely sympathize with that jealous maintenance of the principles laid down in the Canons of the Œcumenical Councils, and attested by the consensus of the Catholic Fathers.' The Association's objective, therefore, was 'to evince that these principles are equally venerated in the Anglican Church'. Indeed, as George Williams put it, the onus 'of proving our Catholic pedigree' was on Anglicans, as members of the newer communion.[119] To that end, the Association published a series of occasional papers, beginning with a vindication of *The Apostolic Succession in the Church of England* by William Stubbs, and including papers by Pusey, Williams, and George Percy Badger.[120]

When the Vatican Council of 1869-70 effectively precluded any possibility of accommodation with Rome, Anglo-Catholic ecumenical interest in the Eastern Church only became more acute.[121] As Gladstone put it in his second Vatican pamphlet, the Eastern Church preserved 'an authentic and living record' of the primitive church's 'early provisions for a balance of Church-power, and for securing the laity against

[118] Brandreth, 'The Church of England and the Orthodox Churches', p. 30. See also M. S. Lawson (ed.), *Letters of John Mason Neale* (London, 1910), pp. 344-5 for the Association's initial division of labour.
[119] [George Williams] in Stubbs, 'The Apostolic Succession in the Church of England', p. 3.
[120] Stubbs, 'The Apostolic Succession in the Church of England'; E. B. Pusey, 'The Essential Unity of the Church of Christ', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 2 (London, 1866); George Williams, 'A Collection of Documents: Relating Chiefly to the Visit of Alexander Archbishop of Syros and Tenos to England in 1870', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 14 (London, 1872); George Percy Badger, 'The Syriac Liturgies', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 17 (London, 1875).
[121] See Chapman, *Fantasy of Reunion*, pp. 203-23.

sacerdotal domination'.[122] In due course, Döllinger's Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875 gave more tangible form to the 'indefinite feeling of sympathy' which Liddon claimed had existed between the Eastern and Anglican communions, 'ever since the Anglican Episcopate had repudiated the usurped supremacy of Rome'.[123] Most of the Anglican representatives at the Bonn Conferences were, perhaps unsurprisingly, members of the Eastern Church Association.[124] The increasing cordiality of relations between the Anglican and Orthodox clergy, indeed, was only interrupted by the Eastern Crisis of 1875, which stymied hopes of further reunion conferences. So the 'political crisis' in south-eastern Europe was thus, as Liddon's biographer noted, 'closely connected also with the hopes of reunion with the Eastern Church'.[125]

The small group of Tractarians to which interest in ecumenicalism and the Eastern Church was confined was very much Freeman's milieu, and this context helps to account for his enduring sympathy for Eastern Orthodoxy and Byzantium in general, as well as his decision to apportion the Eastern Church a rather more prominent role in his account of Greek history than Finlay had been prepared to concede it. Finlay, indeed, had explicitly questioned the idea that the church 'was the means of preserving [Greek] nationality during three centuries of servitude'. The Greeks had been led to exaggerate the importance of their church, he cuttingly suggested, by the desire 'to invest the only prominent national institution they possessed with all imaginary power and virtue'. In reality, Finlay argued,

> the primary cause of the preserving endurance of the Hellenic race was in its own obstinate nationality, not in the ecclesiastical organisation which was capable of being converted into an instrument of Ottoman oppression. The virtues which the rural population practised, and not the power which the church prostituted to the service of a Mohammedan government,

[122] Quoted in Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East', p. 437.
[123] Henry Liddon (ed.), *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference Held at Bonn* (London, 1875), p. xiii.
[124] Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East', p. 434.
[125] Johnston, *Life and Letters of Liddon*, p. 206.

> preserved the nation. The church of Constantinople was always more orthodox than it was Greek.[126]

Freeman, by contrast, insisted that the Greeks' 'Orthodox faith has been the badge of their nationality', believing, like Gladstone, that their 'religion was ... intimately associated with the preservation of their national life during their degradation'.[127]

Of course, enthusiasm for the Eastern Church was only one of several contexts which informed Freeman's sympathetic appraisal of the Byzantine Empire and its history. Indeed, as the preserver of the twin legacies of Greece and Rome, the Eastern Empire was also the natural beneficiary of the ardent classicism that complemented Freeman's medievalism. Greece ranked among Freeman's earliest enthusiasms. Ballad poetry, descanting on the glories of classical Greece, expressed the Byronic philhellenism of his youth.[128] In later years, the comparative method afforded Freeman the additional satisfaction of family pride: he found it 'one of the most quickening and ennobling of thoughts, that those men of Hellas were our kinsfolk, men of the same great family as ourselves'.[129] In the city states of Ancient Greece he would always identify 'the earliest and most brilliant ... of all the forms of man's political life', and his definition of politics was always Aristotle's.[130] But Rome exercised its fascination too, as J. R. Green complained. The historian of the Norman Conquest, after all, was also the schoolboy who had declaimed Horace in playground altercations.[131] For

---

[126] The most that Finlay was prepared to concede was that the parish priests did help, and 'had an influence on the fate of Greece quite incommensurate with their social rank': 'to their conduct we must surely attribute the confidence which the agricultural population retained in the promises of the Gospel, and their firm persistence in a persecuted faith'. Finlay, *History of Greece*, v. 152.
[127] H. C. G. Matthew (ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries: 1861-68* (Oxford, 1986), p. 200.
[128] See JRL, Freeman papers, EAF/3/3/2; Edward Freeman and George Cox, *Poems Legendary and Historical* (London, 1850), pp. 3-20, 39-49, 50-62. See also *Original Ballads by Living Authors*, ed. Reverend H. Thompson (London, 1850), which contains a poem by Freeman entitled 'The Last Address of the Emperor Canstantine Palaiologos to His People on the Eve of the Capture of Constantinople by the Turks'
[129] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 7.
[130] Ibid., pp. 39f.
[131] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 8.

Freeman, the Byzantine Empire had not only 'preserved the language of Thucydides and Aristotle'[132]—'my friend Aristotle',[133] as Freeman called him—but also 'the political power of Augustus and Constantine'.[134] As such, the Eastern Empire was 'the surest witness to the unity of history'.[135]

But whereas the Roman Empire in the West had passed on the baton of civilisation to the Teutons, in the East, Greeks and Romans had been joined by Slavs. For Freeman, 'the Slaves [*sic*] were to the Eastern lands of Rome, as the Teutons were to the Western, at once conquerors and disciples'.[136] The Slavs were members of the Aryan family of nations, and the comparative method had proved that 'all members of the great family are alike kinsfolk, entitled to stand side by side on equal terms'.[137] In Freeman's thought, racial antipathies were matched by equally ardent racial sympathies, and the Slavs' inclusion in the 'great family' proved them fit to be the heirs of Rome. Moreover, the Slavs were neither 'mere savages … nor yet, like the Saracens and Ottomans, the representatives of a rival system of religion, polity, and social life'.[138] The Slavs, on the contrary, 'looked with reverence to the city from which they had derived their religion, and whose civilization they had begun to appreciate and adopt'.[139]

A Slavonic empire at Constantinople, it followed, might 'have been a gain to Christianity and civilization',[140] and that thought sometimes inspired Freeman to counter-factual speculation:

> What if Samuel of Ochrida, and not Baldwin of Bruges or Mahomet of Brusa, had made his way within the walls of Constantinople, on an errand matching

[132] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 232.
[133] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 32.
[134] *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 232.
[135] Ibid., p. 241-2.
[136] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 100.
[137] Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, p. 307. Cf. Freeman, *Historical Essays, 2nd Series*, p. 235: in 'unrecorded days … Greek, Italian, Celt, Teuton, Slave, Hindoo, and Persian, were as yet members of one undivided brotherhood'.
[138] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 267.
[139] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii, 160.
[140] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, 267.

> the errand of the first Otto in the West, to make the Imperial city abide for ever a seat of Christian rule, as the head of a Roman Empire of the Slavonic Nation?[141]

A Slav conquest 'in the ninth century', he wrote elsewhere, 'might have prevented the necessity of contending against one in the nineteenth'.[142] That had been the Slavs' 'historic calling': they were participants in the 'Unity' of European history as the rightful Aryan heirs of a vindicated Byzantine Empire.[143] Freeman's phrasing recalls Macaulay's 'preserving revolution' in the tenth chapter of the *History of England*, and it is curious to reflect that Freeman may have regarded the prospect of a Slavonic Constantinople as something like a world-historical 1688. But unlike the Teutons in the West, they had played that role only imperfectly: the Eastern Empire had been too strong, Constantinople too important and impregnable. So the Slav had 'always remained an outsider, in a way in which the Teuton did not remain in the West'.[144] The Ottoman conquest of Constantinople and south-eastern Europe had erected a further obstacle between the Slavs and their world-historical destiny.

The *telos* of this history was still in the future, but it suggested an obvious solution to the Eastern Question. The Slavs' 'independent being, which once took a form which promised to become the dominant power of south-eastern Europe', was now 'shut up' in the 'little principality' of Montenegro, but it was full of latent potential.[145] Already in 1853, Freeman pointed out the opportunity for 'a new Aratus [of Sicyon][146] or Washington [to] establish a great Græco-Slavic federation'.[147] Almost a decade later, in his *History of Federal Government*, Freeman returned to the same theme, arguing

---

[141] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, pp. 132-3.
[142] Stephens, *Life and Letters*, i. 160.
[143] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 100.
[144] Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 102.
[145] Freeman, 'The Illyrian Emperors and Their Land', p. 6.
[146] Aratus of Sicyon was one of the leaders of the Achaean League, a confederation of Greek city states formed in the 5th century BC and which Freeman treated at length in the *History of Federal Government.*
[147] Edward Freeman, 'Russians, Turks, Greeks, Slaves, and Danes', *The Spectator* (29 Oct. 1853), pp. 1037-8.

that the legacy of the Byzantine Empire could unite the Slav and Greek inhabitants of south-eastern Europe in a federal state:

> Here would be the grandest field that the world has ever seen for trying the great experiment of Monarchic Federalism. The nations of the Byzantine peninsula, differing in origin, language, and feeling, are united by common wrongs, by a common religion, and by the common reverence of ages for the Imperial City of the Basils and the Constantines.[148]

In such a scenario, Constantinople would become 'the Ægium[149] or Washington of a great south-eastern federation'.[150] As he put it elsewhere, 'everything tends to show that something in the shape of a federal union among the lands to be delivered, a federal union whose centre shall be the New Rome, is destined to take the place of the foul fabric of oppression which is doomed of God and man'.[151] History, in other words, indicated that what appeared to be the disparate peoples of south-eastern Europe were in fact a great federal state in embryo.

Freeman found evidence to support this contention in contemporary south-eastern Europe, using the comparative method to show that the Slavs were members of the 'great family' of European Aryans. He believed that they were climbing the same ladder to civilisation that the English had already ascended, identifying in the institutions and customs of the south-eastern European Slavs 'survivals' of social states through which the civilised nations of Western Europe had once passed themselves. Freeman's visit to the Dalmatian Coast and to Montenegro in 1876 proved suggestive of such comparisons. Montenegro in particular, he told his friends Richard Burton and Henry Liddon, offered the spectacle of 'a tribe and its prince civilizing themselves with next to no bother from outsiders'.[152] On another occasion, Freeman's observations prompted

[148] Freeman, *Federal Government*, i. 713.
[149] Ægium had been the capital of the Achaean League, along with the United States one of Freeman's model federations.
[150] Freeman, 'The Greek People and the Greek Kingdom', p. 388.
[151] Freeman, 'The Turks in Europe', p. 469.
[152] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 9 Nov. 1876; Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 142f.

him to write to his friend Sir Henry Maine with information about the 'communal lands' he had observed; for communal land tenure was a feature of the so-called 'village community', one of the earliest forms of social organisation identified by practitioners of the comparative methods, and the subject, as we shall see, of one of Maine's most important works.[153] The Slavs of south-eastern Europe, in other words, represented an early stage in the etiological history of civilisation and political institutions which more typically found its consummation in English history.[154]

[153] See in particular John Burrow, '"The Village Community" and the Uses of History in late-Nineteenth-Century England' in Neil McKendrick (ed.) *Historical perspectives* (London, 1974), pp. 255-84.
[154] See Michelle Tusan, *Smyrna's Ashes: Humanitarianism, Genocide and the Birth of the Middle East* (Berkeley, 2012). Tusan rightly observes that Freeman's sympathy for Orthodoxy allowed him to identify with the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire (pp. 8, 21 and *passim*). Whether Freeman, an outspoken critic of imperialism of any kind, would have endorsed the idea of Britain 'staking its claim in the Near East' (p. 3), rhetorically or otherwise, is another matter. See above, pp. 71-2, for a discussion of Freeman's attitude to imperialism.

Part Two
Intellectuals and the Eastern Crisis

Chapter Three

Framing the Eastern Question: Balkan Travel Literature

The crowd that assembled for the Eastern Question Association's National Conference on 9 December 1876 was much more familiar with south-eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire than even Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet had been on the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853. Some had visited the Balkans themselves, but many more had become acquainted with the region in the pages of travel literature. This chapter explores how Victorian travel writers portrayed south-eastern Europe, emphasising the ways in which they fostered an historically-minded approach to the pressing political problems posed by the Eastern Question.

A number of historians have studied this important genre. Many, following the influential example of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), have chosen to emphasise the ways in which nineteenth-century travel writers 'constructed' a putative Balkan 'other'. Maria Todorova, for example, declares that

> by being geographically inextricable from Europe, yet culturally constructed as "the other" within, the Balkans have been able to absorb conveniently a number of externalized political, ideological, and cultural frustrations stemming from tensions and contradictions inherent to the regions and societies outside the Balkans.[1]

Vesna Goldsworthy agrees, arguing that nineteenth-century travel writers were at work constructing 'an internal Other—a stranger within—against which Western European

[1] Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford, 1997), p. 188.

writers project and exorcize Europe's own identity-related taboos'.[2] Western writers, she believes, 'created a fictional Balkan world' in an act of 'cultural'—and even 'textual'—'colonisation'. Indeed, historians such as Goldsworthy and Todorova sometimes avow a relativism so extreme as to deny the Balkans any objective existence, reducing the region to nothing more than 'a series of overlapping imagined spaces'.[3] Tim Youngs, Reinhold Schiffer and Andrew Hammond are among the many historians who follow suit,[4] and while Michelle Tusan departs from this orthodoxy, noting that nineteenth-century authors frequently portrayed the Balkan Slavs as 'a people who shared a distant religious and cultural past with the British', she goes on to insist that Britain's 'imagined kinship with Eastern Christians' was a sleight of hand by which the British 'rhetorically incorporated the Ottoman Empire into [their] imperial network'.[5] These analytical categories, needless to say, are far from autochthonous.

Historiography of this kind has tended to obscure the true nature of many nineteenth-century travel writers' engagement with the Balkans, and this chapter is therefore distinctly revisionist. Rather than 'constructing' others, we will see that writers frequently identified distant kinsmen—even brothers—in the Orthodox Christian Serbs, Montenegrins, Bulgarians and Herzegovinians. In reading this literature, fraternity, indeed, is a more useful heuristic than alterity. While Victorians observers' cultural and intellectual preconceptions certainly shaped how they interpreted what they saw, they did not simply 'construct' or 'imagine' the Balkans. This chapter thus finds a common theme to nineteenth-century Balkan travel literature

---

[2] Vesna Goldsworthy, 'The Balkans in Nineteenth-Century British Travel Writing' in Tim Youngs (ed.), *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2006), pp 19-36 at p. 29.
[3] Vesna Goldsworthy, *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination* (New Haven CT, 1998), pp. x, 3.
[4] Andrew Hammond, *British and American Representations of the Balkans* (Cardiff, 2007); Reinhold Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama: British Travellers in Nineteenth-Century Turkey* (Amsterdam, 1999); Youngs, *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century*.
[5] Michelle Tusan, *Smyrna's Ashes: Humanitarianism, Genocide, and the Birth of the Near East* (Berkeley CA, 2012), pp. 3, 6-8, 13 and *passim*.

not in projected 'taboos', but rather in a shared sense that south-eastern Europe's identity ultimately resided in its history. Moreover, that history was generally thought to indicate that the Balkans—far from being an 'Other within'—were fundamentally European. Time and again, writers emphasised the many ways in which the Balkans had been part of Europe before the Ottoman conquest; and for many, the past seemed to be an indication of the shape of things to come.

This corrective to the scholarly consensus is important, because when the Eastern Question 'reopened' in the 1870s, many observers turned to travel literature to inform themselves about the Balkans. Supply followed demand, and fresh contributions to the genre graced the shelves alongside new editions of old classics. Publication statistics tell the story simply but eloquently: 18 new books of Balkan travel writing appeared in 1875, 116 in 1876, and 129 in 1877.[6] Reviewed in the periodicals; quoted in speeches; excerpted in pamphlets—travel writing was central to British intellectuals' engagement with the Eastern Question.

William Gladstone's appetite for such literature, for example, was voracious. His diary notes that in 1876 he read Arthur Evans' *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot*, William Denton's *The Christians of the East* (1st ed., 1863), John Cam Hobhouse's *Travels in Albania and Other Provinces of Turkey* (1st ed., 1813), James Creagh's *Over the Borders of Christendom and Eslamiah* (1876), Edward Clarke's *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa* (1st ed., 1810), Henry Barkley's *Between the Danube and the Black Sea* (1876), Paulina Irby's *Travels Through the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in Europe* (1st ed. 1867), and William Forsyth's *The Slavonic Provinces South of the Danube* (1876). In 1877, Gladstone added to this list J. M.

[6] Goldsworthy, 'The Balkans in Nineteenth-Century British Travel Writing', p. 28. See also Edward Cox, *A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel* (3 vols., Seattle, 1935-50).

Neale's *Notes, Historical and Picturesque, on Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria, Styria, with a Visit to Montenegro* (1861), William Stillman's *Herzegovina* (1877), J. Gardner Wilkinson's *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (1848), Viscount and Viscountess Strangford's *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic in 1863* (1864), James Baker's *Turkey in Europe* (1877) and William Denton's *Montenegro* (1877).[7]

It was no accident that all the works Gladstone recorded in his diary dated from the nineteenth century. By the time of the Bulgarian Agitation, Balkan travel literature had become an important and growing sub-genre, but this was a comparatively recent phenomenon. While the earliest Anglophone accounts of Balkan travel date back to the sixteenth century, a distinctive tradition had only really begun to form two hundred years later.[8] Until the end of the eighteenth century, British travellers had seldom visited south-eastern Europe, and travel accounts were correspondingly few. As late as the 1780s, Edward Gibbon could remark that Albania, 'a country within sight of Italy, is less known than the interior of America'.[9]

But around that time Greece began to displace Italy as the destination of choice for the grand tour—a shift only accelerated by the dislocations of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.[10] The typical grand tourist's enthusiasms evolved too, and while the classical past continued to exercise an undeniable attraction, the Ottoman-ruled Balkans increasingly appealed to the Romantic imagination. Above all, it was Byron who had succeeded in glamorizing contemporary Greece and Albania in poems such as *The Giaour* (1813), *The Bride of Abydos* (1813), *The Corsair* (1814), *The Siege of Corinth*

[7] H. C. G. Matthew (ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries: 1875-80* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 94-279.
[8] See Omer Hadziselimovic, *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (Boulder, 2001).
[9] Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. David Womersley (3 vols., London, 1994), i. 50.
[10] Jeremy Black, *The British and the Grand Tour* (London, 1985); J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Greek Revival* (London, 1972), p. 41. For the persistence of the Italian Grand Tour, however, see Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance* (London, 1998).

(1816) and *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812-8).[11] In Byron's verse, south-eastern Europe became alluringly exotic—a land of fearless outlaws and implacable despots.

South-eastern Europe's comparative isolation from western civilization only added to its exoticism, for while the region was an increasingly popular destination for British travellers of means, it remained untouched by mass tourism. As the Irish traveller James Creagh reflected at the turn of the twentieth century, even as late as the 1860s

> the frontier provinces of European Turkey and Austria were unknown to the west of Europe; and as they had not then been vulgarized by railways, the architecture, the ruins, the slow methods of travelling, the scenery, the life, the wild and beautiful music, the old-fashioned inns—like those in Chaucer or Cervantes—the costumes, the suggestive dances, the dominant and subject populations in the dominions of both the Sultan and the Emperor, as well as the manners and customs of the [Slavs] charmed and even fascinated me.[12]

But, as Creagh's comments indicate, the Balkans' allure did not derive merely from picturesque unfamiliarity: just as important was their capacity to evoke earlier and simpler eras in western European history—the eras of 'Chaucer or Cervantes'. One of Creagh's contemporaries, for example, identified in the southern Slavs 'a people living in a state of the most primitive simplicity, and practising all those virtues which distinguish men who have not yet been corrupted by the wealth, luxury, and artificial civilization of the West.'[13] That 'primitive simplicity' was calculated to appeal not so much to the Romanticism of *Childe Harold* as to that embodied in Sir Walter Scott's Waverley novels. Time and again, the inhabitants of the Balkans reminded Victorian travellers of 'the Scotch Highlanders one hundred years ago' that Scott had depicted so popularly. 'Does not the foregoing', one author inquired after relating a Balkan vignette,

---

[11] Nigel Leask, 'Byron and the Eastern Mediterranean: *Childe Harold* II and the "Polemic of Ottoman Greece"' in Drummond Bone (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Bryon* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 99–117; Massimiliano Demata, 'Byron, Turkey and the Orient' in Richard Cardwell (ed.), *The Reception of Byron in Europe* (2 vols., London, 2004), ii. 439–52.
[12] James Creagh, *Sparks from Campfires: An Autobiography* (London, 1901), p. 302.
[13] Edmund Spencer, *Travels in France and Germany in 1865 and 1866* (London, 1866), p. xi.

'read like a chapter in *Waverley*, or in *Rob Roy*?'[14] Another described his guide, armed to the 'teeth with gun, pistols, and dagger, and stalking away before me like one of the Highlanders in "Rob Roy" or "Waverley"'.[15] As we shall see, the inhabitants of the mountainous principality of Montenegro were particularly suggestive of such historically-minded analogies.

The Balkans were also replete with material for the Romantic movement's more scholarly and antiquarian dimensions. Just as Wilhelm and Jacob Grimm had collected and published German folklore earlier in the century, so scholars and amateurs began to collect and translate Balkan folk songs by the 1860s.[16] In 1861, for example, Robert Bulwer-Lytton (the poet, diplomat and future viceroy of India) published an anthology of *Serbski Pesme; or, National Songs of Servia* in 1861, celebrating 'the poetry of a people amongst whom literature is yet unborn; who in the nineteenth century retain, with the traditions, many also of the habits and customs, of a barbarous age'. For Lytton, the real fascination of that poetry lay in the authenticity with which it expressed the sentiments of the *folk*; for it originated, he believed, 'not in the heads of a few, but in the hearts of all. This is a poetry of which the People is the Poet ... "the People," as expressive of one great nationality.' Poetry and song of this kind were not to be found in industrialising and urbanising western Europe: 'that spontaneity and unity, that evidence of collective inspiration … has never survived the childhood of a people'.[17] So

[14] R. H. R., *Rambles in Istria, Dalmatia and Montenegro* (London, 1875), p. 217.
[15] W. F. Wingfield, *A Tour in Dalmatia, Albania, and Montenegro; with an Historical Sketch of the Republic of Ragusa* (London, 1859), p. 128.
[16] Most importantly, see Dimitur & Konstantin Miladinov, *Bŭlgarski Narodni P͡iesni* (Zagreb, 1861), an anthology published under the sponsorship of Bishop Joseph Strossmayer. See also Auguste Dozon, *Bŭlgarski Narodni P͡iesni: Chansons Populaires Bulgares Inédites* (Paris, 1875).
[17] Owen Meredith, *Serbski Pesme; or, National Songs of Servia* (London, 1861), pp. ix, x, xi.

the folk songs of Serbia and other Slavonic nations in south-eastern Europe were all the more poignant resources for Romantic nostalgia.[18]

But if nineteenth-century travellers were drawn to south-eastern Europe by new imperatives, in other respects many may be thought of as the successors to the eighteenth-century grand tourists who had formerly tended to confine their itineraries to western Europe and the antiquities of Greece. Most were affluent, and almost all were well-educated. Though several historians have accurately observed that an unusually large number of British travellers in the Balkans were female, those female travellers—just like the bulk of their male counterparts—always emerged from the upper echelons of society, distinctions of class arguably counting for more than distinctions of sex.[19] Lady Strangford, for example, advised her readers on where best to moor one's yacht on the Dalmatian coast, and the most advantageous locations for shooting snipe in Albania. Moreover, the grand tour's ethos was reflected in a notably learned travel literature that devoted considerable attention to archaeology, ethnography, manners, customs, and above all history.

The first significant nineteenth-century work of Balkan travel literature, indeed, was written by an author firmly situated within the traditions of the grand tour: Sir John Gardner Wilkinson. The son of an antiquarian clergyman, Gardner Wilkinson was educated at Harrow for three years before matriculating at Exeter College, Oxford, in 1816; but in 1819 he left the university without taking a degree to begin a grand tour, travelling through Europe to Italy, and then, in 1821, to Egypt—where he would remain for the next twelve years. His antiquarian and archaeological investigations,

[18] Cf. John Oxenford, 'The Brigands of Bulgarian Song', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 34 (Aug. 1876), pp. 362-7; John Oxenford, 'The Bogies of Bulgarian Song', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 34 (Oct. 1876), pp. 547-52.

[19] John Allcock and Antonia Young, *Black Lambs and Grey Falcons: Women Travellers in the Balkans* (Bradford, 1991). See also Brian Dolan, *Ladies of the Grand Tour* (London, 2001).

complemented by talented sketches, soon made Gardner Wilkinson the foremost Egyptologist of his era, fêted in learned circles. He published essays in the *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society* in addition to a series of books including specialist studies on hieroglyphics and a more general account of the *Topography of Thebes and General View of Egypt* (1835). Above all, his copiously-illustrated *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (1837) introduced several generations of British readers to the world of Ancient Egypt.[20]

But while Gardner Wilkinson is best known today for his contributions to Egyptology, Egypt did not monopolise his attention. At Harrow, he had transcribed some of Byron's manuscripts, and throughout his life, as his biographer notes, he was 'always drawn to places with Byronic associations'.[21] It is no surprise, therefore, that in 1844 Gardner Wilkinson made extensive travels in the Balkans, which issued four years later in a pioneering text, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (1848), which enjoyed an enduring influence throughout the nineteenth century. Arthur Evans, for example, who had catalogued Gardner Wilkinson's coin collection as a Harrow schoolboy, would draw on the older Harrovian's conclusions in his *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot* (1876).[22] Paulina Irby and Georgina Mackenzie even went so far as to travel with the German translation of *Dalmatia and Montenegro* constantly at hand during the expedition that gave rise to their own important volume of travel writing.[23] And during the Eastern Crisis of the 1870s, other authors including E. A. Freeman, William

[20] Jason Thompson, 'Wilkinson, Sir John Gardner (1797–1875)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[21] Jason Thompson, *Sir Gardner Wilkinson and His Circle* (Austin, Texas, 1992), p. 5.
[22] Ibid., p. 343.
[23] Paulina Irby and Georgina Muir Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (2 vols., 5th ed., London, 1877), ii. 271. Gardner Wilkinson's work appeared in German as *Dalmatien und Montenegro* (Leipzig, 1849).

Gladstone, Valerian Krasinski and William Denton all cited *Dalmatia and Montenegro* with admiration.[24]

Like his works on Egypt, Gardner Wilkinson's two volumes of *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, together amounting to almost 1,000 pages, are replete with erudite observations. Exhaustive descriptions of ruins, costumes and customs are frequently accompanied by illustrative sketches. Noblemen's family trees are traced back to the middle ages with antiquarian precision. But while Gardner Wilkinson gives free rein to a variety of learned enthusiasms, it was above all from history, he believed, that travel derived its interest. Tourists, he insisted, visited the antiquities of Rome rather than the better-preserved classical remains at Nîmes solely on account of Rome's more familiar historical associations. He therefore wrote with commensurate attention to the 'ancient and modern history' of the Balkans. Chapter three, for example, charts the history of Spalato.[25] Chapters five and six do the same for Ragusa and Montenegro respectively—the latter notably the first Anglophone account of that small principality's history.[26] Chapter nine chronicles 'The history of Dalmatia' from 'the arrival of the Slavonians' in the seventh century 'to the peace of 1814'; and appendices look further back still to the classical history and pre-history of the region.[27] Historical asides and allusions, moreover, punctuate the rest of Gardner Wilkinson's travel narrative.

Gardner Wilkinson's interest in history deeply informed how he interpreted what he saw in south-eastern Europe. Above all, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* is characterised by a fascination with the antique past typical of the classically-educated British grand

[24] Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88 at p. 282; W. E. Gladstone, 'Montenegro', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), pp. 360-79 at p. 379; Valerian Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (London, 1853), p. 106; [William Denton], 'Montenegro', *Church Quarterly Review*, 3 (Oct. 1876), pp. 158-88 at p. 159.
[25] John Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (2 vols., London, 1848), i. v.
[26] Ibid, i. 243-401; 402-564.
[27] Ibid., ii. 219-430; 431-455.

tourist. Sometimes that fascination could mislead. Writing of Mostar's sixteenth-century Ottoman bridge, for example, Gardner Wilkinson records that:

> The building of the bridge is attributed to Trajan, or, according to some, to Adrian [*sic*]; and reports speak of an inscription, that once existed upon it, with the name of one of those emperors. The Turks attribute its erection to Suleyman, the Magnificent; but the Vizir, in answer to my question respecting the date, said that "though they claim it as a work of the Sultan, the truth is, it was there long before his time, and was probably built by the Pagans." The Turk entirely concealed the original masonry; not a block is to be seen of Roman time, and the smallness of the stones, the torus under the parapet, and the spandril [*sic*] projecting slightly over the arch, give it all the appearance of Turkish. But the grandeur of the work, the form of the arch, and tradition, all argue in favour of its Roman origin; and the fact that the town being called Mostar, shows that an "*old bridge*" already existed there, where it received that name; and Mostar was a city long before the Turkish invasion of the country.[28]

This thesis, since discredited, is not purely of Gardner Wilkinson's invention: he was following other authorities, and there is no particular reason to doubt his account of the Ottoman Vizier's testimony.[29] But his acceptance of the bridge's putative Roman origins is of a piece with the rest of *Dalmatia and Montenegro*: elsewhere, for example, he attributes elements of Saracen and Norman architecture, such as rope and chevron mouldings, to late antique influence, and indulges in grand generalizations, seeing the legacy of Rome in 'the vertical line itself, which has always been considered the peculiar mark of Gothic, or church, architecture'. Describing the military tactics of the Montenegrins, Gardner Wilkinson quotes extensively from the *Stretegikon* of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice; and to analyse their system of government he refers to Procopius.[30] On a more mundane plane, wherever he went Gardner Wilkinson carefully noted Roman remains and recorded whatever classical inscriptions he found, often

[28] Ibid., ii. 59-60.
[29] For an extended discussion of the implications of Gardner Wilkinson's analysis of Mostar bridge, see Bozidar Jezernik, *Wild Europe: The Balkans in the Gaze of Western Travellers* (London, 2004), pp. 191-205.
[30] Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, i. 138-9, 24, 35.

offering full transcriptions.[31] All this served to incorporate the Balkans within the grand narrative of Europe's classical past, thereby affirming that their identity was ultimately European—even if their current government happened to be Ottoman.

But Gardner Wilkinson was equally immersed in contemporary scholarship, and his erudition is especially evident when he turns to the subjects of language and ethnicity, drawing on the conclusions of comparative philology which Friedrich Max Müller would popularise in Britain in the following decade to speculate about the pre-history of the Balkan Slavs. Greeks, Latins and Slavs, Gardner Wilkinson believed, were all alike 'offsets of the same parent stock': the 'Indo-European tribes, who emigrated out of Central Asia'. He noted the similarities between English and Slavonic words—'stone' and '*stina*'; 'brother' and '*brate*', 'sister' and '*sestra*'[32]—citing the German linguist Franz Bopp's *Comparative Grammar*, a pioneering text of German comparative philology which was first reviewed in English in 1851.[33] A table even juxtaposes the Slavonic, Sanskrit, Latin, Greek, German and Zend words for the cardinal numbers.[34] All this was proof, he believed, of strong and hitherto unexplored family ties in deep history between the English and the Slavs of southern Europe.

Gardner Wilkinson was equally daring when he contemplated the Balkans' place in universal history. 'All nations in their turn', he believed, appear to be afforded the opportunity 'of obtaining celebrity and power'; and the time had come for the Slavs to have theirs. It was not, therefore, 'only from their history that the Dalmatians and Montenegrins derive their only interest, but also from being members of the great Slavonic race', which 'promises to take a conspicuous position in Eastern Europe'.[35] Of

[31] E.g. ibid, ii. 147-50.
[32] Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro,* i. 7-9.
[33] [Friedrich Max Müller], 'Comparative Philology', *Edinburgh Review*, 94 (Oct. 1851), pp. 297-339.
[34] Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, i. 7-9.
[35] Ibid., i. 4-5.

course, Russia's important role in the Napoleonic wars and Holy Alliance Europe certainly indicated to all but the most oblivious that the Slavonic peoples were likely to play a leading part in the world's future, but this racially-inflected conception of universal history had few precedents in British thought. A few years earlier, in 1843, Thomas Arnold had expressed a similar premonition, following Barthold Niebuhr, in his inaugural lecture as Oxford's regius professor of modern history.[36] Another source may have been the work of Jakob Fallmerayer, with which Gardner Wilkinson engages in *Dalmatia and Montenegro*.[37] Fallmerayer had notoriously argued that the Hellenic population of the Morea had been displaced by Slavs in the middle ages, and thus that the modern Greeks were Slavonic rather than Hellenic; but he also believed that the Slavs' as yet unrealised world-historical potential threatened western Europe: for Fallmerayer, 'the [seventh-century] insurgents of the Peloponnesus', as one nineteenth-century reviewer put it, 'were but the *avant garde* of the Muscovites'.[38] Unlike the ardently Russophobic Fallmerayer, however, Gardner Wilkinson was distinctly sympathetic to the southern Slavs, hoping that they would soon be 'once more free from the despotism of the Turks, under which they have for ages groaned'.[39] Whatever its sources, his conception of universal history lent the Slavs an obvious importance.

Not all Balkan travellers, of course, were latter-day grand tourists like Gardner Wilkinson. Around the time of the Crimean War, increasing numbers of British diplomats, merchants, professionals, and career-soldiers visited the Ottoman Empire too, including Henry Barkley (a civil engineer who worked on railways in Bulgaria) and Valentine Baker (a disgraced British Army officer who entered the Turkish service)—

[36] Thomas Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History* (2nd ed., London, 1843), p. 28.
[37] Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, ii. 446-53.
[38] 'The Works of Fallmerayer', *North American Review*, 99 (July 1864), pp. 281-7 at p. 284.
[39] Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, i. 1.

both of whom recorded their experiences in travel writing.[40] Others were brought to the Balkans by religion. Some, such as Lady Paulina Irby, were motivated by Christian charity.[41] Many were missionaries, both British and American. Missionary authors such as Rufus Anderson, Henry van Lennep, Edward Robinson and William Goodell produced important books, exploring the formerly closed Ottoman Empire and describing the geography, ethnology and history of Egypt, Asia Minor, and the Balkans in minute detail.[42] The Church Missionary Society had despatched the first nineteenth-century British missionaries to the east in 1810, 'seeking the enlightenment and revival of the old Churches of the East', and within a decade they had been joined by American colleagues—and competitors.[43] The missionaries were learned and polyglot: in 1874 alone the American mission's press printed 1,006,000 pages in Armenian, 220,400 in Armeno-Turkish, 107,800 in Greco-Turkish, and 450,420 in Bulgarian. A writer in the *British Quarterly Review* doubted 'whether the Turkish Government itself can present so complete and truthful a record of the material, social, and moral progress of the empire' as the American missionaries' reports. Thanks to the missionaries, he added, 'we have a vast amount of historical information resting on a solid basis of ascertained facts'.[44]

---

[40] Henry Barkley, *Between the Danube and the Black Sea* (London, 1876); Valentine Baker, *War in Bulgaria* (London, 1879). Another soldier-traveller who recorded his experiences was George Arbuthnot, *Herzegovina; or Omer Pacha and the Christian Rebels* (London, 1861). See Orlando Figes, *Crimea*, p. 427.

[41] J. M. Neale, *Notes, Ecclesiological and Picturesque, on Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria, Styria: With a Visit to Montenegro* (London, 1861); Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (1st ed., London, 1866).

[42] Rufus Anderson, *History of the Missions of the A.B.C.F.M. to the Oriental Churches* (2 vols., Boston, 1873); H. J. Van Lennep, *Travels in Little-Known Parts of Asia Minor* (2 vols., London, 1870); Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (London, 1856); William Goodell, *Forty Years in the Turkish Empire* (New York, 1876).

[43] *One Hundred Years, Being the Short History of the Church Missionary Society* (London, 1899), p. 38.

[44] Tillman Trowbridge, 'The Americans in Turkey', *British Quarterly Review*, 67 (Jan. 1878), pp. 28-59 at pp. 29, 34.

Alongside the missionaries' accounts appeared volumes of travel writing by ecclesiologists pursuing an interest in the Eastern Churches, and while theirs was a small constituency it was one that played a disproportionately important role during the Eastern Crisis of the 1870s. One such author was James Mason Neale, one of the founder-members of the Eastern Church Association, who published *Notes, Ecclesiological and Picturesque, on Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria, Styria, with a Visit to Montenegro* in 1861. Neale, who benefited from Gladstone's patronage, had long been, as we have seen, 'deeply interested, and engaged on the history of, the Eastern Church'. He admired existing travel literature by the likes of Gardner Wilkinson and Paton, but believed 'an ecclesiological account of Dalmatia had yet to be written'—a deficit he sought to remedy. Neale, a keen student of liturgy, also recorded his experiences in 'a portion of Istria, and the whole Island of Veglia, so curious from the Glagolita [*sic*] rite—[hitherto] never … described by an English traveller'.[45] Neale's intended audience in 1861 was composed of his fellow ecclesiologists—above all 'my valued friends and fellow-students the Committee of the Ecclesiological Society'—but events in south-eastern Europe endowed his work with new salience. In the 1870s he was duly cited in publications including *Macmillan's Magazine* and *The Nineteenth Century*.[46] Moreover, Neale's *Notes* were joined, as we shall see, by a less overtly ecclesiological volume on *Montenegro, its People and Their History* (1876) by William Denton, another founder-member of the Eastern Church Association. While Denton's *Montenegro* was more obviously topical in its inception, Denton and Neale were interested in south-eastern Europe for very similar reasons.[47]

[45] Neale, *Notes, Ecclesiological and Picturesque*, p. v.
[46] Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88 at p. 278; W. E. Gladstone, 'Montenegro', *The Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), pp. 360-79 at p. 379.
[47] For Denton, see below, pp. xx.

Many of these religious authors—for all that they differed from travel writers with more purely mundane concerns—shared similar interests with the latter-day grand tourists, and their works tend to sit comfortably within the same literary tradition. Gardner Wilkinson's *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, for example, presents interesting points of comparison with another work that appeared in print a year later, Andrew Archibald Paton's *Highlands and Islands of the Adriatic* (1849). Like *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, Paton's narrative was extensive, its two volumes amounting together to over 600 pages. While Gardner Wilkinson had embarked upon a grand tour aged twenty-two, Paton, a young man of more modest means, had walked from Naples to Vienna at the age of twenty-five, thereafter travelling in south-eastern Europe, Syria and—like Gardner Wilkinson—Egypt, acquiring an intimate knowledge of the east. Whereas Gardner Wilkinson remained an independent scholar, by 1843 Paton had been appointed acting consul-general in Serbia, an experience which informed his first book, *Servia, the Youngest Member of the European Family* (1845).

Like many of his generation, Paton displays a Romantic attraction to a south-eastern Europe untouched by civilization: 'the men of the [Serbian] back-woods', he writes, 'neither poor nor barbarous, delighted me by the patriarchal simplicity of their manners, and the poetic originality of their language'. Like Gardner Wilkinson, he was optimistic for the Slavs' future: in Serbia, he identified 'a hopeful young nation approaching its puberty'—and he believed 'there can be no spectacle more delightful to a rightly constituted mind'. Unlike Gardner Wilkinson, however, Paton was constrained by his employment in government service, avoiding 'political conversations' with Serbian Christians since 'my government is at present on the best terms with the

Porte'.[48] Such considerations also made Paton's *Servia* a more topical book, more concerned with its subject's future in European politics, and less exclusively devoted to scholarly and antiquarian inquiry.

That was equally true of *Highlands and Islands*. Certainly, Paton shared many of Gardner Wilkinson's enthusiasms. Archaeology and history were particular interests. In the town of Zara, for example, he identifies the remains of temples and columns—'just what one expects in a Roman provincial capital'—and traces the settlement's history through late antiquity into the middle ages, describing Venetian sieges and, finally, Austrian domination.[49] In Ragusa, 'an eager perusal of the native historians' issues in a chapter on the city republic's history.[50] Diocletian's palace at Split prompts characteristically grandiose reflections: 'Athens, Rome, and Thebes, I had seen in ruins,—here the majesty of imperial antiquity conveyed august illusions of contemporaneous existence.'[51] Following in Gardner Wilkinson's footsteps to Montenegro, in his second volume Paton tells the story of its Christian past with similar verve, recounting how, among the Slavonic nations of the Balkans, Montenegro alone had risen 'like Ararat, amid the overwhelming floods of Islamism'.[52] Shorter historical asides recur throughout his narrative.

While Paton's erudition is no match for Gardner Wilkinson's, the result is superficially similar to *Dalmatia and Montenegro*. Indeed, as Paton conceded, with only a cursory glance one might easily overlook 'the spirit in which the whole work has been written'—for its purpose was in fact 'to explore the material resources of the Austrian

[48] Andrew Archibald Paton, *Servia, the Youngest Member of the European Family* (London, 1845), pp. 141, 170, 251.
[49] Andrew Archibald Paton, *Highlands and Islands of the Adriatic* (2 vols., London, 1849), ii. 60. See also Naval Berber, *Unveiling Bosnia-Herzegovina in British Travel Literature* (Pisa, 2010), p. 2.
[50] Ibid., i. 121-40.
[51] Ibid., ii. 234.
[52] Ibid., ii. 81-94.

empire', and more particularly to make sense of 'the interests of Great Britain in the Austrian and Ottoman empires'.[53] Paton, in fact, concludes with a scheme for the wholesale reform of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in particular and European diplomacy in general. That *Highlands and Islands*, in other words, was emphatically—though unobtrusively—the work of a consul, exemplifies how the conventions of learned travel literature could accommodate a variety of authorial purposes.

The same observation might be made of Polish émigré Valerian Krasinski's *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (1853). Whereas Paton had written about south-eastern Europe in his capacity as a diplomat interested in the future of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Krasinski's volume was precipitated by the Crimean War: the Slavs, he explained, 'enter essentially into the Turkish question, which is now rapidly becoming one of vital importance in European politics'.[54] That made the deficit of reliable information concerning south-eastern Europe all the more glaringly apparent. The inhabitants of the Balkans, Krasinski complained, 'are perhaps less known to the English public than the islanders of the Pacific'.[55] Bulgaria in particular was 'only known to the students of geography, who were also for the most part ignorant to what race and religion this remote people belonged'. Indeed, Western travellers in south-eastern Europe had tended to ignore what was before their eyes, paying 'more attention to the ruins of a by-gone age.[56]

Like other authors of travel literature, Krasinski sought to redress contemporary ignorance by setting the Balkans in historical context, reminding his readers that

> those Slavonians who are now forcing themselves upon the attention of Europe, have exercised since the Middle Ages a decisive influence on the Byzantine Empire, and formed independent states, which played a not

[53] Ibid., i. i.
[54] Valerian Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (London, 1853), p. vi.
[55] Ibid., p. 87.
[56] Ibid., pp. 125, 127.

> inconsiderable part in the struggles between the West and East, between Christendom and Islamism.[57]

The events of the day gave every indication that the Balkan Slavs were about to reprise that crucial role, so their history merited renewed attention, which Krasinski goes on to supply in a hundred-and-fifty erudite pages, ranging confidently from the Fallmerayer controversy to the Paterene heresy.[58]

Those pages are deeply informed by a whiggish sense of the inevitability of Slavonic greatness, consummated in successful nation states, so it is worth noting that Krasinski had argued elsewhere that the Slavs were called upon by 'Providence' to take a leading role in the world.[59] Indeed, an earlier volume on *Panslavism and Germanism* (1848)—dedicated to none other than the historian Hallam—had been introduced by an epigraph from Fallmerayer to the effect that 'the dominion over mankind is now to pass from the Romanic and Germanic nations and be transferred to the great Slavonic nation'.[60] As a Pole in exile, Krasinski was simultaneously a Panslav and a Russophobe; hence his attempt to divert Fallmerayer's prophecy from Russia, 'the great Slavonic nation', to incipient Balkan nationalism. *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* was thus of very different inspiration from a less politically freighted volume of travel writing such as Sir John Gardner Wilkinson's. But despite that, it was similarly erudite and replete with sophisticated historical reflection.

The emerging conventions of Balkan travel writing only became more entrenched, and works in the same tradition were still being produced two decades later. Viscount and Viscountess Strangford's *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic* (1864) covered much of the same ground as *Dalmatia and Montenegro*, although the Strangfords were also

[57] Ibid., pp. 86-7.
[58] Ibid., pp. 92-3, 102-6.
[59] Valerian Krasinski, *Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations* (Edinburgh, 1851), p. xi.
[60] Valerian Krasinski, *Panslavism and Germanism* (London, 1848).

among the first British writers to take an interest in Bulgaria. Like Gardner Wilkinson, Percy Smythe had studied at Harrow (where he taught himself Persian) and Oxford (where he learnt Arabic). He was the younger brother of George Smythe, a leading figure in the Young England movement upon whom the protagonist of Disraeli's *Coningsby* was modelled, whom he succeeded as Viscount Strangford in 1857. In the 1840s and 1850s Smythe worked successively as an attaché in Constantinople and then as oriental secretary, acquiring a thorough knowledge of Turkish and modern Greek in the process. Simultaneously, he studied Sanskrit and oriental philology attentively.[61] One year his senior, his future wife, Emily Beaufort, had travelled in Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor and Syria, publishing two illustrated volumes on *Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines* in 1861.[62] The two married in 1862.

Eastern Shores is an idiosyncratic mélange even by the standards of this inherently mixed medium: four narrative chapters by Lady Strangford telling the story of a journey through Albania, the Dalmatian coast and Montenegro are interspersed with three essays by Lord Strangford on the Eastern Question which provide, in Lady Strangford's words, 'something better and more solid'. The resulting book was emphatically not an artefact of mass tourism. The Strangfords travelled in some style: beginning at Corfu, they had been deposited in Albania by the Lord High Commissioner's yacht, proceeding on horseback with native guides. 'Our expedition', Lady Strangford recorded, 'was of the rough-and-ready kind … We were three ladies and three gentlemen; and we had provided ourselves with two tents, a cook, and two men-servants.'[63] Their apparel even

[61] G. Le G. Norgate, 'Smythe, Percy Ellen Algernon Frederick William Sydney, eighth Viscount Strangford (1825–1869)', rev. Elizabeth Baigent, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[62] Elizabeth Baigent, 'Smythe, Emily Anne, Viscountess Strangford (*bap.* 1826, *d.* 1887)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004). Strangford adverts to her Greek travels in *Eastern Shores,* p. 14 and *passim*.
[63] Strangford, *Eastern Shores,* pp. 2-3.

included a folding India rubber bathtub—an amenity that E. A. Freeman found a similarly essential accessory to Balkan travel.[64] Throughout their trip, moreover, the Strangfords enjoyed the advantages that accrued to an English diplomatist and peer.

But if *Eastern Shores* is marked by its authors' status, it is equally strongly shaped by their intellectual interests. Lord Strangford's philological learning surfaces: a footnote observes, for example, that the Montenegrin word *yest*, meaning 'it is', is 'common to all the Aryan languages'.[65] Like Gardner Wilkinson and Paton, Lady Strangford describes architecture (above all ecclesiastical) and archaeological remains (in particular Roman); enthusiasms already evident in her *Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines*. Romantic tendencies are revealed when their travels take them, like Gardner Wilkinson, in Lord Byron's footsteps. In southern Albania, they search for Byron's 'volumèd cataract'—the famous 'Falls of the Kalamá'—and visit

> Monastic Zitza! …
> Thou small but favoured spot of holy ground.[66]

Later the Strangfords travel to Ioannina, the seat of the tyrant Ali Pasha whose court is described in the second canto of *Childe Harold*; and visit the island where, in 1822, 'the lion of Ioannina' was finally put to death.[67] Nor were their Romantic sentiments limited to following Byron's itinerary: both repeatedly express admiration for the 'simple' and the 'primitive'.[68]

Such enthusiasms did not go without some qualification. Lord Strangford in particular was critical of the excesses of Philhellenism, which he believed was 'still an active evil among us to warp our judgment'. Gladstone is gently lampooned for having kissed the hand of the Greek archbishop of Corfu during his time as Lord High

[64] Ibid., p. 167.
[65] Ibid., p. 170. Cf. p. 301.
[66] Byron, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage,* 2.48.
[67] Strangford, *Eastern Shores*, p. 31.
[68] E.g. ibid., pp. 149-50.

Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, and Strangford laments that, 'in real life, [the Greeks] don't care an *obolus* about Homer'.[69] Instead, his sympathies were reserved for the Bulgarians, whom he believed of all the south-eastern European nations presented the only 'really hopeful prospect', thanks to 'their numerical preponderance; their utter primitiveness … their industry and thrift, their obstinacy, and their sobriety of character'.[70] Indeed, it is only when he writes of the Bulgarians that Lord Strangford's self-consciously judicious realism seems to falter. But for all that, the Strangfords were both cut from essentially Romantic cloth. When the young George Finlay had claimed to be 'one of those prosaic persons who either never had the good fortune to meet with a Romantic incident in his life or else was so dull that he could not perceive the romance of those incidents that were really Romantic', Byron had replied that the very fact of Finlay's presence in Greece refuted this: the Strangfords might justly have met with the same retort.[71]

It is important to note that the tradition in which the Strangfords wrote was by no means exclusively Anglophone: by the time of the Bulgarian Agitation, polyglot Victorians could also draw upon an extensive body of French and German travel literature that shared many of the conventions of British travel writing. François Lenormant's *Turcs et Montenegrins* (Paris, 1866), for example, identified in the Montenegrins the same primitive simplicity, uncorrupted by the artificiality of Western civilization, that had appealed to so many British writers:

> Les habitants du Monténégro sont, en effet, de moeurs et de caractère aussi rudes que leurs montagnes … Vierges de toute influence civilisatrice de l'Occident, mais en même temps de la corruption que cette influence apporte aux peuples qui ne sont pas suffisamment préparés à la recevoir; isolés pendant des siècles du reste du monde, les Monténégrins ont

[69] Ibid., pp. 150, 80.
[70] Ibid., p. 321.
[71] Quoted in Hussey, 'George Finlay in Perspective', p. 137.

> conservé dans leur vigueur première les qualités et les vertus naturelles aux peuples de race slave.[72]

Like many British authors, Lenormant also compared the Montenegrins to the Scottish Highlanders whom Sir Walter Scott had invested with so much Romantic appeal: Montenegrin extended families, for example, patriarchal in their organisation and extensive in their scope, amounted to 'une tribu semblable aux anciens clans écossais'.[73] Here Lenormant was only echoing an earlier French author and one of his sources, the prolific Xavier Marmier, a man of letters and regular contributor to the Liberal *Revue des Deux Mondes*, who had described Montenegro, rather theatrically, as 'cette sauvage highland de l'Adriatique, de ce rocher de … slaves, de ce nid de Caucasiens grecs, de ce clan de Rob-Roy'.[74] Elsewhere, Lenormant pursued another popular analogy 'entre les Monténégrins et les Romains des âges primitifs'—and in particular between the legislatures of modern Montenegro and the earliest days of the Roman Republic:

> Certes, les assemblées du sénat de pâtres et de proscrits vêtus de peaux de bêtes, que Romulus réunissait au son de la trompe des bergers sur le mont Palatin, devrait ressembler fort aux rustiques assemblées du sénat monténégrin.[75]

So when Montenegro attained temporary celebrity in 1876-8, it is unsurprising that British readers, well-acquainted with the travel literature in their own language, could turn to texts like Lenormant's and find much that was familiar.

