


The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 4 (2007)

Vol 4, No (2007)



E. A. Freeman (1823-1892), a Neglected Commentator on Byzantium and Modern Greece

Paul Stephenson

doi: [10.12681/hr.211](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.211)

To cite this article:

Stephenson, P. (2008). E. A. Freeman (1823-1892), a Neglected Commentator on Byzantium and Modern Greece. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 4, 119–156. <https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.211>

E. A. FREEMAN (1823-1892),
A NEGLECTED COMMENTATOR ON BYZANTIUM AND MODERN GREECE

Paul Stephenson

ABSTRACT: E. A. Freeman, principally known as an historian of medieval Europe, is a neglected pioneer of Byzantine history. He was among the leading British commentators on the “Eastern Question”. His friendship with George Finlay, reflected in letters preserved at the British School at Athens, informed his analysis of Greece and South-East Europe. He travelled and lectured widely throughout his life, publishing prolifically and repetitiously. However, he never published an overview of Greek history, leaving unfinished manuscripts. His writings demonstrate his commitment to “universal history” and to contemporary racial theories. He considered the Greeks to be a superseded strain of the Aryan race, whose potency had been bequeathed to the Teutons, and more particularly to the English.

E. A. Freeman (1823-1892), from 1884 Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Oxford, is best known for his monumental *History of the Norman Conquest of England*.¹ However, his mature passion was “universal history” and his gaze was frequently turned on classical Greece, on Italy and the legacy of Rome; on the Germanic “Holy Roman Empire” and Byzantium, the

I am very grateful to: the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation for supporting my research in Athens; to the British School at Athens, notably the archivist Amalia Kakissis, for providing access to essential materials; and to the INR/NHRF, particularly the director Professor Paschalis Kitromilides, for offering me the opportunity to present my research to a learned audience.

¹ On Freeman’s life see at greatest length and eulogistically W. R. W. Stephens, *Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D.*, 2 Vols, London 1895. The Venerable William Stephens, Dean of Winchester Cathedral, evidently shared many of Freeman’s political views, and it is frequently difficult to discern where Stephens ends and Freeman begins. The most expansive obituary of Freeman is a “warts and all” piece by James [Viscount] Bryce, in *English Historical Review* 7 (July 1892), pp. 497-509, which includes the observation “Limitations in taste are not uncommon among eminent men. What was really uncommon in Freeman was the perfect frankness with which he avowed them.” The Bryce archive in the Bodleian Library has five volumes of material pertaining to Freeman (MSS. Bryce 5-9: Extent: 295, 269, 258 186, 375 leaves). For distinct mid-twentieth-century perspectives, see H. Cronne, “Edward Augustus Freeman, 1823-1892”, *History* 28 (1943), pp. 78-92; I. S. Zvavich, “Eduard Friman i formirovanie angliiskoi istoriografii”, *Izvestiia Akademii nauk SSSR. Serii istorii i filosofii* (= *Bulletin de l’Académie des sciences de l’Union des Républiques Soviétiques Socialistes. Série historique et philosophique*) 6 (1946), pp. 535-546.

Empire of the New Rome; and latterly on the presumptive heir of New Rome, Modern Greece, and its Slavic neighbours.² Freeman, whose papers are preserved in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester,³ was a pioneer of Byzantine history, and was among the leading British commentators on the Eastern Question.⁴

Throughout his life Freeman wrote for an educated public, meaning of course those educated like himself in the nation's ancient universities. His pieces appeared most frequently in the *Saturday Review* from 1856 to 1876, and from 1865 in both the *Fortnightly Review* and the *British Quarterly Review*.⁵ He wrote outside the academic milieu, having lost his fellowship at Trinity College, Oxford, following his marriage in 1847 to Miss Eleanor Gutch, and

² The best modern analysis of the full range of Freeman's historical writings is contained in J. W. Burrow, *A Liberal Descent: Victorian Historians and the English Past*, Cambridge 1981, pp. 155-228. Also useful are the published papers of a seminar convened in Pisa by A. Momigliano, "Seminario su Edward Augustus Freeman", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* III, 11, 2 (1981), pp. 309-361. Lacking in empathy is the brief account by J. Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England since the Renaissance*, 2nd edn, London 1993, pp. 159-164. On Freeman's contributions to Norman history, see the introduction by J. W. Burrow in the abridged E. A. Freeman, *History of the Norman Conquest of England*, Chicago 1974; M. E. Bratchel, *Edward Augustus Freeman and the Victorian Interpretation of the Norman Conquest*, Ilfracombe 1969; B. Wilkinson, "Freeman and the Crisis of 1051", *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 22/ii (1938), pp. 368-387.

³ See P. McNiven, "Handlist of the Papers of Edward Augustus Freeman in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester", *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 72/ii (1990), pp. 27-71. The papers, donated by Freeman's family and friends between 1902 and 1908, followed his library, which had been purchased at his death by Owens College, of the federal Victoria University of Manchester.

⁴ It is striking that Freeman features not at all in an excellent recent collection devoted to British contributors to Byzantine studies, R. Cormack and E. Jeffreys (eds), *Through the Looking Glass: Byzantium through British Eyes*, Aldershot 2000. On the Eastern Question and related matters are preserved, besides offprints of his published thoughts, 236 letters to Freeman (1/2/1-236), and 4 scrapbooks filled with cuttings, reviews and drafts (5/1/1-4). See McNiven, "Handlist", pp. 32-33, 62.

⁵ Several revised articles from the *Saturday Review* are collected in E. A. Freeman, *Historical Essays*, 3rd series, London 1879; 2nd edn, 1892. The *Fortnightly Review* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1865-1931; Horace Marshall, 1931-1954) was first published in May 1865. Freeman's first contribution was to the second volume, a paper entitled "The Proposed Revision of the Swiss Federal Constitution", *Fortnightly Review* 2 (15 August - 1 November 1865), pp. 533-548. Fifty-two of Freeman's letters (1871-1883) to Henry Allon (1818-1892), from 1865 an editor of *British Quarterly Review*, are preserved at Dr Williams's Library, London.




Fig. 1. E. A. Freeman in his last decade. Source: Amanda Capern, "Anatomy of a Friendship: E. A. Freeman and Edith Thompson" (see note 31).

having failed to secure a chair at Oxford despite two attempts in the 1860s. In the early years of his marriage his private income allowed him to travel widely in Britain, to indulge his passion for ecclesiastical architecture, and his talent for sketching led him to a close study of the material remains of England's medieval past. From 1856 he began to travel abroad, returning to write up his experiences, from 1860, at Somerleaze, his home near Wells in Somerset.

Freeman's attention was drawn early to the Byzantine Empire, largely as a response to the work of George Finlay.⁶ In a lengthy review of Finlay's four published volumes of 1844, 1851 and 1854, Freeman condemns those who write

⁶ See J. Hussey, *The Journals and Letters of George Finlay*, 2 Vols, Camberley 1995, Vol. I, p. xv. Only one letter from Freeman to Finlay has been preserved among Finlay's papers at the British School at Athens. There are also copies or drafts of four letters from Finlay to Freeman, and several references to Freeman and his works elsewhere. See the appendix.

with ignorance and prejudice about what they call the “Lower Empire”, and considers this “the more inexcusable...since the publication of this great work”.⁷

This [ignorance] is all the notice that statesmen can afford to that power which was for ages the only regular, systematic government in the world; this is all the attention due to the legislation of Justinian, of Leo, and of Basil, which gave to so large a portion of the human race the then unique blessing of a regular administration of justice, and of a civil, although despotic, order.⁸

By Freeman’s estimation, “for deep and original research, for a comprehensive grasp of his subject, and above all for a bold and independent spirit of inquiry, he [Finlay] may take his place among the very greatest historical writers of our time.”⁹ However, Freeman concluded that Finlay’s works would likely not prove popular with a general readership, who would stick with their copies of Gibbon, or even Grote.

A copy of Freeman’s review was despatched to Finlay, who pasted it into a folio scrapbook bound between mottled brown covers, now volume E.1

⁷ E. A. Freeman, “Finlay on the Byzantine Empire”, *North British Review* 44 (February 1855), pp. 343-75, here p. 344. A review of G. Finlay, *Greece under the Romans: A Historical View of the Condition of the Greek Nation, from the Time of its Conquest by the Romans, until the Extinction of the Roman Empire in the East, BC 146 - AD 717*, Edinburgh and London 1844; *id.*, *The History of Greece, from its Conquest by the Crusaders, to its Conquest by the Turks, and of the Empire of Trebizond, 1204-1461*, Edinburgh and London 1851; *id.*, *History of the Byzantine and Greek Empires, from 716 to 1453*, 2 Vols, Edinburgh and London 1854.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 345, which continues: “The military student...would blush to devote any spare moments to the obscure exploits of Belisarius and Heraclius, of Nicephorus and Zimisce, and Basil the Slayer of the Bulgarians.” On p. 351, Freeman finds in this ignorance the reason for the division of historical studies at the University of Oxford: “It will not do to say, that ‘ancient’ history ended, and ‘modern’ history began, in 476, when, for nearly a thousand years later, the whole system of Roman and Greek civilisation continued to flourish in what was, for three-fourths of that time, the most wealthy and populous portion of Europe.”

⁹ Freeman, “Finlay on the Byzantine Empire”, pp. 353-354, which further notes that in the writing of later Greek history competition at the time was not fierce, with Sir James Emerson Tennent, in *The History of Modern Greece, from its Conquest by the Romans, BC 186, to the Present Time*, Vol. I, p. 56, claiming that the “final overthrow” of the Bulgarians was accomplished by “Baldwin II in AD 979”: “Imagine the Slayer of the Bulgarians confounded either with the Flemish captive of Joannice, or else with the imperial mendicant whom the first Palaeologus expelled from the throne of Constantinople.” See also G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, London 1913, p. 455, who records Freeman’s judgement.

preserved among Finlay's papers in the archive at the British School at Athens.¹⁰ Freeman and Finlay subsequently developed a correspondence and then a friendship that endured until Finlay's death in 1875, although but a few of the many letters they exchanged have survived.¹¹ In 1856 Freeman published six lectures on *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*, with a dedication "To George Finlay, LL.D., K.R.G., the historian of Constantinople and Mediaeval Greece, this record of the rival empire is inscribed with feelings of gratitude and admiration."¹² They exchanged ideas, papers and cuttings of published articles, many of which are preserved among Finlay's papers. However, like all of Finlay's friendships and many of Freeman's, theirs was not free of spats. In August 1864 Freeman inserted two of Finlay's private letters without his permission into the London *Daily News*. They were subsequently reprinted in *Galignani's Messenger*, an English-language newspaper published daily in

¹⁰ Finlay Papers: E.1, p. 75. Finlay asked his publisher to send him all reviews of his books (especially bad ones), and the offprint surely was one of these. It perhaps was not sent from Freeman directly, as the first page bears the name "Edward A. Freeman" printed in ink beneath the printed details of the book under review. The handwriting does not closely resemble Freeman's. Moreover, one imagines that Freeman would have signed rather than printed his name, and added a note. However, it is possible that Freeman was the donor, and included a letter, now lost, with the offprint, and a second paper by him which is also pasted into Finlay's scrapbook (E.1, p. 73), being a review of books on Greek history by B. G. Niebuhr and C. Thirlwall, also from the *North British Review* 42 (August 1854), pp. 425-450. See J. Hussey, *The Finlay Papers: A Catalogue*, Oxford and Athens 1973, pp. 129-131.