---

[72] François Lenormant, *Turcs et Montenegrins* (Paris, 1866), p. xii. 'The inhabitants of Montenegro are, in effect, in manners and character no less rude than their mountain home … Untouched by civilizing influence of the West, and by the corruption which that influence brings to peoples insufficiently prepared to receive it; isolated over the centuries from the rest of the world, the Montenegrins have preserved in their native vigour the qualities and the virtues inherent to the peoples of the Slavonic race'.

[73] Ibid., p. lv.

[74] Xavier Marmier, *Lettres sur l'Adriatique et le Montenegro* (2 vols., Paris, 1854), i. viii: 'this wild highland of the Adriatic, this Slavonic rock, this nest of Caucasian Greeks, this clan of Rob Roy'. Marmier's extensive bibliography, which prefaces volume one, is a useful source for the French and German travel literature of the Balkans.

[75] Lenormant, *Turcs et Montenegrins*, pp. lxiv-lxv: 'Certainly, the meetings of the senate of herdsmen and outlaws dressed in animal skins, which Romulus convened by the sound of a shepherd's horn upon the Palatine Hill, bear a strong resemblance to the rustic assemblies of the Montenegrin senate'.

When the Eastern Question reopened towards the end of 1875, existing works such as *Eastern Shores* were reread in new contexts. While Lord Strangford had died in 1869, in the aftermath of the atrocities of July 1876 several commentators drew on his reflections on the importance of Bulgaria; and others returned to his wife's chapter on Montenegro—over a decade after it had been written—when the tiny principality became the subject of fleeting but acute enthusiasm in the British press.[76] Gardner Wilkinson's *Dalmatia and Montenegro*[77] and Paton's *Highlands and Islands* were also the recipients of renewed attention.[78] While entirely new works of travel writing certainly did appear, including Arthur Evans' serendipitously-timed *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot* (1876), many authors adapted existing material to meet the needs of the hour: William Denton's *Montenegro, its People and Their History* (1877), for example, reproduced extensive passages verbatim from two travel essays its author had published in the journal *Good Words* eleven years earlier.[79]

Denton, a Tractarian clergyman, social critic and amateur historian, was a founding member of the Eastern Church Association and nurtured personal connections with members of the Orthodox clergy in south-eastern Europe.[80] In 1862 he had published *Servia and the Servians*, one of the first well-informed English books on Serbia. Its sequel, *The Christians in Turkey* (1863), a polemical indictment of the

---

[76] E.g. Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88 at p. 283; Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), i. 165; William Denton, *Montenegro, its People and Their History* (London, 1877), p. 122; W. E. Gladstone, 'Montenegro', *The Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), pp. 360-79 at p. 379; Arthur Evans, *Illyrian Letters. A Revised Selection of Correspondence from the Illyrian Provinces ... Addressed to the* Manchester Guardian (London, 1878), p. 251.

[77] E.g. Freeman, 'Montenegro', pp. 278, 282-3; Arthur Evans, *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot* (London, 1876), pp. 342-3, 345; Gladstone, 'Montenegro', p. 379; Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), ii. 237.

[78] E.g. Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), ii. 323; Denton, *Montenegro,* p. 10.

[79] [William Denton], 'A Visit to the Capital of Montenegro', *Good Words* (1 Jan. 1866), pp. 57-63; [William Denton], 'A Ride through Montenegro', *Good Words* (1 Sept. 1866), pp. 636-44. For attributions, see Denton, *Montenegro,* p. vi.

[80] The Eastern Church Association was founded at William Denton's residence in Finsbury Circus on 13 April 1864. Liddon and Neale were also founder-members. See *The Colonial Church Chronicle, Missionary Journal, and Foreign Ecclesiastical Reporter* (1864), pp. 175-6.

Ottoman Empire's treatment of its Christian subjects, at first met with a less rapturous reception, though it finally sold out—and went through two more editions—in 1876, thanks to the interest generated by the Bulgarian Agitation. What was more, he had visited Montenegro in the 1860s.[81] Returning to the subject a decade later, he could also draw on what had become a substantial body of literature, citing a wide variety of works including Vialla de Sommières' *Voyage Historique et Politique au Monténégro* (1820), Marmier's *Lettres sure l'Adriatique et le Monténégro* (1854), Lenormant's *Turcs et Monténégrins* (1866), Frilley's more recent *Le Monténégro Contemporain* (1876), Gardner Wilkinson's *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (1848), Valerian Krasinski's *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (1853), Archibald Paton's *Researches on the Danube and the Adriatic* (1861), the Strangfords' *Eastern Shores of the Adriatic* (1864), the future Lord Lytton's *National Songs of Servia* (1861), and the anonymous *Rambles in Istria, Dalmatia and Montengro* (1875).

Denton, then, was no mere opportunist. His book mingled travel writing with a detailed account of the principality's history back to its formation in the aftermath of the Turkish conquest of Serbia in the fourteenth century. But despite its scholarly tone, *Montenegro* was also a distinctly topical production: if Denton aspired to avoid mere party politics, he followed E. A. Freeman in believing that 'politics themselves [are] impossible to avoid ... since politics is only another name for the history of the present'. History, in Denton's hands, showed that the Montenegrins were a faithful bastion of Christian Europe, civilizing and replete with potential civilization, but beset on all sides by the iniquity of the Ottoman Empire. For Denton, in other words, historiography was an inherently political genre.

[81] M. C. Curthoys, 'Denton, William (1815–1888)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).

That was in no way incompatible with the established traditions of Balkan travel writing. Indeed, Denton's *Montengro* reveals just how freighted some of the conventions of this genre could be. In its pages, for example, the tiny principality is portrayed as a nation of 'simple highlanders … unperverted by contact with what is called "civilisation"', living a life of 'primitive … almost arcadian, simplicity'.[82] Like so many others, for Denton these highlanders suggested unmistakable analogies with the Highlanders of the Waverley novels; analogies to which he returned again and again. A Montenegrin house, for example, presents

> just such a picture as Sir Walter Scott has left us of the highland cottage of the last century, or indeed such as several estates in Scotland can show at the present moment … it was easy to imagine oneself in some almost unfrequented spot, at a distance from railways, in the northern part of Great Britain.[83]

The Montenegrin citizen-militia similarly recalled

> the Highlanders of a century ago, and their military array and accoutrements carry us back to the days of Prince Charles Edward and to the bands which fought under his standard at Preston-pans and Culloden.[84]

Elsewhere we learn that Montenegrin dancing 'exactly resembles the old Highland reel', that a Montenegrin stream resembles 'a Highland river', and that the favourite song of Slav boatmen is 'one which answers to our "Should auld acquaintance be forgot"'.[85]

To classically-educated Victorians, ancient Rome and Greece were as familiar as Walter Scott's Highlanders, and we have seen that travellers in the Balkans were consistently attentive to any traces of classical remains, however fugitive. Montenegro revealed no such antiquities, but to many travellers, Denton among them, the primitive

---

[82] Denton, *Montenegro,* pp. 123, 4.
[83] Denton, 'A Ride Through Montenegro', pp. 636-44 at p. 643. Reproduced in Denton, *Montenegro*, p. 112.
[84] Denton, *Montenegro*, p. 92.
[85] Ibid.

simplicity of the Montenegrins evoked the heroic age of Homer and ancient Greece just as vividly as it did the clans of Rob Roy. Writing of Mirko, the Crown Prince's father, Denton observes that his 'deeds of bravery sound more like those of the Homeric heroes than of a nineteenth-century soldier'.[86] The popular songs of the Montenegrins, it is suggested—and here Denton is following Cyprien Robert's *Les Slaves de Turquie* (1844)—might become 'the materials for a new Iliad and Eneid [*sic*], which only await the hand of genius to be added to the great poems which are the common heritage of the world.' A new Iliad—or rather, we are tempted to suggest, a new Ossian; for Denton promiscuously intermingles Homeric and Highland analogies: if Mirko, for example, resembles one of Homer's heroes, his victories equally 'carry us back to the days of Montrose or of Charles Edward'. Similarly, the sight of the Crown Prince sitting in judgment recalled '"the just administration of a Homeric chieftain"'—and here Denton is quoting Lady Strangford—but it was also a 'very patriarchal scene', such as 'might have been witnessed in the Highlands of Scotland little more than a century ago'.

Analogies such as these made the Montenegrins the beneficiaries of Romantic nostalgia for a more simple existence, exempted from 'the diseases of our more artificial civilization'—diseases with which, as an ardent critic of working class housing conditions in British cities, Denton was more than familiar.[87] But they also reveal the degree to which historical-mindedness shaped the experience of nineteenth-century travellers: the ostensibly alien Montenegrins are rendered familiar by richly historical associations that identify them as essentially Western, European and Christian. That constituted a powerful rejoinder to attempts by the Porte's British supporters to portray Montenegro as a violent, barbaric and alien nation, no better than

[86] Ibid., p. 290. To Lady Strangford, Mirko was a 'fiery Paladin'.
[87] Denton, 'A Ride through Montenegro', pp. 640, 638; Denton, *Montenegro*, p. 102. For Denton's activities as a social critic, see Curthoys, 'Denton, William', and William Denton, *Observations on the Displacement of the Poor by Metropolitan Railways and other Public Improvements* (London, 1861).

its Ottoman antagonists.

While Denton composed a new volume to address the crisis in south-eastern Europe, many writers simply reissued older travel literature in new editions, reframed to address current affairs—and none enjoyed such great success as Paulina Irby. Together with her friend and co-author Georgina Muir Mackenzie, Irby had published *The Turks, the Greeks and the Slavons: Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* in 1866; a second edition had followed a year later. Already in 1876, William Gladstone was privately recommending *Travels* as 'by far the best English book I have seen on Eastern matters', and when Irby produced a new edition the following year, adding three new chapters on the Balkan insurrections, Gladstone contributed a preface in which he declared that 'no diplomatist, no consul, no traveller, among our countrymen, has made such a valuable contribution to our means of knowledge in this important issue'.[88] Before the year was out, *Travels* had gone through two more editions, and no work of Balkan travel literature was more widely cited or reviewed.[89] Irby and Mackenzie were quoted in Parliament, and their text was the subject of a lecture at Hawarden—which was in turn published as a pamphlet by the Eastern Question Association.[90] But why did the *Travels* enjoy such success?

Irby and Mackenzie emerged from the same social stratum as the latter-day grand tourists: one was the daughter of a baronet, the other of a rear-admiral. Like so many of their peers, they were interested in classical remains, well-read in ancient and modern history, and intrigued by language and ethnology. They had embarked upon a two-year tour of the Austrian empire in 1858 with the innocent object of improving 'delicate

[88] Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), i. ix.
[89] See Goldsworthy, 'The Balkans in Nineteenth-Century British Travel Writing', p. 29; Berber, *Unveiling Bosnia-Herzegovina*, pp. 5, 14.
[90] E.g. *Hansard* CCXXXIV, 7 May 1877, 366-476; W. E. Gladstone, *The Slavonic Provinces of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1877).

health by a change of air and scene', and enjoying the beautiful scenery of 'an out-of-the way region'.[91] But their arrest by Austrian officials on charges of 'Panslavistic tendencies' at Leutschau was to have decisive consequences: neither understood the term 'Panslav', and they spent the next four years remedying their ignorance by extensive travels in the Balkans.[92] Irby and Mackenzie were both earnestly religious, and soon took as keen an interest in humanitarian projects—in particular the education of Christian women and children—as they did in the history and society of the southern Slavs, launching an appeal for funds to establish a school for Bosnian girls in Sarajevo.[93]

While Mackenzie was identified as the author of the 'greater portion of the text' of the *Travels*, she married and embarked upon a new life in 1871, dying at Corfu three years later. Irby, however, remained dedicated to the southern Slavs' cause: when insurrections rocked the Balkans in 1875, she closed her school in Sarajevo and set up a relief fund for Bosnian and Herzegovinian refugees, attracting the support of public figures including Freeman and Florence Nightingale.[94] *Travels* was marked by these mixed motives. One the one hand, both volumes are decidedly scholarly: no fewer than four chapters, for example, take their epigraphs from George Finlay's *History of Greece*, and citations refer to a variety of French, German, and Italian sources.[95] But on the other, Irby and Mackenzie's keenly religious and humanitarian ethos also lent their travel writing a polemical edge—and an underlying dynamic—that is missing in less partisan literature such as the Strangfords' *Eastern Shores*.

Above all, *Travels* is warmly critical of Islam and the Ottoman Empire, denouncing the 'Oriental barbarism, the dirt, squalor, and misery which everywhere mark the

[91] [Paulina Irby and Georgina Mackenzie], *Across the Carpathians* (Cambridge, 1862), p. 2.
[92] Ibid., p. 173.
[93] Paulina Irby and Georgina Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (1st ed., London, 1866). An identical second edition appeared in 1867.
[94] See Dorothy Anderson, *Miss Irby and Her Friends* (London, 1966).
[95] E.g. Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), i. 54, 65, 83; ii. 177, 280, 283.

frontier line of the Asiatic encroachments into Europe'. The Turks are compared unfavourably to earlier conquerors of the Balkans: for example, as Irby and Mackenzie survey the remains of the Skopje aqueduct, built by the Emperor Justinian, they

> descried a tiny garden of melons and pumpkins, and therein, seated and smoking, a white-turbaned Turk. Strange! to find thus in juxtaposition the witnesses of two conquering races: the Roman who builded, the Ottoman who destroys.[96]

In this account, the Ottoman Empire is doomed by a teleology of decline. Turkey-in-Europe is, as we have seen, an 'Asiatic encroachment'; the 'rearguard of Mahommedanism', Islam's 'last stronghold'. The typical Turkish Bey, the Muslim *quasi*-squire of Bosnia, is likewise portrayed as a living fossil, 'too decidedly a megatherion [*sic*] for our age'.[97] Importantly, these conclusions are derived from the history of Turkey-in-Europe, 'a trial of nearly four centuries', which shows that the Turks are incapable of assimilation: in Britain, the Norman conquerors had blended with their English subjects; but in the Ottoman Empire's European dominions things had turned out differently. As Gladstone explained to his audience at Hawarden, making a quintessentially English analogy, it is 'with Turkey not a case of milk put into tea, which amalgamates with the tea' but rather of 'oil put into water, which will not mix'. That immiscibility, ordained by Islamic law, had perpetuated relations of domination and submission, precluding material and intellectual progress.[98]

By contrast, the 'savage and Oriental aspect' of Bosnia under Ottoman rule is juxtaposed with 'the advancing culture' of contemporary and independent Serbia, Hungary and Croatia; and an earlier history is invoked to demonstrate that the southern Slavs are the heirs to the future. The Roman ruins that indict Turkish indolence are also evidence of a European past, and like Gardner Wilkinson and a host of other writers,

---

[96] Ibid., i., 25, 170.
[97] Ibid., i. 8. The *megatherium* was a species of giant ground sloth, now extinct.
[98] Gladstone, *Slavonic Provinces*, pp. 5-6.

Irby and Mackenzie adduce antique remains—as well as early Christian rock hermitages—as testimony to the Balkans' enduring Christian and European identity.[99] Similarly, the Serbian monarchy before the Ottoman conquest is portrayed as a flourishing European polity. While exploring the desolate plain of Kosovo, Irby and Mackenzie reflect that

> Old chronicles tell that at the time when a Turkish army first appeared on it the country was well cultivated and peopled with villages; roads and bridges were the especial care of the ruler; the Serbian parliament generally held its meetings in the neighbourhood; and the adjacent cities ... formed the rendezvous of foreign merchants. Yes, in those days Kossovo [*sic*] belonged to Europe—to a society, though rude, of activity and progress.[100]

Were it not for the Ottoman conquest, Serbia would 'have remained a free state, gradually working out her civilisation, and her junction with surrounding kindred peoples'. The Battle of Kosovo in 1389 had ended those hopes: Tsar Lazar had risked 'his all in striking a bold blow for Christendom', and few defeats had been 'in their consequences more disastrous for civilisation' than his.[101] Only now was the Serbs' interrupted historical destiny being fulfilled, as they resumed the 'traditions of ancient empire' and the 'civilisation [which] distinguished Old Serbia so long as it was a part of Christian Europe'. The historical moral is made explicit: 'if the past was theirs, they only have to look forward to be sure that the future is theirs also; that sooner or later they must become a part of Christian Europe once more.'[102]

As Gladstone put it in his preface, 'on the mirror of the past is drawn the image of the future',[103] and that future looked just as rosy for the Bulgarians as it did for the Serbs. Following George Finlay, Irby and Mackenzie argue that the Bulgarians could have

[99] E.g. Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), i. 262; ii. 79-80.
[100] Ibid., i. 182-3.
[101] Ibid., ii. 307, 310-1.
[102] Ibid., i. 221-2.
[103] Ibid., i. xi-ii.

inherited the Byzantine Empire—and its world-historical role as the champion of western civilization against oriental barbarism. Like Finlay, they hope accordingly for 'the revival of the Bulgarian kingdom'; a 'new Sclavonian [*sic*] power in the east of Europe' which they believe, would equally be the surest guarantee against Russian expansionism and Ottoman aggression.[104] Similarly the Montenegrins—who remind them, predictably, of both 'Scotch Highlanders' and 'Achilles and Patroclus'—prompt Irby and Mackenzie to look forward to a time when the principality will take its rightful 'place among civilized nations'; the place it would naturally have occupied but for the Turkish conquest of the Balkans in the fourteenth century.[105]

[104] Ibid., i. 65, quoting Finlay, *History of Greece*, ii. 188.
[105] Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed., 1877), ii. 228, 239, 270, 279.

Chapter Four

Reporting the Eastern Question: Foreign Correspondents

By the 1870s, of course, travel writing was by no means Victorians' sole source of information concerning south-eastern Europe. During the two decades following the Crimean War, new technology had transformed the reporting of foreign affairs in general, and Balkan affairs in particular. Between 1850, when the very first cable had been laid under the English Channel, and 1874, when Edison's quadruplex system made it possible to send four messages down the same wire simultaneously, electrical telegraphy had made considerable advances.[1] The world seemed smaller, and the annihilation of space by time—steamboats on the Danube and railways across central Europe—meant that the Balkan peninsula was significantly more accessible to Western journalists than it had been in 1855. Western consulates were established in towns such as Sarajevo and Mostar during the 1850s and 1860s, facilitating travel and trade.[2] As Gladstone, writing in May 1877, observed:

> Until our own day, it has never been possible for the people of one country to obtain trustworthy information respecting the contemporary condition of the people of another. The press, the telegraph, the railway, the large and costly development of diplomatic and consular establishments, and the usages of popular governments, have, in their several manners and degrees, contributed to place within our reach this description of knowledge, in other times substantially inaccessible.[3]

---

[1] For a contemporary account, see Julius Vogel, 'Cheap Telegrams', *The Nineteenth Century* 2 (Dec. 1877), pp. 783-95.

[2] Omer Hadziselimovic, *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (Boulder, 2001), p. xxi.

[3] W. E. Gladstone, 'Preface', in Paulina Irby and Georgina Muir Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (2 vols., 5th ed., London, 1877), ii. vii.

The British public were thus informed about events in the Balkans with a rapidity that would have been inconceivable merely three decades earlier. South-eastern Europe, hitherto largely unknown, became familiar in up-to-date despatches from correspondents working for Reuter's news agency or for newspapers such as the *Daily News*, *The Times* and *Daily Telegraph*. Those despatches that were then reproduced outside the metropolis in provincial newspapers.[4] The public, Freeman could declare without exaggeration, 'now knows what happens just as well as a Foreign Secretary can know it', and the daily press frequently anticipated the official reports of the Foreign Office, sometimes to the embarrassment of the ministry.[5]

Indeed, foreign correspondents drove the news cycle during the Eastern Crisis of the 1870s, and newspaper coverage was critical in stimulating an interest which pamphlets, books and periodicals attempted to satisfy. And though this phenomenon has not hitherto received sustained study by historians, contemporaries recognized and appreciated its novelty. Humphry Sandwith, for example, noted how foreign correspondents could arouse the public's curiosity: 'only a few months ago', he reflected, 'few Englishmen would have been able to describe precisely the position of Servia [*sic*] geographically or politically', but within 'the last few weeks … Servia has claimed a large share of the telegrams of the morning papers … and naturally people are beginning to ask, "What is Servia?"'[6] Malcolm MacColl agreed: 'six months ago the mass of Englishmen and Englishwomen had the vaguest possible idea of the real condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte', he asserted, adding that they 'now know that they are grievously oppressed'.[7] An American observer, Edwin Godkin,

[4] Vogel, 'Cheap Telegrams', p. 795.
[5] Quoted in George Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and the Eastern Question* (2 vols., London, 1886), i. 332.
[6] Humphry Sandwith, 'Servia', *British Quarterly Review*, 63 (Jan. 1876), pp. 100-121 at p. 100.
[7] Malcolm MacColl, 'The Christian Subjects of the Porte', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (Nov. 1876), pp. 970-89 at p. 971.

joined the chorus: until recently, he contended, 'down to the introduction of steamboats on the Danube', Bosnia and Herzegovina were

> an unknown land, the whereabouts of which even most educated persons would have found it difficult to fix with an approach to accuracy. The Servian [*sic*] Christians too, like the other Slavonic subjects of the Porte, had no sentimental hold on the Western imagination, such as that which gave the Greek [Revolution] in 1821 so much pathos and dignity. The Slaves had no history that scholars and poets knew or cared for.[8]

Now all that had changed. The new reporting altered how the British understood the Eastern Question. Without foreign correspondents' despatches, it is difficult to understand how the British public could have come to feel such sympathy for what Fitzjames Stephen called 'people a long way off of whom one knows little'.[9] Indeed, from Gladstone's perspective, eliciting British sympathies for the Christians of the Balkans was quite simply 'the most weighty' and 'the most splendid' of 'the many services constantly rendered by free journalism to humanity, to freedom, and to justice'.[10]

The 1870s, moreover, witnessed the emergence of a new species of 'scholarly' journalists, exemplified by the British archaeologist Arthur Evans and the American artist, journalist and polymath William Stillman. Writers such as Evans and Stillman filled two roles: on the one hand, the emerging vocation of the newspaper foreign correspondent, reporting current affairs with unprecedented immediacy; on the other, writing within the established traditions of learned travel literature, informed by ethnography, history and archaeology. They drew on history to interpret current affairs in the Balkans not, however, in works of travel literature, but rather in telegraphed despatches that also drove the news cycle. In their columns, the past was invoked not

---

[8] Edwin L. Godkin, 'The Eastern Question', *North American Review*, 124 (Jan. 1877), pp. 106-26 at p. 109.
[9] Fitzjames Stephen to Lytton, 13 Aug. 1876, quoted in Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (2nd ed., Hamden Conn., 1975), p. 205.
[10] W. E. Gladstone, *The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (London, 1876), p. 13.

only to account for the present but also as a guide to the future; and though the medium in which they wrote precluded sustained historical argument, they were able nonetheless to expound, episodically and allusively, a coherent and synthetic understanding of south-eastern Europe's past.

The principal beneficiaries of their histories were the Balkan Slavs, whom they portrayed as peoples related to nineteenth-century Englishmen by ties of race, language, and above all history. By the 1870s, British intellectuals could identify with the Balkan Slavs as closely as Valerian Krasinski's Russian naval officer, who had felt himself in Montenegro 'transported ... into quite a new world', where he had become 'acquainted with my ancestors of the ninth and tenth centuries'.[11] This sense of propinquity and even kinship was a function of a foreshortening of what Mark Salber Philips would call the 'historical distance' between Britain and the Balkans,[12] and in that foreshortening the affective colouring and unprecedented immediacy of historically minded foreign correspondents played an important role.

There was a dim precedent for all this in William Howard Russell's pioneering Crimean War dispatches for *The Times*. Russell, an Anglo-Irish journalist with little previous battlefield experience, had travelled to the Crimea as *The Times* correspondent in February 1854. In the months that followed, his gripping battle narratives and reports of logistical and medical blundering did much to break Aberdeen's fragile coalition, bringing Palmerston to power. As the duke of Newcastle told Russell, 'it was you who turned out the government'.[13] Indeed, for the duration of the war, the circulation of *The Times* ran at 70,000. In particular, Russell had been one of the first foreign correspondents to make use of the electric telegraph, although when the war began in

[11] Valerian Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (London, 1853), p. 21.
[12] Mark Salber Philips, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven, 2013), pp. 1-4.
[13] A. Hankinson, *Man of Wars: William Howard Russell of* 'The Times' (London, 1982), p. 84.

the Crimea the telegraph line from London had only reached as far as Belgrade, and sending long messages remained difficult throughout the conflict. Russell, indeed, often complained that his descriptively detailed letters—which frequently occupied as much as an entire page of newsprint when they appeared in *The Times*—took two weeks longer to reach London than the laconic telegraphed messages that anticipated them.[14]

But by the 1870s telegraphy had developed considerably, and a new generation of foreign correspondents were ably exploiting its possibilities in relentless pursuit of the 'scoop'. Competition was ruthless, and as 'wiring the news' became more practical and more affordable, journalists went to remarkable lengths to beat their rivals to a story. The American Civil War (1861-5) had been a particularly intensive school for many of the leading war correspondents of the later nineteenth century, who had cut their teeth covering the conflict between the Union and the Confederacy. Many had become masters of the telegraphed despatch. 'These Yankees', as Mowbray Morris, manager of *The Times*, reluctantly conceded, 'are undoubtedly pushing fellows with a great gift for routing out facts', and English journalists were not beneath learning from their example.[15] When war between France and Prussia broke out in 1870, Russell would be scooped time and again by his less complacent competitors.[16]

Many of these 'pushing' foreign correspondents remained in Europe after the Franco-Prussian War—Mowbray Morris complained of 'a cloud of Jefferson Bricks swarming over Europe'[17]—and would go on to report on events in the Balkans, not only with unprecedented rapidity but also with new emotional immediacy. Russell's despatches from the Crimea had dwelt on martial glory, memorably evoking the 'thin

[14] Stefanie Markovits, *The Crimean War in the British Imagination* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 17-8, 25.
[15] Stanley Morrison, *The History of* The Times*: 1841-1884 the Tradition Established* (London, 1935), p. 465.
[16] Roger T. Stearn, 'Russell, Sir William Howard (1820–1907)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[17] Morrison, *History of* The Times, pp. 464f.

red streak topped with steel' that had stopped the Russians at the Battle of Balaclava, and the 'brilliant valour … which would have reflected lustre on the best days of chivalry' exhibited during the Charge of the Light Brigade. But these reports conveyed few personal details: as Russell admitted in later life, he 'did not grasp that it was in my power to give a halo of glory to some unknown warrior by printing his name in type'.[18]

By contrast, the foreign correspondents of the 1870s drew out the human interest of their stories with a flair exemplified by the reports of Januarius MacGahan, a polyglot Irish-American journalist born in Ohio.[19] MacGahan had won renown with his vivid despatches for the *New York Herald* during the Franco-Prussian War—the conflict that also brought celebrity to his English rival, the notorious Archibald Forbes.[20] MacGahan had been the only foreign correspondent to witness the establishment of the Paris Commune, and he had capitalised on his success with a series of important political interviews with the likes of Louis Blanc, Léon Gambetta and Victor Hugo.[21] Remaining in Europe, he travelled to St Petersburg, and his years in Russia bore fruit in the form of a marriage and a book, *Campaigning on the Oxus and the Fall of Khiva* (1874), which chronicled his adventures during the Russian invasion of the Central Asian khanate of Khiva.

In 1876, Frank Hill, the editor of the *Daily News*, commissioned MacGahan to investigate rumours of Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria, and when his lurid telegrammed reports began to appear in print from 7 August, they made an immediate impact, driving the news cycle.[22] Quoted in the House of Commons and republished in other daily and

[18] William Howard Russell, *The Great War with Russia* (London, 1895), p. 93.
[19] See Dale Walker, *Januarius MacGahan: The Life and Campaigns of an American War Correspondent* (Ohio, 1988).
[20] Roger T. Stearn, 'Forbes, Archibald (1838–1900)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[21] Marin V. Pundeff, 'Schuyler and MacGahan before 1876' in his *Bulgaria in American Perspective* (New York, 1994), pp. 204-32 at p. 212f.
[22] Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion*, i. 325.

weekly newspapers shortly after their appearance in the *Daily News*, MacGahan's letters were also compiled into books and pamphlets: at least three editions had appeared by the end of the year, and more followed.[23] Books and pamphlets of this kind ensured the continuing currency of reports which might otherwise have proven ephemeral.

MacGahan's reports were very different from Russell's Crimean despatches of two decades earlier, and not everyone admired their style. Mowbray Morris, for example, deplored his 'sensational proclivities',[24] and the Conservative-leaning *Standard* complained that in MacGahan's hands 'the enterprise of searching out and dwelling upon atrocities has itself become an atrocity of a most disgusting kind'.[25] MacGahan's dramatically vivid first-person perspective bore the stamp of the conventions of travel-and-adventure literature—to which his *Campaigning on the Oxus* had been a defining contribution, going through at least four editions by 1876.[26] His telegrams for the *Daily News* were characterised a similar degree of graphic detail. In one passage, for example, MacGahan relates that his party

> suddenly drew rein with an exclamation of horror, for right before us, almost beneath our horses' feet, was … a heap of skulls, intermingled with bones from all parts of the human body, skeletons, nearly entire, rotting, clothing, human hair, and putrid flesh lying there in one foul heap, around which the grass was growing luxuriantly … in the midst of this heap I could distinguish one slight skeleton form still enclosed in a chemise, the skull wrapped about with a coloured handkerchief, and the bony ankles encased in the embroidered footless stockings worn by the Bulgarian girls.[27]

[23] *The Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria, Letters of the Special Commissioner of the "Daily News"* (London, 1876); *The War Correspondence of the "Daily News"* (3rd ed., London, 1878).
[24] Morrison, *History of* The Times, p. 465.
[25] *The Standard* (31 Aug. 1876).
[26] Januarius MacGahan, *Campaigning on the Oxus and the Fall of Khiva* (4th ed., London, 1876).
[27] *The Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria, Letters of the Special Commissioner of the "Daily News"* (London, 1876), p. 22.

The fate of women and children in particular is a recurring theme. In one report, MacGahan repeats the word 'outraged' eight times in a single paragraph.[28] Elsewhere he describes how the Turkish paramilitaries

> would seize a woman, strip her carefully to her chemise, laying aside articles of clothing that were valuable ... Then as many of them as cared would violate her, and the last man would kill her or not as the humour took him ... The number of children killed in these massacres is something enormous. They were often spitted on bayonets.[29]

Descriptions such as these—'flung', as the newspaper editor William Stead put it, 'with a glare of journalistic limelight before the eyes of a shuddering nation'—would have been unthinkable from Russell's pen.[30] MacGahan made sure to emphasise the British government's complicity in the Turkish atrocities, sometimes addressing the prime minister directly—on one occasion declaring with a typically rhetorical flourish that 'I wish to exchange a few remarks with Mr. Disraeli'.[31]

While his similarly sensational rival, Archibald Forbes, was no admirer of the Bulgarians, adjudging that they possessed 'fewer of the attributes calculated to kindle sympathetic regards and beget genial interest than any other race whose character I have had opportunities of judging',[32] MacGahan's accounts of atrocities were complemented by a celebration of the sober virtues of the Bulgarian peasantry:

> I think people in England and Europe generally have a very imperfect idea of what these Bulgarians are ... there is scarcely a Bulgarian village without a school [and] the percentage of people who can read and write is as great in Bulgaria as in England and France … some of the villages might stand a not very unfavourable comparison with an English or French village. The truth is that these Bulgarians, instead of the savages we have taken them for, are in reality a hardworking, industrious, honest, civilized, and peaceful people.[33]

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 45-6.
[29] Ibid., p. 26.
[30] W. T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia, Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (2 vols., London, 1909), i. 248.
[31] *The Turkish Atrocities*, pp. 33, 46, 62, 66, 68, quotation at p. 62.
[32] Archibald Forbes, 'The Russians, the Turks, and the Bulgarians at the theatre of war', *The Nineteenth Century*, 2 (Nov. 1877), pp. 561-82 at p. 578.
[33] *The Turkish Atrocities*, pp. 24-5.

By analogies such as these, MacGahan situated the Balkan Christians within the pale of European civilisation. Elsewhere he contends that the English, like the Bulgarians, would rise up against a government that imposed iniquitous taxes. Bulgarian schools, he claims, rival those of France, Germany and England.[34] On another occasion, writing of the racial affinities between the southern Slavs, he suggests that one might as well expect 'the English north of the Thames not to sympathise with those south of it, in case the latter were under the domination of the Turks, as to try to prevent these Sclavonic races from helping each other.'[35]

Such analogies were a popular way to bring home the Balkans' complex racial and national divisions to British readers. In the periodicals, for example, E. A. Freeman had compared the border between Dalmatia and Montenegro to the border between Hampshire and Berkshire, and Humphry Sandwith compared the border between Bosnia and Herzegovina to that dividing Yorkshire and Lincolnshire.[36] But MacGahan's analysis appeared not in the more reflective periodicals but interspersed with his reporting in the daily press, interpreting the news for his readers as they read it. That interpretation was distinctly pro-Slav. The Turks, by contrast, are represented as irremediably duplicitous and congenitally incapable of reform, their characteristics as 'Orientals' explicitly contrasted with those of 'Europeans'.[37]

These themes—on the one hand, seeing in the Balkan Slavs progressive and fundamentally European peoples; on the other, identifying the Turks as alien Orientals out of place in a civilised Europe—are implicitly premised on history: the Slavs' past is the guarantee of their future progress, just as Ottoman history suggests a teleology of

[34] Ibid., pp. 14, 36.
[35] Ibid., p. 20.
[36] Sandwith, 'Servia', p. 119. Cf. Edward Freeman, 'The True Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 24 (December 1875), pp. 747-69 at pp. 755, 762.
[37] *The Turkish Atrocities*, pp. 27, 31, 50, 52, 74, 86 at p. 52.

decline. Both notions were staples of the historical literature that flourished during the Bulgarian Agitation and within which their historical rationale was, as we shall see, extensively and explicitly developed. Perhaps most importantly, however, the emotional immediacy of MacGahan's reports, amplified by the sense that they were being published in real time, encouraged his readers to identify with the Christians inhabitants of the Balkans, a prerequisite for a partisan historiography. Ultimately, of course, MacGahan remained a war correspondent, scarcely more historically-minded than Russell had been, and while his reports were read and quoted by what John Morley called '*Mind*', that was not the constituency to which they were intended primarily to appeal. But his despatches do throw into relief the work of a new and different kind of reporter: the scholarly foreign correspondents, Arthur Evans and William Stillman.

Stillman and Evans both composed reflective reports—informed by history, geography and ethnography—of a kind that, before the 1870s, would have been of necessity confined to the pages of books of travel literature, and which were strongly reminiscent of that well-established genre. As Evans put it, he approached south-eastern Europe

> from a variety of standpoints. And in so doing I have not considered the scenery of those countries, their antiquities, and even the folklore and domestic life of their peoples, beside my purpose. I have often deliberately preferred to lead up to political conclusions by such apparently indirect channels.[38]

Evans had in fact already written a book of travel literature, and both he and Stillman republished compilations of their foreign correspondence as volumes of travel writing.[39] Now, thanks to the electric telegraph, writing in this tradition could be printed

[38] Arthur Evans, *Illyrian Letters. A Revised Selection of Correspondence from the Illyrian Provinces ... Addressed to the* Manchester Guardian (London, 1878), p. x.
[39] Stillman republished journalism in his *The Cretan Insurrection of 1876-8* (New York, 1874), *Herzegovina and the Late Uprising* (London, 1877) and subsequently in *Autobiography of a Journalist* (2 vols., Boston, 1901); Evans was the author of *Through Bosnia and Herzegóvina on Foot During the*

in the daily press—in a sense, serialised—as a journalistic commentary on current affairs.

Writing to *The Times* to criticise Forbes' unfavourable verdict on the Bulgarians in *The Nineteenth Century*, E. A. Freeman explained how writers such as Evans and Stillman differed from their rivals:

> Mr. Forbes is a newspaper correspondent ... and nothing more ... he knew nothing of the history or condition of [Bulgaria] before he went there ... He has no claim to rank with men like your own Correspondent in Montenegro [i.e. William Stillman] ... still less does he rank with the great historian who was once your correspondent at Athens [i.e. George Finlay], or with the scholar, traveller, and thinker who sends from Ragusa to Manchester those words of fearless truth which grate so harshly on official ears [i.e. Arthur Evans].[40]

Stillman's dispatches for *The Times* and Evans' letters for the *Manchester Guardian* represented, in other words, a new genre of journalism that addressed 'the cultivated intelligence of England' with a degree of intellectual authority, and from a position of social respectability, that the likes of MacGahan and Forbes were unable to match.

Stillman, twenty-three years Evans' senior, was by some margin the more experienced of the two. Despite his complaint, in his rather misleadingly-titled *Autobiography of a Journalist*, that he had led 'a life so desultory, fragmentary rather, it is useless to keep the chronology', the lineaments of his career are clear.[41] Born in 1828 to a Seventh-Day Baptist mother and a somewhat less earnestly denominational father in New York State, Stillman graduated at age twenty from Union College, one of the oldest liberal arts colleges in the United States. He had determined upon a career as an artist, and in 1850 art took him on a one-way ticket, with characteristic impulsiveness, to England, where he struck up a friendship with John Ruskin.[42] By

---

Insurrection (London, 1876), and republished his reports for the *Manchester Guardian* as *Illyrian Letters* in 1878.

[40] Edward Freeman, 'The Bulgarians', *The Times* (28 Nov. 1877), p. 4.

[41] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 78.

[42] Ibid., i. 112-18.

1851 Stillman was back in New York, where he fell in with Lajos Kossuth—then touring the United States after the failure of the Hungarian Revolution in 1848—and became his agent in an abortive plot to recover the hidden Hungarian crown jewels, which saw Stillman travelling around Europe with secret documents concealed in the heel of his boot. It was, as were so many of Stillman's experiences, disillusioning, and he was strongly affected when he learnt that the Hungarian soldiers to whom he had relayed Kossuth's orders had been punished by decimation for obeying them.[43]

Safely back in New York after this escapade, Stillman enjoyed considerable success as an artist: he became known as 'America's first pre-Raphaelite', and in 1855 he founded America's first art journal, the *Crayon*.[44] Towards the end of the decade, Stillman introduced the likes of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Louis Agassiz, and James Russell Lowell to the 'great primeval forest' of the American wilderness during the camping expeditions he led for the so-called Adirondack Club.[45] For Emerson, indeed, Stillman was

> … our guides' guide, and Commodore,
> Crusoe, Crusader, Pius Æneas …[46]

Later, in 1860, Stillman spent a summer sketching in Switzerland with Ruskin.[47] During this decade the Crimean War, an event of decisive importance for many of the British participants in the Bulgarian Agitation two decades later, seems to have made no appreciable impression on him, and Stillman's first engagement with the Eastern Question was to occur later, in the course of his second career, as a diplomat and journalist.

---

[43] Ibid., i. 119-36.
[44] Ibid., i. 190-5.
[45] Ibid., i. 209-25.
[46] Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Poems* (London, 2012), p. 237.
[47] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, i. 260-75.

That career began in December 1861, on the outbreak of the American Civil War, when the patronage of Union College alumni won Stillman an appointment as the United States' Consul to the Vatican.[48] In 1865, he was transferred from Rome to Crete, in time to witness the beginning of the Cretan Insurrection a year later. Driven both by humanitarian sentiment and a desire to supplement his meagre consular stipend, Stillman became a correspondent for *The Times*, and his telegraphed reports were Europe's primary source of information on the events on the island.[49] More reflective pieces appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine*, and a series of essays on Crete in *The Nation* performed the same service for a North American readership.[50] The sight of Crete in the immediate aftermath of the insurrection was, as he put it, 'a picture which never has passed from my memory', and his plangent descriptions of 'the jaded, listless look of the people, the demoralization of war and exile, the ravage and misery of all surroundings' were finally published as a book in 1874, though the manuscript had been compiled years before.[51] As his biographer remarks, Stillman's essays for *The Nation* had been 'full of historical and ethnographical background', and his *Cretan Insurrection* (1874) was no different.[52]

By this time Stillman had been living in London for several years, where he moved in artistic and intellectual circles, enjoying the intimate society of William Morris, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and Algernon Swinburne; in 1871, he married the noted pre-Raphaelite painter Marie Spartali. During this time Stillman continued his career as a journalist, covering the Vienna Exposition of 1873 for the *New York Tribune*, later recalling with satisfaction how he 'scooped' his rivals (including Archibald Forbes) by

[48] Ibid., i. 283.
[49] Ibid., ii. 1-45.
[50] Stephen L. Dyson, *The Last Amateur: The Life of William Stillman* (New York, 2014), pp. 167-8.
[51] Stillman, *The Cretan Insurrection of 1866-8* (London, 1874). These passages are quoted by Friedrich Max Müller, 'Stillman's *Cretan Insurrection*', *The Times* (26 Nov. 1874), p. 4.
[52] Dyson, *Last Amateur,* p. 167.

a ruse to telegraph his reports first. It was no surprise, then, that two years later his father-in-law suggested Stillman go to Herzegovina to report on the incipient insurrection. When *The Times* initially declined his services, he offered to go at his own expense, 'with the understanding that if they printed my letters they should pay me for them', and was able to invoke Max Müller's favourable review of his Cretan book in *The Times* as testimony to his credentials.[53]

Stillman's experiences during the Cretan Insurrection provided an important context for the ways in which he interpreted the events of the Balkans in the 1870s. Most obviously, it was in Crete, where he had become 'thoroughly conversant with the Turkish manner of making war under similar circumstances, and personally acquainted with many Turkish functionaries, civil and military', that he had formed 'very decided opinions as to the merits of that struggle between humanity and ... barbarism'.[54] Stillman's reports from the Balkans, then, were strongly anti-Turkish. What he had learned in Crete had also led him to predict the character and duration of the Balkan uprisings more accurately than any of his rivals. 'I knew so well', he wrote,

> the condition in which the Turkish Empire had been left by the Cretan affair, and the apathy that had ruled it ever since, that I was convinced that a disaster was pending, and the state to which Russia had brought matters in the Ottoman Empire in 1869 pointed to a Slavonic movement this time.[55]

Of course, he was correct, and the *Times*, its initial scepticism notwithstanding, was soon to feature Herzegovina prominently in its daily editorials. His Cretan experience marked him out among foreign correspondents, and Stillman consistently cast himself as an authority, knowledgeable in the ways and personnel of the Ottoman Empire,

[53] See Max Müller, *The Times* (26 Nov. 1874), p. 4.
[54] William Stillman, *Herzegovina and the Late Uprising: The Causes of the Latter and the Remedies. From the Notes of a Special Correspondent* (London, 1877), p. 1.
[55] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii, 110.

beginning with his very first dispatch from the Balkans, which appeared on 2 September 1875:

> This is not a theoretical conclusion, but one drawn from a thorough experience of Christian Turkey running over some critical years …
>
> … I was in [Crete] the year after, and there was then no change except for the worse, and my latest advices from there assure me that there is no improvement in the condition of the Christians there …
>
> Server Pasha … is an educated, liberal Turk, winning in manner, plausible, and, I believe, really of the most humane disposition …
>
> If I might judge from past experience …[56]

In the vigorously contested public debate over the Eastern Question during these critical years, credibility was important. The leading articles of *The Times* quickly show Stillman's influence, as early as 7 September 1875, when an editorial cites Stillman's reports to qualify the claims of an 'Occasional Correspondent' on the previous page that the revolt in Herzegovina would be pacified within a month or two.[57] Turkophile opinion testified to the weight of Stillman's reputation by attempting to blacken it. Gladstone was informed that Stillman was considered 'an infamous and untrustworthy character' in the Levant, and it was only when Freeman had persuaded Gladstone that such reports were 'the base coinage of political passion' that he was prepared to cite him by name.[58]

Stillman's reputation was no less important abroad. Much of his knowledge of the 'motives and causes' of the Balkan risings, he declared, 'became known to me rather from regard for a certain reputation acquired in years gone by, during [the] insurrection in Crete, of being a sympathiser and active friend of the Rayahs [i.e. non-Muslim subjects of the Sultan], than because I was correspondent of an English journal'. The

[56] *The Times* (2 Sept. 1875), p. 5.
[57] *The Times* (7 Sept. 1875), p. 7.
[58] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 163. For the significance of this incident, see below.

centrifugal and personal politics of the Balkans had much more in common with Crete, indeed, than they had with those of western Europe during the Franco-Prussian War, where Stillman's rivals Forbes and MacGahan had both cut their teeth as war correspondents. In Montenegro in particular, he claimed, 'I had become in a way naturalised',[59] and it was his ability to win audiences with key actors in the uprisings that gave Stillman an edge over less well-connected journalists—an advantage exemplified by the correspondence between the Swiss secretary to the Crown Prince of Montenegro, Monsieur Duby, and E. A. Freeman. Duby recounts jokes and information that he and Stillman had shared, and which reveals that the influence of the English press was keenly appreciated in Montenegro.[60] That was an appreciation that Stillman shared with the Montenegrins, and again it was a lesson he had learned in Crete, as his reports of the Turkish massacres of Cretan insurgents ramified in Europe.[61]

In 1876, Stillman turned forty-three. Arthur Evans was merely twenty-five when the Bulgarian Agitation began, but while he was less experienced than Stillman he too brought considerable expertise to his Balkan correspondence for the *Manchester Guardian*, a Liberal newspaper outspoken in its support for Gladstone. Evans was the eldest son of Sir John Evans, the archaeologist, numismatist and paper magnate who enjoyed, in J. R. Green's phrase, 'high standing in learned society'.[62] After an education at Harrow, Arthur attended Brasenose College, Oxford, matriculating in 1870 and taking archaeology as a special subject in the new school of modern history. He soon displayed a taste for adventure, travelling to France, 'where the fires of war were still smouldering', in June 1871.[63]

---

[59] Ibid., ii. 114.
[60] See e.g. JRL, Freeman Papers, EAF/1/2/46, Duby to Freeman, [25?] Jan. 1877.
[61] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 37-8.
[62] Quoted in J. A. MacGillivray, *Minotaur: Sir Arthur Evans and the Archaeology of the Minoan Myth* (London, 2000), p. 42.
[63] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance, the Story of Arthur Evans and His Forbears* (London, 1943).

Next year, during the Long Vacation of 1872, Evans took inspiration from a book, which his half-sister Joan identified as 'Walsh's *Overland Tour from Constantinople to Vienna*' (purchased by their father in 1835), and travelled in the Carpathian mountains, 'through Carinthia to the Wendish country about Idria', where, characteristically, they 'got about by talking Latin to the priests', and went on 'to reach Turkish Costainica'.[64] This was Evans' first sight of the Ottoman Empire, and it fascinated him. As Joan recorded,

> The romance of the distant and the unfamiliar had always a peculiar charm for Arthur Evans [and here] for the first time [he] encountered the enchanting contrast and blend of east and west, Turkey and Europe: an enchantment that was to hold him for the rest of his life. He bought a complete Turkish outfit and donned it in triumph ... It was a visit of a single day, and a case of love at first sight. Thereafter Arthur Evans set the Balkans before any country in the world.[65]

Importantly, he was already 'deliberately writing up his travels, in no unskilful fashion', in letters home to his family and friends.[66] In 1873 he would publish his first piece of travel writing, an essay on his adventures in the Carpathian Mountains, in *Fraser's Magazine*.[67] But equally significantly, Evans, who was tutored in modern history at Oxford by J. R. Green, already displayed what Joan called a strong 'historic sense'. The uninhabited forests of Lapland, which he explored next year, made an unfavourable impression after the Balkans, enriched by the traces and survivals of the past, and Evan's enthusiasm was only restored when he and his companions discovered a Lap grotto with traces of offerings 'of a bronze age type': 'the cave and the silver ornament ... provided the charm of antiquity which the northern forests and lakes had hitherto seemed to lack'.[68]

---

[64] Ibid., p. 165.
[65] Ibid., p. 166.
[66] Ibid.
[67] [Arthur Evans], 'Over the Marches of Civilized Europe', *Fraser's Magazine*, 87 (May 1873), pp. 578-96.
[68] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance*, p. 174.

Evans' historic sense and his love of travel were to be given free rein after he graduated in 1874. A grandfather's legacy and a generous parental allowance meant that, as his half-sister put it, 'the question was not how to earn his living, but how to spend his time in an interesting and honourable fashion'.[69] After spending a term at Göttingen studying history under Reinhold Pauli, a collaborator and correspondent of William Stubbs and E. A. Freeman, Evans left precipitously at end of July 1875 for Agram, to travel in the region beyond Sziszek:

> This was to be no casual holiday, but Travel: Arthur planned to write a book about it. He armed himself with a camera ... and with a tiny notebook, gaily painted outside with the arms of Bosnia, containing in his microscopic writing a Bosnian vocabulary, a table of money, an epitomized history of Eastern Europe, a list of ethnological types, notes on religions, government, markets and costumes.[70]

Evans' notebook alone, with its notes on history and ethnology and its Bosnian heraldry painted with Romantic enthusiasm, might serve as a hermeneutic key to all his subsequent writings about the Balkans. Indeed, it was precisely 'the high historical and ethnologic interest which attached to the southern Sclaves [*sic*]' that had suggested the journey in the first place.[71]

The book that followed, *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot During the Insurrection* (London, 1876), published at the author's risk by Longman, was richly—and fortuitously—endowed with contemporary salience by the insurrections breaking out in south-eastern Europe; and so, on the strength of what his sister admitted was not much more than 'a certain amount of systematic reading and a month's walking tour', Evans emerged as an established authority on the Balkans. *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot* was widely and favourably reviewed: MPs quoted it in the House

[69] Ibid., p. 176.
[70] Ibid., p. 178.
[71] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, pp. vi-vii.

of Commons, and Gladstone cited Evans' evidence.[72] In turn, Evans reviewed other authors' books on the Balkans in publications including the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Academy*.[73] In 1877, a second edition would follow, reframed by a new preface commenting on the Constantinople Conference.[74] But in the meantime, Evans was well-placed to go to Ragusa as special correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian* in 1876, supplying what E. A. Freeman described as 'a first-rate correspondence … the work of a real traveller and scholar, a man of research, observation, and fearlessness'.[75] It was now that Evans' and Stillman's careers intersected: before setting out, the younger man visited Stillman in Clapham to ask for the seasoned foreign correspondent's advice.[76]

Despite their very different biographies, Stillman and Evans had much in common as foreign correspondents. Both might aptly be situated within what some historians have called the 'intellectual aristocracy' of nineteenth-century Britain.[77] Evans, for example, owed his first from Oxford to Freeman and Green, who together 'wrung' his degree 'from the obdurate [William] Stubbs', despite his inability to answer questions on any period later than the twelfth century.[78] Evans' interests in languages, ethnology, and history told in his favour: his first publication, a paper 'On a hoard of coins found at Oxford' had appeared in the *Numismatic Chronicle* of 1871.[79] So, too, did his father's scholarly standing—Green jocularly referred to him as 'little Evans—son of John Evans

[72] E.g. *Hansard* CCXXXIII, 9 April 1877, 755; Gladstone, *Slavonic Provinces of the Ottoman Empire*, pp. 9-11, quoting Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, pp. 204, 312.
[73] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance*, p. 183.
[74] Arthur Evans, *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot* (2nd ed., London, 1877), p. viii.
[75] Edward Freeman, 'The Relation of the English People to the [Russo-Turkish] War', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Aug. 1877), pp. 481-510 at p. 502.
[76] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance*, p. 184.
[77] See Noel Annan, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy', in J. H. Plumb (ed.), *Studies in Social History* (London, 1955), pp. 241-87 and more recently William Whyte, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy Revisited', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 10 (2005), pp. 15-45.
[78] J. L. Myres, 'Sir Arthur Evans', in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 26 (1942), pp. 323-57 at p. 324.
[79] Arthur Evans, 'On a Hoard of Coins Found at Oxford, with Some Remarks on the Coinage of the First Three Edwards', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 11 (1871), pp. 260–82.

the Great'.[80] Evans' time at Göttingen was similarly arranged by his admiring Harrow headmaster, Henry Montagu Butler, who had commended him to Brasenose College as 'a boy of powerful original mind'.[81] In turn, Evans owed his employment as a reporter for the *Manchester Guardian* to family friends, the Prestwiches: Joseph Prestwich, recently appointed to Oxford's chair in geology in 1874, was a friend of C. P. Scott, editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, and it was thanks to Prestwich's benevolent intervention that Evans was sent to Ragusa, with money for telegrams, to report on events in the Balkans.[82] During his long career at the heart of British intellectual life, Evans would serve as Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford for twenty-five years, and become a founding member of both the British Academy and the British School at Athens. Evans was also closely connected to Freeman, for he married the historian's eldest daughter Margaret in 1878, and when Freeman died at Alicante in 1892 it was Evans who oversaw the editing and publication of the unfinished concluding volume of Freeman's *History of Sicily*.

Stillman could make similarly compelling prosopographical claims to classify as a member of the so-called 'intellectual aristocracy'. Indeed, as one of his biographers has observed, his comparative obscurity today is in striking contrast with the prominent friendships that he enjoyed during his lifetime.[83] As we have seen, Stillman had been on intimate terms with the likes of Emerson, Agassi, Lowell and Longfellow during his years in the United States. Stillman's successful career as an artist as well as his second marriage to Maria Spartali, the most celebrated of the female pre-Raphaelite painters,

[80] J. R. Green to Edward Freeman, 11 Nov. 1875, in Leslie Stephen (ed.), *The Letters of John Richard Green* (London, 1901), p. 422.
[81] MacGillivray, *Minotaur*, p. 37.
[82] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance*, p. 184; MacGillivray, *Minotaur*, p. 51.
[83] Barbara Rotundo (ed.), *Catalogue of the William James Stillman Collection* (Schenectady, 1974), p. xii.

ensured that he moved with equal facility in London's intellectual and artistic circles.[84] At Macmillan's salons, for example, Stillman met the likes of Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes.[85] Ruskin stood godfather to Stillman's firstborn son, and Christina Rossetti enjoyed taking the same boy to the Zoological Gardens in London.[86] Other friends included Leslie Stephen (to whom he was introduced by Lowell) and James Anthony Froude.[87] The importance of connections such as these in establishing Stillman's authority and respectability in intellectual circles is brought home by an incident in 1876: Gladstone, having heard stories calling Stillman's integrity into question, had refrained from citing his reports in *Bulgarian Horrors*, and, as Stillman later recalled,

> though he used my facts, referred them to the authority of a second-hand version. Fortunately for me and my work, Professor Freeman had heard the reports in question, and knowing me personally[88] … applied himself to the investigation of the tales, and satisfied himself and Gladstone that they were simple libels, without a shadow of foundation, and even had never been heard of until they were promulgated in London ... Gladstone sent me word though Freeman that he wished me to call on him to receive personally his apologies.[89]

Stillman would come to know Gladstone better while staying at Longleat with the Marquis of Bath in September 1876;[90] several years later, the journalist and the statesman would enjoy each other's company in Italy. Less well-connected and less respectable journalists such as MacGahan and Forbes were obviously denied such advantages.

---

[84] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 76-92.
[85] Ibid., i. 256.
[86] Rotundo, *Catalogue of the Stillman Collection*, p. xi.
[87] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 93.
[88] Stillman had met Freeman, 'the staunchest of friends and allies', in Ragusa in 1875, and the two had struck up a firm friendship. See ibid., ii. 155.
[89] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 163.
[90] Ibid., ii. 162.

Stillman and Evans similarly shared many of the interests and enthusiasms characteristic of the milieu in which they lived. Both, for example, were fascinated by ethnology, which, as we shall see, informed their keen sense of history: Stillman collected Albanian skulls on behalf of the German doctor and anthropologist, Rudolph Virchow,[91] and during his time as a correspondent in Ragusa the young Arthur Evans performed the same service for the Virchow's Austrian colleague Felix von Luschan.[92] Archaeology was another shared interest, and if Evans later became famous for his work at Knossos, it had been Stillman's 1881 report on Minos Kalokairinos' 1878 excavations there that had made the site's significance well-known.[93] An archaeologist's sensibility permeated their journalism. Travelling in eastern Herzegovina, for example, Stillman recorded how he had come across 'ancient cemeteries with elaborate monuments of an early but unknown people', evidence of 'a great population' that had left no other trace, and therefore a considerable 'archaeological problem': he concluded that had been left behind by nomadic pastoral peoples in 'early Christian times, probably … prior to Diocletian'.[94] In his letters to the *Manchester Guardian,* Evans made similar references to new archaeological finds, reporting on 12 February 1877, for example, that he had 'discovered to my delight a bas-relief of Mercury standing, *caduceus* in hand, which evidently dated from the best period of Roman art'.[95] Two months later in a Turkish town he had turned up 'lots of architectural fragments', silver coins 'familiar to every numismatist' and even an iambic Greek inscription that had 'been made use of to support the wooden pillar of a cranky Turkish verandah!'[96] In Evans' hands, if not in Stillman's,

[91] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 198.
[92] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance*, p. 224.
[93] See Dyson, *Last Amateur*, p. 225.
[94] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 178-80.
[95] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, p. 37.
[96] Ibid., p. 134f.

archaeology was to afford proof, as we shall see, of the Balkans' European and classical heritage.

The two foreign correspondents' enthusiasm for mountaineering and walking was of a piece with such high-minded pursuits. Evans, like many of his contemporaries, had acquired a passion for such pastimes at public school; one of his closest school friends at Harrow, the biologist Francis Maitland Balfour, was to die while attempting the ascent of Mont Blanc decades later.[97] In due course, Evans' undergraduate excursions—like most of his journalistic travels in the Balkans—were pointedly undertaken on foot. His correspondence with friends and family was littered with mountaineering anecdotes: in one typical letter, he describes how 'we clambered, from one rocky gorge to another … [and] descended to a rocky stream, along whose gorge we had literally to fight our way, thorough the almost impervious thickets.'[98] Evans' first book, of course, was explicitly an account of a journey undertaken '*on foot*'. Stillman was an equally enthusiastic outdoorsman: as we have seen, he led the expeditions of the Adirondack Club, masterminding encampments in the forests of New York State and organising hunting parties. Stillman walked with Ruskin in Switzerland, hunting chamois in the snow. In 1878, he walked with Gladstone in the hills at Cortina near Florence, enjoying 'the freedom and openness of mind of a mountain walk, politics and Parliament forgotten'.[99]

All this is significant because walking and mountaineering, as William Whyte has recently reminded us, were 'characteristic—and self-consciously characteristic—occupations of the intellectual aristocracy',[100] a phenomenon that perhaps finds its best illustration in the Alpine Club, established in 1857 by a group of predominantly

[97] J. G. C. Minchin, *Old Harrow Days* (London, 1898), p. 205.
[98] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance*, pp. 170-1.
[99] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 212.
[100] Whyte, 'Intellectual Aristocracy Revisited', p. 35. See also Anne D. Wallace, *Walking, Literature, and English Culture: The Origins and Uses of the Peripatetic in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1994).

Cambridge dons, and numbering the likes of John Tyndall, Leslie Stephen, and Matthew Arnold amongst its members.[101] By the 1870s, the club had attained a certain celebrity in intellectual circles: Freeman, for example, could joke that the ascent to the capital of Montenegro 'is a little frightful to those who are not members of the Alpine Club' without the likelihood of being misunderstood.[102] Like the members of the Alpine Club, Evans—who rhapsodised over the blue gentians in the Balkans mountains[103]—and Stillman—who waxed lyrical on the nobility of the Swiss chamois[104]—exulted in the natural world. And like the Sunday Tramps, another intellectually-inclined walking club, founded a few years later in 1879, they were also keen to explore sites of historical and archaeological significance on foot.[105] This was a variety of outdoorsmanship far removed from the more plutocratic world of field sports.

Culturally and intellectually, then, Stillman and Evans were both well-placed to address 'the cultivated intelligence of England', for this was precisely the milieu to which they belonged; a milieu from which a hard-drinking self-made Irish-American journalist like Januarius MacGahan was excluded. That is not to say that neither Evans nor Stillman were above employing the rhetorical modes of the sensational journalist: Stillman, for example, describes a bloodthirsty ambush in graphic detail,[106] and Evans dwells on the 'squalor which I cannot describe' (although he tries) of a Bosnian refugee encampment.[107] Such journalistic resources heightened the affective colouring of their reporting. But unlike journalists such as MacGahan or Forbes, Stillman and Evans were

[101] Peter H. Hansen, 'Founders of the Alpine Club (*act.* 1857–1863)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[102] Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876, pp. 275-88, at p. 285.
[103] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, p. 114.
[104] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist,* i. 273.
[105] William Whyte, 'Sunday Tramps (*aet.* 1879–1895)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).
[106] William Stillman, 'Herzegovina', *The Times* (9 Oct. 1875), p. 10.
[107] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, p. 15.

also distinctly historically-minded, interpreting events in the Balkans as merely the latest denouements in the Eastern Question's much longer history.

Of the two, Evans made the more sustained use of history. As the *British Quarterly Review* observed, in the pages of *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot* Evans' considerable 'historical and antiquarian scholarship' was 'assiduously brought to bear upon his journey', and this gave the book 'a preponderating historical colour'.[108] That colour was only heightened by the sixty-three small-print pages of extended historical introduction that prefaced the text itself. Not only did this historical introduction emphasise just how deeply history informed Evans' understanding of the Eastern Question, but it also provided a narrative framework for the frequent historical and archaeological animadversions that litter the remainder of the book, transforming them from anecdotes into illustrations. Moreover, since it was with *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot* that Evans had, as Henry Tozer put it in the *Academy*, 'won himself a name', this historical introduction also furnishes an important context for his subsequent correspondence for the *Manchester Guardian* and the volume of *Illyrian Letters* into which it was compiled.[109]

Above all, the purpose of Evans' introduction is to situate the history of south-eastern Europe firmly within European history. His opening sentence sets the tone, describing how,

> About the middle of the fifth century, when Britain was passing definitely into the hands of the English … Sclavonic [*sic*] tribes overran Maesia, Thrace, Macedonia, and Illyricum, and pushed on to the Adriatic shores. From this period the final settlement of the Sclaves [*sic*] in the area of what is now known as Turkey-in-Europe may be safely dated.[110]

---

[108] [Anon.], 'Review: Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (Oct. 1876), pp. 516-18 at pp. 516-17.
[109] Henry Tozer, 'Illyrian Letters', *The Academy*, 315 (18 May 1878), pp. 429-30 at p. 429.
[110] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, p. xix.

Evans is drawing out what he goes on to describe as 'the analogy of our own history of the conquest of Britain' and the history of the Slavonic conquests in south-eastern Europe, and the analogy is more than coincidental.[111] The 'Sclavonic tribes' in the east and the English in the west, branches alike of the Aryan family, both settled in their homelands during the late-antique *völkerwanderung*, and their racial relationship makes the two conquests merely opposing faces of the same coin. In a lecture on 'The Slavs and European Civilisation', delivered to an audience at Sion College, two years later, Evans expatiated on this point, evoking

> a time when the primitive forefathers of the Slavs and the primitive forefathers of the Englishmen formed part of the same agricultural community somewhere in the highlands of Central Asia—a time, the annals of which have been only faintly deciphered in recent times by the science of comparative mythology, when the forefathers of Slavs and Englishmen, and for that matter most European nations, spoke the same mother tongue and belonged to the same Aryan people—and … the still remoter time when the forefathers of both of us were brothers in the most literal sense of the word.[112]

Evans intended, of course, to remind his audience that 'blood is thicker than water', and that while the Balkan Slavs might not be so 'near of kin to us as the Germans or the Norsemen, they are yet our cousins'.[113]

It was significant, therefore, that in *Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot* Evans drew out family resemblances. Bosnian brooches, for example, resemble brooches found in 'our old English barrows'.[114] In his despatches for the *Manchester Guardian*, Evans even contended that no other people in Europe is 'endowed so largely with the English love of field sports', and described 'lads gathered on the village green playing a game … which is nothing else than a rudimentary form of cricket'.[115] The

[111] Ibid., p. xx.
[112] Arthur Evans, *The Slavs and European Civilisation* (London, 1878), p. 5.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina,* p. 20.
[115] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, p. 123.

familiar and uncritical 'village green' here is no less telling than Evans' explicit interpretation of the game played upon it. Elsewhere he identifies another Bosnian pastime as 'nothing else, I can assure you, than the good old English game of "putting the stone."'[116] Evans' introduction reveals that seemingly mundane observations of this kind are in fact informed by, and illustrative of, a deep history of the kinship between Slavs and other members of the 'Aryan family'.[117]

Evans' racial reflections betray a debt to an earlier work of travel literature that he cites several times, authored by Sir John Gardner Wilkinson, the noted Egyptologist, philologist and historian. As a Harrow schoolboy Evans, a budding numismatist, had catalogued Gardner Wilkinson's extensive coin collection[118]—and it happened that, as we have seen, Gardner Wilkinson's *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (1848) was among the most influential works of Balkan travel literature published in the nineteenth century. Gardner Wilkinson's third chapter, for example, charts the history of Spalato back to the era of Diocletian—just as Evans devoted a whole chapter of his *Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot* to the history of Ragusa back to late-antiquity.[119] And Gardner Wilkinson's history, like Evans, is informed by ethnology: just as Evans had pointed to the similarity between the Slavonic '*woda*' and the English 'water', so Gardner Wilkinson had noted the connections between 'stone' and '*stina*', 'brother' and '*brate*', and 'sister' and '*sestra*', citing the German linguist Franz Bopp's *Comparative Grammar*. Comparison between the English and Slavonic languages and Sanskrit proved, Gardner Wilkinson had argued, that both were 'offsets of the same parent stock in Central Asia'.[120]

---

[116] Ibid., p. 122.
[117] Evans uses the expression repeatedly, e.g. *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, p. 37.
[118] Jason Thompson, *Sir Gardner Wilkinson and His Circle* (Austin, Texas, 1992), p. 343.
[119] Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro,* i. v.
[120] Ibid., i. 7-9.

Of course, while the English and the Balkan Slavs were connected by ties of race, they were far from identical. Evans, indeed, questioned 'whether any pure-blooded Anglo-Saxon is capable of fully understanding a Slav', so strong was their proclivity for metaphor and the immaterial. More concretely, whereas their cousins in the west had organized their societies around the 'village community', the Slavs 'primitive social relations' were ordered around the patriarchal 'house-community': 'the people live in large family communities, holding all things in common, and choosing a 'house-father' and a 'house-mother,' generally the elders of the family, to direct [them].'[121] In the west, village communities had developed over time into sophisticated and complex polities; but in the Balkans, the Turkish conquest had levelled the feudal distinctions that had been elaborated during the middle ages. Only the primitive institutions of the house community had endured, and the Ottoman occupation had thus had the unintended consequence of 'purging the sterling democratic ore of society from all this haematitic dross':

> society reverted to that almost patriarchal form which the Sclavonic settlers had carried with them … in the days of [Emperor] Heraclius. *Vlastela* [*i.e.* the nobility] and magnates now make way once more for simple house-fathers, distinctions of rank are merged in the old equality and fraternity that reign within the paling of the house community.[122]

Other travel writers concurred: Irby and Mackenzie, for example, believed that 'almost everything that had been superinduced [*sic*] on the old Slavonic commune was swept away by the besom of Turkish conquest' and that 'the modern Serbian ... comes before us at nearly the same patriarchal stage as his fathers'.[123] But the resilience of the house community made a particularly deep impression on Evans. Even refugees taking shelter in squalid caves in the Bosnian highlands, he claimed, had preserved this distinctively

[121] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, p. 41.
[122] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, p. 45.
[123] Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces*, ii. 314.

Slavonic social structure, and he recorded in the *Manchester Guardian* that 'every cavern has its house-father and house-mother': the refugees had quite simply 'carried their little constitution underground!'[124]

All this proved the Slavs' Aryan descent—and thus their kinship with Evans' English readers—but just as importantly it also vindicated the Slavs' latent capacity for development. Evans quotes approvingly the Austrian geographer Ami Boué, who had compared the Serbs and the English, alike 'born, if any ever were, for parliamentary government'.[125] The representative institutions of the house community were parliaments in microcosm: 'practising every day the forms of parliamentary government in miniature', the Slavs were ideally suited to nurture representative institutions.[126] Racial history, in other words, proved just how similar to their English cousins the Balkan Slavs really were.

In addition to this deep historical tie, Evans also took pains to situate the Balkan Slavs within comparatively more recent European history—above all, the history of the Roman Empire. Soon after they settled in south-eastern Europe, the Slavs had begun to provide Rome with soldiers, and Evans reminds us that Justinian and Belisarius were both Slavs, harking back to 'the days when these now neglected lands gave emperor after emperor to the world'.[127] 'Thus were first cemented', he declares, 'those peculiar relations between the Sclaves [*sic*] and Byzantium which are still of supreme importance in considering the Eastern Question.'[128] In time, the Slavs had established independent states of their own, and for Evans, their true destiny had been to provide the waning Byzantine Empire with a sort of world-historical blood transfusion: had this destiny

[124] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, pp. 16-7.
[125] Ibid., p. 151.
[126] Ibid., pp. 40-1.
[127] Ibid., p. 203.
[128] Ibid. p. xix.

been fulfilled, 'the dotard Greeklings of Byzantium would have given place to a youthful power capable of acting as the champion of Christendom and of competing successfully with the civilisation of the West'.[129]

This transfusion, of course, had failed to materialize. The Ottoman conquest had put an end, not only the Byzantine Empire, but also the Slavs' independent political life. But Evans maintained that the past was the key to the future, and that the emergence of a 'South Slavonic union' where the Byzantine Empire had once ruled would be the most felicitous solution to the Eastern Question. Indeed, Evans believed it was to this that the Slavs aspired, for their national poetry had kept alive the 'memories of a time when one of their princes seemed about to catch up the falling diadem of Byzantium and place it on his brow'.[130] Though the historian George Finlay used different language—he would never have employed the expression 'dotard Greeklings'—the thesis, as Evans acknowledges, is his.[131] Irby and Mackenzie, who likewise cite Finlay, also rue that the opportunity to 'pour the vigour of [these] young northern peoples into the exhausted frame of a long-civilised realm' had been missed, expressing the hope that it will be realized in the future.[132] Valerian Krasinski, an earlier travel writer, had similarly speculated that 'the Eastern Empire might have been saved from destruction, by the establishment of a new dynasty belonging to an energetic race, which would have re-invigorated the effete Byzantines'.[133]

As it was, while the Slavs had failed to inherit the Byzantine polity, Evans insisted that they were nonetheless very much the cultural heirs of the Roman Empire, richly imbued with European civilisation's classical heritage. Time and again, in the pages of

[129] Ibid., p. 216.
[130] Ibid., p. 139; cf. Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, pp. 24, 68-9.
[131] Ibid., p. 251.
[132] Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces*, ii. 297-301.
[133] Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey*, p. 95.

Through Bosnia and Herzegovina On Foot and in his *Manchester Guardian* despatches, Evans records traces of Roman and Byzantine influence. For various pieces of Bosnian crockery, for example, Evans identifies

> a common source—the Eastern Roman Empire. Like the coinage, like the rich architecture of the old Servian [*sic*] Empire, they betray Byzantine influences … This survival of the Roman vessel is shared by the western parts of the empire. The same shaped pot turns up in Spain and Portugal. It is common to south Italy … I have seen Roman pots of this type dug up … almost identical in shape with those sold every day in the market-places of the respective modern towns.[134]

Croat musical instruments prompt similar reflections:

> how strangely classic are the musical instruments of the Croats! … are the pipes and lutes before us actually heirlooms from the very shepherds of whom Theocritus piped on the thymy pastures of Hybla? … It really almost seemed so. I asked a countryman the name of his pipe, and to my amazement his reply was *Fistjela* … this seemed a very good attempt at *Fistula*, the pastoral pipe of the Romans.[135]

Indeed, Evans rarely passes up the opportunity to make a classical analogy or attribution. The windows of Agram 'have a Roman air', recalling 'the amphitheatre of Pola in Istria'. Near Tesanj, Evans wonders if an 'ancient road' really 'represented the continuity of Roman engineering', noting that 'the wooden bridges … strangely recalled some of Trajan's handicraft'.

Mostar bridge Evans also attributes to Trajan (echoing Gardner Wilkinson), and the town itself he declares 'Romanesque if not Roman … Every now and then an Italian physiognomy strikes us among the citizens'. Bosnian tombs, too, give the impression that 'they are descendants of Roman sarcophagi, and indeed their upper part is exactly similar to some Roman monuments'. Old Roman place names suggest connections or analogies between the Balkans and western Europe, and etymology enables Evans to identify an 'Illyrian Narbonne' and 'a Cirencester in the neighbourhood of Zara'. All

[134] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, pp. 16-7.
[135] Ibid., pp. 20-1.

this is indicative of Evans' acutely historically minded sensibility; a sensibility that transformed not only how he presented, but also how he experienced south-eastern Europe. Evans' sense of the Roman past, indeed, coloured his perceptions of the present to such a degree that even the discordant squeaking of Bosnian wagons elicited reflections on Martial's recommendation that villas be situated far from thoroughfares.[136]

But for all his attention to putative evidence of classical descent, Evans was also keenly interested in south-eastern Europe's mediaeval past. Again, he situates the Balkan Slavs, and Bosnia-Herzegovina in particular, firmly within the narrative of European history. South-eastern Europe had a feudal period, Evans reminds us, and he employs analogies to make it more familiar to a British audience: we are told, for instance, that the Diet of Coinica, when King Stephen Thomas sealed a charter ending a civil war in 1446, was 'in a certain sense the Runnymede of Bosnia'.[137] Nor were the connections Evans drew limited to analogies: turning the pages of a Bosnian book of heraldry, he describes how the

> imagination is kindled to realize how these isolated regions fitted once into the polity of medieval Europe. Here, too, in these barbarous neglected lands, the romantic brilliance of chivalry has once held sway … within the limits of Christendom militant. The names, the armorial bearings, recall the European cousin-hood of that hierarchy of birth. In due order among the escutcheons of Bosnian nobles appears the shield of the *Frangepani*; that of the Ruscievic family reproduced the oriflamme of France: next in order, by a curious coincidence, follows that of the Sestricic, strewn with Tudor roses.[138]

It is important to realise that this passage is not a paean to feudalism, of which Evans was—as we shall see elsewhere—a strident critic, but rather to a time when Bosnia enjoyed her rightful place within the European 'polity'. Tellingly, a soberer footnote is

[136] Ibid., pp. 23, 113, 342-4, 171, 361 n. 1, 113; cf. Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, pp. 125, 202f.
[137] Ibid., p. 304.
[138] Ibid., pp. 220-1.

forced to concede that the resemblance to Tudor roses is nothing more, so Evans' imaginative extravagance reveals that his emphasis is not on chivalry, but on the relationships the Bosnian nobility enjoyed with the other noble houses of Europe.

It is not just medieval Bosnia's integration within the matrix of European feudalism, however, that drew Evans' attention: his real enthusiasm in this period was reserved for a dualist heretical sect, the Bosnian Bogomils. Evans aspires to rehabilitate the reputation of the Bogomils, whose history 'has been written by their enemies, and ignored by those who owe most to their heroism'.[139] Their story, he contends, 'has its bearings even on English history',[140] for 'the first Protestants of Western Europe', he argues, 'were spiritual children of the Bogomiles [*sic*] of Bulgaria and Bosnia'.[141] Here Evans is again following Gardner Wilkinson, who identifies in the Bogomils an aspect of Bosnian history 'interesting to Protestants, as it relates to the early reformers of the church, and to that link in the chain, which connects the simplicity of primitive doctrines with the present time', and who devoted a lengthy aside to their history.[142] The Cathars in Provence, the Hussites of Hungary, the 'Publicani, or Paulicians' in England, and ultimately the Reformation of the sixteenth century, are alike linked to the Bogomils, 'those staunch upholders of Puritan faith … whose sweet spiritual influences every reformed church in the world feels still', who emerge from his account—again following Gardner Wilkinson—as a critical force in European religious history.[143]

---

[139] Ibid., p. xliii.
[140] Ibid., p. xxiv.
[141] Ibid., p. xxxv.
[142] John Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (2 vols., London, 1848), ii. 97, and see ii. 97-114. Gardner Wilkinson had been followed by others, including Valerian Krasinski, who had identified the Patarenese as 'the precursors of Protestantism': see Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey*, p. 103.
[143] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, p. 177. Cf. Evans, *The Slavs and European Civilization*, pp. 21-2.

Nor is this essentially Christian narrative the only history within which Evans situates the Bogomils' story: he goes further, identifying them as leaders in what contemporaries sometimes called the 'march of mind':

> Bosnia was the religious Switzerland of Medieval Europe, and the signal service which she has rendered the freedom of the human intellect by her successful stand against authority can hardly be exaggerated. Resistance, broken down in the gardens of Provence, buried beneath the charred rafters of the Roman cities of the Langue d'Oc, smothered in the dungeons of the Inquisition, was prolonged from generation to generation amongst the primeval forests and mountain fastnesses of Bosnia.[144]

Here the emphasis is not so much on the Bogomils' pursuit of a 'purer religion' as on their championship of the 'freedom of the human intellect'. Evans goes on to make his point even more explicit:

> Those who perceive in Protestantism itself nothing more than a stepping-stone to still greater freedom of the human mind, and who recognise the universal bearings of the doctrine of Evolution, will be slow to deny that England herself and the most enlightened countries of the modern world may owe a debt, which it is hard to estimate, to the Bogomiles [*sic*] of Bosnia.[145]

By incorporating the Bogomils into the history of the 'march of mind', Evans emphasised that they were not only part of Europe's past, but also, in another sense, part of its future. That was only of a piece with his attitude to the Balkans' history in general: as he put it in the preface to *Illyrian Letters*, in these 'historic lands', the 'monuments of the Past present the weightiest protest against Present ruin, and form the true mirrors of the Future'.[146]

William Stillman never produced a sustained historical narrative of such sophistication. Indeed, he drew upon history altogether more allusively and episodically than his more scholarly younger colleague. Stillman seems to have shared many of Evans'

[144] Ibid., p. xliii.
[145] Ibid., p. xliii.
[146] Evans, *Illyrian Letters*, p. x.

assumptions about race—assumptions that were idiomatic by the 1870s.[147] Writing of northern Crete, for example, Stillman adverted to the 'waves of Arian [*sic*] emigration which came from the north down on Italy, Hellas, and the Dorian lands'.[148] In his autobiography, he describes the conflict between Ottomans and Slavs as 'the race of races now being run in the Balkans', and its history indicated that there could only be one ending.[149] Like Evans, Stillman also characterised the social organisation of the Balkan Slavs as 'essentially a family confederation'; a 'patriarchal despotism' that 'suits the people' and might prepare the ground for a future democracy.[150]

For both authors, the Slavs were Europeans under foreign domination: for Evans the Ottoman Empire in Europe was an 'alien civilization',[151] and so too for Stillman, Turkey in Europe was nothing more than an 'extended brigandage ... since respected as a *fait accompli*, with the respect men pay to the work of four centuries, even when, as in this case, that work is in itself utterly evil'.[152] Similarly, just as Evans believed that the Balkan Christians had been 'degraded by centuries of oppression', so Stillman explained their vices as an inevitable consequence of 'centuries of oppression and isolation'—a familiar argument from the days when philhellene authors had sought to excuse the vices of the Greeks in the aftermath of the 1821 War of Independence.[153]

But it is in his series of despatches from Montenegro that Stillman's historical imagination seems to fully awaken, and it is in these that his real importance resides. In Montenegro, Stillman believed that he had 'extended my own horizon by the discovery of a people of the old heroic type—a survival of the Homeric age', and he portrayed the

[147] See Colin Kid, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 168-202.
[148] William Stillman, 'The Heart of Crete', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 22 (24 Nov. 1870), pp. 49-61 at p. 49.
[149] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 282.
[150] Stillman, *Herzegovina*, p. 155
[151] Evans, *Bosnia and Herzegovina*, p. xli
[152] Stillman, *Herzegovina*, p. 2.
[153] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 223.

Montenegrins accordingly.[154] Evans duly followed suit with a 'little Montenegrin Iliad' for his readers in the *Manchester Guardian*, descanting on the similarity between the modern-day Montenegrins and Homer's heroes.[155] The sight of women dancing, for example, is a scene from

> Homeric times, and these are the pure, true forms of Antiquity! 'Horo,' their dance is called, and it might have been a 'choros' of some Hellenic festival divine … The people ... pour forth a measured flow of song, antique in tones and cadence as the dances it accompanies ... those who hear them seem to clothe themselves in the flesh and blood of generations of heroic forefathers. It is the infancy of music lisping of the infancy of history, and that dull measured cadence is the heart-throb of a people still in the sturdiness of youth.

Elsewhere, repartee between Turks and Montenegrins is described as an exchange of 'winged words', again evoking Homer.[156] But despite this suggestive foray, Evans readily conceded that it was Stillman who had 'made the modern history of Montenegro his own'.[157] Indeed, Stillman's reports from Montenegro were among his most influential. Disraeli complained to Lord Bath that hitherto 'England had no interest whatever in Montenegro, but … the letters in the *Times* had created such an enthusiasm for the principality that the Government [was] obliged to take it into account'.[158] So his role in what could be called the 'Montenegrin moment' (explored in detail below, pp. 212-41) of the 1870s was considerable.

Of course, Stillman's Montenegrin dispatches were in some respects fairly conventional. Like many travel writers, including his fellow journalist Arthur Evans, Stillman drew by now familiar parallels between the hardy mountaineers of Montenegro and the heroes of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* Observing a group of warriors listening to 'the Servian epics sung by the Prince's bard', which told of 'the legends of the heroic

[154] Stillman, *Herzegovina*, p. 26.
[155] Evans, *Illyrian Letters,* pp. 186, 176.
[156] Ibid., pp. 189-90, 180.
[157] Ibid., p. ix.
[158] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 164.

defence, the rout of Kossovo, and the fall of the great empire, of which they were the only representatives who had never yielded to the rule of the Turk', Stillman inevitably thinks of the *Iliad*: 'Substitute for the rocky ridge which formed the background of the scene, the Dardanelles and the fleet drawn up on the shore before Troy, and you have a parallel such as no other country in our time could give.'[159] Similarly, Stillman suggests that the ethnology of Montenegro corresponded 'as nearly as we can reconstruct ethnology to that of the Greeks in the time of the Trojan war'. In another dispatch, when the Montenegrins blockade the small town of Nikšić, Stillman sees the Trojan war in microcosm: 'in a small way in as close a state of siege, probably, as Troy was for ten years'.[160] In the pages of *The Times*, these Homeric analogies were mingled with other, equally familiar, comparisons: the Montenegrins' dignified simplicity, for example, 'strikes almost all who know Scotland as resembling strongly the Highlander'. Moments later we are told that 'the residence of the Ruler of Montenegro is worthy of its Laecedemonian prototype',[161] evoking a Russian naval officer quoted by Valerian Krasinski, whose visit to Montenegro two decades earlier had prompted him to exclaim, 'I have seen Sparta'.[162]

But although such comparisons were conventional enough, in Stillman's hands they were unconventionally thoughtful, for they were informed by the comparative method: the Montenegrins do not merely *resemble* an earlier stage in the development of western civilisation; they are actually a 'survival' from such a stage. Analogy collapses into identity, and Montenegrin society becomes a valuable artefact, part of the ancestral heritage of civilised Europe. Most Englishman, Stillman believed, would 'entertain a

[159] Ibid., ii. 114.
[160] Ibid., ii. 115, 118-9.
[161] [William Stillman], 'Montenegro', *The Times* (21 Sept. 1875), p. 8; Stillman, *Herzegovina*, pp. 18-20.
[162] Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey,* p. 21.

wish that Montenegro might be preserved intact and unchanged by civilization as a study of what mankind has once been', and his anxiety lest 'progress' efface Montenegro's uniqueness is reminiscent of Sir Henry Maine's concern to preserve the primitive institutions of British India. Like Maine, Stillman believed that it was imperative that progress be incremental and indigenous:

> Liberty has not always had a nursing-mother, and the nations which profit most by their freedom have earned it by sacrifice … The less foreign interference ... in such a process the better ... and therefore Eastern ways are safer to trust than Western, since the system, to which the West has grown habituated, is the worst possible for the present condition of the East.

Indeed, Stillman actually suggests that there may be a role for 'the unequalled experience in such work of English Indian administrators'. As we shall see, Stillman's position resonated deeply with Freeman and Gladstone. For all three, Montenegro was valuable because it taught nineteenth-century Englishmen something important about themselves.

If it was only in these reports from Montenegro that Stillman attained a range of historical reference to match Arthur Evans, we should note nonetheless that he conceived of his *Herzegovina and the Late Uprising*, in which his despatches for *The Times* were republished, as 'a fragment of history' and characterised himself as a 'candid historian'.[163] As we have seen, Evans concurred, adjudging the book a work of 'modern history' and so did Freeman, who recommended Stillman's *Herzegovina* to the readers of *The Academy*:

> Mr. Stillman's book should be read. It gives a picture, such as can hardly be got elsewhere, of what may be called the inner life of the uprising. The stories of the battles might have been told more stirringly; but Mr. Stillman is the least sensational of correspondents. He is always bent on real business. He is a student of insurrections, and he has tracked the ins and outs of this particular one. He tells us throughout what an observant man saw, what an experienced man inferred from what he saw. If any one

[163] Stillman, *Herzegovina*, pp. 1-2.

> wishes really to understand a piece of contemporary history, … he … should read Mr. Stillman … He will then see how events look in the eyes of … one who has lived among the events, and who knows their real meaning.[164]

Freeman's recommendation reminds us that nineteenth-century historical-mindedness could manifest itself in different ways. If Evans' rich historical imagination, at work on putative traces and survivals, issued in travel literature and foreign correspondence of an obviously historical bent, so Stillman's rigorous dissections of the politics of the Herzegovinian and Montenegrin insurgencies stuck his readers as a different variety of historiography—a variety more Thucydidean than Herodotean, certainly, but equally historical. For Freeman at least, it was precisely this that made Stillman 'something higher' than 'a mere Correspondent' such as Archibald Forbes.[165]

[164] Freeman, 'Herzegovina and the Late Uprising', *The Academy*, 257 (7 April 1877), pp. 287-8 at p. 287.
[165] Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 10 Nov. 1877.

Chapter Five

Interpreting the Eastern Question: British Periodicals

When news of the Bulgarian atrocities reached London in July 1876, the press was appreciably more developed that it had been at the time of the Crimean War. The increasing rapidity with which foreign affairs were reported in the newspapers was only one of several developments that had altered Britain's print culture in decisive ways. The repeal of the Stamp Duty in 1855 and the Paper Duty in 1861—the two 'taxes on knowledge'—had issued in 'an enormous growth of popular ephemeral literature' in the decades that followed.[1] By the late 1860s, rotary web presses had made further improvements to the economics of publishing.[2] Newspaper circulation had increased—by 1871 the *Daily Telegraph* had the largest circulation of all the daily newspapers at 200,000—and books and pamphlets were cheaper to produce than ever before. New and important periodicals and journals had emerged: the *Saturday Review* in 1855, *Macmillan's Magazine* in 1859, the *Fortnightly Review* in 1865, and the *Contemporary Review* in 1866. Just over a decade later, in 1877, the inaugural issue of the *Nineteenth Century* would appear. As Mark Pattison observed, it was in these 'new iron monitors' rather than the 'venerable old wooden three-deckers, the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly Review*', that much of 'the active warfare of opinion' tended to be conducted.[3] Increasingly, contributions to the periodicals were signed, and stand-alone

[1] E. E. Kellett, 'The Press' in G. M. Young (ed.), *Early Victorian England 1830-65* (2nd ed., 2 vols., Oxford, 1951), ii. 7.
[2] Lucy Brown, *Victorian News and Newspapers* (Oxford, 1985), p. 8.
[3] Mark Pattison, 'Books and Critics', *Fortnightly Review*, 28 (Nov. 1877), pp. 659-97 at p. 663. In all, some 50,000 different periodical titles were published in Britain during the nineteenth century, and they

essays complemented review articles. As one mid-century observer remarked, no other literary genre was more 'peculiarly the creation of our own age'.[4]

This complex and increasingly self-confident print culture responded rapidly to the concerns of the moment. While the daily press was most obviously reflexive, pamphlets and tracts were also inherently topical, and books were often published as interventions in a debate. In turn, such books might be republished with new prefaces reframing their contents in the context of current affairs. Genres and media were permeable too. As we have seen, in 1878 Arthur Evans, for example, compiled a series of dispatches he had authored for the *Manchester Guardian* as the paper's foreign correspondent during the previous year into *Illyrian Letters*, a volume of travel writing, with a preface referring to the impending Congress of Berlin. *Illyrian Letters* was duly reviewed in the periodical press, its contents once again related to the events of the day.[5] Evans' dispatches for the *Manchester Guardian* were thus presented to a series of audiences in a variety of forms and contexts. In many cases, moreover, texts passed out of their authors' control: Leopold von Ranke's *Die Serbische Revolution* (1829), for example, was translated into English by Mrs Alexander Kerr in 1847 as *A History of Servia*, and reissued in 1853 in response to the Crimean War, with an appendix of translated excerpts from Cyprien Robert's *Les Slaves de Turqie* (1844); in January 1876, forty-seven years after its original publication in Hamburg, Ranke's work (in Kerr's translation, including Robert's appendix) was reviewed in the *British Quarterly Review*

circulated more widely than printed books: see J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. Van Arsdel (eds.), *Victorian Periodicals: A Guide to Research* (2 vols., New York, 1978-89).

[4] [Frederick Oakeley], 'Periodical Literature', *Dublin Review*, 34 (June 1853), pp. 541-66 at pp. 545-546.

[5] [Anon.], 'Evans's Illyrian Letters', *The Spectator* (27 April 1878), p. 534; [Anon.], 'Evans's Illyrian Letters', *Athenaeum* (20 April 1878), p. 504; [Anon.], 'Evans's Illyrian Letters', *Saturday Review* (18 May 1878), pp. 630-1; Henry Tozer, 'Illyrian Letters', *The Academy*, 315 (18 May 1878), pp. 429-30; Humphry Sandwith, 'Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Austria', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (Oct. 1878), pp. 393-414. Cf. [Henry Reeve], 'Bosnia and Bulgaria', *Edinburgh Review*, 144 (Oct. 1876), pp. 536-72.

in the context of uprisings in Bosnia and Herzegovina.[6] Similarly Gladstone's pamphlet on *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*, which sold forty-thousand copies within three or four days of its publication on 6 September 1876, not only excerpted passages from a variety of writers, but was itself excerpted in the press and in pirated editions over the coming weeks.[7] In this way existing literature might acquire new contemporary salience years—or merely days—after its original publication, and in contexts quite different from those that had originally engendered it.

The periodical press exemplified this tendency to adapt and readapt. Between 1875 and 1878, six influential periodicals—the *Quarterly Review*, the *British Quarterly Review*, the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Contemporary Review*, *Macmillan's Magazine* and the *Nineteenth Century*—devoted over two-hundred essays to the Eastern Question, many of them explicitly review articles: in their pages, old and new literature was reframed to address contemporary questions, and books that in themselves were unlikely to attain an extensive readership might be 'read' for and by a wider audience. A periodical article might intervene simultaneously in a contemporary debate and contribute to an existing tradition embodied in the works it reviewed. Or conversely, periodicals might review the daily or weekly press—publications such as the *Daily News*, *The Times* and *The Spectator*—offering a deeper, more sustained analysis of current affairs for an intellectual audience.[8] The same was true of consular reports, Parliamentary Papers and Blue Books, all alike reviewed and dissected in the periodicals.[9] Indeed, by the 1870s Carlyle's prophecy that literature was destined 'to

[6] Humphry Sandwith, 'Servia', *British Quarterly Review*, 63 (Jan. 1876), pp. 100-21.
[7] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903), ii. 552.
[8] E.g. [Anon.], 'The Russian and Turkish War I', *British Quarterly Review*, 67 (April 1878), pp. 482-506; [Anon.], 'The Russian and Turkish War II', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (July 1878), pp. 82-106; [Anon.], 'The Turkish Question: Russian Designs and English Promoters of Them', *Westminster Review*, 107 (Jan. 1877), pp. 93-163.
[9] E.g., [Humphry Sandwith], 'The Independence and Integrity of the Ottoman Empire', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (July 1876), pp. 79-88; Humphry Sandwith, 'Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Austria', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (Oct. 1877), pp. 393-414; Edward Freeman, 'The Three Treaties', *British*

become one boundless self-devouring Review' had, in a sense, been fulfilled, and some commentators went so far as to prophesy the imminent obsolescence of the book.[10] In retrospect, such predictions may have been extravagant, but it is undeniable that the periodicals were at the very heart of British print culture.

An essay by Humphrey Sandwith in the *British Quarterly Review* of January 1876 exemplifies how the periodicals could provide a point of entry into a wider—and not exclusively Anglophone—literature. Sandwith was a British physician who had lived in Constantinople and travelled widely in the Ottoman Empire, and who became an increasingly Turkophobe commentator on Eastern affairs after serving with the Ottoman forces during the Crimean War. His best-selling *A Narrative of the Siege of Kars* (1856), recounting his experience, had firmly established his credentials as an authority on the East and confirmed his reputation for bravery. In 1872, Sandwith had attended the coronation of Prince Milan of Serbia in Belgrade, where he had established ties with Serbian leaders—a visit he had described in the pages of Morley's *Fortnightly* and J. A. Froude's *Fraser's Magazine*.[11] Now Sandwith's pet subject had acquired renewed salience, as events in Bosnia and Herzegovina had brought Serbia to the brink of declaring war on Turkey in support of her Orthodox brethren across the border, making Belgrade the centre of intense diplomatic intrigue, and he duly made 'Servia [*sic*]' his subject in the pages of the *British Quarterly Review*. Yet while Sandwith's piece was distinctly topical, it was far from superficial, for he framed the essay as a review of five substantial works: Ranke's *History of Servia* in the English translation by Mrs Alexander Kerr, Elodie Lawton's *History of Modern Servia*, Felix von Kanitz's

Quarterly Review, 68 (Oct. 1877), pp. 465-508; Edward Freeman, 'Neutrality—Real or Pretended?', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Oct. 1877), pp. 877-93.
[10] Thomas Carlyle, 'Characteristics', *Edinburgh Review*, 54 (Dec. 1831), pp. 351-83.
[11] Humphry Sandwith, 'Servia and its New Prince', *Fortnightly Review*, 19 (March 1873), pp. 304-15.

Die Serbien, Talfy's *Serbische Volks* and Abdolonyme Ubicini's *Les Serbes de Turquie*.

Kerr's translation of Ranke's *History* had originally appeared in 1847; to the third edition, published in 1853 in response to the Crimean War, Kerr had appended a chapter on 'The Slave [*sic*] provinces of Turkey, chiefly from the French of Cyprien Robert, with additions from other sources'—a mélange of material about the southern Slavs. Kerr intended her translation as an intervention in a contemporary debate, expressing the aspiration that her readers would 'unite in hoping that the Mahomedan [*sic*] religion and the obstructive despotism of the "Sublime Porte" should yield to the now swiftly-advancing tide of Christian civilization', and if anything it had gained in illocutionary force when Sandwith cited it two decades after its publication.[12] More recently but equally politically freighted, Elodie Lawton's *History* had been published in 1872. Lawton, a keen abolitionist in the 1850s, had married Čedomilj Mijatović, a prominent Serbian Liberal. Two years later she would publish a collection of Serbian folk-lore.[13] Lawton's history began in 1804, unlike Ranke's which stretched back to the Slav migrations, but her aim, not unlike Kerr's, was better to inform her readers about a state which could make a strong claim 'on the sympathies of all who are interested in the decision of the Eastern Question in a sense favourable to Christian civilisation'.[14] Abdolonyme Ubicini's *Les Serbes de Turquie* was no less anti-Turk, for Ubicini, a French Liberal of Italian descent, had taken part in the Wallachian Revolution of 1848, becoming Secretary to the Provisional Government before being forced to flee from Turkish troops when the revolution was suppressed.[15] Ubicini was thus an ardent

[12] Leopold Ranke, trans. Mrs Alexander Kerr, *The History of Servia and the Servian Revolution* (3rd ed., London, 1853), p. vi.
[13] Elodie Lawton Mijatovics, *Serbian Folk-Lore* (London, 1874).
[14] Elodie Lawton Mijatovics, *The History of Modern Servia* (London, 1872), p. vi.
[15] Abdolonyme Ubicini, *Les Serbes de Turquie: Études Historiques, Statistiques et Politiques sur la Principauté de Serbie, le Montenegro et les Pays Serbes Adjacents* (Paris, 1865).

advocate for what he believed were the oppressed nationalities of the Balkans, and *Les Serbes de Turquie* belongs within an important tradition of French pro-Slav literature which stretched back to the immediate aftermath of the French Revolution of 1789.[16]

While Ubicini's book was well known, it is unclear to whom Sandwith is referring when he cites Talfy's *Serbische Volks.* A plausible possibility is Talvj's *Volkslieder der Serben*—a collection of Serbian folksongs first published under a pseudonym by the German-American author and linguist Therese Robinson in 1826, and reissued in a new and expanded edition, complete with an historical introduction, in 1853.[17] Citations in nineteenth-century periodicals were not notable for their accuracy,[18] and Robinson's work on folksongs certainly had a great deal in common with another text Sandwith was reviewing, the Austro-Hungarian scholar Felix von Kanitz's *Die Serbien*, a book which was the fruit of seven years' historical and ethnographical research in south-eastern Europe.[19] Both works exhibit different facets of a shared interest in folklore, primitive social organisation and national identity so characteristic of nineteenth-century Romanticism.[20] Through Sandwith's article, then, distinct traditions of Germanic and French Slavonic scholarship were made available to an anglophone audience.

Such articles were crucial to the periodicals' success. They surveyed the thought of the age in all its breadth: the May 1877 issue of *The Nineteenth Century*, for example, which led with Gladstone's essay on 'Montenegro', also included a sonnet by Tennyson and essays on 'The abolition of zymotic disease', 'Russian revolutionary literature',

[16] See John Campbell, *French Influence and the Rise of Romanian Nationalism* (New York, 1971), which includes a more general discussion of French engagement with south-eastern Europe.
[17] Talvj, *Volkslieder der Serben* (Leipzig, 1853).
[18] Sandwith's citation for von Kanitz's *Die Serbien*, for example, notes the date of publication as 1867 when in fact it was 1868.
[19] Felix Philipp von Kanitz, *Die Serbien* (Leipzig, 1868).
[20] Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe During the Long Nineteenth Century* (Leiden, 2012). For the philhellene context, see Michael Herzfeld, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece* (Austin, Texas, 1982).

'The Present Crisis in the Church of England', 'An Actor's Notes on Shakespeare' and a review of 'Recent Science'. As Walter Houghton has observed, that compendiousness reflected 'the necessity, under pressure of novel theories and rival interpretations, of having an opinion on scores of contemporary questions', and contemporaries acknowledged their importance in digesting the prodigious output of the nineteenth-century press for their readers.[21] As John Morley put it, the periodicals were entrusted with the 'momentous task of forming national opinion'.[22] For Gladstone, indeed, this was an obligation, for 'towards the formation of [sound] public opinion it is the duty of every one to make his offering': 'in an age of discussion', the public needed to hear from authoritative voices.[23] This was as true of the Eastern Question as it was of other questions, and its commandingly central place in Britain's print culture meant that the periodical press played a crucial role in constituting what Morley called '*Mind*'.

By the superficial metric of circulation their impact was small: the *British Quarterly Review* peaked at a readership of around 2,500 and during the 1870s Morley's own *Fortnightly* consistently attained a similar figure; the *Nineteenth Century* led the field, selling over 10,000 copies per issue.[24] But the readers of the periodicals were of an importance disproportionate to their number, comprising Bagehot's 'mass of influential persons ... who assist at the deliberations of the nation'.[25] The periodicals were read in the universities and the London clubs, the country houses and the country rectories; by the members of town councils and holders of the suffrage in the boroughs

[21] Walter E. Houghton, 'Periodical Literature and the Articulate Classes' in Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.) *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester, 1982), pp. 3-28 at p. 8.
[22] John Morley, *Fortnightly Review*, 2 (1867), p. 292.
[23] W. E. Gladstone, 'The Peace to Come', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (Feb. 1878), pp. 209-26 at p. 209; W. E. Gladstone, 'On the Place of Homer in Classical Education and in Historical Inquiry', *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), iii. 1-56 at 1.
[24] See Alvar Ellegård, *The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Göteborg, 1957) and Walter E. Houghton, *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900* (5 vols., Toronto, 1966-89).
[25] Walter Bagehot, 'The First Edinburgh Reviewers', *National Review*, 1 (Oct. 1855), pp. 253-284.

and counties; by the Bench and the Bar, by the chiefs of political parties, and by Members of Parliament. In short, as Shattock and Wolff note, the periodicals' readership was by turns 'critical, articulate, influential, and ... homogeneous to a degree scarcely recognizable' today.[26] Periodical articles were thus pitched to a distinctly more cultivated audience than the majority of popular pamphlets or political speeches, making them an invaluable source for the study of nineteenth-century intellectual culture.[27]

Of course, for all their homogeneity, the periodicals and their readership were sub-divided to varying degrees along political and confessional lines; and while some, such as the predominantly literary *Cornhill Magazine*, refrained from joining the fray, most of the important reviews took sides over the Eastern Question. Conservative opinion found its leading expression in the *Quarterly Review*, established in 1824 as a rival to the Whig *Edinburgh Review* by a group led by George Canning and the publisher John Murray.[28] The *Quarterly* remained predictably loyal to Disraeli throughout the Eastern Crisis of the later 1870s, engaging with his Liberal critics and condemning the Bulgarian Agitation. Like the *Quarterly*, the *Westminster Review* and the *Saturday Review* were also critical of the Agitation, arguing that by fomenting divisions at home its leaders had irresponsibly weakened the government's hand abroad.[29]

On the other side of the question, the Turks and their British supporters found their warmest critics in the *Fortnightly Review* and the *British Quarterly Review.* The *British*

---

[26] Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.) *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester, 1982), p. xiv.
[27] For suggestive remarks on this subject, see H. C. G. Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East' in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 15 (1978), pp. 417-42 at p. 440.
[28] See Joanne Shattock, *Politics and Reviewers: The* Edinburgh *and the* Quarterly *in the Early Victorian Age* (London, 1989).
[29] [Anon.], 'The Turkish Question: Russian Designs and English Promoters of Them', *The Westminster Review*, 107 (Jan. 1877), pp. 93-163. Freeman complained about the editorial policy of the *Saturday Review* in a letter to Bryce reproduced in W. R. W. Stephens (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (2 vols., London, 1895), ii. 191.