¹¹ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. I, p. vi, states that 54 letters from Finlay to Freeman were available to him, but gives no indication of where they were held. These are now among the 58 letters exchanged by the men held at the John Rylands Library (1/2/55-111, 1/3/9), for which see McNiven, "Handlist", pp. 32-33, 67. Unfortunately, and remarkably, there are no letters from Freeman to Finlay preserved in the archive as copies or drafts. I have yet to consult Freeman's scrapbooks pertaining to the Eastern Question (5/1/1-5), in which such material may be found. For now, one might observe that the only extant letter from Freeman to Finlay is preserved at the British School at Athens.

¹² E. A. Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens: Six Lectures before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution*, London 1856. A transcription of the dedication in Finlay's own hand is preserved among his papers in folder A.16 (24). This loosely-bound exercise book, without cover or boards, is entitled "Extracts Letters and Documents relative to the Writings of George Finlay". A former title, part of which is scored out quite effectively and the rest incorporated into the current title, appears to have been "A Record consisting of Extracts Letters and Documents relative to the Life and Writings of George Finlay". It contains a transcription of the notorious note from *The Times* recording Finlay's "death" in April 1828, and also of a letter to his mother from Finlay's half-brother offering condolences. See Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, pp. 33-34.

Paris. Finlay thought a header, written by the editors of the *Daily News* but which he mistook as a note by Freeman, revealed his identity, and thus his true sentiments about Greek politics and politicians, which he attempted to hide in his public letters to *The Times*.¹³ Freeman, in reply to Finlay's reproach, asked forgiveness but did not regret his action:

I thought that the letters contained information which I ought not to keep to myself, and that, if they were to do any good, it would not do to wait till I could write to you and hear again. I hope I did not judge wrongly, but I am afraid from your letter that I may have done otherwise. That is, that I may have caused you some personal annoyance, for I cannot but think that the public result must be good.¹⁴

Freeman clearly understood and appreciated Finlay's peculiar brand of philhellenism, and in the *Saturday Review*, 19 September 1868, he wrote anonymously of his friend:

It is his special gift, and his special delight, to show up the weak side of all parties. Accidentally he shows up the weak side of the Greeks more than that of any other people. But that is simply because he lives among

¹³ Finlay was concurrently writing public letters at the request of General Eber (Finlay Papers, E.24, p. 173), who had been the special correspondent for *The Times* in Athens, which he sent to the newspaper's manager Mowbray Morris at Printing House Square, London, EC, for possible publication in *The Times* at a fee of five guineas each. He had been paid £31 and 10 shillings (= six guineas) by 16 September (E.24, p. 311), so had had six letters published by the end of August. His fifth letter (E.24, pp. 221-235) on "The New Constitution of Greece", dated 16 June 1864, was not published. It was later agreed that he be paid two and a half guineas for those letters submitted but not published, of which 24 remain in the archive (W. Miller, "George Finlay as a Journalist", *English Historical Review* 39 (1924), pp. 552-567). Finlay's seventh letter (E.24, pp. 257-269) was published early in August. It was entitled "Demonstration on the Arrival of Ionian Deputies. Attack on Turkish and English Ministers [in Greek Newspapers]. Re-election of Deligeorges – Brigandage", dated 28 July 1864, and is prefaced in his personal bound volume with the following note: "It strikes me that my public letters require some private commentary in order to give a more complete view of the mode of thinking & talking in society at Athens. It would not do to say much about the kings position & performances in a public letter as little could be said which would be both good and true."

¹⁴ E. A. Freeman to G. Finlay, 25 September 1864, Finlay Papers: B6 (120). See Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 84. The letter is transcribed in full by Hussey, *Journals and Letters*, Vol. II, pp. 818-820. A later extant letter from Finlay to Freeman, dated 16 March 1865 (Finlay Papers E.25, p. 57 ff.) reveals that Finlay had been somewhat ostracised as a consequence of Freeman's actions: "You remember perhaps that the publication of the unlucky letters was very ill received at court. The policy of King Otho was attempted & it was decided that no courtier was to know that there was a person named Finlay in Greece."

the Greeks...Other people...are by no means let off. But those who can look below the surface can easily see that he is not at heart an enemy of Greece or of the Greek people...The people among who he lives are...to him as a son whom he loves, and towards whom he therefore never spares the rod.¹⁵

Freeman relied heavily on Finlay for firsthand information on affairs in Greece and South-East Europe. In the unapologetic letter of apology of September 1864, cited above, he concluded “I should much like to know something of what has really happened in *МплдпвлбчЯб*. I don’t believe a soul in England understands a word about anything of the kind, except Lord Strangford, who is first in England.”¹⁶ Immediately before that he alluded to other shared interests:

I have just finished an article on Palgraves [sic] two posthumous (*for Saturday [Review]*) volumes.¹⁷ I had so much to say about England that I could barely glance at the Chapter which most concerns you, that on the First Crusade. I cannot bring myself to look on the Crusades generally as just a scheme for dividing the Byzantine Empire, tho’ doubtless a few crafty fellows like Bohemond may well have had such ideas. But I have not gone at all into contemporary literature of the Crusades, so perhaps I ought not to speak. I wish I knew more about the English in the Imperial service. If they kept up their language so long as is generally said, how was the race kept up. You have them in 1204. Had there been new Englishmen come over or were they descendants of the first lot? And how far and how long did they keep themselves distinct from the Greeks?

In the final paragraphs of this single letter, therefore, Freeman’s three abiding interests under the rubric of “universal history” are revealed: medieval history, primarily that of England; contemporary racial theories; and current affairs, notably the Eastern Question. Although the study of Byzantium would appear to fit most easily into the first of these categories, Freeman considered it essential to all three.

The first category, the political history of the medieval Byzantine Empire is most easily dispensed with. Freeman proceeded to develop his ideas, already

¹⁵ [E. A. Freeman], “The *Times* and its Athens Correspondent”, *Saturday Review* (19 September 1868), pp. 388-389; cited by Miller, “Finlay as a Journalist”, p. 555.

¹⁶ Finlay Papers, B6 (120), p. 6; Hussey, *Journals and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 820.

¹⁷ F. Palgrave, *The History of Normandy and of England*, 4 Vols, London 1851-64, the last two volumes of which were published in 1864. The insertion *for Saturday* is barely legible, but one finds the anonymous review, “Palgrave’s Normandy and England”, in *Saturday Review* (16 July 1864), pp. 89-90.

sketched in 1855 in the review of Finlay's volumes, with a paper on "The Roman Empire in the East" in 1873, and a second paper published in the *Saturday Review* in November 1876.¹⁸ These two pieces were pasted together and thoroughly revised for the composite essay entitled "The Byzantine Empire", published in his 1879 collection of *Historical Essays*.¹⁹ A thorough understanding of the political and institutional history of the Byzantine Empire was, Freeman held, essential to the understanding of European historical development. Freeman was ever in search of historical coherence and continuity through political institutions, and Byzantium was the political and institutional heir of Rome. In his *Outlines of History*, "The Roman Empire in the East" gives way to chapters on the medieval and modern histories of the Great Powers, France, Russia, Germany and Italy. England, of course, he treated elsewhere at extraordinary length. Freeman's lectures to the Royal Institution early in 1873 were devoted to comparative politics, or more particularly to demonstrating that "Greeks, Italians and Teutons", among the last of which he numbered the English, "have a large common stock of institutions".

Modern Greece was also an heir of the ancients, of course, although of a different order to the Teutons. In his Rede Lecture, "The Unity of History", Freeman acknowledged the peculiarly Hellenic character of Christianity and, more especially, the Greek language.

The traditions of Greece and Rome, the conquests of Macedonian warriors and of Christian Apostles, all came together when the throne and the name of Rome were transferred to a Greek-speaking city...There went on that long dominion of the laws of Rome, but of the speech, the learning and the arts of Greece...The Empire of Greece has passed away, but her changeless Church remains, the Church which still speaks the tongue of Paul and of Chrysostom, the Church which still sends up the prayers in the words of liturgies of the earliest days...And now again the Hellén, disguised for ages under the Roman name, has once more stood forth as a nation, a nation artificial indeed as regards blood, but a nation well defined by its Greek speech and its Greek religion.²⁰

¹⁸ E. A. Freeman, "The Roman Empire in the East", *Outlines of History*, London and New York 1873.

¹⁹ Freeman, *Historical Essays*, 3rd series, pp. 235-82.

²⁰ E. A. Freeman, "The Unity of History", in *Comparative Politics: Six Lectures Read before the Royal Institution in January and February, 1873, with The Unity of History: The Rede Lecture Read before the University of Cambridge, May 29, 1872*, London and New York 1874, pp. 296-339, here pp. 319-20. In his own Rede Lecture, 28 years later, Frederic Harrison was struck by Freeman's testimony: F. Harrison, *Byzantine History in the Early*

Freeman had generally discounted religion as a means to understand historical societies, and saw this as the cardinal flaw in recent works by Foustel de Coulanges.²¹ However, he wished to highlight a difference between societies which were free to develop by assimilation, such as England and France, and those held in states of suspension, which might therefore be distinguished by adherence to particular religions and languages. In the language of the day, however, he wrote not of societies, but of “races”. While it would be odd, he observed, to find various “races” living together in modern Britain or France, Thracians, Greeks and Illyrians have survived as Romanians, Greeks and Albanians, the latter two retaining their pre-Roman languages. Add to this the various Slavs, who had equally resisted assimilation by the Turks, “the Servian” being the purest, as the Bulgarians assimilated their “Finnish overlords”, and the Russians took the name of their Scandinavian lords, and one had a mosaic unseen in the West. The Ottoman Turks he held responsible for this unnatural condition of the peoples of South-East Europe.²²

Freeman was throughout his life a pious Christian, and this certainly informed his distaste for Muslims, to whom he referred mockingly as infidels, as well as his casual anti-Semitism.²³ His sensibilities were offended by Ottoman political calculation, which permitted acts of great cruelty in suppressing popular unrest, and by which he identified an absence of morality within Islam.²⁴ But it is clear that Freeman’s motivating creed was not religious

Middle Ages: The Rede Lecture Delivered in the Senate House, Cambridge, June 12, 1900, London and New York 1900, p. 5: “In one of the most suggestive of his essays, Professor Freeman calls the Roman Empire on the Bosphorus ‘the surest witness to the unity of history’.” Here Harrison is quoting from Freeman, “The Byzantine Empire”, p. 241.