Quarterly was an important Evangelical Nonconformist publication that first appeared in 1845, and which was edited during these years by Dr Henry Allon, a learned Congregational minister. While in general committed to freedom of opinion, under Allon's editorship the review was unambiguous in its condemnation of the Ottoman Empire and its advocacy of the Balkan Slavs' cause.[30] So, too, was the *Fortnightly Review*'—an 'organ', its founders had declared in 1865, 'for the unbiased expression of many and various minds on topics of general interest in Politics, Literature, Philosophy, Science and Art'.[31] Under John Morley, who succeeded George Henry Lewes as editor in 1872, the *Fortnightly* took a warmly anti-Turk stance on the Eastern Question. Other periodicals, such as *Macmillan's Magazine* and *Fraser's Magazine*, followed suit, though they devoted rather fewer pages to the subject.[32]

Less unanimous was the *Contemporary Review*—until a change in editor and ownership in January 1877. The *Contemporary* had been founded in 1866 as an Anglican riposte to the secular *Fortnightly Review* by Alexander Strahan, the publisher of a number of popular religious magazines such as *Good Words*. Its first editor, Henry Alford, Dean of Canterbury, had struck a distinctively scholarly and clerical tone, but on his retirement in 1870 his successor, James Knowles, the founder of the Metaphysical Society, opened the *Contemporary* to the conflicting opinions of scientists, churchmen, atheists, and Catholics, publishing signed articles by figures including Manning, Arnold, Gladstone, Stanley, Huxley, and Ruskin—many of them, like Knowles, members of the Metaphysical Society. Under Knowles' editorship, the

[30] Henry Allon and Henry Robert Reynolds, 'The Hundredth Number of the *British Quarterly Review*: A Retrospect and a Prospect', *British Quarterly Review*, 50 (Oct. 1869), pp. 520-39 surveys the review's early history. For Allon as editor, see Albert Peel, *Letters to a Victorian Editor: Henry Allon* (London, 1929).
[31] 'Advertisement', *Athenaeum* (27 May 1865), p. 732.
[32] E.g. Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88 and Francis Newman, 'Cause and Objects of the Crimean War', *Fraser's Magazine*, 14 (Oct. 1876), pp. 522-36 at p. 522.

Contemporary aired a variety of perspectives on the Eastern Question: High Churchman Malcolm MacColl's vehemently moralistic denunciations of the Turks qualified Mountstuart Grant Duff's more pragmatic assessment of Eastern affairs; William Gladstone's cautiously Russophile essay of November 1876 elicited a riposte from Reginald Bosworth Smith in the following issue.[33] Hitherto rival periodicals with differing editorial lines had engaged with each other in controversy—and this continued—but now a single periodical could constitute a stand-alone forum for debate. After Knowles' departure, the *Contemporary* reverted to a strong editorial line, becoming consistently anti-Turk; but he was able to realise the 'open platform' to which he was so committed more completely in the *Nineteenth Century*, the review he founded and edited after leaving the *Contemporary*.[34]

The contributors to the *Nineteenth Century* included many of the prominent members of the Metaphysical Society, and the publication was an immediate success, winning a large circulation and becoming a forum for controversial debates in which all positions were represented.[35] A critical essay on the Bulgarians by Archibald Forbes, for example, was countered by Malcolm MacColl in the following issue. Forbes had admitted that the Bulgarians suffered some civil disadvantages, but claimed that they were 'withal prospering mightily', and went on the argue that their liberation from Turkish rule might set a dangerous precedent:

> We must quit India, and bid an apologetic adieu to the Maori, the Kaffir, and the Hottentot, the Spaniard from whom we wrested Gibraltar, the Dutchmen from whom we masterfully took the Cape … Poland must revolt against Austria, Prussia, Russia; the Tartars of the Crimea are to

[33] Grant Duff, 'Eastern Affairs at the Close of the Session', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (Sept. 1876), pp. 694-712; Malcolm MacColl, 'The Christian Subjects of the Porte', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (Nov. 1876); pp. 970-89; W. E. Gladstone, 'Russian Policy and Deeds in Turkistan', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (Nov. 1876), pp. 873-91; Reginald Bosworth Smith, 'The Eastern Question: Turkey and Russia', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Dec. 1876), pp. 147-68.
[34] Priscilla Metcalf, *James Knowles: Victorian Editor and Architect* (Oxford, 1980).
[35] See Frederic Harrison, 'The *Nineteenth Century*: A Retrospect', *Nineteenth Century*, 84 (Oct. 1918), pp. 785-796. See also A. W. Brown, *The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis* (New York, 1947).

> make a struggle for independence; the Irish are to drive forth the Saxon viceroy and his myrmidons at the point of the shillelagh; [and] the Austro-Hungarian Empire shall blaze in a chaotic conflagration.[36]

MacColl responded by attempting to prove 'that the government of Turkey is such that the non-Mussulman subjects of the Porte have an indefeasible right to rebel whenever they see a reasonable hope of success'.[37] On the other hand, anti-Ottoman articles by authors including Gladstone and Humphry Sandwith met with a riposte from none other than Midhat Pasha, the leading reformist Ottoman statesman.[38] The historian Goldwin Smith and Hermann Adler, Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, even debated whether Jews could be patriots—a question suggested by Disraeli's handling of Eastern affairs—continuing a controversy which had begun in the pages of the *Contemporary*.[39] Despite the undeniable veracity of the review's claims to be an 'open platform', however, it was in the *Nineteenth Century* that some of the most resounding indictments of British pro-Ottoman foreign policy would be published.

The periodicals, then, are an unparalleled resource for the intellectual historians, and above all for the historian concerned with the relationship between politics and ideas; yet they have scarcely been exploited by scholars of the Eastern Question. And as we have seen, Shannon's *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*, which does draw on the periodical press, is in fact heavily dependent upon articles excerpted in Carslake Thompson's *Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield* some seventy years earlier. This

---

[36] Archibald Forbes, 'The Russians, the Turks, and the Bulgarians at the Theatre of War', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (Nov. 1877), pp. 561-82 at p. 575.
[37] Malcolm MacColl, 'Some Current Fallacies About Turks, Bulgarians, and Russians', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (Dec. 1877), pp. 831-42 at pp. 831-2.
[38] W. E. Gladstone, 'The Peace to Come', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (Feb. 1878), pp. 209-26; Humphry Sandwith, 'How the Turks Rule in Armenia', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (Feb. 1878), pp. 314-29; Midhat Pasha, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Turkey', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (June 1878), pp. 981-93.
[39] For the debate, see Goldwin Smith, 'England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 31 (Feb. 1878), pp. 603-19 at pp. 617-8; Hermann Adler, 'Can Jews be Patriots?', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (April 1878), pp. 637-46; Goldwin Smith, 'Can Jews be Patriots?', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (May 1878), pp. 875-87. The controversy rumbled on into the next decade.

chapter, however, explores how British intellectuals engaged with the Eastern Question in the periodical press afresh, drawing on a comprehensive survey of the important titles of the day to demonstrate how they repeatedly turned to the past to make sense of the complexities of the present. The account which follows treats the periodical literature of 1875-80 by subject, following the evolving 'conversation' which was carried on between and within different publications in response to events in south-eastern Europe.

I
The Balkan Slavs

In July 1877, surveying the history of 'The Southern Slaves' in the *British Quarterly Review*, E. A. Freeman complained that until recently his subject had been 'utterly unknown' to 'the great mass, even of intelligent and well-read Englishman'.[40] An American observer, Edwin Godkin, agreed: not long ago, he declared, 'the Slaves [*sic*] had no history that scholars and poets knew or cared for'.[41] Freeman and Godkin were guilty of mild exaggeration, but their intention was merely to emphasise how completely the state of affairs had been transformed. In June 1876, news of the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria had reached England; only a few days later, Serbia and Montenegro had declared war on the Ottoman Empire on the symbolic anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo in 1389; in December, the abortive Constantinople Conference had tried and failed to solve the Balkans' problems; and in April 1877 Russia had joined the conflict on the side of her Orthodox brethren. Indeed, Freeman and Godkin were writing at the height of the crisis: only when the Congress of Berlin convened in June

[40] Edward Freeman, 'The Southern Slaves', *Historical Essays, 3rd Series* (London, 1879), pp. 379-427 at p. 420; reproducing his 'The Southern Slaves', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (July 1877), pp. 137-84. Freeman's spelling of 'Slavs' has been retained.
[41] Edwin L. Godkin, 'The Eastern Question', *North American Review*, 124 (Jan. 1877), pp. 106-26 at p. 109. Godkin was editor of *The Nation*, an American periodical which had published numerous essays by William Stillman: see Stephen L. Dyson, *The Last Amateur: The Life of William Stillman* (New York, 2014), p. 167.

of the following year did a resolution finally seem to be within reach. In the light of these events, the Slavs' ethnic identity, their role in any solution to the Eastern Question, and their connection with western Europe had all become contentious subjects in Britain.

Pro-Turkish opinion held that the Slavs were hopelessly divided: Serb and Montenegrin protestations of pan-Slavonic solidarity were a mere pretext, fabricated by Russian agitators, to declare war on the Ottoman Empire in pursuit of territorial aggrandisement. Lord Beaconsfield, for example, followed his mentor Metternich in believing that 'Asia begins at the *Landstrasse*', painting a picture of a Balkan peninsula characterized by

> political intrigues, constant rivalries, a total absence of all public spirit and of the pursuit of objects which patriotic minds would wish to accomplish, the hatred of races, the animosities of rival religions, and, above all, the absence of any controlling power.[42]

'In those countries', he added, 'there are views and feelings of humanity altogether different from our own', and anyone who imagined that the Slavs were any better than the Turks was hopelessly naïve. Layard agreed, explaining that 'horrible deeds' were inevitable 'whenever two barbarous races came into collision'.[43] So did Benjamin Jowett, whose distaste for the 'semi-barbaric' Eastern Christians was no doubt amplified by the rough handling he had received from their admirers among the Oxford Movement. Even Liberals such as Hartingon, who believed that the Christian inhabitants of European Turkey were 'utterly unfit for public duties of any kind', concurred with this distinctly unfavourable assessment. Only the Ottoman Empire, so the argument went, could bring order to such a chaotic region; and in any case, the

[42] Hansard, CCXLI, 18 July 1878, 1759.
[43] Hansard, CLXXXV, 15 Feb. 1867, 437.

Balkan nations were, in Fitzjames Stephen's words—as we have seen—'utterly unknown to us'.[44] Sceptics like Stephen had no time for 'the cant of race'.[45]

But many of the Slavs' British sympathisers believed that these charges betrayed chronic historical ignorance: 'as often happens', Freeman declared, 'error with regard to past history and error with regard to present policy [go] together'.[46] As James Bryce put it, the Eastern Question could only be adequately understood by 'reference rather to the course of … history generally … than to the events of these last few weeks or months'.[47] Some insisted on the priority of an historical perspective—believing, like Henry Liddon, that 'the past of the Slavonic peoples of Turkey' was 'the only sound basis of any forecast of their future'.[48] Others simply assumed it: anyone contemplating the 'present aspect' of south-eastern Europe, Freeman declared, 'will *naturally* come to contemplate its past history'.[49] The result was an historiographical efflorescence: new books, including the first English-language history of Montenegro,[50] graced the shelves alongside old classics: Paulina Irby's richly historical *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe*, first published in 1867, went through four new editions in 1877 alone. Pamphlets proliferated, printed privately or by pressure groups such as the Eastern Question Association. But in a sense the periodicals, simultaneously topical and reflective, were the natural medium to address so politically-freighted a subject: over twenty full-length essays in the major reviews discussed the southern Slavs' history between December 1875 and the end of 1878.

---

[44] Quoted in Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (2nd ed., Hamden Conn., 1975), pp. 213, 128, 47, 205.
[45] Edward Freeman, 'The Southern Slaves', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (July 1877), pp. 137-84 at p. 138.
[46] Edward Freeman, 'The True Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 24 (December 1875), pp. 747-69 at p. 750.
[47] James Bryce, 'Russia and Turkey', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (Dec. 1876), pp. 793-808 at p. 793.
[48] 'Canon Liddon on the Slavs', *The Times* (8 Dec. 1876), p. 6.
[49] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 231-2. Emphasis added.
[50] By William Denton.

Though Edward Gibbon had characterised the inhabitants of the Balkans as nothing more than 'tribes of barbarians, whose savage independence irregularly marks the doubtful limit of the Christian and Mahometan power', by the 1870s many commentators felt differently, and while these essays varied considerably, almost all agreed that the past proved, not only that the Balkan Slavs shared a strong ethnic identity, but also that they could legitimately claim to partake of 'the blood, the speech, the historic memories, the common civilization of Europe'.[51] Their past history prophesied their future prosperity. 'Four or five hundred years ago,' Gladstone explained to the electors of Midlothian, the Balkan Slavs had 'greatly excelled our own forefathers in civilisation'; and their parlous state today was merely the result of 'a cruel and grinding oppression, not resting upon superior civilisation, not upon superior knowledge, but a domination of mere force'.[52] Humphry Sandwith agreed, describing Medieval Serbia as a flourishing state, ruled by kings that 'intermarried with the royal and imperial families of France, Venice, and Constantinople'. After the Ottoman conquest, however, a 'deep sleep of Asiatic torpor and barbarism settled on the doomed land, which became'—and he quotes Psalm 74:20—'one of the dark places of the earth, full of the habitations of cruelty'; but the past showed what was possible. Indeed, for many, the triumph of incipient Slavonic nationalism was just as inevitable as the realisation of Italian Risorgimento and German Unification had been, and that *telos* became the premise for an essentially Whig historical narrative: the Balkan Slavs 'had that great and powerful factor, the element of time' on their side. They need only strive 'to become worthy heritors [*sic*] of what must eventually be theirs';[53] for they were, as

[51] Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. David Womersley (3 vols., London, 1994), i. 50; Edward Freeman, 'The English People in Relation to the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Feb. 1877), pp. 489-515 at p. 506.
[52] W. E. Gladstone, *Political Speeches in Scotland* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1880), i. 92-3.
[53] Hansard, CLXXXV, 15 Feb 1867, 407; Hansard, CCXXXI, 31 July 1876, 181

Henry declared, 'the predestined heirs of the future'.[54] The Slavs, in short, were destined to re-join the European fold from which they had been so brutally separated.

The Slavs' racial origins were crucial to that argument. As the Serbian politician Philip Christitch put it in *Macmillan's Magazine*, knowledge of 'the ethnographic origin of the various Christian populations in European Turkey' was quite simply a prerequisite for coming to any informed judgement on 'the Slavonian question'.[55] For most commentators, the proof of the Slavs' ethnic identity lay in the deep past: the findings of comparative philology indicated that the Slavs were a branch 'of the great Aryan family', their 'Aryan origin … indisputable', who had arrived in their modern-day homelands contemporaneously with the Teutons' arrival in western Europe, as part of 'the second set of Aryan settlements ... which came after the establishment of the Roman power'.[56] While this narrative was more often assumed than asserted in the topical literature of the day, some commentators did dwell on the Slavs' Aryan origins, and none more so than Sir Henry Maine, who devoted a lengthy article to 'South Slavonians and Rajpoots' in the December 1877 issue of the *Nineteenth Century*.

Maine, a leading jurist, had made his reputation by applying the methods of comparative philology to the study of law and society, and his *Ancient Law* (1861), an instant classic, argued that 'the unit of an ancient society was the family; of a modern society the individual'. In Maine's hands, comparative history proved that the individualism and private property characteristic of contemporary western Europe had emerged out of tribalism, customary law and co-proprietorship in a transition, as he famously summarised it, 'from status to contract'. Between 1862 and 1869, Maine had

[54] Henry Liddon to C. T. Redington, 29 Aug. 1876, in J. O. Johnston (ed.), *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (London, 1904), p. 207.
[55] Philip Christitch, 'The Eastern Question from the Point of View of the Eastern Christians (part II)', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 35 (Dec. 1876), pp. 158-76 at p. 159.
[56] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series,* pp. 200, 393; 'Canon Liddon on the Slavs', *The Times* (8 Dec. 1876), p. 6.

worked in the administration of British India as the legal member on the governor-general's council,[57] and after his return to England he had gone on to publish *Village Communities in the East and West* (1871), which explored the similarities between the 'Teutonic townships' of western European history and the still-extant Indian 'Village Community'—a comparison premised on the common Aryan ancestry of Indian and Teuton alike.[58] Maine's 'Comparative Method' drew on a stadial conception of history, and for him it consisted in studying societies and inferring their 'past form … not only from historical records of that past form, but from examples of it which have not yet died out of the world, and are still to be found in it.'[59] India in particular seemed to reveal innumerable 'survivals' (as the anthropologist E. B. Tylor had influentially named such phenomena) from stages of civilization through which the European west had already passed. Indeed, Maine was struck by the realization that sometimes 'the Past *is* the Present', and came to conclude that while aspects of Indian society were barbaric, 'it is a barbarism which contains a great part of our own civilisation'.[60]

Such observations, as Maine had reflected in his Rede Lecture of 1875, could teach western Europeans a great deal about themselves, calling into question uncritical assumptions about the nature of progress and civilisation. It was hypocritical, Maine contented, for anyone to criticise primitive Indian institutions,

> and to say at the same time that he values civilisation. The history of the two cannot be disentangled. Civilisation is nothing more than a name for the old order of the Aryan world, dissolved but perpetually re-constituting itself under a vast variety of solvent influences.[61]

---

[57] George Feaver, *From Status to Contract: A Biography of Sir Henry Maine* (London, 1969). For Maine's thought, see also John Burrow, *Evolution and Society* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 137-78; Casper Sylvest, 'The Foundations of Victorian International Law' in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 47-66 at pp. 53-6.
[58] Henry Maine, *Village Communities in the East and West* (London, 1871), p. 12.
[59] Ibid., pp. 6-7.
[60] Henry Maine, *The Effects of Observation of India on Modern European Thought* (London, 1875), p. 15
[61] Ibid., p. 30.

Others drew the same moral. As Joan Leopold has revealed, a number of prominent Victorian scholars—including the philologist Friedrich Max Müller, the orientalist Monier Williams, and the dean of Canterbury and philologist Frederic William Farrar—emphasised Anglo-Indian racial unity for a variety of purposes. Some even employed such arguments to justify fairer treatment of Indians in the aftermath of the Mutiny of 1857.[62] Indeed, one American anthropologist, Horatio Hale, went so far as to claim that the realisation that Indians were 'not only the blood relations, but the teachers and exemplars' of their British conquerors had been transformative: 'mutual esteem and confidence … took the place of revulsion and disgust'.[63] So while several recent historians have, rather perversely, portrayed Maine as an ardent imperialist,[64] he was in fact not alone in emerging as a plangent critic of those 'who, guided solely by Western Social experience, are too eager for innovations which seem to them indistinguishable from improvements.'[65] On the contrary, history taught scepticism. Such reformers—and Maine would seem to have the Utilitarian school of James Mill in his sights—would, he believed, be overtaken by

> a wholesome distrust when they see in institutions and customs, which would otherwise appear to them ripe for destruction, the materials of knowledge by which the Past, and to some extent the Present, of the West may be interpreted.[66]

Of course, he recognised that it was impossible to avoid altering Indian society; even the lightest touch would leave fingerprints. But he believed that the British administration increasingly avoided innovating or destroying 'in mere arrogance': 'We

[62] Joan Leopold, 'British Applications of the Aryan Theory of Race to India, 1850-70', *English Historical Review*, 89 (July 1974), pp. 578-603.
[63] Horatio Hale, 'Race and Language', *The Popular Science Monthly* (Jan. 1888), pp. 340-51 at p. 350.
[64] Karuna Mantena, *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Ends of Liberal Imperialism* (Princeton, New Jersey, 2010); Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of Great Britain* (Cambridge, 2011).
[65] Maine, *Observation of India*, p. 37.
[66] Ibid. Cf. Eric Stokes, *The English Utilitarians and India* (Oxford, 1959).

rather change because we cannot help it', preserving as many of India's Aryan institutions as possible and minimising the trauma of transition.[67] He was always, to employ the geological idiom to which he was partial, a uniformitarian, not a catastrophist.

Now events had brought the southern Slavs to Maine's attention, and in his *Nineteenth Century* essay he identified in them another 'Aryan race still remaining in a condition of barbarism', among whom 'earlier stages of social development through which the earliest civilised communities of the West may just be seen passing in the twilight of their history' had survived into the present.[68] While India revealed a similar phenomenon, the Slavs' Aryan pedigree was considerably purer. Turkish domination, moreover, had preserved Slav society in a primitive condition; indeed, Muslim rule had even had a retrograde influence, forcing societies 'to retrace part of the path by which they had ascended from a primitive barbarous condition'. As Viscount Strangford had written, the 'growth of their civilization was checked; they were cut off from Europe and buried from the sight of the world'.[69]

Now, as the Ottoman Empire declined, ceding ground to resurgent Slav nationalism, the thinning 'of the superficial crust of Mohammedan institutions' had revealed ancient forms of social organisation which were emerging 'like buried cities from volcanic ashes or lava', ripe for investigation.[70] In particular, the southern Slavs offered 'a nearly perfect example of one of the oldest institutions of the Aryan race'—the 'House Community' that Maine had already studied so extensively in India—and

[67] Ibid., p. 37. See also Stefan Collini, Donald Winch and John Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 216. Cf. Koditschek, who contends that 'Maine did not think it was possible or desirable for this process [*i.e.* progress] to be arrested': *Liberalism and Imperialism*, p. 231.
[68] Henry Maine, 'South Slavonians and Rajpoots', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (Dec. 1877), pp. 796-819 at p. 796.
[69] Viscount and Viscountess Strangford, *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic* (London, 1864), p. 205.
[70] Maine, 'South Slavonians', pp. 796-9.

for students of what Maine called 'social and political embryology' the implications were fascinating. In these house communities, Maine saw 'a living form … of an institution rather hinted at than revealed in the most ancient records of a singularly large number of civilised nations', and he concluded that the 'House Community of the south Slavonians is the Roman *gens*, the Hellenic γένος, the Celtic Sept, the Teutonic kin [and] the Joint Family of the Hindoos'. All these institutions were examples of 'Political Power in the embryo: the Chief growing out of the head of the household, the State taking its first beginnings from the Family', as 'families, instead of dissolving at the death of an ancestor, hold together and take the first steps towards becoming a nation'. As house communities grew, genuine ties of blood had been supplemented and extended by varieties of fictitious consanguinity, similar to the concept of adoption in Roman law. Had Turkish occupation not supervened, the next stages of development would have been the village community—a progression that had been consummated among the Russian Slavs—and feudalism: the crucial moment when the concept of private property emerged.[71]

Maine goes on to draw repeated analogies between the Slav house communities and the historic institutions of the rest of the Aryan family of nations: in the emergent concept of private property—the *peculium* of Roman law—he identifies the solvent of Slav house communities as well as Roman and Hindu 'joint families'. Similarly, in regulating inheritances, Maine contends that 'the Slavonian usage accurately reflects the earliest stage of the English custom of Borough English'.[72] For some commentators, though not explicitly for Maine, these affinities indicated that the Slavs might prove receptive to representative institutions: Arthur Evans had followed the Austrian

[71] Ibid., pp. 800-4.
[72] Ibid., pp. 805-9.

geologist Ami Boué in wondering if the Serbs in particular might be 'the people and language … born, if any ever were, for Parliamentary Government'.[73] In the west, of course, primitive customs and institutions had long since been superseded, and in concluding his analysis Maine expressed anxiety about the future. In the Punjab he had witnessed 'the unintended disintegration of the Indian joint families' by Anglo-Indian law; and now he feared lest the introduction of western European civilisation and legal precepts should have similar consequences in the Balkans. As the Balkan Slavs, emerging from Ottoman domination, were increasingly exposed to the west, the house community was likely to be destroyed: 'it is not barbarism they have to dread, but civilisation'. The irony was that what western influence threatened to destroy was also a part of the west's own cultural patrimony.[74]

Other writers, as we have seen, had described the house and village communities which characterised south-eastern Europe. Readers of *The Times* were given some impression of such institutions in William Stillman's dispatches.[75] Even Januarius MacGahan had hinted at them in the *Daily News*, when he described how Bulgarian communities were organised according to what he called 'the old patriarchal method'—in what scholars would have immediately identified as house-communities:

> fathers and married sons, with their children and children's children, live under the same roof until the grandfather dies. As each son in turn gets married, a new room is added to the old building, until with the new generation there will often be twenty or thirty people living under the same roof, all paying obedience and respect to the head of the family.[76]

But such descriptions were more common in more scholarly writers. Paulina Irby's *Travels*, for example, included an extended translation from the German of an article

[73] Arthur Evans, *Through Bosnia and the Herzegóvina on Foot During the Insurrection* (London, 1876), p. 151.
[74] Maine, 'South Slavonians', pp. 810-1.
[75] E.g. [William Stillman], 'Montenegro', *The Times* (21 Sept. 1875), p. 8.
[76] Ibid., p. 24.

by Felix von Kanitz on 'the Serbian village community as existing in Free Serbia', and even claimed, on Maine's authority, that a 'communal organisation' like the Slavs' could be found 'among … all races of the Indo-European stock'.[77] Elsewhere, E. A. Freeman had identified among the southern Slavs as described by Procopius 'a political stage common to Slave and Teuton, and to every branch of the Aryan family'.[78] Humphry Sandwith, too, had argued that the Serbs in particular had preserved their primitive social organisation despite Turkish domination: in 'the village communes', he wrote,

> we have a striking remnant of a form of government whose origin is lost in antiquity, whose forms have survived Turkish tyranny … The base of the commune or municipality is the family ... A number of families ... join themselves together into a sort of social brotherhood, headed by the oldest patriarch amongst them ... This community lives on … strictly communistic principles.[79]

Leopold von Ranke—like von Kanitz and Cyprien Robert, whom Sandwith was also reviewing—had similarly identified 'family households' in which 'individual interest was … merged … in that of the family' as 'the basis of Servian [*sic*] nationality'.[80] Many of these writers further believed, like Albert Rutson, that this 'strong inherited tradition of village government'—what Arthur Evans called the Balkans' 'sterling democratic ore'—would stand the southern Slavs in good stead when they eventually won their independence.[81]

But while Maine's subject was thus likely to be familiar to many of his readers, his essay in the *Nineteenth Century* drew explicitly upon a more obscure work, Fédor Demelic's newly-published translation of Valtazar Bogišić's research on the customary

---

[77] Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels* (5th ed.), pp. 329-31, 284.
[78] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 397-8.
[79] Sandwith, 'Servia', pp. 116-7.
[80] Ranke, *History*, pp. 56, 397 and *passim.*
[81] [Albert Rutson], 'Reform in Turkey and Coercion', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), pp. 476-505 at p. 481.

law of the southern Slavs, *Le Droit Coutumier des Slaves Méridionaux d'Après les Rechèrches de M. V. Bogišić* (Paris, 1876).[82] Bogišić, 'a native of the ancient Republic of Ragusa' and a jurist who had studied comparative linguistics under Franz Bopp, was a professor at the Russian University in Odessa, engaged since 1873 in codifying the laws of Montenegro.[83] Bogišić was an ardent pan-Slav, who collected Serb poetry and who had begun studying the customary law of the Balkans in the mid-1860s, before his official employment by the Montenegrin crown; these researches had taken him not only to Montenegro but to Albania, Herzegovina and Serbia too, resulting in lengthy volumes: indeed, his Montenegrin civil code was only proclaimed in 1888. But Demelic's translation made Bogišić's initial comparative studies of the southern Slavs' customary law available to a Francophone audience; and Maine in turn introduced this work to a British readership, expanding on Bogišić's comparative resources, as we have seen, to include not merely the entire Balkans, but also contemporary India and pre-historic Europe within his range of reference. Maine's 'South Slavonians and Rajpoots' thus exemplifies the way in which periodicals digested and reconstituted what was sometimes an unfamiliar and specialist literature for a broader constituency of readers.

Equally characteristically, Maine's was a periodical essay with acutely topical conclusions. For far from being, as Fitzjames Stephen had put it, a people 'a long way off of whom one knows little', Maine's findings demonstrated that the Balkan Slavs were part of the living history of western Europe, England included. Indeed, rather than portraying the Slavs as alien 'others', Maine time and again stresses what were literally family resemblances, guaranteed by common Aryan descent, between the east and the west. When British officials went to India 'what they found was very like, and yet

[82] Ibid., p. 800.
[83] 'Law and Custom Among the Southern Slavs', *The Law Magazine and Review*, 5 (1877), pp. 119-212. See also Werner von Zimmermann, *Valtazar Bogišić* (Wiesbaden, 1962).

appreciably unlike, what they had left at home', and that was true *a fortiori* in the more purely Aryan communities of south-eastern Europe.[84] It followed that, just as Maine had advocated preserving aboriginal forms of social organization as far as possible in India, so too in the Balkans his conclusions were essentially conservative: the western powers should resist the hubristic temptation to remake Slav societies in their own image. The Slavs, Maine believed, were 'the bridge connecting two portions of the earth and mankind long arbitrarily separated, the East and the West': 'South Slavonians' and 'Rajpoots' were alike members of the great Aryan family, whose family tree scholars were strenuously uncovering, and both therefore merited sympathetic treatment.[85] In December 1877, as war raged between Russia and Turkey, the implications of this analysis were considerable. Most obviously, family loyalty left no doubt as to whether Britain ought to side with emergent Balkan nationalism or the Ottoman Turks. But Maine's essay would also seem to imply that any settlement of the Eastern Question should try to ensure that civilization in the Balkans evolved as slowly and organically as possible; and such concerns would crystallize around the future of the principality of Montenegro.

Of Maine's contemporaries, only his friend E. A. Freeman devoted such close attention to the racial complexion of south-eastern Europe. Freeman, as we shall see, shared Maine's enthusiasm for the comparative method; indeed, he went to far as to declare that the 'establishment of the Comparative Method of study has been the greatest intellectual achievement of our time'. His *Comparative Politics* (1873) attempted to apply those methods of study to Indo-European 'political institutions' in exactly the same way in which they had been 'so successfully applied to language, to

[84] Maine, *Observation of India*, p. 22.
[85] Maine, 'South Slavonians', p. 818.

mythology, and to the progress of culture'. Maine, who had proposed him for the Athenaeum, was not Freeman's only inspiration for this endeavour: he was on equally good terms with both Friedrich Max Müller, the pioneer of comparative mythology, and E. B. Tylor, the author of *Primitive Culture* (1871) and student of comparative anthropology, and he acknowledged his intellectual debts to all three in the introduction to *Comparative Politics*.[86]

It was unsurprising, therefore, that Freeman arrived at many of the same conclusions as Maine. For Freeman, as for Maine, south-eastern Europe was a land of survivals, where different stages on the path to civilisation could be found, coexisting and contemporaneous:

> In Western Europe earlier times have influenced later times in the ordinary way of cause and effect. In Eastern Europe, the relationship between the present and the past—even the very remote past—is much closer than this; we may say with truth that the past and the present are in being side by side ... several different centuries are in those lands really contemporary.[87]

Like Maine, Freeman believed that Ottoman domination had caused the Slavs to 'lag behind'; and like Maine he also believed that ascending the path to civilisation would be rendered all the more difficult by the temptation to emulate western examples: progress, he suspected, will be 'real and lasting in exactly the proportion by which it is native'. Obtaining the 'substance' rather than the mere 'varnish' of civilization would be a challenge for the emerging Balkan nations that the nations of the west had never had to face.[88]

Whereas Maine's attention, however, was largely monopolised by the traces and survivals of primitive Aryan institutions that he identified among the southern Slavs, Freeman was more concerned to account for the racial and national distinctions that

[86] Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, pp. iii, vi, 18f.
[87] Edward Freeman, 'The Geographical Aspect of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (Jan. 1877), pp. 73-87 at p. 73.
[88] Ibid., pp. 73-4.

characterised south-eastern Europe, and which bulked increasingly large in the politics of the Eastern Question. These, he believed, were a different kind of historical 'survival', and Freeman made them the subject of two important articles: the first on 'The Geographical Aspect of the Eastern Question' in the *Fortnightly Review* of January 1877; the second on 'Race and Language' in the *Contemporary Review* three months later. Freeman was to amalgamate these two essays into one in the third series of his *Historical Essays* (1879), and historians have tended to interpret the resulting piece as Freeman's definitive statement of his racial thought—and one produced, for that matter, 'in response' to a purely intellectual 'crisis' in racial theory—without attention to the contexts which informed his two original essays.[89]

Yet in their original incarnations both essays were elicited by current affairs: in 'The Geographical Aspect of the Eastern Question', Freeman aspired to prove the salience of historical geography and ethnology to 'the great questions of the present moment'; and in 'Race and Language' it was a recent story of compliments exchanged between Magyar students and an Ottoman general at Constantinople—familiar to 'those who have read their newspapers during the last few months with becoming care'—that prompted extended reflections on contemporary ethnological theory and the 'doctrine of race' more generally.[90] Far from attempting to prove, as Theodore Koditschek postulates, that 'Anglo-Saxons were the *über*-Aryans of the modern era who had the obligation to stand watch at the gates of racial nirvana', Freeman's most

[89] Christopher Parker, *The English Historical Tradition Since 1850* (Edinburgh, 1990), p. 44, mistakenly contends that 'Race and Language' was Freeman's 'response' to a crisis precipitated by Max Müller's renunciation of a physiological basis for racial distinctions; in fact, it was a response to events in south-eastern Europe.
[90] Ibid., p. 74; Edward Freeman, 'Race and Language', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (March 1877), pp. 711-41 at p. 717.

sustained exposition of his racial thought was thus in origin an historically-minded but distinctly topical intervention on the Eastern Question.[91]

In the first of the two essays, published in the immediate aftermath of the abortive Constantinople Conference, Freeman turned to the historical origins of the different races inhabiting the Balkans, distinguishing two groups. The first, which he called the 'præ-Roman races'—'the original races, those whom we find there at the first beginnings of history'—were the Greeks, the Albanians and the 'Vlachs or Roumans'. The oldest of these races were the Greeks. Of equal antiquity were the Albanians, who 'represent the ancient Illyrians'. In the Roumans, Freeman identified 'the surviving representatives of the great Thracian race', who had learned 'to adopt the speech and manners of Rome' after their conquest by Trajan in the second century AD. Unlike their equivalents in the west—'Highlanders, Welshmen, Bretons, Basques'—the Greeks, Albanians and Roumans had all maintained an enduring national life; they remained nations, in other words, as well as races.

The second group Freeman identified consisted of those who had only arrived after the Roman conquest: the Bulgarians, Magyars, Turks and Slavs. The Slavs had arrived during the late-antique *völkerwanderung* which had also witnessed the Teutonic migrations in the west. But the Slavs soon found themselves living alongside more recent arrivals still. The Bulgarians were originally Finnish, but 'have been lost among Slavonic subjects and neighbours': today, Freeman determined, 'the modern Bulgarian is a Slave [*sic*] bearing the Bulgarian name, as the modern French is a Gaul bearing the Frankish name'. But unlike the Bulgarians, the Magyars invaders had preserved their racial identity, separating the Slavs of the Baltic from the Slavs of the Balkans. Nor had the Ottoman Turks, as we shall see, integrated into their European dominions.

[91] Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination*, p. 248 and *passim*.

With the exception of the Bulgarians, all these different races still lived 'side by side', having preserved their own 'lasting and distinct character'. In western Europe, by contrast, assimilation had been the rule: the modern Frenchman, for example, was the product of the fusion of 'blood which is mainly Celtic, with a speech which is mainly Latin, … with a historical polity which is mainly Teutonic'. Flemings, Basques and Bretons were peripheral exceptions that proved the rule—like the Irish, Scottish and Welsh in Britain.[92] To emphasise his point, Freeman invites his readers to imagine that the different races that had settled in Britain had remained as distinct as those of south-eastern Europe:

> Let us suppose … we came successively to districts, towns, or villages, where we found one after another, first, Britons speaking Welsh; then Romans speaking Latin; then Saxons or Angles speaking an older for of our own tongue; then Scandinavians speaking Danish; then Normans speaking old French; lastly perhaps a settlement of Flemings, Huguenots, or Palatines, still remaining a distinct people and speaking their own tongue.

In the Balkans, moreover, such distinctions of race and language were amplified by distinctions of religion: 'Let us conceive one village Roman Catholic, another Anglican, others Nonconformist of various types, even if we do not call up any remnants of the worshippers of Jupiter or of Woden.' Such a situation, Freeman concluded, would seem absurd in 'any Western country'; but the 'absurdity of the West is the living reality of the East'.[93]

These racial 'survivals' could only be understood by the light of history. 'Here [in south-eastern Europe] at least', Freeman believed, 'questions of this sort cannot be set aside as mere "antiquarian rubbish". They are the very life of the whole matter.' History provided the key to the animosities of the present. The Hungarians, for example, were

[92] Freeman, 'Geographical Aspect', pp. 74-5.
[93] Ibid., p. 76.

unsympathetic to the national aspirations of the southern Slavs because they were Magyars and because they were Catholics—a state of affairs that had its origin in the ninth and tenth centuries. When Freeman reflects that, 'if the Apostolic Stephen [*i.e.* Stephen I of Hungary] had got his Christianity from the New Rome instead of the Old, one great hindrance to a just settlement of south-eastern Europe would in all likelihood not have stood in our way', he is suggesting that an Orthodox Hungary would have encouraged the Habsburgs to pursue a more pro-Slav policy in the south-eastern Europe.[94]

Such lessons of history had implications for the future too. Freeman argued, for example, that the Roman Empire had presided over the Balkans' halcyon days. Before the Roman conquest, the coast of the Mediterranean and the Adriatic had been inhabited by Greeks and Phoenicians, the European mainland by Celts and Iberians. But in the Roman province of Illyria, coastline and interior—'body' and 'mouth'—had been temporarily united, issuing in a cultural and economic efflorescence under a *Pax Romana*: for a few centuries, 'Illyria was one of the most prominent and flourishing parts of the world, renowned above all things as the land which gave the world its leaders'—the Emperor Diocletian merely most prominent among them. With 'the great Slavonic movement' of the sixth and seventh centuries, the Balkans had reverted to their anterior condition: the civilisation of the Eastern Empire clung to the Dalmatian coast, while the interior was reduced to barbarism. The problem of the future would be how to reconcile the different races' claims to the coastline, and between Bulgaria and Greece this issue was likely to be hotly disputed: history could teach statesmen what to expect.[95]

[94] Ibid., pp. 74, 87.
[95] Ibid., pp. 83-5.

Of course, these reflections in the *Fortnightly Review* begged a more fundamental question: what was race? As we have seen, Freeman's answer in 'Race and Language', published in the *Contemporary Review* three months later, was just as topical as its predecessor essay; but it also intersected with an important moment in the history of nineteenth-century racial thought. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Prussian diplomat Baron Christian Bunsen and his protégé Friedrich Max Müller (who become a naturalised British subject in 1855) had done much to popularise the study of comparative philology in Britain, introducing an Anglophone audience to the research of German scholars including Friedrich Schlegel, Jacob Grimm, and Franz Bopp. In early 1851, Max Müller had been appointed deputy Taylorian professor of modern European languages at Oxford, giving a first course of lectures on the history and origin of modern languages which drew on the insights of the comparative method. Such ideas were soon presented to a wider audience in Bunsen's *Outlines of the Philosophy of World History* (1854)—which included extensive contributions by Max Müller—and Max Müller's own influential essay on 'Comparative Mythology' in John Parker's *Oxford Essays* two years later.[96]

Already in 1854, Max Müller had insisted that 'ethnological race and phonological race are not commensurate, except in antehistorical times, or, perhaps, at the very dawn of history', and he reiterated the distinction time and again throughout his career.[97] But if many of his readers drew different conclusions, it is easy to see why. 'Race' was an ambiguous term, which might mean no more than 'group', but increasingly came to

[96] Friedrich Max Müller, 'Comparative Mythology' in *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), ii. 1-87.
[97] Christian von Bunsen, *Outlines of the Philosophy of World History* (2 vols., London, 1854), i. 129-30. For a later statement, see Friedrich Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop* (4 vols., London, 1894-5), i. 230-1. See also K. Jankowsky, 'Friedrich Max Müller and the Development of Linguistic Science', *Historiographia Linguistica*, 6 (1979), pp. 339-59; R. C. C. Fynes, 'Müller, Friedrich Max (1823–1900)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004).

imply a group related by blood. In the same volume, he and Bunsen had emphasised the 'common descent … and legitimate relationship between Hindoo, Greek and Teuton': when 'we challenge the seeming-stranger', they went on, 'whether he answers with the lip of a Greek, a German, or an Indian, we recognise him as one of ourselves'.[98] And a decade later, in his *Lectures on the Science of Language*, Max Müller again referred to 'the Aryan race', the 'Aryan family' and the Aryans' shared 'common home'.[99] As Freeman observed, while scholarly caveats were all well and good,

> any one who begins his studies on these matters with Professor Müller's famous Oxford Essay will practically come to another way of looking at things. He will fill his mind with a vivid picture of the great Aryan family, as yet one, dwelling in one place, speaking one tongue, having already taken the first steps towards settled society, recognizing the domestic relations, possessing the first rudiments of government and religion, and calling all these first elements of culture by names of which traces still abide, here and there among the many nations of the common stock.

The consequence was, as Colin Kidd notes, that the 'Aryan idea broke free from its philological moorings', becoming increasingly associated with physiology and biology.[100] By the end of the century, a reaction against such excesses was well under way, and in 1915 James Bryce would satirise the notion that 'the Aryan started from the slopes of the Hindu Kush, driving his cattle before him, and fared always westward till he arrived at the Ocean House at San Francisco in a motor-car'; but in the 1877 such questions were still contentious.[101] Most recently, Archibald Sayce, an Oxford don and philologer who had studied under Max Müller, had devoted a chapter of his *The Principles of Comparative Philology* to refuting 'the fallacy that language is a sure

[98] Ibid., i. 349. Cf. Friedrich Max Müller, *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1859), pp. 13-4.
[99] Friedrich Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language, first Series* (London, 1861), pp. 198, 236, 239; Friedrich Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language, second Series* (London, 1864), p. 501.
[100] Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 177 and *passim* at pp. 168-202.
[101] James Bryce, *Race Sentiment as a Factor in History* (London, 1915), p. 28.

index of race'; an idea, he added dismissively, 'which still crops up occasionally, especially in second and third-hand writers'.[102]

It was with this debate that Freeman was engaging in the *Contemporary Review*. 'Professor Max Müller warned us long ago that we must not speak of a Celtic skull', he remarked, and 'Mr Sayce has more lately warned us that we must not infer from community of Aryan speech that there is any kindred in blood between this or that Englishman and this or that Hindoo.'[103] The arguments of philologers such as Max Müller and Sayce, Freeman believed, had proven that ethnology was thus a 'strictly physical science', akin to zoology and palaeontology, and had nothing to do with philology, the study of language. The two were emphatically not commensurate, as the historical record showed:

> Greek in the East, Latin in the West, became the familiar speech of millions who had not a drop of Greek or Italian blood in their veins. The same has been the case in later times with Arabic, Persian, Spanish, German, English.[104]

What was more, physiologically speaking it was difficult to draw clear distinctions between racial groups: 'no nation', Freeman admitted, 'can boast of absolute purity of blood ... no existing nation is, in the physiologist's sense of purity, purely Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, or anything else'. Neither philology nor biology, in other words, justified the rhetoric of race, and 'scientifically' speaking one should limit oneself to the observation that 'certain groups of mankind have a common history, they have languages, creeds, and institutions in common'.

Such 'scientific' distinctions, however, raised a practical problem, for race sentiment nonetheless exercised an increasingly important influence in modern Europe; and despite the caveats of scholars including Max Müller and Sayce, philology and

---

[102] Archibald Sayce, *The Principles of Comparative Philology* (London, 1874), pp. 166ff.
[103] Freeman, 'Race and Language', p. 722.
[104] Ibid., pp. 718-21.

physiology were commonly conflated. Freeman had begun his essay by adverting to a recent story in the newspapers: a party of Hungarian Students had travelled to Constantinople to present a sword of honour to an Ottoman general, citing 'the ancient kindred of Turks and Magyars'.[105] For Freeman, this incident was merely an extreme example—'ethnological theory run mad'—of a phenomenon that had transformed European politics: 'new lines of scientific and historical inquiry' concerning race and language 'have had a distinct and deep effect', he believed, 'upon the politics of the age'. The world was 'not the same world as it was when men had not yet dreamed of the kindred between Sanscrit, Greek, and English'. In the last twenty years, 'ethnological and philological researches … have opened the way for new national sympathies, new national antipathies, such as would have been unintelligible a hundred years ago.'[106] These novel sympathies and antipathies were related to but distinct from religious or national sentiment: the feeling of race

> is a feeling at whose bidding the call to union goes forth to men whose dwellings are geographically far apart, men who may have had no direct dealings with one another for years or for ages, men whose languages, though the scholar may at once see that they are closely akin, may not be so closely akin as to be mutually intelligible for common purposes.[107]

Race sentiment, then, was 'essentially an artificial doctrine, a learned doctrine', but it was no less important for all that. However artificial, ideas of race enjoyed too great a currency to be ignored: 'the most highly educated man, in the most highly educated society cannot sneer them out of being'.[108]

To resolve this dilemma, Freeman offered his readers an idealist definition of race, emphasising not descent itself but the presumption of descent. Here he drew on one of Sir Henry Maine's *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions*, on 'Kinship as the

[105] Ibid., pp. 711-2.
[106] Ibid., p. 713.
[107] Ibid., p. 715.
[108] Ibid., p. 718.

basis of society', where Maine had argued that the idea of kinship, though not necessarily its reality, was the foundation of 'the earliest tie which knitted men together in communities'.[109] By the 'legal fiction' of adoption or assimilation, strangers could partake of that tie. Physiological purity, then, was not important: to identify a race,

> all that we seek is to establish a relation in which the community of blood is the leading idea, and in which, where natural community of blood does not exist, its place is supplied by something which by a legal fiction is looked upon as its equivalent.[110]

A definition of this kind, Freeman insisted, was much more useful for 'practical, political, historical purposes', and he insisted on the priority of an historical perspective: 'the Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic races of man are real living and abiding groups, the distinction between which we must accept among the primary facts of history.' In other words, while 'from the purely scientific or physiological point of view … there is no such thing as purity of race at all', from the 'standing point … of history … we may say unhesitatingly that there are such things as races and nations'. While religion, institutions and culture were all indices of race, for Freeman, language remained the best test, and a people's language—like their religion, institutions and culture—was ultimately a product of history: 'the science of the philologer', he declared, 'is strictly historical'.[111] So while Freeman accepted the philologers' caveats he maintained that a pragmatic, historical definition of race—with language as its rough and ready test—was an essential heuristic for making sense of Europe and its past.

Freeman's argument had important implications. While subsequent historians, from Christopher Parker to Theodore Koditschek, have tended to emphasise the undeniable vehemence of Freeman's racial antipathies, 'Race and Language' was more

---

109 Sir Henry Maine, *Lectures on the Early History of Institutions,* (3rd ed., London, John Murray, 1880), p. 64. See John Burrow, 'Henry Maine and Mid-Victorian Ideas of Progress' in Alan Diamond (ed.), *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 55-69.
110 Freeman, 'Race and Language', p. 726.
111 Ibid., pp. 729-30, 731, 719.

concerned with racial affinities.[112] In March 1877, Serbia and Montenegro were at war with the Ottoman Empire with the professed ambition of liberating their Slavonic brethren in Herzegovina from oppression; in the following month, Russia would declare war on the Porte, similarly motivated by Slavonic solidarity. The Turks' British allies were portraying such sentiments as pretexts for aggressive expansionism, and it was to such criticisms that Freeman was responding when he asserted the validity of 'those generous emotions which, in the present state of European feeling, are beginning to bind together the greater as well as the lesser groups of mankind'. The peroration of his essay in its concluding paragraph is the clue to the topicality of the thirty preceding pages:

> No … hindrance exists to stop the flow of natural and generous feeling between the Slave [*sic*] of Russia and the Slave [*sic*] of the south-Eastern lands. Those whose statesmanship consists in some hand-to-mouth shift for the moment, whose wisdom consists in refusing to look either back to the past or onward to the future, cannot understand this great fact of our times; and what they cannot understand they mock at. But the fact exists and does its work in spite of them. And it does its work none the less because in some cases the feeling of sympathy is awakened by a claim of kindred, where, in the sense of the physiologist or the genealogist, there is no kindred at all.[113]

This was not the first time Freeman had used history to make this argument: two months earlier, for example, in a review of Guizot's *History of France*, he had rather more obliquely denounced 'that snare of exclusive patriotism which [Thomas] Arnold denounced as a prejudice of barbarism'.[114] Others had made similar arguments: Humphry Sandwith, for example, had assured his readers in the same issue of the *British Quarterly Review* that the Serbian declaration of war had been motivated by

---

[112] Christopher Parker, 'The Failure of Liberal Racialism: The Racial Ideas of Edward Freeman', *Historical Journal*, 24 (Dec. 1981), pp. 825-46; Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Two Types of Universal History: The Cases of Edward Freeman and Max Weber', *Journal of Modern History*, 58 (March 1986), pp. 325-46; Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination*.
[113] Freeman, 'Race and Language', p. 740.
[114] Edward Freeman, 'Guizot's *History of France*', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (Jan. 1877), pp. 165-95 at p. 165.

fellow-feeling for their Slavonic neighbours: politicians who questioned that, he declared, 'can no more understand a generous sentiment than a blind man can comprehend colour'.[115] But Freeman's essay was by far the most closely-argued defence of Slavonic racial solidarity to appear during the Eastern Crisis.

In addition to this obviously polemical point, 'Race and Language' had another important implication for the Eastern Question. Race sentiment, Freeman argued, was increasingly inflecting European nationalism: 'it is a special mark of our time', he believed, and

> a special mark of the influence which doctrines about race and language have had on men's minds, that we have seen great nations united by processes in which theories of race and language have really had much to do with bringing about their union

Pointing to 'the reunion of the severed German and Italian nations', he argued that—even allowing for the influence of nationalist statesmen—'the conscious feeling of nationality, and the acceptance of a common language as the outward badge of nationality' had exercised a pivotal role: 'Poets sang of language as the badge of national union; statesman made it the badge, so far as political considerations did not lead them to do anything else.'[116] Race, nationality and polity thus all tended to converge in western Europe, with the one exception of the Swiss Confederation; a country Freeman identified as 'an artificial nation, united by an act of its own free-will' from detached shards of the 'German, Italian, and Burgundian nations'.[117]

In eastern Europe, however, nationality and polity had altogether parted company. Most of the Balkans' inhabitants lived under the rule of two empires equally 'opposed to those ideas of nationality towards which Western Europe has been long feeling its

---

[115] Humphry Sandwith, 'The Servian War', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (Jan. 1877), pp. 195-220 at p. 213.
[116] Freeman, 'Race and Language', p. 735.
[117] Ibid., p. 736.

way': the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Ottoman Empire. The Greek and Serb states were far from encompassing all south-eastern Europe's Greeks and Serbs:

> No one nation forms a single national government. One fragment of a nation is free under a national government, another fragment is ruled by civilized strangers [*i.e.* Austria-Hungary], a third is trampled down by barbarians [*i.e.* the Turks].

Incipient nationality, in other words, founded on community of race and language, had been denied political recognition in much of the Balkans; but it followed from Freeman's argument that the triumph of nationalism was the inevitable *telos* of history in the east, as it had proven to be in the west. Freeman, in other words, believed that what Gladstone called 'the great Emancipation' of the southern Slavs promised soon 'to take its place in the region of accomplished facts'.[118] As Gladstone would explain to the Midlothian electorate, such histories seemed to prophesy that 'in future times [the Balkan Slavs] again shall arrive at the prosperity and civilisation which they once enjoyed'.

While peering into the deep past could thus illuminate the racial sympathies and antipathies which characterised south-eastern Europe, commentators more often devoted their attention to the Balkan Slavs' more recent history, and this was the subject of another essay by E. A. Freeman which occupied forty-eight pages in the July 1877 issue of the *British Quarterly Review*; an essay which exemplifies how the periodicals constituted a self-referential forum for intellectual debate. Freeman began by adverting once again to the increasing importance of racial and national sentiment in European politics, drawing on the conclusions of 'Race and Language': nowhere was racial solidarity so strong, he argued, or so little occluded by the more exclusive sentiments

[118] W. E. Gladstone, 'Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (Aug. 1877), pp. 149-66 at p. 166.

of nationalism, than among the Slavs. The affinities that had brought about German unification and Italian Risorgimento in the west were more narrowly delimited than the pan-Slavism of the east. While in western Europe it was possible to speak of the Italian or the German nation, 'when we speak of the Celtic or the Teutonic *race'*, Freeman explained, 'we are dealing with a fact of science, a discovery of learned inquiry, which is marked by an arbitrary scientific name', and which enjoyed no popular traction. In a note, Freeman even speculates—*pace* Theodore Koditschek—that the term 'Teuton' may be etymologically incorrect, having 'come in through a mere mistake'.[119] In eastern Europe, however, he insisted that 'with the Slavonic name it is otherwise. The name by which that kindred is marked is no arbitrary invention of scholars.' So if Serbia seemed likely to play, as Humphry Sandwith put it 'the part played by Cavour and Victor Emmanuel in the Italian peninsula', she would be leading a racial rather than a merely national movement.[120] But Freeman did not dilate on that point at any great length: instead he merely cited 'Race and Language' in the *Contemporary Review*, remarking that 'we assume the positions that are drawn out there'.[121]

A few pages later Freeman reiterated the arguments of another essay, on 'The Illyrian Emperors and their land', which had appeared in the *British Quarterly Review* a year earlier: there he had contended that the 'Eastern shores of the Hadriatic' had always been a 'border-land' between 'languages, empires, and religions', separating Latin from Greek Europe, and ultimately civilisation from barbarism. To Freeman, the Dalmatian coast, with its islands, peninsulas and inland seas, seemed to be 'a secondary Aegean', 'a secondary Hellas'—similarly destined to cultivate a sophisticated civilisation. But, unlike Greece, the civilisation of the Dalmatian coast had not been

[119] Edward Freeman, 'Southern Slaves', pp. 140-1.
[120] Humphry Sandwith, 'Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Austria', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (Oct. 1878), pp. 393-414 at p. 394.
[121] Ibid., pp. 137-41.

geographically isolated from the barbarism of the interior, and while the two had clashed neither had gained the upper hand: 'The barbarian has been checked in his calling as destroyer; the civilized man has been checked in his calling as enlightener.'[122] Only under Rome had mainland and interior been temporarily reconciled—an argument which, as we have seen, Freeman had repeated in 'The Geographical Aspect of the Eastern Question'—and thus able to realise their innate potential, personified in the Illyrian Emperors, 'the external champions and internal reformers' of the Empire, whose careers Freeman went on to chronicle.[123] Others had emphasised how the legacy of this Roman period had endured in the contemporary Balkans: Arthur Evans, for example, had identified vestiges of Roman designs in Bosnian 'fiddles and pots', which, as Freeman admiringly acknowledged, 'I should never think of', and Philip Christitch adverted to 'the classic soil of the Balkans'.[124] Freeman similarly related the modern divisions of the Balkans to 'the geography of the transitional days of the Roman Empire', and looked to two of his great enthusiasms, place names and architecture, for evidence of Roman influences.[125] But his concern above all was to explore the central role that south-eastern Europe had played in the classical world, thereby asserting the Balkans' fundamentally European identity.

In 'The southern Slaves', Freeman built on the conclusions of these two earlier essays, continuing the story from where he had left off in the seventh century. The southern Slavs, he believed, had their 'main historic being in relation to the Eastern Empire and the power which has supplanted it', the Ottoman Empire.[126] The Slavs

[122] Edward Freeman, 'The Illyrian Emperors and Their Land', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (July 1876), pp. 1-35 at pp. 1-2.
[123] Ibid., p. 9.
[124] Joan Evans, *Time and Chance, the Story of Arthur Evans and His Forbears* (London, 1943), p. 190; Christitch, 'The Eastern Question (part II)', p. 165.
[125] Freeman, 'Illyrian Emperors', p. 5.
[126] Freeman, 'Southern Slaves', p. 145.

arrival in the east had been contemporaneous with the irruption of their Aryan cousins the Teutons in the west, and the two, Freeman believed, had been destined to play corresponding roles in universal history. As Thomas Arnold had put it in his inaugural lecture as regius professor of modern history at Oxford, a lecture which had exercised a formative influence on the young Freeman's mind, 'the Sclavonic [*sic*] race is another new element [of uncommon power], which has overrun the east of Europe, as the German has overrun the west'.[127] But if 'the Slave in the East' had played 'the part of the Teuton in the West', that part had been played 'far less perfectly', for the parallels were not exact.[128] In the west, Teutonic and Latin races had assimilated, and the conquering Teutons had become the cultural and political heirs and 'disciples' to Rome: in the end, 'the conquered led captive the conqueror'. Synthesis of this kind appealed to Freeman: he applied the same formulation, borrowed from Horace, to the Norman conquest of England, as well as to the Roman and Macedonian conquests of Greece.[129]

In the east, however, the story had turned out very differently. In many respects, and above all religion, the Eastern Empire had been, as Freeman's friend James Bryce put it in *Macmillan's Magazine*, 'the instructress of the Slavs, just as Italy was the instructress of the Teutons and the Celts'.[130] In his *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (1862), A. P. Stanley, Thomas Arnold's pupil, friend and biographer, had declared that the conversion of the Slavs by the Eastern Church 'corresponds to the conversion of the Teutonic tribes by the Latin Church'.[131] But while men of Slavonic birth had served in the Imperial armies and even occupied the Imperial throne itself, the

[127] Arnold, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 28.
[128] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, pp. 218-9.
[129] See Freeman, *Historical Essays, 2nd Series*, p. 30; Freeman, *Chief Periods*, p. 85f; Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, p. 41. Horace, *Epistles*, 2. 1. 156-7: *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit / et artes intulit agresti Latio.* But cf. also Ephesians 4.8: 'When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men'.
[130] James Bryce, 'Constantinople', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 37 (Feb. 1878), pp. 337-52 at p. 340.
[131] A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (2nd ed., London, 1862), p. 16.

Eastern Empire had never become Slavonic in the way that the Western Empire had become Teutonic when Charles the Great succeeded to Constantine VI in 800. Moreover, racial assimilation had never taken place: there was nothing in the east 'which exactly answers to the Romance nations of the west', and 'the old and the new nations remained distinct'.[132]

The reasons for this state of affairs were twofold. The first, Freeman believed, was that the Eastern Empire had shown the Slavs two faces, one Roman and the other Greek. This, he suggested, was an artefact of the Roman conquest of Greece: in the west, 'where Rome conquered she civilized', and subject Gauls and Spaniards had become Roman in customs and in speech; in the east, the Roman had been confronted by 'a civilisation and literature older and higher than his', and while the Greeks had learnt 'to glory in the Roman name' they had never become Roman in 'any but the merest political sense'. Latin loan-words appear in Byzantine Greek, he observed, in exactly the same way that Norman French is used in English law: 'the Latin words remain perfect strangers, used in their purely technical meaning'. In the west, 'the Church and the Empire both spoke one tongue'; but the civil administration of the Eastern Empire was Roman, its Church Greek. The result was that

> the power that was neither wholly Roman nor wholly Greek had not the same magic charm. The invading Slave [*sic*] became in many ways an apt disciple of the New Rome; but he never laid aside his own speech and national being; he could not thoroughly merge himself in a system which spoke with an uncertain voice. He became a disciple; but in becoming a disciple he became also, in a way in which the Teuton of the West never did, a rival and an enemy.[133]

But in that rivalry the Slavs had not prevailed: the Eastern Empire and above all its impregnable seat at Constantinople—'New Rome'—had simply been too strong, and

[132] Freeman, 'Southern Slaves', pp. 148-9.
[133] Ibid., pp. 150-1.

herein lay the second and more fundamental reason why the Slavs had been unable to play in the east the role taken by the Teutons in the west.

Whereas 'Old Rome' had gradually lost her strategic importance, supplanted within the Italian peninsula by Milan and Ravenna, and no longer the permanent dwelling place of the Emperor and his administration, in the east Constantinople 'remained a ruling city, an impregnable fortress'. The older Rome had, in a sense, become an idea, losing its local importance; but Constantinople, on the other hand, had remained strategically vital at the junction of Europe and Asia:

> The eternity of the elder Rome is the eternity of a moral influence; the eternity of the younger Rome is the eternity of a city and fortress fixed on a spot which nature itself had destined to be the seat of the empire of two worlds.[134]

The strategic importance of Constantinople had time and again 'prolonged the duration of powers'—Byzantine, Frankish, Greek and Ottoman—'which must otherwise have crumbled away'; and by prolonging the existence of the Eastern Empire, Constantinople had shaped decisively the history of south-eastern Europe: indeed, 'the difference between Eastern and Western Europe', Freeman believed, 'came out of the fact that New Rome was New Rome, and not Old'.[135] Freeman's insistence on this point was shared by Bryce, for whom there were four 'cities that have influenced the whole world, or round which history has at one time or another revolved': Jerusalem, Athens, Rome and Constantinople. But the first three, he contended, 'belong mainly to the past', whereas, thanks to her strategic importance, Constantinople remained 'a power in the present, and may be a mighty factor in the future'.[136]

What might have happened if Constantinople *had* fallen to Slavonic conquerors, however, was a question that acquired increasing salience as Russian armies advanced

---

[134] Ibid., pp. 151-3.
[135] Ibid., p. 149.
[136] Bryce, 'Constantinople', p. 337.

towards the city, finally halting within seven miles of its walls in March 1878. An earlier Slavonic conquest 'in the ninth century', Freeman once speculated, 'might have prevented the necessity of contending against one in the nineteenth', and the beneficiary of such an outcome would have been the Kingdom of Bulgaria, foremost amongst the Empire's frustrated Slavonic rivals and enemies. In the ninth century, under Boris I, the Bulgarians had converted to the Eastern Church; his son and successor Simeon I had expanded the kingdom to include swathes of Thrace, Macedonia and Albania—the bulk, indeed, of the Balkan peninsula. Simeon, a 'learned scholar … deeply versed in Hellenic lore', and moreover the

> ruler of such a realm, was not satisfied to be a mere barbarian *khan*, a mere Slavonic king. No title was worthy of him but that which was borne by the princes who were kept, as it were, shut up in the New Rome. First of his race, he bore the imperial name, and handed on the title of *Cæsar*, in its shortened form of *Czar*, to a long line of Russian, Servian, and Bulgarian successors.[137]

Simeon's ambitions had been frustrated by 'the sword of John Tzimiskês'; those of Samuel of Ochrida, his successor, by Basil II 'the Bulgarian-slayer'. But Freeman wondered 'whether it might not have been a gain to Christianity and civilization if Constantinople had fallen into [Bulgarian] hands'. The Bulgarians, unlike the Ottoman Turks, were members of the Aryan family: they 'looked with reverence to the city from which they had derived their religion, and whose civilization they had begun to appreciate and adopt'.[138] Echoing Finlay, Freeman believed that the Bulgarians might have infused new life into the Empire in the east, just as the Teutons had in the west, thereby preventing the Ottoman conquest. Such an appealing hypothetical seemed to imply that a seemingly-imminent Russian—in other words Slavonic—occupation of

[137] Freeman, 'Southern Slaves', pp. 181-2.
[138] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 267.

Constantinople might not be so very terrible; indeed, it almost amounted to the fulfilment of an unrealised destiny.

Of course, this is not to suggest that the Bulgarians feature in Freeman's essay merely as an historical proxy for Russia: events had endowed them with an acute interest of their own. By situating the kingdom of Bulgaria so firmly within the story of European—as opposed to Oriental—history, Freeman was implicitly asserting the European identity of the modern Bulgarians massacred in 1876; an identity which had been contested by the Bulgarian Agitation's opponents. But he was also responding to a more recent development: Russian forces had established an independent Bulgaria in April 1877, and the new state was emerging as an important factor in European politics, likely to play a part in any prospective settlement of the Eastern Question. That lent obvious general interest to Bulgarian history, which Freeman sought to satisfy by—for example—introducing his readers to one of the most important new books on the subject, the Czech historian Konstantin Jireček's German-language *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (1876).[139]

More specifically politically-freighted in July 1877, however, were Freeman's counterfactuals: Bulgarian and Greek territorial aspirations, centred on Constantinople, had begun to conflict, and Freeman contemplated the prospect of a Constantinople either Greek or Bulgarian—ruled either by 'a successor of Basil or a successor of Samuel'. Freeman certainly believed that history supported some of Bulgaria's territorial claims: 'the Bulgarian folk and speech, the remains of the kingdom of Samuel', he had written a year earlier, 'reach far to the south of the mountains'.[140] But he reminded his readers that tensions between Bulgaria and Greece were ultimately a

[139] Freeman, 'Southern Slaves', p. 137. Konstantin Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876).
[140] Edward Freeman, 'Present Aspects of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (Oct. 1876), pp. 409-23 at p. 420.

distraction from the more important conflict with the Ottoman Turks: 'Basil and Samuel alike', he argued, 'would willingly place his rival on his own throne rather than see the heir of Othman on the throne of Constantinople'.[141] So by dreaming of the greater nation that might have emerged out of the fusion of the Greek-speaking Byzantine Empire and the Bulgarian Empire in the ninth century, Freeman's counter-factual history was an argument for Greek and Bulgarian cooperation in the future.

If by July 1877 events in south-eastern Europe suggested parallels with the era of Basil and Samuel, a year earlier, when Serbia had declared on the Ottoman Empire in June 1876, commentators had been more likely to look back to the Serbian kingdom of the fourteenth century. During its heyday, Serbia had, as Humphry Sandwith put it, 'attained the force and dignity of a powerful kingdom, and opposed a formidable barrier to the Turkish arms which were steadily advancing into this part of Europe'.[142] The old Serbian kingdom had included, according to Philip Christitch, 'a portion of what is now called Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Northern Albania, Montenegro, a portion of Herzegovina, Old Servia, and the Servian Principality of the present day', while the independent but allied Servo-Bosnian kingdom had consisted of Bosnia and western Herzegovina.[143] That kingdom had flourished, above all under Stephen Dushan, Serbia's greatest ruler. Indeed, Freeman was only one of a number of authors who believed that at one time the Serbian kings, like the Bulgarian Czars before them, had seemed poised to inherit the Eastern Empire:

> As it was with the Bulgarian at the end of the tenth [century], so it was with the Servian in the middle of the fourteenth. At each of those times, things looked as if a Slavonic power ... was about to be enthroned in the seat of the Eastern Caesars, to play ... nearly the same part which the Frank

[141] Freeman, 'Southern Slaves', p. 184.
[142] Humphry Sandwith, 'The Independence and Integrity of the Ottoman Empire', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (July 1876), pp. 78-98 at p. 88.
[143] Philip Christitch, 'The Eastern Question from the Point of View of the Eastern Christians', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 35 (Dec. 1876), pp. 158-76 at p. 158.

> had played in the elder Rome. Servia was a nation without a capital; the Byzantine Empire had become a capital without a nation.[144]

Paulina Irby had adumbrated the same argument, similarly premised upon the Arnoldian analogy between Slavs and Teutons, in her popular *Travels*:

> Why should not Dushan anticipate the Turk, take Constantinople, wear the crown of empire, and wield the united strength of Slavon [*sic*] and Greek? Thus he might turn the tide of Moslem conquest, and pour the vigour of his young northern peoples into the exhausted frame of a long-civilised realm. It was a grand dream, and had it come true perhaps this portion of the old Roman Empire would, like the West, have seen a revival of national energy and classic culture, and the south-eastern peninsula might have become a second Italy.[145]

As we have seen, like Freeman and Irby, Arthur Evans also believed that when Dushan had advanced on Constantinople,

> the Eastern Question was nearer a felicitous solution then than it has ever been since! Had Dushan found a successor worthy to support his shield, or to wear the double-eagled casque, in all human probability the Turk would never have made good his footing in Europe, the dotard Greeklings of Byzantium would have given place to a youthful power capable of acting as the champion of Christendom and of competing successfully with the civilisation of the West.[146]

Once again, however, Constantinople had presented an insuperable obstacle to a Slavonic conquest: Dushan, legend had it, had shed tears when he realised he would never capture the imperial city. Instead, the Serbs had been obliged to resist the Ottoman advance on home ground, in the Balkans, and they had done so doggedly, the Serbian army fighting to the last man at the Battle of Kosovo in 1389. Gladstone for one believed the western powers owed a debt 'to the race which has conferred upon Europe such invaluable service by her never-dying resistance to the flood of barbarism'.[147]

---

[144] Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88 at p. 281.
[145] Irby and Mackenzie, *Travels*, ii. 297.
[146] Evans, *Bosnia and the Herzegóvina*, pp. 216-17. See above, p. 154.
[147] W. E. Gladstone, 'The Peace to Come', *Nineteenth Century* 3 (Feb. 1878), pp. 209-26 at p. 223.

Now the missed opportunities of the past seemed to promise to be fulfilled in the future. Serbian statesmen, Humphry Sandwith reported, 'proposed to unite all the Slavonians' and 'resuscitate with modifications the Empire of Dushan which perished on the fatal field of Kosovo'.[148] Arthur Evans, whom Sandwith was reviewing, identified similar historically-informed ambitions among the southern Slavs: their national poetry, he believed, had

> turned their mind's eye back from the divisions of the present to the union of the past, and has fed their ambition with the memories of a time when one of their princes seemed about to catch up the falling diadem of Byzantium and place it on his brow.[149]

Writing in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Evans claimed that such national traditions—which had 'survived four centuries of alien bondage'—more than justified the Bosnian Serbs in rejecting the rule of Austria-Hungary, 'whose imperial crown ranks in point of antiquity with that of Brazil': indeed, 'the bones of Dushan', he prophesied, 'may yet work more miracles than the living arm of Francis Joseph'.[150] Philip Christitch agreed: the Serbs' 'recollections of their historical past' had, despite the intervening centuries, 'never been extinguished in their breasts'. Now such recollections 'have gained strength, and seem to be constantly urging the Christians towards the restoration of their ancient national life'.[151] The rebels in Bosnia and Herzegovina were thus, as Gladstone argued, merely 'making an effort to retrieve what they have lost so long, but have not ceased to love and desire'.[152]

---

[148] Humphry Sandwith, 'Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Austria', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (Oct. 1878), pp. 393-414 at pp. 394-5.
[149] Arthur Evans, *Illyrian Letters. A Revised Selection of Correspondence from the Illyrian Provinces... Addressed to the* Manchester Guardian (London, 1878), pp. 138-9.
[150] Arthur Evans, 'The Austrians in Bosnia', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 38 (Oct. 1878), pp. 495-504 at pp. 503-4.
[151] Philip Christitch, 'The Eastern Question', p. 158.
[152] Hansard, CCXXXIV, 7 May 1877, 437.

But whether Greek, Bulgarian or Serbian, all these narratives implied a revived Byzantine Empire of some kind, and for historically-minded observers this seemed an excellent solution to the Eastern Question. As Lady Frances Verney observed, John Sobieski's ambition to destroy the Ottoman Empire 'and raise once more on its ruins a Byzantine empire' was shared by many of the authors of 'speeches and writings at the present crisis'.[153] Freeman, of course, was among them, looking forward to a 'Byzantine Empire, a Byzantine Confederation, whenever it is fully and finally formed'.[154] But by January 1877, even a cautious observer such as Grant Duff might advocate 'the creation of a new Byzantine Empire under some European prince'—and he was irenic about whom that prince might be:

> Mr. Freeman, writing recently upon the subject, pointed out that a European prince sent to Constantinople would soon cease to be English, or German, or Russian, and become Byzantine—the spell of the great imperial city being too strong for all other influences.[155]

That contention was never put to the test, but Constantinople certainly cast a strong spell over a number of British observers, captivated above all by the prospect of a Christian Haga Sophia. Humphry Sandwith rhapsodised over the church's remaining Christian artwork, 'which in all human probability will some day be uncovered to delight a Greek congregation'. The Radical writer Arthur Arnold wondered

> Who shall trace again in glaring gold those crosses upon the walls, which ages of Mahommedan [*sic*] occupation have not entirely obliterated? Who shall readjust the theological compass in this evidently Christian church?[156]

[153] Lady Frances Verney, 'Turkish Invasions of Europe in 1670-83: Sobieski's Letters to His Wife', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (March 1877), pp. 635-59 at p. 647.
[154] Freeman, 'Geographical Aspect', p. 87.
[155] Grant Duff, 'The Five Nights' Debate', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (July 1877), pp. 857-78 at p. 870.
[156] Arthur Arnold, 'Turkey', *The Contemporary Review*, 28 (July 1876), pp. 191-214 at p. 212.

For Freeman, the time was ripe to 'cleanse the church of Justinian from the defilement of a false worship'.[157] And James Bryce similarly reflected on the desecration of 'this church of Justinian' by Mohamed the Conqueror in 1453:

> Looking round this noble monument of Christian art, and thinking of that awful scene, it was impossible not to wish for the speedy advent of a day when the fierce faith of Arabia shall be driven out, and the voice of Christian worship be heard once more beneath this sounding dome.[158]

As Orlando Figes has recently reminded us, the reconsecration of the Haga Sophia was a perennial fixation in Eastern Orthodoxy, but Freeman, Sandwith, Arnold and Bryce were Anglican, not Orthodox.[159] This is an episode in intellectual history which we have already explored, but it is clear at the very least that these rhapsodic projections of a Christian Haga Sophia owed as much to the historical imagination as they did to pragmatic analyses of the present.

All these histories tended to situate the southern Slavs firmly within the narrative of European history. Racially, religiously and culturally European, the Slavs were portrayed as the legitimate heirs to a rehabilitated Eastern Roman Empire. The conflict between the Ottoman Empire and incipient Balkan nationalism was thus very far from being a clash between 'two barbarous races'. On the contrary, as Goldwin Smith explained, south-eastern Europe revealed the spectacle of 'young communities belonging by religion and character to a higher civilization' subject to the dominion of an 'alien tyranny'.[160] The histories that supported this argument were elicited to differing degrees by the developing crisis in south-eastern Europe: some responded to particular events; others took the form of more leisurely and general reflections on the

[157] Edward Freeman, 'The English People in Relation to the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Feb. 1877), pp. 489-515 at p. 506.
[158] Bryce, 'Constantinople', p. 348.
[159] Orlando Figes, *Crimea* (London, 2010), p. 25.
[160] Goldwin Smith, 'England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 31 (Feb. 1878), pp. 603-19

Eastern Question. But all had clear and usually explicit political implications. These, then, were pragmatic histories which drew on the past to make sense of the present. But far from being merely topical productions of the moment, these periodical essays were also *foci* for larger literatures: foreign-language scholarship; works of travel literature, ethnology, history; the daily and weekly press; diplomatic reports—all alike subsumed by what Walter Bagehot termed the 'essay-like review' and the 'review-like essay'.

II
The Montenegrin Moment

During the years of the Eastern Crisis, none of the Slavonic peoples of the Balkans inspired more ardent enthusiasm among 'the cultivated intelligence of England' than the Montenegrins. The tiny principality had first come to the notice of the British public during the Napoleonic Wars, when in 1813 Montenegro had succeeded—with British and Russian support—in wresting control of the Bay of Kotor from the French. Divested of her new conquest by the treaty of Vienna a few months later, Montenegro's plight had elicited the sympathy of Liberals in Britain and in France. Over the following years, Montenegro assumed an importance in Balkan travel writing disproportionate to its size. British travellers in south-eastern Europe, beginning with Sir Gardner Wilkinson—and including the Strangfords, J. M. Neale, Andrew Paton, Georgina Mackenzie and others—often made a point of visiting Montenegro. A parallel Francophone tradition emerged too, beginning even earlier in the century with Vialla de Sommières' *Voyage Historique et Politique au Monténégro* (1820).[161] Polyglot Victorians could also draw on the works of German and Slavonic authors. As we have seen, Montenegro's diminutive size and the hardy simplicity of its mountaineer

[161] Colonel Vialla de Sommières was Napoleon I's envoy to Montenegro.

inhabitants suggested analogies with Ancient Greece and the Scottish Highlands that were irresistible to the Romantic sensibilities of many nineteenth-century travel writers. By the 1870s, moreover, the insights of the comparative method could collapse such analogies into identity, interpreting the Montenegrins and their primitive intuitions as the living ancestors of civilized Western Europe.

But it was the nationalist insurrections which began in Herzegovina in July 1875 that really 'made Montenegro', as William Denton remarked, 'a household word in this country'.[162] As her co-religionists across the border took up arms against the Turks, Montenegro remained officially neutral; but her prince and people made an open secret of their sympathy for a rebellion which many believed also benefited from their material support. The disposition of the Montenegrin government, whether towards war or peace, became a question of significance and controversy; and Montenegro thus enjoyed a period of celebrity that would endure until the Congress of Berlin. By September 1875, William Stillman had arrived in Cettinje, the capital of Montenegro, authoring reports for *The Times* which, as Disraeli complained, 'created such an enthusiasm for the principality that the Government [was] obliged to take it into account'.[163] As we have seen, Stillman's historically-minded dispatches—like those of his colleague Arthur Evans, who visited Montenegro on behalf of the *Manchester Guardian* two years later—sat comfortably within the well-established tradition of Balkan travel literature; and they also portrayed Montenegro and her inhabitants with unprecedented chronological and emotional immediacy.

Stillman's reports were complemented in December by an article on 'The True Eastern Question' by E. A. Freeman. Like Stillman, Freeman was writing from first-

[162] [William Denton], 'Montenegro', *Church Quarterly Review*, 3 (Oct. 1876), pp. 158-88 at p. 158.
[163] Quoted in William Stillman, *The Autobiography of a Journalist* (2 vols., London, 1901), ii. 164.

hand experience, for he had just returned from south-eastern Europe, accompanied by John Morley. Though Morley was anxious 'to see what there was in the affair in the Herzegovina', Freeman—as we have seen—had not been drawn to the Balkans by current affairs.[164] On the contrary, his had been a visit, he insisted, 'planned long ago with objects bearing wholly on the history of past times'—'the accomplishment of a thirty years' yearning'.[165] Together they had travelled along the Dalmatian Coast by steamer, entranced by the region's evocative antique past: 'Tonight we have got to Spalato by moonlight', he rhapsodized to his daughter on 7 October, 'and contemplated the arcades of the court of Jovius. How long have I yearned for this—it is like getting one's fellowship or seeing one's first Landesgemeinde'.[166] 'Think of all that', he told James Bryce: 'the glory of the moonlight to-night makes one half turn pagan in a lunatic fashion'.[167] For Freeman, the sight was a veritable rite of passage because the Landesgemeinde (or cantonal assemblies) of Switzerland and 'the arcades of Jovius' were alike living history: the arches of Diocletian's palace still housed Spalato's bustling modern quayside, just as the Swiss assemblies were the living and functioning descendants, he believed, of institutions described in Tacitus' *Germania*. Freeman would portray this and other sites of historic interest to the readers of the *Saturday Review* in essays that were later compiled into a volume of *Sketches from the Subject and Neighbour Lands of Venice* (1881).[168]

But whatever the motivation for his visit to south-eastern Europe, Freeman engaged with what he called 'present history' just as emotionally as he did with the

[164] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 155.
[165] Edward Freeman, 'The True Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 24 (Dec. 1875), pp. 747-69 at p. 747.
[166] Freeman to Miss Freeman, 7 Oct. 1875 in Stephens, *Life and letters*, ii. 96.
[167] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 105, Freeman to James Bryce, 8 Oct. 1875.
[168] Edward Freeman, *Sketches from the Subject and Neighbour Lands of Venice* (London, 1881). See ibid., pp. i-ix for the work's inception.

region's past.[169] The visiting Englishmen were lionised in Montenegro, despite a misunderstanding which Freeman related in a letter home:

> the Prince's prime minister made a great dinner for us, and bade the lords, high captains, and chief estates of Montenegro to meet us—only they never told *us*; so we never went. We called up and down the street expecting somebody to notice us; they looked at us, believing that we knew and expecting us to come to them. Did you ever hear anything so absurd?

As his biographer observed, Freeman's sympathy for the Balkan insurrections 'was intensified by his being brought into close contact with the scene of the first outbreak, and learning from the mouths of eye-witnesses the tale of intolerable wrongs ... and of ... frightful cruelties'.[170]

'The true Eastern Question', which appeared in the pages of Morley's *Fortnightly* shortly after Freeman's return to England thus differed in its inception from many of the 'essay-like reviews' or 'review-like essays' that were the staple of the periodical press. Freeman mingled elements of reportage with the measured reflections more characteristic of the genre in which he was writing. Vivid descriptions of 'hapless and homeless fugitives who have fled before the face of the barbarian invader' were accompanied by virulent polemic.[171] So as well as surveying current affairs, Freeman was also reporting on them—and he identified strongly with the Eastern Christians he had found so hospitable and evocative.

Of course, reportage and polemic were not mutually exclusive with careful analysis, and the bulk of Freeman's essay was some twenty-three pages which reviewed recent events in south-eastern Europe from a staunchly historicist perspective. Freeman began by complaining that the Balkan Christians received little sympathy from their western coreligionists, for which he identified an historical cause: ever since the schism

[169] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', p. 747.
[170] Ibid., ii. 101.
[171] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', pp. 769, 747.

between East and West, a 'kind of dislike and contempt towards the Christian nations of the East had been fostered … in the minds of the Christian nations of the West'. The consequence of that prejudice, he went on, was that a large part of European history 'has been utterly misconceived', and the historical importance of the Byzantine Empire and its Slavonic successor kingdoms had gone unappreciated.[172] Without an accurate knowledge of history, Freeman argued, it was impossible to understand south-eastern Europe; and, as 'often happens, error with regard to past history and error with regard to present policy' had gone together. Many commentators had thus simply misinterpreted the Balkans:

> Because in Western Europe England and the English, France and the French, mean much the same things, they could not understand a state of things in which the Turks were not Turkey, but simply the invaders and oppressors of Turkey.[173]

The Turks, he contended, had never assimilated with their subject peoples in south-eastern Europe, and while conquest 'is legalized as soon as the conquerors and the conquered feel themselves parts of one nation, with common national interests and feelings', that had never happened in the Ottoman Empire's European dominions—indeed, Islam's strictures against equality of religion precluded it, as 'the experience of twelve hundred years of history ought by this time to have taught us'. Separated from their subjects by race, religion and history, the Ottomans in fact remained nothing more than 'an Asiatic horde encamped in Europe'.[174] Freeman, setting the nationalist uprisings in the Balkans in the distinctly Liberal context of Italian Risorgimento and German unification, looked forward to their consummation in free states, although he was not sure what form those should take.

---

[172] Ibid., pp. 747-8.
[173] Ibid., pp. 748-50.
[174] Ibid., p. 757.

Montenegro's role in this extended historical disquisition on the Eastern Question was twofold: as an exemplary unconquered bastion of Christian freedom; and as the source of a possible solution to the contemporary dilemma of how to establish free Balkan nation states. The idea of annexing revolted Bosnia and Herzegovina to either Serbia or Montenegro—or dividing them between them—was seductive: ties of race, religion and history told in its favour. But on the other hand

> the question presents itself, whether an extended Montenegro might not lose its distinctive character, and the Montenegrin experiment, the experiment of civilizing a small warlike tribe, without destroying its distinctive character, without bringing it down to the dead level of common European life, is so interesting, and has hitherto been so successful, that one is loath to do anything to disturb it.[175]

This telling passage reveals once again Freeman's commitment to the comparative method's stadial model of social evolution: the Montenegrins are on the path to civilisation that other members of the 'Aryan family of nations' have already charted, and it is imperative that the organic development of their institutions and society be allowed to follow its natural course. Stillman, as we have seen, voiced similar concerns, hoping that Montenegro might be preserved 'intact and unchanged by civilization as a study of what mankind has once been'; and we have heard Sir Henry Maine's refrain that 'it is not barbarism [that the Slavs] have to dread, but civilisation'.[176]

As one of the leading scholarly proponents of the comparative method, Montenegro had immediately struck Freeman as a land of survivals. As he told his friend the Orientalist and consul Richard Burton in a passage which he echoed in the *Fortnightly Review*, Montenegro presented the unique spectacle of 'the tribe civilizing itself'.[177] The mountain principality, much like Ragusa's quayside, was thus a piece of living history of the kind that Freeman found uniquely appealing. Throughout his brief

[175] Ibid., p. 768.
[176] See above, p. 184.
[177] Freeman to Richard Burton, 12 Nov. 1876 in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 142.

visit, this sense of Montenegro's importance as revealed by the insights of the comparative method informed many of his observations. Writing to Sir Henry Maine on 12 October 1875, for example, Freeman related that in Montenegro he had observed a state of affairs relevant to the discussion of land tenure in *Village Communities* and *Ancient Law*: 'besides state-lands and private lands, there are communal lands, both pasture and forest, but, I understand, no tillage. So pray turn your mind to Montenegro'. Later in the same letter, he speculated that there might be

> such a thing as a common Aryan, perhaps a common human, dress? The dresses in these parts, the Roman military dress, the Highland dress before army-tailors took it in hand, and the dress which our own forefathers are shown in the [Bayeux] tapestry, all seem varieties of one type. And the kind of shawl or blanket which the Montenegrin uses is very like a toga.[178]

As we have seen before, the comparative method served to collapse analogies into identities: the Montenegrins' shawls are not merely similar to Roman togas; they are lineally related, variations of a 'type'. What is more, Freeman's animadversions reveal just how inclusive the comparative method could be, tentatively untethered here from even the notably compendious 'Aryan family' to encompass nothing less than the human race. Of course, that inclusiveness did not extend to the Ottoman Turks; but it did lie behind some of the intense enthusiasm Freeman demonstrated for Montenegro in the pages of the *Fortnightly*.

'The True Eastern Question' introduced Montenegro and her history to the readers of the periodical press, fleshing out the allusive bones of Stillman's revelations in *The Times*. J. R. Green reported from London at the time that the piece had 'made a bit of a stir'.[179] A quarter of a century later, Carslake Thompson would single it out for 'the influence it undoubtedly had in forming Public Opinion',[180] and Stillman himself

[178] Freeman to Sir Henry Maine, 12 Oct. 1875 in ibid., ii. 100.
[179] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 107, Freeman to James Bryce, 19 Dec. 1875.
[180] George Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and the Eastern Question* (2 vols., London, 1886), i. 78.

believed that 'much of the weight given to the "Times" reports' was due to Freeman's essay in Morley's journal.[181] That said, the essay was undeniably extensive in its scope: it was only with a second piece, exclusively devoted to Montenegro, that Freeman explored the principality's history more systematically and comprehensively. Published in *Macmillan's Magazine* in January 1876, a month after its predecessor in the *Fortnightly*, Freeman's 'Montenegro' fits much more easily within the tradition of the 'essay-like review'. On the one hand, he drew upon historically-minded travel writers such as Gardner Wilkinson, J. M. Neale and the Strangfords to supply a fourteen-page history of Montenegro, 'this land, so deeply interesting, alike from its past, its present, and its future', complemented by his own erudition and personal observation.[182] On the other, Freeman lambasts James Creagh's recent *Over the Borders of Christendom and Eslamiah* (1876) as 'coarse, vulgar, and libellous', and its author as a 'libellous jester'. In Freeman's hands, Creagh's volumes stand proxy for other unflattering portrayals of Montenegro in the press, dating back to the time when 'the madness of the Russian war was at its height' twenty years earlier. 'Montenegro', is thus a much more typical periodical article, surveying a body of literature and engaging with it, sometimes critically.

Like so much of Freeman's oeuvre, 'Montenegro' is shaped by historical analogies. As we have seen, many nineteenth-century British authors drew Romantic comparisons between the Montenegrins and the Scottish Highlanders immortalised in the historical novels of Walter Scott. Comparisons with the ancient Greeks, and above all the Homeric heroes, were also popular. But by contrast, Freeman's analogies were more systematic and structuring: for he believed that Montenegro was one of the key

[181] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 156.
[182] Edward Freeman, 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (Jan. 1876), pp. 275-88 at pp. 283, 285 and *passim*.

battlegrounds in the perpetual conflict between East and West that lay at the heart of his conception of universal history. Montenegro, he declared, had been for centuries 'the abiding fortress of right against wrong, of freedom against bondage, of Europe against Asia, or Christendom against Islam'. Thus he compares the Montenegrins to a series of the West's 'champions' in that conflict: variously the Spartans at Thermopylae, the Athenians at the Battle of Marathon, 'Geoffrey's Crusaders', John Hunyadi (or 'Huniades') and the Emperor Constantine.[183]

Moreover, since the clash between East and West was also a conflict 'between freedom and bondage', Freeman was able to assimilate his conception of the Eastern Question with more conventionally British and European Whig histories of liberty. So in addition to likening the Montenegrins to the West's champions against the East, Freeman could also link them with 'Cromwell's Ironsides', who had upheld the 'Good old cause' of constitutional liberty in the English Civil War; with the Swiss Confederacy—'Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden'—that had preserved its freedom in the face of Dukes of Austria and of Burgundy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and with the 'stout-hearted men' of the Dutch Republic.[184] Indeed, for Freeman the two conflicts—between freedom and tyranny, and between the East and West—were simply inextricable: the national life of Montenegro, he insisted, had been 'simply one prolonged fight of Marathon *or* Morgarten'; the Montenegrin warrior, he descanted, 'goes forth with a heart like that of Godfrey's Crusaders *or* of Cromwell's Ironsides'.[185]

[183] Freeman, 'Montenegro', pp. 277, 280-2. 'Geoffrey's crusaders' is most likely a reference to Geoffrey of Bouillon, one of the leaders of the First Crusade, but Freeman might also be adverting to Geoffrey of Villehardouin, who wrote an important chronicle of the First Crusade. John Hunyadi was a fifteenth-century Hungarian statesman and military commander who enjoyed great success against the Ottoman Turks. The Emperor Constantine was preparing a campaign against the Persian Empire on his death.
[184] Ibid., pp. 277, 280-2.
[185] Freeman, 'Montenegro', pp. 277, 280-2. Emphasis added.

Analogy approached identity. 'I preach MMM', Freeman told Bryce: 'Marathon, Morgarten, & Maretoviza'.[186]

By incorporating the principality and its people within this web of analogies, Freeman situated them firmly among the beneficiaries of Whig historical sympathies; among company including no less than George Washington, whom he once similarly compared with 'the men of sturdy and enduring might who won victories for freedom on the field of Morgarten or among the dykes of Holland and Zealand'.[187] Moreover, Freeman also clearly identified Montenegro as fundamentally Western, Christian and European. In the 1870s, this was a distinctly political point. Since the time of the Crimean War, the Ottoman Empire's British supporters had attempted to deny that the Balkan Christians were any better than the Turks—the argument being that atrocities were to be expected, as Layard had notoriously contended, 'whenever two barbarous races came into collision'.[188] James Creagh, for example, the victim of Freeman's caustic invective, had claimed that among the Montenegrins all classes were 'equally coarse', displaying 'evil countenances' and 'low and cunning aspects' which made him 'little anxious for their society'.[189] Freeman's history of Montenegro clearly cast the principality in a very different light.

There was an element of *apologia*, too, in Freeman's description of Montenegro's capacity for progress. Addressing the Montenegrins' only recently abolished custom of displaying severed heads from the tower of Cettinje, for example, Freeman pointedly reminds his British readers that, 'not much more than a hundred years back, the heads

[186] Bodleian Library, Bryce Papers, MS Bryce 6, fol. 116, Freeman to Bryce, 19 March 1876. The Battle of Maretoviza was fought between the Montenegrins and the Ottoman Empire.
[187] Edward Freeman, *Greater Greece and Greater Britain & George Washington The Expander of England* (London, 1886), p. 68.
[188] *Hansard* CLXXXV (15 Feb 1867), 427.
[189] James Creagh, *Over the Borders of Christendom and Eslamiah* (London, 1876), quoted in Freeman, 'Montenegro', p. 276.

of domestic rebels were set up on Temple-Bar'.[190] Montenegro, like Britain, had advanced greatly since those days; and by extension Freeman made the principality's progress an *apologia* for all the Balkan Slavs: 'it is the existence of Montenegro', he argued,

> which ... gives the best hope that something better may be in store for the subject nations of south-Eastern Europe than simply to be transferred from one despotism to another ... In the little state on the Black Mountain we see what the Eastern Christian can do. We see that he is able to defend his freedom for ages by his own right hand; and we see that, under rulers of his own blood, he is capable of making advances in civilization and good order with a speed and thoroughness which strike the beholder with wonder. If we read of Montenegro, as described by Sir Gardner Wilkinson twenty-seven years ago, and then go and look at Montenegro now, we shall at once see that there is no part of the world in which improvement of every kind has gone on with swifter steps than in the exposed out-post of Christendom.[191]

Freeman had defended the Greeks from their detractors since his earliest days as a public intellectual, and like many philhellenes, one of his arguments had been that since the Greeks had been corrupted and debased by centuries of Ottoman rule, they could not be blamed for their failures or vices. In the 1870s, British philoslavs extended that argument to the south-eastern European Christians, and Freeman took the advancing civilisation of Montenegro, a Christian state never subject to the Sultan, as a ringing endorsement of this position. As he put it less formally in a letter to James Bryce, 'I don't say that Slaves [*sic*] could ever equal Dutchmen; but, poor dears, how can they improve as long as they have the Turk over them?'[192]

Of course, Freeman's *apologia* intersected with his sense of what the comparative method revealed about progress in Montenegro, as revealed more allusively in his

[190] Freeman, 'Montenegro', p. 277.
[191] Ibid., p. 278.
[192] Freeman to James Bryce, 12 May 1876 in Stephens, *Life and Letters*, ii. 137. By Dutchmen, Freeman meant Germans: the inhabitants of the Netherlands he designated 'Low Dutch'.

correspondence and in his essay on the Eastern Question a month earlier. He made it very explicit that he construed Montenegro as a 'survival'; a piece of living history:

> Here, and perhaps only here, in the modern world, we can see the very model of a warrior tribe, a nation of a quarter of a million, who have known how to maintain their independence with their own right hands, and who at the same time are making rapid strides to a higher place among civilized nations than some of the great powers of the world.

Freeman was always peculiarly susceptible, perhaps following the teaching of 'my friend Aristotle', to the appeal of small polities, where government might be conducted face-to-face. Indeed, as John Burrow observed, much of his fondness for federalism lay in its ability to perpetuate 'the virtues of the *polis* in an age of large states'.[193] In Montenegro, those virtue were not so much ersatz as aboriginal.

It is telling, therefore, that Freeman was prepared to admit a certain disappointment in Montenegro's representative institutions. He confessed that he had hoped to find something 'answering to the old Teutonic assemblies of the whole people which still survive in the old democratic cantons of Switzerland'. But he had looked in vain for 'such gatherings as Tacitus described of old, such as I have myself seen in Uri and in Appenzell', or 'those armed assemblies of the Macedonian people before whom Alexander appeared as an accuser, and did not always carry the verdict of the assembly with him'. The compensation was that Montenegro was so small: in a community where everyone knew his neighbour, informal representation was possible to a degree that would be impractical in a more geographically and numerically extensive population. This assessment in turn reveals another reason behind Freeman's doubt, already articulated elsewhere the year before, 'whether an enlarged Montenegro would remain Montenegro'. It was not just Romantic concern about the corrupting influence of

[193] John Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past* (Cambridge, 1981), p. 175. Cf. Edward Freeman, *A History of Federal Government* (London, 1863), p. 69.

modern civilisation that informed Freeman's misgivings, but also fear lest any enlargement might undermine the essentially informal mechanisms of representation which were the essence of Montenegrin freedom. He doubted whether, as he put it, 'the problem of civilizing a small independent tribe without destroying its distinctive character' could be resolved in a larger territory. In such a situation, the Prince could 'hardly continue to be the same personal shepherd of his people' and a system of informal representation might easily segue into 'a simple tyranny'.[194]

On 18 June 1876, some five months after Freeman's essay in *Macmillan's Magazine* appeared, Serbia and Montenegro jointly declared war on the Ottoman Empire, ending a precarious peace. While the Serbians' military setbacks disappointed their western supporters, as Carslake Thompson noted, the Montenegrins fared much better.[195] Turkish forces, led by Mahmud Pasha, advanced across the border, but they were beaten back repeatedly in a series of skirmishes and pitched battles. By the summer of 1877, Prince Nicolas was preparing to launch a counter-offensive. The Montenegrins' military successes, vividly chronicled in Stillman's reports for *The Times*, only added to the principality's already considerable lustre in the eyes of its admirers. It was during this period that Gladstone finally engaged with the Eastern Question controversy, and the publication of his pamphlet on the *Bulgarian Horrors* in September 1876 signalled his return to political life. As he would reflect two decades later, from 'that time forward until the final consummation in 1879-80 I made the Eastern Question the main business of my life'.[196]

[194] See above, p. 184.
[195] Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and Lord Beaconsfield*, i. 339.
[196] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903), iii. 550.

Naturally enough, Gladstone's attention was drawn to Montenegro—'good, gallant, glorious Montenegro'.[197] 'Though he did not usually read the "Times,"' he told William Stillman in 1876, 'he had taken it to read my letters, having become warmly interested in the little mountain principality by my correspondence.'[198] In a letter to his future wife, J. R. Green described an evening spent with Gladstone early the next year:

> Stubbs was there, and Goldwin Smith, and Humphrey Sandwith, and Mackenzie Wallace, whose great book on Russia is making such a stir ... [Gladstone] was very pleasant to me, and talked of the new historic school he hoped we were building up as enlisting his warmest sympathy. I wish you could have seen with what a glow he spoke of the Montenegrins and their struggle for freedom; how he called on us who wrote history to write what we could of that long fight for liberty![199]

In May, Gladstone would address the House of Commons on the subject of the 'great battle of freedom against oppression' going on in the Balkans, singling out the Montenegrins, 'a band of heroes such as the world as rarely seen', for particular praise.[200] But while he adverted to Montenegro and her struggle in the House, it was rather in the pages of *The Nineteenth Century* with an essay entitled 'Montenegro' that Gladstone chose to follow the advice he had given to Green and his fellow historians just over a month before.[201]

Gladstone's essay ran as the leading article in the third issue of *The Nineteenth Century*, but it was a sonnet on 'Montenegro' by Tennyson that occupied the title page preceding it:

MONTENEGRO

> They rose to where their sovran eagle sails,
> They kept their faith, their freedom, on the height,
> Chaste, frugal, savage, arm'd by day and night
> Against the Turk; whose inroad nowhere scales

[197] Gladstone to Olga Novikof, 20 Jan. 1878, quoted in W. T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia, Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (2 vols., London, 1909), i. 436.
[198] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 162.
[199] J. R. Green to Miss Stopford, 21 Feb. 1877 in Stephen, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p. 466.
[200] *Hansard* CCXXXIV, 7 May 1877, 437.
[201] W. E. Gladstone, 'Montenegro', *The Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), pp. 360-79.

Their headlong passes, but his footstep fails,
And red with blood the Crescent reels from fight
Before their dauntless hundreds, in prone flight
By thousands down the crags and thro' the vales.
O smallest among peoples! rough rock-throne
Of Freedom! warriors beating back the swarm
Of Turkish Islam for five hundred years,
Great Tsernogora! never since thine own
Black ridges drew the cloud and brake the storm
Has breathed a race of mightier mountaineers.[202]

Tennyson had composed these verses in March, calling on Gladstone shortly after 'to gain your approval of the sonnet of which you were the inspirer'. As his son recorded, the poet 'always put ['Montenegro'] first among his sonnets'.[203] Indeed, 'Montenegro' was the only sonnet Tennyson selected for Samuel Waddington's *English Sonnets by Living Writers* (1881), and it was much anthologised into the twentieth century. The poem was even translated into Serbian by Ljubomir Nenadovic—assisted by William Stillman.[204]

The subject seems to have appealed to Tennyson not only as an opportunity to celebrate the heroic virtues of Montenegro's warriors, but also as a chance to follow in the literary footsteps of two of his heroes: Byron and Milton. The similarities between Tennyson's 'Montenegro' and the former's depiction of Albania, above all in *Childe Harold*, have tended to monopolise the attention of recent historians, probably thanks to Gladstone's remark in his opening paragraph, that Montenegro has suffered from the want of 'a Scott to learn and tell the marvels of its history, or a Byron to spend and be spent on its behalf', and that in the person of 'my friend Mr. Tennyson' the principality has at length found 'an interpreter'.[205] The parallels are certainly notable: for Byron, Albania was 'a rugged nurse of savage men', just as for Tennyson, the world had never

[202] Alfred Lord Tennyson, 'Montenegro', *The Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), p. 359.
[203] Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir* (London, 1906), p. 500.
[204] Vesna Goldsworthy, *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination* (New Haven CT, 1998), p. 34.
[205] Gladstone, 'Montenegro', p. 360.

'breathed a race of mightier mountaineers' than the Montenegrins.[206] Both poets compare their subjects to eagles.[207] And Byron's influence on Tennyson is well known, the future laureate famously carving '"Byron is dead"' into the sandstone when he learnt as a child of the older poet's passing.[208] Tennyson was also a warm supporter of national unification—whether in Italy or Poland—so it is easy to credit the suggestion that, just as Mazzini had encouraged Swinburne to become the Byron of the Risorgimento, so Gladstone encouraged Tennyson to play his hero's role for Montenegro.[209]

In their sensitivity to Byronic parallels, however, recent historians such as Vesna Goldsworthy have tended to ignore Tennyson's other model: Milton's 'On the Late Massacre in Piedmont' (1655). Victorian commentators, however, were alive to the conspicuous relationship between the two sonnets: one critic, for example, was convinced that Tennyson had 'consciously matched himself against his great predecessor'.[210] Indeed, Tennyson had already done so with his sonnet 'Shorter Poland' in 1830 (reprinted in 1871 as simply 'Poland'). So had Wordsworth, in his series of poems dedicated to national independence and liberty (1802-16),[211] and so too had Matthew Arnold in his 'Sonnet to the Hungarian Nation' (1849).[212] By the 1870s, then, this was something of a tradition, albeit rather an exclusive one; and of all these poems,

---

[206] Byron, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, 38.339.
[207] For an extended, though limited, discussion, see Vesna Goldsworthy, 'Tennyson and Montenegro', *Tennyson Research Bulletin* 7.1 (Nov. 1997), pp. 7-17.
[208] See Christopher Ricks, 'Tennyson, Alfred, first Baron Tennyson (1809–1892)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004)
[209] David Roessel, *In Byron's Shadow: Modern Greece in the British and American Imagination* (Oxford, 2002), p. 139. See also Matthew Reynolds, *The Realms of Verse 1830-70: English Poetry in a Time of Nation-Building* (Oxford, 2005), p. 203.
[210] George Milner, 'A Note on Two Sonnets by Milton and Tennyson', *Papers of the Manchester Literary Club*, 51 (1892), pp. 356-9.
[211] Stopford Brooke collected the poems in a single volume at the turn of the century as William Wordsworth, *Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty* (London, 1897).
[212] Most recently see James G. Nelson, *The Sublime Puritan: Milton and the Victorians* (Connecticut, 1975), p. 33 and *passim*.

'Montenegro' corresponded most closely to Milton's inaugurating verses. In addition to their shared sonnet form, Tennyson's assonant 'sovran … sails' subtly evokes the 'slaughtered saints' of Milton's first line. The Montenegrins had 'kept their faith', just as the Milton's Piedmontese had 'kept thy truth'; and the Turks had fled 'down the crags'— the mirror image of the Waldensians who had been rolled 'down the rocks'. More tangibly, Cromwell's forceful protest against the atrocities perpetrated by the Duke of Savoy's troops found an obvious counterpart in Gladstone's protest against the so-called Bulgarian Horrors. The latter analogy was not lost on Tennyson's contemporaries: William Stead, editor of the *Northern Echo*, had already made much of it,[213] and many of Gladstone's admirers—including Samuel Gardiner and John Morley—were wont to portray him, in John Adamson's phrase, as 'Cromwell in a frock coat'.[214] So Tennyson's 'sonnet seems to have owed much to the poet whom he arrestingly described as the 'God-gifted organ-voice of England'.[215] By writing in Milton's tradition as well as Byron's, Tennyson 'interpreted' Montenegro's history to his contemporaries in a way that connected the mountain principality with a number of other Liberal *causes célèbres*.