²¹ Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, pp. iii, vi-viii: “Since these lectures were written I have fallen in with the work of M. de Coulanges called *La Cité antique*...But the book, notwithstanding its general title, is almost wholly confined to Greek and Roman matters, and deals hardly at all with the kindred Teutonic institutions. Nor can I at all pledge myself to the author’s views on all matters, as he seems too anxious to account for everything by reference to single principle, that of religion.”

²² For Freeman’s thoughts, see “Race and Language” in his *Historical Essays*, 4th series, London and New York 1892, pp. 176-234, revising ideas presented in the *Contemporary Review* (February 1877) and *Fortnightly Review* (January 1877), with as an appendix a revision of “The Jews in Europe”, *Saturday Review* (10 February 1877), pp. 161-162.

²³ The latter is illustrated in his treatment of Lord Beaconsfield, whom he calls in private correspondence “The Jew”. See Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 126.

²⁴ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 121, opines: “Freeman brought every question to the touchstone of morals. He did not ask in the first instance whether any proposed course of action was likely to promote British interests and power, but whether it was

intolerance, but rather, as Momigliano showed quite devastatingly, racism. Freeman embraced contemporary racial theories, espousing a theory of universal history which placed at the fore the Aryan race.²⁵ He loathed the Turks as inferior to the Aryan race which had led European society in its “three most illustrious branches of the common stock – the Greek, Roman and Teuton...who went before our own race in holding first place among the nations on the earth”.²⁶ Of course, such sentiments were ubiquitous in nineteenth-century Britain, and sat not at all uncomfortably with Freeman’s liberalism. He served for decades as a magistrate in his county of Somerset, considered standing for parliament as a candidate of the Liberal Party in 1859, and did so unsuccessfully in 1868. He was a correspondent of Gladstone for four decades and owed his appointment to the Regius Chair to Gladstone’s own elevation to Prime Minister.²⁷

A commitment to national self-determination and autonomy, informed by his understanding of medieval history, which was entirely political and institutional, made Freeman vocal and passionate in his support for Greek irredentism. This was mirrored in his equally vocal and passionate support for Irish Home Rule.²⁸ Freeman wished to see British policy on the Eastern Question changed to embrace and support Russian efforts to destabilise or dissolve the Ottoman Empire. He staked out his position as early as the outbreak of the Crimean War and stuck to it at considerable financial and

honourable, straightforward and just. It was his zeal for righteousness which inspired him with detestation of the Turks, not only on account of the cruelty and repression of their rule, but also on account of the nameless vices to which they were addicted.”

²⁵ A. Momigliano, “Two Types of Universal History: The Cases of E. A. Freeman and Max Weber”, *Journal of Modern History* 58 (1986), pp. 235-245, here p. 240: “I chose Freeman as the case to oppose to Max Weber because he is a good example of the situation in which universal historians found themselves when they accepted power struggles as the most important feature of history and, furthermore, treated them as being brought about by the coexistence of incompatible racial groups.”

²⁶ Freeman, “Unity of History”, quoted by Momigliano, “Two Types of Universal History”, p. 238. See also Bryce, p. 502: “By far the strongest political interest – indeed it rose to a passion – in his later years was his hatred of the Turk.” See also Momigliano, “Seminario”, pp. 318-321, on Freeman’s search for the unity not of man, but of the Aryan race of man. See also Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, pp. 188-192.

²⁷ Freeman’s letters to Gladstone are deposited in the British Library (additional manuscripts, 44086-44835). See *British Museum Catalogue of Additions to Manuscripts: The Gladstone Papers*, London 1953, p. 159, which lists correspondence between 1854 and 1890, as well as “[Freeman], verses in memory of, 1892”.

²⁸ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, pp. 291-294.

professional costs. When the *Saturday Review* favoured Lord Beaconsfield's support for the Sultan in 1876, Freeman resigned from the paper, losing his annual stipend of 600 pounds, but also his most valuable forum. Henceforth, according to Stephens, "Freeman, by his letters in the public press, more especially the *Manchester Express* and the *Manchester Guardian*, drew vivid pictures of the unhappy condition of these distressed people [the Greeks], and maintained that 'the eternal Eastern Question' must continue to be eternal until the rule of the Turk over Christian nations was abolished."²⁹

Freeman's preferred solution to the Eastern Question was the formation of a Balkan federation. He addressed numerous public meetings, including a gathering in St James' Hall, London, on 9 December 1876, to demand British support for Russian campaigns. Refuting claims that the presence of a Russian warship in the Mediterranean would spell the end for Britain's empire, nevertheless he insisted "Let it be so, let duty come first and interest second, and perish the interests of England, perish our dominion in India, rather than we should speak one word on behalf of the wrong against the right."³⁰ The final speaker to take the rostrum that evening was Gladstone. In writing shortly afterwards, on 24 December, to Edith Thompson, his regular correspondent and sometime research assistant, Freeman noted "I have sent you my Manchester speech; of the full report of the Conference they have sent me only one; so you may spend a shilling in buying what Gladstone and I really said. How the Jews, Turks and Tories do lie!"³¹ To the Reverend T. G. Bonney, he wrote six days later, "I see you are a helper in the cause; so I send you my speech at Manchester, which the Turks there did not like at all."³² Besides his public speeches, Freeman

²⁹ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 119, which continues: "By those who were opposed to Freeman's views on this question, he was denounced as an 'itinerant demagogue', and 'agitator', 'an hysterical screamer', 'a philanthropic enthusiast', 'a sentimental, unpractical politician', and the like." Freeman defended himself and others against such charges in his "Sentimental and Practical Politics", *Princeton Review* (1877), i, pp. 311-344.

³⁰ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 113.

³¹ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 144. The papers of Edith Thompson (*d.* 1929), including 186 letters and 3 postcards from Freeman, were deposited in the Hull University archives in 1934. They are catalogued as DX/9 and have been examined by Amanda Capern, "Anatomy of a Friendship: E. A. Freeman and Edith Thompson", *Paragon Review* 6 (1997), <http://www.hull.ac.uk/oldlib/archives/paragon/1997/anatomy.html>. Thompson, at Freeman's urging, produced a *History of England* for the Macmillan *Historical Course for School*, which outsold any of Freeman's own publications. In 1886 she contributed anonymously, as was her practice, to the first fascicle of a journal Freeman had co-founded: the *English Historical Review*.

³² Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 145.

wrote copiously both privately and publicly on these matters. According to Stephens, “[Freeman’s] letters...show how deeply he was absorbed by the troubles of south-eastern Europe, and how hard he worked in the cause which he believed to be that of humanity and justice...He wrote sometimes as many as seventeen or eighteen letters a day in addition to his other work.” Stephens also lists fourteen pertinent articles that Freeman published between December 1875 and May 1882, the greatest number in the *Contemporary Review*.³³ His fullest, but far from final, disquisition was his book *The Ottoman Power in Europe* (London 1877), which at over 300 pages was a rather rapid expansion of his 61-page pamphlet for the “Popular Library for the People”, entitled *The Turks in Europe* (London 1877). This is inscribed with his new title, Knight Commander of the Greek Order of the Saviour and of the Servian Order of Takova. The former honour had been bestowed with, apparently, no prior announcement or ceremony, in the early months of 1875. On 19 July 1875 he wrote to Prime Minister Harilaos Trikoupis, in Athens, to express his surprise, pleasure and gratitude, “that the highest honour I have ever received from any quarter should come from Greece”. At this time he had still never visited Greece, but warned Trikoupis that he would now do his very best to remedy that, which he did in 1877, two years after the death of his friend Finlay.³⁴

Freeman’s political and ideological support for those throwing off the “Ottoman yoke” was, therefore, only latterly informed by personal experience. Freeman travelled throughout South-East Europe in the 1870s, was present in Dalmatia when refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina flooded into Ragusa (Dubrovnik), provoking him to write letters to countless friends wringing donations from them.³⁵ According to Bryce, while travelling in Greece in 1877,

³³ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, pp. 124-125. In the same period Freeman’s academic works included: numerous papers, collected in his *Historical Essays*, 3rd and 4th series; parts of the third edition of his *Norman Conquest*; an abbreviation of his earlier *Outlines of History* to be published for an American audience as a short primer on the *History of Europe*, New York 1879; an article on “England” for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, being the history of the nation to 1603 (about which a letter to Edith Thompson reveals that the last 500 years were written entirely in August 1877); his two volumes on *The Historical Geography of Europe*, London 1881, which appeared in a second edition the following year; an *Introduction to American Institutional History*, Baltimore 1882, admittedly only a 39-page introduction; and his two-volume *History of the Reign of William Rufus*, London 1882. Bryce, p. 507, notes that Freeman kept three separate desks in his working rooms on which were placed the books for separate projects, and between which he would circulate for assigned periods each day.

³⁴ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 92.

³⁵ See Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 127, where in a letter Freeman mentions his first trips *in partibus infidelium*.

although “French was the only [foreign] language he could speak with ease...[Freeman] made some vigorous speeches to the people in their own tongue”.³⁶ A glance at one of his occasional bilingual compositions to his young daughter, Margaret, from 1857, suggests that at that time he well remembered his ancient Greek composition classes from school, and he certainly read modern Greek.³⁷ However, his preference for ancient over modern is demonstrated in frequent interpolations in his letters, and is made plain in a letter to Edith Thompson dated 29 July 1877. “By the way,” he asked, “why did you doubt my power of making a Greek speech. That is easy enough with a little time to think it over. (N.B. In my speech to the Professors [a paraphrase of Demosthenes] was considered a great hit.) What is hard is to talk common chatter – Margaret [his now adult daughter] got on better with *κερό, φυμί* and *κρᾶσί* than I did.”³⁸ Subsequently, in 1878, he shared at length his “First Impressions of Athens” with the readers of the *International Review*.³⁹

Freeman also took his views to audiences in the United States, arguing to a most receptive audience in favour of a “national morality” that placed human rights over national interests. His first major American article was published in an 1878 fascicle of the *Princeton Review*, then a vigorous publication.⁴⁰ Of the 1877 war between Russia and Turkey, Freeman had no doubt of which nation had acted with honour:

³⁶ Bryce, p. 498.

³⁷ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. I, between pp. 166 and 167.

³⁸ Stephens, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 154.

³⁹ Freeman, *Historical Essays*, 3rd series, pp. 278-302.