Such an historically-minded sonnet was an appropriate prelude to Gladstone's 'sketch' on Montenegro, which occupied the next nineteen pages of *The Nineteenth Century*. That sketch was an exemplary 'essay-like review', concluding with a summary of recent Anglophone literature on Montenegro: Sir Gardner Wilkinson, we are told, 'led the way'; 'Lady Strangford's sketch is light and thin, but with ample power

[213] E.g. William Stead, 'Bulgaria and Piedmont: a Parallel and a Contrast', *Northern Echo* (25 Aug. 1876), p. 3. See also Stéphanie Prévost, 'W. T. Stead and the Eastern Question (1875-1911); or, How to Rouse England and Why?', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 16 (May 2013), pp. 1-28.
[214] J. S. A. Adamson, 'S. R. Gardiner and the Liberal as Hero', *The Historical Journal*, 33 (Sept. 1990), pp. 641-57.
[215] Alfred Lord Tennyson, 'Milton'.

of observation'; J. M. Neale's ecclesiological notes are 'brief but interesting'; and Irby and Mackenzie are praised for having produced 'much the most valuable contribution extant in our language'. Gladstone also adverted favourably to two periodical articles: one by Denton, and the other 'guaranteed by the high name of Mr. Freeman'.[216] But the article also introduced Gladstone's readers to two foreign-language works: *Le Monténégro Contemporain* by Gabriel Frilley and Jovan Wlahoviti, published in Paris in 1876 (misprinted in Gladstone's review as 1870); and Spiridon Gopčević's *Montenegro und die Montenegriner* (Vienna, 1877). In the light of the Eastern Crisis, both works had become, as *Scribner's Magazine* put it, 'what is called "timely"'.[217]

Of the two texts, Gladstone drew on Frilley's the more extensively, as evidenced by the range of his citations. Frilley, a French physician and recipient of the Legion of Honour, worked in Montenegro between 1868 and 1880, overseeing the construction of the principality's first modern hospital. He thus had ample opportunity to observe the Montenegrins and familiarise himself with their history, which (*pace* his title) occupies the first 178 pages of a lengthy volume. That history is complemented by a portrayal of Montenegrin politics, physiognomy, manners and customs—occupying a further 500 pages—revealing a keen ethnologist's eye and warmly Liberal political inclinations. Like so many of his British contemporaries, Frilley portrayed the Montenegrins as fundamentally European. They were members, he explained, of 'la race Ariane, dans toutes ses variétés'.[218] What was more, he speculated that the emigrating Serbs in the fourteenth century had found and mingled with 'les descendants de la race primitive auxquels Grecs et Romains s'étaient déjà successivement mêlés', so their pedigree was not merely Aryan but classical too.[219]

---

[216] Gladstone, 'Montenegro', p. 379.
[217] *Scribner's Magazine* 12 (May 1876), p. 761.
[218] Gabriel Frilley, *Le Monténégro Contemporain* (Paris, 1876), p. 125.
[219] Ibid., p. 127.

Like a number of the British texts with which we are already familiar, *Le Monténégro Contemporain* compounded such evidence of lineal descent with analogies that suggested identity. For Frilley, for example, the conduct of the women of Montenegro evokes, across the intervening centuries,

> la conduite audacieuse de ces femmes germaines dont Tacite écrivait: <<Memoriae proditur, quasdam acies, inclinatas jam et labantes, a faminis restitutas, constantia precum, et objectu pectorum, et monstrata cominus captivitate.>>[220]

Similarly, writing of Montenegrin folksongs, Frilley contends that

> nous verrons ces chants primitifs transporter, *comme au temps des Homérides*, de tribu en tribu, de maison en maison, les souvenirs, les gloires, les espérances d'un peuple, et bien mieux que nos mélodies folles, passionnées ou savantes, élever son âme, agrandir son courage, et lui conserver peut-être le trésor de foi et d'énergie qu'il lui faudra dépenser un jour pour reprendre sa place parmi les nations civilisées.[221]

Here the Montenegrins are likened, not to Tacitus' Germans but to the Greeks of the Homeric age. But the result is the same: to situate Montenegro within the cultural and historic world of Europe, asserting her fundamentally Western identity. Moreover, the Montenegrins' European heritage is the guarantee that they will one day reassume their former standing among 'les nations civilisées'.

Frilley's characterisation of Montenegro's ethnic and cultural identity would not have seemed unfamiliar to British readers, and neither would some of the observations he makes or the anecdotes he recounts. Consider the portrayal of Montenegrin justice in *Le Monténégro Contemporain*: in a passage dilating on the powerfully primitive simplicity of Montenegrin rhetoric, Frilley describes how the Prince convenes tribunals

---

[220] Ibid., p. 161: 'the audacious conduct of certain German women of whom Tacitus wrote: "Their traditions tell that more than once, when a German line was wavering on the point of giving way, the women rallied it, urgently entreating the men to fight on, baring their breasts and crying out that their captivity was at hand."'

[221] Ibid., p. 145, emphasis added: 'We see conveyed in these primitive songs, as in the Homeric age, from tribe to tribe and from house to house, the memories, the glories and the hopes of a people; and much better than our trivial, romantic or thoughtful melodies, they elevate the soul, amplify the courage, and preserve perhaps the resources of faith and energy which [the Montenegrins] may one day have to draw on to restore their place among civilized nations.'

to arbitrate and judge, 'tantôt sous un arbre, tantôt au seuil d'une maison'.[222] Depictions such as this—of open-air, patriarchal justice, evoking the practice of times gone by—were staples of nineteenth-century Montenegrin travel literature. Lady Strangford, for example, had described Cettinje's court convened beneath 'a very fine plane tree' as a 'patriarchal and primitive' sight.[223] Denton had followed suit, explaining that

> All ordinary assemblies, whether for council or the trial of civil and criminal causes, are held under the plane-tree in front of the palace, the heavens its roof and the horizon its boundaries ... I strolled out of my lodgings about six o'clock, and found a court of justice then sitting ... It was a very patriarchal scene, and such as might have been witnessed in the Highlands of Scotland little more than a century ago.[224]

For 'R. H. R.', the anonymous author of *Rambles in Dalmatia, Istria and Montenegro* (1875), the sight evoked not the Highlands of Scotland but 'a chapter in the Old Testament—Deborah judging Israel under a palm tree, "between Ramah and Beth-el in Mount Ephraim!"' He also parted company with Strangford and Denton by identifying what he called 'the Tree of Justice' as not a plane tree but a carob tree.[225] Here Stillman differed too, believing that the Prince administered justice beneath neither a plane nor a carob, but instead a 'lime tree of considerable size'; and for Stillman the assemblies beneath it recalled neither the Old Testament nor the Highlands of Scotland, but rather 'its Laecedemonian prototype' in the tribunals of the ancient Spartans.[226] But while all these authors differed in the details they gave and the analogies they drew, it is clear that they all—whether British or French—interpreted Montenegrin justice in fundamentally the same way.

---

[222] Ibid., p. 143: 'sometimes beneath a tree, sometimes on the stoop of a house'.
[223] Strangford, *Eastern Shores*, p. 151.
[224] William Denton, 'A Visit to the Capital of Montenegro', *Good Words* (1 Jan. 1866), pp. 57-63 at p. 61.
[225] R. H. R., *Rambles in Istria, Dalmatia and Montenegro* (London, 1875), p. 188.
[226] William Stillman, 'Cettinje', *The Times* (21 Sept. 1875), p. 8; cf. Stillman, *Herzegovina*, pp. 18-20. Ranke agreed, thinking Sparta 'the Montenegro of Greece': Leopold Ranke, trans. Mrs Alexander Kerr, *The History of Servia and the Servian Revolution* (3rd ed., London, 1853), p. 452.

In part, these similarities derived from a shared sensibility: the Romantic movement's admiration for the natural and the primitive, amplified by a sense that Montenegro's present was western Europe's past. But it is equally true that neither British nor Continental writers were writing in isolation. Frilley, for example, cites 'La comtesse Strangford' on six occasions, even quoting her in English.[227] Gopčević's *Montenegro und die Montenegriner* cites Sir Gardner Wilkinson similarly extensively, as well as drawing on the French of Cyprien Robert.[228] So it would not be fanciful to speak of a European tradition in Montenegrin travel writing encompassing narrower national traditions. An anecdote 'with a comic turn', recounted by Gladstone in his essay, exemplifies how stories or details could pass from one author to another:

> When the Austrians and Montenegrins were fighting against the Turks, allies of the French, on a certain occasion a handful of men had to fly for their lives. Two Austrians were among them, of whom one had the misfortune to be what is called stout. When the party had run some way, he showed signs of extreme distress, and said he would throw himself on the ground, and take his chance. 'Very well,' said a fellow-fugitive, 'make haste, say your prayers, make the sign of the cross, and I will then cut off your head for you.' As might be expected, this was not at all the view of the Austrian in his proposal, and the friendly offer had such an effect upon him, that he resumed the race and reached a place of safety.[229]

This story originated with Sir Gardner Wilkinson in 1840.[230] Thereafter it was translated into French by Cyprien Robert in 1844; and thence back into English when Cyprien Robert's text was appended to the third edition of Mrs Alexander Kerr's translation of Ranke's *History of Servia* in 1853.[231] That same year, Valerian Krasinski also recapitulated the anecdote; and was in turn copied two decades later by 'R. H. R.'

---

[227] Frilley, *Le Monténégro*, pp. 83, 116, 120, 138, 325-6; quoting at p. 326.
[228] Spiridon Gopčević, *Montenegro und die Montenegriner* (Leipzig, 1877).
[229] Gladstone, 'Montenegro', p. 376.
[230] John Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (2 vols., London, 1848), i. 434.
[231] Cyprien Robert, *Les Slaves de Turquie* (2 vols., Paris, 1844); 'The Slave Provinces of Turkey, Chiefly from the French of Cyprien Robert, with Additions from Other Sources' in Leopold von Ranke (trans. Mrs. Alexander Kerr), *The History of Servia* (London, 1853).

without attribution.[232] In 1866, meanwhile, the story had been repeated again by François Lenormant in his *Turcs et Monténégrins*, though he embellishes Gardner Wilkinson's original and makes the officer not an Austrian but a Russian:

> Lorsqu'au commencement de ce siècle les Monténégrins et les Russes coalisés vinrent attaquer dans Raguse les soldats de Napoléon, un officier supérieur russe fut blessé dans un des assauts. Aussitôt un capitaine monténégrin, qui s'état lié d'amitié avec lui, accourut en le voyant tomber. <<Mon ami, lui dit-il, tu es un bon chrétien et un brave soldat. Fais ta prière, je vais te couper la tête pour les ennemis ne la prennent pas. C'est le seul service et la dernière preuve d'amitié que je puisse te rendre maintenant.>> L'officier russe ne se souciait guère de cette marque d'amitié par trop monténégrine; la crainte de se voir couper la tête par son frère d'armes lui rendit des forces, et il parvint à s'éloigner du champ de bataille.[233]

This story, in other words, to which Gladstone duly introduced the readers of *The Nineteenth Century*, already had a long and exemplary history, and well-read Victorians would have found a great deal of familiar material of this kind in Continental writing concerned with Montenegro.

The argument of Gladstone's essay-like review was distinctive in its range of reference and emphases, but familiar in its lineaments, for the bulk of its pages are occupied by a politically freighted account of Montenegro's history. 'The vast cyclone' of the Ottoman's westward advance, Gladstone explained, had 'blasted … the fortunes of countries the chief part of which were then among the most civilised, Italy alone being excepted, of all Europe'; and he—like other authors including E. A. Freeman and

---

[232] Valerian Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (London, 1853), p. 51; R. H. R., *Rambles*, p. 212.

[233] François Lenormant, *Turcs et Monténégrins* (Paris, 1866), p. xiv: 'When, at the beginning of this century, the Montenegrins and the Russians together attacked Napoleon's soldiers in Ragusa, a Russian senior officer was wounded in the assault. Immediately, a Montenegrin captain who had befriended him ran to him as soon has he saw him fall. "My friend", he said to him, "you are a good Christian and a brave soldier. Say your prayers, and I will cut of your head so the enemy cannot take it. It's the only service and the last proof of my friendship which I can offer you now". The Russian officer did not care for this excessively Montenegrin friendly gesture; the fear of being beheaded by his brother-in-arms restored his strength, and he managed to get away from the battlefield.'

Arthur Evans—took pains to emphasise that the Christian kingdoms of the Balkans notably partook of that civilisation. 'The Servian [*sic*] sovereigns of the fifteenth century', for example, 'were great and brave men, ruling a stout and brave people', and a 'flourishing' land of 'rich and fair plains'. These Balkan kingdoms, Gladstone reminded his readers,

> had to encounter in its unbroken strength, and to reduce, the mighty wave [of Ottoman expansionism], of which only the residue ... all but overwhelmed not Hungary alone, but Austria and Poland ... It was Slav resistance, unaided by the West, which abated the impetus of the Ottoman attack just to such a point, that is reserve force became capable of being checked by European combinations.[234]

Decisively defeated at the Battle of Kosovo in 1389, the Serbs and their allies had eventually been subjugated; but for their valiant resistance, Gladstone believed, the rest of Europe owed them an enduring debt of gratitude. And even after many of their countrymen had opted, not unreasonably, 'to purchase by conformity a debasing peace', a remnant of the race had chosen instead 'a life of cold, want, hardship, and perpetual peril' in the barren and inhospitable mountains of Montenegro.[235]

In that choice lay the true nobility of Montenegro's history, and Gladstone took pains to emphasise just how costly a choice it had been. The founding Montenegrins, he insisted, had been just as civilized as the flourishing Serbian kingdom of which they were the only unconquered survivors. In its early days, for example, the principality had possessed a printing press—only sixteen years after the first press had been established in Rome in 1468, and when there was as yet 'no printing-press in Oxford, or in Cambridge, or in Edinburgh'. In the end, during one of the Turks' periodical incursions, the type had been melted down to fashion ammunition and the press had been destroyed; and Gladstone makes the press a synecdoche for Montenegrin

[234] Gladstone, 'Montenegro', pp. 360-1.
[235] Ibid., p. 362.

civilization more generally. 'The men of the printing-press as well as of the sword,' he tries to persuade us, 'were not savages by nature, only afterwards when the Turks in time made them so'. The very act of attempting to preserve the press 'demonstrated the habits, and implied to hopes, of a true civilisation'.[236]

The Montenegrins, in other words, were not naturally barbaric, as some of their British detractors such as Layard and Disraeli had claimed. Instead, constant warfare and privation had coarsened then. As Gladstone reiterated, the dilemma that had faced them had been almost paradoxical: for those 'who refused to betray their faith, there were no alternatives but two: if not savages they must be slaves, if not slaves they must come near to being savages'.[237] This argument was familiar from philhellene *apologia*, but in that context it had generally been employed to explain the Greeks' governmental failings. When applied to Montenegro, it was her warriors' violence—and in particular their penchant for decapitation—that Gladstone sought to excuse. Severed heads had been displayed even in England as recently as the mid-eighteenth century, we are reminded. And another carefully-chosen comparison completed the argument: the Montenegrins' mode of fighting, we are told, has 'a far better justification than any of the Highland or Border raids that we have learned to judge so leniently'.[238]

In addition to contributing to a pro-Montenegrin *apologia*, that comparison with the Scottish Highlanders had connotations which we have already explored. It was, moreover, of a piece with the rest of Gladstone's essay, wherein analogies and comparisons are repeatedly employed to situate the Montenegrins' history alongside a number of other, better-known Whig histories. Sometimes comparisons are with English history: Montenegro's founding principles of fidelity to the Christian religion

[236] Ibid., pp. 362-3, 374.
[237] Ibid., p. 364.
[238] Ibid., p. 365.

and resistance to the Ottoman Empire, for example, are rendered as nothing less than another '*Magna Charta* … without reproach to others … the noblest in the world'.[239] Elsewhere, he invokes the history of the Chosen People: Montenegro's Vladika's, or prince-bishops, Gladstone explains, 'like Moses, or Joshua, or Barak, or the son of Jesse, taught in the sanctuary, presided in the council, and fought in the front of the battle'. Elsewhere he compares Montenegrin folk songs to 'the sanguinary episodes of the Old Testament'.[240] Like Freeman, though less extensively, Gladstone also explores analogies with the free Swiss: 'Great is the glory of the Swiss in their Burgundian wars for freedom; but can it be matched with the exploits of the bishops of Montenegro and their martial flocks?'[241] Like Freeman, Gladstone also compares Montenegro with the 'little States, of parochial extension' that defended their freedom 'upon the rock of Corinth' and 'the Acropolis of Athens'; and the comparison is favourable, because the Greek city-state's Persian enemy 'had his seat afar', whereas 'Montenegro fought with a valour that rivalled, if it did not surpass, that of Thermopylae and Marathon; with number and resources far inferior, against a foe braver and far more terrible.'[242] Comparisons such as these, familiar by now from the work of other authors, served to induct Montenegro into the Whig pantheon, simultaneously rendering her history more familiar to British readers who would have known their Classics and their Old Testament thoroughly, and likely been acquainted with the merits of the Swiss, but to whom Montenegro would have been comparatively unfamiliar territory.

None of Gladstone's analogies, however, spoke more clearly of their author than what he believed were the striking 'resemblances between the characteristic features of

[239] Ibid., p. 362.
[240] Ibid., pp. 363-4.
[241] Ibid., p. 367.
[242] Ibid., p. 363.

Montenegro and of Homeric or Achaian Greece'.[243] If 'an old *volkslied*' that recounted warfare between Turks and Montenegrins bore a resemblance to the Old Testament, as we have seen, it also recalled 'the fiery gloom of the *Agamemnon*'. Gladstone re-told the story:

> Three Montenegrins went down to the Turkish encampment by night, and traversed the slumbering masses; just as, in the tenth Iliad, Odusseus and Diomed moved amid the sleeping allies of Troy.

In due course, the Montenegrin scouts return to tell their countrymen that

> "So many are the Turks, that, had we three all been pounded into salt, we should not be enough to salt a supper for them." How this recalls the oldest census in the world, the census of Homer, who says: "Were the Achaians divided into parties of ten, and every Trojan employed in serving them with wine, one for each party, many a ten would lack a wine-server."[244]

Nor was Gladstone's sensitivity to Homeric parallels limited to Montenegrin literature: the principality's administration, he believed, 'was carried on as in the Greece of the heroic age … like the Homeric communities, by oral authority and tradition'. More generally, Montenegro and Homeric Greece were both distinguished by 'the growth of men truly great in small theatres of action'.[245]

These analogies are not merely episodic and illustrative but sustained and systematic: moral rather than superficial. That was notable because of the quasi-revelatory weight that attached to Homer in Gladstone's mind.[246] Convinced of what he called the 'relative parallelism between the oldest Holy Scriptures and the works of Homer', Gladstone believed that the Homeric poems 'supplied materials for the intellectual and social portions of that European civilization, which derives its spiritual

[243] Ibid., p. 370.
[244] Ibid., p. 367.
[245] Ibid., pp. 369-70.
[246] See David Bebbington, 'Gladstone and Homer' in David Bebbington & Roger Swift (eds.), *Gladstone Centenary Essays* (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 57-74; Frank Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (London and New Haven, 1981), pp. 135-86.

substance from the Christian Faith'.[247] Homer's poetry, in other words, was the earliest statement of the values and organisation of a civilized society; 'a representation and development of human nature, and of man in his social relations, that Scripture from its very nature could not supply'.[248] Homer, Gladstone argued, was 'for the bodily and mental faculties of man, that which the patriarchal and early Hebrew histories are for his spiritual life', containing 'the seeds' of political organization (which had found their most complete growth in ancient Rome) and the development of the individual (most fully realised in ancient Greece).[249] Between Homeric Greece and 'the best ideas of our British and European ancestry'—such as political debate—Gladstone identified 'an original similitude', but by locating the origins of western civilization in Greece rather than the highlands of Central Asia, he departed significantly and idiosyncratically from the Aryan orthodoxies of the comparative method.[250] In their implications in this context, however, both theories were similar: just as Maine perceived 'political power in the embryo' among the southern Slavs, so Gladstone found in the Montenegrins a society closely resembling that which he believed to be the *fons et origo* of western civilization.

Given his lofty estimation of Montenegro's significance, it followed that Gladstone shared an anxiety about the principality's future with those who subscribed to more conventional notions of social development. William Stillman recalled that during an audience in 1876 Gladstone had explored the possibility that Montenegro might become 'the nucleus of a great south Slavonic organisation', presumably of a federal character. Among the statesman's questions 'was one which, at the time, gave

[247] W. E. Gladstone, *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* (Oxford, 1858), pp. 522-3.
[248] Ibid., p. 524.
[249] Ibid., pp. 527-8.
[250] W. E. Gladstone, *Juventus Mundi* (London, 1869), p. 413. See also H. G. C. Matthew, *Gladstone 1809-98* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 152-7.

me great thought, and still retains its significance. It was, "Have the Montenegrins any institutions on which a national future can be built."'[251] Stillman had answered in the negative, warning that an enlarged Montenegro might turn out to be 'a little Russia', and Gladstone's concern on that account was only compounded by an anxiety lest exposure to the influence of western civilisation should corrupt the Montenegrins' primitive virtue. In contemporary Montenegro, 'rudeness and ferocity are rapidly vanishing', he observed. 'When their last trace disappears', he wondered,

> will the simplicity, the truth, the purity, the high-strung devotion, the indomitable heroism, lose by degrees their native tone and their clear sharp outline, and will a vision on the whole so glorious for them, so salutary and corrective for us,
>
> 'Die away,
> And fade into the light of common day?'

That had happened not long ago when a society of Pitcairn islanders had been relocated to Norfolk Island, Gladstone reminds us. 'The spot was lovely, and the conditions favourable', but

> the organism would not bear transplanting, and the Pitcairners fast declined into the common mass of men. Is this to be the fate of the men of Montenegro when they substitute ease, and plenty, and power, and the pleasures and luxuries of life, for that stern but chivalrous wooing of Adversity ... in which they have been reared to a maturity of such incomparable hardihood?[252]

So Gladstone saw the Montenegrins, like the Pitcairners, as a 'survival' from an earlier stage of society; from the childhood of western civilization, as his quotation from Wordsworth's *Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood* implies. Where he differed from like-minded commentators such as Maine and Freeman was in his optimism: "Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee; I will make then an eternal excellency, a joy of many

[251] Stillman, *Autobiography of a Journalist*, ii. 163.
[252] Gladstone, 'Montenegro', p. 378.

generations", he concluded, quoting Isaiah LX. 15. The Montenegrins' future, he believed, would ultimately 'redeem the miseries of their past', and we are reminded that Gladstone's faith in progress was appreciably stronger than Maine's and Freeman's.[253]

Much like their Slavonic brethren in Serbia, Herzegovina, Bosnia and Bulgaria, the Montenegrins were thus portrayed as racially, religiously and culturally European; their progressive potential juxtaposed with the stagnant and regressive Ottoman Empire. Montenegro was made the beneficiary—and protagonist—of sympathetic Whig histories which sometimes went so far as to prophesy its future as the nucleus of a great south Slavonic federal state. Montenegro, however, did exercise a particular appeal over the Victorian imagination: its small size, its mountainous terrain, its primitive but hardy civilisation—all conspired to win the principality unequalled enthusiasm among historically minded British intellectuals. The 'Montenegrin moment' of the 1870s also admirably illustrates how influential the nexus of newspaper foreign correspondents and periodical essayists could be in the field of foreign policy.

III
The Greeks

The Greeks remained nothing more than interested spectators during both the Balkan insurrections and the Serb and Montenegrin campaigns against the Ottoman Empire, and they had always been indifferent to the fate of the Bulgarians. British commentators thus afforded Greece scant attention in the periodical press during the early years of the so-called Eastern Crisis. One of the few exceptions to that rule, an essay by Lady Frances Verney on the 'Songs and legends of modern Greece' which appeared in the

[253] Ibid., p. 379.

December 1875 issue of the *Contemporary Review*, was exemplary in its philhellenism but lacking in topicality. Verney interpreted modern Greek songs as 'survivals' from a stage in the history of civilisation that had long since elapsed in the west, and which display

> the childlike enjoyment in grief, and entire want of self-consciousness, or of looking at their own emotions from without, an utter abandonment to the feeling of the moment, [which] is the distinctive feature of all 'folk-lore'. … The Greek songs have preserved the characteristics of these compositions down to our own days in a remarkable degree. Cut off from the rest of Europe, and the general advance of civilization by their subjection to the Turks … [these] songs were the refuge of the patriotic spirit of the people, and served to keep alive the feeling of nationality.[254]

Verney's analysis is indebted to the analogy between the life of a nation and the life of an individual that was so common in the work of the Liberal Anglican historians; an analogy which ultimately had its roots in German sources including Niebuhr and Herder. Julius Hare, for example, had suggested—like Verney—that 'the poet … seems to lose himself in the objects of his song' during a nation's childhood, 'and hardly to contemplate himself in his distinctness and separation', concluding that poetry 'is rather a natural growth of the mind, than a work of art'.[255] By the 1870s such notions had become almost idiomatic: indeed, we have already seen them in the pages of the future Lord Lytton's *National Songs of Servia.*

By identifying in Greece a nation in its childhood, Verney both excused Greek backwardness and found the promise of future progress. The *klephts*, or brigands, of contemporary Greece are explained away as the equivalents of Robin Hood, or the eighteenth-century Highlanders—all alike products of a particular, and temporary, stage in social progress.[256] This, then, is a philhellene *apologia* as well as an essay in

[254] Lady Frances Verney, 'Songs and Legends of Modern Greece', *Contemporary Review*, 27 (Dec. 1875), pp. 96-113 at p. 96.
[255] A. W. Hare & J. C. Hare, *Guesses at Truth* (2nd ed., 2nd Series, London, 1848), pp. 159-160.
[256] Verney, 'Songs and Legends', p. 108. In this respect, Verney's essay notably recalls many of the pro-Slav periodical articles with which we are already familiar: for Verney, for example, it is Greek bandits

comparative history, and it has a didactic edge: had the modern Greek state been governed differently, Verney speculates, Greece might have become such a nation

> as would by this time have materially helped in solving the vexed 'Eastern Question,' and even the ever-recurring difficulty of finding trustworthy occupants for Constantinople. The Christian provinces of the Turk, whose rising seems once more about to excite the cupidity of the great neighbouring powers ... might then have found their natural inheritors.[257]

Here she seems to be envisioning the emergence of a Greek neo-Byzantine polity with its capital at Constantinople as a possible solution to the problems of south-eastern Europe. The only problem was that in December 1875, Greece showed no signs of actually fulfilling so important a world-historical role. Such musings, therefore, had little obvious relevance or utility, and few authors chose to follow in Verney's footsteps.

It was only when Russia declared war on the Porte on 24 April 1877 that the situation changed: the Eastern Question seemed to be approaching a fresh and perhaps definitive solution, and the Greeks were anxious to be included in any settlement. To many Greek nationalists, the irredentist objectives of the 'Great Idea' seemed close to realisation. By May, public opinion had begun to demand that party divisions to be put to one side, and a bloodless revolution in Athens installed the veteran statesman and admiral Constantine Kanáres at the head of a ministry of all the talents—the 'Ecumenical Government'. Under Kanáres' leadership and pressure from the Great Powers, Greece remained officially neutral; but by February 1878, Kanáres was dead, and the Russians were advancing on Adrianople. Unable to resist popular pressure, the ministry resigned, and the Greek state at last mobilised for war, inciting uprisings in the Greek provinces of Turkey—Thessaly and Epirus—and moving to intervene in their

---

that evoke Robin Hood, whereas for Humphry Sandwith it was Karađorđe—'Kara George'—the leader of the first Serbian uprising; but the point made by both authors is essentially the same, and similarly premised on a stadial conception of history: Sandwith, 'Servia', p. 103.

[257] Ibid., p. 113.

support. The opportunity, however, had been missed: as their troops reached Domokós, the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish armistice convinced the Greeks that if they persevered they would be obliged to fight alone, and the army was recalled. Though Britain had promised the Greeks a role in the forthcoming Congress of Berlin, their territorial aspirations on the mainland and in Crete went unrealised, and it was made clear that the Greeks' concerns were decidedly secondary to the Great Powers'.[258]

But although the Greeks thus played a comparatively minor role in the 'Eastern crisis', what Gladstone called 'the Hellenic factor in the Eastern problem' nevertheless aroused significant interest in Britain; and once again British observers turned to history make sense of events. As Gladstone put it in the same essay, 'some review of the past is necessary, in order to secure a fair chance of judging rightly of the present'.[259] While the students of the Balkan Slavs and Ottoman Turks, however, had tended to draw on a diverse literature, one text alone dominated the study of the Greek past: George Finlay's monumental seven-volume *History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time*, which appeared for the first time in a complete edition in 1877. Few publications could have been more serendipitous. Even E. A. Freeman admitted that these volumes were not 'books for the lounger at an idle moment'.[260] But the events of the day invested them with intense salience: as Grant Duff observed, it would have been difficult to name another author 'whose books so much deserve re-perusal at the present juncture'.[261] As Finlay's editor Henry Tozer mildly put it, 'as long as the south-eastern peninsula of Europe continues to be politically interesting, it must

[258] Lord Acton and A. W. Ward (eds.), *The Cambridge Modern History* (13 vols., Cambridge, 1902-12), x. 390-1; M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question, 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations* (London, 1966), pp. 221-2.
[259] W. E. Gladstone, 'The Hellenic Factor in the Eastern Problem', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Dec. 1876), pp. 1-27 at pp. 17f.
[260] Edward Freeman, 'The Later Greek Nation', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (July 1878), pp. 162-192 at p. 163.
[261] M. E. Grant Duff, 'Eastern Affairs at the Close of the Session', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (Sept. 1876), pp. 694-712 at p. 695.

be important to know the origin and antecedents of the races that inhabit it'.[262] Sir John Mahaffy, professor of ancient history at Trinity College, Dublin, agreed:

> Nothing could be more opportune than the publication of a complete, uniform, and enlarged edition of Finlay's historical works at this time. The Eastern Question is again absorbing the political interests of the day, and there is no statesman or publicist who should not make himself thoroughly acquainted with its earlier phases.[263]

Three of the four important periodical articles which engaged with Greece's past in relation to its future took the form of reviews of Finlay's *History*; and the other, Gladstone's essay in the *Contemporary Review*, cited Finlay no fewer than twelve times.[264] These articles exemplify how the periodical press could digest large, even recondite texts—texts ill-suited to the idle lounger—into elegant essays that engaged with the affairs of the moment, and which were sure to reach a considerably wider audience.

Gladstone's essay appeared in the December number of the *Contemporary Review*, and its aspiration was to influence British diplomacy at the forthcoming Constantinople Conference, which would convene on the 23rd of that month and run until 20 January 1877. Like many of the speakers who addressed the St. James's Hall Conference on 8 December, Gladstone had a great deal of faith in Lord Salisbury, the British delegate to Constantinople. Salisbury, a High Churchman, was widely believed to be sympathetic to the Eastern Christians; indeed, even Beaconsfield complained to Victoria that the Marquess 'is thinking more of raising the Cross on the cupola of St Sophia than the power of England'.[265] Though their hopeful expectations were soon to be disappointed,

---

[262] H. F. Tozer, 'Preface' in George Finlay, *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time* (7 vols., Oxford, 1877), i. vii.
[263] Sir John Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece', *Contemporary Review*, 31 (March 1878) pp. 728-44 at p. 728.
[264] Gladstone, 'The Hellenic Factor', pp. 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17; Humphry Sandwith, 'The Greek Revolution', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (Oct. 1877), pp. 434-68; Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece'; Freeman, 'Later Greek Nation'.
[265] Beaconsfield to Victoria, 17 April 1877, quoted in Miloš Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question* (Oxford, 2010), p. 200.

in November and early December the Agitation leaders went so far as to lobby Salisbury over particular issues—Montenegro's access to a sea port, for example—assuming that he was in fundamental agreement with 'the general points to insist upon'.[266] Gladstone's essay was composed during this optimistic moment, and like Freeman and Liddon he seems to anticipate a favourable settlement from the forthcoming Conference. Indeed, he casts himself as merely the publicist of the wishes of the Greek people, anxious lest their claims be forgotten amidst the clamour of voices at Constantinople. He pointedly appeals, too, to the diplomatic advantages to be derived from supporting the friendless Greeks, 'on whose affections we may take a standing hold' by giving them a modicum of 'friendly care at this juncture'.

This was, in fact, the same policy Gladstone had advocated as Lord High Commissioner to the Ionian Islands in 1858-9, and Gladstone made it clear to readers of the *Contemporary* that he remained an ardent philhellene. After all, he believed that the Greeks had a special place in what he called the 'providential order of the world', and his Homeric studies were dedicated to proving the dual revelation to Hebrew and Hellene, the first examples of 'religious nationality'.[267] The concluding page of his essay even reproduces fourteen lines of Byron's 'precious utterances of immortal song', in which the poet celebrates Hellenic freedom and Greece's glorious past. Like other philhellenes, Gladstone stressed western Europe's enduring debt to ancient Greek culture and intellect: the Greeks of today, he believed, were owed 'gratitude for what Greece had once been and done', and he observed more particularly that in 'handling

[266] Freeman wrote to Liddon and Richard Burton (the Orientalist and British consul in Trieste), asking them to lobby Salisbury en route to Constantinople; Liddon in turn invoked Lady Salisbury's assistance. See Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 9 Nov. 1876; Liddon to Lady Salisbury, 10 Nov. 1876, quoted in Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, p. 254; Keble College, Liddon Papers, Freeman to Liddon, 12 Nov. 1876; Freeman to Captain Richard Burton, 10 Nov. 1876, quoted in Stephens (ed.), *Life and Letters*, ii. 142.

[267] W. E. Gladstone, 'On the Place of Homer in Classical Education and in Historical Inquiry', *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), iii. 1-56. See Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East', pp. 425-41.

matters of prime public importance in public assembly' the English were following in Greek footsteps.[268]

In keeping with the conventions of philhellene *apologia*, Gladstone also sought to explain away the modern Greek state's failings with the argument that they had been 'debased' and 'degraded' by foreign domination.[269] Characteristically, it was by a sketch of 'the most material parts of an interesting history' that Gladstone sought to show how that had come to pass. Following Finlay, he argued that the Roman conquest had marked 'the first stage of [the Greek's] descent': while culturally the Greeks had led captive their conquerors—as Horace put it, '*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*'—Roman domination had eroded the manly independence of spirit that self-government had formerly cultivated.[270] Under the Ottomans, the descent had accelerated: the Turks had decapitated Greek society by exterminating its aristocracy, and morally and spiritually debased the people by imposing the hated institution of the child tribute.[271]

The west, Gladstone took pains to emphasize, was partly to blame for this state of affairs: 'there is no chapter of history more disgraceful to Western Christendom', Gladstone insisted, than the indifference with which Catholic Europe had observed the Ottoman conquest of Greece. He deplored the 'ecclesiastical ambition' of Pope Pius II, who had offered Mahomet II legitimate sovereignty over the Greek lands he had conquered if only he would convert to Christianity and re-establish the Papal supremacy. Indeed, it had been the 'peculiar fate' of the Greek Orthodox

> to be smitten on one cheek because they were Christians, and on the other because they were not Latin Christians. Had it not been … for the religious

[268] Gladstone, 'Hellenic Factor', pp. 12, 1.
[269] Gladstone might have struggled to answer Viscount Strangford's criticism, that Philhellenes were wont to portray the Greeks as 'utterly corrupt and degraded by Turkish rule, and at the same time as fit for self-government as a New Englander': Strangford, *Eastern Shores*, p. 340.
[270] Horace, *Epistles*, 2. i. 156-7: 'Captive Greece took captive her savage conqueror'.
[271] Gladstone, 'Hellenic Factor', pp. 3-4.

> division of East and West, the Turks never could have established their dominion in Europe.[272]

In a bitter twist of irony, Greek merchants trading in the west had even been obliged to disguise themselves as Turks to secure themselves better treatment than they would have received as Eastern Christians. Gladstone's critique of the Latin Christians reminds us that the author of *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* had also been the author of *Vaticanism* only a year earlier, the critic of 'ecclesiastical ambition' in the present as well as the past.[273] That distaste for Popery also informed his warm sympathy for the Eastern Church as—like the Church of England—a catholic church outside the Roman communion. The Eastern Church was thus an example of 'religious nationality' in a way that churches subordinate to the Vatican could never be, and it was the Church that had preserved Greek nationality under Ottoman domination, in an 'heroic' example of 'endurance and persistency'. That was partly due to 'the fact that even the popular services of the Eastern Church appear to be profusely charged with matter directly drawn from Scripture' which gave congregations access 'to a fountain of living waters'. But it was also because the Greek clergy—unlike their Catholic counterparts—were not celibate, and 'the institution of marriage' thus 'made and kept them citizens as fully as members of their flocks'. While the higher clergy were corrupted by the bribery and blandishments of the Ottoman administration, the parish priests therefore remained true to their calling, cultivating Greek national identity and exerting—Gladstone quotes Finlay—an '"influence on the fate of Greece quite incommensurate with their social rank"'.[274]

---

[272] Ibid., pp. 5-6.
[273] W. E. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees and their Bearing on Civil Obedience* (London, 1874) and *Vaticanism: An Answer to Reproofs and Replies* (London, 1875). On Gladstone's interrelated views on Rome and Eastern Orthodoxy, see Matthew, 'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East'.
[274] Gladstone, 'Hellenic Factor', p. 8. Gladstone is quoting Finlay, *History*, v. 152.

The endurance of Greek national life was what lent Gladstone's narrative its continuity, despite Greece's material and moral degradation under Ottoman domination.

The Eastern Church, then, had ministered to vulnerable Greek nationality at its nadir during the first three centuries of Ottoman rule; and as the Porte's power started to wane by the end of the seventeenth-century Gladstone's story became one of incremental progress and renaissance. The Turks gradually lost their military supremacy, and the child tribute fell into abeyance; the Greeks traded with Venice and the other European powers. Under foreign rule, of course, the Greeks' full potential had nonetheless remained unrealised, and Gladstone pointed to the instructive comparisons to be made between Ottoman Greece and the prosperous semi-autonomous Island of Chios: 'What a lesson, on the comparative results of servitude on the one hand, and even a very modest share of freedom with order on the other.' As the Greeks enjoyed the fruits of commerce and their Turkish rulers lapsed into decadence and decline, the ground was prepared for change. In due course, 'the time soon arrived'—and here Gladstone's philhellene optimism is apparent—'when the Greeks began to feel the moral influence of the French Revolution'.[275] The Greeks, of course, had known liberty before, and like Freeman, Gladstone was acutely alive to even the most tendentious signs that Greece's classical heritage was at last reviving: just as the historian, observing a riot from the acropolis, had seemed to see the '*Dêmos* of Athens' gathering as once they did among 'the forsaken stones of the Pnyx', so the statesman exulted in the news that 'the silence of the Pnyx at Athens' had been broken 'for the first time

[275] Gladstone, 'Hellenic Factor', pp. 9, 10.

during two thousand years' by 'the stir of an assembly comprising ... about ten thousand persons'.[276]

The Revolution's catastrophic failures, and the new Greek state's shambolic lawlessness and corruption, scarcely interrupt these neoclassical reveries, dismissed as the fault of the political class and the consequence of degradation under Turkish rule. Though the Greeks had exhibited 'a tenacity and valour, not less than that of the American colonists in their famous revolt', unlike the American revolutionaries the Greeks had lacked statesmen: 'the Revolution of Greece was the people's revolution'.[277] What was more, nothing else could have been expected from a nation 'crushed and ground down' for four centuries: '[i]t is in and by freedom only,' Gladstone contended, 'that adequate preparation for fuller freedom can be made'. Teething pains, then, were to be expected, and Gladstone shared the Greeks' belief that 'the severity of their trials [was] in truth a presage of a happy and distinguished future'.[278] English history, he reminded his readers, told the same story: Greek venality, for example, recalled 'England under Sir Robert Walpole'. Greece, in other words, was following England down the same path, and Gladstone insisted that progress since 1821 has been material and social as well as political: we are told, for example, that the Greek population had risen from 650,000 in 1834 to 1,238,000 in 1870; and if in 1830 there had been only 110 schools, in 1860 there were as many as 752. These statistics bolster what is essentially a Whig account of Greek history, similar in essentials to the Whiggish histories of the Balkans which we have already reviewed. Indeed, Gladstone adverted to those very affinities, remarking that 'the history' of post-Revolutionary Greece afforded 'most interesting precedents' and 'admirable guidance' for those

[276] Freeman, *Historical Essays, 3rd Series*, p. 297; Gladstone, 'Hellenic factor', p. 1.
[277] Gladstone, 'Hellenic Factor', p. 16. Gladstone cites Finlay, who remarks that the Greek Revolution 'was pre-eminently the movement of the people' in his *History*, vi. 180-2.
[278] Gladstone, 'Hellenic Factor', pp. 17, 3.

confronting the Eastern Question's latest phase in the Balkans. Whig history, we note, is also almost unavoidably pragmatic history.[279]

Sandwith was the author of a similarly Whiggish and pragmatic history, but his essay engaged with a different context. Gladstone had written at the end of 1876 in a flush of optimism: the Bulgarian Agitation seemed to have done its work, and the Constantinople Conference promised to resolve south-eastern Europe's problems. By contrast, Sandwith wrote ten months later, in October 1877, in the aftermath of the outbreak of war between Turkey and Russia, hanging an essay that attempted to make sense of current affairs on the peg of a review of the new edition of Finlay's *History of Greece*. To many, the Ottoman Empire's fall seemed imminent, but Sandwith believed that history counselled caution: 'within the lifetime of elderly men', he reminded his readers, 'a crisis similar to the present ... has actually occurred'—the Greek Revolution of 1821. The Porte had endured that crisis, as well as Ali Pasha's rebellion and the Serbian Revolution, so its powers of endurance and rejuvenation should not be underestimated.[280] On the other hand, Sandwith believed—like Gladstone—that the analogy between the 1820s and 1870s offered insights into how to handle the Balkan Christians' national aspirations: aspects of the Greek Revolution, he observed, were 'strikingly like what we have heard connected with the miserable rising in Bulgaria', and the predictive power of Greek history, in other words, was salient to the future of the Balkans as well as to the future of Greece.

Sandwith's account of that history corresponded closely with Gladstone's. Like the Balkan Christians, the Greeks had been degraded by Ottoman rule, which 'literally spoils the breed of men who have to submit to it'. Only as the Porte's strength and

[279] Ibid., pp. 20-1, 3.
[280] Sandwith, 'Greek Revolution', p. 434.

authority declined, and the Greeks' prosperity grew, were the preconditions for a rebellion met. Like Gladstone, he believed that Greek national identity had been 'fused together' by ties of religion; and like Gladstone, he paid tribute to British philhellenes and the policies of George Canning. Perhaps the most interesting respect in which the two authors align, however, is in their treatment of the French Revolution. Gladstone, as we have seen, commented on the importance of the Revolution's 'moral influence', and Sandwith concurred in numbering 1821 among 'the multiform results which followed upon the French revolution': like a number of other nations, Greece had partaken 'of that general movement towards liberty which caused so much anxiety to the despots of Europe'.[281] But Sandwith followed Finlay more closely, explicitly subordinating France to the Atlantic world by quoting a passage from the sixth volume of the *History of Greece* that declares the French and Greek Revolutions alike were ultimately inspired by 'English liberty and American independence', which 'struck chords which vibrated wherever civilized men dwelt'.[282] While the Greeks had taken inspiration from 1789, they had no need for its ideology: Ottoman oppression provided 'practical lessons' in the 'the inestimable value of constitutional liberty', so it 'was not necessary for them to become acquainted with the writings of Voltaire or the theories of Rousseau'.[283] The Whiggish history of freedom, in other words, finds its consummation not in the abstract idealism of France, with all its concomitant excesses, but in practical and pragmatic England and the United States. That fact, Gladstone, Sandwith and Finlay all agreed, had been notably appreciated by George Canning.

[281] Ibid., pp. 437-8.
[282] Ibid., pp. 438-9, quoting Finlay, *History*, vi. 97.
[283] Finlay, *History*, vi. 97.

When Sir John Mahaffy and E. A. Freeman addressed Greek history in 1878, the situation had changed once more. Greek irredentism was in the ascendant, encouraged by the hope that the Tsarist forces were about to drive the Turks out of Europe, and its territorial aspirations, as we have seen, centred around the Greek-speaking provinces of the Ottoman Empire: Thessaly, Epirus and the island of Crete. Until the Treaty of San Stefano ended the Russo-Turkish War on 3 March 1878, it had appeared that the Greeks would seize those provinces by force; thereafter it seemed possible that they might be ceded to Greece by the Great Powers. Mahaffy's essay on 'Modern Greece', which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* in March, was likely composed before the Treaty of San Stefano, for he remarks that there is an 'increasing possibility' that the Kingdom of Greece 'may play a leading part in the next settlement of the long duel between Slavonic aggression and Mohammedan tenacity'—presumably anticipating a military intervention by Greece in the Russo-Turkish War.[284] Freeman, by contrast, writing four months later, explicitly refrains from a specific engagement with current affairs, 'lest what we write at the beginning of the article should be proved false before we come to the end of it'.[285] But the question of the nature and extent of Greek nationality remained just as important in July as it had been in March, and it was with this question that both Mahaffy and Freeman were fundamentally concerned.

Both historians framed their essays as reviews of Tozer's new edition of Finlay's *History of Greece*, but they took somewhat different approaches to their common subject. Mahaffy begins his discussion of Greek national identity by engaging with the work of Jacob Fallmerayer and the debates it had engendered. Fallmerayer had contended that the modern Greeks 'were not Greeks in blood, but a mixed race, made

[284] Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece', p. 728.
[285] Freeman, 'Later Greek Nation', p. 85.

up of Sclavonians [*sic*], Albanians, and other later immigrants'. While he dismisses out of hand the objections of outraged philhellenes, Mahaffy traces the rigorously empirical German scholarship that had challenged Fallmerayer's controversial thesis with, he believes, conclusive success. Moreover, he faults Finlay for his sympathetic treatment of Fallmerayer:

> it was the high authority of Finlay which, for a season at least, placed a seal upon the bold theory of Fallmerayer … It was thought by most Germans that so shrewd and able a critic as Finlay, who lived on the spot, would not have accepted Fallmerayer's quotations from the archives at Athens without proper evidence.[286]

Crucially, however, Mahaffey concludes that Finlay had correctly perceived the 'really important issue' which had been overlooked by both sides of the Fallmerayer debate: it is 'the habits, the traditions, and the sentiments' of a people, rather than its ancestry, that determine its identity. Dublin, he observes, has been invaded by Danes and settled by the English, but if 'another Fallmerayer were to bring up all this evidence and infer from hence that the people of Dublin were really English adventurers and Norse pirates, he would be justly disbelieved and ridiculed by all'. Finlay's genius, Mahaffey believed, had been to write a history of 'the Greeks, and not Greece', showing how Greek national identity had endured throughout 'those darker and less-known centuries' since 'the paralyzing grasp of Rome destroyed her political vitality'; and so the Fallmerayer debate was really beside the point.[287] Just as Stubbs and Freeman had shown that the English continued to be English after 1066, so Finlay had proven that the Greeks continued to be Greek despite their longer subjection to foreign domination.

The implications of all this for 'Modern Greece', the nominal subject of Mahaffy's essay, are clear: a Whig history is impossible without a protagonist, and a

[286] Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece', pp. 732-3. See also J. M. Hussey, 'Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer and George Finlay', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 4 (Jan. 1978), pp. 79-87.
[287] Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece', pp. 735-7.

demonstration of the continuity of Greek national life is therefore indispensable to any history of incremental progress and renaissance. Finlay's 'broad philosophic generalisations, drawn from long study of the facts, combined with the native shrewdness of the Scot' had satisfied that requirement, and Mahaffy goes on to summarise Finlay's account of the centuries of Roman, Frankish, Venetian and Ottoman rule, showing that 'Greece has steadily improved' since her liberation from both the oppression of Ottoman rule and the dead hand of the more centralizing and scarcely less alien Bavarian monarchy which followed it. 'The Piraeus', we are assured, 'is now full of factories, and the Morea … is now a well-cultivated and secure country'. Setbacks are excused by the usual philhellene *apologia* that makes the Turks ultimately responsible for the Greek's moral degradation, but the story is overall one of progress. The moral for the present is obvious: 'when the frontiers of Greece are rectified, as must surely soon come to pass', Thessaly and Epirus will become part of the Greek state, and the promise of the past will be realised in the present, as Greece comes 'to fulfil a greater destiny, and occupy a place in the world's history more worthy of her ancient fame'.[288] If Mahaffy had praised Finlay for writing a history not of Greece but of the Greeks, his own essay concludes by arguing that the two are destined, sooner or later, to become one.

Freeman's article is considerably longer—thirty-one pages to Mahaffy's sixteen—and represents an altogether more thorough and thoughtful engagement with an historian who was, as we have seen, one of his principal intellectual influences. Indeed, Freeman referred to Mahaffy's piece in the *Contemporary* rather dismissively as the work of a 'jaunty' writer.[289] His conclusion, however, is ultimately not far removed

[288] Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece', pp. 736-44.
[289] Freeman, 'Modern Greek Kingdom', p. 171.

from Mahaffy's: both follow Finlay in tracing an enduring Greek national life throughout the centuries, and both make it the protagonist of their histories. Freeman describes how the Greeks colonised the islands and peninsulas of the Peloponnese and Asia Minor; how colonisation led to the 'process of Hellenization, of adoption of strangers within the Greek pale', and how the Macedonian conquests served 'to carry yet further the process which the Greek colonies had begun'.[290] Freeman goes on to describe how these Hellenized lands fell, piece by piece, under Roman dominion, but how they retained their Greek identity even if they were denied the benefits—moral, social and political—of self-government. Above all, he applauds Finlay's rehabilitation of the Eastern Roman Empire: before Finlay, Freeman declares, 'the general public had fully made up its mind that Byzantine history was of no value whatever', and the evident frustration of a partisan Byzantinist only amplifies his appreciation for Finlay's achievement.[291] All this leaves little space, as Freeman admits, for a survey of Greece under first Frankish and then Ottoman rule, but the story will by now be familiar: endurance in the face of diversity; inevitable degradation mitigated by the pastoral ministrations of the lower clergy, and slowly reversed by growing prosperity—culminating in the Revolution of 1821. Freeman concludes his history on an optimistic note, characteristically looking to the past even as he celebrates the achievements of the present: 'the people who led the way in European civilization, and who now, refreshed by adoption, taught by adversity, are far from being left furthest behind in the race which they began'.[292]

This narrative informs Freeman's conclusion that the Greek cause should be 'warmly pressed in the Congress [of Berlin] which is now sitting'. Greece, he has

[290] Ibid., pp. 174-5.
[291] Ibid, p. 163.
[292] Ibid., p. 191.

shown, has always been nothing more and nothing less than the home of the Greeks; and the Greek people have always been defined by culture and language: wherever 'Hellênes form the mass of the Christian people, that land should be Hellas'. Of course, a Greek kingdom delimited on that basis would be anything but a continuous territory. Instead, Greece would become 'a scattered land', where 'the communication between one part and another is mainly by sea'. But far from being deterred by such a prospect, Freeman sees in it the serendipity of an historical recapitulation: it is wonderful, he declares, 'how nearly the map of such a Greek state … answers to the map of many periods of past history'. Greece, after all, had from the beginning been a land of 'coasts', 'islands', and 'long and slender peninsulas'. That meant, most immediately, that Epirus, Thessaly and Crete should be ceded to Greece. But more controversially, Freeman also advocates Greece's claim to Constantinople, again for historical reasons: the city is 'their own ancient capital', 'the city of the Constantines, the Leos, and the Basils'. By contrast, the Turks should be sent back, 'at the nearest', to an equally historically-appropriate location, 'the old Seljuk quarters at Iconium'.[293] While Freeman, then, read the lessons of history more literally than Mahaffy, hopefully anticipating not merely renaissance but restoration, the practical conclusions drawn by both historians were similar. Both essays, like Gladstone's and Sandwith's before them, also demonstrate how politically freighted the reading of Finlay's *History of Greece* had become in the later 1870s.