⁴⁰ “National Morality”, *Princeton Review* (1878), ii, pp. 641-672, in which particular scorn is poured on concerns for “national *prestige*” (his italics) over “honour”, on Englishmen who fought for the Turks in the war of 1876-1878, and on the British press and parliamentarians that placed narrow interests above morality, without which patriotism “England might have won to herself the attachment of all the nations of Southeastern Europe”. In origin a Presbyterian theological journal, recent contributions to the *Princeton Review* included: G. W. Leyburn, “The Modern Greeks, and Opinions Concerning Them”, *Princeton Review* (1874), iii, pp. 143-165, which argued against the “stereotyped language of disparagement used against [modern Greeks] in English and American periodicals, if not Continental periodicals”; E. D. G. Prime, “Civil and Religious Liberty in Turkey”, *Princeton Review* (1875), iv, pp. 608-628, which was exceptional in wishing to draw attention to advances in religious freedoms under recent sultans, but did so to warn against recent recidivism; E. Riggs, “The Decay of the Turkish Empire”, *Princeton Review* (1876), v, pp. 496-512, written by a Christian missionary in Sivas, Turkey, which advanced views on the Turks’ backwardness and moral corruption with which Freeman concurred; and D. S. Gregory, “The Eastern Problem”, *Princeton Review* (1878), i, pp. 49-98, which cited Freeman approvingly in a historical geographical survey.

It was on the part of Russia either a frightful national crime or else an act of almost unparalleled national virtue. It can be justified on one ground, and on one ground only. If the Christian nations of Southeastern Europe were ground down under the cruel bondage of alien taskmasters, if they had no power to help themselves, if the other nations of Christian Europe refused to help them, if the wrong had risen to such a pitch as to be utterly intolerable, if it was such that any nation which had the power was justified in stepping in to redress it, while Russia, specially bound to the sufferers by ties of race and creed, was called to step in before all other powers – if the war was entered into on such grounds as these – and on the part of the Russian people it undoubtedly was entered into on such grounds – then no war that ever was waged was more truly honourable, because none was ever waged in a purer and more righteous cause...The Russian, in short, fought that he might save his brethren from the foul and bloody passions of the Turk.⁴¹

This article Freeman followed with papers on “Sentimental and Practical Politics” and “The Fulfillment of the Berlin Treaty”, both devoted to South-East Europe.⁴² In 1881-1882 Freeman travelled through the eastern United States, lecturing to university and general audiences in Boston, Baltimore, Ithaca, New Haven, New York and Philadelphia, as well as St Louis. The published lectures show that his main focus was “The English People in its Three Homes”, but he could not resist adding a long tract on “Rome Transplanted”, that is, Byzantium. He asked his audience to travel with him from England to “those further lands of Europe where, in these days of progress, Europe is still in bondage to Asia, the civilized man in bondage to the barbarian, the follower of Christ to the follower of Mahomet, and where the powers of Europe still love to have it so”.⁴³ Here Freeman expressed most bluntly his familiar refrain that medieval and modern must be read together, most especially in the Balkans, for “there is no part in which history is more truly past politics, and politics more truly present history”.⁴⁴ The *provocateur* of his ire on this occasion was not the Turk, but the Austrian emperor, “Francis Joseph [who] now reigns in Crivoscia as Xerxes once reigned in Athens. May

⁴¹ Freeman, “National Morality”, pp. 653-654.

⁴² To these must be added two revised editions of six lectures he had delivered in 1855, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*, 2nd edn, London 1876; 3rd edn, London 1877.

⁴³ E. A. Freeman, “Rome Transplanted”, *Lectures to American Audiences*, Philadelphia 1882, pp. 400-455, here p. 401.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 402. Bryce, p. 499, attests to the ubiquity of this refrain in Freeman’s conversation as well as his writing. See also Burrow, *A Liberal Descent*, p. 165.



Fig. 2. E. A. Freeman in his study at Oriel College, Oxford, November 1891.

Source: Capern, *op. cit.*

the possession of the one despot be as short-lived as that of the other.”⁴⁵ However, the larger part of the lecture was devoted to a condemnation of the “interests of Turkey”, employing Freeman’s regular qualification that he refused to use the term “Turkey...[in place of] enslaved Greece, enslaved Bulgaria, and the rest”.⁴⁶

Gladstone, whose task it would be upon ascending in April 1880 to the position of Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to reconsider and implement conditions of the Treaty of Berlin, was naturally predisposed to Freeman’s point of view. In 1884, when the Regius Chair in Modern History at Oxford fell vacant, Gladstone saw that Freeman filled it. Freeman would later complain heartily of his return to Oxford, where dining at Oriel and the need to lecture to ever-diminishing crowds of students undermined his productivity. In this first year he delivered his six lectures on “The Chief Periods of European History”, drawing heavily on his earlier outlines and surveys, as well as recent

⁴⁵ Freeman, *Lectures to American Audiences*, p. v.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

public lectures.⁴⁷ His thought at the time was taken up with close studies of Gregory of Tours, Paul the Deacon, and “the history of the teutonic nations in Gaul”.⁴⁸ Freeman never came, therefore, to offer a full outline history of Greece, ancient to modern, or indeed a single volume devoted to the Byzantine empire.⁴⁹ Perhaps he was satisfied, as he had been at the outset of his Byzantine studies, that Finlay had said it all as well as he might, but that seems unlikely. It is more likely that he was satisfied with the contributions of a new generation of scholars, foremost among which was J. B. Bury, fellow and tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, whose first study of Byzantium appeared in 1889.⁵⁰ Bury ended his preface with the observation “Speaking of Mr. Freeman, I am impelled to add that his brilliant and stimulating essays first taught me in all its bearings the truth that the Roman Empire is the key to European history.” Most likely of all, however, is that Freeman had no further interest in presenting the medieval Greeks outside the context he had elaborated for them: as an original, but now superseded strain of the Aryan race, whose potency had been bequeathed to the Teutons, and more particularly to the English.

University of Durham

⁴⁷ E. A. Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History: Six Lectures Read in the University of Oxford in Trinity Term, 1885, with an Essay on Greek Cities under Roman Rule*, London and New York 1886. On the repetition of certain ideas, here referring to a recent lecture delivered in Edinburgh, Freeman explained (pp. v-vi) “I can only say that a thought which is worth suggesting once is worth suggesting twice.”

⁴⁸ See the opening paragraph of E. A. Freeman, “The Tyrants of Britain, Gaul, and Spain, AD 406-411”, *English Historical Review* 1 (1886), pp. 53-85. These were subsequently published as E. A. Freeman, *Four Oxford Lectures 1887: Fifty Years of European History: Teutonic Conquest in Gaul and Britain*, London and New York 1888.

⁴⁹ There are among Freeman’s paper at the John Rylands Library two unfinished, unpublished manuscripts entitled *History of Greece (3/2/2)* and *Little Greek History (3/2/3)*, neither of which stretches beyond the Peloponnesian War. See McNiven, “Handlist”, p. 45.

⁵⁰ J. B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire, from Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.)*, 2 Vols, London and New York 1889. In 1893 Bury saw to the posthumous publication as essays of parts of Freeman’s second volume on the *History of Federal Government*. See also C. Oman, *The Story of the Byzantine Empire*, London and New York 1892, in the popular series *The Story of Nations*. Oman was then a fellow of All Souls, Oxford. On the next generation of British scholars of Byzantium see Averil Cameron, “Bury, Baynes and Toynbee”, in *Through the Looking Glass*, pp. 163-175.

APPENDIX:

The Letters Exchanged by George Finlay and E. A. Freeman
Preserved among the Finlay Papers at the British School at Athens*

1. Letter from G. Finlay to E. A. Freeman, 4 August 1864.

Sources: *Finlay Papers: E.24*, pp. 155-163;¹ *E.33* (no pagination, but one finds the letters pasted on a page marked by the fourth cardboard divider); J. Hussey, *The Finlay Papers: A Catalogue, Oxford and Athens 1973*, p. 143: "Two letters on the State of Greece inserted in the *Daily News*² dated 4 Aug^t & 11 Aug^t 1864." *Ibid.*, p. 169: "Two letters on Greek politics addressed by George Finlay to Edward A. Freeman Esq^f inserted in the *Daily News* without his authority and from their details much to his regret. Dated Aug^t 4 & 11 and inserted in the *Daily News* Aug. 23. 1864."

These letters are not listed in Hussey's index under "Freeman, E. A.", on p. 193. The first letter was transcribed as fully as possible by Hussey from Finlay's onion skin copy,³ glued onto white sheets bound between brown mottle boards. See J. Hussey, *The Journals and Letters of George Finlay*, 2 Vols, Camberley 1995, Vol. II, pp. 815-818. However, Hussey omits the header from the *Daily News*, on p. 155, and provides no cross-reference to volume E.33, where she might have filled in those parts she found impossible to read and found corrections for some misreadings.

*Editorial note: I have endeavoured in transcription to retain as far as possible the style and presentation of the handwritten originals. I have not, therefore, corrected spelling or grammar, nor imposed consistency. I have indicated where corrections have been made by the authors either with single or double strikethrough marks, and adopted superscript where interpolations have been made.

¹ The former classification, which I shall not cite in full for documents hereafter, is R. 8. 19. This referred to shelves in the cupboards in the common room at the British School, in this case next to the fireplace. These marks are no longer useful in locating documents, which are stored in the archive according to Hussey's reclassification of 1973.

² [*London*] *Daily News* (1846-1912) was founded and edited for 17 editions by Charles Dickens. Subsequently edited until 1870 by John Foster, it offered a liberal viewpoint in contradistinction to the *Whig Morning Chronicle*. In 1912 it merged with the *Morning Leader*. Finlay's letters appeared on 23 August 1864. See W. Miller, "George Finlay as a Journalist", *English Historical Review* 39 (1924), pp. 552-567, here p. 553.

³ To make a copy of one's letter one would press a slightly dampened sheet of onion skin paper upon the freshly written text and ink would wick upwards. The resulting copy is often indecipherable, where ink has spread and blurred.