IV
The Ottoman Empire

[293] Ibid., pp. 190-2.

By the time the Eastern Question reopened in the 1870s, it had been Britain's policy to maintain the 'independence and integrity' of the Ottoman Empire for over four decades. Since the early 1830s, the British had sought to preserve the Ottoman Empire as a buffer state to check Russian expansionism, redoubling their efforts to influence the Porte and seeking to impose reforms to revitalise the Empire and alleviate the disabilities faced by the Sultan's Christian subjects. The Tariff Convention of 1838, imposed on an unwilling Sultan, made the Ottoman Empire a British free-trade zone in all but name. The Danube was transformed into a busy commercial highway, and British trade with Turkey increased eleven fold by 1850, making Turkey one of Britain's most valuable export markets.[294] British capital flooded the empire: loans to the Porte amounted to £5 million by time the Crimean War concluded in 1855, and by 1877 that figure had increased to £77 million.[295] At the same time, beginning in 1839 and guided by Stratford Canning, the charismatic British ambassador in Constantinople, the Porte embarked upon a series of reforms that would ultimately lead to the first Ottoman parliament in 1876. These so-called Tanzimat reforms attempted to promote the empire's prosperity and stability by offering guarantees to non-Muslim minorities, and by reorganizing the empire's financial and military administration. But these reforms were largely abortive, and the Ottoman Empire continued to decline, shaken by civil war in Lebanon (1860-1) and bloody insurrection in Crete (1863-6).[296]

In Britain, however, broad swathes of public opinion remained sympathetic to the Ottoman Empire. Turkey was seen as an important ally against an alarmingly expansionist Russia, and continued to be a valuable market for British goods. Turkish

[294] Figes, *Crimea*; Anderson, *The Eastern Question*.
[295] Figes, *Crimea*, p. 472.
[296] See F. Bailey, *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement 1826-53* (London, 1942); Sinan Kuneralp (ed.), *The Cretan Uprising 1866-1869* (Istanbul, 2010); Richard Millman, 'The Bulgarian massacres reconsidered', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 58 (April 1980), pp. 218-231.

bondholders emerged as an influential constituency in British politics.[297] Many maintained, following the notorious Turkophile David Urquhart, that the Ottoman Empire was capable of progress and reform.[298] Conservative opinion, moreover, tended to regard the Sultan's empire with a benevolent sense of imperial solidarity: the legitimacy of empire must be defended. During the Cretan insurrection of 1863-6, for example, Henry Layard would compare the position of the Ottoman Empire in Europe to that of the English in Ireland. Though this was, of course, an argument that could cut both ways, a decade later Disraeli and Lord Derby would reiterate the Irish analogy when they repudiated demands for Bosnian and Herzegovinian autonomy.[299] It followed that support for the Turks went hand in hand with support for the traditional social order. If, as David Cannadine has suggested, the British sometimes envisioned their empire as a layered and hierarchical world which 'replicated and enforced the domestic social order', then the manner in which many British observers perceived the Ottoman Empire—their *de facto* client state—was quintessentially 'Ornamentalist'.[300] During his travels in the Ottoman Empire, the young Disraeli, for example, equated the British and Ottoman social hierarchies, characterising himself as 'the son of an English bey', and identifying the Grand Vizier as 'the Turkish Prime Minister'.[301] Others drew the same analogies, which received the sanction of the British honours system when Sultan Abdülmecid I became the first non-Christian to be admitted to the Order of the Garter as a Stranger Knight in 1856. Similarly, British officers such as Admiral Augustus Hobart-Hampden ('Hobart Pasha') and Captain Valentine Baker ('Baker

[297] E.g. *The Times* (23 Aug. 1875), p. 7.
[298] See e.g. David Urquhart, *England, France, Russia and Turkey* (London, 1834).
[299] Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question,* p. 91; for Layard, see Hansard, CLXXXV, 15 Feb. 1867, 418-38.
[300] David Cannadine, *Ornamentalism: How the British saw Their Empire* (London, 2001). For an assessment of Cannadine's argument within the context of Imperial history, see Richard Price, 'One Big Thing: Britain, Its Empire, and Their Imperial Culture', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (July 2004), pp. 602-27.
[301] Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question,* p. 22.

Pasha') served in the Ottoman armed forces without compunction. In other words, just as Liberals identified putative ties of kinship between the British and the Slavonic Christians of the Balkans, so Conservatives perceived affinities between the British and the Ottoman Empires.[302]

Liberal critics of the Ottoman Empire disputed this analysis, opposing Ornamentalism with Orientalism. The Turkish Empire, they contended, was incapable of reform and doomed to stagnation, depravity and decline. The Bulgarian atrocities, they believed, were merely the most recent episode in a long catalogue of oppression. Commentators frequently turned to history to advance such arguments, insisting on the priority of an historical perspective. As the Liberal politician Leonard Courtney put it,

> In attempting to form a sober judgment of what it behoves us to desire in the East, we must go back far beyond the Bulgarian atrocities of last summer. We should not err if we tried to form some estimate of the character of that tide which flowed into Europe more than three centuries since, and for two centuries has been slowly receding from the lands it once owned.[303]

Many did just that. In 1876, for example, E. A. Freeman re-published his *History and Conquests of the Saracens* (1856), a work originally engendered by the Crimean War. A year later, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens* was going through another edition, accompanied by a companion piece, *The Turks in Europe* (1877). In 1878, Edward Creasy followed Freeman's example, reissuing an updated edition of his denunciatory *History of the Ottoman Turks*—based on the Austrian Orientalist Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall's ten-volume *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiche* (1827-35). Pamphlets were important too: William Gladstone's *Bulgarian Horrors* was the most famous to make use of historical arguments, but there were many others, including the

[302] On the 'construction of affinities', see Harry Liebersohn, 'Discovering Indigenous Nobility: Tocqueville, Chamisso, and Romantic Travel Writing', *American Historical Review*, 99 (June 1994), pp. 746-66.
[303] Leonard Courtney, 'Our Eastern Policy', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (May 1877), pp. 603-26 at p. 604.

Duke of Argyll's *What the Turks Are* (1876) and Henry Richard's *Evidences of Turkish Misrule* (1877). Once again, however, the periodicals were central, reviewing books new and old and responding to the latest news with a reflexivity that only the daily and weekly press could surpass. As we have seen, E. A. Freeman was one of the earliest authors to address the subject, in what Gladstone called his 'powerful article on the Turks' of October 1876.[304] But many followed suit; indeed, more than twenty-eight full-length periodical articles devoted extended attention to the history of the Ottoman Empire between the end of 1875 and the conclusion of the Congress of Berlin in 1878.[305]

Historically-minded criticism of the Ottoman Empire might take many approaches. One was to turn the Ornamentalist analogy on its head. To the leaders of the Bulgarian Agitation, the London clubs—where the Turks were admired as 'gentlemen'—came to symbolise all that was wrong with contemporary Britain. As Gladstone told the American diplomat Eugene Schuyler, the clubs

> are the homes of the anti-popular sentiment. Of all the great legislative measures, which in this country have given name and mark to the age, there is not one that has been carried by the agency or with the approval of these clubs.[306]

In the *Contemporary Review*, E. A. Freeman duly assaulted the ethos of clubland, identifying in William Rufus, 'one of the most hateful characters in English or in any other history', the 'first recorded gentleman'. For Freeman, history showed that gentlemanly chivalry had always elevated individual honour and status rank above the higher and truer 'law of right', and he offered copious illustrations of its injustices. During the middle ages, 'the law of honour', he believed, could merely regulate what

[304] H. C. G. Matthew (ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries: 1875-80* (Oxford, 1986), p. 156.
[305] See Paul Auchterlonie, 'From the Eastern Question to the Death of General Gordon, 1876-1885', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 28 (2001), pp. 5-24.
[306] Gladstone to Eugene Schuyler, 29 Jan. 1877, quoted in Eugene Schuyler, *Memoir and Essays* (London, 1901), pp. 101-2.

'law and morality' would 'altogether forbid'. When Rufus describes himself as a *probus miles*, Freeman significantly offers the freighted translation '"an officer and a gentleman"'.[307]

Another Liberal historian, Goldwin Smith, followed suit, linking Turkophile sentiments with British support for the American Confederacy in the more recent past: if the Turks were defeated by Russia, Goldwin Smith believed, then 'it will be as difficult to find a Turkophilist [*sic*] in the clubs and drawing-rooms of London as it was to find a Secessionist after the surrender of Lee.' Just as Freeman had stigmatised the concept of the gentleman, extended to the Ottoman elite, by associating it with the injustices of the middle ages, so Goldwin Smith drew out the historical parallels between the Turks and the slave owners of the south:

> The Ottoman, a conqueror and a master, represents privilege, exclusiveness, a reign of force, a defiance of philanthropy, an antagonism to popular enlightenment and to the intellectual element of civilisation. He is Reaction in its most pronounced and stolid form. In this he is the counterpart, or rather the exaggeration, of the Slaveowner, and he has a similar attraction for the same minds and for the same classes.[308]

The Ottomans' vices are identified not only with those of the southern slave owners, but also with their Conservative British supporters, and the analogy is neither arbitrary nor superficial but moral. Indeed, Goldwin Smith's faith in the insights to be derived from what he called 'decisive analogies of history' suggests a debt to the Liberal Anglican conception of the value of historical comparisons, and above all to Thomas Arnold.[309] In the pages of the *Nineteenth Century*, Gladstone would draw the same

---

[307] Edward Freeman, 'The Law of Honour', *Contemporary Review*, 26 (Dec. 1876), pp. 731-51 at pp. 731, 750, 732. Elsewhere, Freeman would denounce British officers in Ottoman service as a 'renegade gang', dismissing their claims to soldierly honour on the same principles: see Edward Freeman, 'The Relation of the English People to the [Russo-Turkish] War', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Aug. 1877), pp. 481-510 at p. 501.

[308] Goldwin Smith, 'The Slaveowner and the Turk', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (Nov. 1877), pp. 1055-69 at pp. 1069, 1059, 1055.

[309] See Duncan Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge, 1952), pp. 182-3.

comparison, and in his correspondence he too links support for the Turks with a reluctance to 'liberate the negro slave'.[310] Of course, such analogies also indicate 'the probable result': that the Ottoman Empire, like the Confederacy, will be defeated.[311]

An historical analogy of a rather different kind was made by Lady Frances Verney, writing—like Freeman and Goldwin Smith—in the *Contemporary Review*. Verney, the younger sibling of Florence Nightingale, had emerged as a popular novelist, social critic, and amateur historian after her marriage in 1858 to the Liberal MP for Buckingham, Sir Harry Verney.[312] Her middle name, Parthenope, was a nod to Naples, her birthplace, but equally indicative of the thorough classical education she received from her parents.[313] Verney wrote in response to the Constantinople Conference of 1876, but her subject was the Polish king John Sobieski, who had broken the last Turkish siege of Vienna in a decisive battle fought in 1683. 'The history of Sobieski', she declared,

> has a peculiar interest at the present moment, as helping to interpret that present which has its roots, as ever, in the past. The 'Bulgarian atrocities,' which have shocked the world, are seen to be merely a survival' (as Mr. Tylor would call it) of the ordinary usages of the Turks in war and in the suppression of rebellion.

Verney's rather uncertain nod to E. B. Tylor's work in comparative anthropology is largely decorative, for her essay is a straightforward—and straightforwardly

---

[310] W. E. Gladstone, 'The Peace to Come', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (Feb. 1878), pp. 209-26 at p. 212: 'this question is, above and before all things, the question of subject races; of redeeming, from a servitude worse than that of the negro, a population twice that of the negroes ever held in slavery'; W. E. Gladstone to Olga Novikoff, 17 Oct. 1876, quoted in W. T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia, Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (2 vols., London, 1909), ii. 262-3. Cf. Humphrey Sandwith, who compares the Turks not with the Confederate slaveowners but with the West Indian planters in 'The Greek Revolution', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (Oct. 1877), pp. 434-68 at p. 422.

[311] Goldwin Smith, 'England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 31 (Feb. 1878), pp. 603-19 at p. 609.

[312] John D. Haigh, 'Verney, Frances Parthenope, Lady Verney (1819–1890)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004); E. D. Mackerness, 'Frances Parthenope, Lady Verney (1819-1890)', *The Journal of Modern History*, 30 (June 1958), pp. 131-6.

[313] Parthenope was a Greek settlement on the site of modern-day Naples.

didactic—narrative history. In an introduction rich with irony, she observes that since the Turks seem to 'have vindicated their right to "do what they like with their own"', it is interesting

> to turn to the record of a time when there seemed considerable danger that the greater part of Europe might have been subjected to the blessings of their rule, and to recall the terror and dismay with which their advance was regarded, and the desperate efforts made to avert what was then considered as the greatest misfortune that could happen to civilization and Christianity.[314]

Verney's quotation, we should note, alludes to the fourth duke of Newcastle, Henry Pelham-Clinton, who had notoriously demanded whether it was presumed 'that I am not to do what I will with my own?' when he was criticised for evicting tenants who had voted against his candidate in an 1829 election. Newcastle had been one of the Reform Bill's most ardent opponents in the House of Lords, so it would seem that Verney is attempting to associate the Conservative Turkophiles of the 1870s with the Tory ultras of forty years earlier, and more generally with what Goldwin Smith called 'Reaction'.[315] But the ironic centre of gravity of Verney's introduction lies elsewhere, interesting though this aside is, for the remainder of her essay describes how Sobieski saved much of Europe from the 'blessings' of Turkish rule in the seventeenth century.

Drawing on a 'rare' French translation of Sobieski's letters to his wife,[316] and informed by both von Hammer-Purgstall's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiche* and Narcisse-Achille Salvandy's *Histoire de Pologne* (1829), Verney's essay takes the form of an emotive biography of Sobieski, whose achievement at Vienna is cast as 'almost tantamount to the salvation of Christendom'. Nineteenth-century Britons have complacently forgotten, she contends, 'the political and religious horror which

[314] Verney, 'Turkish Invasions', pp. 659, 635.
[315] See Michael Brock, *The Great Reform Act* (London, 1973), p. 63.
[316] Stanislas Plater (trans.), *Lettres du Roi de Pologne Jean Sobieski à la Reine Marie Casimire, Pendant la Campagne de Vienne* (Paris, 1826).

followed the long series of triumphs that carried the standard of Mahomet from Mecca, Jerusalem, and Damascus, into the very heart of Europe.'[317] The growing 'menace' of the Ottoman Empire is followed from the fall of Constantinople in 1453: first Rhodes, Cyprus and the Venetian Greek islands succumb; then the strongholds of the Peloponnesus; and soon the Turks advance into Dalmatia, Moldavia, Bessarabia, Serbia, Bosnia and finally Hungary. Nor, in Sobieski's time, had these incursions showed any signs of abating: 'four times in eleven years, between 1672 and 1683, irruptions of immense hordes of barbarians threatened the centre of Europe', accompanied by horrific atrocities. In the provinces under their dominion, the Turks characteristically reveal the 'utter absence of all capacity for ruling or amalgamating with their subject races'—an argument with which we are familiar—remaining oppressive alien masters and 'incapable of progress, in the European sense of the word'. The preparations for the 1683 invasion itself are described in terms which recall the assembly of Xerxes' equally alien Oriental host in Herodotus' seventh book: Tartars, we learn, 'were arriving in hordes', and 'Moldavia was full of battalions of strange men from the heart of Asia', all accompanied by 'immense siege trains ... a numerous fleet [and] seven hundred camels'.[318] Just as Darius had vowed to destroy Athens, so the Turks aspired to stable 'the horses of the Sultan in the Basilica of St. Peter'. All this reached a climax in 1683, as 'Europe and Asia', 'Christianity and Islamism', 'civilization and barbarism' confronted each other at a moment of world-historical antithesis. Sobieski's role in deciding the outcome of this confrontation had been decisive, against the odds, and his example should encourage the Great Powers, Verney

[317] Verney, 'Turkish Invasions', pp. 635, 658.
[318] Ibid., pp. 636-7, 644, 658.

believes, to 'act a more Christian part'.[319] Even had it been left unsaid, in March 1877 the lesson would have been impossible to miss.

When Verney portrayed the Turks as 'incapable of progress, in the European sense of the word', she was drawing on a staple theme. Many commentators portrayed the Turks as simply congenitally incapable of progress: innately servile and submissive, they were 'a languid and unenterprising people', 'a dwindling and backward race'.[320] Gladstone agreed, telling the House of Commons that the 'Mahomedans' of the Balkans

> are a dwindling race and likewise a backward race; that there is no element of progress among them; that industry among them is low; that the old traditions of force and ruling by force tends to depress peaceful pursuits; that arts do not flourish among them.[321]

Indeed, he believed that the Turks had always been 'the one great anti-human specimen of humanity'.[322] They lacked what he called the 'civic individuality', the capacity for national life, that was one of the distinguishing features of European civilisation.[323] Another author dilated on the differences between the east and the west:

> The Oriental is sluggish almost to indifference; he dreads change, he easily submits to the decrees of fate ... Abundance of sleep, plenty of food, pipes, coffee, narcotics, long stories, formality, dignity, all these enter largely into the daily life of the dweller in the East.[324]

The durable notion of Oriental despotism, inherited from Aristotle and prominent in the work of classical historians of the clash between east and west such as Xenophon, was at work too.[325] Goldwin Smith, for example, excoriated the Ottoman Empire in Europe as an 'incubus of intrusive Orientalism', characterised by 'fatalism … cruelty …

---

[319] Ibid., p. 659.
[320] Albert Rutson, 'Reform in Turkey and Coercion', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), pp. 465-505 at p. 489; Gladstone in Hansard, CCXXXI, 31 July 1876, 172ff.
[321] Hansard, CCXXXI, 31 July 1876, 181.
[322] Gladstone, *Bulgarian Horrors,* p. 9.
[323] H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1809-1874* (Oxford, 1986), p. 182.
[324] Tillman Trowbridge, 'The Americans in Turkey', *British Quarterly Review*, 67 (Jan. 1878), pp. 28-59 at pp. 32-3.
[325] See Franco Venturi, 'Oriental Despotism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *24* (Jan.-March 1963), pp. 133-42.

filthiness … polygamy … impalements … slavishness' and a 'tyrant anarchy of satraps under the guise of a despotism'. Progress in the western sense, needless to say, was not a characteristic of Oriental despotisms such as the Ottoman Empire: 'industry, liberty, science, progress of every kind, are essentially alien to it'.[326]

By the 1870s, such characterisations had begun to become conventional, but they were no mere inventions of an 'orientalist' imagination. Many writers were responding to recent events. By the 1870s, British patience with the Porte was wearing thin. Critical commentators were beginning to believe that Ottoman reform was merely cosmetic, and that Britain's sacrifices in the Crimean War had been in vain. As one observer put it, Turkey had proven to be 'a land of illusions'.[327] Chaos in Lebanon, Crete, and the Balkans had only amplified such scepticism.[328] Many authors, however, believed that these events were merely the most recent episodes in a longer history, and they drew on a deeper historical perspective. For E. A. Freeman, for example, that the Turks were incapable of reform was the 'very simple lesson' imparted by the 'experience of twelve hundred years of history'.[329] Humphry Sandwith agreed: far from being a 'novel' experiment, 'Turkish rule', he declared, 'has a history embracing many ages and countries, and that history tells one invariable uniform tale':

> The student of history … must reject as idle dreams all hopes and theories which start from the hypothesis that the Turkish Government can ever reform itself. The iniquities of its administration are organic. They belong to the essence of Turkish rule.[330]

---

[326] Goldwin Smith, 'England's Abandonment', p. 609; Goldwin Smith, 'The Eastern Crisis' *Fortnightly Review*, 29 (May 1878), pp. 647-61 at p. 648.
[327] Robert Land, 'Reform in Turkey', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 39 (Nov. 1878), pp. 82-90 at p. 82.
[328] See e.g. Rowland Blennerhassett, 'The Reform of the Ottoman Empire', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (Feb. 1877), pp. 220-36; Stratford de Redcliffe, 'Turkey, Part I', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (June 1877), pp. 707-28; Stratford de Redcliffe, 'Turkey, Part II', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (July 1877), pp. 729-52.
[329] Freeman, 'True Eastern Question', p. 762.
[330] Humphry Sandwith, 'How the Turks Rule in Armenia', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (Feb. 1878), pp. 314-29 at p. 326.

Goldwin Smith again added his voice to the chorus: 'a little knowledge of Turkish history', he announced, was all that was required to appreciate that Ottoman reform would fail.[331] And James Bryce followed suit: 'the history of Mohammedan empires' shows that 'no development of the arts of government or society, no advance in thought or industry, is to be looked for under them'.[332] Once again, history was freighted with political implications.

Islam and its influence played a prominent role in many of these histories, and it was typical of the manner in which the periodical press engaged with the affairs of the day that a recent book, Reginald Bosworth Smith's four Royal Society lectures on *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* (1874), should have become a focus of controversy. Bosworth Smith, educated at Marlborough and Oxford, was a Trinity fellow turned Harrow schoolmaster, and his lectures on Islam had originally been intended for a Harrow essay society. So great was the unintended topicality of *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* that a second edition, expanded and enlarged, came out in 1876. Bosworth Smith's volume, of course, was far from being the only recent work to address Islam and its history. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, for example, had published James Stobart's *Islam and its Founder* in 1876—a year which also witnessed a new and revised edition of John Rodwell's translation of *The Koran* (1861), the first significant English translation of the Koran since George Sale's *The Koran: Commonly Called the Alcoran of Mahomet* (1734), which had gone through countless editions since its debut more than a century before. A new edition of Sir William Muir's four-volume *Life of Mahomet* (1857-61), abridged to a single more manageable tome, similarly appeared in 1877, reissued in 1878: 'at the present time',

[331] Goldwin Smith, 'England's Abandonment', p. 604.
[332] James Bryce, 'The Future of Asiatic Turkey', *Fortnightly Review*, 29 (June 1878), pp. 925-36 at p. 928.

observed an anonymous reviewer, 'it is peculiarly opportune that we should have a faithful and not too unwieldy life of the founder of Islam'.[333] But none of these books acquired the same notoriety as *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*.

The explanation for that probably lies in the unusual warmth of Bosworth Smith's assessment of Islam and its founder, for he explicitly set out to 'render justice to what was great in Mohammed's character, and to what has been good in Mohammed's influence upon the world'. His lectures were premised upon the conviction, informed by the work of Max Müller and F. D. Maurice in comparative religion, that '"the children of one father may worship him under different names"'. Indeed, in a conclusion that approached to syncretism, he goes so far as to suggest that 'the truest Christianity will one day, I believe, agree' in recognising Mahomet as 'a very Prophet of God'.[334] The first chapter of *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* duly seeks to confute what Bosworth Smith believed were the calumnies that several centuries of Christian commentators had levelled against Mahomet. Nor is the *apologia* limited to Mahomet and his creed: Bosworth Smith even seeks to defend the Muslim invasions of Asia-Minor and Europe: 'of the Mohammedan conquests', for example, we are told that 'it would be rather true to say that after the first wave of invasion had swept by, two blades of grass were found growing where one had grown', sowing 'seeds of literature, of commerce, and of civilization'. He entertained, then, a high opinion of Islamic civilisation. Equally controversially, the Christians of the East were given short shrift.[335]

---

[333] [Anon.], 'Review: William Muir, *The Life of Mohamet*', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), p. 524.
[334] Reginald Bosworth Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* (London, 1874), pp. vii, xi, 238. For Bosworth Smith's debt to Müller and Maurice, see Clinton Bennett, *Victorian Images of Islam* (London, 1992), pp. 74-102.
[335] Bosworth Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*, p. 155.

Bosworth Smith's positive portrayal of Islam marked a radical departure from scholarly tradition, but it found a naturally sympathetic audience in Turkophile circles. The Turkish ambassador even formally conveyed the Porte's appreciation.[336] As Edward Palmer, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge University, observed in the *Quarterly Review*, the leading Tory organ of the day, Bosworth Smith's book was an important intervention into contemporary debates: 'is Islam', he inquired with a rhetorical flourish, 'adapted to the reforms which ... are required, or must it be eliminated altogether from Europe?' For Palmer, the answer was obviously affirmative, and he deplored the 'new crusade … instituted by Mr. Gladstone and his friends' which, he assured his readers, 'must inevitably lead to the most disastrous results'.[337] Recapitulating the arguments of *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*, and chronicling Mahomet's life, Palmer concluded that Islam is 'a religion cognate, if inferior, to our own' which 'may be made a valuable instrument for good, and may be employed in the interests of progress and civilization'. Like Bosworth Smith, Palmer draws on the testimony of history: we learn, for example, that 'history proves to us' that 'most of the chivalry, refinement, and intellectual enlightenment was on the side of the Saracens' during the Crusades.[338] So, for once, historical arguments were made on both sides of the question.

But the Ottoman Empire's critics naturally received *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* rather less favourably. The missionary press, as Clinton Bennett notes, were advised not to bother with Bosworth Smith at all, and to read Muir instead. Smith, it was observed, did not know Arabic, and had never lived in a Muslim country.

---

[336] Bennett, *Victorian Images of Islam*, p. 101.
[337] When Palmer was murdered by Bedouin in the Sinai five years later, he may not have appreciated the irony.
[338] E. H. Palmer, 'Mohammed and Mohammedanism', *Quarterly Review*, 143 (Jan. 1877), pp. 205-37 at pp. 205, 210, 237.

One reviewer wondered what parents of Harrow boys must feel now they realised into 'whose hands they had committed their sons'.[339] The *British Quarterly Review* faulted the author's historical scholarship, adding dismissively that 'it would have been better for his work if he had given some attention to Mr. Freeman's very able 'Lectures on the History and Conquests of the Saracens.'' In the *Contemporary Review*, Sir Arthur Arnold arrived at a similarly withering assessment of what he called Bosworth Smith's 'attempt … to varnish the Koran'.[340] But the most sustained assault on *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* came from George Percy Badger, an Anglican priest who had travelled to Kurdistan on an educational mission to collaborate with the Eastern Christians in the 1840s, and who had served as a chaplain in Bombay and Aden.[341] While he conceded that Islam had 'effected a vast moral and social reformation among the Arabs and other pagan nations' and that more recently it had worked similar wonders 'among the negro races of Africa', he disputes the rest of Bosworth Smith's arguments, challenging his account of the history of the Muslim conquests and rejecting his 'libel upon Oriental Christians'—for whom, as an Anglican deeply interested in the possibility of reunion, he felt keen sympathy.[342] Mahomet's tolerance for polygamy, condoned by Bosworth Smith as a pragmatic concession to the spirit of the times, comes in for special censure.[343] Nor is the reader given the impression that a new Crusade would have entirely 'disastrous consequences'. Palmer and Badger, then, took historical arguments to very different conclusions, and the deceptively innocent activity of reviewing a volume of Royal Institution lectures had become intensely politicised.

[339] Bennett, *Victorian Images of Islam*, pp. 123, 96.
[340] Arthur Arnold, 'Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (July 1876), pp. 191-214 at p. 196.
[341] For Badger, see J. F. Coakley, *The Church of the East and the Church of England* (Oxford, 1992).
[342] Badger was a member of the Eastern Church Association, contributing a pamphlet on 'The Syriac Liturgies' to the association's series of 'occasional papers' in 1875.
[343] George Percy Badger, 'Mohammed and Mohammedanism', *Contemporary Review*, 26 (June 1875), pp. 87-102 at pp. 96, 99.

Though Bosworth Smith's daughter recorded that he was 'gravely hurt' by his early critics' 'contempt and obloquy',[344] he did little to mitigate his notoriety, for in December 1876, he recapitulated the arguments of *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* in a polemical essay in the *Contemporary Review*.[345] Under James Knowles, the review's pages had been opened to the advocates of conflicting opinions, and Bosworth Smith's article was a riposte to Gladstone's article in the previous issue.[346] Commenting on the recent Russian military expedition in Turkistan, Gladstone had argued that Islam had not been a blessing to the region and its people: 'history seems to show', he suggested, that Islam had always 'developed itself best and most congenially among Semitic races', and the Turkmens were not Semites: a militaristic religion had exacerbated their violent inclinations, for Muslims (reversing a biblical trope) 'are ever tempted to beat their ploughshares into swords, and their pruning-hooks into spears'. Exonerating the Russian troops from accusations of inhumanity, Gladstone had reminded his readers that the Tsarist forces were dealing with 'societies which, as Mr. Freeman points out in his most able lectures on the Saracens, are fundamentally polygamous, arbitrary, non-progressive'.[347] Bosworth Smith responded forcefully, attempting to undermine Gladstone's confident assumption of Christianity's superiority. Indeed, he believed on the contrary that history showed Christianity to have been no more successful at effacing national defects than Islam: after all, the Gospel had failed eradicate either 'the licentiousness of the French', 'the cruelty of the Spaniard', or 'the drunkenness of the English'. Similarly, if Turcoman Islam was brutal, then by the same token Byzantine Christianity had been 'effete and … idolatrous'. The

[344] E. F. Grogan, *Reginald Bosworth Smith: A Memoire* (London, 1909), p. 178n.
[345] Reginald Bosworth Smith, 'The Eastern Question: Turkey and Russia', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (Dec. 1876), pp. 147-68.
[346] W. E. Gladstone, 'Russian Policy and Deeds in Turkistan', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (Nov. 1876), pp. 873-91.
[347] Ibid., pp. 878-9.

Muslim conquests in Asia Minor and Europe had not, *pace* Gladstone, been characterized by forced conversions or extermination. What was more, Gladstone judged the Islamic conquerors by anachronistic standards: toleration 'in the full sense of the word is a product of the nineteenth century'.[348] History, in other words, was capable of being a medium for debate rather than merely a polemical instrument.

While writers such as Bosworth Smith, Badger, Palmer, and Gladstone ranged widely, discussing the life of Mahomet, Islam and the Muslim conquest, other authors pursued a more focussed approach. In the *Nineteenth Century*, Badger devoted an essay to the theology and history of the Caliphate, and he was not the only commentator to devote detailed attention to Islamic questions.[349] Robert Osborn, for example, devoted two articles to a detailed account of the evolution of 'Muhammadan Law'. Osborn, a thoughtful major in the British Army, had been born into a military family in Agra, serving as a lieutenant in the 16th Native Bengal Infantry during the Indian Mutiny (1857). Like Bosworth Smith, he had been an admirer of F. D. Maurice, but India had been a very different school from Oxford and Harrow. As a serving officer, Osborn had been struck how on the one hand, his Indian troops knew 'nothing of English history or of anything that interests Englishmen'; and on the other, how very few English officers commanding 'Sikhs, Afghans, Ghoorkhas, or Mahrattas' knew 'what these names signify' or 'the history of those who bear them'. The desire to remedy that deficiency, and thereby strengthen the cohesion between officers and men, led him inevitably to Islam, and thence to its history before it arrived in India; for he perceived 'that to understand the events of Muhammadan history I must trace them upwards from their source'.[350] The result was a book, *Islam Under the Arabs* (1876), which Osborn had

[348] Bosworth Smith, 'The Eastern Question', pp. 153, 150, 156.
[349] George Percy Badger, 'The Precedents and Usages Regulating the Muslim Khalîfate', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (Sept. 1877), pp. 274-82.
[350] Robert Osborn, *Islam under the Arabs* (London, 1876), pp. v-vii.

intended as a prelude to two more projected volumes on Indian history. But events in south-eastern Europe endowed the book—and Osborn's authority as its author—with a different kind of salience. Osborn was sympathetic to the Bulgarian Agitation—in September 1877, for example, E. A. Freeman would record that the major had 'come to-day, and we have had a good cursing of Turks'—and now he drew out his studies' implications for the Eastern Question in his two essays in the *Contemporary*.[351]

Osborn began with the Koran's origin as a spoken text; its collation and codification beginning under Caliph Abu Bakr; and the subsequent evolution of Islamic law. Muslims, he explained, believe that Mahomet was the recipient of divine revelation, and consequently that all of Mahomet's judgements concerning matters moral, ceremonial, or theological reflected the revealed will of God. According to Osborn, Islam denied that man had any capacity to uncover divine truth for himself: '"The light that lighteth every man who comes into the world" had no existence for Muhammed'. There was thus no room for conscience, aspiration or development in Islam: everything emanated from the Koran, which was simultaneously

> a religious creed and a political revelation. Church and State are so completely identified, that the religious life is made subject to the supervision of the Courts of Law; and the constitution of society and the government is supposed to be the result of a series of divine enactments. In religion, therefore, all spiritual development is treated as a crime against society and punished accordingly. In civil and political life, all efforts after reform or improvement are regarded as a rebellion against the revealed will of God and punished as infidelity. The system, as a whole, rejects experience as a guide to deeper insight or a wider knowledge; tramples upon the teaching of the past; pays no heed to differences of climate, character or history; but regards itself as a body of absolute truth.[352]

After Mahomet's death, his judgements—known as 'traditions'—had begun to be recorded, and while many were fabricated by his successors, Osborn sought to show

[351] Freeman to Edith Thompson, 23 Sept. 1877, in Stephens, *Life and letters*, ii. 156.
[352] Robert Osborn, 'Muhammadan Law: Its Growth and Character (II)', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (June 1877), pp. 55-71 at p. 66.

that ‘the immense accumulation of traditions was, in the main, the result of simple gossip’. Over time, the principle of ‘analogical deduction’, derived from Byzantine jurisprudence, had been invoked to resolve questions which Mahomet had not directly addressed, but even this was a step onto uncertain territory, fraught with the possibility of mishap—as the biographies of important jurists illustrated. Moreover, there had never been any attempt to adapt Islamic law to the state of society: ‘the wants and wishes of men, the previous history of a country’, indeed, ‘all those considerations … which are held, in the West, to be the governing principles of legislation’, were of no account whatsoever.[353]

Osborn was quick to concede that every ‘crime or defect in the history of Islam’ had a counterpart in the history of Christianity, but Islam’s incapacity for progress and reform set the two religions apart. Moreover, Christian reformers could appeal to the supremely humane example of Jesus himself; Muslims could only appeal to Mahomet:

> How hopeless in Christendom would have been the cause of humanity if Jesus of Nazareth ... had practised polygamy, connived at murder, traded in slaves, sanctioned and superintended a massacre of Pharisees, and preached the prosecution of religious wars as the surest passport to heaven![354]

According to the Koran, all property belonged to true believers; and from this precept ‘legists deduce the legitimacy of slavery, piracy, and a state of perpetual war between the Faithful and the unbelieving world’. What some commentators mistook for religious tolerance in the aftermath of the Muslim conquests in Asia Minor and Europe was therefore in fact mere indifference to the doings of slaves: Christians had no civil rights, and could make no claim to justice upon grounds of common humanity. It followed that, ‘in moments of exasperation’—and the allusion to events in Bulgaria is

[353] Ibid., p. 66; Robert Osborn, ‘Muhammadan Law: Its Growth and Character (I)’, *Contemporary Review*, 29 (May 1877), pp. 1092-111 at pp. 1105-6.
[354] Osborn, ‘Muhammadan Law (II)’, p. 71.

unmistakable—'non-Muhammadan races have always been liable to be savagely slaughtered by their Moslem rulers'.[355]

It is apparent that Osborn sometimes struggled to subject a religion that claimed to be ahistorical to an historical treatment: his two essays, as their titles reveal, are concerned not only with Islam's 'growth' over time, but also its unchanging 'character'. Indeed, Osborn's analysis of Islamic polities and societies as fundamentally stationary mitigated against narrative. This was a problem encountered by many of the commentators discussed in these pages. As E. A. Freeman put it, 'there arises in oriental history a certain sameness and monotony which we do not find in the history of any western country'.[356] 'The Turk is *semper idem*,' complained Henry Liddon, 'the same varnished savage that he was four centuries ago'.[357] But as we have seen, this tension, though evident, did not preclude extensive historical treatment of Islam and the Ottoman Empire. Those histories, teleologies of decline, stood in stark relief to the sympathetic Whig histories of the dynamic and progressive Balkan Slavs that we have already encountered.

V
The Eastern Question and the British Past

If the so-called Eastern Crisis was an event in the history of south-eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire, it was also an event in British history, and this did not go unnoticed by historically-minded commentators. The most obvious course of action, pursued by a number of writers in the periodical press, was to set British foreign policy in historical context in an attempt to inform its future direction. In the *Nineteenth*

[355] Osborn, 'Muhammadan Law (I)', pp. 1106, 1104.
[356] Edward Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens* (Oxford, 1856), p. 5.
[357] Liddon to Redington, 29 Aug. 1876, in Johnston, *Life and Letters*, p. 207.

Century, for example, the experienced diplomatist Stratford de Redcliffe analysed Anglo-Turkish relations back to the Crimean War, suggesting that 'reflecting on the past' might well offer more valuable insight than 'peering too soon into the gloom of futurity'.[358] Similarly, the *British Quarterly Review* of April 1878 charted the recent 'phases of the Eastern Question … the better to judge what England's policy should be'.[359] Essays such as these testify to the ubiquity of the assumption that historical perspective was an invaluable asset to political judgement, but most were essentially reviews, concerned with major events that would have been familiar to many Victorians.[360]

Other critics of Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy, however, carried their historicism further still, arguing that the government's support for the Ottoman Empires represented an aberration in British history. It was deeply disconcerting, Henry Liddon told his congregation in St Paul's, that Turkey, whose 'proceedings are not to be judged by the standard of a European and Christian civilization' should seek succour, not from 'any of the *historical* houses of despotism or oppression', but instead from 'free, humane, Christian England'.[361] As Peter Cain has recently observed, by the mid-1870s, Liberals were inclined to see what they sometimes called 'Beaconsfieldism' as 'nothing less than an attempt to set in reverse the long march towards liberty and constitutionalism that … they saw as the great and glorious achievement of English history'.[362] The most prominent statement of this position in the periodicals came from

[358] Stratford de Redcliffe, 'Turkey, Part I', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (June 1877), pp. 707-728 at p. 728.
[359] John Probyn, 'Phases of the Eastern Question', *British Quarterly Review*, 67 (April 1878), pp. 506-27.
[360] See also e.g. [Humphry Sandwith], 'The Servian War', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (Jan. 1877), pp. 195-220 at p. 202; John Lubbock, 'On the Imperial Policy of Great Britain', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (March 1877), pp. 37-49; [Albert Rutson], 'Reform in Turkey and Coercion', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), pp. 476-506; Leonard Courtney, 'Our Eastern Policy', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (May 1877), pp. 603-26; Grant Duff, 'The Situation', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (March 1878), pp. 571-604.
[361] Johnston, *Life and Letters*, p. 206.
[362] Peter Cain, 'Radicalism, Gladstone, and the Liberal Critique of Disraelian "Imperialism"' in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 215-38 at p. 218.

Gladstone in two powerful essays in the *Nineteenth Century*. The first, on 'Liberty in the East and West', published in June 1878, was precipitated by the government's decision to station Indian troops on the island of Malta, thence to deploy them in the event of war with Russia—a decision which the Liberal MP Robert Lowe, writing in the *Contemporary Review*, denounced as 'in all probability ranked by posterity among the most momentous that has occurred during the last six hundred years'.[363] For Gladstone, bringing Indian troops to Europe contravened a long-established constitutional prohibition on raising standing armies without the consent of Parliament. The government, Gladstone declared, had ridden roughshod over 'one among the immemorial unwritten laws, which, according to Mr. Burke, it was the glory of the Revolution of 1688 not to create but to re-affirm, and to place beyond the reach of desecrating hands.' The prohibition on standing armies in particular, he added, could be traced back to 'the yet more venerable provision of Magna Charta'.[364] In a noteworthy passage, Gladstone pointed to the American Declaration of Independence—with its complaint that George III 'has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures'—to argue that the principle in question was not merely a matter of national legislation but of the ancient patrimony of the race:

> They [the American colonists] had it as part of the Old English Common Law, which they carried with them from these shores: and just as a philologist, if he finds a word in Sanscrit and the same word in Greek, takes these indications for a proof that the speakers of these two tongues once had that word in common possession, so the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence unite in bearing witness to the ancient common law, which the forefathers of Englishmen and of Americans had unitedly enjoyed in the times before the branch was struck out from the trunk that bore it.[365]

[363] Robert Lowe, 'Imperialism', *Fortnightly Review*, 24 (Oct. 1878), pp. 453-65 at p. 453.
[364] W. E. Gladstone, 'Liberty in the East and West', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (June 1878), pp. 1154-74 at pp. 1155-6.
[365] Ibid., p. 1158.

The prescriptive force of this unambiguously Whig history of liberty is only amplified by its ecumenicism, encompassing, as it does, not only England but all the English-speaking peoples; and Gladstone warned that the Ministry's disregard for that history and its imperatives—demonstrated by a 'chaos of broken statutes, dishonoured traditions, and repudiated authorities'—amounted to a threat to liberty in the West:

> the chilled unfriendliness, exhibited … by the existing British Government to liberty in the East, has developed a controversy on our own liberty in the West, which has grown out of an assault upon the common law of England, and the setting up of a forged and pretended military prerogative that has no place in our history, and cannot root itself in our hearts or understandings.[366]

Beaconsfield's foreign policy was so worrying and so unnatural, in other words, precisely because it repudiated British history.

Despite such acute misgivings, writing in May on the eve of the Congress of Berlin, Gladstone could still conclude his essay on a note of guarded optimism.[367] But when he returned to the same subject in September, in an essay on 'England's Mission', his fears had been confirmed and his tone had hardened. At Berlin, Beaconsfield and Salisbury had once again taken 'the side of servitude, of reaction, and of barbarism', labouring 'to set up the principles of Metternich [and the Holy Alliance], and to put down the principles of Canning' in a shameful 'abandonment of the traditions of British freedom'.[368] In Berlin, 'the voice of England', as Gladstone had put it in Parliament a few weeks earlier, '[had] not been heard in unison with the institutions, the history, and the character of England'.[369] For Gladstone, a foreign policy antithetical to liberty abroad was inconsistent with England's long tradition of liberty at home. Even the public displays with which Beaconsfield and Salisbury were received upon their return

---

[366] Ibid., pp. 1162, 1167-8.
[367] 'Liberty in the East and West' was published in the June 1878 issue of the *Nineteenth Century*, but it is signed 'May 28, 1878' on p. 1174. The Congress of Berlin convened on 13 June 1878.
[368] W. E. Gladstone, 'England's Mission', *Nineteenth Century*, 4 (Sept. 1878), pp. 560-84 at p. 562.
[369] *Hansard* CCXLII, 30 July 1878, p. 683.

from Berlin were singled out for censure as 'an obsequious reception, unexampled … in the history of our civilians', unsettlingly reminiscent of a Roman Triumph.

This denunciation was the starting point for a wholesale indictment of the government's imperialist foreign policy. For Gladstone, one of history's lessons was that 'the central strength of England lies in England', not in her foreign dominions. Indeed, for Gladstone is was not Britain's vaunted Indian Empire but rather 'the American colonies' which were 'the grandest monument ever erected by a people of modern times'—second only, indeed, 'to the Greek colonisation in the history of the whole world', their historical analogue.[370] The distinction was that the American colonists, like their Greek predecessors, had created not an empire of exploited subjects but a home away from home; an extension of civilisation, and a great nation in its own right. Therein lay their glory, and by contrast the pomp and theatre of the Indian Empire was illusory and dangerous; indeed, the example of Rome—a popular analogy—showed just how dear and deleterious imperial overextension could be:

> Some seem actually to believe they are increasing strength, when they multiply the points they are to occupy and defend, without adding a single man to the force they can arm, or a pound to the fund by which that force is to be sustained.[371]

These arguments were to form one of the keystones to Gladstone's critique of 'Beaconsfieldism' during the Midlothian campaign at the end of the decade, when he himself would admit that the Eastern Question was 'the question out of which almost every other question has grown collaterally'.[372]

---

[370] Gladstone, 'England's Mission', pp. 560, 584.
[371] Ibid., p. 568. See R. F. Betts, 'The Allusion to Rome in British Imperialist Thought', *Victorian Studies*, 15 (Dec. 1971), pp. 149-59; C. A. Hagerman, *Britain's Imperial Muse: The Classics, Imperialism, and the Indian Empire, 1784-1914* (London, 2013).
[372] W. E. Gladstone to H. N. Gladstone, 2 Dec 1881, quoted in H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1875-1898* (Oxford, 1995), p. 55.

Indeed, Gladstone's correspondence suggests that he came to view the Bulgarian Agitation as an important denouement in what we have learnt to recognise as a Whig history of England. Beaconsfield and his supporters had set their faces in opposition to the direction of that history. Gladstone believed that 'what are called the "Upper Ten Thousand"' were the Turks' principal British aiders and abetters, as he explained to Olga Novikoff:

> From this body there has never on any occasion within my memory proceeded the impulse which has prompted and finally achieved *any* of the great measures, which in the last half century have contributed so much to the fame and happiness of England. They did not emancipate the Dissenters, the Roman Catholics, and the Jews; they did not reform the Parliament. They did not liberate the negro slave. They did not abolish the Corn Laws. They did not take the taxes off the Press. They did not abolish the Irish Established Church. They did not cheer on the work of Italian freedom and reconstruction. Yet all these things have been done, and done by agencies other than theirs, and despite their opposition.[373]

The Ottoman Empire's supporters, in other words, found themselves on the wrong side of history; just as the Ottomans themselves found themselves on the wrong side of history in the Balkans. While Richard Shannon and Colin Matthew both noted that Gladstone's sense that he was in agreement with 'the nation' with regards to the Eastern Question played an instrumental role in his return to active political life, neither seem to have noted how important it was that Gladstone believed the will of the nation also, in this case, corresponded to the direction of a distinctly teleological history.[374]

While Gladstone's two essays in the *Nineteenth Century* were the most prominent historicist repudiation of Beaconsfieldian foreign policy, he was not alone in pursuing this approach. In fact, Goldwin Smith had anticipated many of Gladstone's arguments

[373] Gladstone to Olga Novikoff, 17 Oct. 1876, quoted in W. T. Stead, *M.P. for Russia,* i. 262.
[374] See Matthew, *Gladstone 1875-1898*, pp. 53-5; Shannon, *Bulgarian Agitation*, pp. 154-5. For an exploration of the importance of history to Gladstone's political thought in a different context, see John-Paul McCarthy, 'Gladstone's Irish Questions: An Historical Approach, 1830-66', University of Oxford DPhil Thesis (2010).

in the pages of the *Contemporary Review* four months before 'Liberty in the East and West' appeared. Like Gladstone's, Smith's essay invoked a Whig history, albeit one that was still more stridently partisan: 'the Liberal party', he asserted,

> is the party of Cromwell, of William III., of Marlborough, of Canning … It is the party that fought reactionary Spain, that fought Louis XIV., that fought, not the French Republic, but Napoleon, that, not without demonstrations of force, wrested Europe from the Holy Alliance.[375]

Support for what Smith called 'the revolution in Eastern Europe' was merely consistent with that tradition, and Smith shared Gladstone's belief that liberty in the East and West were sides of the same coin. Indeed, he had already expressed his hope that 'the ultimate result' of the Congress of Berlin would be, 'not a re-enslavement of the Bulgarian, but an emancipation of the English people'.[376]

Like Gladstone, Smith also criticised the imperialist foreign policy of which Beaconsfield's alliance with the Ottoman Empire was a part; but whereas Gladstone had invoked what he portrayed as a long-standing and noble tradition of English anti-Imperialism, Smith went further. 'Empire', he declared, 'is an anachronism', assaulting what he believed was the mistaken notion of an 'irrepressible struggle for empire'. Such a struggle, he argued, had

> raged no doubt with great fury among the savage or semi-savage races of the early world. It continues still to rage among the representatives of those races … [but] among civilized races it dies out in proportion to their civilization. It is gradually quelled by enlightened self-interest, as well as by the civilized conscience. Men learn by degrees that industry brings them more wealth than plunder.

A few months later he would emphasise that empire was mutually exclusive with progress and prosperity; and since imperialism seemed to be in the ascendant, he feared lest 'the leadership of political progress, which has hitherto belonged to England, and

[375] Goldwin Smith, 'England's Abandonment', pp. 603-19 at p. 608.
[376] Goldwin Smith, 'The Eastern Crisis', *Fortnightly Review*, 29 (May 1878), pp. 647-61 at p. 661.

has constituted a special interest of her history, will, in the near future, pass into other hands.' Smith's argument in these essays is more explicitly dependent upon a philosophy of history than Gladstone's, with bolder claims of universality: his contention is not only that empire is un-English but also that empire, correctly construed, is a thing of the past; something that Smith's chosen political tradition understood, but which its opponents did not. Smith's complaint that Beaconsfield treats England as 'a gambling table, not a country' is a slight directed at the prime minister's Jewish heritage, not his sense of the past.[377] Gladstone, too, in a sentence edited out of the draft of 'Liberty in the East and West' by Knowles, would stigmatize Beaconsfield as an 'alien' who wished 'to annex England to his native East and make it the appendage of his Asiatic empire'.[378]

In October 1878, Freeman made similar arguments in an essay in the *British Quarterly Review* surveying recent foreign policy. Freeman reviewed a recent edition of *Parliamentary Papers* in addition to issues of *The Times* and *The Spectator*, setting current affairs in deeper context.[379] Like his friends and fellow-Liberals, Freeman believed that the policy pursued by the government had no precedent in English, or even European, history. On the world stage, Freeman insisted, 'the voice that speaks in the name of England is not an English voice' but the voice of Lord Beaconsfield,

> an adventurer who has nothing in common with England or Europe, but whose mind has been through life filled with wild dreams of Eastern splendour, Eastern dominion, the whole train of ideas which are called up by the utterance of the words Eastern, Oriental, Asiatic. To make the course of history run backwards … to make the freedom of Europe bow to

---

[377] Ibid., pp. 607-9, 619. Smith's contention that Jews could not be patriots initiated a debate with Herman Adler, the chief Rabbi of the British Empire: Hermann Adler, 'Can Jews be patriots?', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (April 1878), pp. 637-46; Goldwin Smith, 'Can Jews be patriots?', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (May 1878), pp. 875-87. The controversy rumbled on into the next decade. See also Colin Holmes, 'Goldwin Smith (1823-1910): A Liberal Anti-Semite', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 6 (1972), pp. 25-30.

[378] Richard Shannon, *Gladstone 1865-1898* (London, 1999), p. 221.

[379] Edward Freeman, 'The Three Treaties', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (Oct. 1878), pp. 465-508 at p. 465.

> the despotism of Asia, has been throughout life the consistent object which Lord Beaconsfield has set before himself. It is the theme of his novels; it is the object of his policy. He has dishonoured the crown of England by the addition of a barbarian title;[380] he has insulted Europe by the presence of barbarian mercenaries;[381] his whole scheme of government involves the wiping out of the whole story of English and European freedom, and falling back on the simpler rule of a Sultan and his Vizier.

Like Smith, Freeman seasoned his critique with anti-Semitism: the un-English character of Beaconsfield's administration follows from his Jewish—'Hebrew'—heritage. Disraeli's novels, *Tancred* in particular, were grist to the mill: the 'great Asian mystery', after all, was a phrase of Disraeli's own coining.[382] For Freeman, however, the prime minister's un-Englishness was manifested in what he identified as an 'attempt to make the course of history run backwards', in disregard of 'the whole story of English and European freedom'.[383] So Freeman is invoking not only the English Whig tradition—of which he, Smith and Gladstone were all enthusiastic celebrants—but also the notion of perpetual conflict between East and West which structured much of his historical thinking.