[p. 155]

*Two letters on the state of affairs in Greece from the Daily News. copied into Galignani's Messenger.*⁴ August 26, 1864

~~~~~

"Greek politics

*"The following extracts from the private letters of an eminent English Philhellene<sup>5</sup> have been placed in our hands for publication. Although somewhat free & trenchant in personal criticism, they claim attention as the deliberate and impartial testimony of a shrewd and experienced observer, deeply versed in modern greek [sic]<sup>6</sup> history and politics and a sincere well-wisher to the Greek nation."*

[Remainder transcribed from E.33. For text of E.24, pp. 156-163, consult Hussey, *Journals and Letters, op. cit.*]

*Athens, August 4 1864*

*..... I will now try to give you a correct view of some compartments of Greek politics. To begin with the Crown and King George. The political office and individual occupant are not in accordance. The choice of a boy was bad, and if it were not that the general opinion of the country and the manner in which the administration is conducted strengthen the crown, the selection might be though unlucky. A constitutional king has some duties to perform, or else he is an idle and very expensive pageant, and ought to be dispensed with in a poor and roadless country. Now King George performs no duty, and, what is much worse, is not taking any measures than can fit him for performing his political duty at some future period. By those who are much in his company he is said to have an active and intelligent mind, but his education appears to have been either neglected or mismanaged. He knows little of Greece, past or present, nothing at all of political science or the practice of administration, and has no desire to learn. He does not hold regular cabinet councils, and you know that the cabinet*

<sup>4</sup> *Galignani's Messenger*, an English-language newspaper published daily in Paris from 1814. It continued as *Daily Messenger* from 1884 until it was discontinued in 1904. Finlay's letters were reprinted in its pages on 26 August 1864.

<sup>5</sup> i.e. E. A. Freeman. Finlay evidently mistook these words, written by the editors of the *Daily News*, for Freeman's, and thought they identified him or Sir Richard Church as the author. See below at B6 (120).

<sup>6</sup> Finlay was quite inconsistent in his use of upper-case letters.

*in Greece, as it really ought to be in centralised monarchies, is a recognised constitutional body in the State. All agree that King George is very idle. He thinks seriously of nothing but amusing himself, and his only intellectual pursuit is reading the novels of Paul de Kock and Alexandre Dumas. He has hitherto done no service to Greece except coming to the country; but he has done England a very great service by repudiating all connexion with the British government. There was some danger of English policy getting into an embarrassing position by having the Ottoman empire and the Hellenic kingdom both under its protection. The manner in which King George has treated everything English has set all right. He has kicked English policy out of his palace quite as decidedly and openly as King Otho did. Now, I do not think this is likely to do Greece any harm. It keeps England to her real work, which is looking after the Ottoman empire, and when the day comes that her aid will be useful to the Greeks, I have no doubt that it will be given sincerely and effectually, though the king were as rude and ill-mannered as a king can be. For the present Count Sponneck is held responsible, and justly so, for all the errors of the king, for though the king is major, he is young in mind and experience for his years.*

*Count Sponneck occupies a very important position. He is the king's political adviser, and holds the place openly and avowedly of an irresponsible Prime Minister. With more constitutional knowledge and administrative experience he could easily have created for himself a controlling power as representing the will and duties of the Crown, which would have made his position extremely useful. He seems to be a man of no great experience and a limited capacity. I doubt whether he could ever have been more than a second-rate man even in poor Denmark. There are many Greeks of as much administrative experience, and far more political tact, already in office. He may have some superiority in moral principle, but he has not gained credit even for that generally. He has made one or two false political moves, appealing to inaccurate applications of constitutional principles, and allowing himself to be defeated by his opponents, who applied the principles he put forward more logically. The manner in which he wrote to the Archbishop of Corfu about his silence concerning the demolition of the fortifications at Corfu and the neutrality of the islands made the Greeks of all parties doubt his sincerity. Policy might have been a good reason for silence, but the attempt to spread a calumny against England proved very bad policy. The archbishop believed Sponneck spoke the truth, published the letter, and discovered it was false. I could give you some amusing anecdotes of his animosity to England, but one is always afraid lest the stories have gained by transmission. Of his administrative incapacities we*

have daily proofs, and really the only thing the Greeks wanted from abroad was administrative capacity. Maurer showed them in the judicial branch (in Greece then the most difficult of all) how much administrative knowledge can effect. Sponneck has not even been able to call in public opinion to aid the Crown in enforcing established administrative arrangements. By neglecting to publish the army and navy lists he has allowed the ministers to continue to direct affairs in an arbitrary manner. At present he excuses his delay in organizing the public service by pretending that he is waiting until the Ionian deputies decide to what party in the National Assembly a majority is secured;<sup>7</sup> as if it required a majority in parliament<sup>8</sup> to prepare "Hart's Army List!" I never saw a minister succeed who could not set to work the day he took office with his lever and fulcrum ready.

It would be impossible to give a very correct account of the state of parties or the views of leaders in the National Assembly, for they are in continual change. The court have been endeavouring to give Bulgaris and the Morest party a bad name lately by calling them revolutionarists, but the popular reproach to Bulgaris is that he is far too conservative. He holds fast to all the principles of King Otho's government, and what he seeks is to carry on the administration as prime minister under that system. The constitution is to aid him by enforcing the rule that the king is to reign and not to govern (which I think is twaddle in a centralized monarchy), and that Count Sponneck as alter ego ought to assist the king in doing nothing. In general no party in Greece is more or less attached to one set of principles than another. They all agree in being ready to make great concessions in order to get into office. Even Count Sponneck has been so long in the political atmosphere of Athens that no one seems to be sure whether his policy is liberal or revolutionary, conservative or philorthodox; he acts inconsistently and talks very wildly. Ranares [sic] is a political leader only because various minor bands can form coalitions by making him President of the cabinet. His nullity makes the division of patronage and pelf<sup>9</sup> easier.

Of course everybody is discontented with this state of things, but I think that ultimately it may turn out advantageously for Greece. The prolongation of the administrative disorder that prevails impedes the progress of the country, but on the other hand, the greater part of Greece enjoyed so little administrative order before the revolution that the disorder during the last

---

<sup>7</sup> Hussey, *Journal and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 817, here failed to decipher "secured", rendering it <...>.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, "As if it required a majority in parliament to propose that Army lists <...>".

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 818, Hussey misread "pelf" as "self".

two years have been less injurious than might be supposed, for the revolution removed severe obstructions to progress which were created by the central government. Public opinion is in an unsettled state on all questions that most nearly interest the people, so that there is some advantage in having a weak government. Until most questions, both of central government and local administration, take more definite and practical forms that they have yet assume Greece cannot give herself permanent institutions. Experience is still defective. Even the importance of securing some system of self-government as a means of creating a national union, which the geographical location of the Greek race renders so difficult, is not generally felt. The great idea nourishes a tendency to imperialism, which is an assurance company for the Ottoman empire.

*In my next letter I shall give you some news of the constitution.*

---

2. Letter from G. Finlay to E. A. Freeman, 11 August 1864, inserted by Freeman without Finlay's permission in the *Daily News*.

Sources: *Finlay Papers*: E.24, pp. 165-171; E.33 (as above); *Hussey*, *Finlay Papers*, p. 143 (as above).

Three and one-fifth pages in length, in black ink on the front of white pages, bound between mottled brown boards in notebook E.24. In draft form, the letter contains no indication that it was addressed to Freeman, and perhaps similar letters were sent to several correspondents.

[p. 165]

*Athens 11 August 1864*

*In a letter last week I tried to give you a view of the highest peaks of the political land,<sup>10</sup> I shall now descend to the lower ridges that traverse the whole country. Parties in Greece are in a state of continual movement & change. Every partisan fights as much for his own hand (like Harry [?] Wynd)<sup>11</sup> ##### as for<sup>12</sup> his nominal leader and asserts his right of choosing his station in the fight,<sup>13</sup> generally at the most inconvenient moment for the rest of his party. Lately, however, antipathy to Count Sponneck on the one side, and the hope of using the incapacity of the court as a means of ruling*

---

<sup>10</sup> Published version, E.33, omits "of the political land".

<sup>11</sup> Omitted in E.33.

<sup>12</sup> E.33 has "for the cause of his nominal leader".

<sup>13</sup> E.33 omits "in the fight".

*the country on the other, have divided the National Assembly into two parties. The plain & the mountain.<sup>14</sup> The plain who call themselves the constitutionalist are under the leading of Bulgares.<sup>15</sup> The mountain who call themselves conservatives because they wish to preserve the Othonic system support Count Sponneck.<sup>16</sup> The Ionian deputies have given a dedicated majority to the conservatives, who support the present ministry.<sup>17</sup> Kanares who is prime minister is a mere name & serves only as a bond of union to a number of small parties & as a restraint on individual pretensions to the primiership [sic].<sup>18</sup> He is president of the cabinet & minister of the marine.<sup>19</sup> You are aware that in Greece the cabinet is a recognised constitutional body in the political organization of the monarchy. I think Englishmen overlook frequently the importance of this circumstance which seems to me a necessity in such a government as Greece has. Kanares leads a section of the radicals. The other ministers are Koumounduros of the*

[p. 167]

*interior. He is an able man & possesses considerable influence in the Assembly, and may be considered the leader of the conservatives who wish to perpetuate the centralized system of administration. Theodore Deliyannes the minister of<sup>20</sup> foreign affairs is also an able & influential member of the conservative party; not so able but honest than Koumounduros. Londos the minister of justice is the man who ruined the ministry of Mavrocordatos in 1844 by ordering the gendarmes to interfere in the election of Patras. He has gained neither in experience, influence nor honesty with age. Soteropoulos, the minister of finance is an experienced official and a good minister of routine. He is the nominee of Koumounduros. Major Karnales*

<sup>14</sup> E.33 elides two sentences: “the plain and the Constitutionalists under Bulgaris”.

<sup>15</sup> Finlay’s ninth public letter (E.24, pp. 281-289) to *The Times*, “Question of Confidence between Count Sponneck and Mr. Bulgares and the Letter of Plasteras”, dated 1 September 1864, was published on 10 September. The tone is, of course, quite different to that taken in his private letter to Freeman.

<sup>16</sup> E.33: “because they wish to govern on the Othonic system.”

<sup>17</sup> E.33: “...decided majority to the conservatives, who now unite a section of the radicals under Kanaris.”

<sup>18</sup> E.33 omits this sentence, and extensive editing is clear in the following sentences, which include material from later in the letter, for example “the Russians under Skarlotos Soutzos”; and adds information missing from Finlay’s copy: “the anti-English under Levidhe, the editor of the *Elpis*, and the 80 Ionian deputies.”

<sup>19</sup> E.33 and E.24 begin once again to correspond.

<sup>20</sup> E.33 omits “the minister of” here and below.

the minister of war is the nominee of General Hahn and represents the military system of King Otho, he is a man of neither talent, influence nor reputation, and is regarded as the court or Sponneck nominee through Hahn's ~~influence~~ recommendation.<sup>21</sup> Koumounduros for the present directs Kanares & guides the cabinet. This ministry has more than average talent and perhaps more than average reputation for honesty. Theodore Deliyanni and Soteropoulos are regarded by their countrymen as honest and I have a good opinion of both. Londos I know is worthless and I am told that Kanares is no better.<sup>22</sup> The ministry has also the support of the philorthodox directed by Philemon the Russian party with Skarlatos Soutzos the marshal of the palace and the Athonists with such small assistance as they and Mr Condouriottes can give to Count Sponneck.

The leader of the other party whether it be called

[p. 169]

the plain, the constitutionalists or the outs, is Demetrius Bulgares<sup>23</sup> whom I have already sketched. He has been an Othonistic conservative, a Gallican, and is called just now an Anglican, but he always was & will always remain more of a Bulgarist than anything else. He is a clever, selfish, ambitious and obstinate Albanian who would fain make a political party something like a Skypetar phara [sic].<sup>24</sup> His arrogance and jobbing have lost him his hereditary influence in Hydra, but his powers of intrigue make him the most influential man in the National Assembly. He has been joined by a large section of the radicals or mountain under Grivas and Deligeorges.<sup>25</sup> Deliyorghes,<sup>26</sup> who is now president of the assembly, is a lawyer of Mesolonghi and seems to be the man of most promise among the young greek statesmen. The english clique (Mavrocordatos, Tricouphe [sic], Dosios, Dros, &c)<sup>27</sup> also supports Bulgares at present, though rather sulkily, more from hatred of Sponneck than deference to the party influence of Bulgares

---

<sup>21</sup> E.33: "Karnales, War, a major of neither talent, influence nor reputation. He is the court or Sponneck nominee through Hahn's recommendation."

<sup>22</sup> E.33 incorporates this final section into the earlier revisions.

<sup>23</sup> E.33: "...D. Bulgares [sic], who has been an Othonistic conservative..."

<sup>24</sup> E.33: "Skypetarphara".

<sup>25</sup> E.33: "Griva and Deliyorghes".

<sup>26</sup> Hussey, *Journals and Letters*, Vol. I, p. xiii: "George Finlay's spelling was frequently erratic and faulty. He was notoriously inconsistent particularly in spelling place and personal names, and two versions of a word might appear in the same sentence. This is partly due to his failure to have any consistent system of transliteration for Greek words..."

<sup>27</sup> E.33 omits names.



*himself, and it holds itself ready to be bought off as usual under any conservative pretext which may promise official advantages.<sup>28</sup> Bulgares is so domineering and selfish that his accession to power as president of the council<sup>29</sup> is viewed with distrust by some of the ablest men who act with his party in the Assembly, from his always endeavouring to fill his cabinet with his own creatures. He is jealous of talent and so Othonic in his electioneering tactics<sup>30</sup> that he is one of the strongest administrative conservatives and is as much opposed to a free municipal system &<sup>31</sup> local self government as<sup>32</sup> Koumounduros.*

*The discussion of the constitution was commenced*

[p. 171]

*yesterday and it is generally thought that it will last three months. Some talk of finishing the constitution<sup>33</sup> with the year. I fear it will be a mere repetition of that of 1844 without any attempt to give the people local institutions or to raise the law above the administration.<sup>34</sup>*

---

3. E. A. Freeman to G. Finlay, 25 September 1864.

*Sources: Finlay Papers: B6 (120); Hussey, Finlay Papers, p. 84: "Regrets any offence he may have caused by publishing GF's letter in the Daily News. Comments on new Greek constitution. Is reviewing Palgrave. Queries on English in Byzantine imperial guard. 6 pp."*

Loose letter. On folded, light grey notepaper, small embossed crest in top centre (lion rampant emerging from crown, holding shield with small cross of St George). Transcribed in full by J. Hussey, *Journals and Letters*, Vol. II, pp. 818-820.

---

<sup>28</sup> E.33 omits "which may promise official advantages".

<sup>29</sup> E.33 omits "of the council".

<sup>30</sup> E.33 reads: "so eager for electioneering tactics".

<sup>31</sup> E.33 omits: "a free municipal system &".

<sup>32</sup> E.33 inserts "his rival".

<sup>33</sup> E.33 reads "it with the year".

<sup>34</sup> E.33 inserts "I have not left myself time to say more..."

Somerleaze, Wells, September  
25th, 1864

My dear Mr. Finlay,

I trust I did not do wrong in putting your letters into the Daily News. If we were not at two opposite ends of Europe I should ~~have~~ of course not do such a thing without your distinct leave. As it was, I was obliged to act on my own judgement. I thought that the letters contained information which I ought not to keep to myself, and that, if they were to do any good, it would not do to wait till I could write to you and hear again. I hope I did not judge wrongly, but I am afraid from your letter

[p. 2]

that I may have done otherwise. That is, that I may have caused you some personal ~~an~~ annoyance, for I cannot but think that the public result must be good. Pray forgive me. But I don't understand about either you or Church<sup>35</sup> being indicated as the author. The few words attached to the letter were the Editors and not mine,<sup>36</sup> but I am sure they were not meant to have any such meaning.

I have read the Constitution, and I am reading the remarks of Diomédès Kyriakos, which, as far as I have got, seem very sensible indeed. Free all Greeks are equal before the

[p. 3]

law - but does that mean that public officers can be proceeded against just like other men? For I have learned from you that that is the real difference between and good and a bad Government. I am also studying the proceedings of the last Landesgemeinde in Glarus, which I could not stay for in May because of the Schools. I cannot understand the way in which some people despise the affairs of small staes. To me the affairs of France ~~Greece~~ and Glarus have an inherent interest as parts of the study of man; while France and Austria only interest one as a Wild beast interests one; you want

---

<sup>35</sup> Sir Richard Church (1784-1873), whose papers in 29 volumes are now in the British Library, including his correspondence with Finlay (Add. MSS. 36566 ff. 42-58). For copies of Finlay's 22 letters to Church, his tenant, requesting payment of rent arrears (1852-1858), see Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, pp. 71-72.

<sup>36</sup> See above E.24, p. 155.

[p. 4]

to understand its nature that you may know how to knock it on the head or get out of its way. Your Diomédês, I see, called LRB *дбѣмъныйт ВнЮс*, an ambiguous description according to which sense of *дбѣмън* you take.

I have just finished an article on Palgraves [sic] two posthumous *for Saturday [Review] volumes*.<sup>37</sup> I had so much to say about England that I could barely glance at the Chapter which most concerns you, that on the *First Crusades*. I cannot bring myself to look on the Crusades generally as just a scheme for dividing the Byzantine Empire, tho' doubtless a few crafty fellows like Bohemond may

[p. 5]

well have had such ideas. But I have not gone at all into contemporary literature of the Crusades, so perhaps I ought not to speak. I wish I knew more about the English in the Imperial service. If they kept up their language so long as is generally said, how ~~would~~ <sup>was</sup> the race kept up. You have them in 1204. Had there been new Englishmen come over or were they descendants of the first lot? And how far and how long did they keep themselves distinct from the Greeks?

I will send Hahn's papers to Macmillan as soon as I get them.<sup>38</sup>

[p. 6]

I should much like to know something of what has really happened in *МнѣднѣлѣчѣЯб*. I don't believe a soul in England understands a word about anything of the kind, except Lord Strangford, who is first in England.

Believe me very truly yours,  
Edward A Freeman

<sup>37</sup> See note 17 in the above article.

<sup>38</sup> One presumes this refers to English translations by Finlay of Hahn's papers on Troy, one of which Freeman sent to C. T. Newton, for whom see note 52 below. No paper by Hahn appears in *Macmillan's Magazine* in 1864 or 1865. Freeman may also be referring to his publisher, Alexander Macmillan, but in that case one must imagine a book-length manuscript of collected papers.

4. Letter from G. Finlay to E. A. Freeman, 16 March 1865.

Sources: *Finlay Papers: E.25*, pp. 57-65; *Hussey, Finlay Papers*, pp. 144-147, here p. 145: "Letter to Mr Freeman 16 March 1865".

Bound letter. Elegant script, but copy is in fading, spreading ink on light blue onion skin paper, which renders much of the writing very hard to decipher. All sheets are attached to glossy white leaves bound between brown mottle boards. The spine is inscribed in black ink in Finlay's hand: "Letters on Greek Affairs 1865". Now also marked E.25 in pencil.

Athens 16 March 1865

Dear Mr Freeman

*I have not written lately Because [sic] I thought you could use the letters of "our own correspondent"<sup>39</sup> in "The Times" which contained as much information as it was in my power to cram into a letter. The difficulties of the present government are steadily increasing and in my opinion they arose entirely from administrative incapacity & official bad-will. The vicious conduct of the men in uniform and the defects of the constitution are the principal source of all the [suits?] that now afflict Greece. Everybody saw the abuses that require immediate reform. Every man who obtains powers increases the strength of these abuses. And the [lack?] of [...] municipal institutions renders public opinion powerless.*

*I shall not attempt to do more than send you some personal anecdotes, for politics are an affair of personalities at Athens. As a friend of the two Trikoupes you must have seen the conduct of old Trikoupes in the proceedings of Prince Julies of (Un)Glücksburg, with regret. I always expected him to be [ousted?] by his selfishness when the [thing is .....?]*

[p. 2, stamped in the lower right-hand corner "263"]

2

*His conduct no longer affects the reputation of what is called the english [sic] party. Indeed no diplomat more keeps aloof from all parties & is known to be equally ready to assist any minister who will attempt to reform abuses. I might I think say nearly the same of the other foreign ministers at present, – alike to them [Morcello/Martello] or [Connors?] – a [Grandenigo or a Fossario/Fassacio?]*

---

<sup>39</sup> The closing quotation mark is missing. Finlay was aware of his role as provider of first-hand information on matters Greek, Balkan and Ottoman, and refers frequently to himself as "Your own correspondent" in letters to friends.

*A discussion in the national assembly ratified the position of Count Sponneck as perfectly constitutional. Though by passing to the order of the day it avoided a division on the question whether a communication he held with the [Assembly?] of Corfu before the Union without the knowledge of the minister of F.affairs was not unconstitutional. Towards the end of the assembly & after the constitution was voted, Count Sponneck wished the assembly to vote the budget of [...] This was to avoid [...]ing the [...] of the country for a year. There should be no doubt that the national composed largely of deputies from [...]a[.] who passed no taxes but drew large salaries in many cases, could not vote the taxes after the duties for which the assembly had been called were performed. [...] [...] if a majority consisting of the true*