It is important to observe that Freeman, Smith, and Gladstone were all writing during the first secure Tory ministry since Peel's in the 1840s—and even Peel could be claimed, retrospectively, for Liberalism in his capacity as a great economic reformer. Beaconsfield's government thus threatened to undo the achievements of a generation. As the historian Frederic Seebohm related, under Liberal guidance, the nation had

> grown in freedom and in respect for law, as well as in population, commerce and wealth. It is a nation of whom alone it could be said that her army is supplied entirely by voluntary enlistment, and that the masses of her people, if they chose to abstain from a few common luxuries, need hardly know that they were taxed at all; a nation in whose experience democracy had been trained and guided into peaceful paths, until the

[380] In the Royal Titles Act 1876, Queen Victoria had been controversially awarded the title 'Empress of India' at Disraeli's instigation.
[381] Freeman is referring to the stationing of Indian troops on the island of Malta.
[382] See Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question*; Todd Endelman and Tony Kushner (eds.), *Disraeli's Jewishness* (London, 2002).
[383] Freeman, 'The Three Treaties', p. 468.

> people, habituated to self-reliance and self-control, had altogether abandoned the old cry of Chartism, the produce of former oppression and unequal laws.[384]

All that was now in jeopardy, making the election of 1880, in Gladstone's opinion, 'the most important crisis in the national history that has occurred during the last half-century.'[385] It followed that the Liberal victory at the polls was also a victory, in a sense, for history itself. 'The act which the English nation has just done raises it to the height of historic sublimity', descanted Freeman. It was 'a victory of sound European and English feeling over the empty brag and tawdry tinsel of Asiatic imperialism.' The British, in other words, had recognised that 'their real interest, their real glory, lay after all, within the four seas of Britain'.[386]

[384] F. Seebohm, 'Imperialism and Socialism', *Nineteenth Century*, 7 (1880).
[385] W. E. Gladstone, *Political Speeches in Scotland, Nov. and Dec. 1879* (Edinburgh, 1879), p. 60. The quotation is taken from Gladstone's second Midlothian address.
[386] Edward Freeman, 'The Election and the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 37 (1880), pp. 958, 966.

Conclusion

This thesis has sought to demonstrate that the Eastern Question was an important subject for Victorian intellectuals, and that by the 1870s many had come to construe it as an historical question. History, it has been argued, framed how the problems of south-eastern Europe were portrayed in travel literature and the daily press, and structured how they were analysed in the periodicals and reviews. The historical writing that those problems elicited, moreover, tended to situate the Christian peoples of the Balkans within the pale of Europe, locating them at an early staging post along the road to civilization which nineteenth-century Britain had already travelled. The intellectual and religious bases which informed much of this historiography have also been explored. Throughout, pains have been taken to emphasise how reflexive a commentary Victorian historical writing could offer on current affairs: new events in the Balkans, it has been shown, elicited new and evolved historiographical responses in Britain. By the same token, this thesis has also emphasised the respects in which the later 1870s were distinctive: rather than offering a synchronic and abstracted summation of nineteenth-century thought, the aspiration has been to show ideas in practice, inextricably linked to their context in time and place.

More localised implications are confined to their respective chapters. Chapter One recovers the full extent of E. A. Freeman's engagement with the Eastern Question and illuminates one of the key prosopographical groups which shaped the Bulgarian Agitation. Chapter Two develops the author's argument that the Eastern Question lay at the heart of Freeman's conception of universal history, exploring some of the intellectual routes which led him to that position. Taken together, they constitute an original contribution to the biography of an important Victorian intellectual. Chapter Three offers a revisionist reading of nineteenth-century Balkan travel writing,

challenging a scholarly literature which has forced it into a Saidian mould. Chapter Four draws attention to the originality of how Balkan affairs were reported in 1870s Britain, assessing the hitherto neglected roles of William Stillman and Arthur Evans in framing how those affairs were perceived and interpreted at home, and situating them within the context of emerging journalistic conventions. Chapter Five offers a thorough survey of historically-minded analyses of the Eastern Question in Victorian periodicals, demonstrating just how complex, layered and interconnected 'conversations' in Britain's most sophisticated print medium could be. While the periodical press continues to be underexploited by historians, Chapter Five offers a case study in the range and depth of material which awaits recovery. The variety of these contributions testifies to the Eastern Question's pervasive place in nineteenth-century culture and intellect.

The Eastern Question was a house of many mansions, and this thesis' implications accordingly touch upon a number of historical sub-disciplines. Taken as a whole, its central contention is that the Eastern Question has been neglected by historians of nineteenth-century culture and intellect, its experiential importance to Victorians far outpacing its largely cursory subsequent coverage. More particularly, it proposes that if Victorian historical writing can be usefully read as a variety of political thought, then that is as true of Victorian historiography concerned with the Balkans as it is of Victorian historiography concerned with England. While the so-called Whig tradition in nineteenth-century histories of England has been extensively explored, the extension of its central premises to south-eastern Europe, studied in detail here, has hitherto passed without notice. The account offered in this thesis thus qualifies assumptions that Victorian historical writing was either insular or Imperialist, exploring a number of the ways in which its authors might portray foreign peoples as 'kin beyond sea'.

Bibliography

I. Manuscripts

Manchester
John Rylands Library, University of Manchester
E. A. Freeman Papers
EAF/1/1, 7, 10: miscellaneous correspondence
EAF/1/2: letters to Freeman on Greece, the Eastern Question and related topics
EAF/5/1: scrapbooks containing newspaper and periodical cuttings
EAF/3/3: juvenilia and verse

Oxford
Bodleian Library, Western MSS
MMS Bryce 5, 6: Bryce-Freeman correspondence
MS Eng. Misc. e 148: Stubbs-Freeman correspondence

Keble College Archives
Liddon 34: uncatalogued Liddon-Freeman correspondence

II. Theses

James Kirby, 'Historians and the Church of England: religion and historical scholarship, *c.* 1870-1920', DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2014.

John-Paul McCarthy, 'Gladstone's Irish Questions: An Historical Approach, 1830-1886', DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2010.

III. Websites

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, <http://www.oxforddnb.com>.
Oxford English Dictionary, <http://www.oed.com>.
Parliamentary Papers Online, <http://parlipapers.chadwyck.co.uk>.
ProQuest British Periodicals, <http://search.proquest.com/britishperiodicals>.
The Times Digital Archive, <http://find.galegroup.com/ttda>.
The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, <http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk>.

IV. Printed Primary

Hermann Adler, 'Can Jews Be Patriots?', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (April 1878), pp. 637-46.
—'Jews and Judaism: A Rejoinder', *Nineteenth Century*, 4 (July 1878), pp. 133-50.
Henry Allon & Henry Robert Reynolds, 'The Hundredth Number of the *British Quarterly Review*: A Retrospect and a Prospect', *British Quarterly Review*, 50 (October 1869), pp. 520-39.

Rufus Anderson, *History of the Missions of the A.B.C.F.M. to the Oriental Churches* (2 vols., Boston, 1873).
[Anon.] 'The St. James's Hall Conference', *Punch*, 71 (16 December 1876).
[Anon.] 'Review: Through Bosnia and Herzegovina on Foot', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (October 1876), pp. 516-8.
[Anon.], 'Bosnia and Bulgaria', *Edinburgh Review*, 44 (October 1876), pp. 535-72.
[Anon.] 'Law and Custom Among the Southern Slavs', *The Law Magazine and Review*, 5 (1877), pp. 119-212.
[Anon.], 'The Genius of Islam', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), pp. 339-66.
George Arbuthnot, *Herzegovina; or Omer Pacha and the Christian Rebels* (London, 1861).
Duke of Argyll, 'Morality in Politics', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (July 1877), pp. 319-33.
Arthur Arnold, 'Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (July 1876), pp. 191-214.
Thomas Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History* (2nd ed., London, 1843).
George Percy Badger, 'The Syriac Liturgies', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 17 (London, 1875).
—'Mohammed and Mohammedanism', *Contemporary Review*, 26 (June 1875), pp. 87-102.
—George Percy Badger, 'The Precedents and Usages Regulating the Muslim Khalîfate', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (September 1877), pp. 274-82.
Walter Bagehot, 'The First Edinburgh Reviewers' *National Review* (October 1855).
Valentine Baker, *War in Bulgaria* (London, 1879).
Henry Barkley, *Between the Danube and the Black Sea* (London, 1876).
[Sir Henry Bartle Frere], 'The Turkish Empire', *Quarterly Review*, 142 (October 1876), pp. 480-513.
Rowland Blennerhassett, 'The Reform of the Ottoman Empire', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (February 1877), pp. 220-36.
James Bryce, 'Russia and Turkey', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (December 1876), pp. 793-808.
—'Constantinople', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 37 (February 1878), pp. 337-52.
—'The Future of Asiatic Turkey', *Fortnightly Review*, 29 (June 1878), pp. 925-36.
—*Race Sentiment as a Factor in History* (London, 1915).
Christian von Bunsen, *Outlines of the Philosophy of World History* (2 vols., London, 1854).
[Montagu Burrows], 'The Balance of Power', *Quarterly Review*, 143 (April 1877), pp. 526-50.
Sir George Campbell, 'The Resettlement of the Turkish Dominions', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (April 1878), pp. 543-59.
Thomas Carlyle, 'Characteristics', *Edinburgh Review* (April 1831).
Leonard Courtney, 'Our Eastern Policy', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (May 1877), pp. 603-26.
[Edward Byles Cowell], 'Turkey', *Quarterly Review*, 143 (April 1847), pp. 573-600.
Philip Christitch, 'The Eastern Question from the Point of View of the Eastern Christians (Part II)', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 35 (December 1876), pp. 158-76.
—'The Eastern Question From the Point of View of the Eastern Christians', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 35 (December 1876), pp. 158-76.
Henry Craik, 'National Interests and National Morality', *Quarterly Review*, 144 (July 1877), pp. 277-310.

— 'The Liberal Party and Foreign Politics', *Quarterly Review*, 144 (October 1877), pp. 555-86.
—'The People of Turkey', *Quarterly Review*, 146 (July 1878), pp. 256-88.
James Creagh, *Sparks from Campfires: An Autobiography* (London, 1901).
William Denton, 'A Visit to the Capital of Montenegro', *Good Words* (1 January 1866), pp. 57-63.
—'A Ride Through Montenegro', *Good Words* (1 September 1866), pp. 636-44.
—'Montenegro', *Church Quarterly Review*, 3 (October 1876), pp. 158-88.
—*Montenegro, its People and its History* (London, 1877).
Edward Dicey, *The Morning Land, Being Sketches of Turkey, the Holy Land, and Egypt* (London, 1870).
—'England's Policy at the Congress', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (April 1878), pp. 779-96.
Auguste Dozon, *Bŭlgarski narodni p͡iesni: chansons populaires bulgares inédites* (Paris, 1875).
Grant Duff, 'Eastern Affairs at the Close of the Session', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (September 1876), pp. 694-712.
—'Russia', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (March 1877), pp. 72-96.
—'Russia', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (April 1877), pp. 298-314.
—'The Five Nights' Debate', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (July 1877), pp. 857-78.
—'The Situation', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (March 1878), pp. 571-604.
—'Echoes of the Late Debate', *Nineteenth Century*, 4 (September 1878), pp. 478-93.
Ralph Earle, 'The Eastern Situation', *Contemporary Review*, 26 (November 1876), pp. 651-70.
Henry Elliot, *Some Revolutions and Other Diplomatic Experiences* (London, 1922).
Arthur H. Elton (ed.), *Tracts for the Present Crisis* (1st ed., Bristol, 1855).
Arthur Evans, 'On a Hoard of Coins Found at Oxford, with Some Remarks on the Coinage of the First Three Edwards', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 11 (1871), pp. 260–282.
—'Over the Marches of Civilized Europe', *Fraser's Magazine*, 87 (May 1873), pp. 578-96.
—*Through Bosnia and the Herzegóvina on Foot During the Insurrection* (London, 1876).
—*Illyrian Letters. A Revised Selection of Correspondence from the Illyrian Provinces... Addressed to the* Manchester Guardian (London, 1878).
—*The Slavs and European Civilisation* (London, 1878).
—'The Austrians in Bosnia', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 38 (October 1878), pp. 495-504.
Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer, *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea* (Stuttgart, 1830).
George Finlay, 'A Glance at Turkish History', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 75 (Feb. 1854), pp. 184-92.
—'The Euthanasia of the Ottoman Empire', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 89 (May 1861), pp. 571-94.
—*A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time*, ed. H. F. Tozer (7 vols., Oxford, 1877).
Archibald Forbes, 'The Russians, the Turks, and the Bulgarians at the Theatre of War', *The Nineteenth Century*, 2 (November 1877), pp. 561-82.
William Forsyth, 'A Recent Visit to Montenegro and its Capital', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 122 (November 1877), pp. 553-69.
E. A. Freeman
—and George Cox, *Poems Legendary and Historical* (London, 1850).

—'Greece During the Macedonian Period', *North British Review*, 21 (August 1854), pp. 425-50.
—'Ancient Greece and Medieval Italy', *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), pp. 129-67.
—'Finlay on the Byzantine Empire', *North British Review*, 22 (February 1855), pp. 343-75.
—*The History and Conquests of the Saracens* (Oxford, 1856).
—'The Greek People and the Greek Kingdom', *Edinburgh Review*, 103 (April 1856), pp. 386-422.
—'Grote's History of Greece', *North British Review*, 25 (May 1856), pp. 141-72.
—'Creasy's History of the Ottoman Turks', *Saturday Review*, 2 (17 May 1856), pp. 60-2.
—'Creasy's History of the Ottoman Turks', *Saturday Review*, 2 (24 May 1856), pp. 88-9.
—'Greece Under the Ottoman Turks', *Saturday Review*, 2 (28 June 1856), pp. 206-7.
—'Alexander the Great', *Edinburgh Review*, 105 (April 1857), pp. 305-41.
—'Colonel Mure and the Attic Historians', *National Review*, 6 (January 1858), pp. 69-91.
—'Trikoupe's History of the Greek Revolution', *Saturday Review*, 5 (20 February 1858), pp. 192-3.
—'The Eastern Church', *Edinburgh Review*, 107 (April 1858), pp. 322-57.
—'Mr. Gladstone's Homer and the Homeric Age', *National Review*, 7 (July 1858), pp. 40-74.
—*A History of Federal Government* (London, 1863).
[—] 'Mr. Kingsley's Roman and Teuton', *Saturday Review* (9 April 1864), pp. 446-8.
[—] 'Damaged History for Popular Consumption', *Saturday Review* (22 June 1861), pp. 635-7.
—*History of the Norman Conquest of England* (5 vols., 1867-1879).
—*The Unity of History* (London, 1872).
—'Mahomet', *British Quarterly Review*, 55 (January 1872), pp. 100-36.
—*Comparative Politics* (3rd ed., London, 1873).
—*Historical Essays, 2nd Series* (London, 1873).
—'The True Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 24 (December 1875), pp. 747-69.
—*The Eastern Question in its Historical Bearings* (Manchester, 1876).
— 'Montenegro', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 33 (January 1876), pp. 275-88.
—'The Illyrian Emperors and Their Lands', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (July 1876), pp. 1-35.
—'The Turks in Europe', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (October 1876), pp. 441-71.
—'Present Aspects of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (October 1876), pp. 409-23.
— 'The Law of Honour', *Fortnightly Review*, 26 (December 1876), pp. 731-51.
—*The Ottoman Power in Europe* (London, 1877).
—'The Geographical Aspect of the Eastern Question', *Fortnightly Review*, 27 (January 1877), pp. 73-87.
—'Guizot's *History of France*', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (January 1877), pp. 165-95.
—'The English People in Relation to the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (February 1877), pp. 489-515.
— 'The Jews in Europe', *Saturday Review* (10 February 1877).
—'Race and Language', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (March 1877), pp. 711-41.

—'The Southern Slaves', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (July 1877), pp. 137-84.
—'The Relation of the English People to the [Russo-Turkish] War', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (August 1877), pp. 481-510.
—'Neutrality—Real or Pretended?', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (October 1877), pp. 877-93.
—'The Three Treaties', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (October 1877), pp. 465-508.
—'National Morality', *Princeton Review* (July 1878), p. 641-73.
—*Historical Essays, 3rd Series* (London, 1879).
—'The Election and the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 37 (June 1880), pp. 956-76.
—'The Austrian Power', *Fraser's Magazine*, 102 (July 1880), pp. 29-47.
—*Sketches from the Subject and Neighbour Lands of Venice* (London, 1881).
—*Greater Greece and Greater Britain and George Washington The Expander of England* (London, 1886).
—*The Chief Periods of European History* (London, 1886).
—*The Methods of Historical Study* (London, 1886).
—*The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times* (4 vols., London, Macmillan, 1891-94).
—'A Review of My Opinions', *The Forum*, 13 (April 1892), pp. 145-60.
G. Frilley & Jovan Wlahovitj, *Le Monténégro Contemporain* (Paris, 1876).
James Gambler, 'The Life of Midhat Pasha', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (January 1878), pp. 71-96.
John Gardner Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro* (2 vols., London, 1848).
—*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (London, 1837).
—*Topography of Thebes and General View of Egypt* (London, 1835).
Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. David Womersley (3 vols., London, 1994).
W. E. Gladstone
—'On the Place of Homer in Classical Education and in Historical Inquiry', *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), iii. 1-56.
—*Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* (Oxford, 1858).
—*Juventus Mundi* (London, 1869).
—*The Vatican Decrees and their Bearing on Civil Obedience* (London, 1874).
—*Vaticanism: An Answer to Reproofs and Replies* (London, 1875).
—*The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (London, 1876).
—'Russian Policy and Deeds in Turkistan', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (November 1876), pp. 873-91.
—'The Hellenic Factor in the Eastern Problem', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (December 1876), pp. 1-27.
—*The Slavonic Provinces of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1877).
—*Lessons in Massacre* (London, 1877).
—'Montenegro', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), pp. 360-79.
—'The Peace to Come', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (February 1878), pp. 209-26.
—'Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (August 1877), pp. 149-66.
—'The Paths of Honour and of Shame', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (March 1878), pp. 591-604.
—'Liberty in the East and West', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (June 1878), pp. 1154-74.
—'England's Mission', *Nineteenth Century*, 4 (September 1878), pp. 560-84.
—'Kin Beyond Sea', *North American Review*, 127 (September 1878), pp. 179-212.

—*Political Speeches in Scotland* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1880).
Edwin L. Godkin, 'The Eastern Question', *North American Review*, 124 (January 1877), pp. 106-26.
William Goodell, *Forty Years in the Turkish Empire* (New York, 1876).
Horatio Hale, 'Race and Language', *The Popular Science Monthly* (January 1888), pp. 340-51.
A. W. Hare & J. C. Hare, *Guesses at Truth, 2nd Series* (2nd ed., London, 1848).
Frederic Harrison, 'Cross and Crescent', *Contemporary Review*, 26 (December 1876), pp. 709-30.
—'The *Nineteenth Century*: A Retrospect', *Nineteenth Century*, 84 (October 1918), pp. 785-796.
Arnold Haultain (ed.), *A Selection from Goldwin Smith's Correspondence* (London, 1913).
Henry Havelock, 'Constantinople and Our Road to India', *Contemporary Review*, 27 (January 1877), pp. 119-34.
F. W. Hirst, *Early Life and Letters of John Morley* (2 vols., London, 1927).
George Howell, 'Working Men and the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (October 1876), pp. 866-72.
W. H. Hutton, *Letters of William Stubbs* (London, 1904).
Paulina Irby and Georgina Muir Mackenzie, *Across the Carpathians* (Cambridge, 1862).
—*Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (2 vols., 1st ed., London, 1866).
—*Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* (2 vols., 5th ed., London, 1877).
Walter C. James, 'Woman in Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 34 (December 1878), pp. 108-30.
Konstantin Jireček, *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876).
J. O. Johnston (ed.), *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (London, 1904).
Felix Philipp von Kanitz, *Die Serbien* (Leipzig, 1868).
E. R. Kelly, *Somersetshire* (London, 1875).
William Keppel, 'The Aggression of Russia and the Duty of Great Britain', *Quarterly Review*, 145 (April 1878), pp. 534-70.
Valerian Krasinski, *Panslavism and Germanism* (London, 1848).
—*Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations* (Edinburgh, 1851).
—*Montenegro and the Slavonians of Turkey* (London, 1853).
Robert Land, 'Reform in Turkey', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 39 (November 1878), pp. 82-90.
Emile de Laveleye, 'British Interests in the Present Crisis', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (July 1877), pp. 25-34.
—'England and the War', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (February 1878) pp. 153-66.
M. S. Lawson (ed.), *Letters of John Mason Neale* (London, 1910).
Elodie Lawton Mijatovics, *The History of Modern Servia* (London, 1872).
—*Serbian Folk-Lore* (London, 1874).
[Sir Austen Henry Layard], 'The Eastern Question and the Conference', *Quarterly Review*, 143 (January 1877), pp. 276-320.
John Lemoinne, 'The Situation', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (March 1878), pp. 567-70.
H. J. Van Lennep, *Travels in Little-Known Parts of Asia Minor* (2 vols., London, 1870).
François Lenormant, *Turcs et Montenegrins* (Paris, 1866).

Henry Liddon (ed.), *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference Held at Bonn* (London, 1875).
—'Canon Liddon on the Slavs', *The Times* (8 December 1876), p. 6.
John Lubbock, 'On the Imperial Policy of Great Britain', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (March 1877), pp. 37-49.
Malcolm MacColl, 'The Christian Subjects of the Porte', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (November 1876), pp. 970-89.
—'Some Current Fallacies About Turks, Bulgarians, and Russians', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (December 1877), pp. 831-42.
—*Three Years of the Eastern Question* (2nd ed., London, 1878).
Januarius MacGahan, *Campaigning on the Oxus and the Fall of Khiva* (4th ed., London, 1876).
Sir John Mahaffy, 'Modern Greece', *Contemporary Review*, 31 (March 1878) pp. 728-44.
Henry Maine, *Village Communities in the East and West* (London, 1871).
—*The Effects of Observation of India on Modern European Thought* (London, 1875).
—'South Slavonians and Rajpoots', *Nineteenth Century*, 2 (December 1877), pp. 796-819.
—Lectures on the Early History of Institutions, (3rd ed., London, 1880).
Xavier Marmier, *Lettres sur l'Adriatique et le Montenegro* (2 vols., Paris, 1854).
Friedrich Max Müller, 'Comparative Philology', *Edinburgh Review*, 94 (October 1851), pp. 297-339.
—*The Languages of the Seat of War in the East* (London, 1854).
—'Comparative Mythology' in *Oxford Essays, contributed by members of the University*, (4 vols., London, 1855-8), ii. 1-87.
—*A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1859).
—*Lectures on the Science of Language, First Series* (London, 1861).
—*Lectures on the Science of Language, Second Series* (London, 1864).
—*Chips from a German Workshop* (4 vols., London, 1894-5).
Owen Meredith, *Serbski Pesme; or, National Songs of Servia* (London, 1861).
Midhat Pasha, 'The Past, Present, and Future of Turkey', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (June 1878), pp. 981-93.
Dimitur & Konstantin Miladinov, *Bŭlgarski Narodni P͡iesni* (Zagreb, 1861).
J. G. C. Minchin, *Old Harrow Days* (London, 1898).
John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (3 vols., London, 1903).
—John Viscount Morley, *Recollections* (2 vols., London, 1917).
J. M. Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (3 vols., 1847-1849).
—*Notes, Ecclesiological and Picturesque, on Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria, Styria: With a Visit to Montenegro* (London, 1861).
—*Hymns of the Eastern Church* (1862).
Francis Newman, 'Cause and Objects of the Crimean War', *Fraser's Magazine*, 14 (October 1876), pp. 522-36 at p. 522.
Frederick Oakeley, 'Periodical Literature', *Dublin Review*, 34 (June 1853), pp. 541-66.
Robert Osborn, *Islam Under the Arabs* (London, 1876).
—'Muhammadan Law: its Growth and Character (II)', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (June 1877), pp. 55-71.
—'Muhammadan Law: its Growth and Character (I)', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (May 1877), pp. 1092-111.
John Oxenford, 'The Brigands of Bulgarian Song', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 34 (August 1876), pp. 362-7.

—'The Bogies of Bulgarian Song', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 34 (October 1876), pp. 547-52.
[William Palgrave], 'The Revival of Turkey', *Quarterly Review*, 146 (October 1878), pp. 549-94.
Edward Palmer, 'Mohammed and Mohammedanism', *Quarterly Review*, 143 (January 1877), pp. 205-37.
William Palmer, *The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy of the British Churches Vindicated Against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman in the* Dublin Review (London, 1840).
—*A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East* (Oxford, 1846).
Andrew Archibald Paton, *Servia, the Youngest Member of the European Family* (London, 1845).
—*Highlands and Islands of the Adriatic* (2 vols., London, 1849).
—*Researches on the Danube and the Adriatic* (London, 1861).
Mark Pattison, 'Books and Critics', *Fortnightly Review*, 28 (November 1877), pp. 659-97.
Edwin Pears, *Life of Abdul Hamid* (London, 1917).
Stanislas Plater (trans.), *Lettres du Roi de Pologne Jean Sobieski à la Reine Marie Casimire, Pendant la Campagne de Vienne* (Paris, 1826).
George Playfair, 'A Month with the Turkish Army in the Balkans, by an Artillery Officer', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 37 (February 1878), pp. 286-98.
George Potter, 'Working Men and the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 28 (October 1876), pp. 851-65.
John Probyn, 'Phases of the Eastern Question', *British Quarterly Review*, 67 (April 1878), pp. 506-27.
E. B. Pusey, *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on Some Circumstances Connected with the Present Crisis in the English Church* (Oxford, 1842).
—'The Essential Unity of the Church of Christ', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 2 (London, 1866).
R. H. R., *Rambles in Istria, Dalmatia and Montenegro* (London, 1875).
William Ralston, 'The Progress of Reform in Russia', *British Quarterly Review*, 63 (April 1876), pp. 382-405.
—'Turkish Story Books', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (March 1877), pp. 23-36.
—'Russia', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), pp. 448-75.
Leopold Ranke, trans. Mrs Alexander Kerr, *The History of Servia and the Servian Revolution* (3rd ed., London, 1853).
Stratford de Redcliffe, 'Turkey, Part I, *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (June 1877), pp. 707-28.
—'Turkey, Part II', *Nineteenth Century*, 1 (July 1877), pp. 729-52.
—*The Eastern Question* (London, 1881).
[Henry Reeve], 'Bosnia and Bulgaria', *Edinburgh Review*, 144 (October 1876), pp. 536-72.
Report of Proceedings at the National Conference at St James's Hall, London, December 8th 1876 (London, 1876).
Cyprien Robert, *Les Slaves de Turquie* (2 vols., Paris, 1844).
Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (London, 1856).
[Frank Russel], 'The War in the East', *Quarterly Review*, 144 (July 1877), pp. 211-41.
William Howard Russell, *The Great War with Russia* (London, 1895).

Albert Rutson, 'Turkey in Europe', *Contemporary Review*, 26 (September 1876), pp. 275-306.
—'Reform in Turkey and Coercion', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (April 1877), pp. 476-505.
Humphry Sandwith, 'Servia and its New Prince', *Fortnightly Review*, 19 (March 1873), pp. 304-15.
—'A Trip into Bosnia', *Fraser's Magazine*, 88 (December 1873), pp. 698-713.
—'Servia', *British Quarterly Review* 63 (January 1876), pp. 100-121.
[—], 'The Independence and Integrity of the Ottoman Empire', *British Quarterly Review*, 64 (July 1876), pp. 79-88.
—'The Servian War', *British Quarterly Review*, 65 (January 1877), pp. 195-220.
—'The Greek Revolution', *British Quarterly Review*, 66 (October 1877), pp. 434-68.
—'How the Turks Rule in Armenia', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (February 1878), pp. 314-29.
—'Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Austria', *British Quarterly Review*, 68 (October 1878), pp. 393-414.
Archibald Sayce, *The Principles of Comparative Philology* (London, 1874).
[Sir William Smith], 'The Eastern Question and the Government', *Quarterly Review*, 142 (October 1876), pp. 544-86.
Goldwin Smith, 'The Slaveowner and the Turk', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (November 1877), pp. 1055-69.
—'England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey', *Contemporary Review*, 31 (February 1878), pp. 603-19.
—'Can Jews Be Patriots?', *Nineteenth Century*, 3 (May 1878), pp. 875-87.
—'The Eastern Crisis', *Fortnightly Review*, 29 (May 1878), pp. 647-61.
—*My Memory of Gladstone* (2nd ed., London, 1909).
—'A Word for Indignation Meetings', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (July 1878), pp. 88-101.
[Philip Smith], 'Mr. Wallace's *Russia*', *Quarterly Review*, 143 (April 1877), pp. 449-84.
Eugene Schuyler, *Memoir and Essays* (London, 1901).
F. Seebohm, 'Imperialism and Socialism', *Nineteenth Century*, 7 (1880).
G. J. Shaw-Lefevre, 'Greece at the Congress of Berlin', *Contemporary Review*, 30 (August 1878), pp. 271-83.
J. H. Skeene, *The Frontier Lands of the Christian and the Turk* (2 vols., London, 1853).
Reginald Bosworth Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* (London, 1874).
—'The Eastern Question: Turkey and Russia', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (December 1876), pp. 147-68.
Vialla de Sommières' *Voyage Historique et Politique au Monténégro* (Paris, 1820).
Edmund Spencer, *Travels in France and Germany in 1865 and 1866* (London, 1866).
A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (2nd ed., London, 1862).
Sir James Stansfeld, 'Mazzini on the Eastern Question', *Contemporary Review*, 27 (April 1877), pp. 559-79.
W. T. Stead, *The M.P. for Russia, Reminiscences & Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (2 vols., London, 1909).
Estelle Stead, *My Father* (London, 1913).
Leslie Stephen (ed.), *The Letters of John Richard Green* (London, 1901).
—*Some Early Impressions* (London, 1924).

W. R. W. Stephens (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (2 vols., London, Macmillan, 1895).
William Stillman, 'The Heart of Crete', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 22 (24 November 1870), pp. 49-61.
—*The Cretan Insurrection of 1876-8* (New York, 1874).
—'Montenegro's Importance' *Nation*, 22 (15 June 1876), pp. 380-1.
—*Herzegovina and the Late Uprising: The Causes of the Latter and the Remedies. From the Notes of a Special Correspondent* (London, 1877).
—*The Autobiography of a Journalist* (2 vols., London, 1901).
Viscount and Viscountess Strangford, *The Eastern Shores of the Adriatic* (London, 1864).
—*A Selection from the Writings of Viscount Strangford* (2 vols., London, 1869).
William Stubbs, 'The Apostolic Succession of the Church of England', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association* no. 1 (London, Eastern Church Association, 1866).
Talvj, *Volkslieder der Serben* (Leipzig, 1853).
Alfred Lord Tennyson, 'Montenegro', *The Nineteenth Century*, 1 (May 1877), p. 359.
Hallam Tennyson, *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir* (London, 1906).
H. Thompson (ed.), *Original Ballads by Living Authors* (London, 1850).
Tillman Trowbridge, 'The Americans in Turkey', *British Quarterly Review*, 67 (January 1878), pp. 28-59.
Henry Tozer, *Researches in the Highlands of Turkey* (2 vols., London, 1869).
—'Illyrian Letters', *The Academy*, 315 (18 May 1878), pp. 429-30.
The Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria, Letters of the Special Commissioner of the "Daily News" (London, 1876).
Abdolonyme Ubicini, *Les Serbes de Turquie: Études Historiques, Statistiques et Politiques sur la Principauté de Serbie, le Montenegro et les Pays Serbes Adjacents* (Paris, 1865).
David Urquhart, *England, France, Russia and Turkey* (London, 1834).
Frances Verney, 'Turkish Invasions of Europe in 1670-83: Sobieski's Letters to His Wife', *Contemporary Review*, 29 (March 1877), pp. 635-59.
—'Songs and Legends of Modern Greece', *Contemporary Review*, 27 (December 1875), pp. 96-113.
Julius Vogel, 'Cheap Telegrams', *The Nineteenth Century*, 2 (December 1877), pp. 783-95.
The War Correspondence of the "Daily News" (3rd ed., London, 1878).
W. G. Ward, *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered in Comparison with Existing Practice* (London, 1844).
George Williams, 'A Collection of Documents: Relating Chiefly to the Visit of Alexander Archbishop of Syros and Tenos to England in 1870', *Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association*, 14 (London, 1872).
W. F. Wingfield, *A Tour in Dalmatia, Albania, and Montenegro; with an Historical Sketch of the Republic of Ragusa* (London, 1859).
Christopher Wordsworth, *The Mohammedan Woe and its Passing Away, A Sermon* (London, 1876).
William Wordsworth, *Poems Dedicated to National Independence and Liberty* (London, 1897).

V. Printed Secondary

Lord Acton and A. W. Ward (eds.), *The Cambridge Modern History* (13 vols., Cambridge, 1902-12).

J. S. A. Adamson, 'S. R. Gardiner and the Liberal as Hero', *The Historical Journal*, 33 (September 1990), pp. 641-57.

John Allcock and Antonia Young, *Black Lambs and Grey Falcons: Women Travellers in the Balkans* (Bradford, 1991).

Dorothy Anderson, *Miss Irby and Her Friends* (London, 1966).

M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question: A Study in International Relations* (London, 1966).

Olive Anderson, 'The Political Uses of History in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 36 (1967), pp. 87–105.

Noel Annan, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy', in J. H. Plumb (ed.), *Studies in Social History* (London, 1955), pp. 241-87.

[Anon.], *One Hundred Years, Being the Short History of the Church Missionary Society* (London, 1899).

V. Askan, *Ottoman Wars 1700-1870: An Empire Besieged* (London, 2007).

Paul Auchterlonie, 'From the Eastern Question to the Death of General Gordon, 1876-1885', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 28 (2001), pp. 5-24.

F. Bailey, *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement 1826-53* (London, 1942).

Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe During the Long Nineteenth Century* (Leiden, 2012).

David Bebbington, 'Gladstone and Homer' in David Bebbington & Roger Swift (eds.), *Gladstone Centenary Essays* (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 57-74.

— *The Mind of Gladstone: Religion, Homer, and Politics* (Oxford, 2004).

Duncan Bell, *Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire* (Princeton, 2016).

—'Alter Orbis: E. A. Freeman on Empire and Racial Destiny', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 217-36.

Clinton Bennett, *Victorian Images of Islam* (London, 1992).

Michael Bentley (ed.), *Companion to Historiography* (London, 1997).

—'The Evolution and Dissemination of Historical Knowledge', in Martin Daunton (ed.), *The Organisation of Knowledge in Victorian Britain* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 173–97.

— *Modernizing England's Past: English Historiography in the Age of Modernism, 1870–1970* (Cambridge, 2006).

Naval Berber, *Unveiling Bosnia-Herzegovina in British Travel Literature* (Pisa, 2010).

R. F. Betts, 'The Allusion to Rome in British Imperialist Thought', *Victorian Studies*, 15 (December 1971), pp. 149-59.

M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review, 1855-1868* (New York, 1941).

E. G. W. Bill (ed.), *Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity* (London, Lambeth Palace, 1967).

Alexander Bitis, *Russia and the Eastern Question: Army, Government and Society 1815-33* (Oxford, 2006).

Jeremy Black, *The British and the Grand Tour* (London, 1985).

Paul Blackstock and Bert Hoselitz (eds.), *The Russian Menace to Europe: A Collection of Articles, Speeches, Letters, and News Dispatches* (London, 1953).

John W. Burrow, *Evolution and Society* (Cambridge, 1970).

—‘“The Village Community” and the Uses of History in late-Nineteenth Century England’ in Neil McKendrick (ed.) *Historical Perspectives* (London, 1974), pp. 255-84.
—*A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past* (Cambridge, 1981).
—‘Henry Maine and mid-Victorian Ideas of Progress’ in Alan Diamond (ed.), The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 55-69.
Henry Brandreth, ‘The Church of England and the Orthodox Churches in the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries’, in E. G. W. Bill (ed.) *Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity* (London, 1967), pp. 19-39 at p. 28.
Michael Brock, *The Great Reform Act* (London, 1973).
A. W. Brown, *The Metaphysical Society: Victorian Minds in Crisis* (New York, 1947).
Lucy Brown, *Victorian News and Newspapers* (Oxford, 1985).
Peter Cain, ‘Radicalism, Gladstone, and the Liberal Critique of Disraelian “Imperialism”’ in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 215-38.
John Campbell, *French Influence and the Rise of Romanian Nationalism* (New York, 1971).
David Cannadine, *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw their Empire* (London, 2001).
John Cannon *et al.* (eds.), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Historians* (Oxford, 1988).
Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations Since the Renaissance* (London, 1998).
Mark D. Chapman, *The Fantasy of Reunion: Anglicans, Catholics, and Ecumenism, 1833-1882* (Oxford, 2014).
G. W. Clarke (ed.), *Rediscovering Hellenism: The Hellenic Inheritance and the English Imagination* (Cambridge, 1981).
J. F. Coakley, *The Church of the East and the Church of England* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992).
Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford, 2006).
Stefan Collini, Donald Winch and John Burrow, *That Noble Science of Politics* (Cambridge, 1983).
Edward Cox, *A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel* (3 vols., Seattle, 1935-50).
A. I. Dasent, *John Delane 1817-1879* (London, 1908).
R. Davison, ‘Turkish Attitudes Concerning Christian-Muslim Equality in the Nineteenth Century’, *American Historical Review*, 59 (1953-4), pp. 844-64.
Massimiliano Demata, ‘Byron, Turkey and the Orient’ in Richard Cardwell (ed.), *The Reception of Byron in Europe* (2 vols., London, 2004), ii. 439–452.
Brian Dolan, *Ladies of the Grand Tour* (London, 2001).
Stephen L. Dyson, *The Last Amateur: The Life of William Stillman* (New York, 2014).
Alvar Ellegård, *The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Göteborg, 1957).
Todd Endelman and Tony Kushner (eds.), *Disraeli’s Jewishness* (London, 2002).
Joan Evans*, Time and Chance, the Story of Arthur Evans and His Forbears* (London, 1943).
Richard J. Evans, *Cosmopolitan Islanders: British Historians and the European Continent* (Cambridge, 2005).
George Feaver, *From Status to Contract: A Biography of Sir Henry Maine* (London, 1969).
Orlando Figes, *Crimea: The Last Crusade* (London, 2010).
H. A. L. Fisher, *James Bryce, Viscount Bryce of Dechmont* (2 vols., London, 1927).
F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Anglican Church Principles* (New York, 1924).

Duncan Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge, 1952).
Peter Ghosh, 'Whig Interpretation of History', in Kelly Boyd (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing* (2 vols., London, 1999).
— *An Historian Reads Max Weber* (Wiesbaden, 2008).
Felix Gilbert, *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Florence* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1965).
Viscount Gladstone, *After Thirty Years* (London, 1928).
J. H. Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Britain* (Cambridge Mass., 1950).
D. Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War* (London, 1995).
Doris S. Goldstein, 'The Professionalization of History in Britain in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,' *Storia della Storiografia*, 3 (1983), pp. 3-27.
— 'The Origins and Early Years of the *English Historical Review*', *English Historical Review*, 51 (January 1986), pp. 6-19.
Vesna Goldsworthy, 'The Balkans in Nineteenth-Century British Travel Writing' in Tim Youngs (ed.), *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2006), pp 19-36
—*Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination* (New Haven, 1998).
—'Tennyson and Montenegro', *Tennyson Research Bulletin*, 7.1 (November 1997), pp. 7-17.
E. F. Grogan, *Reginald Bosworth Smith: A Memoire* (London, 1909).
Omer Hadziselimovic, *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (Boulder, 2001).
C. A. Hagerman, *Britain's Imperial Muse: The Classics, Imperialism, and the Indian Empire, 1784-1914* (London, 2013).
Andrew Hammond, *British and American Representations of the Balkans* (Cardiff, 2007).
A. Hankinson, *Man of Wars: William Howard Russell of* 'The Times' (London, 1982).
Michael Herzfeld, *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece* (Austin, Texas, 1982).
Ian Hesketh, '"Diagnosing Froude's Disease": Boundary Work and the Discipline of History in Late Victorian Britain', *History and Theory*, 47 (2008), pp. 373-95.
Colin Holmes, 'Goldwin Smith (1823-1910): A Liberal Anti-Semite', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 6 (1972), pp. 25-30.
Walter E. Houghton, 'Periodical Literature and the Articulate Classes' in Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.) *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester, 1982), pp. 3-28.
—*The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900* (5 vols., Toronto, 1966-89).
R. W. Hunt, R. Barbour and J. J. G. Alexander, *Greek Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1966).
J. M. Hussey, *The Finlay Papers: A Catalogue* (London, 1973).
—'George Finlay in Perspective: A Centenary Reappraisal', *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 70 (1975), pp. 135-44.
—'Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer and George Finlay', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 4 (January 1978), pp. 79-87.
—(ed.), *The Journals and Letters of George Finlay* (2 vols., Camberley, 1995).
Gary Ianziti, *Writing History in Renaissance Italy: Leonardo Bruni and the Uses of the Past* (London, 2012).
Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing* (London, 2007).

K. Jankowsky, 'Friedrich Max Müller and the Development of Linguistic Science', *Historiographia Linguistica*, 6 (1979), pp. 339-59.
Rosemary Jann, 'From Amateur to Professional: The Case of the Oxbridge Historians,' *Journal of British Studies*, 22 (Spring 1983), pp. 122-147.
Richard Jenkyns, *The Victorians and Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1980).
H. L. Jephson, *The Platform: Its Rise and Progress* (2 vols., London, 1892).
Božidar Jezernik, *Wild Europe: The Balkans in the Gaze of Western Travellers* (London, 2004).
H. S. Jones, 'Historical-Mindedness and the World at Large: E. A. Freeman as Public Intellectual', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 293-310.
Alon Kadish, 'Scholarly Exclusiveness and the Foundation of the *English Historical Review*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 61 (1988), pp. 183–98.
E. E. Kellett, 'The Press' in G. M. Young (ed.), *Early Victorian England 1830-65* (2nd ed., 2 vols., Oxford, 1951).
William Kelley, 'Past Politics and Present History: E. A. Freeman and the Eastern Question', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 119-35.
Christopher Kent, 'Higher Journalism and the Mid-Victorian Clerisy', *Victorian Studies*, 13 (December 1969), pp. 181-98.
Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races* (Cambridge, 2006).
James Kirby, 'From Tractarian to Democrat: The Intellectual Formation of E. A. Freeman', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 31-45.
— *Historians and the Church of England: Religion and Historical Scholarship, 1870-1920* (Oxford, 2016).
Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain* (Cambridge, 2013).
Miloš Ković, *Disraeli and the Eastern Question* (Oxford, 2010).
Sinan Kuneralp (ed.), *The Cretan Uprising 1866-1869* (Istanbul, 2010).
M. Lamb, 'The Making of a Russophobe: David Urquhart—the Formative Years, 1825–1835', *International History Review*, 3 (1981), pp. 330–57.
—'Writing up the Eastern Question in 1835–6', *International History Review*, 15 (1993), pp. 239–68.
Nigel Leask, 'Byron and the Eastern Mediterranean: Childe Harold II and the "Polemic of Ottoman Greece"' in Drummond Bone (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Bryon* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 99–117.
Michael Ledger-Lomas, 'An Erastian Descent: History and Establishment in the Thought of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley and E. A. Freeman', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202, pp. 65-81.
Joan Leopold, 'British Applications of the Aryan Theory of Race to India, 1850-70', *English Historical Review*, 89 (July 1974), pp. 578-603.
Philippa Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838–1886* (Cambridge, 1986).
B. Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford, 2003).
Harry Liebersohn, 'Discovering Indigenous Nobility: Tocqueville, Chamisso, and Romantic Travel Writing', *American Historical Review*, 99 (June 1994), pp. 746-66.
Gabriele Lingelbach, 'The Institutionalization and Professionalization of History in Europe and the United States' in Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók (eds.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume Four, 1800-1945* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 78-96.
Leon Litvack, *J. M. Neale and the Quest for Sobornost* (Oxford, 1994).

Fiona MacCarthy, *William Morris* (London, 1994).
J. A. MacGillivray, *Minotaur: Sir Arthur Evans and the Archaeology of the Minoan Myth* (London, 2000).
E. D. Mackerness, 'Frances Parthenope, Lady Verney (1819-1890)', *The Journal of Modern History*, 30 (June 1958), pp. 131-6.
Scott Mandelbrote, 'English scholarship and the Greek Text of the Old Testament, 1620-1720: The Impact of the Codex Alexandrinus' in Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene (eds.), *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Surrey, 2006), pp. 74-93.
Peter Mandler, *History and National Life* (London, 2002).
Karuna Mantena, *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Ends of Liberal Imperialism* (Princeton, New Jersey, 2010).
Stefanie Markovits, *The Crimean War in the British Imagination* (Cambridge, 2013).
H. C. G. Matthew, *Gladstone 1809-1874* (Oxford, 1986).
—(ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries: 1861-68* (Oxford, 1986).
—(ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries: 1875-80* (Oxford, 1986).
— *Gladstone 1875-1898* (Oxford, 1995).
—'Gladstone, Vaticanism, and the Question of the East' in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History*, 15 (1978), pp. 417-42.
R. McNally, 'The Origins of Russophobia in France: 1812-1830', *American Slavic and East European Review*, 17:2 (April 1958), pp. 179-83.
Billie Melman, *The Culture of History* (Oxford, 2006).
Priscilla Metcalf, *James Knowles: Victorian Editor and Architect* (Oxford, 1980).
Richard Millman, *Britain and the Eastern Question 1875-78* (Oxford, 1979).
—'The Bulgarian Massacres Reconsidered', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 58 (April 1980), pp. 218-231.
George Milner, 'A Note on Two Sonnets by Milton and Tennyson', *Papers of the Manchester Literary Club*, 51 (1892), pp. 356-9.
Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995).
Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Two Types of Universal History: The Cases of E. A. Freeman and Max Weber', *Journal of Modern History*, 58 (March 1986), pp. 325-46.
J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Greek Revival* (London, 1972).
Stanley Morrison, *The History of* The Times*: 1841-1884 the Tradition Established* (London, 1935).
Vicky Morrisroe, 'Eastern History with Western eyes: E. A. Freeman, Islam and Orientalism', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 16 (2011), pp. 24-45.
—'"Sanguinary Amusement': E. A. Freeman, the Comparative Method and Victorian Theories of Race', *Modern Intellectual History*, 10 (April 2013), pp. 27-56.
Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (eds.), *Global Intellectual History* (New York, 2013).
Alexander Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1978).
J. L. Myres, 'Sir Arthur Evans', in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 26 (1942), pp. 323-57.
James G. Nelson, *The Sublime Puritan: Milton and the Victorians* (New Haven, Connecticut, 1975).
Christopher Parker, 'The Failure of Liberal Racialism: The Racial Ideas of E. A. Freeman', *Historical Journal*, 24 (December 1981), pp. 825-46.
— *The English Historical Tradition Since 1850* (Edinburgh, 1990).
Albert Peel, *Letters to a Victorian Editor: Henry Allon* (London, 1929).
Mark Salber Philips, *On Historical Distance* (New Haven, 2013).

J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1975).
—*Barbarism and Religion: The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon* (Cambridge, 2001).
Stéphanie Prévost, 'W. T. Stead and the Eastern Question', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* 16 (2013).
Richard Price, 'One Big Thing: Britain, Its Empire, and Their Imperial Culture', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (July 2004), pp. 602-27.
Marin V. Pundeff, 'Schuyler and MacGahan Before 1876' in his *Bulgaria in American Perspective* (New York, 1994), pp. 204-32.
Matthew Reynolds, *The Realms of Verse 1830-70: English Poetry in a Time of Nation-Building* (Oxford, 2005).
David Roessel, *In Byron's Shadow: Modern Greece in the British and American Imagination* (Oxford, 2002).
Barbara Rotundo (ed.), *Catalogue of the William James Stillman Collection* (Schenectady, 1974).
Ruth Rouse, Stephen Neill et al., *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva, World Council of Churches, 1993).
Steven Runciman, 'The Church of England and the Orthodox Churches in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in Bill (ed.) *Anglican Initiatives in Christian Unity* (London, 1967) at pp. 1-18.
— *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1985).
Geoffrey Rowell, 'Eastern Horizons: Anglicans and the Oriental Orthodox Churches', in Nigel Aston (ed.), *Religious Change in Europe, 1650–1914* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 381–97.
Reinhold Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama: British Travellers in Nineteenth-Century Turkey* (Amsterdam, 1999).
P. E. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church* (Oxford, 1929).
Tatiana Soloviova, 'Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue in the Nineteenth Century and Gladstone's Interest in the Reunion of Christendom', in Peter Francis (ed.), *The Gladstone Umbrella* (Hawarden, 2001), pp. 50–72.
Eric Stokes, *The English Utilitarians and India* (Oxford, 1959).
Michelle Tusan, *Smyrna's Ashes: Humanitarianism, Genocide and the Birth of the Middle East* (Berkeley, 2012).
Susan Walton, 'Charlotte M. Yonge and the "Historic Harem" of Edward Augustus Freeman', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 11 (2006), pp. 226-255.
R. W. Seton Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question* (London, 1935).
Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (2nd ed., Hamden, Conn., 1975).
—*Gladstone 1865-1898* (London, 1999).
Joanne Shattock and Michael Wolff (eds.) *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester, 1982).
Joanne Shattock, *Politics and Reviewers: The* Edinburgh *and the* Quarterly *in the Early Victorian Age* (London, 1989).
Colm Ó Siochrú, '"Edward Semper Augustus": E. A. Freeman on Rome, the Papacy, and the Unity of History', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (2015), pp. 47-63.
Peter Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education: The Study of Modern History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Manchester, 1840–1914* (Manchester, 1986).

William St Clair, *That Greece Might Still be Free: The Philhellenes in the Greek War of Independence* (Oxford, 1972).
Paul Stephenson, 'E. A. Freeman (1823-1892), A Neglected Commentator on Byzantium and Modern Greece', *The Historical Review*, 4 (2008), pp. 119-5.
Casper Sylvest, 'The Foundations of Victorian International Law' in Duncan Bell (ed.), *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 47-66.
—'Liberal Internationalism and the Uses of History' in his *British Liberal Internationalism, 1880-1930: Making Progress?* (Manchester, 2009), pp. 148-84.
George Carslake Thompson, *Public Opinion and the Eastern Question* (2 vols., London, 1886).
Jason Thompson, *Sir Gardner Wilkinson and His Circle* (Austin, Texas, 1992).
Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (2nd ed., Oxford, 2009).
Fani-Maria Tsigakou, *The Rediscovery of Greece: Travellers and Painters of the Romantic Era* (London, 1981).
Frank Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (London and New Haven, 1981).
Nicholas Tyacke, *Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997).
J. Don Vann and Rosemary T. Van Arsdel (eds.), *Victorian Periodicals: A Guide to Research* (2 vols., New York, 1978-89).
Franco Venturi, 'Oriental Despotism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *24 (January-March 1963), pp. 133-42.*
Dale Walker, *Januarius MacGahan: The Life and Campaigns of an American War Correspondent* (Ohio, 1988).
Anne D. Wallace, *Walking, Literature, and English Culture: The Origins and Uses of the Peripatetic in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1994).
William Whyte, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy Revisited', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 10 (2005), pp. 15-45.
G. M. Young, *Victorian England, Portrait of an Age* (London, 1936).
Tim Youngs, *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2006).
Werner von Zimmermann, *Valtazar Bogišić* (Wiesbaden, 1962).