[p. 3]

3

*representatives of the active constituencies would not attend and rendered it impossible for the government to form a house. At this constitutional crisis the man who stepped forward as an independent representative to cut the threat of the constitution [just noted?] was Trikoupes deputy for Manchester. He persuaded Mavrocordatos to accompany him, to Bulgares & as Count Sponneck's agent endeavoured to show Bulgares the advantages to be obtained for "the politicals" by allowing the government to form a house. Bulgares remained firm. He said to his friends that he was not going to violate the constitution to make young Trikoupes minister at Constantinople, which was expected by the calumnious tongues of Athens to be the price offered by the government for the supplies of 1865. The memory of the deputy of Manchester may be short. His son is not minister at Constantinople and he as one of the seven champions of greek liberty, informed poor Prince Julius that the position of Count S is unconstitutional. You can easily understand that this conduct of men who have any facility of studying politics must cause the greeks to look on their old states-*

[p. 4, stamped in the lower right-hand corner "264"]

4

*men with feelings of contempt and aversion. Few of them are likely to enter the new chamber of representatives if it meet without a new revolution.*

*You remember perhaps that the publication of the unlucky letters was very ill received at court. The policy of King Otho was attempted & it was decided that no courtier was to know that there was a person named Finlay*

*in Greece. But times are changed & it seems it would not answer now as it did formerly. So on the 2<sup>nd</sup> [last?] Count Sponneck very unexpected [sic] called on me for the first time. He commenced by saying that he believed he had been guilty of neglect in not calling on me sooner but with courteous phrases hoped that I would forgive him. I replied that I had not the slightest pretension to claim a visit as due from one in his position, being only a private foreigner residing at Athens. As I had no position which authorised me to claim a visit as a right I had nothing to forgive and I was happy to have the honour of receiving his visit. After some desultory conversation in which he let out that he knew very little about Greece during the revolution & that he had not got up my connection with the country, which gave me the*

[p. 5]

5

*occasion of informing him that I came to Greece in 1823, am now the oldest english philhellen, the builder of the first house (at Egina) during the government of Capodistrius & the first foreigner who purchased an estate in Greece after the Turks were authorised to sell their property in Attica and Euboea. He then as people seem to do invariably began to talk politics, glancing rather carelessly from one to subject to another. The conversation was carried on with ease & as much freedom as if one had had a dozen conversations before.*

*Among other things we spoke of brigandage which I told the Count caused me more alarm than the state of parties. It appears to be again becoming a [.....]cal institution and the government is powerless to suppress it even in Attica. I said that the conviction was general that the brigands are supported and protected by powerful men in Athens. C. S said that he could not admit that such a thing was possible. That it was so strongly the interest of the present ministers to suppress brigandage, that he felt convinced that they did every thing in their power to extirpate it. Their reputation suffered & even if they had no*

[p. 6, stamped in the lower right-hand corner "265"]

6

*sense of honour, their instinct would compel them to exert themselves to the utmost for it was their interest that Greece should be well governed. I replied that I am so much of an englishman [sic] that I do not believe that general principles produce much practical effect on individual conduct in politics. Nobody had a stronger interest that Greece should be well governed than*

*King Otho & yet with good intentions he continued to govern it most abominably simply because he would not allow facts to come to his knowledge in such a way as to produce convictions. I denied as public opinion does that the minister of the interior (for, I said, things became clearer when issues give arguments [precision?]) Mr Koumoundouros acts on the principle that his first duty is to suppress brigandage. He is the leader of a party and as leader of a party his first duty is to keep himself in office in order that his partisans may enjoy their due share of government patronage. To suppress brigandage is a very secondary affair. Now it is the general conviction of the landed proprietors and peasants that men in power whose support is necessary to make the party of Koumoundouros profit[?] at the coming elections, protect the brigands in Attica and Koumoundouros thinks*

[p. 7]

*it more for his interest to avoid examining the subject than to act vigorously ag. the brigands. The fact is that the brigands unmolested and 300 paid men without discipline & without regular officers are dispersed over all Attica who can control the elections but who do not pursue the brigands & who [.....] to the municipal elections.*

*The Count remained more than an hour. I have not seen him since as when I called at the palace to return his visit he was engaged with the french minister Count de Gobineau.*

*I enclose the impression of an Achaian coin which appears to give the name of a new town in a different position from that in which the name of the town is usually found. I have shown it to Mr Lambros who following the suggestion of Col. Leake concerning the coin reading [.....] supposes this may be a coin of Polyrrenia [sic] in Crete. I think [...] the [c.....] that all the Achaian money was coined to pay the league troops or for league expenditure and therefore the Polyrrenians might coin Achaian money.*

*(Polybius. IV.53.55.)<sup>40</sup> The coin may interest Mr Warren<sup>41</sup> but it is not well enough formed [?] to make it decisive, so we must wait with*

---

<sup>40</sup> Polybius IV, pp. 53-55, concerns affairs in Crete, where “the Cnossians in alliance with the Gortynians had subjected the whole of Crete with the exception of Lyttus”, but several peoples later joined with Lyttus, including “the people of Polyrrenia, Ceraeae, Lappa, Horium and Arcadia”. Subsequently, “the Polyrrenians...sent envoys to the League requesting their assistance and alliance. The Achaeans and Philip hereupon received them into the general confederacy and sent them as support four hundred Illyrians under the command of Plator, two hundred Achaeans and one hundred Phocians.” See *Polybius, the Histories*, ed. and transl. W. R. Paton, Cambridge, MA, 1954, Vol. II, pp. 426-33.

<sup>41</sup> On Warren see note 58 below.

[p. 8]

patience for the discovery of a similar in better preservation.

Among the celebrities here at present we have M. Renan<sup>42</sup> who is following the footsteps (not really in them I suppose) of the Apostles. I set him yesterday to read the section on the areiopagus in Ahrens de Athenarum statu politico et litterario<sup>43</sup> for the attributions of the courts during the first [.....]

Yours sincerely  
George Finlay

---

5. G. Finlay to E. A. Freeman, 27 September 1866.

Sources: *Finlay Papers: B6 (149)*; Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 87: "Asks F to get Count de Gobineau's letter stating his views on cuneiform writing published in Macmillan's Magazine. This was originally sent to Fraser's Magazine but did not appear, possibly through influence of Col. Rawlinson whose views differ from those of G. 2 pp."

Loose draft letter. Two pages of off-white notepaper, cut to different lengths, writing on front only. This is clearly a first draft that Finlay will have cleaned up in rewriting.

athens 27 Sep<sup>r</sup> 1866

My dear Freeman

I take great liberties I presume I fear too much on the kindness ~~you have~~ with which you have so long ~~shown to me~~ treated me. I have now to lay before you a case ~~in which~~ to obtain your good offices if you think they can be useful. You are probably well acquainted with / ~~some of~~ the works of Count de

---

<sup>42</sup> Ernest Renan (1823-1892), who had recently published his *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques*, Paris 1863. He was then engaged on his multi-volume *Histoires des origines du Christianisme* (1863-1881) and would shortly after this letter was sent publish his *Prière sur l'Acropole*, Paris 1865.

<sup>43</sup> F. H. L. Ahrens, *De Athenarum statu politico et litterario inde ab Achaici foederis interitu usque ad Antoninorum tempora*, Göttingen 1829. Finlay's own copy, at the British School at Athens, is the first work of nine bound into a volume marked *Collectanea de rebus Rom. et Byza*. The pages devoted to the Areopagus (pp. 34-39, De Areopago) are unmarked.

<sup>44</sup> Joseph Arthur, Comte de Gobineau (1816-1882), author of the infamous tract *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*, 4 Vols, Paris 1853-1855, who was mentioned in Finlay's earlier letter to Freeman as being in a meeting with Count Sponeck when Finlay came to call.



Gobineau<sup>44</sup> who was lately french minister in Persia and has now been minister at Athens for about two years. His work *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* called forth a work ~~by~~ in German by Pott which I ~~possessed~~ before I knew the Count an account of some observations on the Albanians.<sup>45</sup> But ~~the~~ what the Germans call linguistic is the great [sic] object of Gobineau studies and / he is I believe an excellent orientalist scholar the and Col Rawlinson hold very different opinions concerning cuneiform writing / ~~and the languages written with the character~~ Now sometime ago a review ~~of one of Gobineau's works~~ appeared in *Frazer's Magazine*<sup>46</sup> in which he thinks his views are not clearly stated. about four months

[p. 2]

ago he sent ~~a state~~[ment?] a letter to the editor of *Frazer* [sic] giving a statement of his ~~views~~ views in French but he authorized its translation - He read it to me and though I understand nothing about arrow heads either for writing or for bows long or short. I thought it a very clear and agreeable statement of opinion inviting examination without being either controversial or argumentative. Just such a letter as I fancied might from its style & ~~matter~~ find a place. Gobineau now thinks that Rawlinson / ~~avoids discussion of [the/that his?]~~<sup>47</sup> influence prevents its publication, ~~and he wishes his opinions~~ He imagines Rawlinson ~~would fain persuade the world that the wish~~ avoids discussion and would fain keep the world ignorant of ~~what much~~ be said ~~ag[ains]t~~ his opinions. In this he the case <sup>Gobineau</sup> ~~he~~ has a claim to be heard. Now I wish to ask you if you think that it is ~~at all~~ at all likely

<sup>45</sup> This is one of several inelegant sentences, but the meaning is always clear enough.

<sup>46</sup> Anon., "Cuneiform Inscriptions – Gobineau Versus Rawlinson", *Frazer's Magazine for Town and Country* 82 (November 1865), pp. 589-613. *Frazer's Magazine for Town and Country* (London: James Fraser, 1830-1869); new series (London: Longman, 1869-1882); continued by *Longman's Magazine* (London: Longman, 1883-1905), was founded as a polemical Tory publication, but by the 1860s had become far tamer. See P. Leary, "Fraser's Magazine and the Literary Life, 1830-1847", *Victorian Periodicals Review* 27/ii (Summer 1994), pp. 105-26. *Fraser's*, like *Macmillan's* cited below, published numerous articles on eugenics, notably those by Francis Galton. A useful conspectus is offered by J. A. Field, "The Progress of Eugenics", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 26/1 (November 1911), pp. 1-67. See also L. F. Ward, "Eugenics, Euthenics, and Eudemics", *American Journal of Sociology* 18/vi (May 1913), pp. 737-754.

<sup>47</sup> The ink is here smudged and quite illegible.

<sup>48</sup> *Macmillan's Magazine* (London: Macmillan, 1859-1907), on which see G. J. Worth, *Macmillan's Magazine 1859-1907: "No Flippancy or Abuse Allowed"*, Burlington, VT, 2003, summarised by L. K. Uffelman in *Victorian Periodicals Review* 39/1 (Spring 2006),

that Gobineau could get his letter inserted in *Macmillan Magazine*,<sup>48</sup> if its style & Matter he approved. He is now engaged on a history of Persia of which he has completed the first volume and I think he wants ~~the~~ his opinions on cuneiform inscriptions discussed before its publication.

[On reverse of p. 2 in Finlay's own hand:]

SP Letter to Freeman

27 Sep 1866

Count de Gobineau's letter to

Frazer's Mag.

---

Addendum: Additional Materials among the Finlay Papers  
Relating to E. A. Freeman

6. C. T. Newton to G. Finlay, 25 November 1864, mentions Freeman as intermediary.

Sources: *Finlay Papers: B6 (121)*; Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 84: "Decision of Royal Society of Literature to publish Hahn's paper in its Transactions. Thanks to GF for political news. 2 pp."

Loose letter. Blue notepaper, folded; handwriting spidery, barely legible.<sup>49</sup>

*British Museum*

*Nov. 25. 1864*

*My dear Finlay,*

*I was about to write to you today when your letter of Nov. 17 arrived. I have to tell you that Dr. von Hahn's paper, forwarded to me thro' Freeman, has been duly read at the Royal Society of Literature, and, as soon [as] you give us the author's permission, shall be printed in the Society's transactions,<sup>50</sup> and the Plans engraved, G. Finlay Esq.*

---

pp. 88-90. If Freeman tried, he evidently failed to have Gobineau's letter inserted, for it does not appear in subsequent fascicles of *Macmillan's*. One notes, however, an essay urging further and closer perusal of Gobineau's work by the Hon. Robert Lytton, "Philosophy in Cuneiform", *Macmillan's Magazine* 15 (November 1866 - April 1867), pp. 499-509.

<sup>49</sup> Evidently, Finlay had replied to Freeman's letter of 25 September 1864, and they remained on friendly terms. This letter is not in the archive (or easily to be found there). Finlay will have included with the letter to Freeman Hahn's paper, which was forwarded to Newton and read at the event stated.

<sup>50</sup> In fact, Hahn's paper did not appear in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of*

[p. 2]

*Spratt has promised to read it over & Vaux<sup>51</sup> will [keep?] her to it.*

*Thank you for your letter the political part of which is very interesting. I will not write more now being very busy except to reciprocate your kind remembrances to yourself and Mrs. Finlay.*

*Yours ever sincerely*

*C. T. Newton<sup>52</sup>*

7. Letter from J. Leicester Warren to G. Finlay, 14 April 1867, mentions Freeman's travels and provides news on sales and reviews of two of his recent books.

*Sources: Finlay Papers: B6 (151);<sup>53</sup> Hussey, Finlay Papers, p. 87: "Discusses GF's numismatic paper with de Salis who is sending GF a series of notes when the Blacas and Ramsay collections are arranged. Freeman in Normandy; vol i of his Norman Conquest well received. In the Pall Mall Gazette Stratford praises GF's letters from Athens. 4 pp."*

*Literature of the United Kingdom*, 2nd series, VIII (1866), in which are published selected papers read between 1863 and 1866, including two by C. T. Newton himself.

<sup>51</sup> W. S. W. Vaux, Honorary Secretary of the Royal Society of Literature.

<sup>52</sup> Sir Charles Thomas Newton (1816-1894), Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum; Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 196, has: "1805-1897, archaeologist".

<sup>53</sup> Finlay's letter, to which this is the reply, is missing. An earlier letter from Finlay to Warren, dated 28 December 1865, is preserved in a copy in Finlay's hand pasted into volume C.17, between pages 61 and 63, for which see Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 123. This offers observations on coins of the Achaean League, and encouragement to Warren to write a paper on that subject. Warren had already published *The Copper Coinage of the Achaean League*, London 1864. Finlay subsequently published his *Thoughts about the Coinage of the Achaean League*, London 1866, a 15-page pamphlet, which appeared like Warren's paper under the auspices of the Numismatic Society of London. It offered also "A Supplement to Mr Warren's Catalogue of the Copper Coins of the Achaean League". Offprints of both papers are contained in a small blue bound volume, C.16, for which see Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 123. One may also consult the handwritten version of Finlay's paper, "Observations on the coinage of the Achaean League", dated 1865, at C.17, pp. 48-60. The latter begins "Mr Freeman says the Achaean League was essentially a national government and points out very clearly that this was the case." It proceeds to observe that "Mr Leicester Warren[']s 'An essay on Greek federal coinage'...is appended to Mr Freeman's great work 'The history of Federal Governments'." Thus the connections between the three men and their interests are revealed. The published version of the paper contains the same information somewhat edited for style.

Loose letter. One sheet of off-white paper, folded in half, with writing on four sides. White and quite brittle with faded black ink on front and back and darker ink showing through from inner pages.

Ap. 14th 1867.  
32<sup>a</sup> Brook St  
London.

My dear Mr. Finlay,

I only break my prolonged silence  
on the subject of your paper<sup>54</sup> ...

[two pages omitted]

[p. 3]

[...]

Freeman is off in Normandy visiting the birth place of the Conqueror &c. His "Norman Conquest" vol 1.<sup>55</sup> is just out & has been very favourably received by the press. I trust the popularity of this

[p. 4]

work may have a retrospective action for good on the sluggish sale of the "Federations"<sup>56</sup> I have heard nothing of Hughes lately. Stratford<sup>57</sup> has

---

<sup>54</sup> This is evidently a paper on Roman coinage which Finlay has submitted in draft form to his friend and fellow numismatist for review. It may have been a revised version of appendix II to the second edition of Finlay's *Greece under the Romans* (1857), "On Roman and Byzantine Money", some parts of which appear to have been preserved, under the heading "The Depreciation of the Roman Coinage", on loose leaves in an envelope kept with C.17. One must be careful not to conflate the leaves with those of two copies of a letter addressed to Professor Comnos "On the value and denomination of an inedited coin ascribed to Athens". Only the latter is listed in Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 123.

<sup>55</sup> *The History of the Norman Conquest of England: Its Causes and its Results*, Vol. I: *The Preliminary History to the Election of Edward the Confessor*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867.

<sup>56</sup> E. A. Freeman, *History of Federal Government, from the Foundation of the Achaian League to the Disruption of the United States*, Vol. I, London 1863. The only volume to appear, this was republished at the initiative of J. B. Bury, with a new chapter on Italy and a fragment on Germany, as *The History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy*, London and New York 1893. See note 50 in the above article.

<sup>57</sup> Stratford Canning, 1st Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe (1786-1880), long-time British ambassador to the Sublime Porte, from which position he resigned in 1858. A contributor to the *Pall Mall Gazette* from its foundation in February 1865, Stratford was also the author

written a good deal lately in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in praise of your letters from Athens. I mention this, as possibly you may not see this paper at Athens.

Believe me,

My dear Mr. Finlay  
yours very faithfully  
J. L. Warren<sup>58</sup>: I

- 
8. Letter from G. Finlay to J. C. McCoan, dated 17 November 1868, requests that a paper by Finlay, if published, be sent to Freeman, and alludes to his lack of success in a recent parliamentary election.

Sources: *Finlay Papers*: E.28, pp. 193, 194, 195-205;<sup>59</sup> Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 155, under "Nov<sup>r</sup> 17. The political relations of Greece and Turkey. Leading article in N<sup>o</sup> [Levant Herald] of 2 Dec<sup>r</sup> 1868."

Draft on fine onion skin tracing paper, bluish-grey. Bound volume. The letter is transcribed in full in Hussey, *Journals and Letters*, Vol. II, p. 838, with a copy of the attached essay "The political relations of Greece &

---

of numerous letters to *The Times*, and of five books, including the posthumous essay collection *The Eastern Question*, London 1881. One notes that in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of 27 January 1871, "Xenos" wrote of Finlay "He has often shown himself the true friend and sound adviser of the Greek people. But he is also...a most consistent and determined critic and satirist of all Greek governments in succession." Quoted by Miller, "Finlay as a Journalist", p. 555. The *Pall Mall Gazette* was incorporated into the [*London*] *Evening Standard* in 1923.

<sup>58</sup> John Byrne Leicester Warren (1835-1895), 3rd Baron de Tabley, numismatist, poet and novelist.

<sup>59</sup> There was some confusion as to where this letter and attachment are located in the archive. A reference at the foot of Hussey's transcription (p. 838) places the letter (and attachment?) in bound volume E.29, but in her *Finlay Papers*, p. 155, Hussey locates the article in bound volume E.28, where it is indeed to be found, handwritten with the letter attached as p. 194. In Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 195, the sole index reference to "McCoan, James Carlile (1829-1904), author and journalist", refers the reader to p. 159. However, there is no mention of McCoan on that page, which covers entries in both volumes E.29 (loose letters) and E.30 (start of bound volume). However, there is a second letter to McCoan bound into the second numbered segment of E.29 (the first numbered segment ends at p. 156), at p. 70, immediately before an essay on "The State of the Hellenic Kingdom, June 30, 1869", submitted to the *Levant Herald*. This may explain the confusion. It is listed in Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 158. One might, therefore, correct the McCoan index entry to pp. 155, 158.

Turkey". It is, in fact, addressed properly to "J. C. McCoan, Esq", not to I. C. McCoan, as Hussey indicates.

[p. 193, plain white sheet with the following title:]

---

*The political relations of Greece and Turkey*

17 Nov<sup>r</sup> 1868

*Leading articles of Levant Herald*

2 Dec<sup>r</sup> 1868

[p. 194]

J. C. McCoan, Esq<sup>r</sup>

*My dear Sir*

*I wrote you on the 10<sup>th</sup> inst & Events have enabled me to try my hand at a leading article. It is perhaps too long. If it suits otherwise you may curtail it to the necessary length. I am anxious that my writing in the Levant Herald should be concealed especially from your correspondent at Athens.*

Athens 15<sup>7</sup> Nov<sup>r</sup> 1868

~~Yours~~

*If you insert this article you would oblige me and I think do some service to the Levant Herald if you would send a copy to "The Marquis of Lorne, M.P., Inverary Castle Argyllshire & another to Edward A. Freeman Esq<sup>r</sup>, ~~not~~ not yet I fear M.P. / Somerleaze Wells Somerset.*

Y<sup>rs</sup> s<sup>ij</sup><sup>r</sup>

G.F

---

9. Offprint: An extensive review of E. A. Freeman's *History of Federal Government*, in German.

Sources: *Finlay Papers: C6 (4)*; Hussey, *Finlay Papers*, p. 123.

Wilhelm Vischer, *Ueber E. A. Freemans History of Federal Government* (Besonderer Abdruck aus dem Schweizerischen Museum, 1864), 48 pp.

---

10. Newspaper cutting: A letter from E. A. Freeman to a newspaper on "The Educational Franchise", dated 8 January 1868.

*Sources: Finlay Papers: E.29; Hussey, Finlay Papers, p. 159.*

Loose cuttings from newspapers placed in front of the bound volume, including one headed: THE EDUCATIONAL FRANCHISE, a letter to the editor of a newspaper from "Edward A. Freeman, Lanrumney, Cardiff, 8 January 1858". Freeman protests the misrepresentation of his views expressed in an earlier letter by one Jelinger Symons. Hussey identifies the newspaper as the *Evening Star*, based on a further cutting from that newspaper dated 6 January 1868. However, to my eye the typeface and header seem identical to that employed in the *Levant Herald [Daily Bulletin]*. A copy dated Thursday, 24 June 1869, is contained in the same batch of cuttings.